

Summary of Submissions:

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

Comments Received in Support:	Administration Comment:
<p><u>Lot Boundary Setbacks</u></p> <p>Comments that the lot boundary setback variations are not an issue and are a by-product of how thin the lot is, including the additional boundary wall of the store room on the rear boundary.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Comments Received in Objection:	Administration Comment:
<p><u>Street Setbacks</u></p> <p>Concerns regarding the proposed street setback of the development and that the character of this portion of Smith Street is in part defined by the significant setbacks and planting areas on lots that allow for substantial vegetation to establish in these set back areas and other parts of the lots. This vegetation contributes significantly to the amenity of the street and neighbourhood by providing a visual buffer between the street and dwellings, habitat for local bird and insect life, shade to foot paths, and an overall contribution to a reduction in any heat island effect for the area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The street setback is sufficient to allow for landscaping to be provided in the street setback area for Units 1 and 2, including the planting of two trees and a number of other smaller plantings. The vegetation would soften the appearance of the proposed development from street and provide an acceptable visual buffer. Between the front of the dwellings and the street boundary, 23.9 square metres of soft landscaping area would be provided, equivalent to 51.2 percent of this setback area.
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding the trees indicated in the areas adjacent to the car parking and the likelihood of any real tree canopy establishing in these areas. Concerns regarding inconsistencies between the landscape concept plan and the site plan in relation to depiction of the existing verge trees. Concerns regarding the retention of the existing verge trees. Concerns that the lack of deep soil zones to Unit 2 would impact the establishment of any significant trees in the front setback area of the Unit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The trees located adjacent to the car parking area would assist in improving the internal amenity of this area and have not been included in the City's canopy coverage calculation. Sufficient tree canopy would be provided by the proposed trees on site. Permeable paving would be provided for the pedestrian path area to support the growth of the trees adjacent to the car parking area. No existing verge trees are proposed to be removed. A condition of approval is recommended requiring retention and protection of the verge trees with written approval from the City to be obtained by the applicant prior to the removal of any verge trees. The street setback area is sufficient to allow for a deep soil area to be provided in this location for Unit 2. The dimensions of the deep soil area are sufficient to not impede the ability for the tree proposed in this area to reach its maximum canopy spread.

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Administration Comment:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that the proposed development will not provide sufficiently similar tree canopy to what present on the site prior to demolition of the dwelling on the property. • Concerns that the provision of site vegetation is not sufficient to maintain and enhance the tree canopy and local sense of place. • Concerns that only 3 medium trees are proposed for the entire site thus reducing the overall tree canopy provided on the site. • Concerns that the proposed development would set a precedent in the area for reduced planting zones, reduced tree canopy, and reduced setbacks, which will impact negatively on the current vegetation in the area and any opportunities for the future establishment of new vegetation. Further concerns that this present would result in reduced shade to footpaths in the area, reduced tree canopy for local fauna (birds and insects), increased potential for heat island effect in the neighbourhood, and a reduction of visual buffer between the street and dwellings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A total of 17 trees of varying species and sizes, and a number of small plantings are proposed across the site including to the street setback area and lot boundaries. This landscaping would make an effective contribution to the landscaping outcome and canopy coverage on site. • The location of the landscaping proposed would provide improved amenity for future residents. The landscaping for Units 3 to 6 would be located adjacent to the lot boundaries and would assist with reducing the impact of the development on adjoining properties. • The tree planting and canopy cover is appropriate and would be commensurate with the nature of the proposal and the extent of development on site. • The proposed plantings and deep soil areas would be sufficient to contribute towards increased urban air quality, tree and vegetation coverage and a sense of open space between the subject site and adjoining properties. This would create a greater landscaping amenity for residents and would make an effective contribution to the City's green canopy to reduce the impact of the urban heat island effect.

Comments Received Expressing Concern:	Administration Comment
<p><u>Environmentally Sustainable Design</u></p> <p>Comments that the proposed black metal cladding for the upper floors and roof should be replaced with a material with reduced solar absorbance in order to reduce the urban heat island effect of the development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development is proposed to predominantly utilise timber framed construction method which would reduce the thermal mass of the development, reducing the potential to radiate heat to adjoining properties. • The development proposes a mix of colours and materials and the extent of the use of the 'Monument' colour is acceptable in considering the sustainability of the proposed development in its entirety, noting that the City's Built Form Policy in itself does not prohibit the use of this colour for cladding.

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