Council Assessment Panel Agenda & Reports

17 February 2025

Our Vision

A City which values its heritage, cultural diversity, sense of place and natural environment.

A progressive City which is prosperous, sustainable and socially cohesive, with a strong community spirit.



& St Peters

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters 175 The Parade, Norwood SA 5067

Telephone8366 4555Emailtownhall@npsp.sa.gov.auWebsitewww.npsp.sa.gov.auSocialsf /cityofnpsp

12 February 2025

To all Members of the Council Assessment Panel:

- Mr Stephen Smith (Presiding Member)
- Mr Julian Rutt
- Cr Christel Mex
 - Mr Paul Mickan (Deputy Member)

NOTICE OF MEETING

I wish to advise that pursuant to Clause 1.5 of the Meeting Procedures, the next Ordinary Meeting of the Norwood Payneham & St Peters Council Assessment Panel, will be held in the Council Chambers, Norwood Town Hall, 175 The Parade, Norwood, on:

•

Monday 17 February 2025, commencing at 6.30pm.

Please advise Tala Aslat on 8366 4530 or email <u>taslat@npsp.sa.gov.au</u> if you are unable to attend this meeting or will be late.

Yours faithfully

Geoff Parsons ASSESSMENT MANAGER1

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters 175 The Parade, Norwood SA 5067

Telephone8366 4555Emailtownhall@npsp.sa.gov.auWebsitewww.npsp.sa.gov.auSocialsf /cityofnpsp



Mr Ross Bateup

Mr Mark Adcock

Cr Kester Moorhouse (Deputy Member)

Page No.

1.	CON	MENCEMENT AND WELCOME	1
2.	APC	LOGIES	1
3.	CON ASS	IFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL ESSMENT PANEL HELD ON 21 JANUARY 2025	1
4.	DEC	LARATION OF INTERESTS	1
5.	DEV	ELOPMENT APPLICATIONS – PDI ACT	2
	5.1	DEVELOPMENT NUMBER – 23012750 – MINUZZO PROJECT MANAGEMENT 2 TORRENS STREET COLLEGE PARK	2
	5.2	DEVELOPMENT NUMBER – 24038142 – LUKE MINICOZI 43 GEORGE STREET NORWOOD	17
6.	DEV	ELOPMENT APPLICATIONS – DEVELOPMENT ACT	31
7.	REV	IEW OF ASSESSMENT MANAGER DECISIONS	31
8.	ERD	OCOURT APPEALS	31
9.	OT⊦	IER BUSINESS	32
	9.1	COUNCIL ASSESSMENT PANEL UPDATED MEETING PROCEDURES	32
10.	CON	IFIDENTIAL REPORTS	35
11.	CLO	SURE	35

VENUE Council Chambers, Norwood Town Hall

HOUR 6.30pm

PRESENT

Panel Members

Staff

APOLOGIES

ABSENT

- 1. COMMENCEMENT AND WELCOME
- 2. APOLOGIES
- 3. CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL ASSESSMENT PANEL HELD ON 21 JANUARY 2025
- 4. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

5. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS – PDI ACT

5.1 DEVELOPMENT NUMBER – 23012750 – MINUZZO PROJECT MANAGEMENT -2 TORRENS STREET COLLEGE PARK

DEVELOPMENT NO.:	23012750
APPLICANT:	Minuzzo Project Management
ADDRESS:	2 TORRENS ST COLLEGE PARK SA 5069
NATURE OF DEVELOPMENT:	Construction of a two-storey dwelling addition (including partial demolition of existing dwelling and demolition of a carport and ancillary structures) and a masonry and metal infill front fence
ZONING INFORMATION:	 Zones: Established Neighbourhood Overlays: Airport Building Heights (Regulated) Historic Area Heritage Adjacency Prescribed Wells Area Regulated and Significant Tree Stormwater Management Urban Tree Canopy Technical Numeric Variations (TNVs): Minimum Frontage (Minimum frontage for a detached dwelling is 17m; semi-detached dwelling is 9m) Minimum Site Area (Minimum site area for a detached dwelling is 300 sqm; semi-detached dwelling is 300 sqm) Minimum Site Area (Minimum site area for a detached dwelling is 900 sqm) Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 1 level) Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 2 levels) Site Coverage (Maximum site coverage is 40 per cent) Site Coverage (Maximum site coverage is 50 per cent)
LODGEMENT DATE:	15 May 2023
RELEVANT AUTHORITY:	Assessment panel at City of Norwood Payneham and St. Peters
PLANNING & DESIGN CODE VERSION:	2023.6 (27/04/2023)
CATEGORY OF DEVELOPMENT:	Code Assessed - Performance Assessed
NOTIFICATION:	Yes
RECOMMENDING OFFICER:	Kieran Fairbrother, Senior Urban Planner
REFERRALS STATUTORY:	Nil
REFERRALS NON-STATUTORY:	David Brown, Heritage Advisor

5:

6:

7:

8:

CONTENTS:

APPENDIX 1:	Relevant P&D Code Policies	ATTACHMENT
ATTACHMENT 1:	Application Documents	ATTACHMENT
ATTACHMENT 2:	Subject Land & Locality Maps	ATTACHMENT
ATTACHMENT 3:	Zoning, Overlay & TNV Maps	ATTACHMENT
ATTACHMENT 4:	Representation Map	

Representations Response to Representations Internal Referral Advice Original Three-Storey Proposal

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:

This proposal is for works to an existing single fronted sandstone cottage, which is a Representative Building within the St Peters Historic Area Overlay. The works involve:

- Demolition of an existing lean-to addition (which appears to have already been unlawfully undertaken);
- Demolition of an existing brush front fence (which has already been unlawfully undertaken);
- Demolition of the rear carport and surrounding fencing;
- Internal alterations to existing dwelling;
- Construction of a new rendered masonry pier and plinth front fence with steel vertical blade infill;
- Construction of a two-storey addition to the dwelling, sited on the rear boundary and both side boundaries, and comprising a garage and living areas at ground level and living areas and a balcony at the second level. The addition is constructed of brickwork at ground level and to the balcony balustrade, and off-white aluminium cladding to the upper level with black metal framed windows.

BACKGROUND:

This application was initially submitted in early 2023 and has since undergone two rounds of public notification – the first in June 2023 and the second in October 2024. Initially, the proposal involved a three-storey addition to the existing dwelling, but following discussions with Council administration the proposal was amended to remove the third building level. In so doing, the additions were re-sited from being mostly on the southern side boundary to now being mostly on the northern side boundary. Despite the loss of the third building level, the overall height of the building has only reduced by 1.76 metres.

The same representor was the sole representor during both rounds of public notification, whose concerns remain despite the removal of the third building level and the re-siting of the development.

SUBJECT LAND & LOCALITY:

Site Description: Location reference: 2 TORRENS ST COLLEGE PARK SA 5069 Title ref.: CT Plan Parcel: F136398 Council: THE CITY OF NORWOOD PAYNEHAM 5661/370 AL47 AND ST PETERS Shape: regular Frontage Width: approximately 8 metres approximately 391m² Area: Topography: dwelling built higher than footpath level, with ground levels falling towards the rear Existing structures: a single fronted sandstone cottage and a freestanding garage

Existing vegetation: a landscaped front yard and very little vegetation elsewhere

Locality

The locality is considered to comprise the area outlined in **Attachment 2**. This encompasses the dwellings with frontages to Torrens Street that are within 50m of the subject land, as well as those with frontages to College Street that are within 70m of the subject land, along with part of the school grounds west of Eton Lane.

This locality is characterised by low density residential development, with the exception of the school oval that adjoins Eton Lane. The built form within this locality is predominantly comprised of single-storey, historical dwellings set on larger allotments. The are two exceptions to this. The first is 6 College Street, which has a two-storey component at the rear of the dwelling that is not readily visible from College Street. The second is the adjoining dwelling at 4 Torrens Street, which has a large three-storey addition at the rear of the dwelling, that is not readily visible from the primary street frontage but is unmissable from Eton Lane and adjoining allotments. This locality enjoys a very high level of amenity due to a combination of the high-quality built form, the larger allotment sizes and consistent, mature street tree plantings.

CONSENT TYPE REQUIRED:

Planning Consent

CATEGORY OF DEVELOPMENT:

- PER ELEMENT: Dwelling alteration or addition Fences and walls Dwelling addition: Code Assessed - Performance Assessed Internal building work: Code Assessed - Performance Assessed Fence: Code Assessed - Performance Assessed Demolition Partial demolition of a building or structure: Code Assessed - Performance Assessed
- OVERALL APPLICATION CATEGORY: Code Assessed - Performance Assessed
- REASON
 P&D Code

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

- REASON
 - Development exceeds the height limit TNV of 1 storey.
 - Involves a boundary wall that exceeds 3.2m in height and 8m in length.
 - \circ $\;$ Involves the partial demolition of a representative building in the Historic Area Overlay.

• LIST OF REPRESENTATIONS

This development has undergone two (2) rounds of public notification, due to the substantial changes that were made following the first round. On both occasions, only one (1) representation was received; both from the adjoining neighbour at 2 College Street, College Park.

• SUMMARY

The single representor's concerns can be read in full in **Attachment 5** but can be summarised as having concerns regarding the height, bulk and scale of the development; the impact of the development on the amenity of their residence next door; and the impact of the development on the prevailing character of the area.

INTERNAL REFERRALS

• David Brown, Heritage Advisor

Council's Heritage Advisor is supportive of the proposal from a heritage perspective, stating that "it will still be quite visible from the neighbour land, but...will not have a detrimental impact on the streetscape or the existing cottage."

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

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

The Council Assessment Panel should note that there appears to be a spatial application issue with the way in which the relevant Zone and Overlay have been applied to this site. In particular, the Planning & Design Code 'snapshot' provided for this site shows that the site falls within both the St Peters and the College Park Historic Area Overlays. Consequently, some Designated Performance Features produce two results (e.g. DPF 3.1 of the Zone, which relates to site coverage, says site coverage should not exceed 50 percent *and* 40 percent.

Part 1 – Rules of Interpretation of the Planning & Design Code states that "reference to the South Australian Property and Planning Atlas of the SA planning database will be made to determine whether a zone, subzone, overly or TNV is relevant to the site of the proposed development application". For the Panel's benefit, **Attachment 3** includes maps that display the applicable TNVs for this site – these are reflective of the same criteria that applied in the Development Plan prior to the transition to the P&D Code. The assessment report below will reference only the applicable TNVs, where relevant.

Finally, the Panel should note that the relevant Historic Area Overlay is *NPSP18: St Peters Historic Area Statement*. The incorrect Historic Area Statement has therefore been omitted in Appendix 1 for ease of reference.

Question of Seriously at Variance

Having considered the proposal against the relevant provisions of the Planning & Design Code (version 2023.6, dated 27/04/2023), the proposal is not considered to be seriously at variance with the provisions of the Planning & Design Code for the following reasons:

- Dwelling additions are envisaged within the Established Neighbourhood Zone;
- The height of the proposed development exceeds the 1 level TNV for this Zone, but is not seriously at odds with the prevailing and anticipated building heights in the locality/neighbourhood; and
- The visual impact produced by the proposal is not considered to be so egregious as to consider the proposal being seriously at variance with the provisions of the Planning & Design Code.

Demolition

This application seeks to demolish the existing carport, the front fence, an existing lean-to addition and a small portion of the original roof at the rear.

Performance Outcome 7.3 of the Historic Area Overlay states:

Buildings or elements of buildings that do not conform with the values described in the Historic Area Statement may be demolished.

The carport, front fence and lean-to addition are not part of the original cottage's building fabric, and their demolition is therefore supported by this Performance Outcome.

Performance Outcome 7.2 of the Historic Area Overlay states:

Partial demolition of a building where that portion to be demolished does not contribute to the historic character of the streetscape.

With respect to the rear section of roofing proposed to be demolished, this is not visible from Torrens Street and its demolition is therefore supported by this Performance Outcome.

The dwelling has two chimneys that extend through the roof and are visible from Torrens Street and should be retained as they are part of the original building fabric. The plans do not note that the chimneys are to be removed, but none of the roof plan, elevations or renders show the chimneys being retained. Accordingly, Condition No. 4 has been recommended to ensure that the chimneys are retained.

Building Height

Performance Outcome 4.1 of the Established Neighbourhood Zone states:

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

The corresponding Designated Performance Feature contains a TNV that states that the maximum building height should be one (1) level.

Performance Outcome 1.1 of the Historic Area Overlay states:

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

With respect to building heights, the Historic Area Statement states "single storey".

Performance Outcome 2.2 of the Historic Area Overlay states:

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

The proposed additions are two storeys in height, which is contrary to the TNV applicable for this site. However, the TNV is contained to a DPF, which is not a policy in its own right.¹ That is to say, a proposal's failure to comply with a TNV does not preclude the proposal from still satisfying the Performance Outcome. Performance Outcome 4.1 of the Zone seeks two outcomes: contribution to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood, and the complementation of the height of nearby buildings. The term 'neighbourhood' is not defined in the Planning & Design Code, but it was considered by the ERD Court to perhaps constitute an area larger than a locality.² In that case, as with this one, the character of the locality and what might constitute the larger neighbourhood is essentially the same such that both terms can be considered interchangeably.

There is therefore evident conflict between the policies in the Established Neighbourhood Zone and the Historic Area Overlay because the subject land is on the boundary of the relevant Historic Area Overlay; where it abuts a different Historic Area Overlay which has a 2 level TNV. Performance Outcome 4.1 of the Zone contemplates an assessment of the locality / neighbourhood, which would include the neighbouring Historic Area Overlay with an applicable TNV of 2 levels; whereas, conversely, Performance Outcome 1.1 and 2.2 of the Historic Area Overlay contemplate an assessment that only considers the relevant Overlay.

As pointed out by Commissioner Dyer in *Parkins*³, 'it is a fundamental tenant of planning assessment that policy is applied having regard [to] the specific circumstances of each case'. In this case, the subject land sits adjacent to a three-storey building at 4 Torrens Street (in the 1 level TNV) and abuts a section of the Established Neighbourhood Zone where a 2 level TNV applies (i.e. 2 College Street and to the east and south) – see **Attachment 3**. Although the *Rules of Interpretation* to the Planning & Design Code say that where there is an inconsistency between policies, the Overlay takes precedence over the Zone, it would be erroneous to consider this proposal with isolated regard to the 1 level TNV applicable to the site and the relevant Historic Area Statement, and ignoring the character and built form to the south and east of the site. Instead, the proper approach is to consider the site's immediate context and surroundings.

Consequently, the proposal for a two-storey addition on this site is not considered, in principle, to be fatal to the proposal. The additions will not impact the Torrens Street streetscape and will only be readily visible from Eton Lane and the neighbouring allotments; thereby satisfying the intent of the Historic Area Overlay provisions – to not adversely impact on the historic character of the historic area.

Notably, the tallest point of the addition is only 1.1m higher than the ridge line of the existing dwelling, and is lower than the ridge line of the dwelling at 4 Torrens Street and lower than the three-storey addition to that dwelling. Accordingly, the height of the building is considered to complement the height of nearby buildings in accordance with PO 4.1 of the Zone (above).

When considered in the broader context of the locality, the proposed additions will contribute to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood insofar as the additions will not be taller than additions contemplated in the neighbouring Historic Area Overlay and do not impact on streetscape character at all.

Heritage, Design & Appearance

Performance Outcome 4.2 of the Established Neighbourhood Zone states:

Additions and alterations do not adversely impact on streetscape character.

Performance Outcome 2.1 of the Historic Area Overlay states:

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.

² Minicozzi (Osmond Terrace) Pty Ltd v The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters Assessment Panel [2024] SAERDC 18 at [9]-[19].

³ Parkins v Adelaide Hills Council Assessment Manager [2022] SAERDC 12 at [96].

As discussed above, the additions will not be readily visible from Torrens Street and are therefore not considered to impact on the streetscape character at all, consistent with Performance Outcome 4.2 above – a view shared by Council's Heritage Advisor.

The rectilinear form and the two-storey scale of the proposed additions, which will be visible from the public realm in Eton Lane, are not consistent with the prevailing historic characteristics of the historic area: one made up predominantly of single-storey villas and cottages.

Performance Outcome 3.1 of the Historic Area Overlay states:

Alterations and additions complement the subject building, employ a contextual design approach and are sited to ensure they do not dominate the primary façade.

Performance Outcome 2.5 of the Historic Area Overlay states:

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

The proposed addition is a simple rectilinear form that, due to the fall in levels towards the rear of the site, only rises to 1.1m above the ridge line of the existing dwelling. The ground level of the addition and the balcony balustrade will be constructed of light grey bricks whereas the upper level is proposed to be constructed with an off-white aluminium cladding. A good level of fenestration is proposed at the upper level to break up the bulk of the additions and soften the appearance of the building from neighbouring allotments.

The existing sandstone single-fronted cottage maintains a lightly-coloured and textured palette, and the materials and colours chosen for the proposed addition complement the existing dwelling by remaining subdued and not dominating the original dwelling – consistent with Performance Outcome 3.1 of the Historic Area Overlay. The original cottage is proposed to be reroofed in heritage galvanised steel sheets, which is a good outcome consistent with Performance Outcome 2.5 above.

Accordingly, despite the form and scale of the additions being at odds with the prevailing characteristics of the historic area, the height, materials and colours provide for a contextually-responsive development that is nonetheless appropriate in the context of the subject dwelling and subject land.

The one negative aspect of the way the additions are proposed to be constructed is the continuation of the existing roof of the cottage. This blurs the line between original and new and is not a good outcome. However, this does not stand as a reason to refuse this proposal.

Performance Outcome 4.4 of the Historic Area Overlay states:

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.

The front fence proposed is a masonry rendered blockwork pillared fence (in off-white) with vertical batten steel blade infill (in black). The fence is unusually tall for this type of fence in a historic area – ranging from 2.11m to 2.38m above the footpath level. But this height is necessitated by the existing dwelling finished floor level and the slope in the Torrens Street footpath; meaning all but the top 1.2 metres of fencing acts as a retaining wall. The fence is similar in height to the neighbouring fences and so it will not sit uncomfortably in the streetscape and is therefore acceptable in this respect. The materials and colours are a contemporary take on a traditional pillared fence and are acceptable per Performance Outcomes 2.5 and 4.4 of the Historic Area Overlay.

Setbacks and Visual Impact

Performance Outcome 7.1 of the Established Neighbourhood Zone states:

Dwelling boundary walls are limited in height and length to manage visual and overshadowing impacts on adjoining properties.

This development involves the construction of walls on both side boundaries. Along the southeast side boundary – the one shared with the sole representor – the development involves a brick wall of 7.2m length and 5.9m height. This wall forms the side wall of the ground level garage and the 1.7m balustrade to the second level balcony. This boundary wall abuts a garage/outbuilding on the neighbouring allotment that is longer in length but lower in height. The proposed boundary wall protrudes 1.7m higher than the neighbouring garage at the eastern end, lowering to 900mm higher where the garage roof ridge is, and then extending to 3.6m taller at the boundary with Eton Lane. To describe this another way, the boundary wall has a surface area of 42.5m² of which only a third will be visible beyond the neighbour's garage/outbuilding.

Adjacent the neighbouring garage/shed is a large carport structure. The main area of private open space associated with the neighbouring dwelling is the tennis court, which will not directly abut the proposed boundary wall. Otherwise, the dwelling is approximately 19m away from the proposed development and therefore any views of this development from within the dwelling are considered to be reasonable given the separation between the two. In this context, the visual impact proposed by the boundary wall of this development is considered to be acceptable per Performance Outcome 7.1 above.

On the northwest side boundary, the development involves a wall extending from Eton Lane of 5.6m height and 5.1m length that then increases to a height of 8m for another 4.1m length. Then, separated by 2.7m, a second boundary wall is proposed for a length of 2.9m and a height between 6.6m and 6.4m. These walls abut the neighbour's undercroft garage entrance and a boundary wall of the neighbour's own development. The proposed boundary walls will be taller than the boundary walls of the neighbouring dwelling and will likely shadow a few of the skylight windows at 4 Torrens Street in the morning.

The height and length of the walls proposed on the boundary shared with 4 Torrens Street would not ordinarily be supported were it not for the existing conditions of that neighbouring property. Considered accordingly, the development will produce some small visual and overshadowing impacts due to the presence of the skylights, but this is not considered to be fatal to the proposal. Throughout both rounds of public notification, the owner/occupant of 4 Torrens Street did not raise any objections to the proposal – this is notable because the original proposal did not involve any boundary walls on this shared boundary whereas the amended proposal shifted the development onto this boundary. Thus, in the absence of an objection by the occupant of 4 Torrens Street, it is reasonable to infer that they are relatively comfortable with the impacts of the proposal.

Performance Outcome 8.1 of the Established Neighbourhood Zone states:

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.

The corresponding Designated Performance Outcome prescribes a quantitative method for determining side setbacks based on the height of the wall.

Performance Outcome 2.4 of the Historic Area Overlay states:

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

Performance Outcome 20.3 of the Design in Urban Areas module of the general development policies states:

The visual mass of larger buildings is reduced when viewed from adjoining allotments or public streets.

The balance of the additions (at both building levels) is set back 1.4m from the southeast side boundary shared with 2 College Street. The proposed additions measure between 7.5m and 6.5m tall on the neighbour's side, due to the slope of the land and the roof profile of the additions. The formula provided in DPF 8.1 of the Zone suggests that a wall of this height should be setback between 2.0m - 2.3m; hence there is a shortfall when assessed against the DPF.

The two-level addition will remain well separated from the dwelling at 2 College Street, despite the reduced setback, such that the visual impact of the addition from within the dwelling is acceptable. Similarly, the majority of the area of private open space associated with 2 College Street will be sufficient separated from the development such that it is only the western corner of the tennis court – where it is closest to the proposed development – that the visual bulk of the building will be most readily apparent and most impactful. For the reasons expressed above, the material and colour palette chosen for this development will help to soften the visual bulk of the development – especially with the contrast between ground level and the upper level. The development employs a good level of fenestration to the same effect.

The development will not unreasonably impact on access to light and ventilation for the occupants of 2 College Street by virtue of the separation provided by the tennis court. The subject land is a narrow site when compared to the two sites surrounding it, and it is therefore reasonable to expect a slightly lesser side setback for new additions. While it is probable that the addition could be narrowed further to provide a larger side setback, that is not what is being proposed here and therefore one must assess the proposal as it stands.

Because of the separation between the subject land and the dwelling at 2 College Street, because of the large area of private open space available to the occupants of 2 College Street, because of the siting of the ancillary structures (garage/outbuilding and carport) between part of the proposed development and the dwelling at 2 College Street, and because of the appropriate palette of materials and colours, the proposed development is considered to satisfy the three abovementioned Performance Outcomes in that there will still be separation between buildings consistent with the pattern in the historic area, and the bulk, mass and visual impact of the development on the occupants of 2 College Street is tolerable.

There is no doubt that the occupants of 2 College Street will have views onto the development, and the development will be noticeable when compared to their current outlook, but the impact of those views is not considered to be unacceptable such that the proposal warrants refusal. Council administration did try to negotiate a better outcome with the applicant, requesting that the building design be amended to reduce the ceiling height of the garage and therefore reduce the overall height of the building. Unfortunately, the applicant did not seek to make any amendments despite these concerns.

Performance Outcome 9.1 of the Established Neighbourhood Zone states:

Buildings are set back from rear boundaries to provide:

- (a) Separation between dwellings in a way that complements the established character of the locality
- (b) Access to natural light and ventilation for neighbours

- (c) Private open space
- (d) Space for landscaping and vegetation.

The rear boundary of the subject land abuts Eton Lane, on the other side of which are the playing fields associated with an educational establishment. The pattern of development along this section of Torrens Street involves buildings constructed on or close to the rear boundary and so this Performance Outcome is considered to have little relevance to this proposal.

Overlooking and Overshadowing

Performance Outcome 10.1 of the Design in Urban Areas module of the general development policies states:

Development mitigates direct overlooking from upper-level windows to habitable rooms and private open spaces of adjoining residential uses in neighbourhood-type zones.

The corresponding Designated Performance Features suggests that obscure glazing to 1.5 metres above the internal floor level of the upper floor is sufficient to satisfying this outcome. This is the generally-accepted approach and so Condition No. 3 has been recommended to ensure that all windows facing the side boundaries are obscured to this height.

Performance Outcome 10.2 of the Design in Urban Areas module of the general development policies states:

Development mitigates direct overlooking from balconies to habitable rooms and private open space of adjoining residential uses in neighbourhood type zones.

The proposed additions include an upper-level balcony at the rear of the building. When this application was subject to public notification, the balustrade for the balcony was noted as being 1.5m tall and the representor had concerns with this height. In response, the brick balustrade has now been amended to be 1.7m tall on both side boundaries to satisfy the representor in this respect. This is considered to be consistent with Performance Outcome 10.2 above.

Performance Outcome 3.2 of the Interface Between Land Uses module of the general development policies states:

Overshadowing of the primary area of private open space or communal open space of adjacent residential land uses in... a neighbourhood type zone is minimised to maintain access to direct winter sunlight.

The development will result in some afternoon overshadowing of the tennis court associated with 2 College Street. But the extent of overshadowing anticipated to occur during winter is considered reasonable.

Site Coverage, Private Open Space and Soft Landscaping

Performance Outcome 3.1 of the Established Neighbourhood Zone states:

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.

The corresponding Designated Performance Feature states that site coverage should not exceed 50%.

The subject land has a site area of approximately 391m². The existing site coverage is approximately 195m², which equates to a site coverage of 50%. The proposed site coverage is 257m², which equates to a site coverage of 65.7%. This exceeds the Designated Performance Feature but is not considered to be at odds with the Performance Outcome. The proposed building footprint is not entirely inconsistent with other building footprints that are located within the same St Peters Historic Area Overlay (i.e. where the 50% DPF applies). For example, the neighbouring dwelling at 4 Torrens Street has an approximate site coverage of 56%, created by a 537m² footprint. The visual impact of this footprint is discussed in the preceding sections of this report, but from a purely quantitative perspective, the proposed site coverage is not considered to be problematic.

Performance Outcome 21.1 of the Design in Urban Areas module of the general development policies states:

Dwellings are provided with suitable sized areas of usable private open space to meet the needs of occupants.

Performance Outcome 21.2 of the Design in Urban Areas module of the general development policies states:

Private open space is positioned to provide convenient access from internal living areas.

The existing dwelling has approximately 54m² of functional private open space in the rear yard area, being the area available around the carport and between the rear wall of the dwelling and the rear boundary. Following completion of the proposed additions, the resultant dwelling will have approximately 38m² of private open space, which will be solely comprised of the floor area of the rear balcony that is not occupied by the planter box.

Although this is less than the 60m² expected of the DPF, and less than what is currently provided on the site, this space is arguably more functional than the existing private open space on the site as it better integrates with the internal living areas of the dwelling and will accommodate a better use of the outdoor area for the occupants. Accordingly, Performance Outcome 21.1 is not considered to be offended.

Performance Outcome 22.1 of the Design in Urban Areas module of the general development policies states:

Soft landscaping is incorporated into development to:

- (a) Minimise heat absorption and reflection
- (b) Contribute shade and shelter
- (c) Provide for stormwater infiltration and biodiversity
- (d) Enhance the appearance of land and streetscapes.

The corresponding Designated Performance Feature suggests that sites between 200m² and 450m² should be minimum 20% comprised of soft landscaping.

This application proposes a slight reduction in soft landscaping on the site; which currently accounts for approximately $61m^2$ (15.6%) of the site. The front yard area is to remain landscaped as per existing conditions. The reduction occurs in the rear yard, where several conifer trees abutting the northern side boundary and a small lawn area are being removed to facilitate the development; and are being replaced by a small $3m^2$ planter box that runs the length of the rear boundary on the second level balcony.

The result will be that only 48m² (12.3%) of soft landscaping will remain on the site. Importantly, the front yard area will remain the same and therefore there will be no change in the Torrens Street streetscape.

Further, the existing plantings in the rear yard do not provide for any shade or shelter, meaning there is no negative result from the development in this respect. The slight increase in stormwater run-off and the additional heat absorption resulting from the development is not considered to be such that the application is at odds with Performance Outcome 22.1 (above).

Traffic Impact, Access and Parking

Performance Outcome 5.1 of the Transport, Access and Parking module of the general development policies states:

Sufficient on-site vehicle parking...[is] provided to meet the needs of the development...

The corresponding Designated Performance Feature suggests that a provision of car parking spaces equivalent to listed in Table 1 of the module is sufficient to satisfy the Performance Outcome. This is the generally accepted practice in respect of dwellings.

To that end, Table 1 suggests that this dwelling should provide two (2) off-street car parking spaces, of which at least one (1) should be covered. The application provides for 2 car parking spaces in the way of the extra-wide double garage, accessed from Eton Lane.

Performance Outcome 23.5 of the Design in Urban Areas module of the general development policies states:

Driveways are designed to enable safe and convenient vehicle movements from the public road to on-site parking spaces.

Eton Lane is approximately 4.5 metres wide from boundary to boundary. Ordinarily, this does not provide enough width to allow vehicles to enter and exit the garage in no less than a three-point turn manoeuvre. In this case, though, the garage opening is setback 900mm from the lane, providing an effective apron width of 5.4 metres, and the garage door is 6.7m wide. This enables a B85 vehicle to enter and exit the garage in no more than a three-point turn manoeuvre and therefore Performance Outcome 23.5 is satisfied.

CONCLUSION

This application seeks approval for the construction of a two-storey dwelling addition and a masonry front fence in what is inherently a single-storey historic area. Contextually, though, the subject land sits in between a site containing a three-storey dwelling addition (4 Torrens Street) and a site within the adjacent College Park Historic Area Overlay which contemplates two-storey development.

The addition is sited to the rear of the existing single fronted sandstone cottage and will not be readily visible from Torrens Street, extending above the ridgeline of the existing dwelling by only 1.7m and being set back approximately 20m from the building line. Accordingly, the Torrens Street streetscape is only going to be impacted by the new front fence which, while objectively tall, is appropriate in the context and will sit comfortably between the two neighbouring fences.

The two-storey addition will be constructed on both side boundaries as well as the rear boundary. Although this is not an ideal outcome, it is considered acceptable given the surrounding circumstances. Eton Lane enjoys a low level of amenity and the garage and brick balcony that will be constructed on the rear boundary will not detrimentally affect this amenity or the appearance of the lane.

The fact that the additions are constructed two stories tall on the northern side boundary is at odds with

Performance Outcome 8.1 of the Zone in that it fails to provide any separation between the subject building and the building at 4 Torrens Street. However, the boundary walls will have limited impact on the affected neighbour by virtue of the neighbour's own boundary construction adjacent a three-storey tall addition that is set on the rear boundary with Eton Lane.

With respect to the impacts of the development on the representor's property, there is no doubt that the development will be visible from their private open space and from within their dwelling. But the visual impact of the development is mitigated by: the separation between the proposed additions and the representor's dwelling (almost 20m); the large amount of private open space available to the representor that won't be readily impacted by the development; the presence of existing ancillary structures on the representor's land that will impede views of the majority of the boundary walling; and the softening materials and colours employed on the second level. When considered in this context, the impact of the development on the amenity of the representor's land is considered acceptable.

The subject land will see a slight reduction in soft landscaping and private open space as a result of the proposed additions, but these reductions are considered so slight that they do not warrant refusal of the application. Finally, sufficient on-site vehicle parking is provided to meet the needs of the development, and the wider garage door facilitates safe and convenient access for vehicles.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council Assessment Panel resolve that:

- 1. The proposed development is not considered seriously at variance with the relevant Desired Outcomes and Performance Outcomes of the Planning and Design Code pursuant to section 107(2)(c) of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016.*
- 2. Development Application Number 23012750, by Minuzzo Project Management is granted Planning Consent subject to the following conditions:

CONDITIONS Planning Consent

Condition 1

The development granted Planning Consent shall be undertaken and completed in accordance with the stamped plans and documentation, except where varied by conditions below (if any).

Condition 2

All stormwater from buildings and hard-surfaced areas shall be disposed of in accordance with recognised engineering practices in a manner and with materials that does not result in the entry of water onto any adjoining property or any building, and does not affect the stability of any building and in all instances the stormwater drainage system shall be directly connected into either the adjacent street kerb & water table or a Council underground pipe drainage system.

Please note that disposal of the stormwater to Eton Lane is not permitted and compliance with this condition will only be achieved with all stormwater being directed to the primary street kerb and water table or associated underground pipe drainage system.

Condition 3

All upper floor windows facing the side boundaries of the site shall either have sill heights of a minimum of

1500mm above floor level or be treated to a minimum height of 1500mm above floor level, prior to occupation of the building, in a manner that restricts views being obtained by a person within the room to the reasonable satisfaction of the Assessment Manager and such treatment shall be maintained at all times.

Condition 4

The two (2) existing chimneys on the roof of the building that are closest to the Torrens Street boundary of the site are to be retained and shall not be demolished.

Condition 5

No changes to ground levels in Eton Lane are permitted. Any change in gradient required to facilitate vehicle access for the proposed garage shall be accommodated entirely within the boundaries of the site.

Condition 6

All areas nominated as landscaping or garden areas on the approved plans shall be planted with a suitable mix and density of trees, shrubs and groundcovers within the next available planting season after the occupation of the premises to the reasonable satisfaction of the Assessment Manager and such plants, as well as any existing plants which are shown to be retained, shall be nurtured and maintained in good health and condition at all times, with any diseased or dying plants being replaced, to the reasonable satisfaction of the Assessment Manager or its delegate.

ADVISORY NOTES Planning Consent

Advisory Note 1

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.

Advisory Note 2

Consents issued for this Development Application will remain valid for the following periods of time:

- 1. Planning Consent is valid for 24 months following the date of issue, within which time Development Approval must be obtained;
- 2. Development Approval is valid for 24 months following the date of issue, within which time works must have substantially commenced on site;
- 3. Works must be substantially completed within 3 years of the date on which Development Approval is issued.

If an extension is required to any of the above-mentioned timeframes a request can be made for an extension of time by emailing the Planning Department at townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au. Whether or not an extension of time will be granted will be at the discretion of the relevant authority.

Advisory Note 3

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.

Advisory Note 4

The Applicant is reminded of its responsibilities under the *Environment Protection Act 1993*, to not harm the environment. Specifically, paint, plaster, concrete, brick wastes and wash waters should not be discharged into the stormwater system, litter should be appropriately stored on site pending removal,

excavation and site disturbance should be limited, entry/exit points to the site should be managed to prevent soil being carried off site by vehicles, sediment barriers should be used (particularly on sloping sites), and material stockpiles should all be placed on site and not on the footpath or public roads or reserves. Further information is available by contacting the EPA.

Advisory Note 5

The granting of this consent does not remove the need for the beneficiary to obtain all other consents which may be required by any other legislation.

The Applicant's attention is particularly drawn to the requirements of the *Fences Act 1975* regarding notification of any neighbours affected by new boundary development or boundary fencing. Further information is available in the 'Fences and the Law' booklet available through the Legal Services Commission.

Advisory Note 6

The Applicant is advised that construction noise is not allowed:

- 1. on any Sunday or public holiday; or
- 2. after 7pm or before 7am on any other day

Advisory Note 7

The Applicant is advised that any works undertaken on Council owned land (including but not limited to works relating to crossovers, driveways, footpaths, street trees and stormwater connections) will require the approval of the Council pursuant to the *Local Government Act 1999* prior to any works being undertaken. Further information may be obtained by contacting Council's Public Realm Compliance Officer on 8366 4513.

Advisory Note 8

The Applicant is advised that the condition of the footpath, kerbing, vehicular crossing point, street tree(s) and any other Council infrastructure located adjacent to the subject land will be inspected by the Council prior to the commencement of building work and at the completion of building work. Any damage to Council infrastructure that occurs during construction must be rectified as soon as practicable and in any event, no later than four (4) weeks after substantial completion of the building work. The Council reserves its right to recover all costs associated with remedying any damage that has not been repaired in a timely manner from the appropriate person.

Advisory Note 9

The Council has not surveyed the subject land and has, for the purpose of its assessment, assumed that all dimensions and other details provided by the Applicant are correct and accurate.

Advisory Note 10

Many of the laneways within the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters are only of sufficient width and design to accommodate the manoeuvring of a B99 vehicle (such as a normal sedan or 4WD). Larger vehicles which may be involved in construction activity should exercise caution in accessing the laneways. Any company / driver who causes damage to public infrastructure (such as kerbing and footpaths) through the manoeuvring of larger vehicles may be held liable for the costs associated with any repair or reinstatement.

Address:

2 TORRENS ST COLLEGE PARK SA 5069

Click to view a detailed interactive SAILIS

To view a detailed interactive property map in SAPPA click on the map below



Property Zoning Details Zone

	Established Neighbourhood	
Overlay		
	Airport Building Heights (Regulated) (All structures over 110 metres)	
	Historic Area (NPSP1)	
	Historic Area (NPSP18)	
	Heritage Adjacency	
	Prescribed Wells Area	
	Regulated and Significant Tree	
	Stormwater Management	
	Urban Tree Canopy	
Local Variation (TNV)		
	Minimum Frontage (Minimum frontage for a detached dwelling is 17m; semi-detached dwelling is 9m)	
	Minimum Site Area (Minimum site area for a detached dwelling is 300 sqm; semi-detached dwelling is 300 sqm)	
	Minimum Site Area (Minimum site area for a detached dwelling is 900 sqm)	
	Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 1 level)	
	Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 2 levels)	
	Site Coverage (Maximum site coverage is 40 per cent)	
	Site Coverage (<i>Maximum site coverage is 50 per cent</i>)	

Selected Development(s)

Dwelling addition

This development may be subject to multiple assessment pathways. Please review the document below to determine which pathway may be applicable based on the proposed development compliances to standards.

If no assessment pathway is shown this mean the proposed development will default to performance assessed. Please contact your local council in this instance. Refer to Part 1 - Rules of Interpretation - Determination of Classes of Development

Property Policy Information for above selection

Dwelling addition - Code Assessed - Performance Assessed

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones

Established Neighbourhood Zone

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

Desired Outcome		
DO 1	A neighbourhood that includes a range of housing types, with new buildings sympathetic to the predominant built form character and development patterns.	
DO 2	Maintain the predominant streetscape character, having regard to key features such as roadside plantings, footpaths, front yards, and space between crossovers.	

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed to Satisfy (DTS) / Designated Performance Feature (DPF) Criteria

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature
PO 31	
Building footprints are consistent with the character and	Development does not result in site coverage exceeding:
around buildings to limit visual impact, provide an attractive	Site Coverage
outlook and access to light and ventilation.	Maximum site coverage is 50 per cent
	Maximum site coverage is 40 per cent
	 In instances where: (a) no value is returned (i.e. there is a blank field), then a maximum 50% site coverage applies (b) more than one value is returned in the same field, refer to the Site Coverage Technical and Numeric Variation layer in the SA planning database to determine the applicable value relevant to the site of the proposed development.
Buildin	g Height
PO 4.1	DTS/DPF 4.1
Buildings contribute to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood and complements the height of nearby buildings.	Building height (excluding garages, carports and outbuildings) is no greater than: (a) the following:
	Maximum Building Height (Levels)
	Maximum building height is 1 level

Appendix 1 P&D Code (in effect) Version 2023.6 27/04/2023 Maximum Building Height (Levels) Maximum building height is 2 levels (b) in all other cases (i.e. there are blank fields for both maximum building height (metres) and maximum building height (levels)) - 2 building levels up to a height of 9m. In relation to DTS/DPF 4.1, in instances where: (c) more than one value is returned in the same field, refer to the Maximum Building Height (Levels) Technical and Numeric Variation layer or Maximum Building Height (Meters) Technical and Numeric Variation layer in the SA planning database to determine the applicable value relevant to the site of the proposed development. (d) only one value is returned for DTS/DPF 4.1(a) (i.e. there is one blank field), then the relevant height in metres

	or building levels applies with no criteria for the other.
PO 4.2	DTS/DPF 4.2
Additions and alterations do not adversely impact on the streetscape character.	 Additions and alterations: (a) are fully contained within the roof space of a building with no external alterations made to the building elevation facing the primary street or (b) meet all of the following: (i) do not include any development forward of the front façade building line (ii) where including a second or subsequent building level addition, does not project beyond a 45 degree angle measured from ground level at the building line of the existing building.

Secondary S	treet Setback
PO 6.1	DTS/DPF 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.	Building walls are set back from the secondary street boundary (other than a rear laneway): (a) no less than:
	or (b) 900mm, whichever is greater or
	(c) if a dwelling on any adjoining allotment is closer to the secondary street, the distance of that dwelling from the boundary with the secondary street.
	In instances where no value is returned in DTS/DPF 6.1(a) (i.e. there is a blank field), then it is taken that the value for DTS/DPF 6.1(a) is zero.

Policy24

Boundary Walls		
PO 7.1	DTS/DPF 7.1	
PO 7.1 Dwelling boundary walls are limited in height and length to manage visual and overshadowing impacts on adjoining properties.	DIS/DPF 7.1 Dwellings do not incorporate side boundary walls where a side boundary setback value is returned in (a) below: (a) or (b) where no side boundary setback value is returned in (a) above, and except where the dwelling is located on a central site within a row dwelling or terrace arrangement, side boundary walls occur only on one side boundary and satisfy (i) or (ii) below: (i) side boundary walls adjoin or abut a boundary wall of a building on adjoining land for the same or lesser length and height (ii) side boundary walls do not: A. exceed 3.2m in height from the lower of the natural or finished ground level B. exceed 8m in length C. when combined with other walls on the boundary of the subject development site, exceed a maximum 45% of the length of the boundary D. encroach within 3m of any other existing or proposed boundary walls on the subject land.	
PO 7.2 Dwellings in a semi-detached, row or terrace arrangement maintain space between buildings consistent with a low density suburban streetscape character.	DTS/DPF 7.2 Dwellings in a semi-detached, row or terrace arrangement are setback from side boundaries shared with allotments outside the development site at least the minimum distance identified in Established Neighbourhood Zone DTS/DPF 8.1.	
Side Bound	ary Setback	
 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. 	DTS/DPF 8.1 Other than walls located on a side boundary in accordance with Established Neighbourhood Zone DTS/DPF 7.1, building walls are set back from the side boundary: (a) no less than: (b) in all other cases (i.e. there is a blank field), then: (i) at least 900mm where the wall is up to 3m (ii) other than for a south facing wall, at least 900mm plus 1/3 of the wall height above 3m (iii) at least 1.9m plus 1/3 of the wall height above 3m for south facing walls.	
Rear Bound	ary Setback	
PO 9.1	DTS/DPF 9.1	
Buildings are set back from rear boundaries to provide:	Other than in relation to an access lane way, buildings are set	

	Appendix 1
Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2023.6 27/04/2023
 (a) separation between dwellings in a way that complements the established character of the locality (b) access to natural light and ventilation for neighbours (c) private open space (d) space for landscaping and vegetation. 	 back from the rear boundary at least: (a) 4m for the first building level (b) 6m for any second building level.
Арре	
PO 10.1 Garages and carports are designed and sited to be discrete and not dominate the appearance of the associated dwelling when viewed from the street.	 DTS/DPF 10.1 Garages and carports facing a street (other than an access lane way): (a) are set back at least 0.5m behind the building line of the associated dwelling (b) are set back at least 5.5m from the boundary of the primary street (c) have a total garage door / opening width not exceeding 30% of the allotment or site frontage, to a maximum width of 7m.
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.	DTS/DPF 10.2 None are applicable.

Table 5 - Procedural Matters (PM) - Notification

The following table identifies, pursuant to section 107(6) of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*, classes of performance assessed development that are excluded from notification. The table also identifies any exemptions to the placement of notices when notification is required.

Interpretation

Notification tables exclude the classes of development listed in Column A from notification provided that they do not fall within a corresponding exclusion prescribed in Column B.

Where a development or an element of a development falls within more than one class of development listed in Column A, it will be excluded from notification if it is excluded (in its entirety) under any of those classes of development. It need not be excluded under all applicable classes of development.

Where a development involves multiple performance assessed elements, all performance assessed elements will require notification (regardless of whether one or more elements are excluded in the applicable notification table) unless every performance assessed element of the application is excluded in the applicable notification table, in which case the application will not require notification.

Class of Development	Exceptions
(Column A)	(Column B)
 Development which, in the opinion of the relevant authority, is of a minor nature only and will not unreasonably impact on the owners or occupiers of land in the locality of the site of the development. 	None specified.

	Appendix 1
Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2023.6 27/04/2023
 2. All development undertaken by: (a) the South Australian Housing Trust either individually or jointly with other persons or bodies or (b) a provider registered under the Community Housing National Law participating in a program relating to the renewal of housing endorsed by the South Australian Housing Trust. 	 Except development involving any of the following: residential flat building(s) of 3 or more building levels the demolition of a State or Local Heritage Place the demolition of a building (except an ancillary building) in a Historic Area Overlay.
 3. Any development involving any of the following (or of any combination of any of the following): (a) air handling unit, air conditioning system or exhaust fan (b) ancillary accommodation (c) building work on railway land (d) carport (e) deck (f) dwelling (g) dwelling addition (h) fence (i) outbuilding (j) pergola (k) private bushfire shelter (l) residential flat building (m) retaining wall (n) shade sail (o) solar photovoltaic panels (roof mounted) (p) swimming pool or spa pool (q) verandah (r) water tank. 	 Except development that: 1. exceeds the maximum building height specified in Established Neighbourhood Zone DTS/DPF 4.1 or 2. involves a building wall (or structure) that is proposed to be situated on (or abut) an allotment boundary (not being a boundary with a primary street or secondary street or an excluded boundary) and: (a) the length of the proposed wall (or structure) exceeds 8m (other than where the proposed wall abuts an existing wall or structure of greater length on the adjoining allotment) or (b) the height of the proposed wall (or post height) exceeds 3.2m measured from the lower of the natural or finished ground level (other than where the proposed wall abuts an existing wall or structure of greater height on the adjoining allotment).
 4. Any development involving any of the following (or of any combination of any of the following): (a) consulting room (b) office (c) shop. 	 Except development that: 1. does not satisfy Established Neighbourhood Zone DTS/DPF 1.2 or 2. exceeds the maximum building height specified in Established Neighbourhood Zone DTS/DPF 4.1 or 3. involves a building wall (or structure) that is proposed to be situated on (or abut) an allotment boundary (not being a boundary with a primary street or secondary street or an excluded boundary) and: (a) the length of the proposed wall (or structure) exceeds 8m (other than where the proposed wall abuts an existing wall or structure of greater length on the adjoining allotment) or (b) the height of the proposed wall (or post height) exceeds 3.2m measured from the lower of the natural or finished ground level (other than where the proposed wall abuts an existing wall or structure of greater height on the adjoining allotment).

Appen P&D Code (in effect) Version olicy24 2023.6 27/04/2023 5. Any of the following (or of any combination of any of None specified. the following): (a) internal building works (b) land division (c) recreation area (d) replacement building (e) temporary accommodation in an area affected by bushfire (f) tree damaging activity. 6. Demolition. Except any of the following: 1. the demolition of a State or Local Heritage Place 2. the demolition of a building (except an ancillary building) in a Historic Area Overlay. Placement of Notices - Exemptions for Performance Assessed Development None specified. Placement of Notices - Exemptions for Restricted Development

None specified.

Part 3 - Overlays

Airport Building Heights (Regulated) Overlay

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

Desired Outcome			
DO 1	Management of potential impacts of buildings and generated emissions to maintain operational and safety requirements of registered and certified commercial and military airfields, airports, airstrips and helicopter landing sites.		

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature	
Built Form		
PO 1.1	DTS/DPF 1.1	

Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2023 6 27/04/2023
Building height does not pose a hazard to the operation of a certified or registered aerodrome.	Buildings are located outside the area identified as 'All structures' (no height limit is prescribed) and do not exceed the height specified in the Airport Building Heights (Regulated) Overlay which applies to the subject site as shown on the SA Property and Planning Atlas. In instances where more than one value applies to the site, the lowest value relevant to the site of the proposed development is applicable.

Procedural Matters (PM) - Referrals

The following table identifies classes of development / activities that require referral in this Overlay and the applicable referral body. It sets out the purpose of the referral as well as the relevant statutory reference from Schedule 9 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017.

Class of Development / Activity	Referral Body	Purpose of Referral	Statutory Reference
 Any of the following classes of development: (a) building located in an area identified as 'All structures' (no height limit is prescribed) or will exceed the height specified in the <i>Airport Building Heights (Regulated) Overlay</i> (b) building comprising exhaust stacks that generates plumes, or may cause plumes to be generated, above a height specified in the <i>Airport Building Heights (Regulated) Overlay</i>. 	The airport-operator company for the relevant airport within the meaning of the <i>Airports</i> <i>Act 1996</i> of the Commonwealth or, if there is no airport-operator company, the Secretary of the Minister responsible for the administration of the <i>Airports Act 1996</i> of the Commonwealth.	To provide expert assessment and direction to the relevant authority on potential impacts on the safety and operation of aviation activities.	Development of a class to which Schedule 9 clause 3 item 1 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017 applies.

Heritage Adjacency Overlay

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

Do 1 Development adjacent to State and Local Heritage Places maintains the heritage and cultural values of those Places.

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome

Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature

Annondiv 1

Built Form

Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2023.6 27/04/2023
PO 1.1	DTS/DPF 1.1
Development adjacent to a State or Local Heritage Place does not dominate, encroach on or unduly impact on the setting of the Place.	None are applicable.

Appendix 1

Procedural Matters (PM) - Referrals

The following table identifies classes of development / activities that require referral in this Overlay and the applicable referral body. It sets out the purpose of the referral as well as the relevant statutory reference from Schedule 9 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017.

Class of Development / Activity	Referral Body	Purpose of Referral	Statutory Reference
Development that may materially affect the context of a State Heritage Place .	Minister responsible for the administration of the <i>Heritage Places Act 1993.</i>	To provide expert assessment and direction to the relevant authority on the potential impacts of development adjacent State Heritage Places.	Development of a class to which Schedule 9 clause 3 item 17 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017 applies.

Historic Area Overlay

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

DO 1Historic 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.

