

Council Referral Response

Development Application No:	24024441		
Description of Proposed Development:	Three-storey residential flat building comprising community housing dwellings (40) and supported accommodation premises (2), two-storey group dwellings (6) and demolition of buildings including one Representative Building		
Property Address:	105 Gibson St Bowden SA 5007		
Planning Officer:	State Planning Commission	Date:	Month 20XX

Assessment of Proposal

*Ensure amended plans are in the 'ASSESSMENT' document and stamped as amended.

Original Plans – All Application Documentation – Date Created
Development Project Engineer – 16/09/2024
Only comments in bold to be sent to applicant
<p><u>Traffic</u></p> <p>Given that the Affordable Housing overlay does not exist, Council has concerns given the significant parking shortfall. Whilst we acknowledge that there is an argument that Unity Housing is promoting an affordable housing product, this is discretionary.</p> <p>Council is not comfortable with the current shortfall provided, and would seek additional parks, not necessarily up to the total shortfall.</p> <p>It is impractical to rely on on-street parking to the extent this proposal does, particularly with the already competing demands for the on-street car parking due to other land uses in the immediate vicinity. A suggested level of comfort would be to provide the correct amount of bike parks, and increasing the car parks to support the visitor parks for the apartments.</p> <p><u>Townhouses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 6 townhouses, and 6 (presumably shared) car parks provided. • This meets the Code requirements for 1 park per townhouse, however neglects 2 visitor parks. • The driveway crossovers on Gibson Street and Hawker Street are required to match footpath clay pavers in line with Council's driveway policy. • The parallel parks alongside a wall/fence and aisle dimensions meet AS 2890 Figure 2.5. • There is a requirement of 1 bike park per dwelling. Cirqa states the townhouse residents would typically keep their bike inside, however it is recommended for there to be official bike parks provided for each townhouse. • Pedestrian sight lines supported. • Driveway dimensions supported. <p><u>Apartments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 42 apartments, and 20 (presumably shared) car parks provided.

- **The Code requires 53 car parks (42 dwelling, and 11 visitor), therefore there is a shortfall of 33 car parks.**
- The report states that Market Place's 12 on-street car parks should be able to accommodate the 11 required visitor parks.
- **There is be 22 bike rails in a secure bike storage room, which is a shortfall of the 1 per dwelling required, i.e. 20 bike park shortfall. This is inadequate, particularly with the car parking shortfall.**
- **Additionally, the report states that the target market for the dwellings is 55+ year old women, and implies that they are less likely to cycle. This is not evidence-based, and therefore unsupported.**
- The 2.49m wide waste ramp onto Market Place is required to match footpath clay pavers.
- The aisle width and car park dimensions are supported.
- **With all the wheel stops (which are supported), there is limited opportunity for people with mobility aids (wheelchair, walkers etc) to access the internal footpath area.**
- Assumed the blind aisle has a 1m extension.
- Pedestrian sight lines supported.
- Driveway dimensions supported, with adequate width waiting area if conflicting movements, which is low likelihood.

Parking restrictions Thursday 9-3pm to allow waste and recycling collections are acceptable.

Waste

Townhouses presenting along Hawker is supported.

Developer to confirm that townhouse bin storage area will be screened. Current looks like they are open.

For the apartments I am supportive of the proposed waste and recycling services as outlined in the WPM prepared by Rawtec. However, I have concerns about only using dual chutes and residents must travel to the ground floor to dispose of co-mingled recycling.

The developer needs to consider equal access to all three streams and adjusting the waste room on each level to include a co-mingle disposal option and provide commentary.

I note the bin collection area and waste truck collection zone will be from Market Place and will require parking restrictions to be in place to allow truck movements. Collection from Market place is supported provided there is not parking Thursday 9-3pm to allow waste and recycling collections.

I also note that the apartments will require an active building manager to monitor and manage the bin under the chute system.

