

## 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 Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Streetscape</u></p> <p>Concerns raised in regards to the bulk and scale of the addition. The addition is not considered to preserve or enhance the existing streetscape. Submissions note that the materials used are not <i>'in keeping'</i> with the surrounding houses.</p>	<p>The development has setback the upper level addition 10.7 metres from the primary street, which exceeds the deemed-to-comply street setback requirement of 6.0 metres. The increased setback is considered to further reduce the visual impact of the lot boundary setback variation when viewed from the street. The proposal has also incorporated additional landscaping within the front setback area. The proposed palm tree and the established frangipani tree will provide additional screening to the second storey addition from the street.</p>
<p><u>Setbacks</u></p> <p>North</p> <p>Concerns raised in regards to the impact of the proposed upper level northern setbacks. Submissions highlight that the proposed setback will create unacceptable bulk to the adjoining property. Submissions note the upper storey is setback 450 millimetres to the eaves and will be raised 2.0 metres from the lowest portion of the parapet wall.</p> <p>South</p> <p>Submissions note that the southern setback exceeds the deemed-to-comply requirement by approximately 40 percent. The proposed variation is considered to have an undue impact when viewed from the street. Submissions note, that the second storey addition should comply with the required 4.8 metre setback.</p>	<p>North</p> <p>The existing boundary wall will screen the majority of the proposed upper level addition, which will protrude 1.2m higher than the highest point of the boundary wall. The portion of the upper level addition that will be visible above the boundary wall has incorporated cladding to reduce the visual impact. It is noted that the northern façade does not incorporate any major openings and therefore, will not result in a loss of privacy. It is noted that building setbacks are measured to the wall of the building, not to the edge of the eaves.</p> <p>South</p> <p>The development meets deemed-to-comply lot boundary setback requirements of the R Codes on the southern façade on the upper level. The proposed variation relates to the ground floor only.</p> <p>The existing dwelling on the site has a wall length of 25.4 metres on the ground level and is setback 3.8 metres from the southern boundary. This development proposes to reconfigure the existing rear portion of the dwelling by introducing a new major opening to the southern façade and reducing the overall length of the building to 22.0 metres.</p> <p>The reduction in the length of the ground floor and introduction of a major opening mitigates the impact of building bulk. Although the ground floor southern boundary elevation contains major openings, the finished floor level of the dwelling does not exceed 0.5 metres above natural ground level and therefore, the proposal complies with the visual privacy requirements of Clause 5.4.1 of the R Codes. The proposal is also compliant with the overshadowing requirements of Clause 5.4.2 of the R Codes.</p>

**Summary of Submissions:**

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Visual Privacy</u></p> <p>Concern regarding overlooking from the two double glazed windows located on the upper level of the master bedroom.</p>	<p>The development complies with the Visual Privacy requirements of Clause 5.4.1 C1.1 of the R Codes, which requires a 4.5 metre cone of vision setback to the bedroom windows.</p>
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <p>Submissions note the palm tree on the perspectives does not exist.</p>	<p>The palm tree is proposed to be plants, as indicated on the site plan.</p>
<p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The windows depicted on the eastern elevations cannot fit below the ceiling heights.</li> <li>• Concerns raised in regards to the intended use of the property as a rental or short-term dwelling. Submissions note that the previous tenants have caused issues with antisocial behaviour.</li> <li>• Concerns raised in regards to the 'existing garage' shown on the site plan and whether this structure was constructed as per the approved plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed louvered windows located on the eastern façade are located beneath the ceiling height of the bedroom. The windows are subject to complying with the visual privacy requirements of the R-Codes. Should the window be re-located to be less than 1.6m from the finished floor level, the window would be required to be obscure or an amended development application would be required to assess the overlooking.</li> <li>• Concerns relating to anti-social behaviour cannot be taken into consideration during the development approval process.</li> <li>• The garage structure does not form part of this development application and cannot be considered in the assessment of the proposed addition. The City's Compliance Services is currently investigating the approval history of the garage structure.</li> </ul>

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