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome

Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature

All Development

DTS/DPF 1.1

PO 1.1

	Appendix 1
Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2023.6 27/04/2023
All development is undertaken having consideration to the historic streetscapes and built form as expressed in the Historic Area Statement.	None are applicable.
Built	Form
PO 2.1	DTS/DPF 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.	None are applicable.
PO 2.2	DTS/DPF 2.2
Development is consistent with the prevailing building and wall heights in the historic area.	None are applicable.
PO 2.3	DTS/DPF 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.	None are applicable.
PO 2.4	DTS/DPF 2.4
Development is consistent with the prevailing front and side boundary setback pattern in the historic area.	None are applicable.
PO 2.5	DTS/DPF 2.5
Materials are either consistent with or complement those within the historic area.	None are applicable.
Alterations a	nd additions
PO 3.1	DTS/DPF 3.1
Alterations and additions complement the subject building, employ a contextual design approach and are sited to ensure they do not dominate the primary façade.	Alterations and additions are fully contained within the roof space of an existing building with no external alterations made to the building elevation facing the primary street.
PO 3.2	DTS/DPF 3.2
Adaptive reuse and revitalisation of buildings to support retention consistent with the Historic Area Statement.	None are applicable.
Context and Stre	eetscape Amenity
PO 6.1	DTS/DPF 6.1
The width of driveways and other vehicle access ways are consistent with the prevailing width of existing driveways of the historic area.	None are applicable.
PO 6.2	DTS/DPF 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.	None are applicable.
Ru	ins
	I

.

	Appendix 1
Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2023.6 27/04/2023
PO 8.1 Development conserves and complements features and ruins associated with former activities of significance.	DTS/DPF 8.1 None are applicable.

Historic Area Statements

St Peters Historic Area	Statement (NPSP18)
-------------------------	--------------------

The Historic Area Overlay identifies localities that comprise characteristics of an identifiable historic, economic and / or social theme of recognised importance. They can comprise land divisions, development patterns, built form characteristics and natural features that provide a legible connection to the historic development of a locality.

These attributes have been identified in the below table. In some cases State and / or Local Heritage Places within the locality contribute to the attributes of an Historic Area.

The preparation of an Historic Impact Statement can assist in determining potential additional attributes of an Historic Area where these are not stated in the below table.

	Eras, themes and context	1870 - 1930s. Detached and semi-detached dwellings.
	Allotments, subdivision and built form patterns	Mix of close-set, single-fronted cottages on narrow allotments and a range of cottages and villas set on larger allotments with more substantial established gardens, in wide streets, often with rear service lanes. Rear lanes used for vehicular access and garages
		In College Park and along Fifth and Sixth Avenue - small to medium sized allotments.
		In this section of First Avenue - modest sized allotments.
	Architectural styles, detailing	In College Park and along Fifth and Sixth Avenue - mainly single-storey double-fronted villas and detached dwellings of modest proportions with some single-fronted dwellings.
	features	In this section of First Avenue - reasonably compact single-fronted, double-fronted, and villa- type dwellings.
NPSP18	Building height	Single storey.
	Materials	Sandstone and bluestone construction.
	Fencing	Low, open fencing that reflects the period and style of the dwellings. Front fencing (including any secondary street frontage up to the alignment to the fain face of the dwelling) generally low in height up to 1.2m (masonry), 1.5m (wrought iron, timber and wire or woven mesh) and 2m (masonry pillars), allowing views to dwelling.
		Timber picket, timber dowelling, masonry and cast iron palisade, or corrugated iron or mini orb within timber.
		Side and rear fences in traditional materials such as timber, corrugated iron or well-detailed

Policy24		P&D Code (in effect) Version 2023.6 27/04/2023	
Statement#	Statement		
		masonry.	
	Setting, landscaping, streetscape and public	In College Park and along Fifth and Sixth Avenue - Reasonably wide streets are characteristic of this area, with significant street planting and fenced front boundaries. Rear vehicle access lanes.	
	realm features	Landscaping around dwellings is an important design element. Streets lined with mature exotic street trees.	
	Representative Buildings	Identified - refer to SA planning database.	

Procedural Matters (PM) - Referrals

The following table identifies classes of development / activities that require referral in this Overlay and the applicable referral body. It sets out the purpose of the referral as well as the relevant statutory reference from Schedule 9 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017.

Class of Development / Activity	Referral Body	Purpose of Referral	Statutory Reference
None	None	None	None

Part 4 - General Development Policies

Clearance from Overhead Powerlines

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

Desired Outcome		
DO 1	Protection of human health and safety when undertaking development in the vicinity of overhead transmission powerlines.	

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature
PO 1.1	DTS/DPF 1.1

	Appendix 1
Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2023.6 27/04/2023
Buildings are adequately separated from aboveground powerlines to minimise potential hazard to people and property.	 One of the following is satisfied: (a) a declaration is provided by or on behalf of the applicant to the effect that the proposal would not be contrary to the regulations prescribed for the purposes of section 86 of the <i>Electricity Act 1996</i> (b) there are no aboveground powerlines adjoining the site that are the subject of the proposed development.

Design in Urban Areas

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

Desired Outcome				
DO 1	Develo	opment is:		
	(a)	contextual - by considering, recognising and carefully responding to its natural surroundings or built environment and positively contributing to the character of the locality		
	(b)	durable - fit for purpose, adaptable and long lasting		
	(c)	inclusive - by integrating landscape design to optimise pedestrian and cyclist usability, privacy and equitable access and promoting the provision of quality spaces integrated with the public realm that can be used for access and recreation and help optimise security and safety both internally and within the public realm, for occupants and visitors		
	(d)	sustainable - by integrating sustainable techniques into the design and siting of development and landscaping to improve community health, urban heat, water management, environmental performance, biodiversity and local amenity and to minimise energy consumption.		

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome

Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature

All Development

Earthworks and sloping land		
PO 8.1	DTS/DPF 8.1	
Development, including any associated driveways and access tracks, minimises the need for earthworks to limit disturbance to natural topography.	 Development does not involve any of the following: (a) excavation exceeding a vertical height of 1m (b) filling exceeding a vertical height of 1m (c) a total combined excavation and filling vertical height of 2m or more. 	
PO 8.2	DTS/DPF 8.2	
Driveways and access tracks designed and constructed to allow safe and convenient access on sloping land.	Driveways and access tracks on sloping land (with a gradient exceeding 1 in 8) satisfy (a) and (b):	

	Appendix 1
Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2023.6 27/04/2023
	point along the driveway
	(b) are constructed with an all-weather trafficable surface.
PO 8.3	DTS/DPF 8.3
Driveways and access tracks on sloping land (with a gradient exceeding 1 in 8):	None are applicable.
 (a) do not contribute to the instability of embankments and cuttings 	
(b) provide level transition areas for the safe movement of people and goods to and from the development	
(c) are designed to integrate with the natural topography of the land.	
PO 8.4	DTS/DPF 8.4
Development on sloping land (with a gradient exceeding 1 in 8) avoids the alteration of natural drainage lines and includes on site drainage systems to minimise erosion.	None are applicable.
PO 8.5	DTS/DPF 8.5
Development does not occur on land at risk of landslip or increase the potential for landslip or land surface instability.	None are applicable.
Overlooking / Visual Pr	ivacy (low rise buildings)
PO 10.1	DTS/DPF 10.1
Development mitigates direct overlooking from upper level windows to habitable rooms and private open spaces of	Upper level windows facing side or rear boundaries shared with a residential use in a neighbourhood-type zone:
adjoining residential uses in neighbourhood-type zones.	 (a) are permanently obscured to a height of 1.5m above finished floor level and are fixed or not capable of being opened more than 125mm
	(b) have sill heights greater than or equal to 1.5m above finished floor level
	(c) incorporate screening with a maximum of 25% openings, permanently fixed no more than 500mm from the window surface and sited adjacent to any part of the window less than 1.5 m above the finished floor level.
PO 10.2	DTS/DPF 10.2
Development mitigates direct overlooking from balconies to habitable rooms and private open space of adjoining residential	One of the following is satisfied:
uses in neighbourhood type zones.	 (a) the longest side of the balcony or terrace will face a public road, public road reserve or public reserve that is at least 15m wide in all places faced by the balcony or terrace
	 or (b) all sides of balconies or terraces on upper building levels are permanently obscured by screening with a maximum 25% transparency/openings fixed to a minimum height of: (i) 1.5m above finished floor level where the balcony is located at least 15 metres from the nearest habitable window of a dwelling on adjacent land

Policv24	Appendix 1 P&D Code (in effect) Version 2023.6 27/04/
	or (ii) 1.7m above finished floor level in all other cases
All residenti	al development
Outlook	and Amenity
PO 18.1	DTS/DPF 18.1
Living rooms have an external outlook to provide a high standard of amenity for occupants.	A living room of a dwelling incorporates a window with an external outlook of the street frontage, private open space, public open space, or waterfront areas.
Residential Deve	lopment - Low Rise
External	appearance
PO 20.3	DTS/DPF 20.3
The visual mass of larger buildings is reduced when viewed from adjoining allotments or public streets.	None are applicable
Private	Dpen Space
PO 21.1	DTS/DPF 21.1
Dwellings are provided with suitable sized areas of usable private open space to meet the needs of occupants.	Private open space is provided in accordance with Design in Urban Areas Table 1 - Private Open Space.
PO 21.2	DTS/DPF 21.2
Private open space is positioned to provide convenient access from internal living areas.	Private open space is directly accessible from a habitable ro
Lang	scaping
PO 22.1	DTS/DPF 22.1
Soft landscaping is incorporated into development to: (a) minimise heat absorption and reflection (b) contribute shade and shelter	Residential development incorporates soft landscaping with minimum dimension of 700mm provided in accordance with and (b):
 (c) provide for stormwater infiltration and biodiversity (d) enhance the appearance of land and streetscapes. 	(a) a total area as determined by the following table:
	Dwelling site area (or in the case Minimum of residential flat building or percentage of group dwelling(s), average site area) (m ²)
	<150 10%
	150-200 15%
	>200-450 20%
	>450 25%
	(b) at least 30% of any land between the primary street boundary and the primary building line.

Car parking, access and manoeuvrability

Appendix 1 P&D Code (in effect) Version 2023.6 27/04/2023

PO 23.1	DTS/DPF 23.1
Enclosed car parking spaces are of dimensions to be functional, accessible and convenient.	Residential car parking spaces enclosed by fencing, walls or other structures have the following internal dimensions (separate from any waste storage area): (a) single width car parking spaces: (i) a minimum length of 5.4m per space (ii) a minimum width of 3.0m (iii) a minimum garage door width of 2.4m (b) double width car parking spaces (side by side): (i) a minimum length of 5.4m (ii) a minimum width of 5.4m (ii) a minimum width of 5.4m (iii) minimum garage door width of 2.4m per space.
PO 23.2	DTS/DPF 23.2
Uncovered car parking space are of dimensions to be	Uncovered car parking spaces have:
functional, accessible and convenient.	 (a) a minimum length of 5.4m (b) a minimum width of 2.4m (c) a minimum width between the centre line of the space and any fence, wall or other obstruction of 1.5m.
PO 23.3	DTS/DPF 23.3
Driveways and access points are located and designed to facilitate safe access and egress while maximising land available for street tree planting, domestic waste collection, landscaped street frontages and on-street parking.	 Driveways and access points satisfy (a) or (b): (a) sites with a frontage to a public road of 10m or less, have a width between 3.0 and 3.2 metres measured at the property boundary and are the only access point provided on the site (b) sites with a frontage to a public road greater than 10m: (i) have a maximum width of 5m measured at the property boundary and are the only access point provided on the site; (ii) have a width between 3.0 metres and 3.2 metres measured at the property boundary and no more than two access points are provided on site, separated by no less than 1m.
PO 23.4	DTS/DPF 23.4
Vehicle access is safe, convenient, minimises interruption to the operation of public roads and does not interfere with street infrastructure or street trees.	 Vehicle access to designated car parking spaces satisfy (a) or (b): (a) is provided via a lawfully existing or authorised access point or an access point for which consent has been granted as part of an application for the division of land (b) where newly proposed, is set back: (i) 0.5m or more from any street furniture, street
	pole, infrastructure services pit, or other stormwater or utility infrastructure unless consent is provided from the asset owner (ii) 2m or more from the base of the trunk of a street tree unless consent is provided from the tree owner for a lesser distance

Daliav24
	Appendix 1	
Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2023.6 27/04/2023	
	(iii) 6m or more from the tangent point of an intersection of 2 or more roads	
	(iv) outside of the marked lines or infrastructure dedicating a pedestrian crossing.	
PO 23.5	DTS/DPF 23.5	
Driveways are designed to enable safe and convenient vehicle	Driveways are designed and sited so that:	
movements from the public road to on-site parking spaces.	 (a) the gradient from the place of access on the boundary of the allotment to the finished floor level at the front of the garage or carport is not steeper than 1-in-4 on average (b) they are aligned relative to the street so that there is no more than a 20 degree deviation from 90 degrees between the centreline of any dedicated car parking space to which it provides access (measured from the front of that space) and the road boundary. (c) if located so as to provide access from an alley, lane or right of way - the alley, lane or right or way is at least 6 2m wide along the boundary of the allotment / site 	
DO 32.6		
Driveways and access points are designed and distributed to optimise the provision of on-street visitor parking.	Where on-street parking is available abutting the site's street frontage, on-street parking is retained in accordance with the following requirements:	
	 (a) minimum 0.33 on-street spaces per dwelling on the site (rounded up to the nearest whole number) (b) minimum car park length of 5.4m where a vehicle can enter or exit a space directly 	
	(c) minimum carpark length of 6m for an intermediate space located between two other parking spaces or to an end obstruction where the parking is indented.	
Waste	storage	
PO 24.1	DTS/DPF 24.1	
Provision is made for the convenient storage of waste bins in a location screened from public view.	Where dwellings abut both side boundaries a waste bin storage area is provided behind the building line of each dwelling that:	
	 (a) has a minimum area of 2m² with a minimum dimension of 900mm (separate from any designated car parking spaces or private open space); and (b) has a continuous unobstructed path of travel (excluding moveable objects like gates, vehicles and roller doors) with a minimum width of 800mm between the waste bin storage area and the street. 	

Table 1 - Private Open Space

Dwelling Type	Dwelling / Site	Minimum Rate
	Configuration	

		Appendix 1
Policy24		P&D Code (in effect) Version 2023.6 27/04/202
Dwelling (at ground level, other than a residential flat building that includes above ground dwellings)		 Total private open space area: (a) Site area <301m2: 24m2 located behind the building line. (b) Site area ≥ 301m2: 60m2 located behind the building line. Minimum directly accessible from a living room: 16m2 / with a minimum dimension 3m.
Cabin or caravan (permanently fixed to the ground) in a residential park or caravan and tourist park		Total area: 16m ² , which may be uses as second car parking space, provided on each site intended for residential occupation.
Dwelling in a residential flat building or mixed use building which	Dwellings at ground level:	15m ² / minimum dimension 3m
incorporate above ground level dwellings	Dwellings above ground level:	
	Studio (no separate bedroom)	4m ² / minimum dimension 1.8m
	One bedroom dwelling	8m ² / minimum dimension 2.1m
	Two bedroom dwelling	11m ² / minimum dimension 2.4m
	Three + bedroom dwelling	15 m ² / minimum dimension 2.6m

Infrastructure and Renewable Energy Facilities

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

Desired Outcome

DO 1 Efficient provision of infrastructure networks and services, renewable energy facilities and ancillary development in a manner that minimises hazard, is environmentally and culturally sensitive and manages adverse visual impacts on natural and rural landscapes and residential amenity.

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature	
Wastewater Services		
PO 12.2	DTS/DPF 12.2	
Effluent drainage fields and other wastewater disposal areas	Development is not built on, or encroaches within, an area that	

are maintained to ensure the effective operation of waste systems and minimise risks to human health and the environment. is, or will be, required for a sewerage system or waste control system.

Interface between Land Uses

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

	Desired Outcome
DO 1	Development is located and designed to mitigate adverse effects on or from neighbouring and proximate land uses.

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature
Oversh	adowing
PO 3.1	DTS/DPF 3.1
Overshadowing of habitable room windows of adjacent residential land uses in:	North-facing windows of habitable rooms of adjacent residential land uses in a neighbourhood-type zone receive at least 3 hours of direct sunlight between 9.00am and 3.00pm on
 a. a neighbourhood-type zone is minimised to maintain access to direct winter sunlight b. other zones is managed to enable access to direct winter sunlight. 	21 June.
PO 3.2	DTS/DPF 3.2
Overshadowing of the primary area of private open space or communal open space of adjacent residential land uses in: a. a neighbourhood type zone is minimised to maintain access to direct winter sunlight	Development maintains 2 hours of direct sunlight between 9.00 am and 3.00 pm on 21 June to adjacent residential land uses in a neighbourhood-type zone in accordance with the following:
b. other zones is managed to enable access to direct winter sunlight.	 a. for ground level private open space, the smaller of the following: i. half the existing ground level open space
	or ii. 35m2 of the existing ground level open space (with at least one of the area's dimensions measuring 2.5m) b. for ground level communal open space, at least half of the existing ground level open space.
PO 3.3	DTS/DPF 3.3
Development does not unduly reduce the generating capacity	None are applicable.

Transport, Access and Parking

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

Desired Outcome			
DO 1	A comprehensive, integrated and connected transport system that is safe, sustainable, efficient, convenient and accessible to all users.		

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature		
Vehicle Pa	rking Rates		
 PO 5.1 Sufficient on-site vehicle parking and specifically marked accessible car parking places are provided to meet the needs of the development or land use having regard to factors that may support a reduced on-site rate such as: (a) availability of on-street car parking (b) shared use of other parking areas (c) in relation to a mixed-use development, where the hours of operation of commercial activities complement the residential use of the site, the provision of vehicle parking may be shared (d) the adaptive reuse of a State or Local Heritage Place. 	 DTS/DPF 5.1 Development provides a number of car parking spaces on-site at a rate no less than the amount calculated using one of the following, whichever is relevant: (a) Transport, Access and Parking Table 1 - General Off-Street Car Parking Requirements (b) Transport, Access and Parking Table 2 - Off-Street Vehicle Parking Requirements in Designated Areas (c) if located in an area where a lawfully established carparking fund operates, the number of spaces calculated under (a) or (b) less the number of spaces offset by contribution to the fund. 		
Corner Cut-Offs			
PO 10.1 Development is located and designed to ensure drivers can safely turn into and out of public road junctions.	DTS/DPF 10.1 Development does not involve building work, or building work is located wholly outside the land shown as Corner Cut-Off Area in the following diagram:		

	Appendix 1
Policy24	Corner Cut- Off Area

Table 1 - General Off-Street Car Parking Requirements

Class of Development	Car Parking Rate (unless
	variad by Table 2 apwards)
	varied by rable 2 onwards)
	Where a development
	comprises more than one
	development type, then the
	overall car parking rate will
	be taken to be the sum of
	the car parking rates for
	each development type.
Residential	Development
Detached Dwelling	Dwelling with 1 bedroom (including rooms capable of being used as a bedroom) - 1 space per dwelling.
	Dwelling with 2 or more bedrooms (including rooms capable of
	being used as a bedroom) - 2 spaces per dwelling, 1 of which is to be covered.
Group Dwelling	Dwelling with 1 or 2 bedrooms (including rooms capable of being used as a bedroom) - 1 space per dwelling.
	Dwelling with 3 or more bedrooms (including rooms capable of
	being used as a bedroom) - 2 spaces per dwelling, 1 of which is
	0.33 spaces per dwelling for visitor parking where development involves 3 or more dwellings.
Residential Flat Building	welling with 1 or 2 bedrooms (including rooms capable of being
	used as a bedroom) - 1 space per dwelling.
	Dwelling with 3 or more bedrooms (including rooms capable of
	to be covered.
	0.22 spaces per dwelling for visitor parking where development
	involves 3 or more dwellings.
Row Dwelling where vehicle access is from the primary street	Dwelling with 1 bedroom (including rooms capable of being used as a bedroom) - 1 space per dwelling.
	Dwelling with 2 or more bedrooms (including rooms capable of
	being used as a bedroom) - 2 spaces per dwelling, 1 of which is to be covered.

	Appendix 1
Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2023.6 27/04/2023
Row Dwelling where vehicle access is not from the primary street (i.e. rear-loaded)	welling with 1 or 2 bedrooms (including rooms capable of being used as a bedroom) - 1 space per dwelling.
	Dwelling with 3 or more bedrooms (including rooms capable of being used as a bedroom) - 2 spaces per dwelling, 1 of which is to be covered.
Semi-Detached Dwelling	Dwelling with 1 bedroom (including rooms capable of being used as a bedroom) - 1 space per dwelling.
	Dwelling with 2 or more bedrooms (including rooms capable of being used as a bedroom) - 2 spaces per dwelling, 1 of which is to be covered.

Table 2 - Off-Street Car Parking Requirements in Designated Areas

Class of Development	Car Parking Rate Where a development comprises more than one development type, then the overall car parking rate will be taken to be the sum of the car parking rates for each development type.		Designated Areas
	Minimum	Maximum	
	number of	number of	
	spaces	spaces	
	Developme	nt generally	Γ
		Primary Pedestrian Area identified in the Primary Pedestrian Area Concept Plan, where the maximum is: 1 space for each dwelling with a total floor area less than 75 square metres 2 spaces for each dwelling with a total floor area between 75 square metres and 150 square metres 3 spaces for each dwelling with a total floor area greater than 150 square metres.	Capital City Zone City Main Street Zone City Riverbank Zone Adelaide Park Lands Zone Business Neighbourhood Zone (within the City of Adelaide) The St Andrews Hospital Precinct Subzone and Women's and Children's Hospital Precinct Subzone of the Community Facilities Zone
		Residential flat building or Residential component of a multi-storey building: 1 visitor space for each 6 dwellings.	

Policy24

Table 2 - CriteriaThe following criteria are used in conjunction with Table 2. The 'Exception' column identifies locations where the criteria do not apply and the car parking rates in Table 2 are applicable.

Criteria		Exceptions		
The designated area is wholly located within Metropolitan Adelaide and any part of the development site satisfies one or more of the following:		(a) (b)	All zones in the City of Adelaide Strategic Innovation Zone in the following locations: (i) City of Burnside (ii) City of Marion (iii) City of Mitcham	
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e) (f)	is within 200 metres of any section of road reserve along which a bus service operates as a high frequency public transit service ⁽²⁾ is within 400 metres of a bus interchange ⁽¹⁾ is within 400 metres of an O-Bahn interchange ⁽¹⁾ is within 400 metres of a passenger rail station ⁽¹⁾ is within 400 metres of a passenger tram station ⁽¹⁾ is within 400 metres of the Adelaide Parklands.	(c) (d) (e) (f) (g)	Urban Corridor (Boulevard) Zone Urban Corridor (Business) Zone Urban Corridor (Living) Zone Urban Corridor (Main Street) Zone Urban Neighbourhood Zone	

[NOTE(S): (1)Measured from an area that contains any platform(s), shelter(s) or stop(s) where people congregate for the purpose waiting to board a bus, tram or train, but does not include areas used for the parking of vehicles. (2) A high frequency public transit service is a route serviced every 15 minutes between 7.30am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday and every 30 minutes at night, Saturday, Sunday and public holidays until 10pm.]

Address:

2 TORRENS ST COLLEGE PARK SA 5069

Click to view a detailed interactive SAILIS in SAILIS

To view a detailed interactive property map in SAPPA click on the map below



Property Zoning Details

Zone

Established Neighbourhood Overlay Airport Building Heights (Regulated) (All structures over 110 metres) Historic Area (NPSP1) Historic Area (NPSP18) Heritage Adjacency Prescribed Wells Area Regulated and Significant Tree Stormwater Management Urban Tree Canopy Local Variation (TNV) Minimum Frontage (Minimum frontage for a detached dwelling is 17m; semi-detached dwelling is 9m) Minimum Site Area (Minimum site area for a detached dwelling is 300 sqm; semi-detached dwelling is 300 sqm) Minimum Site Area (Minimum site area for a detached dwelling is 900 sqm) Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 1 level) Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 2 levels) Site Coverage (Maximum site coverage is 40 per cent) Site Coverage (Maximum site coverage is 50 per cent)

Selected Development(s)

Fence

This development may be subject to multiple assessment pathways. Please review the document below to determine which pathway may be applicable based on the proposed development compliances to standards.

If no assessment pathway is shown this mean the proposed development will default to performance assessed. Please contact your local council in this instance. Refer to Part 1 - Rules of Interpretation - Determination of Classes of Development

Property Policy Information for above selection

Fence - Code Assessed - Performance Assessed

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones

Established Neighbourhood Zone

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

	Desired Outcome
DO 1	A neighbourhood that includes a range of housing types, with new buildings sympathetic to the predominant built form character and development patterns.
DO 2	Maintain the predominant streetscape character, having regard to key features such as roadside plantings, footpaths, front yards, and space between crossovers.

Table 5 - Procedural Matters (PM) - Notification

The following table identifies, pursuant to section 107(6) of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*, classes of performance assessed development that are excluded from notification. The table also identifies any exemptions to the placement of notices when notification is required.

Interpretation

Notification tables exclude the classes of development listed in Column A from notification provided that they do not fall within a corresponding exclusion prescribed in Column B.

Where a development or an element of a development falls within more than one class of development listed in Column A, it will be excluded from notification if it is excluded (in its entirety) under any of those classes of development. It need not be excluded under all applicable classes of development.

Where a development involves multiple performance assessed elements, all performance assessed elements will require notification (regardless of whether one or more elements are excluded in the applicable notification table) unless every performance assessed element of the application is excluded in the applicable notification table, in which case the application will not require notification.

Class of Development	Exceptions
(Column A)	(Column B)
 Development which, in the opinion of the relevant authority, is of a minor nature only and will not unreasonably impact on the owners or occupiers of land in the locality of the site of the development. 	None specified.
 2. All development undertaken by: (a) the South Australian Housing Trust either individually or jointly with other persons or bodies or (b) a provider registered under the Community Housing National Law participating in a program relating to the renewal of housing endorsed by the South Australian Housing Trust. 	 Except development involving any of the following: residential flat building(s) of 3 or more building levels the demolition of a State or Local Heritage Place the demolition of a building (except an ancillary building) in a Historic Area Overlay.

 3. Any development involving any of the following (or of any combination of any of the following): (a) air handling unit, air conditioning system or exhaust fan (b) ancillary accommodation (c) building work on railway land (d) carport (e) deck (f) dwelling (g) dwelling addition (h) fence (i) outbuilding (j) pergola (k) private bushfire shelter (l) residential flat building (m) retaining wall (n) shade sail (o) solar photovoltaic panels (roof mounted) (p) swimming pool or spa pool (q) verandah 	 Except development that: exceeds the maximum building height specified in Established Neighbourhood Zone DTS/DPF 4.1 or involves a building wall (or structure) that is proposed to be situated on (or abut) an allotment boundary (not being a boundary with a primary street or secondary street or an excluded boundary) and: (a) the length of the proposed wall (or structure) exceeds 8m (other than where the proposed wall abuts an existing wall or structure of greater length on the adjoining allotment) or (b) the height of the proposed wall (or post height) exceeds 3.2m measured from the lower of the natural or finished ground level (other than where the proposed wall or structure of greater height on the adjoining allotment).
 4. Any development involving any of the following (or of any combination of any of the following): (a) consulting room (b) office (c) shop. 	 Except development that: 1. does not satisfy Established Neighbourhood Zone DTS/DPF 1.2 or 2. exceeds the maximum building height specified in Established Neighbourhood Zone DTS/DPF 4.1 or 3. involves a building wall (or structure) that is proposed to be situated on (or abut) an allotment boundary (not being a boundary with a primary street or secondary street or an excluded boundary) and: (a) the length of the proposed wall (or structure) exceeds 8m (other than where the proposed wall abuts an existing wall or structure of greater length on the adjoining allotment) or (b) the height of the proposed wall (or post height) exceeds 3.2m measured from the lower of the natural or finished ground level (other than where the proposed wall abuts an existing wall or structure of greater height on the adjoining allotment).
 5. Any of the following (or of any combination of any of the following): (a) internal building works (b) land division (c) recreation area (d) replacement building (e) temporary accommodation in an area affected by bushfire (f) tree damaging activity. 	None specified.

6. Demolition.

olicy24

Except any of the following:

- 1. the demolition of a State or Local Heritage Place
- 2. the demolition of a building (except an ancillary building) in a Historic Area Overlay.

Placement of Notices - Exemptions for Performance Assessed Development

None specified.

Placement of Notices - Exemptions for Restricted Development

None specified.

Part 3 - Overlays

Airport Building Heights (Regulated) Overlay

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

	Desired Outcome
DO 1	Management of potential impacts of buildings and generated emissions to maintain operational and safety requirements of registered and certified commercial and military airfields, airports, airstrips and helicopter landing sites.

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature
Built	Form
PO 1.1 Building height does not pose a hazard to the operation of a certified or registered aerodrome.	DTS/DPF 1.1 Buildings are located outside the area identified as 'All structures' (no height limit is prescribed) and do not exceed the height specified in the Airport Building Heights (Regulated) Overlay which applies to the subject site as shown on the SA Property and Planning Atlas.
	In instances where more than one value applies to the site, the lowest value relevant to the site of the proposed development is applicable.

Procedural Matters (PM) - Referrals

The following table identifies classes of development / activities that require referral in this Overlay and the applicable referral body. It

sets out the purpose of the referral as well as the relevant statutory reference from Schedule 9 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017.

Class of Development / Activity	Referral Body	Purpose of Referral	Statutory Reference
 Any of the following classes of development: (a) building located in an area identified as 'All structures' (no height limit is prescribed) or will exceed the height specified in the Airport Building Heights (Regulated) Overlay (b) building comprising exhaust stacks that generates plumes, or may cause plumes to be generated, above a height specified in the Airport Building Heights (Regulated) Overlay. 	The airport-operator company for the relevant airport within the meaning of the <i>Airports Act 1996</i> of the Commonwealth or, if there is no airport-operator company, the Secretary of the Minister responsible for the administration of the <i>Airports Act 1996</i> of the Commonwealth.	To provide expert assessment and direction to the relevant authority on potential impacts on the safety and operation of aviation activities.	Development of a class to which Schedule 9 clause 3 item 1 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017 applies.

Heritage Adjacency Overlay

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

	Desired Outcome
DO 1	Development adjacent to State and Local Heritage Places maintains the heritage and cultural values of those Places.

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature
Built	Form
PO 1.1	DTS/DPF 1.1
Development adjacent to a State or Local Heritage Place does not dominate, encroach on or unduly impact on the setting of the Place.	None are applicable.

Procedural Matters (PM) - Referrals

The following table identifies classes of development / activities that require referral in this Overlay and the applicable referral body. It sets out the purpose of the referral as well as the relevant statutory reference from Schedule 9 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017.

Class of Development / Activity	Referral Body	Purpose of Referral	Statutory Reference
Downloaded on 15/05/2023	Generated By Policy24		Page 5 of 10

		Append	ix 1
Policy24		P&D Code (in effect) Version 2	023.6 27/04/2023
Development that may materially affect the context of a State Heritage Place .	Minister responsible for the administration of the <i>Heritage</i> <i>Places Act 1993.</i>	To provide expert assessment and direction to the relevant authority on the potential impacts of development adjacent State Heritage Places.	Development of a class to which Schedule 9 clause 3 item 17 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017 applies.

Historic Area Overlay

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

	Desired Outcome
DO 1	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.

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature	
All Deve	lopment	
P0 1.1	DTS/DPF 1.1	
All development is undertaken having consideration to the historic streetscapes and built form as expressed in the Historic Area Statement.	None are applicable.	
Ancillary development		
P0 4.4	DTS/DPF 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.	None are applicable.	

Historic Area Statements

	St Peters Historic Area Statement (NPSP18)			
	The Historic Area Overlay identifies localities that comprise characteristics of an identifiable historic, economic and / or social theme of recognised importance. They can comprise land divisions, development patterns, built form characteristics and natural features that provide a legible connection to the historic development of a locality.			
	These attributes have been identified in the below table. In some cases State and / or Local Heritage Places within the locality contribute to the attributes of an Historic Area.			
	The preparation of Area where these a	an Historic Impact Statement can assist in determining potential additional attributes of an Historic are not stated in the below table.		
	Eras, themes and context	1870 - 1930s. Detached and semi-detached dwellings.		
	Allotments, subdivision and built form	Mix of close-set, single-fronted cottages on narrow allotments and a range of cottages and villas set on larger allotments with more substantial established gardens, in wide streets, often with rear service lanes. Rear lanes used for vehicular access and garages		
	patterns	In College Park and along Fifth and Sixth Avenue - small to medium sized allotments.		
		In this section of First Avenue - modest sized allotments.		
	Architectural styles, detailing	In College Park and along Fifth and Sixth Avenue - mainly single-storey double-fronted villas and detached dwellings of modest proportions with some single-fronted dwellings.		
	features	In this section of First Avenue - reasonably compact single-fronted, double-fronted, and villa-type dwellings.		
NPSP18	Building height Single storey.			
	Materials Sandstone and bluestone construction.			
	Fencing	Low, open fencing that reflects the period and style of the dwellings. Front fencing (including any secondary street frontage up to the alignment to the fain face of the dwelling) generally low in height up to 1.2m (masonry), 1.5m (wrought iron, timber and wire or woven mesh) and 2m (masonry pillars), allowing views to dwelling.		
		Timber picket, timber dowelling, masonry and cast iron palisade, or corrugated iron or mini orb within timber.		
		Side and rear fences in traditional materials such as timber, corrugated iron or well-detailed masonry.		
	Setting, landscaping, streetscape and	In College Park and along Fifth and Sixth Avenue - Reasonably wide streets are characteristic of this area, with significant street planting and fenced front boundaries.		
	public realm	Rear vehicle access lanes.		
	features	Landscaping around dwellings is an important design element.		

Policy24 P&D Code (in effect) Version 2023.6 27/04/202 Statement# Statement Image: Street st

Procedural Matters (PM) - Referrals

The following table identifies classes of development / activities that require referral in this Overlay and the applicable referral body. It sets out the purpose of the referral as well as the relevant statutory reference from Schedule 9 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017.

Class of Development / Activity	Referral Body	Purpose of Referral	Statutory Reference
None	None	None	None

Part 4 - General Development Policies

Clearance from Overhead Powerlines

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

Desired Outcome		
DO 1	Protection of human health and safety when undertaking development in the vicinity of overhead transmission powerlines.	

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature
P0 1.1	DTS/DPF 1.1
Buildings are adequately separated from aboveground powerlines to minimise potential hazard to people and property.	 One of the following is satisfied: (a) a declaration is provided by or on behalf of the applicant to the effect that the proposal would not be contrary to the regulations prescribed for the purposes of section 86 of the <i>Electricity Act 1996</i> (b) there are no aboveground powerlines adjoining the site that are the subject of the proposed development.

Design in Urban Areas

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

Desired Outcome				
DO 1	Development is:			
	(a)	contextual - by considering, recognising and carefully responding to its natural surroundings or built environment and positively contributing to the character of the locality		
	(b) (c)	durable - fit for purpose, adaptable and long lasting inclusive - by integrating landscape design to optimise pedestrian and cyclist usability, privacy and equitable access and promoting the provision of quality spaces integrated with the public realm that can be used for access and recreation and help optimise security and safety both internally and within the public realm, for occupants and visitors		
	(d)	sustainable - by integrating sustainable techniques into the design and siting of development and landscaping to improve community health, urban heat, water management, environmental performance, biodiversity and local amenity and to minimise energy consumption.		

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature	
All Development		
Fences and walls		
P0 9.1	DTS/DPF 9.1	
Fences, walls and retaining walls of sufficient height maintain privacy and security without unreasonably impacting visual amenity and adjoining land's access to sunlight or the amenity of public places.	None are applicable.	

Historic Area Overlay

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

ľ

Demolition		
DTS/DPF 7.1		
None are applicable.		
NTS/DPE 7.2		
None are applicable.		
DTS/DPF 7.3		
None are applicable.		
Ruins		
DTS/DPF 8.1		
None are applicable.		

Ref: 22ADL-1618

2 October 2024

Kieran Fairbrother Senior Urban Planner City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

kfairbrother@npsp.a.gov.au

Dear Kieran

23012750 - Amended Proposal

Introduction

As you are aware, I act for Minuzzo Project Management, the applicant for the above application.

This project dates back to 2022 when the proponent and URPS staff met with Geoff Parsons on site to discuss the proposal. An application was then lodged with Council in May 2023. Council's assessment of the application has progressed through several stages including public notification.

Following public notification my client commenced negotiations with the representor. This concluded in January this year. The application has been on hold since. During our negotiations with the representor we were also liaising with you regarding your concerns with the proposal. I've discussed this in more detail below.

The Public Notification Process and Council's Concerns

The application was publicly notified between 1 June and 22 June 2023. During that period we received one representation from the owner of the adjoining property to the south-east at 2 College Street. Concerns were raised primarily in relation to the height of the additions and their visual impact as viewed from the representor's land.

A response to the representation including amended plans was issued to the representor on 23 November 2023. Amongst other things, the amended proposal involved the deletion of the entire third building level and setting back the addition from the south-eastern boundary by 1.4m.

Occurring concurrently with the negotiations with the neighbour, were discussions with Council. In an email from you on 3 November you advised that while the amended proposal was a step in the right direction, you remained concerned over the potential visual impact to the southern neighbour. These discussions have informed the amended application.

We acknowledge the Kauma People as the Traditional Custodians of the land on which we work and pay respect to Elders past, present and emerging.

https://urpsau.sharepoint.com/sites/Synergy/Shared Documents/Projects/22ADL/22ADL-1618 - 2 Torrens Street, College Park/Working/URPS Planning Advice/240930_C1_V1_Planning Statement_Amended Proposal.docx



Attachment 1

Adelaide 27 Halifax Street Adelaide SA 5000 08 8333 7999

urps.com.au

SHAPING

COMMUNITIES |

GREAT

ADL | MEL | PER

Meeting with Council Planning Staff

To better understand the core planning issues, my client, the architects and I met with you at Council's offices on 6 September 2024.

At that meeting I advised you that the massing of the south-eastern elevation of the building should not be viewed in isolation, but instead examined in the context of the existing circumstances.

I explained that the existing context relevant to the proposed development is influenced by several factors. These include:

- The generous separation between the proposed additions and dwelling on neighbouring site.
- The buffer between the development and the dwelling on adjoining allotment at 2 College Street created by the large tennis court.
- The established vegetation including:
 - 3.8m tall evergreen hedge and chainmesh fence spanning 36m, or 80% of the length of the north-western boundary of the neighbour's allotment.
 - 6m tall evergreen tree located at the end of the hedging, at the south-western end of the tennis court.
- The 5m high gable roofed outbuilding occurring sited on the northern and western boundaries of the neighbour's allotment.

The above observations aid to obscure the visibility of the upper level when viewed from the neighbour's land to the extent that, in our view, the proposed additions will have a negligible impact on the amenity of the neighbour's land. You agreed with this.



Figure 1 – South-eastern elevation with added context of existing site conditions

To evidence this, I explained that we could improve the messaging by dropping in the existing site conditions on a site plan, floor plan and elevation drawings as part of an amended application. An example of this is shown in **Figure 1** above.



Additionally, the architects presented an updated material and colour sample to highlight the improved articulation and visual interest across the elevation in question. You agreed that the context argument and refined selection of materials, finishes and colours were positive and improved the messaging for the proposal.

You advised that what we presented had convinced you to change your opinion on the proposal. While you didn't commit to a formal position, we've submitted the amended proposal on the back of these positive discussions with you.

The Amended Proposal

The amended proposal has been prepared on the back of a significant compromise for my client. The amended application involves a substantial redesign as well as supplementary contextual information to aid Council's assessment.

For completeness, I've discussed these separately below.

Design Amendments

The proposed design revisions include:

- Deletion of the third building level.
- Reduction in building height from 9.32m to 8.16m.
- Ground floor and first floor pulled off the south-eastern boundary. Both levels are setback 1.4m set back from the boundary.
- Reduction in floor area of 95m².
- Face brickwork in "Simmentel Silver" to ground floor elevation in lieu of painted brick in "off white".
- Aluminium cladding in "off white" to first floor elevation in lieu of "warm grey".



Figure 2 – Revised 3D perspective portraying view of the proposed addition from neighbour's site (2 College Street)





• Inclusion of vertically aligned black metal framed windows with fixed obscured glazing to south-eastern elevation.

Supplementary Information

We have included the following additional information to provide site context and aid Council's assessment of the application:

- Additional details with respect to proposed floor levels and existing ground levels.
- Mapping of established trees and vegetation in proximity to the site and relevant to the proposal, including:
 - Location and height of existing evergreen hedge along neighbours northwestern boundary portrayed on site plan, elevations and renders.
- Portrayal of existing outbuildings to the rear of the neighbouring property at 2 College Street on site plan and elevation drawings.
- Portrayal of dwelling on the adjoining property at 4 Torrens Street in background of south-eastern elevation to emphasise its bulk and scale compared to proposed addition.
- Additional details included on elevation drawings to highlight 45 degree angle from building line of existing dwelling.
- Site photos taken by proponent in September 2024 (refer Appendix C).

Additionally, we have had Oxigen prepare an addendum Visual Impact Assessment Addendum report based on the amended proposal (refer **Appendix B**)



Figure 3 – Site plan with additional information portraying existing conditions





Procedural Matters

I understand it is the view of the Council that the proposed variations are substantial. Therefore, the application will be renotified pursuant to Regulation 35(3) of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017.

My client would be grateful if Council commences public notification as soon as possible. Should representations be received in relation to the amended application, I understand the Council Assessment Panel is the relevant authority for deciding the application.

Conclusion

The amended application has been prepared following recent discussions with Council planning staff. These discussions have informed the additional detail in the enclosed planning set and presents a more comprehensive proposal for Council's consideration.

The supplementary information has improved the messaging in the architecture to aid the Council's assessment, and more importantly, resolve the core planning matters relating to visual impact.

Additionally, the amended proposal:

- Is envisaged in the Zone.
- Is of a height that complements the height of nearby buildings.
- It not visible from Torrens Street, preserving the historic character of the representative building and broader streetscape.
- Will have an overall very low visual impact on the broader locality of the subject site.

For these reasons, the proposed development warrants planning approval.

Yours sincerely

Jake Vaccarella Principal Consultant

SHAPING GREAT COMMUNITIES |





Appendix A

Amended Proposal Plans prepared by Aplin Cook Gardner Architects on 11 September 2024











NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation.

Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be verified on site and any discrepancies reported before commencement of any work or shop drawings.

ARCHITECT INTERIOR DESIGN

2 TORRENS STREET COLLEGE PARK, SA

COLLEGE PARK RESIDENCE

236 grenfell st, adelaide, sa 5000

18006





SITE PLAN

Project Description

Project Numbe Drawing Title



DEMOLITION EXISTING WALL TO REMAIN

<u>+ ⁹²⁰ </u>+

2.5 0 1 5m SCALE 1:100 @ A3

NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation. Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be verified on site and any discrepancies reported before

commencement of any work or shop drawings.

6	FOR PLANNING APPROVAL	23/01/25
5	FOR PLANNING APPROVAL	11/09/24
4	PLANNING REVIEW	25/10/23
3	PLANNING REVIEW	21/12/22
2	PLANNING REVIEW	0408/22
1	CLIENT REVIEW	22/06/22
Rev.	Revision Description	Date

APLIN COOK GARDNER

ARCHITECT INTERIOR DESIGN





2 TORRENS STREET COLLEGE PARK, SA 18006

COLLEGE PARK RESIDENCE





Project Number Drawing Title









Issue



8	FOR PLANNING APPROVAL	23/01/25
7	FOR PLANNING APPROVAL	11/09/24
6	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	25/10/23
5	CLIENT REVIEW	26/07/23
4	PLANNING REVIEW	21/12/22
3	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
2	PLANNING REVIEW	0408/22
1	CLIENT REVIEW	22/06/22
Rev.	Revision Description	Date



8	FOR PLANNING APPROVAL	23/01/25
7	FOR PLANNING APPROVAL	11/09/24
6	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	25/10/23
5	CLIENT REVIEW	26/07/23
4	PLANNING REVIEW	21/12/22
3	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
2	PLANNING REVIEW	0408/22
1	CLIENT REVIEW	22/06/22
Rev.	Revision Description	Date
AF	PLIN COOK GARD	NER
A P	CHITECT INTERIOR DI	FSIGN



LEGEND

FFL FINISHED FLOOR LEVEL

ZZ NEW WALL

SUMP/DOWNPIPE S



NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation.

Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be verified on site and any discrepancies reported before commencement of any work or shop drawings.

7	FOR PLANNING APPROVAL	23/01/25
6	FOR PLANNING APPROVAL	11/09/24
5	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	25/10/23
4	PLANNING REVIEW	21/12/22
3	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
2	PLANNING REVIEW	0408/22
1	CLIENT REVIEW	22/06/22
Rev.	Revision Description	Date

APLIN COOK GARDNER







Project Description

2 TORRENS STREET COLLEGE PARK, SA 18006

Scale

COLLEGE PARK RESIDENCE













NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation.

Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be verified on site and any discrepancies reported before commencement of any work or shop drawings.

8	FOR PLANNING APPROVAL	23/01/25
7	FOR PLANNING APPROVAL	11/09/24
6	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	25/10/23
5	CLIENT REVIEW	26/07/23
4	PLANNING REVIEW	21/12/22
3	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
2	PLANNING REVIEW	0408/22
1	CLIENT REVIEW	22/06/22
Rev.	Revision Description	Date

APLIN COOK GARDNER

ARCHITECT INTERIOR DESIGN

236 grenfell st, adelaide, sa 5000



Project Description

PLANNING

Drawing Numbe WD08

Project Number 18006 Drawing Title SECTION AA

Scale 1:100

> Issue 8



NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation.

Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be verified on site and any discrepancies reported before commencement of any work or shop drawings.

10	FOR PLANNING APPROVAL	23/01/25
9	FOR PLANNING APPROVAL	11/09/24
8	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	25/10/23
7	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	10/05/23
6	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	03/03/23
5	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	10/02/23
4	PLANNING REVIEW	21/12/22
3	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
2	PLANNING REVIEW	0408/22
1	CLIENT REVIEW	22/06/22
Rev.	Revision Description	Date



SOUTH - WEST ELEVATION

LEGEND

- BRICKWORK SIMMENTEL SILVER 1
- 2 BLACK ALUMINIUM CLADDING
- 3 BLACK METAL FRAMED WINDOWS AND DOORS
- 4 GLAZED BALUSTRADE WITH BLACK METAL HANDRAIL
- 5 ROLLER DOOR
- 6 VERTICAL BATTEN STEEL BLADES FRAMED GATES & FENCE BLACK
- OFF WHITE ALUMINIUM CLADDING AND EXTRUSIONS LINEAR BOX PROFILE 7
- 8 NEW ROOF SHEETING AND GUTTERS GALVANISED CORRUGATED SHEETING SIMILAR TO TRUE OAK
- 9 CORE-FILLED BLOCKWORK RETAINING WALL / FENCE WITH TEXTURE COAT RENDER FINISH IN OFF WHITE (TO MATCH COLOUR 'SURFMIST')
- 10 FOLDED BLACK ALUMINIUM SUNSHADE HOOD
- OG OBSCURED GLASS UP TO 1700 AFL

RELATIVE LEVELS:

- TW: TOP OF WALL
- BOTTOM OF WALL BW:
- TS: TOP STEP

2.5 0 1 5m SCALE 1:100 @ A3

NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation. Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be

9	FOR PLANNING APPROVAL	23/01/25
8	FOR PLANNING APPROVAL	11/09/24
7	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	25/10/23
6	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	03/03/23
5	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	1002/23
4	PLANNING REVIEW	21/12/22
3	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
2	PLANNING REVIEW	0408/22
1	CLIENT REVIEW	22/06/22
Rev.	Revision Description	Date

APLIN COOK GARDNER ARCHITECT INTERIOR DESIGN

236 GRENFELL ST, ADELAIDE, SA 5000



2 TORRENS STREET COLLEGE PARK, SA 18006

ELEVATION SHEET 02 1:100



Drawing Numbe WD11

Project Numbe Drawing Title



NORTH - WEST ELEVATION

LEGEND

- 1 BRICKWORK SIMMENTEL SILVER
- 2 BLACK ALUMINIUM CLADDING
- 3 BLACK METAL FRAMED WINDOWS AND DOORS
- 4 GLAZED BALUSTRADE WITH BLACK METAL HANDRAIL
- 5 ROLLER DOOR
- 6 VERTICAL BATTEN STEEL BLADES FRAMED GATES & FENCE BLACK
- 7 OFF WHITE ALUMINIUM CLADDING AND EXTRUSIONS LINEAR BOX PROFILE
- 8 NEW ROOF SHEETING AND GUTTERS GALVANISED CORRUGATED SHEETING SIMILAR TO TRUE OAK
- 9 CORE-FILLED BLOCKWORK RETAINING WALL / FENCE WITH TEXTURE COAT RENDER FINISH IN OFF WHITE (TO MATCH COLOUR 'SURFMIST')
- 10 FOLDED BLACK ALUMINIUM SUNSHADE HOOD
- OG OBSCURED GLASS UP TO 1700 AFL

RELATIVE LEVELS:

- TW: TOP OF WALL
- BW: BOTTOM OF WALL
- TS: TOP STEP

0 1 2.5 5m SCALE 1:100 @ A3

NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation.

Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be verified on site and any discrepancies reported before commencement of any work or shop drawings.



PLANNING

Drawing Number



UTH - EAST ELEVATION

LEGEND

- BRICKWORK SIMMENTEL SILVER 1
- 2 BLACK ALUMINIUM CLADDING
- 3 BLACK METAL FRAMED WINDOWS AND DOORS 4 GLAZED BALUSTRADE WITH BLACK METAL HANDRAIL
- 5 ROLLER DOOR
- 6 VERTICAL BATTEN STEEL BLADES FRAMED GATES & FENCE BLACK OFF WHITE ALUMINIUM CLADDING AND EXTRUSIONS - LINEAR BOX PROFILE 7
- 8 NEW ROOF SHEETING AND GUTTERS GALVANISED CORRUGATED SHEETING SIMILAR TO TRUE OAK 9 CORE-FILLED BLOCKWORK RETAINING WALL / FENCE WITH TEXTURE COAT RENDER FINISH IN OFF WHITE
- (TO MATCH COLOUR 'SURFMIST')
- 10 FOLDED BLACK ALUMINIUM SUNSHADE HOOD OG - OBSCURED GLASS UP TO 1700 AFL

RELATIVE LEVELS:

- TW: TOP OF WALL
- BOTTOM OF WALL BW:
- TS: TOP STEP



NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation.

Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be verified on site and any discrepancies reported before

9	FOR PLANNING APPROVAL	23/01/25
8	FOR PLANNING APPROVAL	11/09/24
7	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	25/10/23
6	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	03/03/23
5	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	10/02/23
4	PLANNING REVIEW	21/12/22
3	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
2	PLANNING REVIEW	0408/22
1	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
Rev.	Revision Description	Date

APLIN COOK GARDNER

ARCHITECT INTERIOR DESIGN 236 GRENFELL ST, ADELAIDE, SA 5000

Project Description

COLLEGE PARK RESIDENCE

2 TORRENS STREET COLLEGE PARK, SA 18006

Project Numbe Drawing Title **ELEVATION 04**



Drawing Numb **WD13**

Scale 1:100 Issue


LEGEND

- 1 BRICKWORK SIMMENTEL SILVER
- 2 BLACK ALUMINIUM CLADDING
- 3 BLACK METAL FRAMED WINDOWS AND DOORS
- 4 GLAZED BALUSTRADE WITH BLACK METAL HANDRAIL
- 5 ROLLER DOOR
- 6 VERTICAL BATTEN STEEL BLADES FRAMED GATES & FENCE BLACK
- 7 OFF WHITE ALUMINIUM CLADDING AND EXTRUSIONS LINEAR BOX PROFILE
- 8 NEW ROOF SHEETING AND GUTTERS GALVANISED CORRUGATED SHEETING SIMILAR TO TRUE OAK
- 9 CORE-FILLED BLOCKWORK RETAINING WALL / FENCE WITH TEXTURE COAT RENDER FINISH IN OFF WHITE (TO MATCH COLOUR 'SURFMIST')
- 10 FOLDED BLACK ALUMINIUM SUNSHADE HOOD

NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation.

Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be verified on site and any discrepancies reported before commencement of any work or shop drawings.

PLANNING

MATERIALS Drawing Number

Project Description

Project Number Drawing Title

1 FOR PLANNING APPROVAL

APLIN COOK GARDNER

ARCHITECT INTERIOR DESIGN

2 TORRENS STREET COLLEGE PARK, SA

18006

236 GRENFELL ST, ADELAIDE, SA 5000

Rev. Revision Description

11/09/24

Dote

COLLEGE PARK RESIDENCE

Issue

J WD15

































Appendix B

Visual Impact Assessment prepared by James Hayter, Oxigen on 26 September 2024



7

Visual Assessment of a proposed extension at 2 Torrens Street, College Park

26 SEPTEMBER 2024



Page 33 of 194

VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED EXTENSION TO AN EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK

PREPARED FOR URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING SOLUTIONS



PREPARED BY James Hayter | Oxigen

Landscape Architecture | Urban Design | Urban Planning

Adelaide 98-100 Halifax Street, Adelaide SA 5000

Oxigen Pty Ltd ABN 22 107 472 284 Telephone +61 8 7324 9600 Email jhayter@oxigen.net.au

DOCUMENT STATUS

Issue	J Hayter	26.09.2024
ISSUE	AUTHOR	DATE

3

VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED EXTENSION TO A RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK

CONTENTS

Introduction	04
Methodology	05
Broad Locality	06
Site Description	08
Proposed Development	08
Viewpoints	12
Visual Assessment Summary	26
Conclusion	27

4

Introduction

BACKGROUND

As part of the upgrade of a residential property at 2 Torrens Street, College Park, the proponent seeks to extend the existing dwelling to the west.

The proposed works include the construction of a 2-storey extension to the back, or to the west, of the existing dwelling.

The proposal is described in documents provided by the proponent, comprising:

 Architectural plans comprising site plan, plans, elevations, long section and 3-D representations prepared by Aplin Cook Gardner. A number of these relevant drawings are included within my report.

Within my area of expertise, I have considered:

- 1. The locations at which the proposed building extension is likely to be viewed.
- 2. The effect of visibility from these locations on the character of the locality.

I initially reviewed a proposal for a 3-storey extension to the same building in February 2023. The proposal has now been modified to remove a storey - this has resulted in the current 2-storey proposal which is the subject of this visual assessment and report. I note that my initial report in 2023 supported the 3-storey proposal in respect to its visual impact on the site's context which I considered to be minimal.

5

Methodology

I inspected key viewpoints on 7 February and again on the 11 February 2023 to take photos which were included in my review of an earlier proposal. I further attended the locality in September 2024 to view any changes to adjacent buildings and the streetscape prior to completing this report.

I viewed the subject site only from publicly-accessible areas; that is, from public roads. I did not view or consider the visual impact from private land although one of the viewpoints I considered was over the St Peters College ovals.

I chose to carry out my analysis from evidence on-site rather than purely a desk-top study. I consider the former more reliable on this occasion given the complexity of determining viewpoints within an established urban area that is effected by built form and vegetation.

PHOTOGRAPHY

Photos included within this report were taken using a Nikon digital SLR camera with a 55mm focal lens. I understand this focal length approximates that of the human eye.

VISUAL ASSESSMENT

The analysis within this report includes:

- > Location location of photo viewpoint.
- > Description description of the existing view.
- > Visibility description of the proposed extension's visibility from the viewpoint.
- > Significance my opinion on the viewpoint's significance considering the existing urban character and visibility (ie. whether the viewpoint is likely to affect many people, such as from a main road or rail corridor, or a lesser number, such as from a minor residential street).
- > Likely Visual Impact my opinion on the potential impact of the proposed development on the visual amenity of the locality.
- > Images photographs from the viewpoint towards the subject site identifying the existing view and with the proposed extension photomontaged into the view.

DISTANCES

Data relating to distance of the viewpoint included within this report is taken from Nature Maps (SA Government) January 2023.

REPORT FORMAT

This report is best read as a PDF file. If read as a hard copy, it should be printed with facing pages.

б

Broad Locality



7

VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED EXTENSION TO A RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK

Site Map



8

Site Description

The subject site is described as 2 Torrens Street, College Park. The site is located within the Norwood Payneham St Peters College Park Historic Area (NPSP1), with character houses facing onto Torrens Street and the St Peters College back ovals immediately to the west of the subject site, which also faces onto Eton Lane.

Immediately to the north of the subject site lies a character residence set back further from the road than the residence on the subject site. The width of this allotment is considerably wider than that of the subject site. Views from the street are relatively open and through a relatively recently planted and a semi-mature street tree. A three storey addition has been added to the back (west) of the residence - this is most noticable when viewed from Eton Lane.

Immediately to the south of the subject site lies a tennis court on a large corner block that extends to College Street. The garden is well vegetated which, with the street trees and a brush fence, effectively screens views into the property.

A large, mature plane tree with a canopy extending well into the road sits in the verge in front of the subject site.

From Eton Lane, single storey garages and sheds face onto the lane at its southern end. Immediately to the north of the subject site the three storey addition to the adjacent residence sits on the Eton Lane boundary with windows facing onto Eton Lane and the St Peters College playing fields.

Proposed Development

The proposal as illustrated on the architect's drawings is for a two-storey addition to the existing building. The proposed addition is located on the southern property boundary (part) and along the full length of the shorter western boundary for its full length. The drawings (ACG drawings WD05 and WD06) illustrates retention of the existing building, including roof form, with extension to the west. The proposed addition utilises the existing fall of the land to the west to achieve two storeys facing onto Eton Lane. The north-east elevation taken from Torrens Street illustrates the parapet of the proposed new building sitting 1,160mm lower than the neighbour's highest ridge line.

9

VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED EXTENSION TO A RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK



FIGURES 3 & 4: SITE AND GROUND FLOOR PLAN (APLIN COOK GARDNER)

OXIGEN LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE & URBAN DESIGN



FIGURES 5 & 6: LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN AND ROOF PLAN (APLIN COOK GARDNER)

Page 42 of 194

VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED EXTENSION TO A RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK



FIGURES 7 & 8: SECTION AND ELEVATION (APLIN COOK GARDNER)

Viewpoints from where the proposed addition might be seen were determined by walking and driving along streets within the broad locality of the subject site. Views can be thought of as either direct, uninterupted views or glimpsed views which are interupted by either built form or vegetation.

A photograph is taken from each viewpoint with the proposed addition then identified in the photo.



VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED EXTENSION TO A RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK

Viewpoints Photographic Viewpoints



Viewpoint 1

LOCATION	Hatswell Street adjacent to the intersection with Cambridge Street.
DESCRIPTION	Viewpoint looks over the St Peters College back playing fields towards Eton Lane and properties adjoining it. The proposed addition sits to the right of the existing 3-storey addition immediately to the north of the subject site.
VISIBILITY	The proposed addition will be visible from Hatswell Street at this viewpoint. The slight setback from the western property boundary and backdrop of trees lessens the visability.
SIGNIFICANCE	The proposed addition is seen in the distance. It is lower than the adjacent building to the north and mature tree canopy of the locality.
LIKELY VISUAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	Very low due to the distance and mature tree canopy within the view.



PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 01: EXISTING







PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 01: WITH PROPOSED BUILDING ADDITION

Viewpoint 2

LOCATION	College Street adjacent to the intersection with Torrens Street.
DESCRIPTION	Viewpoint 2 is located at the most southern end of Torrens Street. The views north along the street are channelled within the envelope formed by the mature street trees along Torrens Street. There is little or no visibility from this viewpoint of the proposed extension at the rear of the subject site - views are completely blocked by the street trees and other tree planting within the adjacent property to the south of the subject site.
VISIBILITY	The proposed addition is not visible from this viewpoint.
SIGNIFICANCE	Buildings fronting onto Torrens Street are single storey in character, some with steeply pitched roofs and others with second storeys set well back from the street. The retention of this single storey character along Torrens Street is an important part of maintaining the desired character of the College Park Historic Area (NPSP1).
LIKELY VISUAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	Not visible due to the existing vegetation within the street and in the allotment immediately south of the subject site.



L VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED EXTENSION TO A RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK





PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 02: WITH PROPOSED BUILDING ADDITION

Page 49 of 194

Viewpoint 3

LOCATION	Torrens Street.
DESCRIPTION	Viewpoint 3 is taken from in front of 4 Torrens Street which is located adjacent to the subject site on its northern side. Whilst the street trees in front of 4 Torrens Street are less mature than the plane tree directly in front of the subject site, other trees - cypress pines in the front garden against the northern boundary fence and semi-mature trees in the front garden against the southern boundary of 4 Torrens Street - effectively screen views from this viewpoint.
VISIBILITY	The steep pitched roof form of 4 Torrens Street and the existing boundary tree planting screen or lessen views of the proposed addition at the rear or the subject site.
SIGNIFICANCE	Buildings fronting onto Torrens Street are single storey in character, some with steeply pitched roofs and others with second storeys set well back from the street. The retention of this single storey character along Torrens Street is an important part of maintaining the desired character of the College Park Historic Area (NPSP1).
LIKELY VISUAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	Very low due to the boundary tree planting and height of the roof on the residence at 4 Torrens Street.



PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 03







PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 03: WITH PROPOSED BUILDING ADDITION

Viewpoint 4

LOCATION	Torrens Street.
DESCRIPTION	Viewpoint 4 is located in Torrens Street directly in front of the subject site.
VISIBILITY	The proposed addition will be visible when viewed from directly in front of the subject site and looking west. Depending on the angle of viewing, the view is likely to be similar to that illustrated by the architect in their north-east elevation on drawing WD10.
SIGNIFICANCE	Buildings fronting onto Torrens Street are single storey in character, some with steeply pitched roofs and others with second storeys set well back from the street. The retention of this single storey character along Torrens Street is an important part of maintaining the desired character of the College Park Historic Area (NPSP1).
LIKELY VISUAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	Low given the proposed addition is well set back from Torrens Street and the visibility is limited to a relatively short distance along Torrens Street.



PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 04







PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 04: WITH PROPOSED BUILDING ADDITION
Viewpoint 5

LOCATION	Eton Lane.
DESCRIPTION	Viewpoint 5 is in Elton Lane north of the subject site. The view is looking south with Pembroke Street visible in the distance.
VISIBILITY	Views of the proposed addition on the subject site are blocked by the existing three storey addition at the rear of 4 Torrens Street.
SIGNIFICANCE	Elton Lane is a minor service lane providing access to the rear of properties facing onto Torrens Street. Its primary purpose appears to be provision of access to garages and minor outbuildings facing onto Elton Lane or for garden access. As such, I consider it has less significance than the other residential streets within the locality onto which properties face.
LIKELY VISUAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	Low as the proposed addition is unlikely to be exposed from north of 4 Torrens Street given views are blocked by the existing addition at the rear of 4 Torrens Street. Given the land slopes down from viewpoint 5 to the north, and existing vegetation in the rear gardens of properties adjacent to Elton Lane, I conclude that it is unlikely that the proposed addition will be seen from Elton Lane to the north.



PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 05







PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 05: WITH PROPOSED BUILDING ADDITION

Attachment 1

Viewpoint 6

LOCATION	Eton Lane.
DESCRIPTION	Viewpoint 6 is looking north along Eton Lane. From this view, the proposed addition will sit in front of the existing addition to 4 Torrens Street.
VISIBILITY	The proposed addition will be visible along Eton Lane from the intersection of Eton Lane with Pembroke Street until past 4 Torrens Street when views will be blocked.
SIGNIFICANCE	Elton Lane is a minor service lane providing access to the rear of properties facing onto Torrens Street. Its primary purpose appears to be provision of access to garages and minor outbuildings facing onto Elton Lane or for garden access. As such, I consider it has less significance than the other residential streets within the locality onto which properties face.
LIKELY VISUAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	Medium given the open views towards the subject site from the southern section of Eton Lane.









PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 06: WITH PROPOSED BUILDING ADDITION

Attachment 1

The table below summarises the visual assessment included in this report, considering visibility, significance and likely visual impact from each viewpoint.

Viewpoint	Location	Visibility of subject site (very low, low, medium, high)	Significance (low, medium, high)	Likely visual impact of proposed development (very low, low - medium, medium)
1	Hatswell Street	Very Low	Low	Very low
2	College Street	Hidden	High	Very Low
3	Torrens Street	Very Low	High	Very Low
4	Torrens Street	Low	High	Low
5	Eton Lane	Low	Medium	Low
6	Eton Lane	Medium	Medium	Medium

Conclusion

The likely visual impact of development is informed by:

• The character of the locality and specific location of the viewpoint. The significance of views from Torrens Street is ranked higher than views from Hatswell Street due to distance and from Eton Lane which has a minor, service role function.

ttachment 1

• The foreground of the view and whether trees or built form affects visibility. For example, the mature street trees in Torrens Street form a continuous canopy in this street that contains and directs views along the street.

On the basis of this visual assessment of the proposed development, the addition to the rear of 2 Torrens Street, in my opinion, will have an overall very low to low visual impact on the broader locality of the subject site.

- > The proposed addition, whilst visible over the St Peters College playing fields from Hatswell Street, is likely to have a very low visual impact given distance, location adjacent to the addition at 4 Torrens Street and the backdrop of mature trees.
- > Views from the intersection of College Street and Torrens Street, and from Torrens Street itself are likely to be low given the location of the proposed addition to the rear of the allotment, the density of mature street trees along Torrens Street, gardens with trees on either side of the subject site, and the high pitched roof on the original building at 4 Torrens Street.
- > Whilst the proposed addition will be visible from Eton Lane in the section of laneway from Pembroke Street to north of 4 Torrens Street, I consider these views less significant given the service role function of Eton Lane and the location next to an existing three storey addition. The proposed addition is unlikely to be visible in Eton Lane north of 4 Torrens Street.

Colour and Materials

I note the legend on the architect's drawings WD10 that it is proposed to resheet the roof to the existing building with galvanised corrugated sheeting similar to True Oak. I support the use of this material for the roof when viewed from Torrens Street.

Please let me know if I can assist further in matters relating to this visual assessment.

JAMES HAYTER BArch (Adelaide), MLA (Sheffield), MLAUD (Harvard), FAILA, FAIA, M.ICOMOS, ASLA Director, Oxigen | Landscape Architects + Urban Designers Professor, School of Architecture and Civil Engineering, University of Adelaide Registered Landscape Architect AILA | Member No. 265 Registered Architect APBSA| Member No. 2337 Accredited Professional - Planning Level 2 Registration No. APP20230018

oxigen

98 - 100 Halifax Street Adelaide SA 5000 Australia

+618 7324 9600

design@oxigen.net.au www.oxigen.net.au



Appendix C

Site photos taken by proponent in September 2024



8



SAPPA Report

The SA Property and Planning Atlas is available on the Plan SA website: https://sappa.plan.sa.gov.au

Attachment 2

Subject Land Map

Disclaimer: The information provided above, is not represented to be accurate, current or complete at the time of printing this report. The Government of South Australia accepts no liability for the use of this data, or any reliance placed on it.

Attachment 2

Locality Map

Disclaimer: The information provided above, is not represented to be accurate, current or complete at the time of printing this report. The Government of South Australia accepts no liability for the use of this data, or any reliance placed on it for the use of this data, or any reliance placed on it.

SAPPA Report

The SA Property and Planning Atlas is available on the Plan SA website: https://sappa.plan.sa.gov.au

Zoning Map

Attachment 3

Disclaimer: The information provided above, is not represented to be accurate, current or complete at the time of printing this report. The Government of South Australia accepts no liability for the use of this data, or any reliance placed on it.

Attachment 3

Historic Area Overlay Map

Disclaimer: The information provided above, is not represented to be accurate, current or complete at the time of printing this report. The Government of South Australia accepts no liability for the use of this data or any reliance placed on it for the use of this data, or any reliance placed on it.

Attachment 3

Building Height TNV (Max Levels) Map

Disclaimer: The information provided above, is not represented to be accurate, current or complete at the time of printing this report. The Government of South Australia accepts no liability for the use of this data or any reliance placed on it for the use of this data, or any reliance placed on it.

Attachment 3

Site Coverage TNV Map

Disclaimer: The information provided above, is not represented to be accurate, current or complete at the time of printing this report. The Government of South Australia accepts no liability for the use of this data or any reliance placed on it for the use of this data, or any reliance placed on it.

SAPPA Report

The SA Property and Planning Atlas is available on the Plan SA website: https://sappa.plan.sa.gov.au

Attachment 4

Representation Map

Disclaimer: The information provided above, is not represented to be accurate, current or complete at the time of printing this report. The Government of South Australia accepts no liability for the use of this data, or any reliance placed on it.

Details of Representations

Application Summary

Application ID	23012750
Proposal	Construction of a three-storey dwelling addition and a masonry and metal infill front fence
Location	2 TORRENS ST COLLEGE PARK SA 5069

Representations

Representor 1 - Bill Stefanopoulos

Name	Bill Stefanopoulos
Address	PO BOX 9061 HENLEY BEACH SOUTH SA, 5022 Australia
Submission Date	05/11/2024 08:48 PM
Submission Source	Online
Late Submission	No
Would you like to talk to your representation at the decision-making hearing for this development?	Yes
My position is	I oppose the development
Reasons	

Attached Documents

2023-06-18-Opinion-1425515.pdf

Letter-to-Council-re-Objection-5-November-2024-1425516.pdf

2-Torrens-Street-College-Park-Planning-Report-Town-Planning-Advisers-5.11.24-A-1425517.pdf

James Roder Barrister Howard Zelling Chambers Level 12, 211 Victoria Square ADELAIDE SA 5000 8212 7677 jroder@hzc.com.au ABN 88 553 307 791

Mr Dimitris Parhas WRP Legal & Advisory Level 1, 153 Flinders Street ADELAIDE SA 5000

By email: DParhas@wrplegal.com.au

19 June 2023

Dear Mr Parhas,

Development Application 23012750 – 2 Torrens Street, College Park SA 5069

- 1. You have sought my opinion in respect of a development application described as "dwelling, fence, internal building work and demolition" at 2 Torrens Street, College Park SA 5069 on behalf of our clients Marie and Dimitri Sarantaugas.
- 2. I have considered the plans of the proposed development, the planning report prepared by URPS, the landscape report prepared by James Hayter, legal advice from Emma Herriman of HWL Ebsworth and the provisions of the Planning and Design Code.

Provisions of Code

- 3. The proposed development is situated within the Established Neighbourhood Zone as comprised in the Planning and Design Code.
- 4. The first desired outcome of the Established Neighbourhood Zone is "A neighbourhood that includes a range of housing types, <u>with new buildings</u> <u>sympathetic to the predominant form character and development patterns"</u> (my emphasis).
- 5. Performance Outcome 4 deals with Building Height. Performance Outcome 4.1 seeks that "Buildings contribute to the <u>prevailing</u> character of the neighbourhood <u>and</u> complements the height of nearby buildings" (my emphasis). The DTS/DPF in respect of Performance Outcome 4.1 provides that building height should be no greater than what is comprised in the Technical Numeric Variation of one level.
- 6. I note that the Established Neighbourhood Zone provisions are replete with references to the "predominant form" and seeking contribution to the "prevailing character". This is of course, consistent with the Established Neighbourhood Zone and in particular in this locality. That is, the Zone and locality is comprised of long-established dwellings comprising a high amenity value. The Code provides for

development that is sympathetic to and contributes to the pattern of development that provides for these high levels of amenity. That is, the provisions read together are seeking to preserve existing patterns of development.

- 7. The proposed development is of course three-storeys tall, significantly in excess of the Technical Numeric Variation. To support the substantial departure from the provisions of the Code the planning report appears to rely upon the existence of a three-storey building already existing in the locality.
- 8. In my opinion, such reliance is misplaced and would lead the decision maker into error. The first being that new buildings are to be "sympathetic" to the "predominant" form.
- 9. When the word "sympathetic" is used in a planning instrument of this nature it would tend to require a development to reflect the character traits of the predominant form.¹ "Predominant" of course is defined to be the "most frequent or common".
- 10. As such, in assessing the proposed development as against Desired Outcome 1 the relevant authority must determine the most frequent or common form and character of the locality and determine whether the proposed development would reflect those character traits.
- 11. It would be a significant error for the identification of a singular development in the locality of a similar height to the proposed development to provide for reflective development to the most frequent or common form of development within the locality. Indeed, it would seem that the proposed development is more sympathetic to a singular outlier rather than the predominant form of development in the locality.
- 12. In respect of Performance Outcome 4.1 I note that it requires a contribution to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood and complements the height of other nearby buildings. That is, in order to satisfy an assessment against Performance Outcome 4.1 a development must both contribute to the prevailing character and complement the height of other nearby buildings.
- 13. In respect of the "prevailing character" the Environment, Resources and Development Court's decision in *Ned Ritan Design v City of Adelaide*² is apposite where Commissioner Nolan said:

The presence of one and two storey non-residential uses does not diminish the locality's otherwise prevailing residential character of relatively high amenity.

14. That is, in the circumstances of this proposed development in this locality the existence of a three-storey building in of itself could not be seen to diminish the prevailing residential character of the locality. As such, in my opinion, the proposed development is incapable of contributing to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood indicating it is incompatible with Performance Outcome 4.1. This is of course consistent with the serious variance with DTS/DPF 4.1 limiting building height to one storey.

¹ Khabbaz & Anor v State Planning Commission & Ors [2023] SASCA 10 [141].

² [2016] SAERDC 32.

- 15. Given the proposed development's inability to contribute to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood it is not strictly necessary to assess whether the proposed development complements the height of other nearby buildings. However, in considering whether a proposed development is complementary or compatible is one of whether development is capable of existing together in harmony rather than providing for a notion of sameness.³ As such, in my opinion the mere existence of development of a similar height of the proposed development does not indicate that the proposed developments the height of other nearby buildings.
- 16. Further, even if the proposed development was assessed to satisfy the solitary three-storey building in the locality it is impossible to escape the conclusion that the proposed development would not complement but in fact be seriously dissonant with the vast majority of development in the locality.

Relevance of three-storey development in locality

17. In any event, reliance on the existing development would lead the decision maker into error. That is, the existing development plainly would not be approved under the present planning scheme. Indeed, it is somewhat surprising it was approved at all. In any event, as said by His Honour Justice Bleby in *City of Charles Sturt v Hatch*⁴

Although there might be some political pressure brought to bear on a planning authority to grant a similar application in some other location as a result of its having approved an earlier application, there is no planning doctrine of precedent as such, namely that because one development has been approved so should another. <u>A bad</u> planning decision is not a reason in itself for making another one which is not consistent with the Development Plan.

- 18. In essence, the planning report accompanying the development application falls into error in this way. It invites the relevant authority to in effect replicate a prior poor planning decision and further entrench deviation from the provisions of the Zone in the locality.
- 19. While plainly the existing development cannot be ignored it should be treated with little weight in assessing the proposed development as against the provisions of the Code.⁵

Site Coverage

- 20. Zone Performance Outcome 3.1 seeks to regulate site coverage by requiring building footprints to be consistent with the character and pattern of the neighbourhood and provide sufficient space around buildings to limit visual impact.
- 21. I note that there is again serious variance in respect of the proposed development as assessed against the pertinent DTS/DPF. This of course does not preclude the proposed development achieving the relevant Performance Outcome but is cause for the relevant authority to undertake a serious assessment as to whether the proposed development achieves the outcomes sought.

³ Lodge Construction & Building Pty Ltd v City of Salisbury (No. 2) [2011] SAERDC 44.

⁴ [1999] SASC 523 [31] reaffirmed by Court of Appeal in *Adelaide Hills Council Assessment Manager v Parkins & Anor* [2023] SASCA 66

⁵ See also Grocke v City of Prospect [2022] SAERDC 20.

- 22. I note that the effect of the scale of the proposed development and its failure to achieve the site coverage quantitative provisions will necessarily cause the proposed development to have a significant visual impact when viewed from our clients' property.
- 23. In the circumstances, I consider that no relevant authority, acting reasonably could determine that the proposed development limits its visual impact and as such it is incapable of achieving the relevant Performance Outcome.

Yours Sincerely

James Roder Barrister

Our Ref: DP:07749

5 November 2024

Assessment Panel City of Norwood Payneham and St Peters PO Box 204 Kent Town SA 5067

Dear Sir / Madam

Applicant: Minuzzo Project Management Application ID: 23012750 Subject Land: 2 Torrens Street, College Park Proposed Development: Construction of a 2-Storey Dwelling

We refer to the above matter.

We confirm we act for Marie Sarantaugas, the owner of the property at 2 College Street, College Park. Our client's property neighbours the Subject Land.

We have reviewed the amended application ID 23012750.

As you know, our client previously objected to the original application.

Upon review of the amended application, we consider that there is not a sufficient amount of difference between the original application and the current amended application. Specifically, although the application proposes a reduction from a 3 story dwelling to a 2 story dwelling, the height, bulk and scale, and prevailing character of the proposed application is not materially different.

For those reasons, and all of the reasons previously articulated (which are outlined in Mr Roder's advice from 19 June 2023, and Mr Stefanopoulos' previous advice), in addition to the matters raised in Mr Bill Stefanopoulos' advice, enclosed herewith, our client's objection remains.

Therefore, for the avoidance of doubt, we restate the matters outlined in Mr Stefanopoulos and Mr Roder's submissions, enclosed herein for your reference.

Should you require any further details do not hesitate to contact the writer.

Yours faithfully WRP LEGAL & ADVISORY

Dimitris Parhas Director

- d +61 8 8113 7750
- m +61 402 766 336
- e <u>dparhas@wrplegal.com.au</u>

Level 1 153 Flinders Street, ADELAIDE SA 5000 *tel:* +61 8 8113 7750 *email:* admin@wrplegal.com.au *ABN:* 80 997 581 033 www.wrplegal.com.au

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation

Page 82 of 194

Attachment 5

PO BOX 9061 HENLEY BEACH SOUTH SA 5022 Phone: 08 7070 7496 | Mobile: 0478 509 777 Email: bill@townplanningadvisors.com.au Website: www.townplanningadvisors.com.au

5 November 2024

Mr Geoff Parsons Manager Development Assessment City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

2 Torrens Street College Park - Proposed Dwelling Alterations and Additions - 23012750

Dear Geoff,

1. Introduction

Town Planning Advisors has been engaged to prepare a representation with respect to the proposed alterations and additions to the dwelling at 2 Torrens Street. We have been engaged by the owners of 2 College Street, Marie and Dimitri Sarantaugas, immediately to the south of the subject site.

2. Subject Land and Locality

The allotment is rectangular shape and achieves a frontage of 8.54m to Torrens Street and depth of 45.72m resulting in a total site area of 390.5sqm. The land accommodates a historic detached dwelling and vehicle parking is via Eton Lane at the west. The land slopes downwards from east to west, reducing some 0.7m. The land is devoid of any Regulated Trees.

Figure 1 Aerial view of subject land

The locality is a well-established part of College Park, with residences coexisting with St Peter's College.

Historic dwellings in large, landscaped grounds, with generous front, side and rear setbacks predominate the southern part of Torrens Street, College Street, and Pembroke Street. Historic dwellings on less large lots of various sizes are more characteristic in the north, in particular the north part of Torrens Street, Magdalen Street. Dwellings are predominantly single storey, with several centrally located two storey dwellings and rear additions.

St Peter's College landscaped playing fields are to the west.

The landform slopes gently towards the south-west. The subdivision pattern is in grid form oriented at 40 - 50 degrees from north. Rear lanes are characteristic. Street trees with generous canopies, and wide verges characterise the public realm.

Figure 2 Aerial image of locality

Figure 3 Cadastre of Locality

3. Proposed Development

The application seeks planning consent for alterations and additions. Following notification of additions in June 2023, amended plans are now on notification. The alterations from the mid 2023 scheme reduce the impacts which are gratefully acknowledged. However, in our opinion, the proposal remains insufficient to satisfy the Planning and Design Code.

The plans on notification propose:

- Demolition of the existing rear lean-to addition and carport.
- Alterations and additions to the rear of the existing dwelling, pushing to north side, south side and rear boundaries, that creates:
 - Ground level spaces, bedroom and garage.
 - At first level, open plan living, kitchen and deck.
- New fence and gate to the street frontage.

Noting the slope of the land and portions of the proposed boundary walls are below ground level, the rear additions involve:

- a 7.2M long wall of 5.7m height on the southern boundary, with the two storey portion of some 6.5 to 8.1m height set back 1.3m from the southern boundary.
- a wall of some 6.5 to 8.1m height located on the northern boundary totalling 12.23m in length (broken in one part).
- 120sqm of the site is not roofed, equating to 69% site coverage.
- 52.5sqm of the site is soft landscaping, equating to 13.4% of the site.
- An upper deck of approximately 40 sqm (7.9m by 5m).

Figure 4 Impression of Proposal as viewed from 2 College Street¹

Please note that the tree does not exist

The south facing lower wall is simmentel silver brick and the upper off white aluminium cladding and extrusions – linear box profile. The 3 degree fall roof is essentially flat.

Windows are proposed to be obscure glass to 1.5m above finished floor level, and the upper rear area southern wall to be 1.5m above finished floor level.

4. Procedural Matters

The Subject Land, under the current version of the Planning and Design Code, is located within an Established Neighbourhood Zone ('the Zone'). The proposal is Performance Assessed and due to walls on boundary, is subject to public notification.

¹ Source - Attachment to URPS Report 2 October 2024

Planning Assessment

Zone Desired Outcome

Desired Outcome 1 of the Established Neighbourhood Zone calls for:

A neighbourhood that includes a range of housing types, with new buildings sympathetic to the predominant built form character and development patterns.

Desired Outcome 2 of the Established Neighbourhood Zone calls for:

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

Buildings for residential purposes are envisaged in the Established Neighbourhood Zone.

We note that landscaping in the front and side yards of the existing cottage is to be retained. We note the building addition has limited visibility from Torrens Street principally by being to the rear of the existing historic cottage. Notwithstanding these elements aligning with the streetscape character Desired Outcome of the Zone, the length, height, siting, design, and materials for the proposed building addition – whilst reduced from mid-2023 – remains insufficiently 'sympathetic to the predominant built form character and development patterns', sought as a Desired Outcome.

Zone Site Coverage

Performance Outcome 3.1 of the Zone states:

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.

Associated DTS/DPF 3.1 states:

Development does not result in site coverage exceeding: 50%

50% site coverage is the Deemed to Satisfy standard at the subject site and northwards, whilst at 2 College Street (our clients) and southwards, 40% site coverage is the DTS. These DTS standards reflect the open character to the north and the higher degree of open character to the south.

Both DTS standards are associated with the Performance Outcome that seeks '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.'

The locality comprises lots that are large in size, with single storey dwellings sited well within each site. Other lots are of a variety of sizes, with dwellings generally away from side boundaries at least 1 metre. Walls on boundaries, where they exist, are typically single storey and for short distances, such as for a shed or garage. These are typical of many inner metropolitan residential areas.

With the proposed development, site coverage is 69%, being 38% more than the 50% DTS on the subject site, and 72% more than the 40% site coverage. Along with this high site coverage, the locality contains no two storey walls on boundaries, or buildings with walls on both boundaries as proposed in the development.

Related to site coverage is soft landscaping, of which 13.4% of the site is comprised of. With the proposed development, the site falls well short of the 20% anticipated in the DTS.

Slightly to the north of the subject site are several similar sized lots, which contain dwellings to the front, side setbacks, some rear yard space, and garages off the rear lane.

Unlike the proposed development, the locality contains no buildings that are continual in length from the front wall to the rear boundary, let alone also with walls on both boundaries of at least 5m height and higher.

The proposed building footprint cannot be characterised as consistent with the 'character and pattern of the neighbourhood', being the Outcome sought.

The Performance Outcome goes on to seek 'sufficient space around buildings to limit visual impact, provide an attractive outlook and access to light and ventilation'.

The northern proposed wall on the boundary is 12m in length and 6.5 - 8.1 m height on the boundary, whilst adjoining 2 College Street to the south, the wall on the boundary is 7m long and up to 5.7m high, and the two-storey portion of 6.5 - 8.1m height is setback 1.4m.

Again, DTS 4.1 envisages 1 storey buildings, reflecting the Performance Outcome 4.1 'Buildings contribute to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood and complement the height of nearby buildings', that being of buildings that are generally single storey set in generous open grounds.

The historic dwelling at 2 College Street is sited fronting College Street and with northwest facing windows looking out to what has been a tennis court.

Figure 5 Outlook looking northwest from within 2 College Street towards location of proposed rear addition. Tennis court in foreground

2 College Street is one of the established historic single storey dwellings in large, landscaped grounds that make up the Historic Area.

As outlined in the College Park Historic Area Statement (NPSP1), this is a 'Consistent pattern of prestigious single storey detached dwellings on very large, spacious allotments fronting wide, tree lined streets. Very low density. Side and rear setbacks providing large separation distances between dwellings'.

By the two-storey component being sited only 1.4m from the southern boundary, for occupants at 2 College Street where the explicit envisaged character is dwellings set in generous grounds, the two-storey component affords no *'attractive outlook'* and insufficient *'access to light'* as sought in PO3.1.

The proposals use of light colour materials assists softening. However, this is insufficient to moderate the impact of the length, height, and siting of the two-storey component, noted as not seen anywhere within the locality.

Figure 6 Minor outbuildings at 2 College Street adjacent the proposed two storey addition

Minor outbuildings exist on 2 College Street immediately adjacent the proposed rear addition. The minor outbuildings are of domestic scale, some 2.4m in height with a gable to some 3m, above which the proposed two storey addition will be visually at odds with the envisaged character of single storey dwellings set in generous grounds.


Figure 7 North face of 2 College Street

The occupants of 2 College Street are planning alterations to make better use of the northern outlook from within the dwelling and to improve relationships from within the dwelling to the area that currently comprises a tennis court.

The tennis court may not continue into the future. These alterations remain under consideration and may involve replacing the current minor outbuildings with garden and outdoor leisure areas. Noting these alterations may or may not go ahead, the length and height of the rear addition is visually dominating on these areas.

Zone Building Height

Performance Outcome 4.1 of the Zone states:

Buildings contribute to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood and complement the height of nearby buildings.

Associated DTS/DPF 4.1 states:

Building height (excluding garages, carports and outbuildings) is no greater than: 1 level.

Performance Outcome 4.2 of the Zone states:

Additions and alterations do not adversely impact on the streetscape character.

The associated DTS/DPF 4.2 seeks additions and alterations fully contained within the roof space.

The '... prevailing character of the neighbourhood ...' involves generally single storey dwellings set off boundaries. It is noted there are several two storey dwellings and two storey additions, all centrally located. The only three storey building is the rear addition adjacent the north of the subject site.



Figure 8 Two storey addition set well off boundaries on a dwelling some 70 metres to the east of the subject site



Figure 9 Two storey dwelling centrally located within its site some 70 metres to the south of the subject site



Figure 10 Three storey addition set off boundaries at the rear of the site adjoining to the north of the subject site (viewed from Eton Lane)



Figure 11 Three storey addition at the rear of the site adjoining to the north of the subject site (viewed from Torrens Street)



Figure 12 Impression of two storey as viewed from Eton Lane²



Figure 13 Impression of two storey as viewed from the west³

The existing three-storey rear addition to the north of the subject site has a gable roof form. The proposed building has a flat roof the same height as the majority of the three-storey building to the north, with only the gable roof to the north being higher than the proposed building.

Whilst the overall height is slightly less than the mid 2023 proposal, the height of the proposed garage is 3.69m, 1.2m higher than the mid-2023 2.5m high garage.

² Source - Attachment to URPS Report 2 October 2024

³ Source - Attachment to URPS Report 2 October 2024

Acknowledging overall height reduced from the mid 2023 proposal, the proposed two storey addition with its expansive footprint is overly high given the envisaged dwellings set in generous grounds open character sought for the zone.



Figure 14 Elevation showing proposed two storey flat roof addition at the equivalent height of the majority of the three storey building to the north (with only the gable roof being higher). The tree shown no longer exists.

The bulk presented by the addition means that the proposal is at odds with the '...prevailing character of the neighbourhood...' and at odds with '... complements the height of nearby buildings'.

Aside from the existing three storey rear addition immediately to the north of the subject site, the majority of dwellings in the locality are single storey, with several centrally located two storey dwellings or additions. These are the *'prevailing character'*.

Performance Outcome 4.1 seeks 'Buildings contribute to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood' which is one storey buildings with centrally located two storey buildings. Performance Outcome 4.1 goes on to seek 'and complement the height of nearby buildings', which are single storey or centrally located two storey.

The proposed building with flat roof of the same height as the majority of the three-storey building to the north does not 'complement the height of nearby buildings. Whilst the endeavour for an orderly transition from the gable roof three storey is acknowledged, the height and bulk proposed does not adequately transition to the single storey dwelling in generous grounds at 2 College Street.

When viewed from Torrens Street, It is acknowledged the proposed rear addition 'does not adversely impact streetscape character'.

Performance Outcome 7.1 of the Zone states:

Walls on boundaries are limited in height and length to manage visual and overshadowing impacts on adjoining properties.

The associated DTS/DPF 7.1 envisages walls on boundary of 8m length and 3.2m height from the lower of the natural or finished ground level, and when added with other walls, up to 45% of the boundary length.

Whilst the wall on the southern boundary is 7.2M long and within the 8m provided in the DTS, the proposed 5.7m is almost double the height envisaged in the DTS, noting some portion slightly underground. Acknowledging some reduction in impact from the existing shed at 2 College Street, the proposed boundary wall is overly visually present in a zone envisaged with an open character.

The wall does not *'manage the visual impact ... on adjoining property'* in a way that is consistent with the open character and pattern of the neighbourhood.

Zone Boundary Walls - Overshadowing

Zone Performance Outcome 7.1 references 'managing overshadowing impacts'. Performance Outcome 3.1 of the Interface between Land Uses General Development Policies states:

Overshadowing of habitable room windows of adjacent residential land uses in: a. a neighbourhood-type zone is minimised to maintain access to direct winter sunlight b. other zones is managed to enable access to direct winter sunlight.

The associated DTS/DPF 3.1 seeks north facing habitable rooms of adjacent residential land uses are provided with at least three hours direct sunlight between 9am and 3pm on 21 June.

The proposed addition is two storeys high, and the north facing windows of 2 College some 17m southeast of the addition. Whilst no shadow plans are provided, mid-winter, 2 College Street north facing windows could be anticipated to receive three hours direct sunlight.

Performance Outcome 3.2 of the Interface between Land Uses General Development Policies states:

Overshadowing of the primary area of private open space or communal open space of adjacent residential land uses in:

a. a neighbourhood type zone is minimised to maintain access to direct winter sunlight b. other zones is managed to enable access to direct winter sunlight.

The associated DTS/DPF 3.2 seeks development to maintain two hours direct sunlight between 9am and 3pm on 21 June to the smaller of half of the existing ground level space OR 35sqm of adjacent residential land uses. At 2 College Street, noting the size of the tennis court, DTS 3.2 would require 35sqm receive direct sunlight. The rear addition would begin to shade 2 College northwest facing yard area from around late-morning, and gradually increase by mid-afternoon. This means the eastern part of the north-west facing rear yard would receive direct sunlight till early afternoon.

It could be anticipated that rear yard area of 35sqm would receive two hours sunlight.

Notwithstanding the proposal likely to enable 2 College Street to receive the DTS standards, the height of the two-storey addition does not 'minimise' its shadow impact on the rear yard area of 2 College Street. In other words, a consequence of the two-storey proposed is more shadow than generally anticipated in a Zone characterised by single storey dwellings well set in from boundaries.

Our clients are considering options to upgrade their rear yard, including that portion immediately adjacent the proposal. The extent of unanticipated shading created by the proposal in its current form overly shades their rear yard and will impact the lawn tennis court.

Historic Area Overlay

The Historic Area Overlay policies and Historic Area statements reinforce and are consistent with the Zone policies that question the length, height, siting and approach to the proposed addition.

The Historic Area Statements reference 'stone, brick and rendered masonry' 'traditional colours and materials' and 'pitch and size of the roof makes this an important design element'. The proposed use on the south facing lower wall of simmentel silver brick and the upper off white aluminium cladding and extrusions – linear box profile are a range of materials at odds with the traditional colours and materials. The brick colour – whilst masonry – is not traditional and the aluminium cladding not masonry. Reconsideration of the lower brick colour, and use of brick or rendered masonry on the upper should occur to align with traditional colours and materials.

Desired Outcome 1 of the Historic Area Overlay state (underline added):

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

Performance Outcome 1.1 of the Historic Area Overlay states:

All development is undertaken having consideration to the historic streetscapes and <u>built form</u> as expressed in the Historic Area Statement.

Performance Outcome 2.1 of the Historic Area Overlay states:

The form and scale of new buildings and structures <u>that are visible from the public realm</u> are consistent with the prevailing historic characteristics of the historic area.

Performance Outcome 2.2 of the Historic Area Overlay states (underline added):

Development is <u>consistent with the prevailing building and wall heights</u> in the historic area.

Performance Outcome 2.4 of the Historic Area Overlay states (underline added):

Development is consistent with the <u>prevailing front and side boundary setback pattern</u> in the historic area.

Performance Outcome 2.5 of the Historic Area Overlay states (underline added):

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

Performance Outcome 3.1 of the Historic Area Overlay states (underline added):

Alterations and additions <u>complement the subject building</u>, <u>employ</u> a <u>contextual</u> <u>de</u> <u>approach</u> and are sited to ensure they do not dominate the primary façade.

Performance Outcome 6.2 of the Historic Area Overlay states (underline added):

<u>Development maintains the valued landscape patterns and characteristics that contribute</u> <u>to the historic area</u>, except where they compromise safety, create nuisance, or impact adversely on buildings or infrastructure. Historic Area Statements state (underline added):

	The College Park Historic Area Statement (NPSP1)	St Peters Historic Area Statement (NPSP18)	
	The Historic Area Overlay identifies localities that comprise characteristics of an identifiable historic, economic and / or social theme or recognised importance. They can comprise land divisions, development patterns, built form characteristics and natural features that provide a legible connection to the historic development of a locality.		
	These attributes have been identified in the below table. In some cases State and / or Local Heritage Places within the locality contributes to the attributes of an Historic Area.		
	The preparation of an Historic Impact Statement can assist in determining potential additional attributes of an Historic Area where these are not stated in the below table.		
Eras, themes and context	Subdivision during the 1870s with dwellings built between 1870s and 1920s. Detached dwellings.	1870 - 1930s. Detached and semi-detached dwellings.	
Allotments,	Consistent pattern of prestigious single-storey detached dwellings on	Mix of close-set, single-fronted cottages on narrow allotments and	
subdivision	very large, spacious allotments fronting wide, tree-lined streets. Very	a range of cottages and villas set on larger allotments with more	
and built	low density.	substantial established gardens, in wide streets, often with rear	
form patterns		service lanes. Rear lanes used for vehicular access and garages	
5 1	Side and rear setbacks providing large separation distances between	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
	dwellings.	In College Park and along Fifth and Sixth Avenue - small to medium sized allotments.	
		In this section of First Avenue - modest sized allotments.	
Architectural	Double fronted, symmetrical and asymmetrical dwellings; East	In College Park and along Fifth and Sixth Avenue - mainly single-	
styles,	Adelaide Investment Company dwellings; Larger villas and mansions;	storey double-fronted villas and detached dwellings of modest	
detailing and	Victorian villas; Edwardian Queen Anne and Art Nouveau.	proportions with some single-fronted dwellings.	
built form			
features	The double fronted, symmetrical and asymmetrical dwellings in the	In this section of First Avenue - reasonably compact single-	
	College Park Policy Area are an elegant larger version of the simple	fronted, double-fronted, and villa-type dwellings.	
	colonial cottage with the addition of a projecting wing (in the case of		
	the asymmetrical dwelling), a more elaborate verandah and increased		
	detailing in plaster and render work around openings. The pitch and		

	size of the roof makes this an important design element. The external	
	walls are generally constructed of bluestone or dressed and coursed	
	sandstone. Verandahs along the front elevation are another	
	important element of both the double fronted symmetrical and	
	asymmetrical dwelling.	
Building height	Single storey, two storey in some locations.	Single storey.
Materials	External walls made of bluestone or dressed and coursed	Sandstone and bluestone construction.
	sandstone. Stone, brick and rendered masonry.	
	Traditional colours and materials.	
Fencing	Low, open front fencing (including secondary streets to the main	Low, open fencing that reflects the period and style of the
	façade of building) associated with the traditional period and style of	dwellings. Front fencing (including any secondary street frontage
	the building up to 1.2m (masonry), 1.5m (wrought iron, timber and	up to the alignment to the fain face of the dwelling) generally
	wire) and 2m (masonry pillars) in height, allowing views to dwelling.	low in height up to 1.2m (masonry), 1.5m (wrought iron, timber and wire or woven mesh) and 2m (masonry pillars), allowing
	Timber picket, timber dowelling, masonry and cast iron palisade, or	views to dwelling.
	corrugated iron or mini orb within timber framing for cottages, villas	Timber picket, timber dowelling, masonry and cast iron palisade,
	and other dwellings built during the Victorian period; or timber	or corrugated iron or mini orb within timber.
	picket, timber paling or woven crimped wire; or corrugated iron or	
	mini orb within timber framing for Edwardian dwellings.	Side and rear fences in traditional materials such as timber,
		corrugated iron or well-detailed masonry.
	Side and rear fences are in traditional materials, such as timber,	
	corrugated iron or well detailed masonry. Side fences along street	
	corners continue the detailing of the front fence to the house	
	alignment, solid fencing beyond this point in traditional materials.	

Setting,	Dwellings have sizeable setbacks from all boundaries and are	In College Park and along Fifth and Sixth Avenue - Reasonably
landscaping,	typically set in large landscaped grounds with front boundaries	wide streets are characteristic of this area, with significant street
streetscape	defined by fencing of various styles.	planting and fenced front boundaries.
and public		
realm features	Open landscape character to front garden, which	Rear vehicle access lanes.
	enhances dwelling and streetscape quality.	
		Landscaping around dwellings is an important design element.
	Wide streets lined with mature trees.	
		Streets lined with mature exotic street trees.
Representative	Identified - refer to SA planning database.	
Buildings		

General Development Policies – Design in Urban Areas

There are a range of policies relevant to the proposed alterations and additions. We note, for example, the proposal has sufficient on-site parking, and in our opinion, on balance, sufficient private open space.

Soft Landscaping

Performance Outcome 22.1 Landscaping Design in Urban Areas states:

'Soft landscaping is incorporated into development to:

- minimise heat absorption and reflection
- contribute shade and shelter
- provide for stormwater infiltration and biodiversity
- enhance the appearance of land and streetscapes.'

The associated DTS/DPF 22.1 seeks 20% of the site as soft landscaping.

The proposal results in 13.4% of the site as soft landscaping, falling well short of the 20% anticipated in the DTS.

Noting site coverage of 69% well above the 40% site coverage sought in the DTS, and the building footprint is at odds with the established character, the limited onsite landscaping is considered insufficient to meet the performance outcomes of *'heat absorption', 'shade and shelter', 'stormwater infiltration and biodiversity'* and to *'enhance the appearance of land'*.

Overlooking

Performance Outcome 10.1 Overlooking / Visual Privacy (low rise buildings) states: 'Development mitigates direct overlooking from upper level windows to habitable rooms and private open spaces of adjoining residential uses in neighbourhood-type zones.'

The associated DTS/DPF 10.1 states:

'Upper level windows facing side or rear boundaries shared with a residential use in a neighbourhood-type zone:

- 1. are permanently obscured to a height of 1.5m above finished floor level and are fixed or not capable of being opened more than 125mm
- 2. have sill heights greater than or equal to 1.5m above finished floor level
- 3. incorporate screening with a maximum of 25% openings, permanently fixed no more than 500mm from the window surface and sited adjacent to any part of the window less than 1.5 m above the finished floor level.'

Performance Outcome 10.2 Overlooking / Visual Privacy (low rise buildings) states: 'Development mitigates direct overlooking from balconies to habitable rooms and private open space of adjoining residential uses in neighbourhood type zones.'

The associated DTS/DPF 10.2 states: 'One of the following is satisfied: 1. the longest side of the balcony or terrace will face a public road, public road reserve or public reserve that is at least 15m wide in all places faced by the balcony or terrace

or

- 2. all sides of balconies or terraces on upper building levels are permanently obscured by screening with a maximum 25% transparency/openings fixed to a minimum height of:
 - 1. 1.5m above finished floor level where the balcony is located at least 15 metres from the nearest habitable window of a dwelling on adjacent land

or

2. 1.7m above finished floor level in all other cases'

Windows are proposed to be obscure glass to 1.5m above finished floor level. We seek clarification and confirmation that design features that meet the detail of the DTS.

As noted earlier, the upper rear deck is overly high for its length, this in part due to the small balcony return in the south-east corner that extends the length of the boundary wall.

Noting the spacious size of the balcony enabling a wide range of outdoor activities and as the principal yard space, the small return appears to offer little benefit and should be removed, thereby lessening the impact of the high wall on the boundary.