Civil/Stormwater

Comments below:

FFL

300mm above TOK

- Hawker – $17.360 + 0.300 = 17.660$
- Gibson – $17.510 + 0.300 = 17.810$
- Market – $17.240 + 0.300 = 17.540$

300mm above 1% AEP flood levels – $17.510 + 0.051 + 0.300 = 17.861$

300mm above 1% AEP surface detention ponding levels – N/A

Nominated FFL 17.860 – OK

If surface ponding proposed as detention, there must be a minimum of 150mm freeboard to boundary level to protect neighbouring properties – N/A

Stormwater

Pre-development calcs – 20% AEP – Q10 29.86 L/s – OK

Post-development calcs – 1% AEP

- Building A Roof – 14L/s
- Undetained – 3L/s
- Rest of site – 12L/s

Detention

- **Building A Roof – 14.54kL required – plans nominate 20kL (2x10kL tanks) – orifice to be nominated – suitable for Reserved Matter**
- Rest of site – 54.36kL required – plans nominate (35+22.6) 57.6kL with 12L/s pump - OK

Kerb outlet flow max 10L/s

- Hawker – 14L/s – OK
- Market – 12L/s - OK

Retention

Townhouses

- Tank size – 1kL - OK
- Roof area to tank – 100% - OK
- **Plumbed into W.C. or laundry – to be nominated on plans**

Building A

- Tank size – 5.5 kL - OK
- Roof area to tank – 100% - OK
- Plumbed into W.C. or laundry – for onsite irrigation - OK

Water Quality

Residential

- **Surface areas are required to have devices to remove solid and liquid pollutants such as GPT/Filtration/bioretention/biofiltration**
 - **SMP nominates 6 x Ocean Protect Ocean Guards – plans nominate on GIPs but no 2 SEPs – please nominate – suitable for Reserved Matter**
 - **SMP nominates Ocean Protect Jellyfish JF-900-2-1 - Ocean Guards – plans nominate Ocean Protect Jellyfish JF-900-2-1 – OK**
- MUSIC modelling required to prove nominated treatment system meet EPA requirements – OK
- **Integrated stormwater management**
 - **Area of permeable pavement – nominated in TPZ - OK**
 - **cross-section detail of permeable paving provided drawings - suitable for Reserved Matter**
- Bin storage, loading & unloading & washout areas – OK
 - Bunded & roofed to prevent stormwater entry
 - Impervious
 - Drain wastewater to sewer or holding tank i.e. not connected to stormwater

Pump system

2 pumps each with flow rate capacity - nominated on plans – 12L/s - OK

Alternate duty pump - nominated on plans

Audible alarm system - nominated on plans – OK

Back-up power supply to be installed or safe failure storage area (20% AEP 4hrs) – not nominated but 57.6kL provides adequate safe failure storage - OK

Direct connection to pits

Flow rates greater than 20L/s - NO – direct connect to Council system not supported – discharge to kerb & watertable in Market Place

Retaining walls

Single sleeper - OK

General

Kerb outlets

- Stormwater connection to kerb outlet must be perpendicular to kerb – OK but check updated plan for Market Place
- Boundary sump provided for maintenance/overflow – OK but check updated plan for Market Place
- **Kerb outlets must be minimum of 0.5m from outside edge of driveway invert wing – dimensioned on plans - suitable for Reserved Matter**
- Kerb outlets must be minimum of 0.5m from outside edge of SEP – dimensioned on plans – N/A
- Kerb outlets must be minimum of 2m from base of tree – dimensioned on plans – N/A
- Tophat or box channel kerb outlets must be galvanised and have checkerplate finish on surface – nominated on plans - OK

Driveways

- Driveway crossovers to be 2m from base of tree - dimensioned on plans – N/A
- Driveway crossovers must be minimum of 0.5m from outside edge of utility/service pits/stobie poles – dimensioned on plans
 - if clashing provide written evidence of clearance from asset owner or nominate to be relocated or made trafficable – OK
- Driveway inverts must be minimum of 0.5m from outside edge of driveway invert wing to outside edge of SEP – dimensioned on plans – N/A
- Driveway crossovers to be Paved Commercial type as per Council standard – nominate on plans – OK
- **Driveway crossover grades to be shown on plans - max 2.5% through footpath**
- **Driveway Crossover dimensions at boundary and kerb to be shown on plans**
- **Maximum 0.5m taper for crossovers**
- Driveway inverts to be Commercial type as per Council standard – nominate on plans – OK

