

Summary of residents' concerns and Council response

1 Location of submitters



 Location of submitter

2 Consideration of issues raised

Issue	Planning comment/response
Inadequate building separation to southern boundary and resultant overshadowing and inequitable distribution of ADG separation requirements	<p>The original proposal indicated a 6 m setback along the boundary between the subject site and the adjoining property to the south. This setback was considered inadequate as it resulted in overshadowing and an inequal distribution of the 18 m building separation required under the Apartment Design Guide.</p> <p>The application was revised to increase this setback from 6 m to 9 m. The amendments result in a better outcome, providing increased solar access to the adjoining property and a more equitable distribution of the building separation requirements across the boundary.</p> <p>The revised plans were notified to the submitter and they have noted that the revised setback provides an equitable outcome for both properties, representing the orderly and economic development of land.</p>

Issue	Planning comment/response
Inaccurate assumptions about development of adjoining land	<p>The original proposal included plans which indicated a potential outcome for built form on the land to the south. The plans also showed and also included a park on the western side and a laneway along the shared boundary.</p> <p>Revised plans were submitted by the applicant which removed the laneway and park from the adjoining site, however the built form remains on the plans.</p> <p>The application has not been assessed under any assumption of the built form outcome on the adjoining property and the plan which shows the assumed development on the adjoining site has been removed from the application. Where any building envelope is shown within the DA documentation, this has been marked-up to indicate that it is not part of any proposal by the adjoining land owner.</p>