

## Summary of Submissions:

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

Comments Received in Support:	Administration Comment:
<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal is a fair and balanced approach to improving the liveability of the property while preserving heritage.</li> <li>The visual impact from the front and sides appears to be limited and acceptable.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p>
Comments Received in Objection:	Administration Comment:
<p><u>Building Height</u></p> <p>The additions should be designed to not be visible from the street in order to preserve the heritage streetscape.</p>	<p>The applicant has amended the plans, modifying the roof form to include a shallow pitch from the centre of the roof. This has resulted in a reduction in the overall height by 0.1 metres and reduction in the front facing wall of the second storey addition by 0.3 metres. The second storey addition has also been shifted to sit centrally within the lot, aligning with the pitch of the existing street fronting roof. While a portion of the roof form would remain visible from the street, the bulk of the addition would be obscured from view due to its location to the rear of the existing dwelling (refer to streetscape perspectives included in <b>Attachment 6</b>). The additions have been designed and finished to in a contemporary nature and would be sympathetic to the existing dwelling, ensuring that it does not detract from the visual prominence of the heritage façade of the place.</p>
<p><u>Lot Boundary Setbacks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The western boundary wall height will reduce the amenity of adjoining properties, block sunlight and introduce obtrusively bulky and overbearing mass.</li> <li>Reduction to setbacks will impact existing openness and amenity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant has amended the plans, reducing the height of the western boundary wall by 0.5 metres. The extent of the wall that would be visible from the western neighbours property is limited to 2.5m in length, as the remainder of the boundary wall exists on-site and abuts an existing boundary wall on the western neighbouring lot. The 2.5 metre length of the proposed western boundary wall, the use of contrasting colours and materials, and orientation of the lots would reduce the impact of visual bulk associated with the additional 0.5 metres in height sought for the boundary wall that exceeds the deemed-to-comply standard and would maintain solar access for the adjoining western neighbour.</li> <li>The applicant has amended the plans, shifting the second storey addition to sit centrally within the lot and to comply with the deemed-to-comply lot boundary setbacks to both the east and west.</li> </ul>

## Summary of Submissions:

<b>Comments Received in Objection:</b>	<b>Administration Comment:</b>
<p><u>Access to Daylight</u></p> <p>The proposal will adversely impact access to daylight for adjoining properties.</p>	<p>The subject site has a slightly skewed northern orientation, resulting in some overshadowing to the south-east as measured at 21 June winter solstice in accordance with the R Codes. The length of the proposed eastern boundary wall aligns closely with the rear building line of the eastern adjoining dwelling, ensuring the outdoor living areas of the eastern adjoining property are not affected. Major openings facing this side lot boundary in the eastern adjoining dwelling feature awnings to protect it from the western afternoon sun. This means that the 0.2 metre portion of boundary wall that exceeds the deemed-to-comply height would have a negligible impact on daylight access for the eastern neighbouring property. The shadow from this boundary wall would also largely fall within the shadow cast from the upper floor addition and which has a side lot boundary setback that is compliant with the deemed-to-comply standards of the R Codes.</p>
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <p>Roots from existing trees on the site are damaging sewer connections on adjoining properties. Further landscaping will exacerbate this.</p>	<p>There are no planning standards under the planning policy framework that restricts planting of trees in proximity to lot boundaries. Impacts from vegetation on private property is a civil matter and not regulated under the planning framework.</p>

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