Redundant infrastructure

- Redundant driveway invert & crossover to be replaced with K&G, verge and DDA compliant Paved footpath as per Council standards – nominate on plans – OK
- **Redundant stormwater outlets and pipes to be removed and reinstated to match existing K&G, verge and path as per Council standards – note on plans**

Landscaping

Applicant to provide arborist report on impacts on regulated/significant tree and extent of tree pruning required to facilitate construction.

Street Trees

The street tree in front of 105 Gibson Street, Bowden has been assessed in accordance with Council's Tree and Vegetation Policy and has been approved for removal subject to the owner/developer of the property compensating Council for the amenity value of the tree, tree and stump removal costs. Total amenity evaluation, including tree removal costs is \$738.00 (GST inc) which is required to be paid prior to Council's Arboricultural staff remove the tree.

In regard to the five trees on Hawker Street, the survey plan indicates that the centre of each tree is either on private property or the boundary, subsequently indicating the applicant is taking ownership of the trees, including tree removal.

Encroachments

Developer to confirm that no elements of the front facade of the townhouses will not encroach on Hawker St road reserve

Developer to confirm that no elements of the front facade of the Apartments will not encroach on Market Place road reserve

Heritage

There are no significant concerns from a heritage perspective with the proposed development.

Revised Plans – All Application Documentation – 10/04/2025

Development Project Engineer – 5/05/2025

Only comments in bold to be sent to applicant

Traffic

- There are 30 (28 + 2 SDA) apartments, and 34 (32+ 2 DDA) car parks provided.
- The Code requires 30 (28 + 2 DDA) car parks for residents – this meets the requirements
- The code requires 7 onsite visitor carparks – 4 are provided but due to the gate, these are not freely accessible and is 3 short of requirements
- The availability of on-street carparking within Market Place caters for the shortfall of 3 visitor parks
- **The 4 visitor carparks in the gated area should be marked as such so they are not allocated to a specific apartment**
- **There are 26 bike rails in a secure bike storage room, which is a shortfall of 2 bike rails – this is acceptable**
- All new driveway crossovers and redundant crossover reinstatement to match existing clay pavers - OK
- The 2.49m wide waste ramp onto Market Place is required to match footpath clay pavers.
- The aisle width and car park dimensions are supported.
- **All carparks will require wheel stops to be installed to prevent vehicle overhang over pedestrian access ways and neighbouring fences – suitable for Reserved Matter**
- Driveway dimensions supported, with adequate width waiting area if conflicting movements, which is low likelihood.

Parking restrictions Thursday 9-3pm to allow waste and recycling collections are acceptable.

Waste

Hawker apartments presenting along Hawker is supported.

Design PO 26.3/Design in Urban Areas PO 35.3

Provision is made for suitable household waste and recyclable material storage facilities which are:

- a) located away, or screened, from public view, and**
- b) conveniently located in proximity to dwellings and the waste collection point.**

For the apartments I am supportive of the proposed waste and recycling services as outlined in the WPM prepared by Rawtec. However, I have concerns about only using dual chutes and residents must travel to the

ground floor to dispose of co-mingled recycling which is not convenient and will result in recycling going to landfill.

The developer needs to consider equal access to all three streams and adjusting the waste room on each level to include a co-mingle disposal option and provide commentary.

I note the bin collection area and waste truck collection zone will be from Market Place and will require parking restrictions to be in place to allow truck movements. Collection from Market place is supported provided there is not parking Thursday 9-3pm to allow waste and recycling collections.

I also note that the apartments will require an active building manager to monitor and manage the bin under the chute system.

