TO: COUNCIL ASSESSMENT PANEL

DATE: **26 JUNE 2019**

SUBJECT: COUNCIL ASSESSMENT REPORT

AUTHOR: A STAMATOPOULOS

DEVELOPMENT OFFICER - PLANNING

ATTACHMENTS: 1. LOCALITY MAP

2. PROPOSAL PLANS

3. REPRESENTATIONS

4. RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS

HEARING OF REPRESENTORS: GLORIA AND NICKOLAS DEMBOWSKI

HEARING OF APPLICANT: ROKSOLID CONSTRUCTION

DA NO. : 110/00175/19

APPLICANT : ROKSOLID CONSTRUCTION

LOCATION : 5 STRICKLAND ROAD, KINGSTON PARK

DEVELOPMENT PLAN : CONSOLIDATED 2 JUNE 2016

ZONE AND POLICY AREA : RESIDENTIAL ZONE

NATURE OF DEVELOPMENT: MERIT

PROPOSAL : VARIATION TO DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION 110/00416/17 (TWO

STOREY GROUP DWELLING AND RESIDENTIAL FLAT BUILDING

COMPRISING TWO DWELLINGS) - COMPRISING THE CONSTRUCTION

OF AN UPPER ROOF TERRACE ON RESIDENCE ONE

REFERRALS : NIL

CATEGORY : THREE

REPRESENTATIONS TWO

RECOMMENDATION : DEVELOPMENT PLAN CONSENT SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

1. Background

An application was lodged to Council on the 6th of March 2019 to vary the existing land use application by way of constructing a roof terrace to Residence 1. A land use application (DA 110/00416/17) was lodged and approved by the Council Assessment Panel on the 22 November 2017. The subject site is located in the Residential Zone at 5 Strickland Road, Kingston Park. The application is a Category 3 development as the nature of works is not captured as Category 1 or Category 2 subject to Schedule 9 of the Development Regulations 2008. Two representations were received during the consultation; one was in support of the proposal.

2. Site and Locality

The subject site is located on a rectangle shaped allotment which slopes up substantially from west to east. The majority of dwellings in the locality contain a two storey built form with few examples of single storey dwellings. The subject land overlooks the coast immediately to the west and is bounded by other residential sites to the east and west. A lane separates the allotment to the south and Strickland Road to the north.

New development in the locality is trending with the majority of dwellings being two storeys in height with the intent to capture views of the coast. The size of allotments within the locality is varied. There is a mixture of Torrens Title allotments, Community Title dwellings in the form of group dwellings and 1970s strata units.

Refer to Attachment 1

3. Proposed Development

The applicant proposes to construct a rooftop terrace to residence one which is the dwelling closest to Strickland Road. The rooftop deck contains a solid wall to the eastern rear of the dwelling which steps down to a 1m high balustrade which surrounds the remaining northern, western and southern sides. The terrace is located within the roof footprint as it contains setbacks to all boundaries.

4. Development Data

DEVELOPMENT DATA				
Aspect	Proposed	Compliance		
Terrace Setbacks				
North	7.5m	Complies		
South	5.5m	Complies		
East	10m	Complies		
West	7m	Complies		
Wall Height	9.7m	Exceeds anticipated maximum by 2.7m		

5. Public Consultation

The proposed development was subject to Category 3 public notification, two representations were received. A summary of the representations are shown below:

Mr and Mrs Dembowski of 4/7 Strickland Road, Kingston Park

• Concerns raised regarding overlooking from the terrace

L Ritchie of 3/3 Strickland Road, Kingston Park

• Representor resides in unit behind the subject land and is in favour of the proposed structure.

Refer to Attachment 3

A response was received from the applicant addressing the issues raised. Further documentation showing line of sight diagrams were provided which show that visual privacy of the units to west of the subject will not be compromised.

