

## Summary of Submissions:

The table below summarise the comments received during the initial advertising period (25 January 2023 to 8 February 2023) of the proposal.

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant's Comment
<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed development is excessively proportioned and not appropriately scaled for the site context. As a result significant street setback concessions are being sought across both levels of the development.</li> <li>Concerns relate to the proposed development not complimenting the houses of the adjoining and surrounding neighbourhood which consist of mainly single storey, largely setback, dwellings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The block has a very wide frontage and is significantly shorter on one side, creating an awkward wedge shape. The total lot area is relatively small at 353sqm, making it undevelopable with compliant setbacks.</li> <li>The size and shape of the block mean it would be very difficult to build a single storey dwelling. We have amended the plans to have the upper floor setback from the ground floor, to address comments from the City and neighbours.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Streetscape &amp; Primary Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns relating to the significant ground floor street setback variation and no upper floor street setback as it wouldn't complement or be consistent with any approved or existing dwellings on Auckland Street.</li> <li>The buildings incorporation of design features and minor projections, emphasise the bulk and scale of the development to the street, exacerbating the impact of the reduced street setbacks on the streetscape character.</li> <li>The reduced street setbacks disconnect the subject site from the remainder of Auckland Street and unnecessarily obstructs access to views of significance.</li> <li>Concerns relating to the ground floor setback variation being far too excessive. Additionally, given the lack of upper floor setback, the proposed dwelling would make the area feel overwhelming.</li> <li>The proposed 2.9m primary street setback results in a poor outcome for adjoining properties in relation to the bulk and scale of the building and privacy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The size, shape and orientation of the block, as well as the sewer easement at the rear, make it extremely difficult to develop without some variations to setbacks.</li> <li>We have amended the plans to address the upper floor – this is now setback from the ground floor as per the City's comments.</li> <li>The projections have been removed from the design, to reduce the bulk and scale as per the City's comments.</li> <li>We are fully compliant on building heights and roof pitch, therefore comments around views of significance are not relevant.</li> <li>Upper floor setback has been addressed in the amended plans.</li> </ul>

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant's Comment
<p><u>Upper Floor Street Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The upper floors would not be distinguished from the lower storeys resulting in an upper floor which would have considerable visual bulk to the streetscape.</li> <li>The proposed upper floor would dominate the dwelling façade and create an imposing streetscape presence which would considerably undermine the established and consistent streetscape character.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The upper floor setback has been addressed in the amended plans, as per the City's comments.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Lot Boundary Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns relating to the proposed bulk of the eastern elevation and its impact on the adjoining property.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The eastern elevation has been adjusted in the amended plans, we have added articulation to the wall, added highlight windows to break it up, and incorporated landscaping.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The compromised street setback would restrict the development's ability to provide a suitable level of landscaping to contribute to the streetscape and offset impacts of bulk and scale.</li> <li>Concerns relating to the lack of a garden, vegetation and a shade tree as it would result in a considerable loss to existing green streetscape along the entire length of Auckland Street.</li> <li>Concerns relate to the proposals minimal landscaping visible from the street with a disproportionately large area of impervious surfaces.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscaping areas have been adjusted and are shown in the amended plans.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Design and Character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As Auckland Street is a leafy street with modest new dwellings and original character homes, all substantially setback from the street, the proposed dwelling does not complement the existing character and charm of the street.</li> <li>Concerns relate to the proposed development not complementing or being sympathetic to the general character of Auckland Street as the street consists of wide, open front lawns/gardens and single storey houses with substantial setbacks and minimal privacy issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The required 7.7m setback is not possible on this site, as discussed in our extensive research and development of the plans with the City of Vincent, likewise a functional single storey house is very difficult to achieve on a 353sqm block</li> <li>Significant effort has been made to design a traditional style home to complement the existing character of the street. Comments stating otherwise are misinformed, are opinion, and are not relevant.</li> <li>As the applicant we have committed significant time and research into this development, dating back to July 2022 when we first met with the City to discuss the design, prior to submitting a DA. From the start of the process we have been</li> </ul>

