

HOALPP Sub-section / R-Codes clause	Assessment	Justification
<p>Size and layout of dwellings (HOALPP sub-section 16.1, 16.2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 31c / 2.692m ceilings to primary living space. 28c / 2.435m ceiling height provided to remainder of dwelling. Minimum ceiling height of 2.7m required in habitable rooms. 	<p>Please refer to amended drawings showing an increased ceiling heights to the primary living area as stated in the comments received 13/09/21 supporting a 31c ceiling height.</p> <p>We ask that the City support the following variation to the HOALPP to the remainder of the dwelling, based on the following justification.</p> <p>The proposed residence is located at the rear of an existing dwelling. The building height has no external visual benefit of increased ceiling heights when viewed from the street, there is no impact on the streetscape as the dwelling is located behind the front setback line. The proposed residence provides adequate access to direct sun into the building and appurtenant open spaces. The proposed building provides adequate daylight to major openings into habitable rooms. The additional building height to bedrooms will not have any additional benefit as the proposed openings would still retain the proposed head height and size and would in-fact provide less light to the room as effectively would be additional volume and would be at detriment to the remainder of the residence. The proposed room sizes (L&W) have been designed to comply with the required standards set out in 16.1a &b. Furthermore, the National construction codes (NCC) Part 3.8.2.2 Heights of rooms and other spaces states <i>Heights of rooms and other spaces must not be less than –</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>In a habitable room excluding Kitchen – 2.4m and</i> b) <i>In a kitchen – 2.1m and</i> c) <i>In a corridor, passageway, or the like – 2.1m and</i> d) <i>In a bathroom shower room, laundry sanitary compartment, airlock, pantry, storeroom, garage, car parking area or the line – 2.1m</i>
<p>Tree sizes and deep soil areas (HOALPP sub-section 12)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three Small sized trees provided to Lot 2. Requirement for one Medium sized tree and 36m² deep soil area, with recommended minimum deep soil area dimension of 3m. 	<p>Please refer to amended proposal relating to Lot 2. We ask that the City support the provision for three (3) small trees to Lot 2.</p> <p>The proposed variation to the type/size of tree and required seep soil zone (DSZ) will not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the local streetscape of any adjoining property. In fact, it is contended that the provision of the three (3) small trees in lieu of one (1) medium tree would in fact be a better outcome for Lot 2. The proposed development has been provided with sufficient landscaping through the site. This is consistent with the objective of the City’s policy and the City’s vision to provide adequate coverage of the land and to provide a more environmentally sensitive urban area (given the constraints of the land). The DSZ indicated on Lot 2 has been designed in accordance with R-Code Element 5.3.2 Landscaping which states a minimum tree planting area of 2x2. We</p>

		<p>can apriate the LPP which requests over and above the minimum requirements stated in the R-Code and we ask that the City support a reduced minimum setback of 2m. To enforce a setback of 3m for a DSA will be at detriment to the room sizes of the dwelling and would have a negative affect on the occupants of the dwelling. Concerns are raised regarding the City's Policy applying the tree size and deep soil requirements prescribed within Volume 2 of the R-Codes (which related to apartments) to single dwellings. It should be noted that most apartment developments are on larger lots and typically provide a communal open space area to accommodate the planting of larger trees and associated larger deep soil zones, whilst single dwellings tend to comprise smaller lot sizes. The City's approach of applying the provision of Volume 2 of the R-Codes on small lots is restrictive, is not achievable and compromises the dwelling layout. Given this, it is not practical to apply development standards applicable to an apartment development to a single dwelling. Therefore, it must be recognized and acknowledged that there is a predisposition to greater variations to the landscaping requirements (i.e. tree sizes and deep soil zones) to assist with the positioning of a dwelling on the land. Having regard for the above it is contended that the proposed variation to the tree size and deep soil zone requirements for the proposed development on the subject land satisfies the Objectives of Clause 12 of the City's Policy and may therefore be approved by the City</p>
<p>Resident parking (HOALPP sub-section 7.1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1 hardstand parking area set back 2.8m from the primary street. Minimum setback requirement 5.5m. 	<p>We ask that the City support the hardstand parking area in its current form. The subdivision proposal has received an approval via Department of Planning Lands & Heritage (Application 151-21). This approval would in-fact mean that the city has viewed the proposed subdivision plan prior to the development application being lodged and approved the subdivision in its current form. From the proposed plans we can see that there is insufficient space behind the dwelling to provide a hardstand area. Furthermore, there is no provision for manoeuvrability at the rear of lot 1 to allow for a vehicle to turn into / reverse out. The only onsite provision to be able to provide on-site parking to lot 1 for two (2) vehicles is in the current location indicated on plan. Furthermore, with the vehicle hardstand in its current location, this also allows for an indicative visitor bay behind to allow provision for one (1) on-site visitor parking bay.</p>
<p>Public domain interface (HOALPP sub-section 1.1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1 driveway/hardstand parking area ('vehicle access') comprises 51.73% of the Lot 1 street frontage. Maximum 20% permitted. 	<p>We ask that the City support the driveway hardstand parking area in its current from based on the above justifications. To achieve a maximum 20% hardscaped area when a hardstand parking area is required within the front setback area is not achievable. The application proposes the minimum requirement driveway width along with the minimum requirements for parking as per AS/NZS2890.1.2004 for the provision of two (2) bays. We</p>