Refer to Attachment 4

6. Development Plan Provisions

HOLDFAST BAY (CITY) DEVELOPMENT – ASSESSMENT – RESIDENTIAL ZONE AND POLICY AREAS – OBJECTIVES AND PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

RESIDENTIAL ZONE		
Objectives		
1. A residential zone comprising a range of dwelling types,	N/A	
including a minimum of 15% affordable housing.		
2. Increased dwelling densities in close proximity to centres,	N/A	
public transport routes and public open spaces.		
3. Development that contributes to the desired character of the	Complies	
zone.		
Desired Character		
Development outside of the policy areas will be suburban in	Complies	
nature and evolve in response to progressive infill development		
of existing individual sites and through consolidation of sites to		
form larger comprehensive redevelopment opportunities. Infill		
development outside of the Policy Areas will not compromise		
the suburban character but will progressively increase dwelling		
densities through unobtrusive small-scale developments. In this		
regard, infill development will have a comparable height, mass,		
scale and setbacks to that of existing dwellings in the relevant		
locality.		
The zone's primarily suburban character outside of the policy		
areas is defined by detached dwellings on individual allotments.		
Infill development in these suburban areas will contribute to the		
city's housing diversity through development opportunities that		
(in order of preference):		
(a) increase dwelling numbers on allotments that have dual		
road frontages		
Development outside of the policy areas will comprise:	Γ	
Single storey in areas east of Brighton Road, and up to two	Complies	
storeys in areas west of Brighton Road.		
Buildings both domestic and contemporary in design and	Complies	
character to support and reinforce the essentially suburban		
character through typical domestic design forms, low front		
fencing and landscaping.		
Materials and finishes that respond to the character of the	Complies	
immediate locality and utilise brick, stone and rendered		
finishes to provide visual interest to facades.		
Architectural design and detailing that responds to localised	Complies	
character by way of fenestration, doorways, windows, eaves		
and roof forms.		
Development will be setback and be orientated to minimise	Complies	
impacts of the privacy of neighbouring residents.		

RESIDENTIAL ZONE (Cont)				
Development outside of the policy areas v	vill comprise:			
1. The following forms of development are envisaged in the			lies	
zone:				
 affordable housing 				
 domestic outbuilding in association wit 	h a dwelling			
 domestic structure 				
• dwelling				
 dwelling addition 				
 small scale non-residential use that ser 	ves the local			
community, for example:				
 child care facility 				
 health and welfare service 				
 open space 				
 primary and secondary school 				
 recreation area 				
 supported accommodation. 				
,,				
3. Except where specified in a particular po		Compl	ies	
underutilised land should be developed in a				
ordinated manner to increase housing choi				
dwellings at densities higher than, but compatible with				
adjoining residential development.				
6. Development should not be undertaken unless it is consistent		Compl	lies	
with the desired character for the zone.			dende on a literatura de la compansión de la la compansión de la compansió	
8. Dwellings and residential flat buildings, e		ın a parı	cicular policy area or precinct, sho	ould not exceed the
maximum heights shown in the following table: Location of the dwelling Maximum wall heigh			Maximum height above	
Location of the dwelling	above natural ground		natural ground level	
West of Brighton Road or Tapleys Hill	7 metres	10001	Two storeys	
Road	7 metres		Two storeys	
East of Brighton Road or Tapleys Hill	3.5 metres		One storey, or two storeys	Does not comply
Road	3.5 metres		if the second storey is	Does not comply
Nodu			incorporated within the	
			roof space and the floor	
			area of the second storey	
			does not exceed 40 percent	
			of the ground floor	
			footprint of the dwelling,	
			including attached garages.	

HOLDFAST BAY (CITY) DEVELOPMENT PLAN – ASSESSMENT – RESIDENTIAL - COUNCIL WIDE – PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Siting and Visibility - Objectives		
2. Development that recognises significant views and vistas of the coast	Complies	
and the Southern Mount Lofty Ranges.		
Siting and Visibility – Principles of Development Control		
1. Development should be sited and designed to minimise its visual	Complies	
impact on:		
(b) areas of high visual or scenic value, particularly rural and coastal		
areas		