Civil/Stormwater

Comments below:

FFL

300mm above TOK

- Hawker – $17.360 + 0.300 = 17.660$
- Gibson – $17.510 + 0.300 = 17.810$
- Market – $17.240 + 0.300 = 17.540$

300mm above 1% AEP flood levels – $17.510 + 0.051 + 0.300 = 17.861$

300mm above 1% AEP surface detention ponding levels – N/A

Nominated FFL 17.860 – OK

If surface ponding proposed as detention, there must be a minimum of 150mm freeboard to boundary level to protect neighbouring properties – N/A

Stormwater

Pre-development calcs – 20% AEP – Q10 29.86 L/s – OK

Post-development calcs – 1% AEP

- Building D – 3L/s
- Building A/B/C Roof & surface – 24L/s
- Undetained – 3L/s

Detention

- Building D roof – 8.15kL required - plans nominate 10kL (2 x 5kL tanks) with 30mm orifice - OK
- Building A/B/C Roof & surface – 52.14kL required – plans nominate 57kL (35 & 22kL U/G tanks) with pump system

Kerb outlet flow max 10L/s

- Hawker – 3L/s – OK
- Market – 24L/s - OK

Retention

SMP nominates retention in above ground tanks for onsite reuse but no retention tanks nominated on plans

Stormwater Management Overlay

PO 1.1

Residential development is designed to capture and re-use stormwater to:

- a) **maximise efficient use of water resources**
- b) manage peak stormwater runoff flows and volume to ensure the carrying capacities of downstream systems are not overloaded

c) manage runoff quality to maintain, as close as practical, pre-development conditions.

Water Quality

Residential

- **Surface areas are required to have devices to remove solid and liquid pollutants such as GPT/Filtration/bioretention/biofiltration**
 - **SMP nominates 6 x Ocean Protect Ocean Guards – plans nominate on GIPs but not on 4 SEPs – please nominate – suitable for Reserved Matter**
 - SMP nominates Ocean Protect Jellyfish JF-900-2-1 - Ocean Guards – plans nominate Ocean Protect Jellyfish JF-900-2-1 – OK
- MUSIC modelling required to prove nominated treatment system meet EPA requirements – OK
- **Integrated stormwater management**
 - Area of permeable pavement – nominated in TPZ - OK
 - **cross-section detail of permeable paving provided drawings - suitable for Reserved Matter**
- Bin storage, loading & unloading & washout areas – OK
 - Bunded & roofed to prevent stormwater entry
 - Impervious
 - Drain wastewater to sewer or holding tank i.e. not connected to stormwater

Pump system

2 pumps each with flow rate capacity - nominated on plans – 12L/s - OK

Alternate duty pump - nominated on plans - OK

Audible alarm system - nominated on plans – OK

Back-up power supply to be installed or safe failure storage area (20% AEP 4hrs) – not nominated but 57.6kL provides adequate safe failure storage - OK

Direct connection to pits

Flow rates greater than 20L/s – YES - direct connect to Council system supported

Check pit ownership – DIT pits need written DIT approval to connect – N/A

Pipe through verge must be Class 4 375mm RCP RRJ and perpendicular to kerb – 300mm OK as downstream pipe is smaller

Confirmed pit invert level to be provided on plans to confirm gravity system achievable

Underground services must be shown on plans

Services to be potholed and cross-section prepared confirming gravity system achievable with clearance to services to be provided after planning consent as Reserved Matter

Junction Box installed at/near boundary for maintenance – OK

NOTE to be included on drawing - Council Development Engineer to inspect pipe installation and pit connection prior to backfill - this is a HOLD point. Minimum 48 hours' notice to be provided. – OK

Retaining walls

Single sleeper - OK

General

Kerb outlets

- Stormwater connection to kerb outlet must be perpendicular to kerb – OK but check updated plan for Market Place
- Boundary sump provided for maintenance/overflow – OK but check updated plan for Market Place
- Kerb outlets must be minimum of 0.5m from outside edge of driveway invert wing – dimensioned on plans – N/A
- Kerb outlets must be minimum of 0.5m from outside edge of SEP – dimensioned on plans – N/A

- Kerb outlets must be minimum of 2m from base of tree – dimensioned on plans – N/A
- Tophat or box channel kerb outlets must be galvanised and have checkerplate finish on surface – nominated on plans - OK

