

Design Review Panel – Applicant Response:

DRP Chairperson Referral 1 - Development Plans as Originally Submitted

The development plans dated 25 November 2022 were referred to the Design Review Panel (DRP) Chairperson. The DRP Chairperson provided the following comments in respect to the plans.

The DRP Chairperson noted the following positive aspects of the proposal:

- It is acknowledged the proposal is situated on a challenging irregular shaped, thin, sloping site with a small 7.3 metres wide south side boundary (when you remove the sewer easement).
- More than 50 percent of the front streetscape doesn't have a fence, the portion that does has a visually permeable front fence and there are a large number of windows on the front facade generating an active streetscape and high level of passive surveillance.
- Both verge trees will be retained.
- The ground level footprint utilises multiple floor levels which responds to the natural ground level/slope on the site.

The DRP Chairperson noted the following areas for improvement:

- The drawings don't show the surrounding context illustrating how the proposal sits in and responds to its context. Given the significant front setback variation being sought an analysis of the front setbacks to other properties in the street would also be useful.
- The main living areas, alfresco space and master bedroom are all orientated to the south or west providing limited north light access and exposing these rooms to the harsh western setting sun.
- There are a number of west facing windows without passive shading devices.
- Consider placing the garage on the southern side of the site which would generate opportunities to locate the main living areas, alfresco and master bedroom on the north (wider) section of the site allowing more northern sunlight access. Due to the angle of the site this would also mean the garage would be located behind the front elevation of the house rather than the current highly prominent position in-front of the house façade. This would potentially require an even smaller front setback on the south side of the front boundary but would potentially allow a number of other positive outcomes.
- The architectural language looks to replicate character houses in the local area but currently presents as a faux or 'moch' interpretation / style.
- The proposal generates a large 4 Bed + Family Room house on a relatively small block but includes minimal areas of soft landscaping and no new trees on the site offering limited resident amenity or contribution to its surrounding context.
- The paving on the east side and the decking in the south west corner appear excessive given there is minimal soft landscaping proposed on the site. These could both be reduced to increase soft landscaping on the site.
- The open area in the centre of the front setback (on the west side of the Living Room) is an opportunity for a decent size new tree.
- No soft landscaping details or planting species have been included with the application.
- The proposal does not nominate any external colours for the face brick, rendered walls, window frames, roof sheeting, gutters, barge boards, down pipes etc. Recommend the applicant provides further information in relation to materials and colours for review.
- The east elevation presents as a flat, monotonous two storey wall, with no articulation or diversity of materiality/colour. The applicant is encouraged to increase the level of articulation and diversity of materiality on this facade to improve this interface with the adjoining property and surrounding context.
- The current design does not clearly distinguish the upper floor from the and lower floor as both floor footprints are very similar presenting a relatively flat façade.

Design Review Panel – Applicant Response:

DRP Chairperson Referral 2 - Revised Development Plans (dated 29 March 2023)

In response to the DRP Chairperson comments, the applicant made a suite of changes to the proposal through amended plans dated 29 March 2023. A summary of the changes is as follows:

- The setback of the ground floor from the primary street boundary increased from 2.5 metres to the garage to 2.9 metres to the dining room.
- The setback of the porch from the primary street boundary decreased from 3.0 metres to 2.2 metres.
- The setback of the upper floor from the ground floor building line increased from nil to the garage to 0.7 metres to the sitting room.
- The setback of the upper floor balcony from the ground floor building line increased from 0.2 metres to 0.6 metres.
- The length of the northern boundary wall reduced from 7.9 metres to 7.6 metres.
- The setback of the garage from the ground floor building line increased from nil to 0.5 metres.
- The setback from the northern boundary of the ground floor bed/study wall decreased from 2.1 metres to 1.2 metres.
- The eastern façade modified to increase articulation, introducing the stepping forward of a portion (bathroom, bed 4 and water closet) of the dwelling.
- The primary street fence piers reduced from 0.5 metres in width to 0.3 metres.
- A landscaping plan prepared, providing for 19.2 percent deep soil areas and 30.1 percent of the site as canopy coverage at maturity.

The amended plans dated 29 March 2023 were referred to the DRP Chairperson, with their following comments provided against the 10 principles of good design and subsequent response from the applicant:

DRP Chairperson Comment	Applicant's Response
<p><u>Context & Character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The front setback variation and positioning of the double garage in-front of the main façade of the house is not reflective of the surrounding built form context and character as well as the City's Built Form Policy. Consider a carport.• The surrounding buildings have not been shown on the floorplans or elevations and no visual analysis of the surrounding context has been undertaken to illustrate how the proposal sits within or impacts on the surrounding properties / context.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This is not a good solution in terms of safety, security, functionality and quality of life for the owners. Garages are not an extravagant luxury, they are a modern convenience, and a more cost effective option than adding electric gates and increased fencing to provide security. The only reason to implement is for the look of the façade in relation to the City's local policy.• Elevation image including the house next door is attached. Our design looks very similar to the house next door, and therefore sits well within the streetscape. We do not have access to images of the house on the other side, which is about to be built. Our design is not the only house in the street with proposed variations – we note No. 67 Auckland Street, which is a relatively new build, not character in style, and has no differentiation between the upper and ground floors (our design now has significant differentiation). No. 67 Auckland Street is also a new build, with the garage set forward of the rest of the building line, and the upper floor overhanging the garage. Our design is doing much more than these new builds to address the context of the area and will sit well within the surrounding properties.