Residential Development				
	ings should ansure that direct	Complies		
10. The design and location of buildings should ensure that direct		Compiles		
winter sunlight is available to adjacent dwellings, with particular				
consideration given to:				
(a) windows of habitable rooms (all				
laundries and hallways), particularly	living areas			
(b) ground-level private open space				
(c) upper-level private balconies tha	t provide the primary open space			
area for any dwelling				
(d) access to solar energy.	and the state of t	Consultan		
11. Development should ensure tha		Complies		
rooms (all rooms excluding bathroo				
existing dwelling(s) on the same allo				
receive at least 3 hours of direct sur				
between 9 am and 5 pm on the 21 J				
12. Development should ensure tha		Complies		
existing buildings receives direct sur				
between 9 am and 3 pm on 21 June	to at least the smaller of the			
following:				
(a) half of the existing ground-level				
(b) 35 square metres of the existing				
least one of the area's dimensions n				
1	ne overshadowed area by more than			
	rshadowing already exceeds these			
requirements.				
20. Dwellings should be set back fro		Complies		
(a) contribute to the desired charact				
(b) provide adequate visual privacy	-			
rooms excluding bathrooms, laundr	ies and hallways) from pedestrian			
and vehicle movement.				
21. Residential development (other	than where located on a boundary)			
should be setback from side and rea	r boundaries in accordance with the			
following parameters:				
Parameter	Value			
Side walls with a height up to (and	1 metre			
including) 3 metres at any point		N/A		
above the natural ground level				
Side walls with a height exceeding	1.5 metres plus an additional			
3 metres and up to (and including)	500mm for every metre in height	N/A		
6 metres at any point above the	above 4 metres			
natural ground				
Side walls greater than 6 metres	2.5 metres plus the increase in	Complies		
at any point above the natural	wall height above 6 metres			
ground level	_			
Rear boundary setback for single	4 metres	N/A		
storey buildings with a wall height				
3 metres or less above natural				
ground level				
Rear boundary setback for a	6 metres			
building of two or more storeys		Complies		
with a wall height more than 3				
metres above natural ground level				
I meares above natural ground level				

Residential Development (Cont)	
23. Side boundary walls in residential areas should be limited in length	Complies
and height to:	Complies
(a) minimise their visual impact on adjoining properties	
(b) minimise their visual impact on adjoining properties	
40. Development should protect privacy by minimising direct	Complies
overlooking from upper level windows and external balconies, terraces	Compiles
and decks to habitable rooms (all rooms excluding bathrooms, laundries	
and hallways) windows and useable private open spaces of other	
dwellings.	
41. Where development is greater than single storey:	Complies
(a) any upper storey window that directly overlooks the private open	
space of an adjoining residential property that is within 30 metres from	
the vertical centre line of the overlooking window and beyond a 45	
degree angle from the plane of the wall containing the overlooking	
window (as illustrated by the figure below) should be glazed in fixed	
obscure glass or have window sills a minimum of 1.7 metres above the	
upper floor level:	
(b) any upper storey window that directly overlooks habitable rooms	
(all rooms excluding bathrooms, laundries and hallways) of residential	
buildings that are within 15 metres from the vertical centre line of the	
overlooking window and beyond a 45 degree angle from the plane of	
the wall containing the overlooking window (as illustrated by the figure	
below) should be glazed in fixed obscure glass or have window sills a	
minimum of 1.7 metres above the upper floor level:	
(c) any upper storey balcony should be located and/or designed to	
avoid directly overlooking the private open space of adjoining	
residential properties and into habitable rooms (all rooms excluding	
bathrooms, laundries and hallways) of other dwellings.	

7. Summary of Assessment

The application complies with a majority of the quantitative objectives and principles of the Holdfast Bay Development plan. The following assessment will touch on aspects of the application which requires further discussion.

Built Form

The roof terrace will comprise a stairwell leading to the decked living area, which is 5m by 5.4m. In total the upper area measures 5.4m by 6.7m, a total area of 36sqm and the wall height adjacent to the stairwell measures 2.6m. The area is set in 7.5m from the northern boundary, 5.5m from the southern, 10m from the eastern and 7m from the western boundary. Given the substantial setbacks, concerns of visual privacy loss are alleviated. The roof terrace is substantially setback from the west side boundary which results in the roof of the dwelling acting as a screen to restrict overlooking into the adjacent units. This is reflected in the roof deck overlooking plan (attachment 2.7).

Any impacts of the additional level will be from a visible perspective. Given the minimal size of the terrace, the modest built form with the majority comprised of 1m high balustrading and the fact it that is it set significantly back from each boundary and the second level, the visual impact is considered to be minor and will not unreasonably impact on the streetscape or the amenity of the locality. Furthermore, a letter of support from an eastern adjoining unit owner was lodged to Council who would be subject to the most significant effect of the terrace wall from all adjacent landowners.