The 1.5m high wall to the rear decks southern boundary is inadequate to offer privacy in light of the wide range of activities possible in its spacious size, and as the principal yard space. The southern wall should be increased to 1.7m to offer increased privacy to the outdoor areas that form part of the spaciousness at 2 College Street. Our clients advise that their young children's activities are not always the kind of activities that should be seen by others.

Environmental Performance

Performance Outcome 14.2 Environmental Design in Urban Areas states:

'Development incorporates sustainable design techniques and features such as window orientation, eaves and shading structures, water harvesting and use, green walls and roof designs that enable the provision of rain water tanks (where they are not provided elsewhere on site), green roofs and photovoltaic cells.'

There is no associated DTS/DPF.

Further information should be provided on the matters detailed in the Performance Outcome.

In considering Design in Urban Areas generally, Desired Outcome 1 of the Design in Urban Areas states:

'Development is:

- contextual by considering, recognising and carefully responding to its natural surroundings or built environment and positively contributing to the character of the locality
- durable fit for purpose, adaptable and long lasting
- inclusive by integrating landscape design to optimise pedestrian and cyclist usability, privacy and equitable access and promoting the provision of quality spaces integrated

with the public realm that can be used for access and recreation and help optimise security and safety both internally and within the public realm, for occupants and visitors

 sustainable - by integrating sustainable techniques into the design and siting of development and landscaping to improve community health, urban heat, water management, environmental performance, biodiversity and local amenity and to minimise energy consumption.'

The importance of the proposed development being 'contextual - by considering, recognising and carefully responding to its natural surroundings or built environment and positively contributing to the character of the locality' is a Desired Outcome of Design in Urban Areas. For the reasons outlined earlier, the proposed rear addition does not 'carefully respond to its natural surroundings' or 'positively contribute to the character of the locality'.

Further the proposal needs more work to 'integrate sustainable techniques into the design and siting' and 'to improve ... environmental performance ... minimise energy consumption'

Approach to Development Assessment

Prior to our discussion on the overall merits, we wish to point out that a failure to meet a quantitative provision is not usually, of itself, persuasive grounds for refusal. Part 1 of the Planning & Design Code - "Rules of Interpretation" states the following:

In order to assist a relevant authority to interpret the performance outcomes, in some cases the policy includes a standard outcome which will generally meet the corresponding performance outcome (a designated performance feature or DPF). A DPF provides a guide to a relevant authority as to what is generally considered to satisfy the corresponding performance outcome, and does not need to necessarily be <u>satisfied to meet the performance outcome</u>, and does not derogate from the discretion to determine that the outcome is met in another way, or from the need to assess development on its merits against all relevant policies.

DPF provisions should not be interpreted as minimum (or maximum) quantitative requirements. Instead DPFs represent one way to satisfy the corresponding Performance Outcome (PO). There can be variation from DPF policies and should not be considered as development mandates.

6. Summary and Conclusion

We do not consider the proposal warrants planning consent.

The main variations from the Planning and Design Code the scale and siting of the rear two storey addition.

With a site coverage 72% more than the 40% provided in the DTS, the locality contains no two storey walls on boundaries, buildings with walls on both boundaries, or buildings that are continual in length from the front wall to the rear boundary as proposed in the development.

Buildings with walls on boundaries of the proposed height and footprint are not found in the locality. The building footprint cannot be characterised as consistent with the *'character and pattern of the neighbourhood'*, as sought in Performance Outcome 3.1 of the Zone.

With the proposed development, the site falls well short of the 20% of the site being soft landscaping anticipated in the DTS.

By the two-storey component being sited only 1.4m from the southern boundary, for occupants at 2 College Street where the explicit envisaged character is dwellings set in generous grounds, the two-storey component affords no *'attractive outlook'* and insufficient *'access to light'* as sought in PO3.1.

When viewed from Torrens Street, it is acknowledged the proposed rear addition does '... not adversely impact streetscape character', as sought in Performance Outcome 4.2 of the Zone.

The bulk presented by the addition means that the proposal is at odds with the '...prevailing character of the neighbourhood...' and is at odds with '... complements the height of nearby buildings'. These outcomes are sought in Performance Outcome 4.1 of the Zone.

Aside from the existing three storey rear addition immediately to the north of the subject site, in the locality, dwellings are single storey, with only a few centrally located two storey dwellings or additions. This is the *'prevailing character'* sought for new buildings to *'contribute to'* in Performance Outcome 4.1 of the Zone.

Performance Outcome 4.1 seeks 'Buildings contribute to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood' which is one storey buildings predominantly and only a few centrally located two storey buildings. Performance Outcome 4.1 goes on to seek 'and complement the height of nearby buildings', which are predominantly single storey and a few centrally located two storey. The proposed building has a flat roof the same height as the majority of the three-storey building to the north, with only the gable roof to the north being higher than the proposed building. Acknowledging overall height reduced from the mid 2023 proposal, the proposed two storey addition with its expansive footprint is overly high given the envisaged dwellings set in generous grounds open character sought for the zone. It is also noted the height of the proposed garage is 3.69m, 1.2m higher than the mid-2023 2.5m high garage.

Whilst the wall on the southern boundary is 7.2M long and within the 8m provided in the DTS, the proposed 5.7m is almost double the height envisaged in the DTS, noting some portion slightly underground. Acknowledging some reduction in impact from the existing shed at 2 College Street, the proposed boundary wall is overly visually present in a zone envisaged with an open character.

The Historic Area Overlay policies and Historic Area statements reinforce and are consistent with the Zone policies that question the height and siting of the proposed rear addition.

The Historic Area Statements reference 'stone, brick and rendered masonry' 'traditional colours and materials' and 'pitch and size of the roof makes this an important design element'. The proposed use on the south facing lower wall of simmentel silver brick and the upper off white aluminium cladding and extrusions – linear box profile are a range of materials at odds with the traditional colours and materials. The brick colour – whilst masonry – is not traditional and the aluminium cladding not masonry. Reconsideration of the lower brick colour, and use of brick or rendered masonry on the upper should occur to align with traditional colours and materials.

Noting site coverage of 69% well above the 50% site coverage sought in the DTS for the subject site, and even further above the 40% DTS immediately to the south, both associated with Performance Outcome 3.1 of the Zone, and the building footprint not consistent with the established character, the limited onsite landscaping does not meet the outcomes of *'heat absorption', 'shade and shelter'*,

'stormwater infiltration and biodiversity' and to 'enhance the appearance of land'. These are the outcomes sought in Performance Outcome 22.1 Landscaping Design in Urban Areas.

The proposal is silent about the proposed approach to environmental matters. The proposal needs more work to *'integrate sustainable techniques into the design and siting'* and *'to improve ... environmental performance ... minimise energy consumption'*. Further information should be provided on the matters detailed in the Performance Outcome 14.2 Environmental Design in Urban Areas.

Our clients advise they are prepared to consider a modified design approach.

Subject to reviewing alternative plans, our clients are prepared to consider a proposal with:

- an overall lowering of the two storey component by a 1 metre. This may involve reconsidering the garage design, noting the height of the proposed garage is 3.69m, 1.2m higher than the mid-2023 2.5m high garage.
- removal of the deck nib extension in the south east corner that extends the length of the wall on the boundary some 1.5m.
- increase in the height of the deck south facing screen wall to 1.7m.
- clarification that obscure glass details meet the DTS.
- Reconsideration of the lower brick colour, and use of brick or rendered masonry on the upper to align with traditional colours and materials, with this informed by Council's heritage advisor.

I look forward to the consideration of this representation at the appropriate Council Assessment Panel meeting.

Yours faithfully,

Bill Stefanopoulos, MPIA BA Planning, Grad Dip Environmental Planning



Ref: 22ADL-1618

29 January 2025

Kieran Fairbrother Senior Urban Planner City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

kfairbrother@npsp.sa.gov.au

Dear Kieran

23012750 - Response to Representation

As you are aware, I act for Minuzzo Project Management, the applicant for the above application. I have reviewed the representation received by Council during the notification period and provide a response to the key planning concerns below.

Summary of Representation

The Council received one representation during the public notification period from Bill Stefanopoulos on behalf of Dimitri and Marie Sarantaugas the owners of 2 College Street.

The key concerns raised in the written submission relate to:

- Height, bulk and scale.
- Boundary wall.
- Site coverage.
- Overshadowing.
- Soft landscaping.

Background

Since receiving a copy of the representation, the applicant has met with the representors multiple times in an effort to address their concerns and we have also attended a meeting with their consultant planner.

Following the meetings we have not been able to reach an agreement on the proposed development. I have discussed the outstanding planning concerns below.

We acknowledge the Kaurna People as the Traditional Custodians of the land on which we work and pay respect to Elders past, present and emerging.



Attachment 6

Adelaide 27 Halifax Street Adelaide SA 5000 08 8333 7999

urps.com.au

ADL | MEL | PER

https://urpsau.sharepoint.com/sites/Synergy/Shared Documents/Projects/22ADL-1618 - 2 Torrens Street, College Park/Response to Representation/250123_C1_V2_Response to Representation.docx





Before coming to the specific concerns I will summarise the relevant policy and factual context which is as follows:

- 1. The subject land is located within the Established Neighbourhood Zone.
- 2. Technical and Numeric Variations (TNVs) apply within the Zone, including in relation to maximum building height (levels).
- 3. The subject land, and the adjoining allotment to its north which accommodates a three-storey dwelling addition to its rear, are located within an area in which the maximum building height (levels) is 1 level.
- 4. The representors' property to the immediate south of the subject land is located within an area in which the maximum building height (levels) is 2 levels.
- 5. So in a practical sense, the subject land is sandwiched between an existing 3 storey development of relatively recent construction and an area in which development of up to 2 levels in height is envisaged. It is located hard against the boundary of an area in which development of up to 2 levels in height is envisaged.

It is in all of the above circumstances that my client is proposing a 2-storey addition. It is difficult to see how or why the 1 level TNV, which is ultimately a guideline applying throughout an extensive area, should be strictly adhered to in all of these circumstances.

We respectfully suggest that the existing state of development to the north (comprising a 3 level addition) and the building height limit relevant to land to the immediate south (2 levels) are all part of the relevant context in which the proposed development should be assessed.

Response to Concerns

Height, Bulk and Scale

The representor remains concerned with the height of the additions, particularly the appearance of the south-eastern elevation from their land.

The Code includes the following provisions relating to height, bulk and scale:

Established Neighbourhood Zone

- PO 4.1 <u>Buildings contribute to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood</u> and <u>complements the height of nearby buildings</u>.
- PO 7.1 <u>Walls on boundaries are limited in height and length to manage visual and</u> overshadowing impacts on adjoining properties.
- PO 8.1 Buildings are <u>set back from side boundaries to provide</u>:
 - (a) <u>separation between buildings</u> in a way <u>that complements the established</u> <u>character</u> of the locality



2





(b) access to natural light and ventilation for neighbours. (my underlining)

General Development Policies - Design in Urban Areas

PO 20.3 <u>The visual mass</u> of larger <u>buildings is reduced when viewed from adjoining</u> <u>allotments</u> or public streets. (my underlining)

The proposed development satisfies the above provisions because:

- The proposed addition is similar in height to the building at 4 Torrens Street, College Park.
- The addition projects only 1.1m above the ridgeline of the existing dwelling at its highest point.
- Most of the addition is setback 1.4m from the neighbours boundary. The portion that is sited on the boundary is limited in length and occurs adjacent an existing 5m tall outbuilding.
- The addition is screened by a 3.8m tall evergreen hedge and chainmesh fence spanning 36m, or 80% of the length of the north-western boundary of the neighbour's allotment.
- The thoughtful design reduces the visual mass of the upper level by combining a variety of high-quality materials and finishes that complement the surrounding context, creating articulation and visual interest.
- The neighbours of 2 College Street will continue to enjoy unrestricted access to sunlight and ventilation.



Figure 1: Viewpoint from Torrens Street opposite 2 College Street (Oxigen)

The above observations are supported by James Hayter, Director Oxigen Landscape Architects in an Urban Design Statement dated 24 January 2025 (refer **Appendix B**).





The statement concludes that:

- The proposed addition responds to its built form context with a reduced height in the portion fronting Eton Lane, which also partially sits behind the neighbour's garage.
- The addition is set back from the boundary in the section that ties the existing built form to the lower section fronting Eton Lane.
- The proposal will not affect access to natural light for the neighbours.
- The proposed addition is architecturally designed, is well articulated and is complementary to the materiality, scale, bulk and mass of the existing subject building and the existing built form at 4 Torrens Street.
- The visual impact of the proposal will be minor.

Privacy

The representor remains concerned that the deck to the first floor will permit views into the private open space area of their property.

The notified plans indicated a 1.5m high solid brick balustrade on the south-east elevation. To further demonstrate our client's commitment to maintaining the privacy of the neighbouring properties, the plans have been amended to raise the balustrade height to 1.7m.

The proposal satisfies DPF 10.1(b)(ii) of the Design in Urban Areas section of the Code.

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to address the neighbours' concerns.

For the reasons outlined herein and as previously addressed as part of the initial submission, the proposed development satisfies the relevant provisions of the Code to warrant Consent.

I confirm my attendance in support of the proposal at the Council Assessment Panel meeting to be held on 17 February 2025.

Please contact me on 0409 701 595 if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely

Jake Vaccarella Principal Consultant







Appendix A

Revised Architectural Drawings prepared by Aplin Cook Gardner Architects



5





Appendix B

Urban Design Statement prepared by Oxigen Landscape Architects



6





24 January 2025

Development Application Proposed Addition to an Existing Residence at 2 Torrens Street, College Park

Council area:City of Norwood, Payneham and St PetersZone:Established Neighbourhood Zone

1.0 INTRODUCTION

I have previously prepared a statement on the likely visual impact of an addition to an existing residence at 2 Torrens Street, College Park. In summary, my assessment was:

On the basis of this visual assessment of the proposed development, the addition to the rear of 2 Torrens Street, in my opinion, will have an overall very low to low visual impact on the broader locality of the subject site.

- The proposed addition, whilst visible over the St Peters College playing fields from Hatswell Street, is likely to have a very low visual impact given distance, location adjacent to the addition at 4 Torrens Street and the backdrop of mature trees.
- Views from the intersection of College Street and Torrens Street, and from Torrens Street itself are likely to be low given the location of the proposed addition to the rear of the allotment, the density of mature street trees along Torrens Street, gardens with trees on either side of the subject site, and the high pitched roof on the original building at 4 Torrens Street.
- Whilst the proposed addition will be visible from Eton Lane in the section of laneway from Pembroke Street to north of 4 Torrens Street, I consider these views less significant given the service role function of Eton Lane and the location next to an existing three storey addition. The proposed addition is unlikely to be visible in Eton Lane north of 4 Torrens Street.

I confirm a request from URPS to consider further the likely visual impact of the proposed addition when viewed from the neighbour's property at 2 College Street, College Park.

I chose two viewpoints to assist in determining the visual impact – one on College Street adjacent to the intersection with Eton Lane and the other on Torrens Street. I consider these viewpoints offer the most open views toward the subject land and most closely illustrate the likely view of the proposed addition when viewed by the neighbour.

The view illustrated in Figure 1 is from adjacent to the College Street and Eton Lane intersection and looks approximately north towards the subject land. The view looks over the neighbour's gravel driveway, garage, and part tennis court and fence.

98–100 Halifax Street Adelaide SA 5000 T +61 (08) 7324 9600 design@oxigen.net.au oxigen.net.au People, nature and space.

Page 112 of 194

The proposed addition sits in front of an existing building addition to the rear of 4 Torrens Street. This addition also fronts onto Eton Lane and sits higher than the proposed addition at 2 Torrens Street, as illustrated in the montages. The lower section of the proposed addition fronts directly onto Eton Lane and partially sits behind the neighbour's garage when viewed from their land.

The view illustrated in Figure 2 is from Torrens Street and looks north-west over the neighbour's tennis court and fence. The proposed addition sits at the rear of the allotment. From this viewpoint, the view is towards the existing residence located on the subject land. I note that this building will remain unaltered when viewed from the neighbouring property in respect to height and materials, apart from replacement of the roof sheeting and other minor works.



Figure 1 *Viewpoint adjacent intersection of College Street and Eton Lane*

Oxigen Pty Ltd ABN 22 107 472 284 98–100 Halifax Street Adelaide SA 5000 T +61 (08) 7324 9600 design@oxigen.net.au oxigen.net.au People, nature and space.

Page 113 of 194



3



Figure 2 *Viewpoint from Torrens Street opposite 2 College Street*

2.0 RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF THE PLANNING & DESIGN CODE

In assessing the likely visual impact of the proposed addition as it affects the neighbour at 2 College Street, I have had regard to the provisions of the Planning and Design Code Version 2023.6 effective on 27 April 2023.

In my assessment, I note that the subject land sits within the Established Neighbourhood Zone. I consider the following Assessment Provisions of particular relevance:

Established Neighbourhood Zone

PO 7.1

Walls on boundaries are limited in height and length to manage visual and overshadowing impacts on adjoining properties

Figures 1 and 2 illustrate a contextual approach to the design of the addition that considers the existing residence on the subject land and its height, form and bulk, the taller built form existing to the north of the subject land at 4 Torrens Street, and the existing separation that the tennis court creates between the neighbour's residence and the property boundary.

The proposed addition responds to its built form context with a reduced height in the portion fronting Eton Lane, which also partially sits behind the neighbour's garage. The remaining section of the addition is setback from the boundary in line with the existing residence on the subject land.

98–100 Halifax Street Adelaide SA 5000 T +61 (08) 7324 9600 design@oxigen.net.au oxigen.net.au People, nature and space.



4

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.

The addition is set back from the boundary in the section that ties the existing built form to the lower section fronting Eton Lane. Overall, the south elevation of the proposed built form is well articulated and in character with the articulated built form to the north at 4 Torrens Street.

The proposal will not affect access to natural light for the neighbours.

Historic Area Overlay

PO 3.1

Alterations and additions complement the subject building, employ a contextual design approach and are sited to ensure they do not dominate the primary façade.

The proposed addition is architecturally designed, is well articulated and is complementary to the materiality, scale, bulk and mass of the existing subject building and the existing built form at 4 Torrens Street.

General Development Policies - Design in Urban Areas

PO 20.3

The visual mass of larger buildings is reduced when viewed from adjoining allotments or public streets.

Figures 1 and 2 illustrate a well-articulated built form that complements the existing scale, bulk and mass of its context.

3.0 CONCLUSION

In considering the likely visual impact of the proposal on the neighbour at 2 College Street and whether it meets the relevant provisions of the Planning and Design Code, I conclude that the proposal is not at variance and the visual impact will be minor.

Sincerely



James Hayter

Registered Landscape Architect AILA | Member No. 265 Registered Architect AIA | Member No. 2337 Accredited Professional - Planning Level 2 Registration No. APP20230018 Professor, School of Architecture and Civil Engineering, University of Adelaide Director, Oxigen | Landscape Architects, Architects and Urban Designers

Oxigen Pty Ltd ABN 22 107 472 284 98–100 Halifax Street Adelaide SA 5000 T +61 (08) 7324 9600 design@oxigen.net.au oxigen.net.au People, nature and space.

Page 115 of 194



bbarchitects

PROPERTY ADDRESS: APPLICATION NUMBER: DATE: PROPOSAL: HERITAGE STATUS:

HERITAGE

REPORT

HERITAGE ADVISOR: PLANNER:

2 Torrens Street College Park

23012750 15 October 2024 Three level addition and new front fence. REPRESENTATIVE BUILDING COLLEGE PARK HISTORIC AREA OVERLAY David Brown, BB Architects Kieran Fairbrother



City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

ADVICE SOUGHT

I have not had further discussions with the applicant regarding this revised scheme.

DESCRIPTION

The existing building on the site is a single fronted sandstone cottage. The site is located in the Established Neighbourhood Zone within the St Peters Historic Area Overlay.

PROPOSAL

The revised proposal is to remove the existing rear addition and replace it



with a two level addition, and construct a new front fence and gate.

COMMENTS

The revised proposed addition is set at the rear of the original single fronted cottage. The original roof form of the existing dwelling has been extended to meet the addition, which is not a good outcome as it blurs the extend of the original building. It also makes the addition appear like it is encompassing parts of the original building, which it is not.

The revised drawings still seem to ignore the fact that the house currently has 3 quite significant chimneys, all of which are visible from the street from various angles. Only one chimney is shown on one drawing, the front elevation.

The proposed addition is a simple rectilinear form set well behind the existing dwelling, meaning it will be barely visible from the street. The more modest scale is a better outcome, as is moving it off the side boundary to the property at 2 College Street.

The materials noted for the project include white metal clad walls generally for the upper level, and face brickwork for the boundary wall and lower level. The existing cottage is being reroofed in heritage galvanised steel sheet, which is a good outcome.

The proposed front fence is relatively high for a Historic Area Overlay, but given the existing fence on the site, the retaining wall and the fences on either side, this is an understandable outcome and will not stand out in the streetscape.

CONCLUSION

The revised design is a much better outcome than the previous larger proposal. It will still be quite visible from the neighbouring land, but is a more tolerable outcome in the context than the earlier design, and will not have a detrimental effect on the streetscape or the existing cottage.



bbarchitects

PROPERTY ADDRESS: APPLICATION NUMBER: DATE: PROPOSAL: HERITAGE STATUS:

HERITAGE

REPORT

HERITAGE ADVISOR: PLANNER:

2 Torrens Street College Park

23012750 23 May 2023 Three level addition and new front fence. REPRESENTATIVE BUILDING COLLEGE PARK HISTORIC AREA OVERLAY David Brown, BB Architects Kieran Fairbrother



City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

ADVICE SOUGHT

I met with the applicants at Council's offices to discuss the proposal. What has been submitted is similar to what was discussed. .

DESCRIPTION

The building is a single fronted sandstone cottage. The site is located in the Established Neighbourhood Zone within the St Peters Historic Area Overlay.

The proposal is to. Remove the existing



PROPOSAL

rear addition and replace it with a three level addition, and construct a new front fence and gate.

The rear addition floor levels are off set from the existing house, and it is made up of a lower level with a double garage and theatre space, the middle level with the living areas, and an upper floor with bedroom suite.

COMMENTS

The proposed addition is set at the rear of the original single fronted cottage. The original roof form of the existing dwelling has been extended to meet the addition, which is not a good outcome as it blurs the extend of the original building. It also makes the addition appear like it is encompassing parts of the original building, which it is not.

The drawings seem to ignore the fact that the house currently has 3 quite significant chimneys, all of which are visible from the street from various angles.

The proposed addition is a simple rectilinear form set on the south eastern boundary, and 1m away from the north western boundary. Due to its large setback the impact from Torrens Street is somewhat lessened, however it is still a very tall addition, with its only context being the older tall addition to the house to the north west. While that provides physical context, it is difficult to justify this based on the Performance Outcomes in the Code.

The materials noted for the proposed addition are somewhat vague. Specific materials and colours needs to be provided to adequately assess the impact on the streetscape and the surrounding buildings.

The existing cottage is being reroofed in heritage galvanised steel sheet, which is a good outcome, and if the materials for the addition were somehow related or sympathetic to that without being too shiny, that would be a good outcome.

The proposed front fence is relatively high for a Historic Area Overlay, but given the existing fence on the site, and the fences on either side, this is an understandable outcome.

CONCLUSION

While the proposed addition is overly tall, and its south eastern boundary wall will be quite visible, in the context of what has happened in the past, it is a well designed, clean and contemporary proposal that with some minor adjustments will not detrimentally impact the associated Representative Building. The proposal will have some detrimental impact on the streetscape due to its visibility, and this is likely to be exacerbated by being on the high side of the street. In the context of the adjacent tall addition to No 4, it is not an unreasonable outcome for this small site, but clearly not ideal. The impact on the south eastern site is to the tennis court area, though it will still be a tall wall on the boundary, and not something anticipated in this area. The visual impact on the neighbours will be quite reasonable.

The views from the rear of the proposed addition are an acceptable outcome as it is a rear lane only, and does not have historically significant structures that face on to it. The State Listed school site will not be overly impacted by the new build, as it is set so far from any significant buildings there is no impact to the setting or heritage value of the heritage places. Ref: 22ADL-1618

2 May 2023

Mr Geoff Parsons Manager Development Assessment City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Uploaded to PlanSA Portal

Dear Geoff

Proposed Dwelling Alterations and Additions at 2 Torrens Street, College Park

Introduction

As you are aware URPS acts for our client, Garry Minuzzo the applicant for the enclosed application.

- We have prepared this planning statement on the proposed development following our assessment of:
- The subject land and locality (refer URPS locality plan in (Appendix A).
- Architectural drawings prepared by Aplin Cook Gardner (Appendix B).
- Visual Impact Assessment prepared by James Hayter of Oxigen Landscape Architecture (**Appendix C**)
- Legal Opinion prepared by Emma Herriman of HWL Ebsworth Lawyers (Appendix D)
- The Planning and Design Code (version 2023.6, 27 April 2023).

The Subject Land and Locality

The subject land is located on the south-western side of Torrens Street in College Park, identified in Certificate of Title 5382/733. It is a small, rectangular shaped allotment with a frontage of 8.57 metres and depth of 45.7 metres.

We acknowledge the Kaurna People as the Traditional Custodians of the land on which we work and pay respect to Elders past, present and emerging.



Attachment 8

Adelaide 12/154 Fullarton Rd Rose Park, SA 5067

08 8333 7999

urps.com.au

H:\Synergy\Projects\22ADL\22ADL-1618 - 2 Torrens Street, College Park\Working\URPS Planning Advice\230502_C1_V2_Planning Statement.docx





The existing dwelling is an early 20th Century single-fronted sandstone cottage. It is a Representative Building in the Historic Area Overlay.

An existing lean-to addition occurred at the rear of the dwelling circa 1980s and an outbuilding (carport) is located within the rear yard with access via Eton Lane.

The site backs onto St Peters College. St Peters College is listed in Part 11 of the Code as a Local Heritage Place.

Most dwellings in the locality are turn of the 20th Century, detached, single-storey villas and cottages. Several Representative Buildings within the locality have been improved through renovations, including contemporary additions at the rear of their respective sites. This is particularly evident at the adjoining allotment at 4 Torrens Street, which features a substantial "three-storey" addition built occupying a large portion of the rear yard.



Figure 1 – Locality plan portraying subject land, overlay boundaries, representative buildings (yellow) and adjacent 2 and 3-storey development (red footprint)



2



The Proposal

The proposal involves:

- Demolition of the existing rear lean-to addition.
- Alterations and additions to the rear of the existing dwelling, pushing to side and rear boundaries, that creates:
 - Open plan living, dining, and kitchen area and deck.
 - Bedroom with walk in robe, ensuite and balcony
 - Double garage
 - Theatre room.
- New masonry pillar and plinth front fence.

Procedural Matters

The land is in the Established Neighborhood Zone.

Pursuant to Section 105 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 (the Act) the proposed development falls into the category of 'code assessed development'.

The development cannot be assessed as deemed-to-satisfy development. Therefore, it will be assessed as performance assessed development, assessed on its merits against the Planning and Design Code pursuant to Section 107 of the Act.

Pursuant to Table 5 – Procedural Matters – Notification, the proposed development falls within a class of development which has specific exceptions relating maximum building height (1 level) and building walls situated on a side boundary (where they exceed 8m length and 3.2m height).

The proposed development exceeds the above building height exceptions and as such the application will require public notification.

Approach to Assessment

Part 1 of the Code is entitled "Rules of Interpretation". It includes the following information on the:

Hierarchy of Policies/Modification of Provisions

If there is an inconsistency between provisions in the relevant policies for a particular development, and for the purpose of section 66(3)(b) of the Act, the following rules will apply to the extent of any inconsistency between policies:

(a) the <u>provisions of an overlay will prevail over all other policies</u> applying in the particular case; and





(b) a subzone policy will prevail over a zone policy or a general development policy; and

(c) a zone policy will prevail over a general development policy.

(my underlining)

This hierarchy is represented by the following diagram.



Diagram 1: Hierarchy of Policies

The "Rules of Interpretation provides information on the role of Desired Outcomes, Performance Outcomes and Designated Performance Features:

Policies - Desired Outcomes and Performance Outcomes

Zone, subzone, overlay and general development policies are comprised of desired outcomes (DOs) and performance outcomes (POs). These are applicable to performance assessed development and to restricted development.

Desired outcomes

<u>Desired outcome are policies designed to aid the interpretation of performance outcomes by</u> <u>setting a general policy agenda</u> for a zone, subzone, overlay or general development policies module. Where a relevant authority is uncertain as to whether or how a performance outcome applies to a development, the desired outcome(s) may inform its consideration of the relevance and application of a performance outcome, or assist in assessing the merits of the development against the applicable performance outcomes collectively.

Performance outcomes

<u>Performance outcomes are policies designed to facilitate assessment according to specified factors</u>, including land use, site dimensions and land division, built form, character and hazard risk minimisation.

Designated performance features

In order to assist a relevant authority to interpret the performance outcomes, in some cases the policy includes a standard outcome which will generally meet the corresponding performance outcome (a designated performance feature or DPF). <u>A DPF provides a guide</u>



to a relevant authority as to what is generally considered to satisfy the corresponding performance outcome but does not need to necessarily be satisfied to meet the performance outcome, and does not derogate from the discretion to determine that the outcome is met in another way, or from the need to assess development on its merits against all relevant. (my underlining)

The interpretation of Designated Performance Features has been adopted by the Courts¹ whereby Commissioner Dyer recently observed that:

- A DPF is not the same as a complying standard of Principle of Development Control under the previous planning system.
- A DPF is its own thing and is "advisory", it is one way to satisfy a PO. "If a DPF was the only way a PO was to be satisfied, the PO has no work to do.
- A DPF is only part of the assessment the application needs to be assessed on its merits against all relevant policies.

It is with the above approach in mind we have assessed this proposal.

Planning Assessment

In my view the key planning considerations include:

- Land use.
- Heritage impacts.
- Building height.
- Boundary walls.
- Site coverage.
- Overlooking.
- Overshadowing.
- Private open space .
- Vehicle access and car parking.
- Landscaping.

Each of these matters are discussed below.

5

¹ Parkins v Adelaide Hills Council Assessment Manager, SAERDC 12 (2022)



Land Use

The residential use of the site will not change as a result of this application and additions to dwellings are an anticipated form of development in the Established Neighborhood Zone.

Heritage Impacts

The Historic Area and Heritage Adjacency Overlays seek to conserve and reinforce the historic themes and characteristics of the area through policies that are geared towards conservation, ongoing use and adaptive reuse.

The proposed development readily satisfies key provisions of the Historic Area Overlay, because:

- The dwelling addition satisfies **DO 1** as it occurs at the rear of the Representative Building and thereby preserves the original built form fabric of the single fronted cottage.
- Where visible from the public realm (Eton Lane and St Peters playing oval), the dwelling addition mimics the height of the adjoining dwelling, albeit comprising a sympathetic form and scale achieved through a visually interesting and punctuated façade that uses high quality materials and finishes. The visual impact from this vantage point is relatively low and therefore **PO 2.1** has been satisfied.
- The new built form elements are restrained in approach. High-quality contemporary external materials and finishes including "warm grey" vertical aluminium cladding have been incorporated to conceal the first and second floor elements and maintain the valued historic character of the single storey cottage thereby satisfying **PO 2.5**.
- All the works occur at the rear of the site some 29 metres from the street and behind the ridgeline of the existing cottage, preserving the existing historic elements of the dwelling visible from the street as sought by **PO 3.1**.
- The proposal has a low visual impact when viewed from multiple viewpoints through the adjacent LHP at St Peters College (refer **Appendix C**) This is attributed to the appropriate setback from the LHP, the canopy coverage of mature trees and the scale of the adjoining building at 4 Torrens Street. Accordingly, **PO 1.1** of the Heritage Adjacency Overlay is readily satisfied in that the addition will not dominate, encroach on, or unduly impact the setting of the adjacent LHP.
- The proposed masonry pillar and plinth front fence has regard for the College Park **Historic Area Statement (NPSP1)** as it is low and open in style and allows views to the dwelling.



6



Building Height

PO 4.1 of the Zone seeks:

PO 4.1 Buildings contribute to the <u>prevailing character of the neighbourhood and</u> <u>complements the height of nearby buildings</u>. (my underlining)

It's companion provision (DPF 4.1) provides that one way to satisfy the PO is to limit buildings to a height of 1 building level. The reference to this is through a Technical Numeric Variation (TNV) that spatially applies to the site.

The role that TNVs play in the planning assessment process have been considered further in the legal advice prepared for URPS by HWL Ebsworth Lawyers (refer - **Appendix D**)

In this instance the maximum building height TNV is considered as part of DPF 4.1, and in accordance with the Rules of Interpretation and recent case law mentioned above, is to be interpreted as an "advisory" provision that provides a "guide" to the relevant authority as to what is generally considered to satisfy the PO.

Importantly, while DPF 4.1 (with the maximum building height TNV of 1 level) provides a guide as to what the Council will likely find acceptable in meeting the requirements of PO 4.1, the TNV does not need to be met in order to satisfy PO 4.1 and the Council retains the ability to balance up whether PO 4.1 has been met when assessed against all other relevant policies.

We contend that PO 4.1 has been satisfied having considered:

- The dwelling on the adjoining property to 4 Torrens Street comprises 3 building levels and measures 9.32m in height. The proposed dwelling addition will match the height of the neighbour's dwelling i.e. it is the same as at least one nearby building.
- The proposed addition occurs at the rear of the site, approximately 29.4m from the primary street boundary and 20.6m from the existing façade of the dwelling, and as a result will be largely imperceptible from the streetscape along Torrens Street as per previous commentary on Historic Area Overlay Provisions.
- The existing dwelling sits at a level that is approximately 1m higher than Torrens Street. The addition is sited on a significantly lower finished floor level to that of the existing dwelling and therefore enjoys a higher degree of screening than it might otherwise.
- The addition projects only 1.6m above the ridgeline of the existing dwelling at its closest point to Torrens Street.
- Mature trees form a continuous canopy along Torrens Street, including a mature Plane Tree directing in front of the subject land. The presence of these trees




significantly reduce the visibility of the proposed additions when viewed from Torrens Street.

• The addition has been sited and designed as a sensitive response to the historic character of both existing dwelling and locality and as such satisfies POs 4.2 and 10.2 of the Zone with respect to preserving of streetscape character.



Figure 2 – 3D perspective portraying the proposed additions in the context of the adjoining 3-storey dwelling at 4 Torrens Street

Boundary Walls

POs 7.1 and 8.1 of the Zone seek:

- PO 7.1 <u>Dwelling boundary walls are limited in height and length to manage visual and</u> <u>overshadowing impacts on adjoining properties</u>.
- PO 8.1 <u>Buildings are set back from side boundaries to provide:</u>
 - (a) separation between buildings in a way that <u>complements the established</u> <u>character of the locality</u>
 - (b) access to natural light and ventilation for neighbours.
 (my underlining)

The application of the above provisions is influenced by several factors in this context.

Firstly, the subject land is very narrow. The proposal makes efficient use of this narrow site and naturally occurs at the rear of the site where it is built out to both side boundaries. This is the only practical design solution to develop the site.

Secondly, the subject land sits adjacent to a 3-level dwelling at 4 Torrens Street.

While the same constraints in terms of allotment attributes do not apply for the neighbours at 4 Torrens Street, this property was upgraded with a significant three-storey extension in 2010.





These works comprise substantial boundary development, with a boundary wall on the southeastern boundary for a length of approximately 31m and height at some points of up to 9.32m. The extent of boundary development is portrayed in the photos below.



Figure 3 – Photograph showing the extent of the 3-storey addition at the adjoining property as viewed from Eton Lane

Thirdly, the other property adjoining the subject land at 2 Torrens Street enjoys a large side yard comprising what appears to be a tennis court and mature hedge along the entire common boundary as portrayed below.



Figure 4 – Aerial photograph portraying the large side yard of the adjoining allotment at 2 Torrens Street



- In considering the above, it is contended that the proposed development satisfies POs 7.1 and 8.1 because:
- While the extent of boundary development exceeds the height and length of boundary walls characteristic of buildings in the locality, their visual impact and overshadowing affect is mitigated by several factors including:
 - The height, length and scale of boundary walls on the adjoining property at 4 Torrens Street (i.e. they will not be visible to the occupiers of this land due to the existing situation)
 - The setback of the dwelling on the adjoining property at 2 Torrens Street and the generous area of private open space that cushions their dwelling from the proposed addition.
 - The presence of established evergreen vegetation located along the common boundary.
- The similarities between the proposed development and the neighbour's dwelling addition at 4 Torrens Street to the extent that the building is reflective of and complementary to the established character in terms of its of its bulk, scale and extent of boundary development.
- Access to natural light and ventilation for neighbours is maintained as a result of the proposed development.

Site Coverage

Performance Outcome and Designated Performance Feature 3.1 of the Zone state:

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.

One way of achieving the above is to limit site coverage to 40 per cent, per the companion DPF (3.1).

The subject land is only $391m^2$. To satisfy the DPF quoted above, the floor area of the dwelling would need to be $156m^2$. This is a very small, detached dwelling by contemporary standards.

The building footprint of the proposed development is 273m². This represents a site coverage of 69%.

We note several properties in the locality that have been recently developed comprise a site coverage of more than 40 percent. As such the DPF does not accurately reflect the existing character and pattern of development, and therefore site coverage should be assessed with a different approach.







Regardless of the variation from DPF 3.1, the proposed development satisfies PO 3.1 because:

- The proposal will have a similar building footprint to that on the properties at 4 and 8 Torrens Street, of which both comprises substantial rear additions.
- Visual impact and access to light/ventilation to adjoining properties will be acceptable (as discussed previously).

Overlooking

PO 10.1 and DPF 10.1 of the Design in Urban Areas section of the General Policies section seeks:

- PO 10.1 Development mitigates direct overlooking from upper level windows to habitable rooms and private open spaces of adjoining residential uses in neighbourhood-type zones.
- DPF 10.1 Upper level windows facing side or rear boundaries shared with a residential use in a neighbourhood-type zone:
 - (a) are permanently obscured to a height of 1.5m above finished floor level and are fixed or not capable of being opened more than 125mm
 - (b) have sill heights greater than or equal to 1.5m above finished floor level
 - (c) incorporate screening with a maximum of 25% openings, permanently fixed no more than 500mm from the window surface and sited adjacent to any part of the window less than 1.5 m above the finished floor level.

The subject site has dual street frontages. I consider Eton Lane to be the secondary street frontage rather than the rear boundary for the purposes of the consideration of overlooking. The rear facing windows and balconies do not face residential uses. Therefore, DPF 10.1 is not applicable.

If I have this wrong, I have considered the proposed development in the context its interface with adjacent residential land, and the locality generally. In doing so, I contend:

- Views permissible from elevated deck and balcony areas on the first and second floors are limited to the public realm only. Views of this nature are encouraged by the Code, per DPF 18.1 of Design in Urban Areas.
- Views over adjoining residential land are obscured by the enclosed nature of the balcony.





Overshadowing

DPFs 3.1 and 3.2 of the Interface between Land Uses section of the General Policies section seek:

- DPF 3.1 North-facing windows of habitable rooms of adjacent residential land uses in a neighbourhood-type zone receive at least 3 hours of direct sunlight between 9.00am and 3.00pm on 21 June.
- DPF 3.2 Development maintains 2 hours of direct sunlight between 9.00 am and 3.00 pm on 21 June to adjacent residential land uses in a neighbourhood-type zone in accordance with the following:
 - a. for ground level private open space, the smaller of the following:
 i. half the existing ground level open space
 or

ii. 35m2 of the existing ground level open space (with at least one of the area's dimensions measuring 2.5m)

b. for ground level communal open space, at least half of the existing ground level open space.

The siting of the addition and the orientation of the site ensures that the proposed development preserves sunlight access into north-facing windows or private open space area of adjoining allotments.

As discussed earlier, the proposed development will create a similar overshadowing impact for adjoining land because of established structures and vegetation.

The proposed development maintains existing sunlight levels and as such the proposal satisfies relevant provisions in the Code.

Private Open Space

POs 21.1 and 21.2 of the Design in Urban Areas section of the General Policies section seeks:

- PO 21.1 Dwellings are provided with suitable sized areas of usable private open space to meet the needs of occupants.
- PO 21.2 Private open space is positioned to provide convenient access from internal living areas.

One way to satisfy PO 21.1 is to provide 60m² of private open space. The proposed development provides 50m² of usable private open space across levels 1 and 2. Both areas are accessible from internal living areas.

The shortfall from the advisory provision is negligible in this context as the site retains sufficient open space to meet the needs of its occupants.





Vehicle Access and Car parking

PO 23.5 of the Design in Urban Areas section of the General Policies section seeks:

PO 23.5 Driveways are designed to enable safe and convenient vehicle movements from the public road to on-site parking spaces.

The proposed garaging replaces an existing carport which is currently accessed via Eton Lane. The proposed development therefore maintains the existing scenario with respect to vehicular access.

Table 1 - General Off-Street Car Parking Requirements in the Code states that detached dwellings with two or more bedrooms should provide two on-site parking spaces. The development features a double car garage and thereby satisfies the requirements of Table 1.

Landscaping

PO 22.1 of the Design in Urban Areas section of the General Policies section seeks:

PO 22.1 Soft landscaping is incorporated into development to:

- (a) minimise heat absorption and reflection
- (b) contribute shade and shelter
- (c) provide for stormwater infiltration and biodiversity
- (d) enhance the appearance of land and streetscapes.

Design in Urban Areas DPF 22.1 guides that 20 percent of the site should be dedicated to soft landscaping.

The proposed development retains an area of 65m² (or 17%) of the site for soft landscaping. This is located primarily within the front yard and comprises various landscaping treatments.

In my view, the proposed landscaping arrangement satisfies PO 22.1 in that the amount of landscaping will minimise heat absorption, contribute to shade and shelter, provide adequate stormwater infiltration, and enhance the appearance of land and streetscapes.





Conclusion

The proposal development satisfies the relevant provisions of the Code in the following key respects:

- The addition occurs at the rear of the subject land and will have minimal impact on streetscape character.
- The addition is of a high quality design standard and has been sited and designed to respond to the site's historic context.
- The three-storey component is consistent in height, form and scale with the adjoining three-storey building at 4 Torrens Street.
- The proposed works will not dominate, encroach on, or unduly impact the setting of the adjacent LHP.
- Site coverage is consistent with many dwellings and development patterns in the locality.
- Boundary walls will have an acceptable impact on neighbours in terms of outlook and overshadowing.
- There is adequate private open space.
- Vehicle access and car parking is consistent with the existing scenario.

I look forward to Council granting Planning Consent. Please contact me on 8333 7999 if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely

Jake Vaccarella Senior Consultant





Appendix A – URPS Locality Plan





Legend		
Subject Site		
Zone Boundary		
Heritage Areas Overlay		
Representative Building		
2 Nearby 2+ Storey builtform	n	
Cadastre		



LOCALITY PLAN 2 Torrens Street, College Park

JOB REF.	22ADL-1618
PREPARED BY.	MP
DATE.	17.04.23
REVISION.	1
DATA SOURCE.	MetroMap (27.02.2023) data.sa.gov.au





Appendix B – Architectural Drawings prepared by Aplin Cook Gardner







NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation. Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be

verified on site and any discrepancies reported before commencement of any work or shop drawings.

SCALE 1:200 @ A3

Rev.	Revision Description	Date
1	CLIENT REVIEW	22/06/22
2	PLANNING REVIEW	0408/22
3	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
4	PLANNING REVIEW	21/12/22

APLIN COOK GARDNER

A R C H I T E C T I N T E R I O R D E S I G N 236 GRENFELL ST, ADELAIDE, SA 5000

> 2 TORRENS STREET COLLEGE PARK, SA 18006

COLLEGE PARK RESIDENCE







Project Number 180 Drawing Title SITE PLAN

Project Description



Page 138 of 194

NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation. Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be verified on site and any discrepancies reported before

commencement of any work or shop drawings.



LEGEND

FFL FINISHED FLOOR LEVEL

EXISTING WALL

NEW WALL

TFW NEW TIMBER FRAMED WINDOW

MFW NEW METAL FRAMED WINDOW

MFD NEW STEEL FRAME DOOR

DP DOWNPIPE

FP GAS FIREPLACE

NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation.

Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be verified on site and any discrepancies reported before commencement of any work or shop drawings.



SCALE 1:100 @ A3

NT REVIEW	22/06/22
INING REVIEW	0408/22
INING REVIEW	31/08/22
INING REVIEW	21/12/22
	INING REVIEW INING REVIEW INING REVIEW

APLIN COOK GARDNER

A R C H I T E C T I N T E R I O R D E S I G N 236 GRENFELL ST, ADELAIDE, SA 5000







lssue 4



- MFD NEW STEEL FRAME DOOR
- DP DOWNPIPE
- FP GAS FIREPLACE

NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation. Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be

verified on site and any discrepancies reported before commencement of any work or shop drawings.

Rev.	Revision Description	Date
1	CLIENT REVIEW	22/06/22
2	PLANNING REVIEW	0408/22
3	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
4	PLANNING REVIEW	21/12/22

APLIN COOK GARDNER

ARCHITECT INTERIOR DESIGN 236 grenfell st, adelaide, sa 5000









- MFD NEW STEEL FRAME DOOR
- DP DOWNPIPE
- FP GAS FIREPLACE

NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation.

Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be verified on site and any discrepancies reported before commencement of any work or shop drawings.

Rev.	Revision Description	Date
1	CLIENT REVIEW	22/06/22
2	PLANNING REVIEW	0408/22
3	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
4	PLANNING REVIEW	21/12/22

APLIN COOK GARDNER

ARCHITECT INTERIOR DESIGN 236 grenfell st, adelaide, sa 5000



COLLEGE PARK RESIDENCE 2 TORRENS STREET COLLEGE PARK, SA 18006 Project Number Drawing Title Scale LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN 1:100





LEGEND



ZZ NEW WALL

S SUMP/DOWNPIPE

NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation.

Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be verified on site and any discrepancies reported before commencement of any work or shop drawings.





NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation.

Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be verified on site and any discrepancies reported before commencement of any work or shop drawings.

0 1 2.5 5m

SCALE 1:100 @ A3

4	PLANNING REVIEW	21/12/22
3	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
2	PLANNING REVIEW	0408/22
1	CLIENT REVIEW	22/06/22
Rev.	Revision Description	Date

APLIN COOK GARDNER

A R C H I T E C T I N T E R I O R D E S I G N 236 grenfell st, adelaide, sa 5000

COLLEGE PARK RESIDENCE

Project Description

2 TORRENS STREET COLLEGE PARK, SA 18006

Project Number 18006 Drawing Title SECTION AA



1:100 Issue 4

Scale



NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation.

Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be verified on site and any discrepancies reported before commencement of any work or shop drawings.

Rev.	Revision Description	Date
1	CLIENT REVIEW	22/06/22
2	PLANNING REVIEW	0408/22
3	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
4	PLANNING REVIEW	21/12/22
5	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	10/02/23
6	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	03/03/23
7	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	10/05/23



SOUTH - WEST ELEVATION

LEGEND

- 1 RECYCLED BRICKWORK PAINTED OFF WHITE
- 2 OFF WHITE ALUMINIUM CLADDING INTERLOCKING PANELS
- 3 BLACK METAL FRAMED WINDOWS AND DOORS
- 4 GLAZED BALUSTRADE WITH BLACK METAL HANDRAIL
- 5 ROLLER DOOR
- 6 VERTICAL BATTEN STEEL BLADES FRAMED GATES & FENCE BLACK
 7 WARM GREY ALUMINIUM CLADDING AND EXTRUSIONS LINEAR BOX PROFILE
- 8 NEW ROOF SHEETING AND GUTTERS GALVANISED CORRUGATED SHEETING SIMILAR TO TRUE OAK

0	1	2.5	5m
\square			
SCA	LE 1:10	0 @ A3	

NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation. Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be

verified on site and any discrepancies reported before commencement of any work or shop drawings.

Rev.	Revision Description	Date
1	CLIENT REVIEW	22/06/22
2	PLANNING REVIEW	0408/22
3	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
4	PLANNING REVIEW	21/12/22
5	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	1002/23
6	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	03/03/23





236 grenfell st, adelaide, sa 5000

Project Description

WD11





COLLEGE PARK RESIDENCE

lssue 6



NORTH - WEST ELEVATION

LEGEND

- 1 RECYCLED BRICKWORK PAINTED OFF WHITE
- 2 OFF WHITE ALUMINIUM CLADDING INTERLOCKING PANELS
- 3 BLACK METAL FRAMED WINDOWS AND DOORS
- 4 GLAZED BALUSTRADE WITH BLACK METAL HANDRAIL
- 5 ROLLER DOOR
- 6 VERTICAL BATTEN STEEL BLADES FRAMED GATES & FENCE BLACK
- WARM GREY ALUMINIUM CLADDING AND EXTRUSIONS LINEAR BOX PROFILE 7
- 8 NEW ROOF SHEETING AND GUTTERS GALVANISED CORRUGATED SHEETING SIMILAR TO TRUE OAK



NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation.

Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be verified on site and any discrepancies reported before commencement of any work or shop drawings.



6	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	03/03/23
5	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	10/02/23
4	PLANNING REVIEW	21/12/22
3	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
2	PLANNING REVIEW	0408/22
1	CLIENT REVIEW	22/06/22
Rev.	Revision Description	Date

APLIN COOK GARDNER

ARCHITECT INTERIOR DESIGN 236 GRENFELL ST, ADELAIDE, SA 5000



Project Numbe Drawing Title

Project Description

ELEVATIONS 03

2 TORRENS STREET COLLEGE PARK, SA 18006

PLANNING







- 1 RECYCLED BRICKWORK PAINTED OFF WHITE
- 2 OFF WHITE ALUMINIUM CLADDING INTERLOCKING PANELS
- 3 BLACK METAL FRAMED WINDOWS AND DOORS
- 4 GLAZED BALUSTRADE WITH BLACK METAL HANDRAIL
- 5 ROLLER DOOR
- 6 VERTICAL BATTEN STEEL BLADES FRAMED GATES & FENCE BLACK
- 7 WARM GREY ALUMINIUM CLADDING AND EXTRUSIONS LINEAR BOX PROFILE
- 8 NEW ROOF SHEETING AND GUTTERS GALVANISED CORRUGATED SHEETING SIMILAR TO TRUE OAK



NOTES

This drawing is copyright and the property of APLIN COOK GARDNER and must not be used without written authorisation. Do not scale this drawing. All dimensions are to be

verified on site and any discrepancies reported before commencement of any work or shop drawings.