Driveways

- Driveway crossovers to be 2m from base of tree - dimensioned on plans – N/A
- Driveway crossovers must be minimum of 0.5m from outside edge of utility/service pits/stobie poles – dimensioned on plans
 - if clashing provide written evidence of clearance from asset owner or nominate to be relocated or made trafficable – OK
- Driveway inverts must be minimum of 0.5m from outside edge of driveway invert wing to outside edge of SEP – dimensioned on plans – N/A
- Driveway crossovers to be Paved Commercial type as per Council standard – nominate on plans – OK
- Driveway crossover grades to be shown on plans - max 2.5% through footpath - OK
- Driveway Crossover dimensions at boundary and kerb to be shown on plans - OK
- Maximum 0.5m taper for crossovers - OK
- Driveway inverts to be Commercial type as per Council standard – nominate on plans – OK

Redundant infrastructure

- Redundant driveway invert & crossover to be replaced with K&G, verge and DDA compliant Paved footpath as per Council standards – nominate on plans – OK
- Redundant stormwater outlets and pipes to be removed and reinstated to match existing K&G, verge and path as per Council standards – note on plans - OK

Landscaping

Applicant to provide arborist report on impacts on regulated/significant tree and extent of tree pruning required to facilitate construction.

Street Trees

The street tree in front of 105 Gibson Street, Bowden has been assessed in accordance with Council’s Tree and Vegetation Policy and has been approved for removal subject to the owner/developer of the property compensating Council for the amenity value of the tree, tree and stump removal costs. Total amenity evaluation, including tree removal costs is \$738.00 (GST inc) which is required to be paid prior to Council’s Arboricultural staff remove the tree.

In regard to the five trees on Hawker Street, the survey plan indicates that the centre of each tree is either on private property or the boundary, subsequently indicating the applicant is taking ownership of the trees, including tree removal.

Encroachments

N/A

Heritage

The design quality of the proposed development is high, and the amended scale of the proposed development helps to integrate the proposal into the surrounding Historic Area Overlay and the Established Neighbourhood Zone. The density, mass, scale have all been adjusted to better reflect the locality.



Anaglypta

ARCHITECTURE

ABN 81 614 388 439

PO Box 1390

Mount Barker SA 5251

08 83883440

pippa@anaglypta.com.au

Heritage Advice

DA Number	24024441
Property Address:	105 Gibson Street, Bowden 16 Market Place, Bowden 18 Market Place, Bowden 2-10 Market Place, Bowden 12 Market Place, Bowden
Proposed Development:	Three-storey residential flat building comprising community housing dwellings (40) and supported accommodation premises (2), two-storey group dwellings (6) and demolition of buildings including one Representative Building
Overlay:	Historic Area (ChSt2)
Zone Section:	Established Neighbourhood
Author:	Anaglypta Architecture Pippa Buckberry
Date:	01/10/2024

The following is an assessment of the heritage related Assessment Provisions under the Planning and Design Code, relating to the proposed development.

Given the nature of the proposed development, there are several aspects to consider from a heritage perspective. They are;

1. Proposed demolition of the existing Representative Building
2. Impacts of the proposed design on any nearby Local Heritage Places
3. Impacts of the proposed design on the Historic Area Overlay & Established Neighbourhood Zone

1. Proposed Demolition of an existing Representative Building

Legislative Context:

PlanSA Historic Area Overlay Design Advisory Guidelines state:

Buildings or features that are not consistent with the Historic Area Statement can be demolished or redeveloped in a manner that contextually responds to the existing coherent patterns of land division, site configuration, streetscapes, building siting and built scale, form and features as exhibited in the Historic Area and expressed in the Historic Area Statements.

Historic Area Statements (HAS) define the attributes that are displayed in the streetscape character of a locality. Importantly, a 'unified' streetscape is not a critical feature of a Historic Area Overlay, but rather the concentration of original dwellings representing the eras and styles expressed in the Historic Area Statements.

The following table compares the Ovingham Historic Area (ChSt2) statement, including the Architectural styles, detailing and built form features, against the properties in question at 12-14 Market Place.