Design Review Panel – Applicant Response:

DRP Chairperson Comment	Applicant's Response
<p><u>Landscape Quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little information has been provided in relation to the soft landscaping / planting. Encourage the applicant to include plant spacings, pot / tree sizes, details in relation to reticulation and utilising water-wise native species • The Frangipani is located in a position with a first floor roof overhangs over which will limit its growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plant and tree species have been identified on the plan. These are from the City's recommended list. We can add a note about the gardens being reticulated, however a detailed plan by a landscape designer is expensive and will take months to produce. • Please refer to the included landscaping plan – all the requested information has been provided on this plan. We have increased the spacing and added reticulation notes, we have included water-wise species from the City's recommended list. The landscaping has come a long way from the original proposal and we have responded to all the City's comments around landscaping. We request the DRP to change their report to green on this element, as we have implemented everything they have asked here.
<p><u>Built Form & Scale</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The garage and upper level setback from the front façade has increased however the previously non-compliant setback to the rear has further decreased to achieve this. • Given the size as well as shape of the site and the rear easement achieving a large 4 bedroom house, plus family room and double garage is difficult. The built form on the site appears over-developed resulting in an outcome which is out of keeping with the surrounding context and has negative amenity impacts for both residents and adjoining neighbours. • The double garage sits a significant distance in-front of the front façade of the house. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These items comply with the planning framework. We note the examples of No. 67 and No. 61, as well as No. 69, where the garage is also sitting in front of the front façade of the house.
<p><u>Functionality and Build Quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments
<p><u>Sustainability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All living spaces are orientated south or west and the house generally obtains minimal north light access. • Encourage the applicant to integrate ESD initiatives such as solar panels, not using gas and EV charging capability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solar panels / EV are intended following the build (these are not being done by us as the builder and therefore for clarity, these are not included on our plans). We note that the roof overhangs have been added following the City's

Design Review Panel – Applicant Response:

DRP Chairperson Comment	Applicant's Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The roof overhangs will provide limited shading to the significant number of large west facing windows to all living spaces. 	<p>recommendation. The landscaping provided will also assist with shading to these windows.</p>
<p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All living spaces are orientated south or west and the house generally obtains minimal north light access. Bed 4 has a 2.8 metre dimension which should be increased to a minimum dimension of 3 metres. Bed 4 is reliant on a high level window which limits its outlook, natural light access and cross ventilation. Show the bins and AC external units in a position that does not impact on the amenity of residents or neighbours. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please see amended plans. Bed 4 has increased to 2.95 metres. Bins now shown on the plan, placement of AC external units is still TBC by AC provider, however they will be placed as per requirements and not impact on neighbours. We have already addressed the placement of the living spaces in our justification. We note bed 4 is a minor bedroom and a place to sleep, and therefore the lack of a north facing window should be tolerated.
<p><u>Legibility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments
<p><u>Safety</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments
<p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments
<p><u>Aesthetics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rear (east) elevation is still entirely reliant on rendered materiality with large blank areas. Recommend incorporating a diversity of textural materiality on this façade such as some face brick. Additional face brick has been added to the front (west) façade which is supported however this has been introduced at upper level with rendered walls at lower level. Suggest flipping this or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please see amended plans – we have redesigned the upper floor bathroom and WC and provided more articulation in the rear wall. Please also refer to the landscaping plan for the extent of landscaping to this side of the house, which is significant and will soften the appearance of this wall. Introducing a different material to this wall has significant cost and construction implications, which needs to be considered and balanced against this request. The rear wall is not visible from the street, or the sides – it is a rear wall that is only visible from one neighbour's backyard.

Design Review Panel – Applicant Response:

DRP Chairperson Comment	Applicant's Response
<p>adding greater face brick at lower level as well which more closely reflects the use of face brick at ground level on traditional character houses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposal does not nominate any external colours for the face brick, rendered walls, window frames, roof sheeting, gutters, barge boards, down pipes etc. Recommend the applicant providing further information in relation to the proposed materials and colours.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The face brick is an attractive feature and has been used to distinguish the upper and lower levels as requested. Our design is a modern representation of classic design, we aren't trying to appear faux character or replicate an old house. To increase the amount of face brick that is already proposed, will significantly increase the cost of the build, which needs to be considered.• Please see amended plans. Aesthetically this is a very attractive house and we believe this element should change to green also.