6	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	03/03/23
5	PLANNING REVIEW - AMENDED	10/02/23
4	PLANNING REVIEW	21/12/22
3	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
2	PLANNING REVIEW	0408/22
1	PLANNING REVIEW	31/08/22
Rev.	Revision Description	Date

APLIN COOK GARDNER

ARCHITECT INTERIOR DESIGN 236 GRENFELL ST, ADELAIDE, SA 5000

COLLEGE PARK RESIDENCE

Project Description

2 TORRENS STREET COLLEGE PARK, SA 18006 Project Numbe Drawing Title **ELEVATIONS 04**







6

Scale



Page 148 of 194





Page 150 of 194



















Appendix C - Visual Impact Assessment prepared by James Hayter of Oxigen Landscape Architecture



Visual Assessment of a proposal to extend a residential property at 2 Torrens Street, College Park

FEBURARY 2023



VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED EXTENSION TO AN EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK

PREPARED FOR URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING SOLUTIONS

PREPARED BY

James Hayter Director, Oxigen



Landscape Architecture | Urban Design | Urban Planning

Adelaide 98-100 Halifax Street, Adelaide SA 5000

Oxigen Pty Ltd ABN 22 107 472 284 Telephone +61 8 7324 9600 Email jhayter@oxigen.net.au

DRAFT

DOCUMENT STATUS

ISSUE /	AUTHOR	DATE
Draft Issue	Hayter	24.02.2023

3

VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE REAR OF AN EXISTING RESIDENCE AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK

CONTENTS

ntroduction	04
Methodology	05
Broad Locality	06
Site Description	08
Proposed Development	08
Viewpoints	12
Visual Assessment Summary	44
Conclusion	45

4

Introduction

BACKGROUND

As part of the upgrade of a residential property at 2 Torrens Street, College Park, the proponent seeks to extend the existing dwelling to the west.

The proposed works include the construction of a 3-storey extension to the back, or west, of the existing dwelling.

The proposal is described in documents provided by the proponent, comprising:

 Architectural plans comprising site plan, plans, elevations, long section and 3-D representations prepared by Aplin Cook Gardner.

Within my area of expertise, I have considered:

- 1. The locations at which the proposed building extension is likely to be viewed.
- 2. The effect of visibility from these locations on the character of the locality.
5

Methodology

I inspected key viewpoints on 7 February and again on the 11 February 2023 to take photos prior to preparing this report. I viewed the subject site only from publicly-accessible areas; that is, from streets and within the general locality and Eton Lane from where the proposed built form is most likely to be visible. I did not view or consider the visual impact from private land although one of the viewpoints I considered was over the St Peters College ovals.

I chose to carry out my analysis from evidence on-site rather than purely a desk-top study. I consider the former more reliable on this occasion given the complexity of determining viewpoints within an established urban area that is effected by built form and vegetation.

PHOTOGRAPHY

Photos included within this report were taken using a Nikon digital SLR camera with a 55mm focal lens. I understand this focal length approximates that of the human eye.

VISUAL ASSESSMENT

The analysis within this report includes:

- > Location location of photo viewpoint.
- > Description description of the existing view.
- > Visibility description of the proposed extension's visibility from the viewpoint.
- > Significance my opinion on the viewpoint's significance considering the existing urban character and visibility (ie. whether the viewpoint is likely to affect many people, such as from a main road or rail corridor, or a lesser number, such as from a minor residential street).
- > Likely Visual Impact my opinion on the potential impact of the proposed development on the visual amenity of the locality.
- > Images photographs from the viewpoint towards the subject site identifying the existing view and with the proposed extension photomontaged into the view.

DISTANCES

Data relating to distance of the viewpoint included within this report is taken from Nature Maps (SA Government) January 2023.

REPORT FORMAT

This report is best read as a PDF file. If read as a hard copy, it should be printed with facing pages.

б

Broad Locality



VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE REAR OF AN EXISTING RESIDENCE AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK

Site Map



FIGURE 2: SUBJECT SITE MAP. (SAPPA 2022) The subject site is described as 2 Torrens Street, College Park. The site is located within the Norwood Payneham St Peters College Park Historic Area (NPSP1) with character houses facing onto Torrens Street and the St Peters College back ovals immediately to the west of the subject site which also faces onto Eton Lane.

Immediately to the north of the subject site lies a character residence set back further from the road than the residence on the subject site. The width of this allotment is considerably wider than that of the subject site. Views from the street are relatively open and through a relatively recently planted and a semi-mature street tree. A three storey addition has been added to the back (west) of the residence - this is most noticable when viewed from Eton Lane.

Immediately to the south of the subject site lies a tennis court on a large corner block that extends to College Street. The garden is well vegetated which, with the street trees and a brush fence, effectively screens views into the property.

A large, mature plane tree with a canopy extending well into the road sits in the verge in front of the subject site.

From Elton Lane, single sorey garages and sheds face onto the lane at its southern end. Immediately to the north of the subject site the three storey addition to the adjacent residence sits on the Eton Lane boundary with windows facing onto Eton Lane and the St Peters College playing fields.

Proposed Development

The proposal as illustrated on the architect's drawings is for a three-storey addition to the existing building. The proposed addition is located on the southern property boundary and set back 400mm from the western property boundary on Eton Lane and 500mm from the existing building on the northern property boundary (my measurements from Aplin Cook Gardner drawing WD01). A long section through the proposed development (ACG drawing WD08 Section AA) illustrates retention of the existing building, including roof form. The proposed addition utilising the existing fall of the land to the west to achieve three storeys facing onto Eton Lane. From WD08, the proposed addition sits 2.2m higher than the ridge line of the existing roof, or 4.3m above the gutter lines of the existing roof. I note from the architect's drawings that the height of the proposed addition matches the existing height of the addition to the existing residence immediately to the north.

VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE REAR OF AN EXISTING RESIDENCE AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK



OXIGEN LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE & URBAN DESIGN





FIGURES 5 & 6: LEVEL 1 AND 2 FLOOR PLANS (APLIN COOK GARDNER)

VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE REAR OF AN EXISTING RESIDENCE AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK



FIGURES 7 & 8: SECTION AND ELEVATION (APLIN COOK GARDNER)

Viewpoints from where the proposed addition might be seen were determined by walking and driving along streets within the broad locality of the subject site. Views can be thought of as either direct, uninterupted views or glimpsed views which are interupted by either built form or vegetation.

A photograph is taken from each viewpoint with the proposed addition then identified in the photo.



VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE REAR OF AN EXISTING RESIDENCE AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK

Viewpoints Photographic Viewpoints



13

Attachment 8

Viewpoint 1

LOCATION	Hatswell Street adjacent to the intersection with Cambridge Street.
DESCRIPTION	Viewpoint looks over the St Peters College back playing fields towards Eton Lane and properties adjoining it. The proposed addition sits to the right of the existing 3-storey addition immediately to the north of the subject site.
VISIBILITY	The proposed addition will be visible from Hatswell Street at this viewpoint. The slight setback from the western property boundary and backdrop of trees lessens the visability.
SIGNIFICANCE	The proposed addition is seen in the distance. It is in scale with the adjacent building to the north and mature tree canopy of the locality.
LIKELY VISUAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	Very low due to the distance and mature tree canopy within the view.



PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 01: EXISTING

VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE REAR OF AN EXISTING RESIDENCE AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK





PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 01: WITH PROPOSED BUILDING ADDITION

Page 172 of 194

Viewpoint 2

LOCATION	College Street adjacent to the intersection with Torrens Street.
DESCRIPTION	Viewpoint 2 is located at the most southern end of Torrens Street. The views north along the street are channelled within the envelope formed by the mature street trees along Torrens Street. There is little or no visibility from this viewpoint of the proposed extension at the rear of the subject site - views are completely blocked by the street trees and other tree planting within the adjacent property to the south of the subject site.
VISIBILITY	The proposed addition is not visible from this viewpoint.
SIGNIFICANCE	Buildings fronting onto Torrens Street are single storey in character, some with steeply pitched roofs and others with second storeys set well back from the street. The retention of this single storey character along Torrens Street is an important part of maintaining the desired character of the College Park Historic Area (NPSP1).
LIKELY VISUAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	Low due to the existing vegetation within the street and in the allotment immediately south of the subject site.



17

VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE REAR OF AN EXISTING RESIDENCE AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK





PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 02: WITH PROPOSED BUILDING ADDITION

Viewpoint 3

LOCATION	Torrens Street.
DESCRIPTION	Viewpoint 3 is taken from in front of 4 Torrens Street which is located adjacent to the subject site on its northern side. Whilst the street trees in front of 4 Torrens Street are less mature than the plane tree directly in front of the subject site, other trees - cypress pines in the front garden against the northern boundary fence and semi-mature trees in the front garden against the southern boundary of 4 Torrens Street - effectively screen views from this viewpoint.
VISIBILITY	The steep pitched roof form of 4 Torrens Street and the existing boundary tree planting screen or lessen views of the proposed addition at the rear or the subject site.
SIGNIFICANCE	Buildings fronting onto Torrens Street are single storey in character, some with steeply pitched roofs and others with second storeys set well back from the street. The retention of this single storey character along Torrens Street is an important part of maintaining the desired character of the College Park Historic Area (NPSP1).
LIKELY VISUAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	Low due to the boundary tree planting and height of the roof on the residence at 4 Torrens Street.



PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 03

VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE REAR OF AN EXISTING RESIDENCE AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK





PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 03: WITH PROPOSED BUILDING ADDITION

Viewpoint 4

LOCATION	Torrens Street.
DESCRIPTION	Viewpoint 4 is located in Torrens Street directly in front of the subject site.
VISIBILITY	The proposed addition will be visible when viewed from directly in front of the subject site and looking west. Depending on the angle of viewing, the view is likely to be similar to that illustrated by the architect in their north-east elevation on drawing WD10.
SIGNIFICANCE	Buildings fronting onto Torrens Street are single storey in character, some with steeply pitched roofs and others with second storeys set well back from the street. The retention of this single storey character along Torrens Street is an important part of maintaining the desired character of the College Park Historic Area (NPSP1).
LIKELY VISUAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	Low given the proposed addition is well set back from Torrens Street and the visibility is limited to a relatively short distance along Torrens Street.



PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 04

VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE REAR OF AN EXISTING RESIDENCE AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK





PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 04: WITH PROPOSED BUILDING ADDITION

Viewpoint 5

LOCATION	Eton Lane.
DESCRIPTION	Viewpoint 5 is in Elton Lane north of the subject site. The view is looking south with Pembroke Street visible in the distance.
VISIBILITY	Views of the proposed addition on the subject site are blocked by the three storey addition at the rear of 4 Torrens Street. From this viewpoint it is unlikely that the proposed addition will be visible.
SIGNIFICANCE	Elton Lane is a minor service lane providing access to the rear of properties facing onto Torrens Street. Its primary purpose appears to be provision of access to garages and minor outbuildings facing onto Elton Lane or for garden access. As such, I consider it has less significance than the other residential streets within the locality onto which properties face.
LIKELY VISUAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	Very low as the proposed addition is unlikely to be seen from north of 4 Torrens Street given views are blocked by the existing addition at the rear of 4 Torrens Street. Given the land slopes down from viewpoint 5 to the north, and existing vegetation in the rear gardens of properties adjacent to Elton Lane, I conclude that it is unlikely that the proposed addition will be seen from Elton Lane to the north.



PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 05

VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE REAR OF AN EXISTING RESIDENCE AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK





PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 05: WITH PROPOSED BUILDING ADDITION

23

Viewpoint 6

LOCATION	Eton Lane.
DESCRIPTION	Viewpoint 6 is looking north along Eton Lane. From this view, the proposed addition will sit in front of the existing addition to 4 Torrens Street.
VISIBILITY	The proposed addition will be visible along Eton Lane from the intersection of Eton Lane with Pembroke Street until past 4 Torrens Street when views will be blocked.
SIGNIFICANCE	Elton Lane is a minor service lane providing access to the rear of properties facing onto Torrens Street. Its primary purpose appears to be provision of access to garages and minor outbuildings facing onto Elton Lane or for garden access. As such, I consider it has less significance than the other residential streets within the locality onto which properties face.
LIKELY VISUAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	Medium given the open views towards the subject site from the southern section of Eton Lane.



VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE REAR OF AN EXISTING RESIDENCE AT 2 TORRENS STREET, COLLEGE PARK





PHOTOGRAPH FROM VIEWPOINT 06: WITH PROPOSED BUILDING ADDITION

26

Visual Assessment Summary

The table below summarises the visual assessment included in this report, considering visibility, significance and likely visual impact from each viewpoint.

Viewpoint	Location	Visibility of subject site (low, medium, high)	Significance (low, medium, high)	Likely visual impact of proposed development (very low, low - medium, medium)
1	Hatswell Street	Low	Low	Very low
2	College Street	Low	High	Low
3	Torrens Street	Low	High	Low
4	Torrens Street	Low	High	Low
5	Eton Lane	High	Medium	Very low
6	Eton Lane	High	Medium	Medium

Conclusion

The likely visual impact of development is informed by:

- The character of the locality and specific location of the viewpoint. The significance of views from Torrens Street is ranked higher than views from Hatswell Street due to distance and from Eton Lane which has a minor, service role function.
- The foreground of the view and whether trees or built form affects visibility. For example, the mature street trees in Torrens Street form a continuous canopy in this street that contains and directs views along the street.

On the basis of this visual assessment of the proposed development, the addition to the rear of 2 Torrens Street, in my opinion, will have an overall low visual impact on the broader locality of the subject site.

- > The proposed addition, whilst visible over the St Peters College playing fields from Hatswell Street, is likely to have a very low visual impact given distance, location adjacent to the addition at 4 Torrens Street and the backdrop of mature trees.
- > Views from the intersection of College Street and Torrens Street, and from Torrens Street itself are likely to be low given the location of the proposed addition to the rear of the allotment, the density of mature street trees along Torrens Street, gardens with trees on either side of the subject site, and the high pitched roof on the original building at 4 Torrens Street.
- > Whilst the proposed addition will be visible from Eton Lane in the section of laneway from Pembroke Street to north of 4 Torrens Street, I consider these views less significant given the service role cfunction of Eton Lane and the location next to an existing three storey addition. The proposed addition is unlikely to be visible in Eton Lane north of 4 Torrens Street.

Colour and Materials

I note the legend on the architect's drawings WD10 and WD11 that the new roof sheeting and guttering are to match the existing. Rather, I would recommend using galvanised corrugated sheeting similar to True Oak.

I have concerns over the use of an "off white aluminium cladding - interlocking panels" on the Torrens Street facade. I do not support the use of a reflective metallic material in an off white colour for this facade as it will maximise visibility from Torrens Street. I recommend a more subdued approach that is contextual to the College Park Historic Area (NPSP1).

Please let me know if I can assist further in matters relating to this visual assessment.

JAMES HAYTER

BArch (Adelaide), MLA (Sheffield), MLAUD (Harvard), FAILA, FAIA, M.ICOMOS Registered Landscape Architect, Registered Architect Director, Oxigen | Landscape Architects + Urban Designers Professor, School of Architecture and Civil Engineering, University of Adelaide

oxigen

98 - 100 Halifax Street Adelaide SA 5000 Australia

+618 7324 9600

design@oxigen.net.au www.oxigen.net.au



Appendix D - Legal Opinion prepared by Emma Herriman of HWL Ebsworth Lawyers



18



Our Ref: 1167124

13 April 2023

Attention: Jake Vaccarella / Saskia Sutton c/- URPS 12/154 Fullarton Road ROSE PARK SA 5067

Email: jvaccarella@urps.com.au; ssutton@urps.com.au

This document, including any attachments, may contain privileged and confidential information intended only for the addressee named above. If you are not the intended recipient please notify us. Any unauthorised use, distribution or reproduction of the content of this document is expressly forbidden.

Dear Jake / Saskia

2 Torrens Street, College Park

Thank you for your instructions in relation to the proposed development of a three-storey extension at 2 Torrens Street, College Park (the **Property**).

I confirm you have sought confirmation on what weight technical and/or numeric variations (**TNVs**) should be allocated in the planning assessment process - and specifically, relevant to the proposed development, how the maximum building height TNV in the Established Neighbourhood Zone (the **ENZ**) should be weighted against other relevant policies in the Planning & Design Code (the **Code**).

Summary of advice

- 1. TNVs are brought into effect by section 66(4) of the *Planning Development and Infrastructure Act 2016.*
- 2. TNVs are an adaptation of the spatial layers, rules and policies in the Planning and Design Code to provide for necessary and appropriate local variations in specified circumstances.
- 3. Non-compliance with a TNV does not, of itself, justify the refusal of a proposed development application, irrespective of its context and a balanced consideration of the proposed development against relevant Code policies.
- 4. The maximum building height TNV relevant to the current circumstances is found at DPF4.1 of the ENZ.

Adelaide Brisbane Canberra Darwin Hobart Melbourne Norwest Perth Sydney

Doc ID 1057218103/v1

- 5. DPFs are provided in order to assist a relevant authority to interpret the associated PO (in this case PO4.1). DPF4.1 (and the maximum building height TNV) provide a guide as to what is generally considered to satisfy PO4.1. That is all.
- 6. The presence of the maximum building height TNV at DPF4.1 carries marginal weight in the overall development assessment process in the current circumstances.

Advice

What development is proposed?

- Your client is wishing to build a three storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling at the Property (the Extension). The Extension will comprise garage, mudroom (ground floor), living area, deck (second floor), study and retreat (third floor). The front of the dwelling, including the existing front façade, will be maintained. The Extension has been designed as a sensitive response to both the existing dwelling and the recognised, significant character value of the wider College Park setting.
- 2. The Extension does not accord with the TNV at DPF4.1 of the ENZ which applies to the Property. The TNV provides for a maximum building height of 1 level.

How important is compliance with TNVs in the Code?

What are TNVs?

- 3. TNVs are technical and/or numeric variations included in the Code.
- 4. By way of context:
 - (a) Section 66(1) of the Planning Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 (the PDI Act) provides for the creation of the Code as a 'comprehensive set of policies, rules and classifications which may be selected and applied in various parts of the State... for the purposes of development assessment and related matters within the State.'
 - (b) Section 66(2) drives the construction of the Code, stating that it will incorporate a planning scheme that uses zones, subzones and overlays (spatial layers), as well as policies and rules, that will govern the use and development of an area within a special layer.
 - (c) Section 66(3) outlines requirements for the way in which the Code is drafted¹.
 - (d) Section 66(4) provides for the creation of TNVs. It states:

"The Planning and Design Code may include provisions that provide for the adaptation of the rules that apply in relation to a specified zone or subzone or as an overlay to provide for necessary and appropriate local variations in specified circumstances, including by permitting in the Code -

¹ Including at section 66(3)(a) of the PDI Act, that the "policies and rules for development in a zone, subzone or overlay should be clear and straightforward."

- (a) the variation of a technical or numeric requirement within parameters specified in the Code...." [Emphasises added]
- Part 1 of the Code itself (Rules of Interpretation) provides as follows in relation to TNVs:

The Code has facilities that set or determine various technical and/or numeric requirements in relation to specified classes of development.

Section 66(4) of the Act provides that the Code may include provisions that provide for the <u>adaptation of the rules that apply in relation to a specified zone or subzone or</u> <u>as an overlay to provide for necessary and appropriate local variations in specified</u> <u>circumstances</u>. The requirements specified or reflected in technical or numeric variations form part of the planning rules to apply to the assessment of development, as relevant, through the classification tables and other provisions that make reference to these matters in specified circumstances. <u>In varying a particular policy,</u> these specific provisions or policies may be spatially applied without the need for the <u>Code to apply the specific policy through a separate zone, subzone or overlay.</u>

One type of adaption of the rules is a variation of a technical or numeric requirement that would otherwise apply under a zone, subzone or overlay that applies to a particular location. <u>A technical or numeric variation of a technical or numeric requirement operates within parameters specified in the Code and is spatially applied through the operation of the Code and its interaction with the SA planning database.</u>

- 6. In short, TNVs are adaptations of the rules of the Code that apply to a spatial layer (being a zone, subzone or Overlay) to provide for local circumstances.
- 7. Once TNVs form a part of the Code as it applies, they operate within the parameters and rules specified in the Code itself, for development assessment in relevant circumstances.

How important is the current TNV?

- 8. In order to ascertain what weight should be given to this TNV in the Council's assessment of the proposed Extension, one must consider the role of TNVs in the operation of the Code and the wider development assessment process.
- 9. Section 101 of the PDI Act confirms that "no development may be undertaken, unless that development is an approved development."
- 10. Section 102 specifies what a relevant authority (here, the Council) must take into account in deciding whether or not to approve a development.
- 11. All development is classified under the PDI Act and Code by reference to its form of development; its location; and the zone, subzone and overlays (the **spatial layers**) and associated policies that are applicable to that form of development in that location.

Page 3

- 12. In this case, the development comprising the proposed Extension is classified as "performance assessed" under the Code and as required by section 107(1) of the Act, it will be assessed <u>on its merits</u> against the relevant provisions of the Code².
- 13. The Property falls within the ENZ and is impacted by numerous overlays, including the Historic Area (NPSP1) Overlay; the Historic Area (NPSP18) Overlay, the Heritage Adjacency Overlay and other general development policies³.
- 14. The relevant TNV falls within the ENZ, at DPF 4.1.

Building	y Height
PO 4.1	DTS/DPF 4.1
Buildings contribute to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood and complements the height of nearby buildings.	Building height (excluding garages, carports and outbuildings) is no greater than: (a) the following: Maximum Building Height (Levels) Maximum building height is 1 level

15. As such, and in accordance with the classification of the proposed Extension application as a performance assessed application, the maximum building height TNV is to be considered as part of a Designated Performance Feature (**DPF**) and interpreted as per Part 1 of the Code (Rules of Interpretation).

What is a DPF?

- 16. Part 1 of the Code⁴ confirms that DPFs are available in the Code in order to assist the relevant authority to interpret the Performance Outcomes (POs)....A DPF provides a guide to a relevant authority as to what is generally considered to satisfy the PO but does not need to actually be satisfied in order to meet the PO, and does not derogate from the discretion on the part of the relevant authority, to determine that the outcome is met in another way, or from the need to assess development on its merits against all relevant policies.⁵
- 17. Applied to the current circumstances, the application for the Extension must be considered against PO 4.1 which seeks that "buildings contribute to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood and complement the height of nearby buildings".
- 18. DPF 4.1 (with the maximum building height TNV of 1 level) provides a <u>guide</u> as to what the Council will likely find acceptable in meeting the requirements of PO4.1, but to note:
 - (a) The TNV does not need to be met in order to satisfy PO4.1;

² As well as (b) design standards, and (c) any other instrument prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this definition, none of which are relevant in the current case.

³ Including (but not limited to) Design in Urban Areas, Interface between Land Uses; Transport, Access and Parking etc.

⁴ Planning & Design Code, Part 1, Rules of Interpretation, 'Policies - Desired Outcomes and Performance Outcomes.'

⁵ Planning & Design Code, Part 1, Rules of Interpretation, 'Policies - Desired Outcomes and Performance Outcomes.'

¹³ April 2023

- (b) The Council retains the ability to balance up whether PO4.1 has been met (in its view) in relation to the proposal, against all other relevant Code policies; and
- (c) The presence of the TNV at DPF4.1 does not prevent the Council deciding that it is acceptable that PO4.1 be met in another way, having regard to the text, context and statutory purpose of the relevant Code provisions; *Garden College v City of Salisbury* [2022] SAERDC 10.
- (d) In this case, supported development in the circumstances needs to 'contribute to the prevailing character' of the area and 'compliment the height of nearby buildings'. The proposed Extension does not need to duplicate the prevailing character of the area or single level heights, in order to satisfy this requirement.
- 19. This is not to suggest that the presence of the TNV at DPF4.1 should not be afforded due weight in that it reflects an important location-specific variation to the Code in the circumstances and provides context in which other means of meeting the PO4.1 can be considered. Indeed, single-storey built form characteristics are recognised by the Historic Area Overlay which applies to the Property (see below), so this TNV is another method of reflecting what is, historically, is a characteristic of the greater area. However, it is not a mandatory requirement. PO4.1 can be satisfied as long as a proposal offers a positive contribution to that existing character and complements that height.
- 20. On the facts, we say that the proposed Extension does meet the requirements of PO4.1 it does not deviate from the recognised, guide TNV so drastically on the facts that this conclusion cannot be drawn. The following details are highly relevant to this conclusion:
 - (a) the Property sits adjacent to a 3-level dwelling at 4 Torrens Street, and 2levels at 6 Torrens Street,
 - (b) the existing front façade and dwelling at the Property will be maintained (and is 1 level only),
 - (c) the existing dwelling at the Property (which shall remain) sits at a level higher than Torrens Street and also descends towards Eton Lane to the rear, which means that the Extension placed to the rear of the Property enjoys a higher level of screening than it might otherwise,
 - (d) the proposed Extension is intended to be built down into the Property, set at a FFL of 35.72, when the current dwelling has a FFL of 37.11,
 - (e) the existing dwelling benefits from a steeply pitched roof, such that the proposed Extension only sits 2500mm above the existing dwelling ridgeline at its closest point to Torrens Street,
 - (f) the proposed Extension has been designed as a sensitive response to the historic character of both the front of the dwelling and the wider historic neighbourhood and as such, meets the requirements of such policies as

PO4.2 and 10.2 of the ENZ - it responds positively to the streetscape character⁶,

- (g) Desired Outcome (DO) 1 of the ENZ is a "neighbourhood that includes a range of housing types, with new buildings <u>sympathetic</u> to the predominant build form character and development patterns" which we say the Extension is, and finally,
- (h) the proposed Extension arguably meets the requirements of other policies that speak to the character and height of the development, including PO10.1 of the ENZ, and the more dominant Overlay policies such as PO1.1 -Heritage Adjacency Overlay), PO1.1, 2.1, 2.2 (discussed below), 2.3 (as relevant), 2.5, 3.1, 3.2 (insofar as the front of the existing dwelling will be maintained) of the Historic Area Overlay, and other general development policies, including PO18.1 and 20.3 - Design in Urban Areas.
- 21. Therefore, while the presence of the maximum building height TNV at PDF4.1 should not be ignored, it is far from determinative in the current circumstances. Indeed, our view is that the proposed Extension does meet the performance outcomes of PO4.1, albeit at three levels, in that the proposal does not deviate so significantly, in its context, that it is rendered unacceptable. It contributes to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood in an alternative but equally responsive and overall, acceptable, way.

The TNV and the hierarchy of policies

- 22. The Hierarchy of Policies is set out in the Rules of Interpretation at Part 1 of the Code⁷. The hierarchy notes that if there is an inconsistency between the Code policies that apply to the assessment of a particular development, the following rules will apply to the extent of any inconsistency:
 - (a) the provisions of an overlay will prevail over all other policies applying in the particular case;
 - (b) a subzone policy will prevail over a zone policy or a general development policy; and
 - (c) a zone policy will prevail over a general development policy.
- 23. TNVs are not expressly referenced in the Hierarchy of Policies. This suggests either:
 - (a) they are assumed to a form a part of the relevant spatial layer and policy within which they are placed, and their location within that spatial layer or policy will dictate their importance in the decision making process, and/or
 - (b) they are not of such significance that they need to be given a separate characterisation in the assessment process, outside of their presence in (a).

⁶ Refer to Oxigen, Visual Assessment of a Proposed Extension to an Existing Residential Property at 2 Torrens Street, College Park, 24 February 2023.

⁷ Planning & Design Code, Part 1, Rules of Interpretation, 'Hierarchy of Policies/Modification of Provisions.' 13 April 2023

- 24. Either way, the maximum building height TNV relevant in the current circumstances must be given a lower level of weighting in the overall consideration of the Extension application, than if it sat within an Overlay or subzone. It does not.
- 25. Having said this, and as a final point, it is important to address the fact that the maximum building height TNV in the current circumstances, reflects the recognition of the historical single level development in the applicable Historic Area Overlay. Both Historic Area Statements NPSP1 and NPSP18, note that one of the historic attributes of the College Park and St Peters is the predominantly single storey (in College Park, sometimes two storey) building heights. Indeed, PO1.1, PO2.21, PO2.2 of this Overlay require (respectively) that:
 - (a) "all development is undertaken having consideration to the historic streetscapes and built form as expressed in the Historic Area Statement"
 - (b) "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"
 - (c) "development is consistent with the prevailing building and wall heights in the historic area".
- 26. While these POs clearly pay tribute to 1 or 2 level dwellings in the area as supportive of its historic value, none of them make mandatory ongoing single level development. We would suggest that the purpose of these polices is to seek to protect the existing historic character of the area from development which is insensitive, intrusive and not in keeping with that character, rather than justifying the restriction of all new development to a single level⁸. We would argue that the consideration of this historic feature in the context of the proposed Extension, should be undertaken in a similar way to that of the maximum building height TNV and referenced above: that due consideration be given to this, but that in light of the details provided at paragraph 20, the proposed Extension height is supported and indeed, justified.
- 27. As such, and recognising that the Historic Area Overlay is allocated greater weight in the development assessment process than the ENZ discussed above, albeit they could be used to apply the same height restrictions to development at the Property, we maintain that neither prevents the approval of a sensitive and responsive development which extends beyond 1 level.

Conclusion

28. TNVs are adaptions of the Code spatial layers to provide for appropriate local variations in specific circumstances. The importance and weight they should be allocated will depend on their location within the Code. Irrespective of that location, the development assessment process under the PDI Act and Code requires that a relevant authority to consider the degree to which a proposed development is supported by all relevant policies, applying appropriate rules of interpretation and the

⁸ In addition, it is clear that the details in the Historic Area Statements (which refer to "prestigious single-storey detached dwellings on very large, spacious allotments") do not reflect the reality of the Property's limited size and width, such that the Statement must be held to be somewhat less applicable in order to permit the Property to work at its optimum.



hierarchy of policies, balanced against each other. As such, there is no circumstance in which a TNV, of itself, can be considered 'mandatory'.

29. In the current case, the maximum building height TNV sits within a DPF within a zone, and simply provides a guide, and perhaps a notional measure, as to how the associated PO can be met. Taking this into account, in light of the design and context of the proposal, we are of the firm view that the proposed Extension, in delivering a three level development, still meets the requirements of PO4.1 of the ENZ and, indeed, other relevant Historic Area Overlay requirements, and should be support on these bases.

Yours sincerely

Auna

Emma Herriman Consultant HWL Ebsworth Lawyers

+61 8 8205 0841 eherriman@hwle.com.au

5.2 DEVELOPMENT NUMBER – 24038142 – LUKE MINICOZI – 43 GEORGE STREET NORWOOD

DEVELOPMENT NO.:	24038142
APPLICANT:	Luke Minicozi
ADDRESS:	43 GEORGE ST NORWOOD SA 5067
NATURE OF DEVELOPMENT:	Construction of a two-storey addition at the rear of existing consulting rooms, with partial demolition and alterations to the existing building, formalisation of car parking, and landscaping works
ZONING INFORMATION:	Zones:
	Business Neighbourhood
	Overlays:
	 Airport Building Heights (Regulated)
	Heritage Adjacency
	Hazards (Flooding - General)
	Prescribed Wells Area
	 Regulated and Significant Tree
	Traffic Generating Development
	Technical Numeric Variations (TNVs):
	 Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 2 levels)
LODGEMENT DATE:	 Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 2 levels) 18 November 2024
LODGEMENT DATE: RELEVANT AUTHORITY:	 Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 2 levels) 18 November 2024 Assessment Panel at City of Norwood, Payneham and St. Peters
LODGEMENT DATE: RELEVANT AUTHORITY: PLANNING & DESIGN CODE VERSION:	 Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 2 levels) 18 November 2024 Assessment Panel at City of Norwood, Payneham and St. Peters P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024
LODGEMENT DATE: RELEVANT AUTHORITY: PLANNING & DESIGN CODE VERSION: CATEGORY OF DEVELOPMENT:	 Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 2 levels) 18 November 2024 Assessment Panel at City of Norwood, Payneham and St. Peters P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024 Code Assessed - Performance Assessed
LODGEMENT DATE: RELEVANT AUTHORITY: PLANNING & DESIGN CODE VERSION: CATEGORY OF DEVELOPMENT: NOTIFICATION:	 Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 2 levels) 18 November 2024 Assessment Panel at City of Norwood, Payneham and St. Peters P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024 Code Assessed - Performance Assessed Yes
LODGEMENT DATE: RELEVANT AUTHORITY: PLANNING & DESIGN CODE VERSION: CATEGORY OF DEVELOPMENT: NOTIFICATION: RECOMMENDING OFFICER:	 Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 2 levels) 18 November 2024 Assessment Panel at City of Norwood, Payneham and St. Peters P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024 Code Assessed - Performance Assessed Yes Edmund Feary
LODGEMENT DATE: RELEVANT AUTHORITY: PLANNING & DESIGN CODE VERSION: CATEGORY OF DEVELOPMENT: NOTIFICATION: RECOMMENDING OFFICER:	 Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 2 levels) 18 November 2024 Assessment Panel at City of Norwood, Payneham and St. Peters P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024 Code Assessed - Performance Assessed Yes Edmund Feary Senior Urban Planner
LODGEMENT DATE: RELEVANT AUTHORITY: PLANNING & DESIGN CODE VERSION: CATEGORY OF DEVELOPMENT: NOTIFICATION: RECOMMENDING OFFICER: REFERRALS STATUTORY:	 Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 2 levels) 18 November 2024 Assessment Panel at City of Norwood, Payneham and St. Peters P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024 Code Assessed - Performance Assessed Yes Edmund Feary Senior Urban Planner None
LODGEMENT DATE: RELEVANT AUTHORITY: PLANNING & DESIGN CODE VERSION: CATEGORY OF DEVELOPMENT: NOTIFICATION: RECOMMENDING OFFICER: REFERRALS STATUTORY: REFERRALS NON-STATUTORY:	 Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 2 levels) 18 November 2024 Assessment Panel at City of Norwood, Payneham and St. Peters P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024 Code Assessed - Performance Assessed Yes Edmund Feary Senior Urban Planner None Heritage- David Brown
LODGEMENT DATE: RELEVANT AUTHORITY: PLANNING & DESIGN CODE VERSION: CATEGORY OF DEVELOPMENT: NOTIFICATION: RECOMMENDING OFFICER: REFERRALS STATUTORY: REFERRALS NON-STATUTORY:	 Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 2 levels) 18 November 2024 Assessment Panel at City of Norwood, Payneham and St. Peters P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024 Code Assessed - Performance Assessed Yes Edmund Feary Senior Urban Planner None Heritage- David Brown Traffic- Rebecca Van Der Pennen

CONTENTS:

APPENDIX 1:	Relevant P&D Code Policies	ATTACHMENT 5:	Representations
ATTACHMENT 1:	Application Documents	ATTACHMENT 6:	Response to Representations
ATTACHMENT 2:	Subject Land and Zoning Map	ATTACHMENT 7:	Heritage Referral Advice
ATTACHMENT 3:	Locality Map	ATTACHMENT 8:	Public Notification Documents
ATTACHMENT 4:	Representation Map	ATTACHMENT 9:	Response to Staff Concerns

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:

The proposed development seeks to build a two-storey addition to an existing GP practice. This would involve a relatively small ground floor addition, with an upper floor above the car parking area at the rear. The existing gravel car park has no line marking and would be formalised with this proposal.

The development includes a 21.4m long boundary wall on the northern side boundary, and a 7m tall (10m to the gable end) wall on the western boundary.

The proposal includes facilities for eight consulting rooms, plus three reception/waiting areas, pathology room, practice manager's office, administration room, director's office, and staff rooms. It would provide seven on-site parking spaces (one of which would be accessible). The six non-DDA compliant parking spaces would be designated for staff only in order to minimise the number of vehicle movements through the existing, narrow driveway.

BACKGROUND:

An application was submitted in late January 2024 for a development at 41 George Street Norwood (to the north of this subject site) for *"Partial demolition at the rear of a Local Heritage Place, partial change of use from consulting rooms to consulting rooms and office, and construction of a two storey addition at rear, including reconfiguration of the car parking area and associated fencing".* The development was subject to public notification due to the partial demolition work to the Local Heritage Place, but no opposed representations were received, and this was approved by the Assessment Manager under delegation in early July 2024. This application involved prolonged negotiations to ensure that the proposed car parking area would be functional, but this was eventually resolved. This application has not yet received Building Consent or Development Approval, but Planning Consent will be valid until the 28th of June 2026.

Staff were approached on several occasions and provided preliminary advice for a development at this site of 43 George St, Norwood, with a substantially similar proposal to what is now before the panel being presented at a meeting between staff and the applicant in late October 2024. At that meeting, it was noted that there may be manoeuvring issues given experience with the site to the north, and also it was noted that the upper floor rear setback was not without concern, though more detailed consideration of the policy would be needed.

The application was submitted on the 11th of November 2024, and lodged on the 18th of November 2024. Public notification was required due to the length of the northern boundary wall and height of the western wall, and ran from the 28th of November 2024 to the 18th of December 2024, with one representation in support of the application, and another opposed from the owners of the site to the north.

SUBJECT LAND & LOCALITY:

Site Description:

Location reference: 43 GEORGE ST NORWOOD SA 5067 Title ref.: CT 5246/390 Plan Parcel: D756 AL18

Council: The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Shape:	Rectangular
Frontage width:	13.7m
Area: Topography:	627m ² Fall of approximately 600mm from the street boundary to the rear of the site
Existing structures:	Villa constructed circa 1915 used lawfully as consulting rooms, with a later addition at the rear.
Existing vegetation:	Two small garden beds at the front of the property facing George Street (approximately 12 m ² each).

Locality

The locality extends some 75m to the north and south along George St, includes some properties on Harris Street, the Webbe Street Car Park, the Webbe Street side (rear) of the Norwood Place Shopping Centre, and part of both the Norwood Concert Hall and Parade Central (commonly referred to as the "Hoyts' complex") including the Parade Central carpark.

The site is one of a row of four former dwellings which have been converted to consulting room or office uses, with this row being in the Business Neighbourhood Zone as a transition between the residential development in the Established Neighbourhood Zone to the north, and the surrounding Urban Corridor (Main Street) Zone.

The Urban Corridor Zone contains the core of The Parade District Centre, one of the key commercial hubs of Adelaide's eastern suburbs. This locality sits at the northern periphery of this district centre.

Key developments surrounding the site include:

- Webbe Street Car Park;
 - A two-storey concrete parking structure owned and operated by the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters, which also provides access via a vehicle ramp to the rooftop of Norwood Place, which provides further car parking;
- Norwood Place shopping centre;
 - Norwood Place has a pedestrian entrance and two loading bays off of Webbe Street, as well as a basement carpark, with a rooftop carpark accessed via the Council's car parking structure;
- Parade Central entertainment complex;
 - Along the George Street frontage directly opposite the site is a surface level car park, while the site provides small commercial tenancies along George Street; and,
- Norwood Concert Hall and Town Hall complex
 - One shop tenancy (House of Health) is found on George Street and has outdoor dining. There is also the entrance to the Concert Hall, and functional features such as the stage winch.

Webbe Street's streetscape is mostly dictated by functional requirements, with large blank walls for the shopping centre, wide crossovers for loading bays and car parking. Nonetheless, substantial landscaping on the street does work to improve the amenity of the street.

Harris Street's streetscape is again split, with the car park dominating the southern side, but residential on the northern side.
George Street has a relatively high level of residential amenity to the north, but once on the southern side of Harris/Wall Streets, transitions to a moderate amenity commercial character, with car parking and large blank walls being a feature, though punctuated by active uses.

George Street is also subject of public realm upgrades by the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters, which are intended to improve its pedestrian amenity.

With such commercial activity there is generally a high level of pedestrian traffic, particularly during daylight hours, with a not insubstantial amount of pedestrian traffic after dark (though notably less than during the day).

CONSENT TYPE REQUIRED:

Planning Consent

CATEGORY OF DEVELOPMENT:

PER ELEMENT:
 Demolition

Partial demolition of a building or structure: Accepted Consulting room: Code Assessed - Performance Assessed

- OVERALL APPLICATION CATEGORY: Code Assessed - Performance Assessed
- REASON P&D Code; Proposal is not a change of use

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

- **REASON** Boundary walls exceed dimensions outlined in Business Neighbourhood Zone Table 5 Row 4 (4).
- LIST OF REPRESENTATIONS

First Name	Surname	Address	Position	Wishes to be heard?
John	Turner	Not provided (PO Box in Norwood)	Support	No
Suzanne and Andrew	Whittam	41 George Street, Norwood*	Opposed	Yes

*Mr and Ms Whittam provided their home address in the representation, but the relevant point for the Panel is that they are the owners of the property immediately to the north of the site at 41 George St, Norwood.

• SUMMARY

The opposed representors raised the following issues:

- Bulk and scale;
- Contextuality in design;
- Extent of hard surfacing;
- Visibility of the upper floor addition; and,
- Impact of the boundary wall.

AGENCY REFERRALS

None

INTERNAL REFERRALS

• David Brown- Heritage Advisor

Council's Heritage Advisor provided commentary with regard to the impact of the proposal on the Local Heritage Place to the north. This is discussed under the Heritage section of the assessment.

• Rebecca Van Der Pennen- Traffic Engineer

Council's Traffic Engineer provided some commentary on the functionality of the proposed car parking area. This is discussed further under the Traffic Impact, Access and Parking section of the assessment.

• Melinda Lutton- Principal Civil Engineer (consultant)

Council's consultant civil engineer provided advice on potential flooding impacts. This is discussed under the Flooding section of the assessment.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

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

Question of Seriously at Variance

The proposed development comprises an expansion of existing consulting rooms, with associated works. It is located in the Business Neighbourhood Zone. Development of this nature is appropriate within the site, locality or in the subject Business Neighbourhood Zone for the following reasons.

- Zone DO1 envisages "compatible employment-generating land uses";
- Zone DPF 1.1 and PO 1.1 specifically envisage consulting rooms; and,
- The proposal would retain the existing building on site, contributing to the prevailing neighbourhood character, given the row of former dwellings.

The proposed development is not considered seriously at variance with the relevant Desired Outcomes and Performance Outcomes of the Planning and Design Code pursuant to section 107(2)(c) of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016.*

Land Use and Intensity

The site is presently used as consulting rooms; a use specifically envisaged in Business Neighbourhood Zone DPF and PO 1.1. The PO does state that this is appropriate where it "[does] not materially impact residential amenity". As outlined under the locality section, the locality is predominantly commercial in nature, and there are not considered to be residents who would be impacted by the land use.

DPF 1.2 outlines a floor area guideline of 250 m², with an associated PO as follows:

"Business and commercial land uses complement and enhance the prevailing or emerging neighbourhood character."

As outlined above, the prevailing character of the locality is not residential in nature and is generally that of the outer edge of a district centre. This district centre character will generally see higher intensity uses.

The gross leasable floor area (GLFA) of the development is approximately 467m² though the applicant has suggested that the GLFA is only 245m², the difference being the result of differences in interpretation of the definition of GLFA. The definition in Part 8 of the Code states:

"Means the total floor area of a building excluding public or common tenancy areas such as malls, hallways, verandahs, public or shared tenancy toilets, common storage areas and loading docks."

The applicant has therefore excluded circulation and waiting areas, bathrooms etc, while staff have interpreted the above definition as including these areas, since the site would operate as only one tenancy and these would not be available to people who were not clients, and therefore these are not "public or common tenancy areas".

Regardless of whether or not the development complies with DPF, it is considered that the intensity of the use does complement the character of the locality, given its commercial character.

It is noted that the Out of Activity Centres Development module does envisage development at the edge of activity centres such as is the case here, in PO 1.2 (b). The proposal does not diminish the role of the Parade Core as an activity centre, and indeed reinforces it, consistent with this module.

In terms of the land use interface, it is noted that there are no residential properties adjacent to (i.e. within 60m of) the site. Consulting rooms also generate a limited amount of noise, such that it is not considered that it would at all detract from the amenity of the locality.

The applicant has outlined operating hours of:

- Monday- Friday 8am-5:30pm
- Saturday 8am-12pm

While this could be conditioned, it is considered that the locality is such that broader operating hours would not detract from the locality's amenity, and therefore no such condition is recommended, in order to allow for greater flexibility if it is ever needed.

Building Height

The Zone includes a two storey TNV, meaning that buildings of this height are generally anticipated. The building's height of 9m from the top of the footings to the roof ridge is consistent with this two-storey form.

Setbacks, Design & Appearance

The proposal includes a 21.4m long boundary wall along the northern side. The applicant has advised that this is necessary for fire rating purposes, though the neighbour to the north has not had to do the same. There is ongoing discussion on this point; the applicant is seeking to avoid the construction of this boundary wall if possible, but it appears at this point as though it will be necessary.

The DPF which outlines the 11.5m length guideline is Business Neighbourhood Zone DPF 3.4, however the associated Performance Outcome refers only to residential properties. As the wall would face another commercial property, this is not relevant.

Instead, PO 3.6 is relevant:

Buildings are set back from side boundaries to provide:

- a) Separation between buildings in a way which complements the established character of the locality;
- b) Access to natural light and ventilation for neighbours

The "character of the locality" will depend on what elements of the locality are considered most integral to its character, and to what extent the district centre form influences that character compared to the row of older, former dwellings.

As outlined in the locality section, both of these elements have an influence, and it is not the case the character is either one or the other form, but that instead the district centre character will facilitate a more intense form to still be compatible with the character than might ordinarily be the case in the Business Neighbourhood Zone.

The large boundary wall is a common form found in the district centre, as is evident along Webbe Street and George Street with the Norwood Place and Norwood Concert Hall sites, which have much larger such walls than is proposed here. While the existing row of former dwellings do not incorporate such walls, the proposed form finds a middle ground between these two characters which is compatible with the overall character of the locality.

It is also noted that the boundary wall will not be visible from the street and will only be perceived from the car park of the site to the north, and to some limited extent, from the ground floor of the Webbe Street Car Park.

Regarding the light and ventilation elements, the wall is north facing, so access to light will be essentially unaffected. With regard to ventilation, with the neighbour's car park being open to the air, the level of ventilation is expected to be sufficient.

The upper floor rear wall is also on the boundary, in this case abutting the Webbe Street Car Park and the ramp taking people from the upper floor of the carpark to Webbe Street. At the centre of the gable, the wall would be some 8.2m above the ground level of ramp, which would somewhat loom over the ramp.

Again, as this site is not residential, PO 3.4 is not relevant, and instead PO 3.7 should be considered:

Buildings are set back from rear boundaries to povide:

- a) Separation between buildings in a way that complements the established character of the locality
- b) Access to natural light and ventilation for neighbours
- c) Open space recreational opportunities
- d) Space for landscaping and vegetation

As above, the character must balance the district centre form with the former dwelling form. This outcome, with a boundary wall at the rear abutting the carpark, preserves the former dwelling form from the street, with a transition towards a district centre-esque form at the rear. This will have some visual impact for the sites immediately surrounding it, but it is not incompatible with the character of the locality.

In terms of natural light and ventilation, the impact on the car park in this sense would be relatively minimal given the scale of the car park (though the passive surveillance impact will be discussed below).

There is generally a lack of space for landscaping and vegetation, but this is a function of the size of the car parking area, rather than the rear setback itself. This is discussed further under the landscaping section.

The impact that this boundary wall would have on the passive surveillance of the ramp is also noted, and the large blank wall has the potential to be the target of graffiti. It is currently not uncommon for dumping and graffiti to occur under the ramp up from the Webbe Street Car Park to the Norwood Place rooftop carpark, but the existing openness of the ramp to views along Webbe Street provides some passive surveillance, or at least a perception of it given the trees planted along the northern boundary of 45 George Street. Closing in the ramp by building this boundary wall would have an impact on this.

Design in Urban Areas PO 2.1 states:

Development maximises opportunities for passive surveillance of the public realm by providing clear lines of sight, appropriate lighting and the use visually permeable screening wherever practicable.

This only refers to passive surveillance of the "public realm", which generally refers to streets rather than ramps to multi-storey carparks, and it is likely that this was not intended to capture a situation like this.

It is also noted that there is a light and security camera at the top of the ramp down from the car park, which will provide some deterrence in this case.

Regarding upper floor side setbacks, the development provides a 1.2m setback on the northern side and 2.7m on the southern side, so that it aligns better with the original dwelling, limiting the upper floor's visibility from the street. It is noted that there is no distinction in the Zone (DPF 3.6) between ground floor and upper floor setback guidelines, being 900mm. Therefore, the upper floor setbacks do comply with this guideline, which, noting the discussion of PO 3.6 above, is considered suitable.

Considering the development's overall scale, Zone PO 2.1 seeks for development to "complement surrounding built form, streetscapes and local character". Again, considering the mixed or transitional character of the locality, the proposed scale of the development provides a transition between the district centre and the residential neighbourhood, with the larger scale addition being relatively subtle when viewed from George Street.

Heritage

The site is in the Heritage Adjacency Overlay, with reference to the double-fronted cottage to the north. Council's Heritage Advisor has no objection to the proposal on heritage grounds, noting the following:

While the design is large, simple and dark in colour, it is set well back, and given the commercial context, and the other large structures in the area, both existing and proposed, there will be no real additional detrimental impact to the heritage value and setting of the Local Heritage Place.

Given that the Heritage Adjacency Overlay only seeks for development not to "dominate, encroach on or unduly impact on the setting of the Place", it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

Traffic Impact, Access and Parking

The site is in a designated area for vehicle parking meaning that the applicable rate specified in Table 2-Transport, Access and Parking is three spaces per 100 m² of GLFA. As above, this development would have a GLFA of 467m² meaning a theoretical car parking demand of 14 spaces. It is noted that the applicant contends a lower GLFA of only 245m² which would result in a theoretical demand for 7.35 spaces.

The proposed development does provide seven spaces (including one accessible space), which accords with the applicant's calculations, but does not align with the administration's interpretation of the GLFA applicable to this development.

Performance Outcome 5.1 of the Transport, Access and Parking module does allow for a reduced on-site parking rate to be considered, and provides a non-exhaustive list of reasons, including the availability of on-street parking.

While on-street parking is at a premium, there is an abundance of publicly available car parking in the locality, including the Webbe Street Car Park, and carparks associated with Norwood Place and Parade Central. This being the case, there is ample parking available off-site to meet the needs of the development, which is grounds for a reduced rate under PO 5.1.

Council's Traffic Engineer has examined the proposal and provided the following comments:

- An accessible car park has been provided however access to the building from this location has not been considered. Current plan requires users to walk down the driveway and access from the front of site.
- MECH boxes are shown on bike racks and within car parks. These should not obstruct access and space for vehicles to overhang provided wheel stops.
- Driveway width at narrowest point has not been shown. Acknowledging that this is an existing site constraint the driveway width is narrower than the minimum 3m required in the standard.
- No manoeuvring clearance has been shown on the provided swept paths as required in AS2890.1 to cater for slow moving vehicles travelling within parking aisles or manoeuvring into parking spaces.