	ChSt2 Identified Characteristics	Subject Site 12-14 Market Place, Brompton	Subject Site Consistency with Identified Characteristics:
Eras, themes and context	1850s to 1900 1930s to 1940s 1970s to 1980s (SA Housing Trust)	Likely constructed c1900 - 1920's (see below)	⊖
Allotments, subdivision and built form patterns	Small narrow lots, often on strongly sloping sites. Allotment shape and size variable and angled to suit strongly sloping sites and street pattern including Albert Turnbull Reserve.	The existing allotment is indeed angled; however this appears to be due to the railway line and various changes to roads within the locality. The site is also relatively flat (the strongly sloping portion of the HAO predominantly to the eastern side of the railway tracks) and relatively large in comparison to many in the locality.	⊖
Architectural Styles, detailing and built form features	Single storey, detached and attached, single and double fronted workers' cottages. Bungalows and Austerity houses. Some early SA Housing Trust stock. Typically gable and hipped roofs facing the street, with separate verandah form. Generous roof planes and eaves overhangs to bungalows. Low wide bungalow style overhang verandah or gable.	Original dwelling is an unusual maisonette (or semi-detached) design with curious and conflicting details including; - large gable facing street, with 3 slit vent (common with early, modest Bungalows) - slender stepped brick chimneys (more akin to federation era chimneys than the pared back styles found typically with bungalows) - symmetrical semidetached design (not common with Bungalows) - Bullnosed verandah below protruding brick course (a detail more common with Federation era homes). Despite these strangely hybrid features they are consistent with the characteristics described.	☑
Building height	Single storey with ceiling heights at least 3m.	Single storey, heights consistent with the locality.	☑
Materials	Bluestone, sandstone and pressed metal/corrugated walls.	Building is constructed of redbrick (over painted)	☑

☑ = Displays characteristics of HAO	⊗ = Does not correspond to characteristics of HAO	⊖ = inconclusive
-------------------------------------	---	------------------

	<p>Chimneys; brick or painted render.</p> <p>Red brick walls, chimneys and piers.</p> <p>Render to verandah piers, chimneys and banding.</p> <p>Corrugated steel roofing in galvanised or paint finish.</p> <p>OG guttering in galvanised or paint finish.</p> <p>Painted timber to window frames, doors and roof trim.</p>	<p>Chimneys are painted brick.</p> <p>Corrugated steel roofing, likely galvanised.</p> <p>Guttering appears to be Ogee profile (reinforcing earlier construction date).</p> <p>Painted timber window frames (front windows appear to be multi pane, also reinforcing earlier construction date).</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fencing	<p>Low front fencing, typically picket fencing and low masonry walls or combination thereof.</p>	<p>There is no street facing front fence, however there is an low & open style palisade fencing, non-original, but not unsympathetic to the Historic Area Characteristics, between the two properties.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Displays characteristics of HAO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Does not correspond to characteristics of HAO	<input type="checkbox"/> = inconclusive
---	---	---

Conclusion (Demolition of Representative Building)

The existing semidetached building is currently obscured from view by vegetation, however a visit to the site and earlier google street imagery clearly shows the features of the existing structure.

These features are an unusual combination of federation era and modest bungalow buildings. However, the features are individually consistent with those described within the Historic Area Overlay Characteristics.

It is however relevant to consider the extent to which there is a consistent and historic streetscape in the specific locality. To this end, other than the semidetached structure in question, with the gradual demolition of buildings along Market Place prior to the implementation of the current Planning and Design Code, there are no other examples of early 20th century construction within the whole block bounded by Market Place, the railway tracks, Hawker Street and Gibson Street. Furthermore, across the railway, for the width of the subject site, through to Telford Street is similarly devoid of historic reference points.

Demolition of the identified Representative Building within this context therefore becomes a less radical proposition.

2. Impacts of the proposed design on any nearby Local Heritage Places

There is one Local Heritage Place near to the subject site at 103 Gibson Street. However, the Heritage Adjacency Overlay does not extend across Hawker Street and as Hawker Street is a wide road, the proposed development will have little impact on this specific building.

