

Summary of Submissions:

The tables below summarise the comments received during the advertising period of the proposal, together with the City's response to each comment.

Comments Received in Support:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Landscaping and Materials</u></p> <p>The landscaping and materials has been addressed from the previous application.</p>	Noted.
<p><u>Right of Way Widening</u></p> <p>The widening to Florence Place to facilitate appropriate parking is appreciated.</p>	Noted.
<p><u>Building Height</u></p> <p>No concerns regarding the wall height of 6.6m to Unit 2.</p>	Noted.

Comments Received Neither Support or Object:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Dividing Fences</u></p> <p>The existing boundary fencing between the subject site and western boundary is damaged. The high parapet walls to Units 3 and 4 area considered to be appropriate measures for fencing, however the remaining fencing in poor condition should be replaced.</p>	<p>The comments regarding the heights of the boundary walls being appropriate are noted.</p> <p>Dividing fences are a civil matter between the two parties. It is recommended that the replacement fencing be discussed between the two landowners.</p>

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Street Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development should comply with the street setback requirements and is not aligned with the other properties on the street. • The reduced front setback will result in overlooking to adjoining properties. • Development presents as overcrowded and the orientation of the development is a poor design outcome. • Lack of green within front setback does not contribute to the streetscape and is not in keeping with local properties. 	<p>The development is considered to be appropriately setback as there is adequate landscaping between the proposed development and the streetscape which will assist in reducing the impact of building bulk as viewed from the street.</p> <p>Although proposing a variation to the street setback, the proposed development will be located 2m behind the adjoining dwelling to the east and behind the carport of the adjoining property to the west and as such is considered to be an appropriate distance from the street. Furthermore, the angle of the lot sees street setback increase in distance from the lot boundary.</p> <p>The development has been design to allow for access from the primary street too all units via a corridor between the dwellings. This access way assists in reducing the bulk of the development as viewed from the street.</p> <p>The development complies with the deemed-to-comply standards of the Residential Design Codes in relation to visual privacy and as such the potential of overlooking and resultant loss of privacy is reduced.</p>

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As no landscaping is provided this will increase the heat island effect. Lack of landscaping is inconsistent with the streetscape. 	<p>The landscaping proposed within the streetscape is considered to positively contribute to the existing streetscape, particularly as the immediate adjoining properties to the east and west have little to no landscaping within their front setbacks.</p> <p>It is noted that the development achieves the deep soil requirement of 15 percent as identified in the City's Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form. Administration have noted that 30 percent canopy coverage can be achieved on site and recommend this be a condition should Council approve the development, with 25.3 percent proposed at present.</p>
<p><u>Building Height</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The increase in building height will create overshadowing and overlooking to adjoining properties. The height increase is not in keeping with the locality. 	<p>The proposed building height will not result in any adverse overshadow or overlooking to adjoining properties as the orientation of the lot allows for the overshadow to be cast predominantly within the lot boundary and to the right of way. The visual privacy and overshadowing meet the deemed-to-comply standards of Clause 5.4.1 and 5.4.2 of the R Codes.</p> <p>The proposed height is considered appropriate in the locality with there being numerous two and three storey developments in the area. The proposed increase in height will not have an adverse impact on the streetscape, with the variation being to Unit 2 and lower than the concealed roof height of 7.0m to Unit 1.</p>
<p><u>Setbacks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant height departure for lot boundary will and will impact on the streetscape and surrounding cottage homes. Increased boundary wall height will cause shadow to the adjoining properties and affect ventilation. 	<p>The proposed boundary wall heights to Unit 2 have been reduced from that advertised and result in a height variation of 0.2metres to the maximum and 0.55 metres to the average. The increase in height is not considered to have an adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoining property in terms of building bulk as the façade abutting the dwellings incorporates various finishes and materials.</p> <p>The proposed increase to boundary wall heights are considered to be acceptable and not have any adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoining properties, particularly in regards to overshadowing and ventilation as the orientation of the lot allows for the overshadow to be cast predominantly within the lot boundary and to the right of way. These boundary walls are also located behind the street setback area and are designed so as to have little to no impact on any major openings or habitable spaces of the surrounding properties and as such will have limited impact on the desired streetscape and adjacent properties.</p>

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Traffic and Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Florence Place is a narrow right of way (ROW) which already cannot accommodate the number of dwellings using the access way.• There are poor sight lines from the development to the ROW.• Traffic congestion is an issue within the ROW, and the development will further add to the issue of parking within the area.	<p>The proposed access from Florence Place is considered appropriate and mitigates the impact of crossovers to Vincent Street which is identified by the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage as an Other Regional Road with high volumes of traffic.</p> <p>Vehicle manoeuvring has been assessed by Administration and the sight lines and access areas provided are sufficient. Furthermore, the development does not require visitor parking to be provided in accordance with the R Codes and sufficient parking has been provided for each dwelling.</p>
<p><u>Outdoor Living Areas</u></p> <p>The outdoor living spaces lead to dark unusable spaces.</p>	<p>The outdoor living areas (OLA) have been orientated to have access to northern sun and ventilation. The proposed useable area of the outdoor living areas are consistent with the requirements of the R Codes. The OLA's are also located adjacent to habitable rooms of the respective dwellings to allow for additional usable areas.</p>

Note: Submissions are considered and assessed by issue rather than by individual submitter.