• The provided car parking spaces meet the minimum dimensions in width, length and aisle width as required in the standard.

The first of these points, regarding DDA compliant access, is the most complicated.

Able-bodied people would be able to use the pedestrian path and steps located on the northern side of the site to access the building. However, due to this set of steps, this is not suitable for people with access needs, wheelchair users or others who would be unable to use these steps. They would instead need to walk or wheel down the length of the driveway to then use the ramp at the front of the site.

There are a series of Performance Outcomes relevant in this regard:

- Design in Urban Areas
 - PO 2.3
 - Buildings are designed with safe, perceptible and direct access from public street frontages and vehicle parking areas.
 - o PO 7.3
 - Safe, legible, direct and accessible pedestrian connections are provided between parking areas and the development.
 - Transport, Access and Parking
 - PO 4.1
 - Development is sited and designed to provide safe, dignified and convenient access for people with a disability.
 - o PO 6.4
 - Pedestrian linkages between parking areas and the development are provided and are safe and convenient.

The applicant has expressed a view that the proposed development does meet these outcomes by ensuring that people with access needs can enter the building via the same entrance as everyone else, therefore being dignified, and because the low volume of traffic movements, and the ample sight distances when wheeling down the driveway, would provide sufficient safety.

Despite this, in terms of "dignity" it is generally best to provide people with disabilities options to be able to determine what they feel most comfortable with, so that if they would feel more dignified entering via the rear, they can do so. Moreover, there are still some limited safety issues with wheeling or walking through a vehicle area. It would therefore be ideal if a rear ramp could be provided.

To this end, the applicant has outlined that providing such a ramp at the rear would not be feasible. Under the present configuration, the ramp would be too long and would then interfere with the manoeuvring area, creating further issues. The level of the car park could be raised to reduce the length of ramp needed, but this would require a substantial amount of fill and among other issues, this would result in depositing fill against the slab of the existing building which would require works to the slab of the existing building which would likely be complex and challenging (among other issues).

Therefore, it is considered that the lack of a rear access ramp is not sufficient grounds to refuse the application, given the lack of reasonable alternatives.

The second point regarding the "MECH boxes" has been clarified by the applicant. These boxes are raised to provide height clearance underneath to still allow vehicles and bicycles to sit underneath them.

The narrow width of the driveway was a concern noted early on in the process, given the potential issues with sight distance and two-way movements through a single-width access point. To this end, the applicant has nominated the car parking area as staff only (with the exception of the accessible space) to minimise the number of vehicle movements through this driveway.

While designating car parks as staff only can lead to issues with an underutilised car park while visitors struggle to find a park, in practice, a premises of this size is likely to have more than six staff driving to work, so the car parking utilisation is unlikely to suffer as a result of this being designated for staff. While it will force visitors to look for parking elsewhere, as outlined above there is ample parking available in the locality, and the improved safety is a preferable outcome overall.

Environmental Factors

Waste Management

The proposed development includes a bin enclosure of approximately 4.5m², large enough for five (5) standard wheelie bins. The enclosure is on the northern side of the driveway, hidden from view from the public realm. These bins would then be wheeled down the driveway for presentation to the street. This is consistent with the existing arrangement, where bins are kept at the rear of the site, then wheeled to the street. The existing driveway is too narrow (and cannot be widened without demolishing the existing building) to allow for on-site collection, and this arrangement is proposed to continue.

In terms of waste generation, the Green Industries SA Guide estimates that offices/consulting rooms will produce 1.5L/m²/week of both landfill and recycling, with 0.25L/m²/week of organics. The guide does not clarify whether this is total floor area or GLFA, so it will be presumed for the purposes of this that it is total floor area (i.e. 467m²). In this development therefore, the estimated waste generation based on the Green Industries SA guide is 700L landfill, 700L recycling, and 117L of organics, per week.

With weekly landfill, and fortnightly recycling and organics collections, this would mean one 1100L landfill bin, two 1100L recycling bins, and one 240L organics bin. These bins all together would have a total length of 4.66m- approximately 1.2m longer than the proposed bin enclosures. Moreover, a non-standard waste agreement would need to be made with EastWaste given the larger sizes of bins.

Performance Outcome 11.1 of the Design in Urban Areas states the following:

Development provides a dedicated area for on-site collection and sorting of recyclable materials and refuse, green organic waste and wash bay facilities for the ongoing maintenance of bins that is adequate in size considering the number and nature of the activities they will serve and the frequency of collection.

Ultimately, the Green Industries Guide is only a guide and the actual waste general is likely to be lower than this. Moreover, if a weekly recycling collection can be arranged through EastWaste, or through a private contractor, then the necessary bins would fit in the proposed enclosure, and there are alternative locations for an additional bin if required.

This being the case, an advisory note is recommended reflecting that either a private collection or a nonstandard waste agreement with EastWaste may be needed, but ultimately, it is possible to achieve the standard sought by this PO on the site, and therefore this is not considered fatal to the application.

Levels and Stormwater

It is noted that the site slopes away from the road meaning that the rear carpark is below the water table level. As a result, the applicant has proposed a "sump and pump" system including a detention tank.

The applicant has provided a Stormwater Management Plan with calculations for a series of scenarios. Council's standard is for development to detain the post-development 1% storm at the rate of the predevelopment 20% storm, which is shown in the SMP as requiring 5180.8L of detention. The proposed plans provide 5500L of detention, which is sufficient, but does not specify an orifice diameter other than the 200mm pipe from the detention tank to the sump, with 2x20L/s pumps. Given that the pre-development 1% discharge rate as calculated in this report is 11.86L/s, this pumping rate is higher than what is expected (though this may simply be a case of what the pump is capable of which would come in standard sizes, and this could then be further limited). With these missing details, a condition is recommended to ensure that the Development Approval plans reflect the calculated discharge rate.

With these gradients, the applicant intends to retain existing fencing along the southern boundary, with no new retaining walls here. There is a small portion of new fencing on the northern side, but this is no more than 2.1m above natural ground level and does not require approval.

Flooding

Council's consultant Civil Engineer has reviewed the site and has confirmed that it is not flood affected despite the Hazards (Flooding- General) Overlay being applied to the site. The flooding shown appears to refer to a local low-point at 45 George St, Norwood, and does not flow onto 43 George St, Norwood. The proposed floor level for the ground floor addition is 190mm lower than the existing building, but this is 800mm higher than the existing ground level in the driveway and 500mm above top of kerb, so this is appropriate.

Landscaping

The proposal provides only a limited amount of landscaping (24.4m² or 3.9%). This is roughly equivalent to the existing extent of landscaping on the site, noting that the two existing gardens at the front of the site would be removed in order to provide a DDA compliant access ramp.

There are a series of relevant Performance Outcomes:

- Business Neighbourhood Zone PO 2.3:
 - Site coverage is limited to provide space for landscaping, open space and pervious areas.
 - Associated DPF of 60% site coverage
- Design in Urban Areas PO 3.1:
 - Soft landscaping and tree planting are incorporated to:
 - Minimise heat absorption and reflection
 - Maximise shade and shelter
 - Maximise stormwater infiltration
 - Enhance the appearance of land and streetscapes
- Design in Urban Areas PO 7.6:

0

Vehicle parking areas and associated driveways are landscaped to provide shade and positively contribute to amenity

Regarding site coverage firstly, the site coverage is 414.2 or 66%, but even this is somewhat misleading, given the upper floor sits above the car park to maximise the use of space. In short, the site coverage is relatively limited; it is the extent of car parking, and the space required for the DDA compliant ramp, which limits the extent of landscaping.

PO 3.1 generally speaks in terms of minimising / maximising. Given that there is no way that additional landscaping could be incorporated without either reducing the car parking provision or reducing the size of the building (noting as above that the building is broadly consistent with a reasonably expected footprint), the landscaping is suitably maximised. To accord with this outcome.

PO 7.6 seeks for shading of parking areas, generally through landscaping. In this case, it is more practical to shade the car parking using the building, rather than landscaping. This is also an improvement in amenity from the existing situation where the parking area is unsealed and completely open.

Overall, while far from ideal, the limited amount of landscaping does not warrant refusal of the application based on the policies above.

CONCLUSION

The proposed development seeks to build an addition at the rear of an existing consulting rooms premises. The intensity of the use is broadly consistent with the character of the locality, being on the periphery of the district centre as is the overall built form, despite concerns regarding the size of boundary walls.

The proposed carparking area is suitably functional, and provides seven car parks, with six of these being provided for staff to minimise traffic movements through the existing, non-standard driveway. The locality has sufficient parking in a variety of off-street parking areas to accommodate the needs of the development. The accessible space at the rear of the site is of some concern given the difficult path that is needed to reach the accessible entrance to the building, but the applicant has demonstrated that there are no reasonable alternatives, and ultimately this is not considered sufficient to refuse the application.

There remain some details regarding waste management and stormwater disposal, but the development is able to achieve compliance with these matters, and these can be managed through conditions and notes.

The limited extent of landscaping is also concerning, but with limited policy and limited alternatives, noting also that the building footprint is generally reasonable, the lack of landscaping is broadly acceptable.

On balance, the development is considered to sufficiently accord with the provisions of the Code to warrant consent.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council Assessment Panel resolve that:

- 1. The proposed development is not considered seriously at variance with the relevant Desired Outcomes and Performance Outcomes of the Planning and Design Code pursuant to section 107(2)(c) of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016.*
- 2. Development Application Number 24038142, by Luke Minicozi is granted Planning Consent subject to the following reasons/conditions/reserved matters:

CONDITIONS

Planning Consent

Condition 1

The development granted Planning Consent shall be undertaken and completed in accordance with the stamped plans and documentation, except where varied by conditions below (if any).

Condition 2

All car parking spaces shall be line marked or delineated in a distinctive fashion, with the marking maintained in a clear and visible condition at all times.

Condition 3

Wheel stopping devices shall be placed at the end of each parking bay so as to prevent damage to adjoining fences, buildings or landscaping to the reasonable satisfaction of the Assessment Manager or its delegate.

Condition 4

Driveways, car parking spaces, manoeuvring areas and landscaping areas shall not be used for the storage or display of any goods, materials or waste at any time.

Condition 5

The approved stormwater pump shall discharge at a rate of no more than 11.86L/s, and shall be fitted with an alarm in case of pump or power failure, with a flashing light. The owner is to take all reasonable steps to ensure that the pump is functional at all times.

Condition 6

All stormwater from buildings and hard-surfaced areas shall be disposed of in accordance with recognised engineering practices in a manner and with materials that does not result in the entry of water onto any adjoining property or any building, and does not affect the stability of any building and in all instances the stormwater drainage system shall be directly connected into either the adjacent street kerb & water table or a Council underground pipe drainage system.

Condition 7

All areas nominated as landscaping or garden areas on the approved plans shall be planted with a suitable mix and density of trees, shrubs and groundcovers within the next available planting season after the occupation of the premises to the reasonable satisfaction of the Assessment Manager and such plants, as well as any existing plants which are shown to be retained, shall be nurtured and maintained in good health and condition at all times, with any diseased or dying plants being replaced, to the reasonable satisfaction of the Assessment Manager or its delegate.

ADVISORY NOTES

Planning Consent

Advisory Note 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.

Advisory Note 2

Consents issued for this Development Application will remain valid for the following periods of time:

- 1. Planning Consent is valid for 24 months following the date of issue, within which time Development Approval must be obtained;
- 2. Development Approval is valid for 24 months following the date of issue, within which time works must have substantially commenced on site;
- 3. Works must be substantially completed within 3 years of the date on which Development Approval is issued.

If an extension is required to any of the above-mentioned timeframes a request can be made for an extension of time by emailing the Planning Department at townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au. Whether or not an extension of time will be granted will be at the discretion of the relevant authority.

Advisory Note 3

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.

Advisory Note 4

The Applicant is reminded of its responsibilities under the *Environment Protection Act 1993*, to not harm the environment. Specifically, paint, plaster, concrete, brick wastes and wash waters should not be discharged into the stormwater system, litter should be appropriately stored on site pending removal, excavation and site disturbance should be limited, entry/exit points to the site should be managed to prevent soil being carried off site by vehicles, sediment barriers should be used (particularly on sloping sites), and material stockpiles should all be placed on site and not on the footpath or public roads or reserves. Further information is available by contacting the EPA.

Advisory Note 5

The granting of this consent does not remove the need for the beneficiary to obtain all other consents which may be required by any other legislation.

The Applicant's attention is particularly drawn to the requirements of the *Fences Act 1975* regarding notification of any neighbours affected by new boundary development or boundary fencing. Further information is available in the 'Fences and the Law' booklet available through the Legal Services Commission.

Advisory Note 6

The Applicant is advised that construction noise is not allowed:

- 1. on any Sunday or public holiday; or
- 2. after 7pm or before 7am on any other day

Advisory Note 7

The Applicant is advised that any works undertaken on Council owned land (including but not limited to works relating to crossovers, driveways, footpaths, street trees and stormwater connections), or works that require the closure of the footpath and / or road to undertake works on the development site, will require the approval of the Council pursuant to the *Local Government Act 1999* prior to any works being undertaken. Further information may be obtained by contacting Council's Public Realm Compliance Officer on 8366 4513.

Advisory Note 8

The Applicant is advised that the condition of the footpath, kerbing, vehicular crossing point, street tree(s) and any other Council infrastructure located adjacent to the subject land will be inspected by the Council prior to the commencement of building work and at the completion of building work. Any damage to Council infrastructure that occurs during construction must be rectified as soon as practicable and in any event, no later than four (4) weeks after substantial completion of the building work. The Council reserves its right to recover all costs associated with remedying any damage that has not been repaired in a timely manner from the appropriate person.

Advisory Note 9

The Council has not surveyed the subject land and has, for the purpose of its assessment, assumed that all dimensions and other details provided by the Applicant are correct and accurate.

Advisory Note 10

The Applicant shall note that per the Council's Waste Management Policy, this development falls outside

the scope of the Council's standard waste collection service entitlement. Consequently, the Council provides no guarantee that it or its contractors can service waste collection from this site.

The Applicant may apply to the Council for a Non-Standard Waste Agreement, in accordance with the Council's *Waste Management Policy*, for the collection of waste from the site. The Council, in consultation with its contractor, retains absolute discretion in determining the merits of any application and does not provide any guarantee of any such agreement being endorsed. Alternatively, the Applicant may arrange for the collection of waste with a third-party contractor.

Address: 43 GEORGE ST NORWOOD SA 5067

To view a detailed interactive property map in SAPPA click on the map below



Property Zoning Details

Zone

Overlay

Business Neighbourhood

Airport Building Heights (Regulated) *(All structures over 45 metres)* Heritage Adjacency Hazards (Flooding - General) Prescribed Wells Area Regulated and Significant Tree Traffic Generating Development

Local Variation (TNV)

Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 2 levels)

Selected Development(s)

Consulting room

This development may be subject to multiple assessment pathways. Please review the document below to determine which pathway may be applicable based on the proposed development compliances to standards. If no assessment pathway is shown this mean the proposed development will default to performance assessed. Please contact your local council in this instance. Refer to Part 1 - Rules of Interpretation - Determination of Classes of Development

Consulting room - Code Assessed - Performance Assessed

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones

Business Neighbourhood Zone

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

Appendix 1 P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024

	Desired Outcome
DO 1	A variety of housing and accommodation types and compatible employment-generating land uses in an environment
	characterised by primarily low-rise buildings
DO 2	Buildings of a scale and design that complements surrounding built form, streetscapes and local character and provide for
	landscaping and open space.

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature		
Land Use and Intensity			
PO 1.1	DTS/DPF 1.1		
Housing and accommodation types appropriate to the locality complemented by shops, offices, consulting rooms and other non- residential uses that do not materially impact residential amenity.	 Development comprises one or more of the following: (a) Community facility (b) Consulting room (c) Dwelling (d) Office (e) Residential flat building (f) Shop 		
PO 1.2	DTS/DPF 1.2		
Business and commercial land uses complement and enhance the prevailing or emerging neighbourhood character.	Shops, offices and consulting rooms (or any combination thereof) do not exceed 250m ² in gross leasable floor area.		
PO 1.3	DTS/DPF 1.3		
Changes in the use of land between similar businesses encourages the efficient reuse of commercial premises and supports continued local access to a range of services compatible to the locality.	 A change of use to a shop, office or consulting room or any combination of these uses where all of the following are achieved: (a) the area to be occupied by the proposed development is in an existing building and is currently used as a shop, office, consulting room or any combination of these uses (b) if the proposed change of use is for a shop: (i) the total gross leasable floor area of the shop will not exceed 250m² (ii) if primarily involving the handling and sale of foodstuffs, areas used for the storage and collection of refuse are sited at least 10m from the site of a dwelling (other than a dwelling directly associated with the proposed shop) (iii) if primarily involving heating and cooking of foodstuffs in a commercial kitchen and is within 30m of any residential allotment within a neighbourhood-type zone or a dwelling (other than a dwelling directly associated with the proposed shop) (c) off-street vehicular parking exists in accordance with the rate(s) specified in Transport, Access and Parking Table 1 - General Off-Street Car Parking Requirements or Table 2 - Off-Street Car Parking Requirements in Designated Areas to the nearest whole number, except where: (i) the required contribution will be made into a relevant car parking offset scheme (other than where a relevant contribution has previously been made) or (ii) the building is a local heritage place. 		
Built Form a	nd Character		
Buildings are of a scale and design that complements surrounding	None are applicable.		

Policy24	Appendix P&D Code (in effect) Version 2	x 1
built form, streetscapes and local character.		
PO 2.2	DTS/DPF 2.2	
frontage.	None are applicable.	
PO 2.3	DTS/DPF 2.3	
Site coverage is limited to provide space for landscaping, open space and pervious areas.	Development does not result in site coverage exceedi	ng 60%.
Building heigh	it and setbacks	
PO 3.1	DTS/DPF 3.1	
Buildings are generally of low-rise construction, with taller buildings positioned towards the centre of the zone and away from any adjoining neighbourhood-type zone to positively contribute to the built form character of the locality.	Except on a Catalyst site in the Melbourne Street West Building height (excluding garages, carports and outbu greater than:	t Subzone, iildings) is no
	(a) the following:	
	Maximum Building Height (Levels)	
	Maximum building height is 2 levels	
	(D) in all other cases (ie there is a blank field for be	oth values):
	 (ii) 2 building levels of 9m where the development located adjoining a different zone that envisages residential development (ii) 3 building levels or 12m in all other case 	primarily ses.
	In relation to DTS/DPF 3.1, in instances where:	
	(c) more than one value is returned in the same f	ield:
	 (i) for the purpose of DTS/DPF 3.1(a), reference Maximum Building Height (Metres) Technical and Numeric Variation layer or Maximum II (Levels) Technical and Numeric Variations SA planning database to determine the value relevant to the site of the proposed value relevant to the site of the proposed value relevant to the site of the proposed value is returned for DTS/DPF there is one blank field), then the relevant the other. 	 to the chnical and Building Height on layer in the applicable sed 5.1(a), (i.e. vant height in ho criteria for
PO 3.2	DTS/DPF 3.2	
Buildings are set back from primary street boundaries consistent with the existing streetscape.	Buildings setback from the primary street boundary ir with the following table:	າ accordance
	Development Context Minimu	um setback
	There is an existing building on both abutting sites sharing the same street frontage as the site of the proposed building.	e setback of ; buildings.
	There is an existing building on only one abutting site sharing the same street frontage as the site of the proposed building and the existing building is not on a corner site.	k of the existing
	There is an existing building on only one abutting site sharing the same street(a)Wh exisfrontage as the site of the proposed building and the existing building is on a corner site.frontage as the site of the proposed sha print corner site.frontage as the site of the proposed sha print corner site.frontage as the site of the proposed sha print corner site.	iere the sting building ires the same mary street ntage – the back of the sting building

Appendix 1 P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/202

	(b) Where the existing building has a different primary street frontage - 5m
	There is no existing building on either of 5m the abutting sites sharing the same street frontage as the site of the proposed building.
	 (a) the setback of an existing building on an abutting site to the street boundary that it shares with the site of the proposed building is to be measured from the closest building wall to that street boundary at its closest point to the building wall and any existing projection from the building such as a verandah, porch, balcony, awning or bay window is not taken to form part of the building for the purposes of determining its setback (b) any proposed projections such as a verandah, porch, balcony, awning or bay window may encroach not more than 1.5
	metres into the minimum setback prescribed in the table
PO 3.3 Buildings set back from secondary street boundaries (other than rear laneways) contribute to a consistent streetscape.	DTS/DPF 3.3 Building walls are set back from the secondary street frontage: (a) the average of any existing buildings on adjoining sites having frontage to the same street
	OR (b) not less than 900mm where no building exists on an adjoining site.
PO 3.4 Walls on boundaries are limited in height and length to manage visual and overshadowing impacts on adjoining residential properties.	DTS/DPF 3.4 Except where the building is a dwelling and is located on a central site within a row dwelling or terrace arrangement, side boundary walls occur only on one side boundary and satisfy (a) or (b) below:
	 (a) side boundary walls adjoin or abut a boundary wall of a building on adjoining land for the same or lesser length and height (b) side boundary walls do not:
	 (i) exceed 3.2m in height from the lower of the natural or finished ground level
	 (ii) exceed 11.5m in length (iii) when combined with other walls on the boundary of the subject development site, exceed a maximum 45% of the length of the boundary
	(iv) encroach within 3m of any other existing or proposed boundary walls on the subject land.
PO 3.5 Dwellings in a semi-detached, row or terrace arrangement maintain space between buildings consistent with a suburban streetscape character.	DTS/DPF 3.5 Dwelling walls of dwellings in a semi-detached or row arrangement are set back at least 900mm from side boundaries shared with allotments outside the development site.
PO 3.6	DTS/DPF 3.6
Buildings are set back from side boundaries to provide:(a) separation between buildings in a way that complements the established character of the locality	Other than walls located on a side boundary, building walls are set back at least 900mm from side boundaries.
(b) access to natural light and ventilation for neighbours.	
PO 3.7	DTS/DPF 3.7

Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024
 Buildings are set back from rear 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 (c) open space recreational opportunities (d) space for landscaping and vegetation. 	 Buildings walls are set back from the rear boundary at least: (a) 3m for the first building level (b) 5m for any second building level.
Conce	pt Plans
PO 6.1	DTS/DPF 6.1
Development is compatible with the outcomes sought by any relevant Concept Plan contained within Part 12 - Concept Plans of the Planning and Design Code to support the orderly development of land through staging of development and provision of infrastructure.	 The site of the development is wholly located outside any relevant Concept Plan boundary. The following Concept Plans are relevant: In relation to DTS/DPF 6.1, in instances where: (a) one or more Concept Plan is returned, refer to Part 12 - Concept Plans in the Planning and Design Code to determine if a Concept Plan is relevant to the site of the proposed development. Note: multiple concept plans may be relevant. (b) in instances where 'no value' is returned, there is no relevant concept plan and DTS/DPF 6.1 is met.

Annendix 1

Table 5 - Procedural Matters (PM) - Notification

The following table identifies, pursuant to section 107(6) of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016,* classes of performance assessed development that are excluded from notification. The table also identifies any exemptions to the placement of notices when notification is required.

Interpretation

Notification tables exclude the classes of development listed in Column A from notification provided that they do not fall within a corresponding exclusion prescribed in Column B.

Where a development or an element of a development falls within more than one class of development listed in Column A, it will be excluded from notification if it is excluded (in its entirety) under any of those classes of development. It need not be excluded under all applicable classes of development.

Where a development involves multiple performance assessed elements, all performance assessed elements will require notification (regardless of whether one or more elements are excluded in the applicable notification table) unless every performance assessed element of the application is excluded in the applicable notification table, in which case the application will not require notification.

A relevant authority may determine that a variation to 1 or more corresponding exclusions prescribed in Column B is minor in nature and does not require notification.

Class of Development	Exceptions
(Column A)	(Column B)
1. Development which, in the opinion of the relevant authority, is of a minor nature only and will not unreasonably impact on the owners or occupiers of land in the locality of the site of the development.	None specified.
 2. All development undertaken by: (a) the South Australian Housing Trust either individually or jointly with other persons or bodies or (b) a provider registered under the Community Housing National Law participating in a program relating to the renewal of housing endorsed by the South Australian Housing Trust. 	 Except development involving any of the following: residential flat building(s) of 3 or more building levels the demolition (or partial demolition) of a State or Local Heritage Place (other than an excluded building) the demolition (or partial demolition) of a building in a Historic Area Overlay (other than an excluded building).
 Any development involving any of the following (or of any combination of any of the following): 	Except development that:

	Appendix 1
Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024
 (a) advertisement (b) ancillary accommodation (c) community facility (d) dwelling (e) dwelling addition (f) residential flat building (g) student accommodation. 	 exceeds the maximum building height specified in Business Neighbourhood Zone DTS/DPF 3.1 or is on a Catalyst Site that exceeds the maximum building height in Business Neighbourhood Zone DTS/DPF 3.1 that applies to development not on a Catalyst Site or involves a building wall (or structure) that is proposed to be situated on (or abut) an allotment boundary (not being a boundary with a primary street or secondary street or an excluded boundary) and: (a) the length of the proposed wall (or structure) exceeds 11.5m (other than where the proposed wall abuts an existing wall or structure of greater length on the adjoining allotment) or (b) the height of the proposed wall (or post height) exceeds 3.2m measured from the lower of the natural or finished ground level (other than where the proposed wall abuts an existing wall or structure of greater height on the adjoining allotment).
 4. Any development involving any of the following (or of any combination of any of the following): (a) consulting room (b) office (c) shop. 	 Except development that: 1. does not satisfy Business Neighbourhood Zone DTS/DPF 1.2 or 2. exceeds the maximum building height specified in Business Neighbourhood Zone DTS/DPF 3.1 or 3. is on a Catalyst Site that exceeds the maximum building height in Business Neighbourhood Zone DTS/DPF 3.1 that applies to development not on a Catalyst Site or 4. involves a building wall (or structure) that is proposed to be situated on (or abut) an allotment boundary (not being a boundary with a primary street or secondary street or an excluded boundary) and: (a) the length of the proposed wall (or structure) exceeds 11.5m (other than where the proposed wall abuts an existing wall or structure of greater length on the adjoining allotment) or (b) the height of the proposed wall (or post height) exceeds 3.2m measured from the lower of the natural or finished ground level (other than where the proposed wall abuts an existing wall or structure of greater height on the adjoining allotment).
 5. Any development involving any of the following (or of any combination of any of the following): (a) air handling unit, air conditioning system or exhaust fan (b) carport (c) deck (d) fence (e) internal building work (f) land division (g) outbuilding (h) pergola (i) private bushfire shelter (j) replacement building (k) retaining wall (l) shade sail (m) solar photovoltaic panels (roof mounted) 	None specified.

	Apı	pendix ´	1	
P&D Code	e (in eff	ect) Version 2024.2	20	7/11/2024

Policy24		P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024
(n)	swimming pool or spa pool and associated swimming pool safety features	
(0)	temporary accommodation in an area affected by bushfire	
(p)	tree damaging activity	
(q)	verandah	
(r)	water tank.	
6. Demoli	tion.	 Except any of the following: the demolition (or partial demolition) of a State or Local Heritage Place (other than an excluded building) the demolition (or partial demolition) of a building in a Historic Area Overlay (other than an excluded building).
7. Railway	/ line.	Except where located outside of a rail corridor or rail reserve.
Placement of I	Notices - Exemptions for Performance Assessed Deve	lopment
None specified	ł.	
Placement of I	Notices - Exemptions for Restricted Development	
None specified	1.	

Part 3 - Overlays

Airport Building Heights (Regulated) Overlay

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

	Desired Outcome
DO 1	Management of potential impacts of buildings and generated emissions to maintain operational and safety requirements of
	registered and certified commercial and military airfields, airports, airstrips and helicopter landing sites.

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature
Built	Form
PO 1.1 Building height does not pose a hazard to the operation of a certified or registered aerodrome.	DTS/DPF 1.1 Buildings are located outside the area identified as 'All structures' (no height limit is prescribed) and do not exceed the height specified in
	the Airport Building Heights (Regulated) Overlay which applies to the subject site as shown on the SA Property and Planning Atlas.
	In instances where more than one value applies to the site, the lowest value relevant to the site of the proposed development is applicable.

Procedural Matters (PM) - Referrals

The following table identifies classes of development / activities that require referral in this Overlay and the applicable referral body. It sets out the purpose of the referral as well as the relevant statutory reference from Schedule 9 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017.

Class of Development / Activity	Referral Body	Purpose of Referral	Statutory Reference
wolcodod op 19/11/2024	Concreted By Policy24		Daga 7 of

Appendix 1 P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024

Any of the following classes of development:	The airport-operator	To provide expert	Development of a class to which Schedule 9 clause 3
 (a) building located in an area identified as 'All structures' (no height limit is prescribed) or will exceed the height specified in the <i>Airport Building Heights (Regulated) Overlay</i> (b) building comprising exhaust stacks that generates plumes, or may cause plumes to be generated, above a height specified in the <i>Airport Building Heights (Regulated) Overlay.</i> 	airport within the meaning of the <i>Airports Act 1996</i> of the Commonwealth or, if there is no airport-operator company, the Secretary of the Minister responsible for the administration of the <i>Airports Act 1996</i> of the Commonwealth.	to the relevant authority on potential impacts on the safety and operation of aviation activities.	item 1 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017 applies.

Hazards (Flooding – General) Overlay

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

Desired Outcome		
DO 1	Impacts on people, property, infrastructure and the environment from general flood risk are minimised through the	
	appropriate siting and design of development.	

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature	
Flood Resilience		
PO 2.1	DTS/DPF 2.1	
Development is sited, designed and constructed to prevent the entry of floodwaters where the entry of flood waters is likely to result in undue damage to or compromise ongoing activities within buildings.	Habitable buildings, commercial and industrial buildings, and buildings used for animal keeping incorporate a finished ground and floor level not less than: In instances where no finished floor level value is specified, a building incorporates a finished floor level at least 300mm above the height of a 1% AEP flood event.	
Environmen	tal Protection	
PO 3.1	DTS/DPF 3.1	
Buildings and structures used either partly or wholly to contain or store hazardous materials are designed to prevent spills or leaks leaving the confines of the building during a 1% AEP flood event to avoid potential environmental harm.	Development involving the storage or disposal of hazardous materials is wholly located outside of the 1% AEP flood plain or flow path.	

Procedural Matters (PM) - Referrals

The following table identifies classes of development / activities that require referral in this Overlay and the applicable referral body. It sets out the purpose of the referral as well as the relevant statutory reference from Schedule 9 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017.

Class of Development / Activity	Referral Body	Purpose of Referral	Statutory Reference
None	None	None	None

Heritage Adjacency Overlay

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

	Desired Outcome
DO 1	Development adjacent to State and Local Heritage Places maintains the heritage and cultural values of those Places.

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature	
Built	Form	
PO 1.1	DTS/DPF 1.1	
Development adjacent to a State or Local Heritage Place does not dominate, encroach on or unduly impact on the setting of the Place.	None are applicable.	

Procedural Matters (PM) - Referrals

The following table identifies classes of development / activities that require referral in this Overlay and the applicable referral body. It sets out the purpose of the referral as well as the relevant statutory reference from Schedule 9 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017.

Class of Development / Activity	Referral Body	Purpose of Referral	Statutory Reference
Development which in the opinion of the relevant authority materially affects the context within which the State Heritage Place is situated.	Minister responsible for the administration of the <i>Heritage</i> <i>Places Act 1993.</i>	To provide expert assessment and direction to the relevant authority on the potential impacts of development adjacent State Heritage Places.	Development of a class to which Schedule 9 clause 3 item 17 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017 applies.

Traffic Generating Development Overlay

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

Desired Outcome		
DO 1	Safe and efficient operation of Urban Transport Routes and Major Urban Transport Routes for all road users.	
DO 2	Provision of safe and efficient access to and from urban transport routes and major urban transport routes.	

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed to Satisfy (DTS) / Designated Performance Feature (DPF) Criteria

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature
Traffic Generati	ng Development
PO 1.1	DTS/DPF 1.1

	Appendix 1
Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024
Development designed to minimise its potential impact on the safety, efficiency and functional performance of the State Maintained Road	Access is obtained directly from a State Maintained Road where it involves any of the following types of development:
network.	 (a) building, or buildings, containing in excess of 50 dwellings (b) land division creating 50 or more additional allotments (c) commercial development with a gross floor area of 10,000m2 or more (d) retail development with a gross floor area of 2,000m2 or more (e) a warehouse or transport depot with a gross leasable floor area of 8,000m2 or more (f) industry with a gross floor area of 20,000m2 or more (g) educational facilities with a capacity of 250 students or more.
PO 1.2	DTS/DPF 1.2
Access points sited and designed to accommodate the type and volume of traffic likely to be generated by development.	Access is obtained directly from a State Maintained Road where it involves any of the following types of development:
	 (a) building, or buildings, containing in excess of 50 dwellings (b) land division creating 50 or more additional allotments (c) commercial development with a gross floor area of 10,000m2 or more (d) retail development with a gross floor area of 2,000m2 or more (e) a warehouse or transport depot with a gross leasable floor area of 8,000m2 or more (f) industry with a gross floor area of 20,000m2 or more (g) educational facilities with a capacity of 250 students or more.
PO 1.3	DTS/DPF 1.3
Sufficient accessible on-site queuing provided to meet the needs of the development so that queues do not impact on the State Maintained Road network	Access is obtained directly from a State Maintained Road where it involves any of the following types of development:
	 (a) building, or buildings, containing in excess of 50 dwellings (b) land division creating 50 or more additional allotments (c) commercial development with a gross floor area of 10,000m2 or more (d) retail development with a gross floor area of 2,000m2 or more (e) a warehouse or transport depot with a gross leasable floor area of 8,000m2 or more (f) industry with a gross floor area of 20,000m2 or more (g) educational facilities with a capacity of 250 students or more.

Procedural Matters (PM) - Referrals

The following table identifies classes of development / activities that require referral in this Overlay and the applicable referral body. It sets out the purpose of the referral as well as the relevant statutory reference from Schedule 9 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017.

Class of Development / Activity	Referral Body	Purpose of Referral	Statutory Reference
Except where all of the relevant deemed-to-satisfy	Commissioner of Highways.	To provide expert technical	Development
criteria are met, any of the following classes of		assessment and direction to	of a class to
development that are proposed within 250m of a State		the Relevant Authority on the	which
Maintained Road:		safe and efficient operation and	Schedule 9

Appendix 1 P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024

(a)	except where a proposed development has	management of all roads relevant to the Commissioner	clause 3 item 7 of the
	previously been referred under clause (b) - a building or buildings, containing in overse of 50	of Highways as described in the	Planning,
	dwellings	Planning and Design Code.	Development and
(b)	except where a proposed development has		Infrastructure
	division creating 50 or more additional		(General)
	allotments		Regulations
(c)	commercial development with a gross floor area of 10,000m ² or more		2017 applies.
(d)	retail development with a gross floor area of		
	2,000m ² or more		
(e)	a warehouse or transport depot with a gross		
	leasable floor area of 8,000m ² or more		
(f)	industry with a gross floor area of 20,000m ² or more		
(g)	educational facilities with a capacity of 250 students or more.		

Part 4 - General Development Policies

Clearance from Overhead Powerlines

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

olicy24

	Desired Outcome
DO 1	Protection of human health and safety when undertaking development in the vicinity of overhead transmission powerlines.

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature
PO 1.1	DTS/DPF 1.1
Buildings are adequately separated from aboveground powerlines to minimise potential hazard to people and property.	One of the following is satisfied:
	 (a) a declaration is provided by or on behalf of the applicant to the effect that the proposal would not be contrary to the regulations prescribed for the purposes of section 86 of the <i>Electricity Act 1996</i>
	(b) there are no aboveground powerlines adjoining the site that are the subject of the proposed development.

Design in Urban Areas

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

	Desired Outcome
DO 1	Development is:

		Appendix 1
Policy24		P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/202
	(a)	contextual - by considering, recognising and carefully responding to its natural surroundings or built environment and positively contributing to the character of the locality
	(b)	durable - fit for purpose, adaptable and long lasting
	(c)	inclusive - by integrating landscape design to optimise pedestrian and cyclist usability, privacy and equitable access and promoting the provision of quality spaces integrated with the public realm that can be used for access and recreation and help optimise security and safety both internally and within the public realm, for occupants and visitors
	(d)	sustainable - by integrating sustainable techniques into the design and siting of development and landscaping to improve community health, urban heat, water management, environmental performance, biodiversity and local amenity and to minimise energy consumption.

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature
All Deve	elopment
External A	Appearance
PO 1.1	DTS/DPF 1.1
Buildings reinforce corners through changes in setback, articulation, materials, colour and massing (including height, width, bulk, roof form and slope).	None are applicable.
PO 1.2	DTS/DPF 1.2
Where zero or minor setbacks are desirable, development provides shelter over footpaths (in the form of verandahs, awnings, canopies and the like, with adequate lighting) to positively contribute to the walkability, comfort and safety of the public realm.	None are applicable.
PO 1.3	DTS/DPF 1.3
Building elevations facing the primary street (other than ancillary buildings) are designed and detailed to convey purpose, identify main access points and complement the streetscape.	None are applicable.
PO 1.4	DTS/DPF 1.4
Plant, exhaust and intake vents and other technical equipment are integrated into the building design to minimise visibility from the public realm and negative impacts on residential amenity by:	Development does not incorporate any structures that protrude beyond the roofline.
 (a) positioning plant and equipment discretely, in unobtrusive locations as viewed from public roads and spaces (b) screening rooftop plant and equipment from view (c) when located on the roof of non-residential development, locating the plant and equipment as far as practicable from adjacent sensitive land uses. 	
PO 1.5	DTS/DPF 1.5
The negative visual impact of outdoor storage, waste management, loading and service areas is minimised by integrating them into the building design and screening them from public view (such as fencing, landscaping and built form), taking into account the form of development contemplated in the relevant zone.	None are applicable.
Sa	fety
PO 2.1	DTS/DPF 2.1
Development maximises opportunities for passive surveillance of the public realm by providing clear lines of sight, appropriate lighting and the use of visually permeable screening wherever practicable.	None are applicable.
PO 2.2	DTS/DPF 2.2
Development is designed to differentiate public, communal and private areas.	None are applicable.

Appendix 1

Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024
PO 2.3	DTS/DPF 2.3
Buildings are designed with safe, perceptible and direct access from public street frontages and vehicle parking areas.	None are applicable.
PO 2.4	DTS/DPF 2.4
Development at street level is designed to maximise opportunities for passive surveillance of the adjacent public realm.	None are applicable.
PO 2.5	DTS/DPF 2.5
Common areas and entry points of buildings (such as the foyer areas of residential buildings) and non-residential land uses at street level, maximise passive surveillance from the public realm to the inside of the building at night.	None are applicable.
Lands	caping
PO 3.1	DTS/DPF 3.1
Soft landscaping and tree planting are incorporated to:	None are applicable.
 (a) minimise heat absorption and reflection (b) maximise shade and shelter (c) maximise stormwater infiltration (d) enhance the appearance of land and streetscapes. 	
Environmenta	l Performance
PO 4.1	DTS/DPF 4.1
Buildings are sited, oriented and designed to maximise natural sunlight access and ventilation to main activity areas, habitable rooms, common areas and open spaces.	None are applicable.
PO 4.2	DTS/DPF 4.2
Buildings are sited and designed to maximise passive environmental performance and minimise energy consumption and reliance on mechanical systems, such as heating and cooling.	None are applicable.
PO 4.3	DTS/DPF 4.3
Buildings incorporate climate responsive techniques and features such as building and window orientation, use of eaves, verandahs and shading structures, water harvesting, at ground landscaping, green walls, green roofs and photovoltaic cells.	None are applicable.
On-site Waste Tr	eatment Systems
PO 6.1	DTS/DPF 6.1
Dedicated on-site effluent disposal areas do not include any areas to be used for, or could be reasonably foreseen to be used for, private	Effluent disposal drainage areas do not:
open space, driveways or car parking.	 (a) encroach within an area used as private open space or result in less private open space than that specified in Design in Urban Areas Table 1 - Private Open Space (b) use an area also used as a driveway (c) encroach within an area used for on-site car parking or result in less on-site car parking than that specified in Transport, Access and Parking Table 1 - General Off-Street Car Parking Requirements or Table 2 - Off-Street Car Parking Requirements in Designated Areas.
Car parking	appearance
PO 7.1	DTS/DPF 7.1
Development facing the street is designed to minimise the negative impacts of any semi-basement and undercroft car parking on streetscapes through techniques such as: (a) limiting protrusion above finished ground level	None are applicable.

	Appendix 1
Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/202
 (b) screening through appropriate planting, fencing and mounding (c) limiting the width of openings and integrating them into the building structure. 	
PO 7.2 Vehicle parking areas appropriately located, designed and constructed to minimise impacts on adjacent sensitive receivers through measures such as ensuring they are attractively developed and landscaped, screen fenced and the like.	DTS/DPF 7.2 None are applicable.
PO 7.3 Safe, legible, direct and accessible pedestrian connections are provided between parking areas and the development.	DTS/DPF 7.3 None are applicable.
PO 7.4 Street-level vehicle parking areas incorporate tree planting to provide shade, reduce solar heat absorption and reflection.	DTS/DPF 7.4 Vehicle parking areas that are open to the sky and comprise 10 or more car parking spaces include a shade tree with a mature canopy o 4m diameter spaced for each 10 car parking spaces provided and a landscaped strip on any road frontage of a minimum dimension of 1m.
PO 7.5 Street level parking areas incorporate soft landscaping to improve visual appearance when viewed from within the site and from public places.	DTS/DPF 7.5 Vehicle parking areas comprising 10 or more car parking spaces include soft landscaping with a minimum dimension of: (a) 1m along all public road frontages and allotment boundaries (b) 1m between double rows of car parking spaces.
PO 7.6 Vehicle parking areas and associated driveways are landscaped to provide shade and positively contribute to amenity.	DTS/DPF 7.6 None are applicable.
PO 7.7 Vehicle parking areas and access ways incorporate integrated stormwater management techniques such as permeable or porous surfaces, infiltration systems, drainage swales or rain gardens that integrate with soft landscaping.	DTS/DPF 7.7 None are applicable.
Earthworks a	nd sloping land
PO 8.1 Development, including any associated driveways and access tracks, minimises the need for earthworks to limit disturbance to natural topography.	 DTS/DPF 8.1 Development does not involve any of the following: (a) excavation exceeding a vertical height of 1m (b) filling exceeding a vertical height of 1m (c) a total combined excavation and filling vertical height of 2m or more.
PO 8.2 Driveways and access tracks designed and constructed to allow safe and convenient access on sloping land.	DTS/DPF 8.2 Driveways and access tracks on sloping land (with a gradient exceeding 1 in 8) satisfy (a) and (b): (a) do not have a gradient exceeding 25% (1-in-4) at any point along the driveway (b) are constructed with an all-weather trafficable surface.
PO 8.3 Driveways and access tracks on sloping land (with a gradient exceeding 1 in 8):	DTS/DPF 8.3 None are applicable.
(a) do not contribute to the instability of embankments and cuttings	

	Appendix 1
Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024
 (b) provide level transition areas for the safe movement of people and goods to and from the development (c) are designed to integrate with the natural topography of the land. 	
PO 8.4 Development on sloping land (with a gradient exceeding 1 in 8) avoids the alteration of natural drainage lines and includes on site drainage systems to minimise erosion.	DTS/DPF 8.4 None are applicable.
PO 8.5 Development does not occur on land at risk of landslip or increase the potential for landslip or land surface instability.	DTS/DPF 8.5 None are applicable.
Overlooking / Visual Pr	ivacy (low rise buildings)
PO 10.1 Development mitigates direct overlooking from upper level windows to habitable rooms and private open spaces of adjoining residential uses in neighbourhood-type zones.	 DTS/DPF 10.1 Upper level windows facing side or rear boundaries shared with a residential use in a neighbourhood-type zone: (a) are permanently obscured to a height of 1.5m above finished floor level and are fixed or not capable of being opened more than 125mm (b) have sill heights greater than or equal to 1.5m above finished floor level (c) incorporate screening with a maximum of 25% openings, permanently fixed no more than 500mm from the window surface and sited adjacent to any part of the window less than 1.5 m above the finished floor level.
PO 10.2 Development mitigates direct overlooking from balconies to habitable rooms and private open space of adjoining residential uses in neighbourhood type zones.	 DTS/DPF 10.2 One of the following is satisfied: (a) the longest side of the balcony or terrace will face a public road, public road reserve or public reserve that is at least 15m wide in all places faced by the balcony or terrace or (b) all sides of balconies or terraces on upper building levels are permanently obscured by screening with a maximum 25% transparency/openings fixed to a minimum height of: (i) 1.5m above finished floor level where the balcony is located at least 15 metres from the nearest habitable window of a dwelling on adjacent land or (ii) 1.7m above finished floor level in all other cases
PO 11.1 Development provides a dedicated area for on-site collection and sorting of recyclable materials and refuse, green organic waste and wash bay facilities for the ongoing maintenance of bins that is adequate in size considering the number and nature of the activities they will serve and the frequency of collection.	DTS/DPF 11.1 None are applicable.
PO 11.2 Communal waste storage and collection areas are located, enclosed and designed to be screened from view from the public domain, open space and dwellings.	DTS/DPF 11.2 None are applicable.
PO 11.3 Communal waste storage and collection areas are designed to be well ventilated and located away from habitable rooms.	DTS/DPF 11.3 None are applicable.
PO 11.4 Communal waste storage and collection areas are designed to allow waste and recycling collection vehicles to enter and leave the site without reversing.	DTS/DPF 11.4 None are applicable.
PO 11.5	DTS/DPF 11.5

	Appendix 1
Policy24 For mixed use developments, non-residential waste and recycling storage areas and access provide opportunities for on-site management of food waste through composting or other waste recovery as appropriate	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/202 None are applicable.
All Development - N	Aedium and High Rise
External /	Appearance
PO 12.1	DTS/DPF 12.1
Buildings positively contribute to the character of the local area by responding to local context.	None are applicable.
PO 12.2	DTS/DPF 12.2
Architectural detail at street level and a mixture of materials at lower building levels near the public interface are provided to reinforce a human scale.	None are applicable.
PO 12.3	DTS/DPF 12.3
Buildings are designed to reduce visual mass by breaking up building elevations into distinct elements.	None are applicable.
PO 12.4	DTS/DPF 12.4
Boundary walls visible from public land include visually interesting treatments to break up large blank elevations.	None are applicable.
PO 12.5	DTS/DPF 12.5
External materials and finishes are durable and age well to minimise ongoing maintenance requirements.	Buildings utilise a combination of the following external materials and finishes:
	 (a) masonry (b) natural stone (c) pre-finished materials that minimise staining, discolouring or deterioration.
PO 12.6	DTS/DPF 12.6
Street-facing building elevations are designed to provide attractive, high quality and pedestrian-friendly street frontages.	 Building street frontages incorporate: (a) active uses such as shops or offices (b) prominent entry areas for multi-storey buildings (where it is a common entry) (c) habitable rooms of dwellings (d) areas of communal public realm with public art or the like, where consistent with the zone and/or subzone provisions.
PO 12.7 Entrances to multi-storey buildings are safe, attractive, welcoming, functional and contribute to streetscape character.	 DTS/DPF 12.7 Entrances to multi-storey buildings are: (a) oriented towards the street (b) clearly visible and easily identifiable from the street and vehicle parking areas (c) designed to be prominent, accentuated and a welcoming feature if there are no active or occupied ground floor uses (d) designed to provide shelter, a sense of personal address and transitional space around the entry (e) located as close as practicable to the lift and / or lobby access to minimise the need for long access corridors (f) designed to avoid the creation of potential areas of entrapment.
PO 12.8 Building services, plant and mechanical equipment are screened from	DTS/DPF 12.8 None are applicable.
the public realm.	scaping
Land	scaping

	A	рр	endix	x 1	
P&D Cod	e (in	effect	t) Version 2	024.20	7/11/2024

Policy24		P&D Code (i	n effect) Versio	n 2024.20 7/11/202			
PO 13.1 Development facing a street provides a well landscaped area that contains a deep soil space to accommodate a tree of a species and size adequate to provide shade, contribute to tree canopy targets and soften the appearance of buildings.	DTS/DPF 13.1 Buildings provide a 4m by 4m deep soil space in front of the building that accommodates a medium to large tree, except where no building setback from front property boundaries is desired.						
PO 13.2	DTS/DPF 13.2						
Deep soil zones are provided to retain existing vegetation or provide areas that can accommodate new deep root vegetation, including tall trees with large canopies to provide shade and soften the appearance of multi-storey buildings	Multi-storey dev trees at not less where full site c	Multi-storey development provides deep soil zones and incorporates rees at not less than the following rates, except in a location or zone where full site coverage is desired.					
	Site area	Minimum deep soil area	Minimum dimension	Tree / deep soil zones			
	<300 m ²	10 m ²	1.5m	1 small tree / 10 m ²			
	300-1500 m ²	7% site area	3m	1 medium tree / 30 m ²			
	>1500 m ²	7% site area	6m	1 large or medium tree / 60 m ²			
	Tree size and	site area definitio	e area definitions				
	Small tree	4-6m mature he	ight and 2-4m ca	anopy spread			
	Medium tree	6-12m mature h	eight and 4-8m	canopy spread			
	Large tree	12m mature hei	ght and >8m car	nopy spread			
	Site area	The total area fo area per dwellin	er development s g	site, not average			
PO 13.3 Deep soil zones with access to natural light are provided to assist in maintaining vegetation health.	DTS/DPF 13.3 None are applicable.						
 PO 13.4	DTS/DPF 13.4						
Unless separated by a public road or reserve, development sites adjacent to any zone that has a primary purpose of accommodating low-rise residential development incorporate a deep soil zone along the common boundary to enable medium to large trees to be retained or established to assist in screening new buildings of 3 or more building levels in height.	Building elements of 3 or more building levels in height are set back at least 6m from a zone boundary in which a deep soil zone area is incorporated.						
Enviro	nmental						
PO 14.1	DTS/DPF 14.1						
Development minimises detrimental micro-climatic impacts on adjacent land and buildings.	None are applicable.						
PO 14.2	DTS/DPF 14.2						
Development incorporates sustainable design techniques and features such as window orientation, eaves and shading structures, water harvesting and use, green walls and roof designs that enable the provision of rain water tanks (where they are not provided elsewhere on site), green roofs and photovoltaic cells.	None are applicable.						
PO 14.3	DTS/DPF 14.3						
Development of 5 or more building levels, or 21m or more in height (as measured from natural ground level and excluding roof-mounted	None are applicable.						