3. Impacts of the proposed design on the Historic Area Overlay & Established Neighbourhood Zone

The following Desired Outcomes and Performance Outcomes are considered relevant to the proposed development assessment;

Historic Area Overlay Assessment Provisions

DO1 Historic themes and characteristics are reinforced through conservation and contextually responsive development, design and adaptive reuse that responds to existing coherent patterns of land division, site configuration, streetscapes, building siting and built scale, form and features as exhibited in the Historic Area and expressed in the Historic Area Statement.

Response: The proposed development is a well-considered design response which responds to many of the characteristics of the locality, except for scale. The Historic Area Overlay (HAO) speaks to single storey development and while two-storey development has been constructed within the HAO (and is used as a reference point in this design response – refer item 6 page 15 of the design response) what the proposal fails to recognise is that substantial effort was made to minimise the dominance of these second stories and set them back behind a single storey form which should be the primary reference point. The proposed development is at minimum two stories with a considerable proportion of the site three stories, dwarfing the surrounding historic buildings.

PO 1.1 All development is undertaken having consideration to the historic streetscapes and built form as expressed in the Historic Area Statement.

Response: As described above, the proposed design demonstrates consideration to the historic streetscape, except with respect to scale.

PO 2.1 The form and scale of new buildings and structures that are visible from the public realm are consistent with the prevailing historic characteristics of the historic area.

Response: This Performance Outcome is not satisfied. The Historic Area Statement clearly describes single storey development as the defining characteristic. The proposed development is 2 & 3 stories, with no roof forms or verandahs at a single storey level.

PO 2.2 Development is consistent with the prevailing building and wall heights in the historic area.

Response: This Performance Outcome is not satisfied. Ceiling heights of 3m are described within the Historic Area Statement, roof heights of the proposed development range between 6.8m to 11.5m.

PO 2.3 Design and architectural detailing of street-facing buildings (including but not limited to roof pitch and form, openings, chimneys and verandahs) complement the prevailing characteristics in the historic area.

Response: This Performance Outcome is satisfied by the proposed development, which takes its detailing and design cues from the surrounding neighbourhood.

PO 2.4 Development is consistent with the prevailing front and side boundary setback pattern in the historic area.

Response: This Performance Outcome is satisfied by the proposed development, which has similar setbacks to many other adjacent and nearby dwellings.

PO 2.5 Materials are either consistent with or complement those within the historic area.

Response: In terms of texture the materials selected have responded to the locality, choosing brickwork, corrugated materials, timber and various light weight cladding choices.

In terms of colour, they are bold choices which have subverted the traditional choices ('Pale Eucalypt' corrugated steel, white and brown bricks, white profiled cladding etc). However, the locality is a 'gritty' urban environment with many varied textures and colours so the selections themselves are not necessarily going to undermine the integrity of the Historic Area Overlay.

PO 4.1 Ancillary development, including carports, outbuildings and garages, complements the historic character of the area and associated buildings.

PO 4.2 Ancillary development, including carports, outbuildings and garages, is located behind the building line of the principal building(s) and does not dominate the building or its setting.

Response (4.1 & 4.2): Garaging is not a visual element from primary and secondary street frontages, being accessed from rear boundaries of the site. This approach is supported & these Performance Outcomes are satisfied.

PO 4.4 Fencing and gates closer to a street boundary (other than a laneway) than the elevation of the associated building are consistent with the traditional period, style and form of the associated building.

Response: This Performance Outcome is satisfied. Low masonry walls, utilising the same bricks as the development behind, with and without bushes and shrubs, is consistent with the Historic Area characteristics.

PO 6.2 Development maintains the valued landscape patterns and characteristics that contribute to the historic area, except where they compromise safety, create nuisance, or impact adversely on buildings or infrastructure.

Response: The proposal appears to be broadly consistent with the Historic Area characteristics with respect to landscape patterns.