Views

Regard has to be given to the potential loss of views of the dwellings to the adjoining east. In assessing the importance of views guidance can be taken from the ERD Court judgement *HUTCHENS & ANOR v CITY OF HOLDFAST BAY & ANOR* [2007] SASC 238. This case was for an Esplanade Development of three storeys at Seacliff where consent was issued and an appeal was lodged by the rear adjoining neighbours. I have underlined parts of the case which is relevant to the current proposal.

"As they (the dwellings of the appellant) look directly west between the Seacliff Hotel and the three storey residential flat building to the north of the proposed development, the appellants enjoy a view of the coast. They have a clear view of the sea and the horizon. The view is available from the upper level at the front of their dwellings. It is a notorious fact that coastal and sea views are highly regarded and are in keen demand. The proposed development will affect the view that the appellants now enjoy. If the proposed building is erected, they will have nothing but the barest glimpse of the sea and the horizon on either side of the proposed building. Instead of a pleasant view, they will look directly at the rear walls and roof of the proposed building. To all intents and purposes, they will lose their view to the west. It will be an extreme loss of the view they currently enjoy.

The proposed development complies with the Development Plan in that the Plan states that three storey residential accommodation is appropriate in this zone. However, it is appropriate only if it also complies with relevant principles of development control. Notwithstanding that the proposed building is of a height which may be permitted in an appropriate part of the Residential D Zone and notwithstanding the fact that in other respects it complies with the Development Plan, the proposal effectively obliterates the appellants' view. It does not, therefore, comply with all relevant principles of development control. It offends the principles relating to views to such an extent that development consent must be refused.

In addition, it does not preserve the existing land form contrary to Principle 19. Conformity with Principle 19 can be effected by reducing the height of the proposed building to two storeys. That will give the appearance of buildings being stepped down the slope. The existing buildings on either side of the proposal are likely to remain for the foreseeable future. The height of the roof of the three storey flats is to all intents and purposes the same as the height of the roof of the Seacliff Hotel. The height of the roof of the proposal is noticeably higher than both. The proposal is such a complete obliteration of the views enjoyed by the appellants and so adversely affects their amenity that it is entirely inconsistent with those provisions of the Development Plan which protect views. No one has a monopoly upon views. At the same time, that does not entitle the proponents of a new building to obstruct the views currently enjoyed by others especially where, as here, it is possible to construct a new building at a level which will permit those behind to continue to enjoy the views at present available to them. Development consent should not, therefore, be permitted.

For these reasons, the appeal will be allowed. The decision of the Environment Court will be set aside. There will also be an order setting aside the decision of the Council made on the 16 August 2005 granting development consent and in lieu thereof there will be an order refusing development consent."

Siting and visibility Objective 2 states that development should recognise significant views and vistas of the coast and the Southern Mount Lofty Ranges. Design and Appearance Principle 5 requires buildings to not unreasonably restrict existing views from neighbouring properties.

It is stated in the *Hutchens* case that the appellants contained a "clear view of the sea and the horizon" as the appellants dwelling was located directly behind buildings that fronted the Esplanade. It can be argued that the views from the eastern units are not a <u>clear view of the sea and horizon</u> given it is interrupted by existing vegetation and dwellings. As this is the case whether there is an <u>obliteration</u> of views or not becomes irrelevant as the view in the first instance it is not considered as <u>clear</u> and therefore does not result in <u>an extreme loss of the view</u>.

Conclusion

When assessed against the relevant provisions of the Development Plan and having regard to the context of the locality and the nature of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposal as amended on balance satisfies the relevant provisions of the Development Plan. The proposal is broadly consistent with the desired character of the zone and will not detrimentally impact upon the amenity of the adjoining properties of the locality. Accordingly, the proposal warrants Development Plan Consent subject to conditions.

8. RECOMMENDATION

- 1. The proposed development is NOT seriously at variance with the policies in the Development Plan.
- 2. Following a detailed assessment of the proposal against the provisions of the Holdfast Bay (City) Development Plan, the Council Assessment Panel resolves to grant Development Plan Consent to Development Application 110/00175/19 subject to the following conditions:

PLANNING CONDITIONS

- That the design and siting of all buildings and structures and site works shall be as shown on the plans submitted to and approved by Council unless varied by any subsequent conditions imposed herein.
- 2. That adequate provision be made for the disposal of stormwater to the reasonable satisfaction of Council. Where possible, stormwater should be retained on site by the use of natural drainage methods.