Design Review Panel – Applicant Response:

DRP Chairperson Referral 3 - Revised Development Plans (dated 24 April 2023)

In response to the DRP Chairperson comments, the applicant made further amendments in plans dated 24 April 2023. These amended plans were provided accompanying the applicant’s response in the table above to the DRP Chairperson’s comments. A summary of the changes is as follows:

- Amendments to the landscaping plan including:
 - increased spacing of planting;
 - updates to species list to include water-wise species from the City’s recommended list;
 - provision of additional plantings (bamboo) along the eastern lot boundary; and
 - increase in canopy coverage to 36.8 percent of the subject site at maturity.
- Increase in dimension of bed 4 minimum dimension from 2.8 metres to 2.95 metres.
- Reduction of upper floor bathroom area, providing articulation in the walls presenting to the north and east.
- Increased primary street setback to the entry porch from 2.2 metres to 2.7 metres.

The amended plans dated 24 April 2023 were referred to the DRP Chairperson, with a summary of their comments provided against the 10 principles of good design and subsequent response from the applicant:

Design Review Panel Comment	Applicant’s Comment
<p><u>Context & Character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The front setback and positioning of the double garage in front of the main façade of the house is not reflective of the surrounding area. • Further information is needed in relation to the surrounding context. • Given the irregular shaped site, it is difficult to develop a character style of house. Most character house styles have a lot which is deeper than it is wide and provide a larger upper level setback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surrounding context information has been provided in previous comments and in streetscape elevation image with photos of adjoining sites. • It is more opinion than fact to say the style is unfortunate in relation to the site. We believe the design is very attractive and responds well to the site and to the planning framework.
<p><u>Landscape Quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preference generally for a landscaping plan to be prepared by a landscape architect or professional to ensure a viable landscaping outcome is achieved. • Details of plant spacings, pot / tree sizes, reticulation and species to be included in landscaping plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The landscape plan has been done by the applicant, in conjunction with the City’s landscape policies and recommendations. • The owners are likely to engage a landscape designer down the track, and do plan to achieve a high level of landscaping with the finished house. We can provide updated landscaping plans when this happens. • The time taken in council for the DA process is having significant financial impact on the owners, with holding costs of the undeveloped land, finance costs, and

Design Review Panel – Applicant Response:

Design Review Panel Comment	Applicant's Comment
	<p>rental costs. Engaging a landscape designer is an expensive exercise, particularly when it's uncertain if / when this DA is going to be approved.</p>
<p><u>Built Form & Scale</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the primary street and rear setback do not appear consistent with the surrounding context. • The built form appears too large for a shallow and irregular shaped site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design responds to the planning framework and meets the design principles guidelines.
<p><u>Functionality and Build Quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments.
<p><u>Sustainability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmentally sustainable design initiatives to be integrated. • Living spaces and the main bedroom are orientated south or west, with minimal northern light access. • Shading to western facing windows. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The orientation was chosen to achieve the best possible outcomes around the planning framework (particularly the setbacks) and design guidelines. • An overshadowing variation for the northern neighbouring lot was approved, and therefore the northern side of our site will be in perpetual shade anyway. • The site has 26 metre western frontage. It's impossible not to have west facing windows on a site such as this. Eaves and landscaping have been provided to improve shading.
<p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bedroom 4 should have a minimum 3 metre dimension. • Bedroom 4 is reliant on high level window for amenity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our original application had no bedrooms under a 3 metre dimension. Throughout this long process, lots of amendments have been made to the plans in response to feedback from the City and community consultation, and this was one of the changes made, in order to improve the boundary setbacks. The design meets the planning framework.
<p><u>Legibility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments.

Design Review Panel – Applicant Response:

Design Review Panel Comment	Applicant's Comment
<p><u>Safety</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No comments.
<p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No comments.
<p><u>Aesthetics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The rear elevation is lacking diversity of textural materiality.• Incorporating face brick at ground level better reflects traditional style housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Throughout the process, we have made significant amendments to the plans and attempts to address this concern, including redesigning this side of the house to lessen the bulk and add more articulation to the walls, adding / changing windows, and adding significant landscaping to soften it.• We note the natural constraints of the site, the cost and construction implications of adding an expensive face brick to what is essentially the 'dead' side of the house, and that this side of the house is not visible from the street or to any neighbours, it is only visible from the backyard of one house.

Final Development Plans (dated 2 June 2023)

Final amendments were made to the proposed plans on 2 June 2023 in response to the DRP comments.

These amendments included the following changes:

- Providing obscured glass to the kitchen window to the eastern façade. The proposal satisfies the deemed-to-comply standard for eastern lot boundary setback with this change.
- The rear elevation has been treated with contrasting coloured render to the upper floor and moulding strips to differentiate between the ground and upper floors.