	Appendix 1
Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/202
mechanical plant and equipment) is designed to minimise the impacts of wind through measures such as:	
 (a) a podium at the base of a tall tower and aligned with the street to deflect wind away from the street (b) substantial verandahs around a building to deflect downward travelling wind flows over pedestrian areas 	
 (c) the placement of buildings and use of setbacks to deflect the wind at ground level (d) availating tall about almost protections that ground it is an almost protection. 	
(d) avoiding tall shear elevations that create windy conditions at street level.	
Car P	arking
PO 15.1	DTS/DPF 15.1
Multi-level vehicle parking structures are designed to contribute to active street frontages and complement neighbouring buildings.	 Multi-level vehicle parking structures within buildings: (a) provide land uses such as commercial, retail or other non-car parking uses along ground floor street frontages (b) incorporate facade treatments in building elevations facing along major street frontages that are sufficiently enclosed and detailed to complement adjacent buildings.
PO 15.2	DTS/DPF 15.2
Multi-level vehicle parking structures within buildings complement the surrounding built form in terms of height, massing and scale.	None are applicable.
Overlooking	Visual Privacy
PO 16.1	DTS/DPF 16.1
Development mitigates direct overlooking of habitable rooms and private open spaces of adjacent residential uses in neighbourhood- type zones through measures such as:	None are applicable.
 (a) appropriate site layout and building orientation (b) off-setting the location of balconies and windows of habitable rooms or areas with those of other buildings so that views are oblique rather than direct to avoid direct line of sight (c) building setbacks from boundaries (including building boundary to boundary where appropriate) that interrupt views or that provide a spatial separation between balconies or windows of habitable rooms (d) screening devices that are integrated into the building design and have minimal negative effect on residents' or neighbours' amenity. 	
All non-residen	tial development
Water Sens	sitive Design
PO 42.1	DTS/DPF 42.1
Development likely to result in risk of export of sediment, suspended solids, organic matter, nutrients, oil and grease include stormwater management systems designed to minimise pollutants entering stormwater.	None are applicable.
PO 42.2	DTS/DPF 42.2
Water discharged from a development site is of a physical, chemical and biological condition equivalent to or better than its pre-developed state.	None are applicable.
PO 42.3	DTS/DPF 42.3
Development includes stormwater management systems to mitigate peak flows and manage the rate and duration of stormwater discharges from the site to ensure that development does not increase peak flows in downstream systems.	None are applicable.

	Wash-down and Wast	Loading and Unloading
PO 43.1		DTS/DPF 43.1
Areas f refuse areas u	or activities including loading and unloading, storage of waste bins in commercial and industrial development or wash-down used for the cleaning of vehicles, plant or equipment are:	None are applicable.
(a) (b) (c) (d)	 designed to contain all wastewater likely to pollute stormwater within a bunded and roofed area to exclude the entry of external surface stormwater run-off paved with an impervious material to facilitate wastewater collection of sufficient size to prevent 'splash-out' or 'over-spray' of wastewater from the wash-down area are designed to drain wastewater to either: (i) a treatment device such as a sediment trap and coalescing plate oil separator with subsequent disposal to a sewer, private or Community Wastewater Management Scheme or (ii) a holding tank and its subsequent removal off-site on a regular basis. 	
	Laneway [evelopment
	Infrastructu	re and Access
PO 44.1 Develo right of	ppment with a primary street comprising a laneway, alley, lane, f way or similar minor thoroughfare only occurs where:	DTS/DPF 44.1 Development with a primary street frontage that is not an alley, lane, right of way or similar public thoroughfare.
(a)	existing utility infrastructure and services are capable of accommodating the development	
(b)	the primary street can support access by emergency and regular service vehicles (such as waste collection)	
(c)	it does not require the provision or upgrading of infrastructure on public land (such as footpaths and stormwater management systems)	
(d)	safety of pedestrians or vehicle movement is maintained	
(e)	any necessary grade transition is accommodated within the site of the development to support an appropriate development intensity and orderly development of land fronting minor thoroughfares.	

Interface between Land Uses

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

	Desired Outcome
DO 1	Development is located and designed to mitigate adverse effects on or from neighbouring and proximate land uses.

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature
Hours of	Operation
PO 2.1	DTS/DPF 2.1
Non-residential development does not unreasonably impact the	Development operating within the following hours:

Policy24

Appendix 1 P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024

 amenity of sensitive receivers (or lawfully approved sensitive receivers) or an adjacent zone primarily for sensitive receivers through its hours of operation having regard to: (a) the nature of the development (b) measures to mitigate off-site impacts (c) the extent to which the development is desired in the zone (d) measures that might be taken in an adjacent zone primarily for sensitive receivers that mitigate adverse impacts without unreasonably compromising the intended use of that land. 	Class of DevelopmentHours of operationConsulting room7am to 9pm, Monday to Friday 8am to 5pm, SaturdayOffice7am to 9pm, Monday to Friday 8am to 5pm, SaturdayOffice7am to 9pm, Monday to Friday 8am to 5pm, SaturdayShop, other than any one or combination of the following:7am to 9pm, Monday to Friday 8am to 5pm, Saturday(a)restaurant (b)cellar door in the Productive Rural Landscape Zone, Rural Zone or Rural Horticulture Zone7am to 9pm, Saturday and Sunday	
Oversh	adowing	
PO 31	DTS/DPE 3 1	
Overshadowing of habitable room windows of adjacent residential land uses in: a. a neighbourhood-type zone is minimised to maintain access to direct winter sunlight b. other zones is managed to enable access to direct winter sunlight.	DTS/DPF 3.1 North-facing windows of habitable rooms of adjacent residential land uses in a neighbourhood-type zone receive at least 3 hours of direct sunlight between 9.00am and 3.00pm on 21 June.	
PO 3.2	DTS/DPF 3.2	
Overshadowing of the primary area of private open space or communal open space of adjacent residential land uses in: a. a neighbourhood type zone is minimised to maintain access to direct winter sunlight b. other zones is managed to enable access to direct winter sunlight.	 Development maintains 2 hours of direct sunlight between 9.00 am and 3.00 pm on 21 June to adjacent residential land uses in a neighbourhood-type zone in accordance with the following: a. for ground level private open space, the smaller of the following: i. half the existing ground level open space or ii. 35m2 of the existing ground level open space (with at least one of the area's dimensions measuring 2.5m) b. for ground level communal open space, at least half of the existing ground level open space. 	
PO 3.3	DTS/DPF 3.3	
Development does not unduly reduce the generating capacity of adjacent rooftop solar energy facilities taking into account: (a) the form of development contemplated in the zone (b) the orientation of the solar energy facilities	None are applicable.	
 (c) the extent to which the solar energy facilities are already overshadowed. 		
Activities Generatir	g Noise or Vibration	
PO 4.1	DTS/DPF 4.1	
Development that emits noise (other than music) does not unreasonably impact the amenity of sensitive receivers (or lawfully approved sensitive receivers).	Noise that affects sensitive receivers achieves the relevant Environment Protection (Commercial and Industrial Noise) Policy criteria.	
PO 4.2	DTS/DPF 4.2	

Appendix 1 28D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/202

Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024
 Areas for the on-site manoeuvring of service and delivery vehicles, plant and equipment, outdoor work spaces (and the like) are designed and sited to not unreasonably impact the amenity of adjacent sensitive receivers (or lawfully approved sensitive receivers) and zones primarily intended to accommodate sensitive receivers due to noise and vibration by adopting techniques including: (a) locating openings of buildings and associated services away from the interface with the adjacent sensitive receivers and zones primarily intended to accommodate sensitive receivers (b) when sited outdoors, locating such areas as far as practicable from adjacent sensitive receivers and zones primarily intended to accommodate sensitive receivers (c) housing plant and equipment within an enclosed structure or acoustic enclosure (d) providing a suitable acoustic barrier between the plant and / or equipment and the adjacent sensitive receiver boundary or zone. 	None are applicable.
PO 4.5 Outdoor areas associated with licensed premises (such as beer gardens or dining areas) are designed and/or sited to not cause unreasonable noise impact on existing adjacent sensitive receivers (or lawfully approved sensitive receivers).	DTS/DPF 4.5 None are applicable.
PO 4.6 Development incorporating music achieves suitable acoustic amenity when measured at the boundary of an adjacent sensitive receiver (or lawfully approved sensitive receiver) or zone primarily intended to accommodate sensitive receivers.	DTS/DPF 4.6Development incorporating music includes noise attenuation measures that will achieve the following noise levels:Assessment locationMusic noise levelExternally at the nearest existing or envisaged noise sensitive locationLess than 8dB above the level of background noise (L90,15min) in any octave band of the sound spectrum (LOCT10,15 < LOCT90,15 + 8dB)
 Air Q	uality
 PO 5.2 Development that includes chimneys or exhaust flues (including cafes, restaurants and fast food outlets) is designed to minimise nuisance or adverse health impacts to sensitive receivers (or lawfully approved sensitive receivers) by: (a) incorporating appropriate treatment technology before exhaust emissions are released (b) locating and designing chimneys or exhaust flues to maximise the dispersion of exhaust emissions, taking into account the location of sensitive receivers. 	DTS/DPF 5.2 None are applicable.
Light	Spill
PO 6.1 External lighting is positioned and designed to not cause unreasonable light spill impact on adjacent sensitive receivers (or lawfully approved sensitive receivers).	DTS/DPF 6.1 None are applicable.
Solar Reflec	tivity / Glare
PO 7.1 Development is designed and comprised of materials and finishes that do not unreasonably cause a distraction to adjacent road users and pedestrian areas or unreasonably cause heat loading and micro- climatic impacts on adjacent buildings and land uses as a result of reflective solar glare.	DTS/DPF 7.1 None are applicable.

Out of Activity Centre Development

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

	Desired Outcome
DO1	The role of Activity Centres in contributing to the form and pattern of development and enabling equitable and convenient access
	to a range of shopping, administrative, cultural, entertainment and other facilities in a single trip is maintained and reinforced.

Performance Outcomes and Deemed to Satisfy / Designated Performance Outcome Criteria

	Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature
PO 1.1		DTS/DPF 1.1
Non-re type th	sidential development outside Activity Centres of a scale and at does not diminish the role of Activity Centres:	None are applicable.
(a)	as primary locations for shopping, administrative, cultural, entertainment and community services	
(b)	as a focus for regular social and business gatherings	
(c)	in contributing to or maintaining a pattern of development that supports equitable community access to services and facilities.	
PO 1.2		DTS/DPF 1.2
Out-of Activity	activity centre non-residential development complements Centres through the provision of services and facilities:	None are applicable.
(a)	that support the needs of local residents and workers, particularly in underserviced locations	
(b)	at the edge of Activities Centres where they cannot readily be accommodated within an existing Activity Centre to expand the range of services on offer and support the role of the Activity Centre.	

Site Contamination

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

	Desired Outcome
DO 1	Ensure land is suitable for the proposed use in circumstances where it is, or may have been, subject to site contamination.

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature
PO 1.1	DTS/DPF 1.1
Ensure land is suitable for use when land use changes to a more sensitive use.	 Development satisfies (a), (b), (c) or (d): (a) does not involve a change in the use of land (b) involves a change in the use of land that does not constitute a change to a more sensitive use

			Appendix 1
Policy24		l	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024
	(c) (d)	involves a cha land at which demonstrate involves a cha land at which demonstrate satisfies both (i) a site unde relati state A. B. C. (ii) and (iii) a site unde relati state A.	ange in the use of land to a more sensitive use on a site contamination is unlikely to exist (as d in a site contamination declaration form) ange in the use of land to a more sensitive use on a site contamination exists, or may exist (as d in a site contamination declaration form), and o of the following: contamination audit report has been prepared r Part 10A of the <i>Environment Protection Act 1993</i> in on to the land within the previous 5 years which s that- site contamination does not exist (or no longer exists) at the land or the land is suitable for the proposed use or range of uses (without the need for any further remediation) or where remediation is, or remains, necessary for the proposed use (or range of uses), remediation work has been carried out or will be carried out (and the applicant has provided a written undertaking that the remediation works will be implemented in association with the development)

Transport, Access and Parking

Assessment Provisions (AP)

Desired Outcome (DO)

	Desired Outcome
DO 1	A comprehensive, integrated and connected transport system that is safe, sustainable, efficient, convenient and accessible to all
	users.

Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

Performance Outcome	Deemed-to-Satisfy Criteria / Designated Performance Feature	
Movement Systems		
PO 1.2 Development is designed to discourage commercial and industrial vehicle movements through residential streets and adjacent other sensitive receivers.	DTS/DPF 1.2 None are applicable.	
PO 1.4 Development is sited and designed so that loading, unloading and turning of all traffic avoids interrupting the operation of and queuing on public roads and pedestrian paths.	DTS/DPF 1.4 All vehicle manoeuvring occurs onsite.	
Sightlines		
PO 2.1 Sightlines at intersections, pedestrian and cycle crossings, and	DTS/DPF 2.1 None are applicable.	

	Appendix 1
Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024
crossovers to allotments for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians are maintained or enhanced to ensure safety for all road users and pedestrians.	
PO 2.2 Walls, fencing and landscaping adjacent to driveways and corner sites are designed to provide adequate sightlines between vehicles and pedestrians.	DTS/DPF 2.2 None are applicable.
Vehicle	Access
PO 3.1 Safe and convenient access minimises impact or interruption on the operation of public roads.	 DTS/DPF 3.1 The access is: (a) provided via a lawfully existing or authorised driveway or access point or an access point for which consent has been granted as part of an application for the division of land or (b) not located within 6m of an intersection of 2 or more roads or a pedestrian activated crossing.
PO 3.2 Development incorporating vehicular access ramps ensures vehicles can enter and exit a site safely and without creating a hazard to pedestrians and other vehicular traffic.	DTS/DPF 3.2 None are applicable.
PO 3.3 Access points are sited and designed to accommodate the type and volume of traffic likely to be generated by the development or land use.	DTS/DPF 3.3 None are applicable.
PO 3.4 Access points are sited and designed to minimise any adverse impacts on neighbouring properties.	DTS/DPF 3.4 None are applicable.
PO 3.5 Access points are located so as not to interfere with street trees, existing street furniture (including directional signs, lighting, seating and weather shelters) or infrastructure services to maintain the appearance of the streetscape, preserve local amenity and minimise disruption to utility infrastructure assets.	 DTS/DPF 3.5 Vehicle access to designated car parking spaces satisfy (a) or (b): (a) is provided via a lawfully existing or authorised access point or an access point for which consent has been granted as part of an application for the division of land (b) where newly proposed, is set back: (i) 0.5m or more from any street furniture, street pole, infrastructure services pit, or other stormwater or utility infrastructure unless consent is provided from the asset owner (ii) 2m or more from the base of the trunk of a street tree unless consent is provided from the tree owner for a lesser distance (iii) 6m or more from the tangent point of an intersection of 2 or more roads (iv) outside of the marked lines or infrastructure dedicating a pedestrian crossing.
PO 3.6 Driveways and access points are separated and minimised in number to optimise the provision of on-street visitor parking (where on-street parking is appropriate).	DTS/DPF 3.6 Driveways and access points: (a) for sites with a frontage to a public road of 20m or less, one access point no greater than 3.5m in width is provided (b) for sites with a frontage to a public road greater than 20m: (i) a single access point no greater than 6m in width is provided or (ii) not more than two access points with a width of 3.5m each are provided.

Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024
PO 3.7 Access points are appropriately separated from level crossings to avoid interference and ensure their safe ongoing operation.	DTS/DPF 3.7 Development does not involve a new or modified access or cause an increase in traffic through an existing access that is located within the following distance from a railway crossing: (a) 80 km/h road - 110m (b) 70 km/h road - 90m (c) 60 km/h road - 70m
	(d) 50km/h or less road - 50m.
PO 3.8 Driveways, access points, access tracks and parking areas are designed and constructed to allow adequate movement and manoeuvrability having regard to the types of vehicles that are reasonably anticipated.	DTS/DPF 3.8 None are applicable.
PO 3.9 Development is designed to ensure vehicle circulation between activity areas occurs within the site without the need to use public roads.	DTS/DPF 3.9 None are applicable.
Access for Peop	le with Disabilities
PO 4.1	DTS/DPF 4.1
Development is sited and designed to provide safe, dignified and convenient access for people with a disability.	None are applicable.
Vehicle Pa	Irking Rates
PO 5.1	DTS/DPF 5.1
 Sufficient on-site vehicle parking and specifically marked accessible car parking places are provided to meet the needs of the development or land use having regard to factors that may support a reduced on-site rate such as: (a) availability of on-street car parking (b) shared use of other parking areas (c) in relation to a mixed-use development, where the hours of operation of commercial activities complement the residential use of the site, the provision of vehicle parking may be shared (d) the adaptive reuse of a State or Local Heritage Place. 	 Development provides a number of car parking spaces on-site at a rate no less than the amount calculated using one of the following, whichever is relevant: (a) Transport, Access and Parking Table 2 - Off-Street Vehicle Parking Requirements in Designated Areas if the development is a class of development listed in Table 2 and the site is in a Designated Area (b) Transport, Access and Parking Table 1 - General Off-Street Car Parking Requirements where (a) does not apply (c) if located in an area where a lawfully established carparking fund operates, the number of spaces calculated under (a) or (b) less the number of spaces offset by contribution to the fund.
Vehicle Pa	irking Areas
PO 6.1 Vehicle parking areas are sited and designed to minimise impact on the operation of public roads by avoiding the use of public roads when moving from one part of a parking area to another.	DTS/DPF 6.1 Movement between vehicle parking areas within the site can occur without the need to use a public road.
PO 6.2 Vehicle parking areas are appropriately located, designed and constructed to minimise impacts on adjacent sensitive receivers through measures such as ensuring they are attractively developed and landscaped, screen fenced, and the like.	DTS/DPF 6.2 None are applicable.
PO 6.3 Vehicle parking areas are designed to provide opportunity for integration and shared-use of adjacent car parking areas to reduce the total extent of vehicle parking areas and access points.	DTS/DPF 6.3 None are applicable.
Appendix 1

Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024
PO 6.4	DTS/DPF 6.4
Pedestrian linkages between parking areas and the development are provided and are safe and convenient.	None are applicable.
PO 6.5	DTS/DPF 6.5
Vehicle parking areas that are likely to be used during non-daylight hours are provided with sufficient lighting to entry and exit points to ensure clear visibility to users.	None are applicable.
PO 6.6	DTS/DPF 6.6
Loading areas and designated parking spaces for service vehicles are provided within the boundary of the site.	Loading areas and designated parking spaces are wholly located within the site.
Undercroft and Below Ground C	Saraging and Parking of Vehicles
PO 7.1	DTS/DPF 7.1
Undercroft and below ground garaging of vehicles is designed to enable safe entry and exit from the site without compromising pedestrian or cyclist safety or causing conflict with other vehicles.	None are applicable.
Bicycle Parking in	Designated Areas
PO 9.1	DTS/DPF 9.1
The provision of adequately sized on-site bicycle parking facilities encourages cycling as an active transport mode.	Areas and / or fixtures are provided for the parking and storage of bicycles at a rate not less than the amount calculated using Transport, Access and Parking Table 3 - Off Street Bicycle Parking Requirements.
PO 9.2 Bicycle parking facilities provide for the secure storage and tethering of bicycles in a place where casual surveillance is possible, is well lit and signed for the safety and convenience of cyclists and deters property theft.	DTS/DPF 9.2 None are applicable.
PO 9.3	DTS/DPF 9.3
Non-residential development incorporates end-of-journey facilities for employees such as showers, changing facilities and secure lockers, and signage indicating the location of the facilities to encourage cycling as a mode of journey-to-work transport.	None are applicable.
Corner	Cut-Offs
PO 10.1	DTS/DPF 10.1
Development is located and designed to ensure drivers can safely turn into and out of public road junctions.	Development does not involve building work, or building work is located wholly outside the land shown as Corner Cut-Off Area in the following diagram:
	Corner Cut- Off Area

Table 1 - General Off-Street Car Parking Requirements

Class of Development	Car Parking Rate (unless varied by Table 2 onwards)
	Where a development comprises more than one development type, then the overall car parking rate will be taken to be the sum of the car parking rates for each development type.
Health Re	elated Uses

Policy24

Table 2 - Off-Street Car Parking Requirements in Designated Areas

	Car Parking Rate		Designated Areas
Where a dev then the ove ca Minimum	elopment comprises erall car parking rate ar parking rates for e number of spaces	more than one development type, will be taken to be the sum of the ach development type. Maximum number of spaces	
	Non-residentia	l development	
Non-residential development 3 spaces per 1 excluding tourist accommodation leasable floor	l00m2 of gross area.	6 spaces per 100m2 of gross leasable floor area.	Strategic Innovation Zone in the City of Burnside, City of Marion or City of Mitcham Strategic Innovation Zone outside the City of Burnside, City of Marion or City of Mitcham when the site is also in a high frequency public transit area Suburban Activity Centre Zone when the site is also in a high frequency public transit area Suburban Business Zone when the site is also in a high frequency public transit area Business Neighbourhood Zone outside of the City of Adelaide when the site is also in a high frequency public transit area Suburban Main Street Zone when the site is also in a high frequency public transit area

Table 3 - Off-Street Bicycle Parking Requirements

Class of	Bicycle Parking Rate		
Development	ere a development comprises more than one development type, then the overall bicycle parking rate will be taken to b the sum of the bicycle parking rates for each development type.		
Consulting room	1 space per 20 employees plus 1 space per 20 consulting rooms for customers.		
Schedule to Table 3	Designated Area	ed Area Relevant part of the State	
		The bicycle parking rate applies to a designated area located in a relevant part of the State described below.	
	All zones	City of Adelaide	
	Business Neighbourhood Zone	Metropolitan Adelaide	
	Strategic Innovation Zone		
	Suburban Activity Centre Zone		
	Suburban Business Zone		
	Suburban Main Street Zone		
	Urban Activity Centre Zone		

	Appendix 1
Policy24	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2024.20 7/11/2024
Urban Corridor (Boulevard) Zone	
Urban Corridor (Business) Zone	
Urban Corridor (Living) Zone	
Urban Corridor (Main Street) Zone	
Urban Neighbourhood Zone	

NORWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE 43 GEORGE ST, NORWOOD, SA 5067





REASON FOR ISSUE FOR PLANNING PLANNING AMENDMENT

REV	DATE
А	08/11/2024
В	06/02/2025

Attachment 1







ROOF PLAN

WALTER ARCHITECTURE INTERIOR DESIGN LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE MASTER PLANNING

REASON FOR ISSUE FOR PLANNING PLANNING AMENDMENT





Attachment 1

-1	たんさん むこうかい かいてい さんごうちょう えいひき さかいがた しつ
1	소작의 사람은 것 것 것 것 같은 사람은 것을 숨지는 것이.
	양소가 많은 것이 같은 것을 물건을 가 많이 많을 수 없다.
	눈가 깨끗을 줄 수가 많은 동네가 가 들었다. 말을 가 들었다.
	승규는 집안에서 집에서 가지 않는 것 같아요. 것은 것을 수 있는데.
ľ	한 방송 것 같은 것 같은 것은 것 같은 것 같은 것 같은 것 같은 것 같은
	문화 같은 소문을 가지 않는 것을 만들었는 것을 것 같이 많다.
	「わくてひ」 ひちょうえん しょうてき ふくしちょうがん ちょうよう ようしょう
-	
	5 5 Y 이상 2 10 5 5 2 10 5 5 5 5 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10
	그렇게 물통을 것 같아. 말한 것 같아. 가지 않는 것 같아.
	수건, 방소, 영양, 가지, 아니는 소가, 양식, 방문, 가지, 가지, 방문, 감독, 감독, 감독, 감독, 감독, 감독, 감독, 감독, 감독, 감독
	승규는 방송을 가슴을 가슴을 가슴을 가슴을 가슴을 다.
1	장 사람은 동안을 위한 것이 있는 것이 같은 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이 없다.
-	옷을 가지 않는 것이 같은 것을 가지 않는 것을 것을 다 없을까?
	호망 있는 다 말에서 한 것이 없는 것이라는 것이다.
Ť	
	같아? 같은 것 같은 집에 가지 않는 것 같아. 것 같아. 것 같아. 말 것 같아. 말 것 같아. 것 같아. 말 것 같아.
Т	그는 것을 잘 다 있는 것을 물러 가지 않는 것이 없다. 것은 것이 없는 것이 없다.
1	제 있다. 성소는 상태는 것은 것 것 같아. 여성은 것 수가 소기
1	PREPRORINEW STATISTICS AND A CONTRACTOR OF STATES
	SUBFACE STATES STATES
	한 문제는 것 같은 것 같
1	
Т	and a station for the state of the
-	
	- REMOVE KERB
1	, 성상, 영상, 전, 영상, 영상, 전, 영상, 영상, 영상, 영상, 영상, 영상, 영상, 영상, 영상, 영상
	이는 영상은 것 같은 것 같은 것 같은 것 같은 것 같은 것 같은 것을 했다.
-	사람이 아이에 가슴 것 같아요. 친구 안 다양이 있는 것
	공연 첫번 감독 승규는 그 소문의 유민이가 있다.
	5 영금 20 5 20 GAA 중 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5
-	- REMOVE SLAB
	ANDRAMP
	가장 집과 사람이 뒤집을 알았다. 영화가 2015년 4월 3월
1	- REMOVE POST BOX
1	– REMOVE POST BOX
1	- REMOVE POST BOX
1	- REMOVE POST BOX
	- REMOVE POST BOX - REMOVE COLUMNS ANT TEMPORARILY PROP AS REQUIRED. PREP FOR NEW STRUCTURE. - CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE - TRENCH FOR NEW SERVICES
	- REMOVE POST BOX - REMOVE COLUMNS ANT TEMPORARILY PROP AS REQUIRED. PREP FOR NEW STRUCTURE. - CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE - TRENCH FOR NEW SERVICES CONNECTIONS
	- REMOVE POST BOX - REMOVE COLUMNS ANT TEMPORARILY PROP AS RÉQUIRED. PREP.FOR NEW STRUCTÜRE. - CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE - TRENCH FOR NEW SERVICES CONNECTIONS
	 REMOVE POST BOX REMOVE COLUMNS ANT REQUIRED. PREP FOR NEW STRUCTURE. CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE TRENCH FOR NEW SERVICES CONNECTIONS
	- REMOVE POST BOX - REMOVE COLUMNS ANT TEMPORARILY PROP AS REQUIRED. PREP.FOR NEW STRUCTURE CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE - TRENCH FOR NEW SERVICES CONNECTIONS
	- REMOVE POST BOX - REMOVE COLUMNS ANT TEMPORARILY PROP AS REQUIRED. PREP FOR NEW STRUCTURE. - CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE - TRENCH FOR NEW SERVICES CONNECTIONS
	- REMOVE POST BOX - REMOVE COLUMNS ANT TEMPORARILY PROP AS REQUIRED. PREP.FOR NEW STRUCTURE. - CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE - TRENCH FOR NEW SERVICES CONNECTIONS
	 REMOVE POST BOX REMOVE COLUMNS ANT REQUIRED. PREP FOR NEW STRUCTÜRE. CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE TRENCH FOR TRENCH FOR TRENCH FOR NEW SERVICES CONNECTIONS
	 REMOVE POST BOX REMOVE COLUMNS ANT REQUIRED. PREP.FOR NEW STRUCTURE. CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE TRENCH FOR NEW SERVICES CONNECTIONS
	 REMOVE POST BOX REMOVE COLUMNS ANT REQUIRED. PREP FOR NEW STRUCTURE. CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE TRENCH FOR NEW SERVICES CONNECTIONS
	- REMOVE POST BOX
	 REMOVE POST BOX REMOVE COLUMNS ANT TEMPORARILY PROP AS RÉQUIRED. PREP FOR NEW STRUCTÜRE. CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE TRENCH FOR NEW SERVICES CONNECTIONS
	 REMOVE POST BOX REMOVE COLUMNS ANT TEMPORARILY PROP AS REQUIRED. PREP.FOR NEW STRUCTURE. CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE TRENCH FOR NEW SERVICES CONNECTIONS
	 REMOVE POST BOX REMOVE COLUMNS ANT REQUIRED. PREP.FOR NEW STRUCTURE. CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE TRENCH FOR NEW SERVICES CONNECTIONS
	- REMOVE POST BOX
	 REMOVE POST BOX REMOVE COLUMNS ANT TEMPORARILY PROP AS RÉQUIRED. PREP FOR NEW STRUCTÜRE. CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE TRENCH FOR NEW SERVICES CONNECTIONS
	 REMOVE POST BOX REMOVE COLUMNS ANT TEMPORARILY PROP AS REQUIRED. PREP FOR NEW STRUCTURE. CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE TRENCH FOR NEW SERVICES CONNECTIONS
	 REMOVE POST BOX REMOVE COLUMNS ANT REQUIRED. PREP.FOR NEW STRUCTURE. CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE TRENCH FOR NEW SERVICES CONNECTIONS

DEMOLITION & ROOF	DRAWING — DA02
	revision — b
1 : 100 @A1	PROJECT — 24-0874



WALTER ARCHITECTURE INTERIOR DESIGN LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE MASTER PLANNING

REASON FOR ISSUE FOR PLANNING PLANNING AMENDMENT





Attachment 1

	GROSS LEASABLE AR	EA	
\mathbf{i}			
5	ROOM	AREA	
	CONSULT ROOM	18 m	
(PATHOLOGY	11 m	
	TREATMENT ROOM	14 m	
(CONSULT ROOM	17 m	
\succ	CONSULT ROOM	17 m	
(CONSULT ROOM	17 m	
	ADMIN ROOM	12 m	
7	CONSULT ROOM	15 m	
5	CONSULT ROOM	15 m	
$\left(\right)$	CONSULT ROOM	15 m	
(DIRECTOR'S OFFICE	14 m	
\mathbf{i}	PRACTICE MANAGER	14 m	^
	TOTAL: 12	178 m	
Z			<u> </u>
			GLA REDUCED

LEGEND - PLANTING

CODE BOTANIC NAME **Planting Bed** (Type 1) *Plectranthus Argentatus*

Nephrolepis Exaltata Aspidistra Elatior Brunnera Macrophylla Hellebore Ficus Pumila Planting Bed (Type 2) Philodendron Xanadu

Planting Bed (Type 3) Stachys Byzantina Nepeta Tuberosa

Convolvulus Salvia Erigeron Karvinskianus

PB3

Silver Spurflower Sword Fern Cast Iron Plant Silver Heart Molly's White Creeping Fig

Winterbourn Philodendron

COMMON NAME

Lamb's-ear Giant Catmint New Blue Moon Love and Wishes Seaside Daisy

LEGEND - EXTERNAL MATERIALS

IMAGE	CODE	DESCRIPTION
	FC	Prefinished Fibre Cement (Grey)
	МС	Profiled Metal Cladding (Light grey)
Tablast toward	PC	Powdercoat Aluminium Framed Glazing / Fixed Sunshades (Dark grey)
	GL	Glazing (Transparent)
	BL	Masonry Block (Light finish)
	со	Concrete (Light finish)
	PW	Prefinished Wall System (Light finish)
	PF	Paint Finish (Light finish)
	BIT	Bitumen (Light finish)
	GRV	Gravel (Light finish)

FLOOR PLANS	DRAWING — DA01
	revision — b
1 : 100 @A1	PROJECT — 24-0874

WALTER ARCHITECTURE INTERIOR DESIGN LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE MASTER PLANNING

REASON FOR ISSUE FOR PLANNING PLANNING AMENDMENT





NORTH ELEVATION 1:100



REV	DATE
А	08/11/2024
В	06/02/2025

GEORGE STREET

EX.GROUND FLOOR FFL. 61.690





Attachment 1

LEGEND - EXTERNAL MATERIALS

IMAGE	CODE	DESCRIPTION
	FC	Prefinished Fibre Cement (Grey)
	МС	Profiled Metal Cladding (Light grey)
We have	PC	Powdercoat Aluminium Framed Glazing / Fixed Sunshades (Dark grey)
	GL	Glazing (Transparent)
	BL	Masonry Block (Light finish)
	со	Concrete (Light finish)
	PW	Prefinished Wall System (Light finish)
	PF	Paint Finish (Light finish)
	ΒΙΤ	Bitumen (Light finish)
	GRV	Gravel (Light finish)

ELEVATIONS	DRAWING — DA03
	revision — b
1 : 100 @A1	PROJECT — 24-0874





NORWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE CIVIL DRAWINGS

CIVIL GENERAL NOTES

- THESE DRAWINGS SHALL BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS (INCLUDING ALL OTHER CONSULTANTS DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS) AND ANY WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS ISSUED DURING THE COURSE OF THE CONTRACT.
- ALL DISCREPANCIES SHALL BE REFERRED TO THE SUPERINTENDENT BEFORE 2 PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK.
- WARNING TO CONTRACTORS: CONTRACTORS MUST ASCERTAIN EXACT LOCATIONS 3. OF ALL EXISTING SERVICES WHICH COULD BE AFFECTED BY THE WORKS AND CONTACT ALL RELEVANT AUTHORITIES BEFORE COMMENCING ANY EXCAVATION.
- ALL EXCAVATED AND FILLED AREAS SHALL BE SURFACED WITH A LAYER OF APPROVED TOPSOIL IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS DRAWINGS.
- ALL TRENCHING WORK SHALL TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RELEVANT ACTS, REGULATIONS & CODES OF PRACTICE. TRENCHES AND EXCAVATIONS BENEATH PAVEMENTS ARE TO BE BACKFILLED WITH CLASS 2 CRUSHED ROCK (20mm SIZE) AND COMPACTED TO 95% OF MODIFIED MAXIMUM DRY DENSITY UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE
- ALL TRENCHES THAT EXTENDS BELOW THE ANGLE OF REPOSE (SAFE TEMPORARY BATTER ANGLE) OF AN ADJOINING PROPERTY OR FOUNDATIONS SHALL BE ADEQUATELY SHORED (REGARDLESS OF DEPTH) OR CONSTRUCTED IN A HIT/MISS SEQUENCE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT TO ENSURE THAT THE ADJOINING PROPERTY OR FOUNDATIONS ARE PROTECTED AT ALL TIMES.



- ALL INTERNAL DRAINAGE WORKS SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AS/NZS 3500-2015 AUSTRALIAN STANDARD SERIES FOR 'PLUMBING AND DRAINAGE'.
- ALL STORMWATER DRAINAGE PIPES 150Ø OR LESS SHALL BE SEWER QUALITY UPVC WITH SOLVENT WELDED JOINTS. UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. -CLASS SN6 MINIMUM IN NON TRAFFICABLE AREAS -CLASS SN12 MINIMUM IN TRAFFICABLE AREAS
- ALL CONCRETE STORMWATER DRAINS TO BE 9 -CLASS 2 FRC OR CLASS 3 RCP (COVER < 2400) U.N.O
- -CLASS 3 FRC OR CLASS 3 RCP (COVER > 2400) UNO 10. ALL DOWNPIPE CONNECTIONS SHALL BE A MINIMUM OF150Ø OR EQUAL TO THE DOWNPIPE DIAMETER, UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. ALL DOWNPIPES SHALL BE SEWER QUALITY UPVC WITH SOLVENT WELDED JOINTS.
- SUB-SOIL DRAINS SHALL BE 100 Ø PERFORATED CORRUGATED CLASS 400 WITH 11. FILTER SOCK LAID AT 1:100 MIN. CONNECTIONS TO STORMWATER DRAINAGE SYSTEM TO BE 100 Ø UPVC.
- PIT COVER LEVELS SHALL MATCH SURROUNDING FINISHED LEVELS. DRAINAGE PITS 12. SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED IN CONCRETE WITH 150mm THICK BASE & WALLS IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY OF NORWOOD, PAYNEHAM & ST PETERS STANDARD DRAWINGS, PIT DIMENSIONS ARE INTERNAL, ALL PITS DEEPER THAN 1000mm SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH STEP IRONS AT 300mm MAXIMUM CENTRES.
- 13. CUT AND FILL BATTERS SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT
- 14. EXISTING CONTOURS SHOWN REFLECT SITE CONDITIONS AT TIME OF SURVEY.
- 15. LEVELS ARE TO AUSTRALIAN HEIGHT DATUM.
- 16. ALL LEVELS SHOWN ARE IN METRES. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN MILLIMETRES.
- 17. SURVEY BACKGROUND INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY: ALEXANDER SYMONDS SURVEYING CONSULTANTS
- ALL VEGETATION/TREES REQUIRING REMOVAL SHALL BE REMOVED OFF SITE BY 18. THE CONTRACTOR.
- BEFORE THE CONTRACTOR IMPORTS ANY FILL ON TO SITE THEY MUST PROVIDE 19. THE SUPERINTENDENT WITH A REPORT/STATEMENT THAT THE MATERIAL IS NOT CONTAMINATED.
- AT THE COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION WORKS, ALL AREAS DISTURBED DURING 20. CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE REINSTATED AT THE CONTRACTORS EXPENSE.

- DOWNPIPE BRANCHES ARE NOT SHOWN IN SCHEDULES FOR CLARITY. 21
- ALL PIT COVERS IN LIGHT TO MEDIUM DUTY TRAFFICABLE PAVEMENTS SHALL BE 22. CLASS 'C' U.N.O. ALL PIT COVERS IN HEAVY DUTY TRAFFICABLE PAVEMENTS SHALL BE CLASS 'D' U.N.O. ALL PIT COVERS IN LANDSCAPE AREAS SHALL BE CLASS 'A' U.N.O. GRATES AND FITTINGS SHALL BE MEDIUM DUTY HOT DIP GALVANISED.
- 23. MATERIALS: ALL MATERIAL SHALL COMPLY WITH THE RELEVANT AUSTRALIAN STANDARDS.
- 24. INSTALLATION OF UNDERGROUND STORMWATER DRAINS SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AS2032:2006 SECTIONS 5 (BURIED PIPES & FITTINGS).
- 25. REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPES AND FIBRE REINFORCED CONCRETE DRAINS SHALL BE CLASS 2 RUBBER RING JOINTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH AS1302 U.N.O.
- WHERE A PIPELINE MAY BE SUBJECT TO ABNORMAL LOADING DURING 26. CONSTRUCTION, TEMPORARY (OR PERMANENT) MEASURES SHALL BE TAKEN TO ENSURE THAT THE PIPELINE IS NOT OVERLOADED.
- DRAIN LAYING: BEFORE COMMENCING DRAINAGE WORK, OBTAIN BY SITE 27. MEASUREMENT THE INVERT LEVELS OF ALL DRAINS TO WHICH CONNECTION IS TO BE MADE. IF THE LEVELS DIFFER FROM THOSE SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS, ADVISE THE SUPERINTENDENT BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE DRAIN LAYING. DO NOT SCALE FROM CIVIL DRAWINGS. OBTAIN ALL DIMENSIONS FROM ARCHITECT OR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT DRAWINGS.
- CONFIRM ALL STORMWATER DRAIN PIPE LEVELS BEFORE COMMENCEMENT OF 28. CONSTRUCTION, WHERE NO LEVELS ARE SHOWN, LAY STORMWATER PIPES AT A MINIMUM GRADE OF 1 IN 100. UNLESS NOTED ON DRAWINGS THE MINIMUM COVER TO DRAINS IS 300mm.
- ALL FILLING MATERIAL, COMPACTION AND CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS TO BE IN 29. ACCORDANCE WITH GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERS REPORT.
- 30. ALL SITEWORK CONCRETE SHALL BE F'c = 32MPa NORMAL CLASS CONCRETE U.N.O. ALL WORK SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AS3600 INCLUDING CURING REQUIREMENTS. THESE NOTES ARE SUPPLEMENTARY TO AND DO NOT REPLACE THE SPECIFICATION
- TO WHICH THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY WITH. REFER TO ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS FOR SETTING OUT DIMENSIONS NOT SHOWN ON SITEWORKS DRAWING. ANY STRUCTURES, PAVEMENTS OR SURFACES DAMAGED, DIRTIED OR MADE 32.
- UNSERVICEABLE DUE TO CONSTRUCTION WORK SHALL BE REINSTATED AND MADE GOOD. 33.
- THE CONTRACTOR SHALL OBTAIN BUILD OVER CONSENT FOR ANY WORKS OVER EASEMENTS. DRAINAGE PIT COVERS SHALL BE LEVEL WITH AND SHALL CONFORM TO SLOPE AND
- CROSSFALL OF THE FINISHED SURFACE. THE FINISHED SURFACE LEVELS SHOWN AT PIT LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE ONLY AND SHALL NOT BE USED FOR THE FIXING OF ANY DRAINAGE PIT COVER.
- UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE, MINIMUM PIPE FALLS SHALL BE: 35. - 1:100 FOR 100Ø/150Ø - 1:200 FOR 225Ø - 1:250 FOR 300Ø - 1:300 FOR 375Ø
 - 1:350 FOR 450Ø
- PREMIXED CONCRETE SHALL BE MANUFACTURED AND DELIVERED IN ACCORDANCE 36. WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF AS1379 CEMENT SHALL BE GENERAL PURPOSE PORTLAND CEMENT TYPE GP IN 37.
- ACCORDANCE WITH AS3972. AGGREGATE SHALL COMPLY WITH AS2758.1
- CHEMICAL ADMIXTURES SHALL COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF AS1478 AND SHALL BE USED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PRACTICES DETAILED IN APPENDIX C OF THAT STANDARD.
- 39. SUPERPLASTICISERS MAY BE USED TO INCREASE WORKABILITY AND TO MAINTAIN MAXIMUM WATER CEMENT RATIOS SPECIFIED, SUBJECT TO ENGINEER APPROVAL.
- REINFORCEMENT SHALL COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF AS1302, AS1303 AND 40. AS1304, AS APPROPRIATE. REINFORCEMENT TO BE SUPPORTED IN ITS FINAL POSITION ON APPROVED BAR CHAIRS SUPPORTED ON PLASTIC DISKS ON A 600 x 600 GRID. FABRIC TO BE LAPPED A MINIMUM OF 2 CROSS WIRES PLUS 50mm.
- LIQUID MEMBRANE FORMING CURING COMPOUNDS SHALL COMPLY WITH THE 41. REQUIREMENTS OF AS3799 AND SHALL BE APPLIED STRICTLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MANUFACTURERS INSTRUCTIONS.

NORWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE

PROJECT NORWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE Page 7 of 71

CLIENT

SHEET TITLE **CIVIL NOTES SHEET**

Attachment ²

DRAWN BY:	CHECKED BY:	APPROVED BY:	SCALE: 1:100	DRAWN DATE: 20/10/2024	
PROJECT NO:		SHEET NO:		REVISION NO:	→
24030)	CSK	(001	03	



REV. DATE 01 22/10/2024 02 29/10/2024 08/11/2024 03

 \longrightarrow

 \longrightarrow

S.K. S.K. S.K.

CLIENT NORWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE		SHEET TITLE
PROJECT	MATTER	LEVEL
NORWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE		
Page 8 of 71		

Attachment 1

GROSS LEASABLE AREA

ROOM	AREA
CONSULT ROOM	15 m
CONSULT ROOM	18 m
PATHOLOGY	11 m
CONSULT ROOM	17 m
CONSULT ROOM	17 m
CONSULT ROOM	17 m
ADMIN ROOM	12 m
CONSULT ROOM	15 m
CONSULT ROOM	15 m
CONSULT ROOM	15 m
NEW CROSS OVER TO CITY	15 m
THE CITY OF NORWOOD,	15 m
PAYNEHA, & ST PETERS DETAIL AND SATISFACTION	183 m

LEGEND - PLANTING

CODE	BOTANIC NAME	COMMON NAME

PB1	Planting Bed (Type 1) Plectranthus Argentatus Nephrolepis Exaltata Aspidistra Elatior Brunnera Macrophylla Hellebore Ficus Pumila
PB2	Planting Bed (Type 2)

Philodendron Xanadu **Planting Bed** (Type 3) *Stachys Byzantina* Nepeta Tuberosa Salvia

Erigeron Karvinskianus

PB3

Silver Spurflower Sword Fern Cast Iron Plant

Silver Heart Molly's White Creeping Fig

Winterbourn Philodendron

Lamb's-ear Giant Catmint New Blue Moon Love and Wishes Seaside Daisy

LEGEND - EXTERNAL MATERIALS

IMAGE	CODE	DESCRIPTION
	FC	Prefinished Fibre Cement (Grey)
	MC	Profiled Metal Cladding (Light grey)
Maria Salada di Yanan di	PC	Powdercoat Aluminium Framed Glazing / Fixed Sunshades (Dark grey)
	GL	Glazing (Transparent)
	BL	Masonry Block (Light finish)
	СО	Concrete (Light finish)
	PW	Prefinished Wall System (Light finish)
	PF	Paint Finish (Light finish)
	BIT	Bitumen (Light finish)
	GRV	Gravel (Light finish)

FER GROUND

24030		CSK	(001	03	
PROJECT NO:		SHEET NO:		REVISION N	v D:
SK	WE	-	1:100	20/10/2024	¢
DRAWN BY:	CHECKED BY:	APPROVED BY:	SCALE:	DRAWN DATE:	•







TYPICAL AGGI DRAIN TO PIPE DETAIL 1:10

TYPICAL AGGI DRAIN DETAIL 1:20

NOTE:





1:10

CLIENT	SHEET TITLE			v
NORWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE	TYPICAL STORMWATER			
	AND PAVING DETAILS			
	AND I AVING DETAILO		BY: APPROVED BY: SCALE:	
		SK WE	- 1:100	20/10/2024
		PROJECT NO:	SHEET NO:	REVISION NO:
PRACTICE		24030	CSK001	03
Page 9 of 71		24000		00

CBR	SUBBASE
2%	220mm CLASS 3 CRUSHED ROCK + 100mm CLASS 2 CRUSHED ROCK
4%	130mm CLASS 3 CRUSHED ROCK + 100mm CLASS 2 CRUSHED ROCK
6%	100mm CLASS 3 CRUSHED ROCK + 90mm CLASS 2 CRUSHED ROCK
≥8%	160mm CLASS 2 CRUSHED ROCK

1:20

LIGHT DUTY TRAFFICABLE ASPHALT DETAIL



MATTER

NORWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE



Stormwater Management Report

Project No.: 24030 27 November 2024 *Revision No. 1*

REVISION	DATE	COMMENT	AUTHOR	CHECKER
1.0	27/11/2024	Planning Approval	SK	WE



MATTER

Level 5, 95 Grenfell St Adelaide SA 5000 (08) 8311 3769

Table of Contents

1.	General	3	
[Design Summary		4
2.	Catchment Areas	4	
3.	PSD Calculations	5	
4.	Overflow mechanism and Point of Discharge	10	
5.	Flood overlay Error! Bookmark not defin	ed.	



Level 5, 95 Grenfell St Adelaide SA 5000 (08) 8311 3769

MATTER

1. General

This project is located at 43 George St, Norwood SA 5067. The project comprises the extension of existing medical practice. This stormwater design calculations are carried out in accordance with the following documents;

- Architectural Drawings dated 06 November 2024
- Australian Standards 3500.3 Plumbing and Drainage Stormwater drainage
- Feature Survey Drawings provided by Alexander Symonds dated 24 January 2024
- Australian Rainfall and Runoff 2016 Guidelines

The satellite image below shows the approximate site boundary for the new development at 43 George Street, Norwood





Level 5, 95 Grenfell St Adelaide SA 5000 (08) 8311 3769

Design Summary

- Existing site is mostly gravel car park.
- The proposed development will include roofed areas
- Most of the new development catchment is proposed to discharge to George street.



Figure 1: Stormwater Ground Floor Plan



2. Catchment Areas



MATTER

Level 5, 95 Grenfell St Adelaide SA 5000 (08) 8311 3769

3. PSD Calculations

IFD of local meteorology has been adopted for the calculations, the data is taken from

Rainfall IFD Data System: Water Information: Bureau of Meteorology (bom.gov.au)

Download all CSV (.zip) Download all PNG (.zip)

Location

 Label:
 Not provided

 Latitude:
 -34.9199 [Nearest grid cell: 34.9125 (§)]

 Longitude:
 138.6363 [Nearest grid cell: 138.6375 (E)]



IFD Design Rainfall Intensity (mm/h)

Rainfall intensity for Durations, Exceedance per Year (EY), and Annual Exceedance Probabilities (AEP). FAQ for New ARR probability terminology

Table Chart

Unit: mm/h 🗸

Issued: 27 November 2024

		Annu	ial Exceed	ance Prob	ability (A	EP)	
Duration	63.2%	50%#	20%*	10%	5%	2%	1%
1 <u>min</u>	77.6	88.5	126	155	186	231	270
2 <u>min</u>	68.3	77.6	110	135	162	203	238
3 <u>min</u>	60.8	69.1	98.0	120	145	181	212
4 <u>min</u>	55.0	62.6	88.9	109	131	164	191
5 <u>min</u>	50.4	57.4	81.6	100	120	150	175
10 <u>min</u>	36.5	41.7	59.5	73.1	87.7	109	127
15 <u>min</u>	29.4	33.6	48.0	58.9	70.7	87.9	103
20 <u>min</u>	25.0	28.5	40.7	50.0	60.0	74.7	87.1
25 <u>min</u>	21.9	25.0	35.6	43.8	52.5	65.4	76.4
30 <u>min</u>	19.6	22.4	31.9	39.2	47.0	58.5	68.4
45 <u>min</u>	15.3	17.4	24.7	30.3	36.3	45.3	52.9
1 hour	12.7	14.4	20.5	25.1	30.1	37.5	43.8
1.5 hour	9.78	11.1	15.6	19.1	22.9	28.5	33.3
2 hour	8.10	9.17	12.9	15.8	18.8	23.4	27.3
3 hour	6.20	7.01	9.79	11.9	14.2	17.6	20.5
4.5 hour	4.73	5.34	7.42	9.01	10.7	13.2	15.2
6 hour	3.90	4.40	6.09	7.36	8.72	10.7	12.3
9 hour	2.97	3.34	4.59	5.53	6.51	7.91	9.06
12 hour	2.44	2.74	3.75	4.50	5.27	6.37	7.27
18 hour	1.84	2.06	2.81	3.35	3.90	4.67	5.30
24 hour	1.50	1.68	2.27	2.70	3.13	3.73	4.22
30 hour	1.28	1.43	1.93	2.28	2.64	3.13	3.52
36 hour	1.12	1.25	1.68	1.98	2.28	2.70	3.03
48 hour	0.906	1.01	1.35	1.58	1.81	2.14	2.39
72 hour	0.668	0.742	0.977	1.14	1.30	1.52	1.69
96 hour	0.536	0.594	0.775	0.898	1.02	1.18	1.31
120 hour	0.452	0.499	0.646	0.745	0.840	0.971	1.07
144 hour	0.392	0.433	0.556	0.638	0.716	0.824	0.905
168 hour	0 349	0 384	0.490	0.560	0.625	0 715	0 783

Note:

The 50% AEP IFD **does not** correspond to the 2 year Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) IFD. Rather it corresponds to the 1.44 ARI.