PO 7.1

Buildings and structures, or features thereof, that demonstrate the historic characteristics as expressed in the Historic Area Statement are not demolished, unless:

(a) the front elevation of the building has been substantially altered and cannot be reasonably restored in a manner consistent with the building's original style or

(b) the structural integrity or safe condition of the original building is beyond reasonable repair.

Response: Refer above assessment – Item 1: Proposed demolition of the existing Representative Building.

Established Neighbourhood Zone Assessment Provisions

D02 Maintain the predominant streetscape character, having regard to key features such as roadside plantings, footpaths, front yards, and space between crossovers.

Response: The proposed development amalgamates 6 existing allotments into a single allotment, albeit with two distinct parts. While crossovers are kept in similar locations to existing, the predominant streetscape character created by semi-regular separate allotments is disrupted by the scale, mass and density of the proposed development.

PO 2.1 Allotments/sites for residential purposes are of suitable size and dimension to accommodate the anticipated dwelling form and are compatible with the prevailing development pattern in the locality.

Technical and Numeric Variations applicable -

- *Minimum Frontage (residential flat building is 18m)*
- *Minimum Site Area (residential flat building is 275 sqm)*

Response: The proposed development can essentially be considered in two portions; the two storey townhouses in one part (site area 605m²) and the three storey apartments (site area 2427m²).

The two storey townhouses consist of 6 two bedroom/two bathroom townhouses; effectively equating to 100m² on average per townhouse (6 apartments on the site area of 605m²) well below the TNV of 275m².

The three storey apartment block consists of 42 apartments; effectively equating to 58m² on average per apartment (42 apartments on the site area of 2427m²), substantially below the TNV of 275m².

The proposal would therefore appear to be excessively dense for development within the Established Neighbourhood Zone.

PO 3.1 Building footprints are consistent with the character and pattern of the neighbourhood and provide sufficient space around buildings to limit visual impact, provide an attractive outlook and access to light and ventilation.

Response: The building footprints of the proposed development are inconsistent with the general character and pattern of the neighbourhood. There will be substantial visual impact on the locality given the height, scale, mass and density of the proposed development.

PO 4.1 Buildings contribute to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood and complements the height of nearby buildings.

Technical and Numeric Variations applicable -

- *Maximum Building Height (Metres) (Maximum building height is 6m)*
- *Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 1 level)*

Response: The proposed development is in excess of the applicable TNV's (being 3 levels high and with a maximum height of 11.5m) and will dominate the existing prevailing character of the neighbourhood.

PO 5.1 Buildings are set back from primary street boundaries consistent with the existing streetscape.

Response: Street boundaries within the locality are varied and, in many cases, minimal. The proposed development is consistent with primary street boundaries.

PO 6.1 Buildings are set back from secondary street boundaries (not being a rear laneway) to maintain the established pattern of separation between buildings and public streets and reinforce streetscape character.

Response: Secondary street frontages are broadly consistent with the locality.

PO 8.1 Buildings are set back from side boundaries to provide:

(a) separation between buildings in a way that complements the established character of the locality

(b) access to natural light and ventilation for neighbours

Response: This assessment provision is predicated on individual blocks of typically 18m width with approximately 2-4m of separation between each building. The proposed development, as effectively three large apartment blocks (two facing Hawker Street and 1 facing the railway line) is inconsistent with this pattern of built form and physical separation between buildings.

PO 10.2 The appearance of development as viewed from public roads is sympathetic to the wall height, roof forms and roof pitches of the predominant housing stock in the locality.

Response: The inclusion of visible roof forms to the proposed apartment blocks is one positive attribute of the design, nevertheless, the roof pitches are at much lower degrees than is typical within the ENZ (3 degrees in the proposed development, where typically 27 degree pitches are common). In addition, the wall heights and roof forms are not sympathetic to the predominant housing stock of the locality.

Conclusion (Impacts on HAO & ENZ)

While the design quality of the proposed development is high, the scale of the proposed development is at odds with the surrounding Historic Area Overlay and the Established Neighbourhood Zone. The density, mass, scale and development footprint are all inconsistent with the locality, ignoring the predominantly single storey nature of the locality.