

**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 setback is considered to further reduce the visual impact of the proposed lot boundary setback when viewed from the street. The proposal has also incorporated additional landscaping within the front setback area and has tapered the roof of the existing dwelling. The tapered roof, proposed tree and the established frangipani tree provides additional screening to the second storey addition when viewed 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. 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 standards of the R Codes on the southern façade on the upper level. The departure from the deemed-to-comply lot boundary setback standard related to the lower level 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 deemed-to-comply visual privacy standards 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 two double glazed windows of the bedroom on the upper level are setback 4.5 metres from the adjoining lot boundaries and therefore satisfy deemed-to-comply visual privacy requirements of the R Codes. All other windows to the upper level bedroom have a minimum height of at least 1.6 metres above the finished floor level, which also satisfies the deemed-to-comply requirements of the R Codes. It is noted that the R Codes do not provide visual privacy requirements for windows to non-habitable rooms.</p>
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <p>Submissions note the palm tree on the perspectives does not exist.</p>	<p>The application proposes the provision of a palm tree in the front setback area. The palm tree is not on the City's recommended species list and the City has concerns as to the ability of the palm tree to grow to a height greater than 2.0 metres. If the application is approved, it is recommended that a condition be imposed to require an amended landscape plan to be submitted so that an appropriate tree species in line with the City's recommended species can be provided.</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>• The City has received no evidence that anti-social behaviour will result from the proposed second storey addition. As such the matter of anti-social behaviour cannot be taken into consideration during this 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.