

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • legible access; • pedestrian safety; • minimal crossovers; and • high quality landscaping features. 	<p>retaining along the entire length of the secondary street which would have been completed during the subdivision stage. The crossover is adequately setback from a low traffic volume corner with no concerns regarding sightlines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only one (1) vehicle access is proposed to minimise access points to the streetscape. • It is considered that legible access is provided as the crossover is aligned at right angles and is of sufficient width. • As mentioned, only one (1) crossover is proposed. • The development is considered to demonstrate compliance with landscaping of the street setback area which provides for an acceptable level of landscaping to the street. The crossover/driveway is of a width required for two (2) vehicles and not excessively more than required.
--	--

Clause 5.4.1 – Visual Privacy

The balcony has been deemed to not satisfy the minimum setback requirement of the R-Codes, being 7.5m from the lot boundary, as only 7m is provided and the balcony partially overlooks a portion of 91 Burleigh Drive behind the street setback line.

The proposal is considered to demonstrate compliance with the relevant Design Principles of clause 5.4.1 due to the following reasons:

Design Principle	
<p>P1.1 Minimal direct overlooking of active habitable spaces and outdoor living areas of adjacent dwellings achieved through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • building layout and location; • design of major openings; • landscape screening of outdoor active habitable spaces; and/or 	<p>P1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The layout and location of the dwelling have been designed to have an outlook towards the street rather than adjacent properties. • As above, major openings have only been designed to front the street.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • location of screening devices. <p>P1.2 Maximum visual privacy to side and rear boundaries through measures such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • offsetting the location of ground and first floor windows so that viewing is oblique rather than direct; • building to the boundary where appropriate; • setting back the first floor from the side boundary; • providing higher or opaque and fixed windows; and/or • screen devices (including landscaping, fencing, obscure glazing, timber screens, external blinds, window hoods and shutters). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No landscape screening is proposed or considered necessary as no outdoor habitable space is overlooked. • No screening devices are proposed. However, should the balcony be used for seating, as shown on the plans, the view to the neighbouring property will be restricted by the balustrade/half wall. <p>P1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While not a window per se, the balcony is significantly offset to create a larger setback to the neighbouring property than major openings on the ground floor. • No habitable rooms are proposed on the boundary, nor are they considered necessary as it will only create perceived impacts of building bulk. • The upper floor is appropriately setback from the side boundary, including a further setback to the balcony. • Only obscure windows are proposed on the upper floor, largely due to being to bathrooms, but this will also allow for adequate privacy to the neighbouring property. • A portion of the 'Jane & Kennedy' bedroom is used as a screening device to assist in screening views further to the neighbouring property from the balcony.
---	--

Conclusion

As identified above, the proposed development is generally compliant with the relevant provisions of the Scheme and Local Planning Policies, and the proposal is considered to demonstrate compliance with the relevant design principles of the R-Codes.