

DEVELOPMENT NO.:	21035481
APPLICANT:	David Bulluss Haydn Frayne Abby Riggs
ADDRESS:	UNIT 2 23 ALMA ST GLENELG SOUTH SA 5045
NATURE OF DEVELOPMENT:	Alterations and two storey addition to existing dwelling and swimming pool in rear yard
ZONING INFORMATION:	<p>Zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established Neighbourhood <p>Overlays:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Airport Building Heights (Regulated) • Affordable Housing • Building Near Airfields • Historic Area • Heritage Adjacency • Prescribed Wells Area • Regulated and Significant Tree • Stormwater Management • Urban Tree Canopy <p>Technical Numeric Variations (TNVs):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum Building Height (Metres) • Minimum Site Area • Maximum Building Height (Levels)
LODGEMENT DATE:	15 Nov 2021
RELEVANT AUTHORITY:	Assessment panel at City of Holdfast Bay
PLANNING & DESIGN CODE VERSION:	4 November 2021 - 2021.16
CATEGORY OF DEVELOPMENT:	Code Assessed - Performance Assessed
NOTIFICATION:	Yes
RECOMMENDING OFFICER	Dean Spasic Development Officer - Planning
Referral:	Andrew Stevens, Heritage Architect

CONTENTS:

APPENDIX 1:	Relevant P&D Code Policies	ATTACHMENT 2:	Representations
ATTACHMENT 1:	Proposed Plans	ATTACHMENT 3:	Response to Representations

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:

The proposal comprises a two storey addition to an existing single storey semi-detached dwelling, which is setback 8.3 metres from the building façade. The roof material and pitch matches the existing dwelling and the walls are clad with Scyon Axon. A swimming pool is located in the south-western rear corner of the back yard.

BACKGROUND:

A development application 110/010408/20 was considered by the Council Assessment Panel, which was refused on the basis of the proposal failing to satisfy the Development Plan with respect to sympathetic design. Following this refusal, the applicant engaged a Heritage Architect (Dash Architects) as well as a Planning Consultant (MasterPlan), who assisted in considering the design relative to the heritage character area, and providing a professional view in support of the proposal as well as additional information in the form of 3D renders to better illustrate the merits of the proposal (See Attachment 1). The proposal is also now assessed against the new Planning system, against the relevant provisions of the Design Code. In essence, the proposal has been viewed by two separate Heritage Architects, both of which consider the design to be appropriate in the context of the heritage character. Further, the proposed displays sufficient compliance with the Design Code.

SUBJECT LAND & LOCALITY:**Site Description:**

The site is the northern-most single storey semi-detached dwelling, on an allotment of 175 square metres.



To the north, is a single storey detached dwelling of the same architectural scheme. The detached dwelling is attached to the semi-detached dwellings by way of only a front verandah.



Location reference: UNIT 2 23 ALMA ST GLENELG SOUTH SA 5045

Title ref.: CT 5400/861 **Plan Parcel:** S7828 UN2 **Council:** CITY OF HOLDFAST BAY

Locality



The locality is residential, and more specifically, within the New Glenelg Historic Area Overlay. The buildings found within the locality are from the 1860s to 1930s, with the most intense development occurring in the 1870s to 1880s following the subdivision of land in the 1850s.

The subject building does not have a Heritage or Representative listing, however it displays architecture reflective of the kind of built form that contributes to the overall character of the locality.

There is a Local Heritage place located south-west of the subject site at 16 Ramsgate Street. The proposed addition is not located in view of the Local Heritage building when viewed from different vantage points on Ramsgate or Alma Streets. The site is mostly surrounded by Representative Buildings, hence the predominant heritage character in the locality is intact, with very few examples of architecture that is out of character.

The built form is mostly reflective of late Victorian to early 20th Century Period architecture, characterised by:

- Symmetrical and asymmetrical cottages of low scale and simple form;
- High degree of modulation and articulation;
- Low scale;
- Steep roof pitches in the order of 30 to 40 degrees;
- Short roof spans with hipped and gable roof forms;
- Concave, bullnose and straight-pitched verandahs;
- Fine grain detailing;
- High solid to void ratio;
- Vertical proportions in windows and doors;
- Predominantly single storey;
- Building materials are reflective of the 1840s to 1920s period, which includes sandstone, bluestone and brick, corrugated iron and tiled roofing and timber joinery.