		propose the minimum amount of hardscape area to try and achieve the maximum amount of softscape/landscaping to the proposed development within the front setback area.
Pedestrian access (R-Codes clause 5.3.6 C6.5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No pedestrian path provided within common property driveway. Requirement for separate pedestrian path. 	<p>We ask that the City support the proposal in its current form based on the following justification.</p> <p>We refer to R-Code Element 5.3.5 Vehicular access C5.2 Driveways to primary or secondary street provided as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Driveways serving four dwellings or less not narrower than 3m at the street boundary <p>C5.3 Driveways shall be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No closer than 0.5m from a side lot boundary or street pole <p>To achieve a pedestrian access path on the previously approved subdivision application (WAPC-151-21) would in-fact require the proposed driveway to extend to the boundary extents and void the provision for landscaping for the entirety of the driveway to achieve a 1.0m wide access path. To provide a pedestrian access path would be at detriment to the appearance of the access leg as it would reduce the landscape and soft scaped areas of the development.</p>
Street setbacks (HOALPP sub-section 5.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Garage set back 0.15m from communal street boundary. Minimum 2.5m setback required. 	<p>We ask that the City support the Garage setback of 0.15m from the communal street boundary.</p> <p>The proposed residence considers orientation on the site. The garage location has been formulated to provide two (2) on-site parking bays and maintain vehicle manoeuvrability. The proposed residence has been designed with the garage location at a 90 degree turn to the secondary street. This has been designed to provide an attractive communal street and positioned as such to consider the neighbouring buildings and maximising the residential amenity. The proposed residence provides adequate landscaping to the secondary street as indicated on the proposed landscaping plan. The proposed residence provides provision for three (3) on-site trees. The proposed residence provides visual privacy to outdoor living areas (OLA) and does not impede on the OLA of the existing and neighbouring properties. The proposed setback has no adverse effect on the neighbouring buildings as the proposed garage location is setback outside the primary street setback. Furthermore, the provision of one (1) boundary wall is deemed acceptable development and would therefore have no adverse effect on the visual aesthetic of the existing residence or adjoining residences.</p>
Boundary walls (HOALPP sub-section 6.4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Garage boundary wall projects 0.5m forward of communal street. Minimum 2.5m setback required. 	<p>We ask that the city support the Garage wall projection of 0.5m forward of the communal street. The garage wall proposes a brick wall to be built up to the lot boundary comprising a wall length of 7.69m and height of 2.5m. The proposed boundary wall follows the Strata lot boundary of Lot 1 & Lot 2 which comprises a</p>

		<p>length of 19.5m. The portion of common property truncation is only provided to allow for vehicle manoeuvrability and to be penalised in providing a secondary street setback to the truncation is at detriment to the development.</p> <p>The projection of 0.5m is considered minor and will not have any adverse effect on neighbouring properties.</p>
--	--	--