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant's Comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns regarding the inconsistency with the local and neighbourhood character, with specific reference to the proposed bulk and scale of the proposed development.</li> <li>Concerns that the bulk and scale of the proposed development will negatively impact on the amenity and character of the surrounding area.</li> </ul>	<p>working closely with the City, trying to design something in line with the City's policies around design and character, on what we all agree is a difficult site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The design is a very attractive, relatively small house at 319sqm, and will positively impact on the amenity and character of the surrounding area.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Visual Privacy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns relating to the visual privacy to the north (from the minor projection) and south (from the balcony) that will be an issue for adjoining neighbours children who play in the front garden.</li> <li>The result of the backfill to the alfresco area (south) would detrimentally affect the southern adjoining property. The proposal has not been designed or landscaped with any regard for privacy of the adjoining neighbours.</li> <li>Concerns relating to the visual privacy to the south (from the alfresco).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no variations sought on visual privacy or fill, so these comments are not relevant.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns relating to the proposed change in level along the southern boundary as the current plans show no indication of erecting sufficient fencing.</li> <li>Concerns regarding the future structural integrity and waterproofing of the existing southern boundary wall.</li> <li>Concerns relating to the ground works potentially impacting the structural integrity of the southern adjoining lots as the dwelling is an original 1930's Californian bungalow with brick and tile on limestone. Possible vibration during building works may damage the integral character features of the property.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The construction of the home will occur within all the relevant building codes and requirements</li> </ul>

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

Further to the concerns raised within the previous consultation period, the table below summarise the additional comments received during the secondary advertising period (4 May 2023 to 10 May 2023) of the proposal.

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant's Comment
<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns relate to the location of the pool with relation to the balcony and the possible situation where people jump into the pool from the balcony.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The pool is fully compliant. The owners are mature adults with no plans to jump off the balcony.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Impact on Northern Adjoining Property</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns relate to the proposed reduced street setback and bulk significantly impacting views of significance and, as such the property's value.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our design is fully compliant on wall heights and roof pitch, and meets design principles guidelines in all areas including street setback. We also made significant changes to the plans after the first assessment in response to these concerns.</li> <li>Any house built on our block would impact the Northern neighbour's views – this is not the owner's fault, they should be allowed to develop their own land. The northern neighbour cannot reasonably expect our owners to build a single storey on such a small block, or for the site to remain undeveloped, just to maintain their own view. The northern neighbour is also building a two-storey home, it is unreasonable to attempt to block others doing the same.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Lot Boundary Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns relating to the proposed bulk of the eastern elevation being increased as a greater concession on the Eastern boundary setback for Bed 1/Study is being sought.</li> <li>Proposed outdoor living area is not compliant with R-Codes 5.1.3 Lot Boundary Setback, C3.1(iii) which requires unenclosed areas accessible, elevated 0.5m or more above natural ground level, to be setback 1.5m. The proposed Alfresco is setback 1.0m with eaves further extending into the setback area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We have provided amended plans to address the eastern elevation setback, and this is no longer a variation.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Garage Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed garage has been setback 0.44m from ground floor dwelling alignment which does not align with the street context of Auckland Street (single car garages and carports).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The garage setback has been amended to address this concern and this is no longer a variation. Amended plans have been provided.</li> </ul>

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant's Comment
<p><u>Outdoor Living Area</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed outdoor living area is significantly less than the deemed to comply 30m<sup>2</sup> as outdoor living areas, within the primary street setback area, cannot contribute to the total outdoor living area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our proposal meets the design principles guidelines for outdoor living areas.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Queries regarding whether the canopy coverage (30%), deep soil (12%) and planting area (3%) requirements have been met.</li> <li>Concerns relating to the proposed species of trees selected within the landscaping plan with specific concerns relating to the spacing not being sufficient between trees.</li> <li>Concerns relate to the trees located on the lot boundaries and the maintenance required to ensure neighbouring properties are not impacted (by overgrowth and root systems).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscaping plans have been provided, then amended and provided again, based on comments from the DRP and community, and are in line with the City's local policies, including species and spacing.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Other – Community Consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that only the adjoining properties have been consulted on all current and historic planning applications with regards to both 80 Auckland Street and 31 Gill Street.</li> <li>Concerns that the extent of advertising is not sufficient as variations (such as those relating to street setback) impact more than just the adjoining properties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is hard to see the logic behind this comment. The DA process for this site, including the advertising, has been long, extensive, thorough, extremely onerous on the applicant and at times frustrating. The current applicants and owners have made significant concessions and changes to the plans, we have addressed every single concern raised by the community and the city. We have provided amended plans several times, pages and pages of supporting information, and been through two rounds of community consultation and DRP review. We have been engaged in several meetings with the planning department, we have made amendments to the plans quickly and efficiently, we have provided all the required information in a timely matter.</li> <li>The City has had the application for 180 days. The consultation period has been more than sufficient. This comment provides evidence that the neighbour is trying to block any development on our site, in any way possible.</li> </ul>