There is a predominance of single storey buildings, however there are also examples of two storey buildings, including:

1 Baker Street
20 Alma Street
20A Alma Street
16 Ramsgate Street

CONSENT TYPE REQUIRED:

Planning Consent

CATEGORY OF DEVELOPMENT:

- **PER ELEMENT:** Dwelling alteration or addition
Swimming pool, spa pool or associated safety features: Code Assessed - Performance Assessed
Dwelling addition: Code Assessed - Performance Assessed
Internal building work: Accepted
- **OVERALL APPLICATION CATEGORY:**
Code Assessed - Performance Assessed

- **REASON**
P&D Code

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

- **REASON**
Wall on boundary exceeds 3.2 metres in height.
Note: Following the initial public notification process, Council was advised by a number of neighbouring residents that they did not receive a notification letter. Although Council is confident that due process was achieved in the initial notification period, the Applicant agreed with Council to re-send letters to neighbours in order to ensure a fair and impartial assessment process.
- **LIST OF REPRESENTATIONS**
A total of 10 Representations were received, with 6 (green circle) in support and 4 (red circle) against the proposal.



- **SUMMARY**
For those in support of the proposal:
 - Development in keeping with the area;
 - Does not impact on the aesthetic of the street;
 - Adds value to surrounding properties;

- Well designed, looks great;
- Will not impact the character of the locality;
- Addition will add functionality for a family; and
- No change to the density of the street

For those against the proposal:

- Visual privacy;
- Increase in density;
- No architectural merit in building appearance;
- Exceeds site coverage parameters;
- Impact on streetscape (public laneway);
- Insufficient side and rear setbacks;
- Insufficient car parking;
- Does not conserve historical significance of locality;
- Does not contribute to the desired character of the locality;
- Noise pollution;
- Overshadowing;
- Inappropriate colour selection;
- Not environmentally friendly;
- Excessive building height;
- Addition dominates the primary façade;
- Does not maintain space between buildings consistent with low density streetscape character;
- No space for landscaping or vegetation;

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

The application has been assessed against the relevant provisions of the Planning & Design Code, which are contained in Appendix One.

Heritage and Built Form

The existing dwelling is a circa 1880/90s Late Victorian semi-detached cottage (northern-most house). It is of high integrity and makes a positive contribution to the streetscape character and is consistent with the eras, themes and context mentioned in the New Glenelg Historic Area Statement.

The building reflects a low scale, simple form, cottage with stonework to the façade, rendered to window and door frames, corrugated straight pitched front verandah with lacework to the underside, hipped corrugated roofing at a 30 degree pitch.

A referral was made to Council's Heritage Consultant, Andrew Stevens, who provided the following summary:

The upper level addition is setback 8.3 metres behind the main face of the existing dwelling, with Sycon wall cladding (Wallaby colour) and 22.5 degree hipped corrugated iron roof pitch.

The demolition of the rear building elements and construction of the rear additions is acceptable as the additions are single-storey form, low in scale and do not impact on the streetscape appearance of the subject dwelling. Important building features such as the chimneys are retained.

The proposed upper storey addition is acceptable for the following reasons:

- It is well setback from the front of the building and sufficiently well setback such that its streetscape impact is relatively minor;
- It has simple, rectilinear form and a hipped roof, compatible with the main dwelling but of a lower pitch to reduce its impact;
- It is relatively low in scale and simple in form and the overall height is reasonably compatible with the subject dwelling, given the front setback;
- Proposed materials and colours are compatible with the dwelling (Sycon wall cladding is a recessive colour of mid to dark grey and corrugated galvanised steel to match the main dwelling roof); and
- The proposed development is sufficiently distant from the Local Heritage Place at 16 Ramsgate Street to not adversely impact its heritage value.



3D render prepared by Dash Architects to demonstrate the appearance from the streetscape

Building Height

The Design Code allows a maximum building height of 9 metres and 2 levels. The proposed addition has a total height of only 7 metres and 2 levels, therefore within the height limits anticipated by the Code.

Boundary Setbacks

The addition is setback 8.3 metres behind the main face of the existing dwelling, therefore it does not present any significant visual prominence as viewed from Alma Street.



3D render prepared by Dash Architects to demonstrate the appearance from the streetscape



3D render prepared by Dash Architects to demonstrate the appearance from the streetscape

The building has a wall height of 5.7 metres and is setback 870mm from the northern side boundary. The Design Code requires a minimum side boundary setback of 1.8 metres, therefore the northern side setback is at variance by 930mm. As demonstrated with the perspective drawings, the northern elevation will not be visible from the streetscape, and critically, will not cast a shadow over the northern adjacent property.

The upper level wall is located on the southern side boundary, which abuts the party wall between the semi-detached dwellings. The wall will not overshadow the southern abutting semi-detached dwelling, as it will simply cast a shadow over the roof. Visually, the southern elevation will not be visually dominant relative to the existing dwelling, therefore the significance of the setback variance is limited.

The upper level wall is setback 5 metres from the western rear boundary, which is at variance with the Design Code minimum of 6 metres.

Site Coverage

Site coverage amounts to 63 percent of the site area (110 square metres), which exceeds the maximum of 50 percent allowed by the Design Code. The existing building covers 54 percent of the site (95 square metres). Although the percentage of exceedance appears significant, 63 percent vs the existing 54 percent), the actual increase in building area for the purpose of site coverage is only 15 square metres.

Private Open Space

Private open space amounts to 42 square metres, which is beyond the minimum of 24 square metres required by the Design Code.

Visual Privacy

A condition of planning consent is included to ensure all upstairs windows to the side and rear elevations are fixed, obscured and not openable up to 1500mm above the finished upper floor level.

Landscaping

A total of 14.9 percent soft landscaping is proposed as part of the development application. The Design Code requires a minimum of 15 percent soft landscaping. The less than 1 percent shortfall is negligible, particularly as the swimming pool can accommodate any excess water runoff.

Traffic Impact, Access and Parking

A dwelling addition does not generate the requirement for additional on-site car parking.

CONCLUSION

The proposed development is considered to meet the relevant principles of the Design Code, and critically the design has been referred to a suitably qualified Heritage Architect, who has advised Council that the design is appropriate and satisfactory in the context of the heritage setting. The only variance is with respect to the upper-level wall side boundary setbacks, however as discussed, the variances are not considered inappropriate given there are no visual or overshadowing impacts on neighbouring properties or the streetscape.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council Assessment Panel/SCAP resolve that:

1. Pursuant to Section 107(2)(c) of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, and having undertaken an assessment of the application against the Planning and Design Code, the application is NOT seriously at variance with the provisions of the Planning and Design Code; and

2. Development Application Number 21035481, by David Bulluss, Haydn Frayne and Abby Riggs is GRANTED Planning Consent subject to the following conditions:

CONDITIONS

Planning Consent

1. The development granted approval shall be undertaken and completed in accordance with the stamped plans and documentation, except where varied by conditions below (if any).
2. That all upstairs windows to side and rear elevations shall have minimum window sill heights of 1.5 metres above finished floor level, or any glass below 1.5 metres shall be obscure and fixed shut or as otherwise approved prior to occupation.
3. That the associated filter pump must be enclosed in such a way that noise levels do not exceed 45db(a) measured at adjoining property boundaries.

ADVISORY NOTES

General Notes

1. No work can commence on this development unless a Development Approval has been obtained. If one or more consents have been granted on this Decision Notification Form, you must not start any site works or building work or change of use of the land until you have received notification that Development Approval has been granted.
2. Appeal rights – General rights of review and appeal exist in relation to any assessment, request, direction or act of a relevant authority in relation to the determination of this application, including conditions.
3. This consent or approval will lapse at the expiration of 2 years from its operative date, subject to the below or subject to an extension having been granted by the relevant authority.
4. Where an approved development has been substantially commenced within 2 years from the operative date of approval, the approval will then lapse 3 years from the operative date of the approval (unless the development has been substantially or fully completed within those 3 years, in which case the approval will not lapse).
5. A decision of the Commission in respect of a development classified as restricted development in respect of which representations have been made under section 110 of the Act does not operate—
 - a. until the time within which any person who made any such representation may appeal against a decision to grant the development authorisation has expired; or
 - b. if an appeal is commenced—
 - i. until the appeal is dismissed, struck out or withdrawn; or
 - ii. until the questions raised by the appeal have been finally determined (other than any question as to costs).

OFFICER MAKING RECOMMENDATION**Name:** Dean Spasic**Title:** Development Officer - Planning**Date:** 07/04/2022