* The 20% AEP IFD **does not** correspond to the 5 year Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) IFD. Rather it corresponds to the 4.48 ARI.

MATTER

Level 5, 95 Grenfell St Adelaide SA 5000 (08) 8311 3769

MATTER CONSULTING STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS

achment

1

Post-development flow calculations (Pre-development and Post-development 100 years ARI)

calculations												м	Α	· ·	т	т	Е	R	2
project Norwood Family Pr	actice I	lorv	hoov																
project Norwood Failing Ph	actice, i		lood																
On-site Detention Requireme	nts																		
	lanced							0/0	0.04	Т									
job no. 24030A des	ignea	-	'n	Ga Ga	ste		4/1	0/2	024		pag	e no.							
Stormwater detention/infiltra	tion des	ign	(via Me	odifie	d Ra	tion	nal I	Vlet	hod)										
	++	+	\vdash							+	<u> </u>		\square	_		+	+	\vdash	-
Location of design	++	+	++	┝┯	USE	RD		<u>ч</u>	┥	╋	\vdash		\vdash	-		+	+	+	⊢
Pre-development flows	++	+		\vdash	+		+	+	+	╋	\vdash		+			+	+	+	\vdash
ARI adopted for pre-developme	ent					100													
Des development finds of some			.			-				-	_			_				_	_
Design Rainfall Intensity	ntration	+		\vdash	1	0 78 7	0	min	utes /hr	+	\vdash	\vdash	\vdash	-	\vdash	+	+		\vdash
Development areas	++	+		\vdash	+	<u> </u>				+	\vdash	\vdash	\vdash		+	+	+		\vdash
Roof (c=1.0)	++	+		\square		170		m²	+	\top	\vdash	\square	\square		\square	+	+		\vdash
Concrete paving (c=0.	9)					65		m²											
Bitumen paving (c=0.7	')					0		m²											
Soft landscaping (c=0.3	9	1	\square	\square	\perp	390	_	m²	-	_				_		\perp	_		
sum	++	+		\vdash	+	625	-	m"	+	+			$ \rightarrow $	_		+	+	+	
Pre-development weighted C	++	+	\vdash	\vdash	+) 55'	2	+	Lleor	0.000		H				+	+	+	⊢
Adopted pre-development C	++	+).55	3	+	Usei	0ve						+	+		-
Maximum Pre-development f	ow	+		ГГ	Ť	17.1	5	l/s	+		\vdash					+	+	+	\vdash
		\top		\square												+			
Post-development flows																			
ARI adopted for post-developm	ent					100													
Post-development time of conc	entratio			ГГ	_	5		min	utes	\mathbf{T}							—		<u> </u>
Design Rainfall Intensity		+		\vdash	1	78.7	0	mm	hr	+		\vdash	+			+	+	+	\vdash
Development areas		+		\vdash			-			\top						+	+	\square	
Roof (c=1.0)						400		m²											
Concrete paving (c=0.9))					146		m²											
Bitumen paving (c=0.7	2	+	\square	\square	+	0	_	m²	\rightarrow	\perp			\square	_		+	_	\vdash	
Soft landscaping (c=0.3	9	+	\vdash	\vdash	+	79	-	m²	+	+			$ \rightarrow $	_		+	+	+	
sum	++	+		\vdash	-	625	-	m-	+	+	\vdash	\vdash	\vdash	-	\square	+	+		\vdash
Post-development weighted C	++	+		\vdash	-).88	8	+	User	ove	rrid4				\vdash	+	+	+	⊢
Adopted pre-development C	++	+		\vdash		0.888	B	+	3301	1		Ĩ				+	+	+	\vdash
Maximum Post-devleopment	flow				2	27.5	5	l/s											
Difference between pre and p	ost are	as				0													
			. .			.				_									_
Soli infiltration	++	+	\vdash	\vdash	+	Ļ	+	-	+	+	\vdash	\vdash	\vdash	-		+	+	+	\vdash
Infiltration rate (I/s/m2)	++	+		\vdash	+	0	+	-	+	+	\vdash	\vdash	\vdash	-	\vdash	+	+	+	\vdash
Infiltration system absorption ra	ite (l/s)	+		\vdash	+	0.0	+	+	+	+	\vdash	\vdash	\vdash	\neg	\vdash	+	+	+	\vdash
	A 17 MAR 1	-		\vdash	+	Ē	+	-	+	+		\vdash	\vdash	-		+	+	+	
	ΤŤ							I	1							- 1			
Required detention system c	apacity	<u>ш</u>			3	122	.6		for a	5.13	mi	nute	eve	ent	dur	ation			
Required detention system c	apacity	<u>(1)</u>			3	122	.6		for a	5.13	mi	nute	ev	ent	dur	atior	1		
Required detention system c Required detention system c	apacity apacity	(I) (m^	3)		3.12	1 22 256	.6 673	2	for a	5.13	mi	nute	e ev	ent	dur	ation	1		

Attachment 1 MATTER CONSULTING STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS

MATTER

Level 5, 95 Grenfell St Adelaide SA 5000 (08) 8311 3769

Pre-development and Post-development 20 years ARI

calculations					MA	TTER	
project Norwood Family Practice, Norwood							
On-site Detention Requi	rements						
job no. 24030A	designed	SK	date 14/	10/2024	page no.	1	
Stormwater detention/in	filtration des	ign (via Moo	dified Rational	Method)			
Location of design			USER DAT	A		+++++	
Pre-development flows							
ARI adopted for pre-devel	opment		20				
Pro dovelopment time of a	oncontration		5	minutor			
Design Rainfall Intensity		++++	123.54	mm/hr		+++++	
Development areas							
Roof (c	=1.0)	++++	170	m ²			
Concrete paving	c=0.9)		65	m ²			
Bitumen paving (c=0.7)		0	m ²			
Soft landscaping (c=0.3)		390	m ²			
sum			625	m²			
		++++					
Pre-development weighte		+++	0.553	User ov	verride C		
Adopted pre-development	ontflow	+++	0.553	1/e	++++		
waximum Pre-developm		++++	11.00	1/5			
Post-development flows			++++			+++++	
ARI adopted for post-deve	elopment		20				
Post-development time of	concentration		5	minutes	++++	+ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$	
Design Rainfall Intensity	++++	++++	123.54	mm/hr	++++		
Development areas		++++	400	m ²			
Concrete paving	-1.0)	++++	146	m ²		+++++	
Bitumen paving (c=0.7)	++++	0	m ²		+++++	
Soft landscaping (c=0.3)	++++	79	m ²			
sum			625	m ²			
Post-development weighte	ed C		0.888	User ov	verride C		
Adopted pre-development	C	+++	0.888			++++	
Maximum Post-devleopr	nent flow	++++	19.05	l/s	++++		
					+ $+$ $+$ $+$		
Difference between pre	and post area	as	0				
Soil infiltration							
Infiltration rate (I/s/m2)			0				
Infiltration area		++++	0				
Infiltration system absorpt	ion rate (l/s)		0.0				
Required detention syst	em capacity	φ	2159.5	for a 5.	17 minute eve	ent duration	
		(++++		
Required detention syst	em capacity	(m^3)	2.15945870	03	++++	+++++	
						Version 1 April 2018	



Level 5, 95 Grenfell St Adelaide SA 5000 (08) 8311 3769

MATTER

Pre-development of 20 years ARI and Post-development 100 years ARI

calculations													М	A	١	т	Т	•	Ε	R	2
project Norwood Family Practice, Norwood																					
On-site Detention Requi	rements	5																			
job no. 24030A	designe	эd	SK		date		1	14/1	0/2	2024		pa	ge no)_				1			
Stormwater detention/in	filtratio	n desi	gn (via	a Mod	ified	Ra	tior	nal	Me	tho	<u>(k</u>										
			\square								\perp	+	+	⊢		_					⊢
Location of design	$\left \right $		\vdash	\vdash	- U	SE	RD	AT	A		_	+	+	-	-	-					⊢
Pre-development flows	+ + +		\vdash	++	+	+	_				+	+	+	⊢	-	\vdash					⊢
Pre-development nows	+++		\vdash	++	+						+	+	+	⊢	\vdash	\vdash					⊢
ARI adopted for pre-devel	opment		\vdash	++			20				+	+	+	\vdash	\vdash	\vdash					\vdash
· · · · · · · · ·					_							-	-	•	-	-	_				-
Pre-development time of	concentr	ation					5		mi	nute	s										
Design Rainfall Intensity						12	23.5	4	mr	n/hr											
Development areas			\square	\square						\square		+	\vdash	┡		\vdash					
Roof (c	=1.0)	-	\vdash	\square		1	170		m	\vdash		+	+	⊢	\vdash	1					
Concrete paving	c=0.9)		\vdash	++	+		65 ^		m ²	\vdash	+	+	+-	┞	-						<u> </u>
Bitumen paving (c=0.7)		\vdash	++	+		0		m ^e	\vdash	+	+	+-	⊢	-	\vdash					-
Soft landscaping (c=0.3)	-+	++	++	+		390 805		m²	\vdash	+	+	+	╟	\vdash	\vdash					-
sum	$\left \right $		\vdash	++	+		025		m.	\vdash	+	+	+	⊢	\vdash	\vdash	\vdash		\vdash		\vdash
Pre-development weighte			\vdash	\vdash			55	2		Llee		arric						_	_	_	\vdash
Adopted pre-development			\vdash	+	-	0	55	3		USE	1 00		T		Γ	Г					\vdash
Maximum Pre-development	ent flow	, –	\vdash			1	1.8	6	l/s		+	+	+	⊢	\vdash	\vdash					\vdash
		-	\vdash	\vdash		-i		Ť	11.0		+	+	+	⊢	\vdash	\vdash					\vdash
Post-development flows			\vdash								+	+	+	\vdash	\vdash	\vdash					
			\square								+	\top	\top	\square	\square	\square					
ARI adopted for post-deve	lopmen	t					100														
					_									_			_				_
Post-development time of	concent	tration					5		mi	nute	s	\perp	\perp								
Design Rainfall Intensity			\square	\vdash		17	78.7	0	mr	n/hr	\rightarrow	+	+	⊢	└	_					└─
Development areas			\square	\vdash	+				.,		+	+	+	⊢	-						<u> </u>
Root (c	=1.0)		\vdash	\vdash		4	400		m ²		+	+	+	⊢	-						_
Concrete paving	c=0.9)		\vdash	++	+	i	146		m~		+	+	+	-	-	+					-
Bitumen paving (c=0.7)		\vdash	++	+		70	-	m^2		+	+	+	⊢	-	⊢	-	_	_	_	┣
Soit landscaping (C=0.3)		\vdash	++	+		625		m^2		+	+	+	⊢	\vdash	\vdash	\vdash				⊢
	+++		\vdash	++	+	-i	020		11	\vdash	+	+	+	⊢	\vdash	\vdash					\vdash
Post-development weight	ad C	+	++	++		0	.88	8		Use	er ov	errid	le C	\vdash	1	1					
Adopted pre-development	c	+	++	++		0	.88	8			1	T	Ĩ	\vdash	Γ						\vdash
Maximum Post-devleop	nent flo	w	\vdash	++	\top	2	7.5	5	l/s	\square	+	+	\top	\vdash	\vdash	\square					\vdash
			\square	++	\top					\square	\top	1		T	\square						F
Difference between pre	and pos	t area	IS				0														
Soil infiltration												Τ	Т	Г							
Infiltration rate (l/s/m2)			\vdash	++			0	\neg		\vdash	+	+	\top	\vdash	\vdash	\square					\vdash
Infiltration area			\vdash	++			0	\neg		\vdash	+	+	+	\vdash	\vdash	\vdash					
Infiltration system absorpt	ion rate	(l/s)					0.0					\top		\square							
Required detention syst	em capa	acity (1)			51	80	.8		for	a 8.2	7 m	inut	e ev	/en	t du	ratio	on			
Required detention syst	em capa	acity (m^3)		5	.180)83	198	8												
																	1	Versi	on 1/	April	2018



Level 5, 95 Grenfell St Adelaide SA 5000 (08) 8311 3769

In 100 years and 20 years event the maximum discharge is 27.5 l/sec, and detention volume is required for 5200l, therefore a underground tank is provided on the site with 5500 capacity.





4. Overflow mechanism and Point of Discharge

In case of any overflow, a pit is provided near the boundary of the building which can discharge water directly to the gutter on George Street.



Ned Feary

From: Sent: To: Subject: Matilda Asser Wednesday, 5 February 2025 5:32 PM Ned Feary FW: 24030 - Norwood Family Practise - Structural BRC Calculation Report

Hi Ned

Please see below detail in relation to the orifice size.

Kind regards



Matilda Asser (she/her) Consultant High Rise & Commercial Development



Kaurna Country

The contents of this email are confidential. No representation is made that this email is free of viruses or other defects. Virus scanning is recommended and is the responsibility of the recipient. If you have received this communication in error, you must not copy or distribute this message or any part of it or otherwise disclose its contents to anyone.

From: Sent: Wednesday, 5 February 2025 5:23 PM To: Matilda Asser Subject: FW: 24030 - Norwood Family Practise - Structural BRC Calculation Report

FYI below as requested

From: Wahid Elgohary
Sent: Tuesday, 4 February 2025 6:14 PM
To:
Cc: Simran Khehra

Subject: RE: 24030 - Norwood Family Practise - Structural BRC Calculation Report

Hi Luke,

Confirming orifice size is 61mm, to limit site discharge to 10 L/s to street gutter as per council guidelines.

	ORIFICE CA	LCULATIONS	Q = cA (2gH)^0.	5	
	Q = flow (PS	SD) H = head	over centre of orifice	D = dep	th to invert (m)
c = disch coef	f = 1.00				
PSD (l/s)) = 10.00			D =	
for diam (mm)	=	H (n	n) =		
for H (m)) = 0.600	dia (mn	n) = 6 0.9	0.630	

WAHID ELGOHARY Associate Director		
MATTER	matterconsulting.com.au	

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From:	
Sent: Tuesday, 4 February 2025 3:59 PM	
To: 'Wahid Elgohary'	
Cc:	: 'Simran Khehra'
Subject: RE: 24030 - Norwood Family Pr	actise - Structural BRC Calculation Report

Hi wahid,

Can you please confirm the orifice size as its been requested by council

SAPPA Report

The SA Property and Planning Atlas is available on the Plan SA website: https://sappa.plan.sa.gov.au

Subject Land and Zoning Map



Disclaimer: The information provided above, is not represented to be accurate, current or complete at the time of printing this report. The Government of South Australia accepts no liability for the use of this data, or any reliance placed on it. or any reliance placed on it.



SAPPA Report

The SA Property and Planning Atlas is available on the Plan SA website: https://sappa.plan.sa.gov.au

Locality Map- 43 George Street Norwood



Disclaimer: The information provided above, is not represented to be accurate, current or complete at the time of printing this report. The Government of South Australia accepts no liability for the use of this data, or any reliance placed on it.

Attachment 3

SAPPA Report

The SA Property and Planning Atlas is available on the Plan SA website: https://sappa.plan.sa.gov.au

Representation Map



Disclaimer: The information provided above, is not represented to be accurate, current or complete at the time of printing this report. The Government of South Australia accepts no liability for the use of this data, or any reliance placed on it.



	Beulah Rd
	Percival St
-	
Queen St	
	Henry St
_	
	Wesley Lane
	Caims St 5525

Details of Representations

Application Summary

Application ID	24038142
Proposal	Construction of a two-storey addition at the rear of existing consulting rooms, with partial demolition and alterations to the existing building, formalisation of car parking, and landscaping works
Location	43 GEORGE ST NORWOOD SA 5067

Representations

Representor 1 - John Turner

John Turner
PO Box3142 NORWOOD SA, 5067 Australia
18/12/2024 08:36 PM
Online
No
No
I support the development

Reasons

The proposed development appears to be a well thought out upgrade of an existing building which serves the local community well.

Attached Documents

Representor 2 - Suzanne Whittam

Name	Suzanne Whittam
Address	7 Mayfair St MAYLANDS SA, 5069 Australia
Submission Date	18/12/2024 09:43 PM
Submission Source	Online
Late Submission	No
Would you like to talk to your representation at the decision-making hearing for this development?	Yes
My position is	I oppose the development

Reasons

Thank you for the opportunity to review and respond to the proposed development at 43 George Street, Norwood. We are the northern neighbours at 41 George Street and while we don't wish to impede future development, we do have some concerns regarding the proposal in its current form. 1. Bulk and Scale The lack of any rear offset is of concern, especially the overall height directly along the western boundary of over 9.5m. This would appear to create a security issue along the western ramp to the carpark (lack of passive surveillance potential), prevent cross views from Webbe Street through to Harris Street and compete with the existing character of the area. We think a softening of the design in terms of built form, colouring and potentially a breaking up of a very consistent form would be beneficial to the greater area. 2. Contextuality While the western structures are guite bland, the eastern structures are rather vibrant and have a strong historical character and charm. The extensive nature of the proposed upper level seems oppressive in relation to the detailed and articulated frontages of George Street. The proposed upper level is easily viewed from the broader George street footpaths and we think greater care should be taken to better contextualise the design to the heritage qualities of the area, or significantly juxtapose from them, rather than siding with the bland elements to the west for contextual inspiration. 3. Site Coverage There appears to be excessive hard surfacing to the site. We would expect a greater attempt to greenscape the western aspect of the block to soften the transition between the proposed structure (in excess of 9.5m high) and the western concrete ramp. The council have made significant effort to soften and greenscape Webbe Street, knowing it is a high foot traffic area. Future plans for George Street suggest even more foot traffic is anticipated therefore it would seem vital that spatial relief is provided when developing these character George street sites rather than massing concrete from boundary to boundary. 4. Visibility We think it's important for the applicant to consider that the proposal will be viewable from more angles than street level, as suggested by the Southern Elevation. We feel a certain degree of added finesse would be beneficial to the design given the high level of visibility from the eastern side of George Street, George street + Parade intersection, western carpark and ramp way. The high level of interactivity around this sight warrants a deeper consideration of design than the current proposal which is unfortunately, and perhaps intentionally, rather monolithic and grey. 5. Wall on Boundary We would like to see further consideration regarding the 21.46m long wall on the northern boundary and would become a fence to our local heritage property. Either consideration of it being set back off the boundary and / or collaboration with us regarding the fence between our properties would be welcomed. We are more than happy to share our survey report. Thank you again for the opportunity to respond. We would encourage council to work with the owners and designers to achieve a sympathetic solution which contributes positively, interestingly and successfully with this wonderfully vibrant and unique section of the Norwood area. Kind Regards, Suzanne and Andrew Whittam

Attached Documents

Ref: 24ADL-1087

10 February 2025

Ned Feary Senior Urban Planner City of Norwood, Payneham & St Peters 175 The Parade Norwood SA 4531

Submitted via PlanSA portal

Dear Ned

Response to Representations – Application ID 24038142 – 43 George Street, Norwood

Introduction

URPS continues to act for the applicant for the above Development Application. This letter responds to the representations received during the public notification period.

Summary of Representations

Two representations were received during public notification:

No.	Representor	Representor's Address	Position	Wishes to be heard
1	John Turner	PO Box 3142 Norwood	Supports	No
2	Suzanne and Andrew Whittam	7 Mayfair Street	Oppose	Yes

One representor opposes the development and wishes to be heard by the Council Assessment Panel. This letter responds to this representation in isolation.



Adelaide 27 Halifax Street Adelaide SA 5000 08 8333 7999

urps.com.au

ADL | MEL | PER

SHAPING GREAT COMMUNITIES

URPS

Response to Representors

On Friday 24 January 2025 we coordinated a site meeting with representors Suzanne and Andrew Whittam. The purpose of the meeting was to better understand their key concerns.

I note that you and I attended this meeting, as well as:

- Luke Minicozzi, Senior Project Manager Two Fold Projects.
- Cameron Stevenson, Architect Walter Brooke.
- Ben Clements, Architect Clements Architecture. The representor requested Ben attend the meeting as the architect of their proposed development of a two-storey office building at 41 George Street. We note that this development received planning consent on 28 June 2024 (DA240017978).

Discussions during the site meeting resolved that Suzanne and Andrew's primary concerns were in relation to the proposed wall on the shared boundary. Their concerns related to the height, length and materials proposed for the wall.

Responses to their concerns were discussed with the representors on site. These are summarised under the following headings:

- Requirement for a boundary wall.
- Wall height and length.
- Materials.

Requirement for a boundary wall

Our client requested that National Construction Code (NCC) requirements be considered during preliminary concept design for this project. This means that documentation submitted for planning consent has considered elements which will form part of the building consent stage. This approach has been adopted to consider planning and building requirement concurrently and aims to minimise the timeframe between concept design and construction.

One key finding was that there is insufficient water pressure on site to provide drenchers to all windows along the northern boundary of the site. Fire protection measures are required due to the minimal existing setback between the buildings and narrow allotment width.

Therefore, to provide sufficient fire protection to stop the spread of fire between properties, a boundary wall along a portion of the boundary is proposed.





Note that a boundary wall is not required along the southern boundary as car parking spaces do not immediately abut the boundary and the upper level is setback more than 3 metres to the boundary.

Where car parking spaces were sufficiently separated from the northern boundary, the wall would not be required. However, this would severely limit the number of on-site car spaces, even where alternative orientations for the spaces were explored.

As discussed with Suzanne and Andrew on site, NCC and fire rating requirements will be something they need to explore when they navigate a building consent application for their development. This too is because of the setback of the upper-level, location of car parking abutting the shared boundary as well as the location of multiple on-site EV charging stations proposed on their development plans. We understand that since the site visit, Suzanne and Andrew have sought advice from their building certifier to confirm their specific requirements.

Wall height and length

The wall on boundary has a maximum height of 3.12m from natural ground level.

The wall height has a direct correlation to the wall height of the upper level. This is specified by the fire prevention requirements of the NCC.

Drenchers will be provided to the maximum number of windows as supported by the available water pressure on site. This means the length of the wall has been minimised as much as possible while still satisfying the fire rating requirements.

Materials

The boundary wall is to be constructed of a masonry architectural blockwork, see **Annexure A**.

90/90/90 is the required fire residant level (FRL) for this wall. This provides several options for wall materials such as precast, brick or fibre cement products. The proposed architectural block was selected as the best outcome given the historical character of the existing buildings. This also provides a high-quality external face to the wall when viewed from 41 George Street.

The fire rating level does not allow for any openings in this wall without providing further drenchers.

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to address the concerns of the representors in writing following the recent site meeting. We acknowledge that the primary requirement for





the boundary wall stems from NCC requirements which do not directly form part of this planning assessment.

It is our view that the representors wished to understand the rationale behind the boundary wall height, length and materials. This has now been discussed with them in detail.

I will attend the Council Assessment Panel meeting to respond to the representors should they still wish to be heard and answer any questions the CAP members may have.

I can be contacted on 8333 7999 if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely

Matilda Asser Consultant





Annexure A







HERITAGE I M P A C T R E P O R T

bbarchitects

PROPERTY ADDRESS: APPLICATION NUMBER: DATE: PROPOSAL: HERITAGE STATUS: HERITAGE ADVISOR: PLANNER:

43 George Street Norwood

24038142 21 November 2024 Two level addition to existing former dwelling HERITAGE ADJACENCY David Brown, BB Architects Edmund Feary

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

ADVICE SOUGHT

I provided some preliminary advice on this design. Given the context of what is being proposed to the Adjacent Local Heritage Place, the impact is minor.

DESCRIPTION

The site is adjacent to a Local Heritage Place in the Business Neighbourhood Zone.



PROPOSAL

The proposal is for a large 2 level rear addition to the existing building on the site. The addition is a relatively common shed style design, in a dark metal cladding set behind the existing former dwelling.

COMMENTS

While the design is large, simple and dark in colour, it is set well back, and given the commercial context, and the other large structures in the area, both existing and proposed, there will be no real additional detrimental impact to the heritage value and setting of the Local Heritage Place.

8 November 2024

Ned Feary Senior Urban Planner City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Uploaded to PlanSA Portal

Dear Ned

Alterations and Additions to Consulting Rooms at Lot 18 D756

Introduction

URPS has been engaged by Two-Fold Projects Pty Ltd to provide a supporting statement and lodge this development application for 43 George Street, Norwood.

We have prepared this statement following our assessment of:

- The subject land and locality.
- Development plans prepared by Walter Brooke & Associates Pty Ltd (Appendix A).
- Civil and Stormwater Plan prepared by Matter Consulting (Appendix B).
- Traffic and Car Parking Assessment prepared by Phil Weaver and Associates Pty Ltd (**Appendix C**).
- The Planning and Design Code (Version 2024.20, 7 November 2024).

Subject Site and Locality

The subject site is 43 George Street, Norwood and is identified in CT5246/390 refer **Figure 1** below). The allotment is rectangular in shape with a 13.7m frontage to George Street and depth of 45.75m.

The 634m² allotment contains an existing single-storey building which is currently used as consulting rooms (Norwood Family Practice).

Vehicular access is provided to the rear of the site via an existing single width crossover to George Street and driveway along the southern boundary of the site.

The existing building is setback 4.3m from George Street. The front setback is landscaped and contains existing ramp access.

We acknowledge the Kauma People as the Traditional Custodians of the land on which we work and pay respect to Elders past, present and emerging.

SHAPING GREAT COMMUNITIES J

https://urpsau.sharepoint.com/sites/Synergy/Shared Documents/Projects/24ADL/24ADL-1087 - 43 George Street, Norwood/Working/URPS Planning Advice/20241108_C1_V3_Planning Statement.docx



Attachment 8

Adelaide 27 Halifax Street Adelaide SA 5000 08 8333 7999

urps.com.au

ADL | MEL | PER




The property to the north of the subject site contains a Victorian sandstone villa which is listed as a Local Heritage Place (ID:5765).

Land adjoining the rear boundary of the site is in the Urban Corridor Zone and comprises an existing two-level public car park. The car park is managed by Council and services the commercial properties and Council Office fronting The Parade.

The land is within a predominantly commercial locality, with low-density residential to the North of Harris Street.

The site is in the Business Neighbourhood Zone and shares northern and southern boundaries with existing commercial businesses within the same Zone. Buildings between Harris Street and Webbe Street are currently single-storey. 41 George Street, to the north of the site, has recently received development approval for a two-storey addition and use as a consulting room and office.

Opposite the site is a ground level public car park which services the 4-level retail building identified as Parade Central. South of Webbe Street is a mixed-use building containing Council's offices, town hall and multiple retail businesses. The building incorporates the Town Hall and has a building height similar to Parade Central.

 Explosite Do

 Under et etter

 Business

 Under etter

 Business

 Under etter

 Business

 Under etter

 Business

 Under etter

 Business

 Business

 Business

 Business

 Business

 Business

 Business

 Business

 Business

 Business

Figure 1: Subject site and zoning map.





The Proposal

The proposal involves the construction of a two-storey addition to the rear of the existing building and features:

- A total floor area of approximately 440m² and gross leasable floor area of approximately 245m².
- A maximum building height of 9.95m.
- Contemporary pitched roof addition with light grey metal cladding.
- 21.46m long wall on the northern boundary and 13.7m long wall along the western boundary for fire-rating purposes, finished in masonry block.
- Secure under-croft car parking area at the rear of the property with 7 car parking spaces, including one accessible space.
- Internal configuration with 5 consulting rooms, pathology room, reception area, waiting room at the ground level and 3 consulting rooms, directors and practice managers office and waiting room at the first floor.
- Shared tenancy areas and services include, staff kitchen and flexible space, storage areas, publicly accessible toilets, administration room, hallway, lift and lobby areas.
- Landscaping and accessibility ramp within the front setback.

The development will result in the intensification of the existing land use as consulting rooms.

The proposal also includes partial demolition of the existing building as detailed on the Demolition Plan (see **Annexure A**). The demolition of the whole building is excluded from the definition of 'development' by Schedule 4 of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017.*

Procedural Matters

The subject land is in the Business Neighbourhood Zone of the Planning & Design Code (the Code). It is not located in a Sub-Zone.

The following Overlays are relevant to this site and application:

- Airport Building Heights (Regulated) (All structures over 45 metres).
- Heritage Adjacency
- Hazards (Flooding General).
- Prescribed Wells Area.





- Regulated and Significant Tree
- Traffic Generating Development.

The following Technical and Numeric Variation (TNV) is relevant to this site:

• Maximum Building Height – 2 levels

The development application is subject to the *performance assessed* process as identified in the Business Neighbourhood Zone.

Table 5 – Procedural Matters – Notification of the Business Neighbourhood Zone lists public notification requirements and exemptions.

4(a) of the table provides that the use and development of a consulting room does not require public notification unless the exceptions in Column B cannot be satisfied.

While the gross leasable floor area is less than 250m² and the development does not exceed the 2-level maximum building height specified in Zone, the application will require public notice because:

- The development involves a building wall on a boundary exceeding 11.5m in length, and
- The walls on boundaries exceed a height of 3.2m

Approach to Assessment

Part 1 – Rules of Interpretation of the Code sets out the correct approach to Performance Assessment. Recent judgements of the ERD Court have also expanded upon this. In summary:

- Designated Performance Features (DPFs) simply represent one way to satisfy the corresponding Performance Outcome (PO), but not the only way.
- A DPF is not the same as a complying standard or a Principle of Development Control under the previous planning system.
- A departure from a DPF is, in itself, not a reason to refuse a development.
- The proposal will ultimately succeed or fail depending on how it is assessed against the relevant Performance Outcomes.

It is with the above approach in mind we have assessed this proposal.

Planning Assessment

Consulting rooms is a directly anticipated land use in the Business Neighbourhood Zone.







The proposed building does not exceed 2 levels to satisfy the maximum building height of the Zone and maintains the existing street setback to George Street. Further, the land does not adjoin residential development within a neighbourhood-type zone.

Key planning considerations are therefore limited to the following matters:

- Site Coverage.
- Walls on Boundaries.
- Boundary Setbacks.
- Built form and Character.
- Heritage Adjacency.
- Traffic, Access and Parking.
- Waste Management.
- Landscaping.
- Stormwater Management.
- Land Use Interface.

Site Coverage

The Business Neighbourhood Zones seeks:

PO 2.3 Site coverage is limited to provide space for landscaping, open space and pervious areas.

DPF 2.3 Development does not result in site coverage exceeding 60%.

The proposed development results in a site coverage of 66%.

The provision is listed alongside other provisions which consider built form and character of development.

As a neighbourhood-type zone which anticipates residential and non-residential development, the provision in part has the intent of considering open space, landscaping and pervious areas characteristic for residential development.

The proposal satisfies PO 2.3 despite varying from DPF 2.3 because:

- The additional 6% or 38m² site coverage is considered a minor variation to the site coverage guided by the DPF.
- The proposed site coverage is consistent with the built form and site coverage characteristics in the locality.







• The proposal preserves the landscaped front setback to George Street and the building has been designed to incorporate additional landscaped and pervious areas around the building.

Walls on Boundaries

The Zone seeks:

PO 3.4 Walls on boundaries are limited in height and length to manage visual and overshadowing impacts <u>on adjoining residential properties</u>. (Underlining added)

The development proposes a 21.46m long wall on the northern boundary which forms part of the under-croft car park and ensures the building can be appropriately fire rated. The wall has a maximum height of 3.12m and is adjacent to the car parking area on the adjacent property.

In addition, the development proposes a wall along the rear boundary. This wall extends to a maximum height of 9.95m at the gable of the upper level and is adjacent to Council's multi-storey public car park.

The development satisfies PO 3.4 as neither wall on boundary adjoins residential properties.

Boundary Setbacks

The Zone seeks the following for side boundaries:

- PO 3.6 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.
- DPF 3.6 Other than walls located on a side boundary, building walls are set back at least 900mm from side boundaries.

In addition, the below policy considers rear boundary setbacks:

- PO 3.7 Buildings are set back from rear 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
 - (c) open space recreational opportunities
 - (d) space for landscaping and vegetation.
- DPF 3.7 Buildings walls are set back from the rear boundary at least:
 - (c) 3m for the first building level
 - (d) 5m for any second building level.





Except where walls on boundaries are proposed, the proposed development at the rear of the existing building provides a 1.2m setback to the northern boundary and minimum setback of 2.73m to the southern boundary from the upper level.

As noted above, the proposal includes walls on the rear boundary at the ground and upper level.

The development satisfies the above provisions because:

- Except where walls on boundaries are proposed, the proposed development is setback a minimum of 1.2m from side boundaries to satisfy PO 3.6 and DPF 3.6.
- The rear boundary does not have an interface with residential properties, open space or landscaped spaces in the public realm. As illustrated in shadow diagrams, the development continues to provide access to natural light and ventilation for the adjoining pedestrian ramp despite proposing a wall on the rear boundary.

Built form and Character

The Zone seeks:

PO 2.1 Buildings are of a scale and design that complements surrounding built form, streetscapes and local character.

The development satisfies PO 2.1 because:

- The development is sympathetic to the residential origins of the existing building.
- The addition has been sited to the rear of the existing building and is of a scale which respects the built form and character of the locality.
- The development incorporates materials and finishes which complement the nature of the locality and Business Neighbourhood Zone.

Heritage Adjacency

The Heritage Adjacency Overlay seeks:

PO 1.1 Development adjacent to a State or Local Heritage Place does not dominate, encroach on or unduly impact on the setting of the Place.

The Victorian sandstone villa at 41 George Street is a Local Heritage Place (LHP). The LHP is sited to the north of the subject site and is slightly recessed from the building line at the subject site. The LHP is only visible from the George Street frontage.

Figure 2: Local Heritage Place at 41 George Street adjacent to the subject site.







The proposed alterations and two-storey rear addition satisfy PO 1.1 because:

- The proposed two-storey form is setback 20 metres from the street and is sited behind the ridgeline of the existing building to provide a concealed view from the street which does not dominate the setting of the LHP.
- The existing minimal side setbacks between the LHP and the existing building at 43 George Street provide limited sightlines to observe the proposed development at the rear of the subject site. The two-storey form is also setback from the northern boundary to ensure it is visually recessive.
- The development provides a neutral form and external materials palette to ensure it does not dominate or unduly impact the LHP.

Traffic, Access and Parking

The following provisions are relevant under the Transport, Access and Parking General Development policy:

- PO 3.1 Safe and convenient access <u>minimises impact or interruption on the operation of</u> <u>public roads</u>.
- PO 5.1 <u>Sufficient on-site vehicle parking</u> and specifically marked accessible car parking places are provided to <u>meet the needs of the development or land use</u> having regard to factors that may support a reduced on-site rate such as:
 - (a) availability of on-street car parking
 - (b) shared use of other parking areas
 - (c) in relation to a mixed-use development, where the hours of operation of commercial activities complement the residential use of the site, the provision of vehicle parking may be shared
 - (d) the adaptive reuse of a State or Local Heritage Place.
- DPF 5.1 Development provides a number of car parking spaces on-site at a rate no less than the amount calculated using one of the following, whichever is relevant:



- (a) Transport, Access and Parking Table 2 Off-Street Vehicle Parking Requirements in Designated Areas if the development is a class of development listed in Table 2 and the site is in a Designated Area
- (b) Transport, Access and Parking Table 1 General Off-Street Car Parking Requirements where (a) does not apply

(Underlining added)

The site is within a "high frequency public transit area" because it is within 200m of The Parade which has high frequency bus services. This means the site is in a Designated Area and Table 2 applies.

Table 2 –Off-Street Car Parking Requirements in Designated Areas provides the following car parking rate for non-residential development:

- Minimum number of spaces 3 spaces per 100m2 of gross leasable floor area.
- Maximum number of spaces 6 spaces per 100m2 of gross leasable floor area.

Part 8 of the Code provides the following definition:

Term	Definition
Gross leasable floor area	Means the total floor area of a building <u>excluding public or</u> <u>common tenancy areas such as malls, hallways, verandahs,</u> <u>public or shared tenancy toilets, common storage areas and</u> <u>loading docks.</u> (Underlining added)

The proposed development has a gross leasable floor area of approximately 245m².

This means the Code seeks a minimum of 6 car parking spaces and a maximum of 12.

The development will be serviced by a total of 7 off-street car parking spaces. These spaces will be restricted for use by consultants and staff members with an automatic gate provided along the driveway. This means that entry and exit to the car park will generally be limited to one entry and one exit per day, per car parking space.

The proposal does not impact existing on-street parking along George Street.

A Traffic and Parking Report has been prepared by Phil Weaver and Associates Pty Ltd (see **Annexure C**). This report provides an assessment of on-site car parking rates as well as the safe and convenient access and vehicle manoeuvres on site.

Further, Table 3 of the Transport, Access and Parking General Development policy seeks one bicycle space per 20 employees and one space per 20 consulting rooms.

A total of 3 bicycle parking spaces are provided to the rear of the building to satisfy the relevant policy.





Waste Management

The following provisions of the Design in Urban Areas General Development Policy guides the management of waste on site:

- PO 1.5 The negative visual impact of outdoor storage, waste management, loading and service areas is minimised by integrating them into the building design and <u>screening them from public view</u> (such as fencing, landscaping and built form), taking into account the form of development contemplated in the relevant zone.
- PO 11.1 Development provides a <u>dedicated area</u> for on-site collection and sorting of recyclable materials and refuse, green organic waste and wash bay facilities for the ongoing maintenance of bins that is <u>adequate in size considering the number</u> <u>and nature of the activities they will serve and the frequency of collection</u>.
- PO 11.2 Communal waste storage and collection areas are located, enclosed and designed to be screened from view from the public domain, open space and dwellings.

The development has been designed to provide a bin enclosure inset within the building form, adjacent to the lift. This area provides storage of 5 bins and is concealed from the street, sited behind the existing building wall. The proposed waste generation and provision of bins for the development has been deduced from existing waste generation of the existing consulting rooms.

Bins will continue to be presented to George Street for Council collection.

The development satisfies relevant policy provisions above because:

- A dedicated bin storage area has been included within the design. The bin storage area is screened from public view and does not impede vehicular movements on site.
- The bin storage area is adequate in size to support the nature of the land use.

Landscaping

The Zone seeks:

PO 2.2 Development provides attractive landscaping to the primary street frontage.

While the Design in Urban Areas General Development Policy seeks:

- PO 3.1 Soft landscaping and tree planting are incorporated to:
 - (a) minimise heat absorption and reflection
 - (b) maximise shade and shelter
 - (c) maximise stormwater infiltration
 - (d) enhance the appearance of land and streetscapes.

There is no technical or numerical policy guidance for non-residential development in the Zone.

The proposal satisfies the above policy because:



- **O** URPS
- The development has been designed to provide an improved streetscape appearance through improved landscaping in the front setback.
- Soft landscaping has been incorporated within the transitional space between the existing building and proposed rear addition.
- The development incorporates soft landscaping to a scale anticipated for non-residential development in the Zone.

Stormwater Management

The Design in Urban Areas General Development Policy seeks:

PO 42.3 Development includes stormwater management systems to mitigate peak flows and manage the rate and duration of stormwater discharges from the site to ensure that development does not increase peak flows in downstream systems.

Matter Consulting have prepared a Civil and Stormwater Plan for the site, see **Annexure B**.

This plan provides details of proposed new stormwater infrastructure which will be integrated with the existing stormwater management on the site. It also provides a 5,500L underground detention tank within the rear car park to manage peak flows.

Land Use Interface

Adjoining properties are within the Business Neighbourhood Zone. While this neighbourhood-type Zone supports and anticipates a mix of residential and compatible employment-generating land uses, there are no residential uses on adjacent sites.

Similarly, there is no private open space or habitable room windows within 15 metres of the subject site boundaries.

This means provisions which consider impacts to sensitive receivers such as overlooking or visual privacy provisions do not need to be considered.

This also means the assessment does not consider provisions within the Interface between Land Uses General Development Policy.

Noting this however, the consulting rooms will continue operate within the hours of operation guided by this policy. The operating hours will continue to be:

- 8am to 5.30pm Monday to Friday
- 8am to 12pm Saturday

This ensures the land use will not unreasonably impact the amenity of residential development within the neighbourhood-type Zone.



Conclusion

The proposed development satisfies the relevant provisions of the Code to warrant Planning Consent because:

- Development associated with the use of consulting rooms is a directly anticipated land use in the Business Neighbourhood Zone and the height and scale of the development satisfies the maximum building height of the Zone.
- The development has been sited to the rear of the existing building and its neutral form and materials palette ensures it does not dominate, encroach on or unduly impact the setting of the adjacent heritage place.
- Sufficient car parking has been provided on-site to meet the needs of the consulting rooms.
- The development is supported by appropriate waste management solutions for the site.
- The development incorporates soft landscaping and an enhanced streetscape appearance to George Street.
- The proposal seeks to expand an established land use which provides important community services within the locality. It is surrounded by similar uses anticipated in the Zone and the development has been designed to provide a concealed and complementary built form in the locality.

Please contact me on 8333 7999 if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely

Matilda Asser Consultant







Annexure A



NORWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE 43 GEORGE ST, NORWOOD, SA 5067





REASON FOR ISSUE FOR PLANNING

REV	DATE
А	08/11/2024

DRAWING LIST

SHEET NO,	SHEET NAME
DAoo	COVER SHEET
DA01	FLOOR PLANS
DA02	DEMOLITION & ROOF
DA03	ELEVATIONS



WALTER ARCHITECTURE INTERIOR DESIGN LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE MASTER PLANNING

REASON FOR ISSUE

 REV
 DATE

 A
 08/11/2024

Norwood Family Pracitce 43 George St, Norwood SA 5067 POST BOX AND SIGNAGE BIN LOCATIONS (PICKUP ONLY)

ORGE ST

ш

ш

Ъ

GЕO

GROSS LEASABLE AREA

AREA
15 m
18 m
11 m
17 m
17 m
17 m
12 m
15 m
183 m

LEGEND - PLANTING

CODE	BOTANIC NAME	COMMON NAME
PB1	Planting Bed (Type 1) Plectranthus Argentatus Nephrolepis Exaltata Aspidistra Elatior Brunnera Macrophylla Hellebore Ficus Pumila	Silver Spurflower Sword Fern Cast Iron Plant Silver Heart Molly's White Creeping Fig
PB2	Planting Bed (Type 2) Philodendron Xanadu	Winterbourn Philodendron
PB3	Planting Bed (Type 3) Stachys Byzantina Nepeta Tuberosa Convolvulus Salvia Erigeron Karvinskianus	Lamb's-ear Giant Catmint New Blue Moon Love and Wishes Seaside Daisy

LEGEND - EXTERNAL MATERIALS

IMAGE	CODE	DESCRIPTION
	FC	Prefinished Fibre Cement (Grey)
	МС	Profiled Metal Cladding (Light grey)
Colored House	PC	Powdercoat Aluminium Framed Glazing / Fixed Sunshades (Dark grey)
	GL	Glazing (Transparent)
	BL	Masonry Block (Light finish)
	со	Concrete (Light finish)
	PW	Prefinished Wall System (Light finish)
	PF	Paint Finish (Light finish)
	BIT	Bitumen (Light finish)
	GRV	Gravel (Light finish)

FLOOR PLANS	DRAWING — DA01
	revision — a
1 : 100 @A1	PROJECT — 24-0874



GROUND FLOOR & SITE DEMOLITION PLAN 1:100



ROOF PLAN 1:100



REASON FOR ISSUE FOR PLANNING





l	
1	
I	
el.	
I	
I	- REMOVE SLAB AND
	PREP FOR NEW
	SURFACE.
T	- REMOVE SLAB AND
	WATER FOUNTAIN
T	- REMOVE SIGNAGE
Í	
I	- REMOVE SLAB
	AND KAMP
T	
I	
I	
	REQUIRED PREP FOR
Í	NEW STRUCTURE.

ш

ш

 α

ш

Ċ К

0

ш Ю

CLEAR PLANTER BED AND PREPARE FOR NEW SURFACE



DEMOLITION & ROOF	DRAWING — DA02
	revision — a
1 : 100 @A1	PROJECT — 24-0874

SOUTH ELEVATION



EAST ELEVATION



NORTH ELEVATION



Attachment 8





REV	DATE
А	08/11/2024

LEGEND - EXTERNAL MATERIALS

IMAGE	CODE	DESCRIPTION
	FC	Prefinished Fibre Cement (Grey)
	МС	Profiled Metal Cladding (Light grey)
Endot Novemb	PC	Powdercoat Aluminium Framed Glazing / Fixed Sunshades (Dark grey)
	GL	Glazing (Transparent)
	BL	Masonry Block (Light finish)
	со	Concrete (Light finish)
	PW	Prefinished Wall System (Light finish)
	PF	Paint Finish (Light finish)
	ΒІТ	Bitumen (Light finish)
	GRV	Gravel (Light finish)

ELEVATIONS	DRAWING — DA03
	REVISION — A
1 : 100 @A1	PROJECT — 24-0874





Annexure B



NORWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE CIVIL DRAWINGS

CIVIL GENERAL NOTES

- THESE DRAWINGS SHALL BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS (INCLUDING ALL OTHER CONSULTANTS DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS) AND ANY WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS ISSUED DURING THE COURSE OF THE CONTRACT.
- ALL DISCREPANCIES SHALL BE REFERRED TO THE SUPERINTENDENT BEFORE 2 PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK.
- WARNING TO CONTRACTORS: CONTRACTORS MUST ASCERTAIN EXACT LOCATIONS 3. OF ALL EXISTING SERVICES WHICH COULD BE AFFECTED BY THE WORKS AND CONTACT ALL RELEVANT AUTHORITIES BEFORE COMMENCING ANY EXCAVATION.
- ALL EXCAVATED AND FILLED AREAS SHALL BE SURFACED WITH A LAYER OF APPROVED TOPSOIL IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS DRAWINGS.
- ALL TRENCHING WORK SHALL TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RELEVANT ACTS, REGULATIONS & CODES OF PRACTICE. TRENCHES AND EXCAVATIONS BENEATH PAVEMENTS ARE TO BE BACKFILLED WITH CLASS 2 CRUSHED ROCK (20mm SIZE) AND COMPACTED TO 95% OF MODIFIED MAXIMUM DRY DENSITY UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE
- ALL TRENCHES THAT EXTENDS BELOW THE ANGLE OF REPOSE (SAFE TEMPORARY BATTER ANGLE) OF AN ADJOINING PROPERTY OR FOUNDATIONS SHALL BE ADEQUATELY SHORED (REGARDLESS OF DEPTH) OR CONSTRUCTED IN A HIT/MISS SEQUENCE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT TO ENSURE THAT THE ADJOINING PROPERTY OR FOUNDATIONS ARE PROTECTED AT ALL TIMES.



- ALL INTERNAL DRAINAGE WORKS SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AS/NZS 3500-2015 AUSTRALIAN STANDARD SERIES FOR 'PLUMBING AND DRAINAGE'.
- ALL STORMWATER DRAINAGE PIPES 150Ø OR LESS SHALL BE SEWER QUALITY UPVC WITH SOLVENT WELDED JOINTS. UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. -CLASS SN6 MINIMUM IN NON TRAFFICABLE AREAS -CLASS SN12 MINIMUM IN TRAFFICABLE AREAS
- ALL CONCRETE STORMWATER DRAINS TO BE 9 -CLASS 2 FRC OR CLASS 3 RCP (COVER < 2400) U.N.O
- -CLASS 3 FRC OR CLASS 3 RCP (COVER > 2400) UNO 10. ALL DOWNPIPE CONNECTIONS SHALL BE A MINIMUM OF150Ø OR EQUAL TO THE DOWNPIPE DIAMETER, UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. ALL DOWNPIPES SHALL BE SEWER QUALITY UPVC WITH SOLVENT WELDED JOINTS.
- SUB-SOIL DRAINS SHALL BE 100 Ø PERFORATED CORRUGATED CLASS 400 WITH 11. FILTER SOCK LAID AT 1:100 MIN. CONNECTIONS TO STORMWATER DRAINAGE SYSTEM TO BE 100 Ø UPVC.
- PIT COVER LEVELS SHALL MATCH SURROUNDING FINISHED LEVELS. DRAINAGE PITS 12. SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED IN CONCRETE WITH 150mm THICK BASE & WALLS IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY OF NORWOOD, PAYNEHAM & ST PETERS STANDARD DRAWINGS, PIT DIMENSIONS ARE INTERNAL, ALL PITS DEEPER THAN 1000mm SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH STEP IRONS AT 300mm MAXIMUM CENTRES.
- 13. CUT AND FILL BATTERS SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT
- 14. EXISTING CONTOURS SHOWN REFLECT SITE CONDITIONS AT TIME OF SURVEY.
- 15. LEVELS ARE TO AUSTRALIAN HEIGHT DATUM.
- 16. ALL LEVELS SHOWN ARE IN METRES. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN MILLIMETRES.
- 17. SURVEY BACKGROUND INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY: ALEXANDER SYMONDS SURVEYING CONSULTANTS
- ALL VEGETATION/TREES REQUIRING REMOVAL SHALL BE REMOVED OFF SITE BY 18. THE CONTRACTOR.
- BEFORE THE CONTRACTOR IMPORTS ANY FILL ON TO SITE THEY MUST PROVIDE 19. THE SUPERINTENDENT WITH A REPORT/STATEMENT THAT THE MATERIAL IS NOT CONTAMINATED.
- AT THE COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION WORKS, ALL AREAS DISTURBED DURING 20. CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE REINSTATED AT THE CONTRACTORS EXPENSE.

- DOWNPIPE BRANCHES ARE NOT SHOWN IN SCHEDULES FOR CLARITY. 21
- ALL PIT COVERS IN LIGHT TO MEDIUM DUTY TRAFFICABLE PAVEMENTS SHALL BE 22. CLASS 'C' U.N.O. ALL PIT COVERS IN HEAVY DUTY TRAFFICABLE PAVEMENTS SHALL BE CLASS 'D' U.N.O. ALL PIT COVERS IN LANDSCAPE AREAS SHALL BE CLASS 'A' U.N.O. GRATES AND FITTINGS SHALL BE MEDIUM DUTY HOT DIP GALVANISED.
- 23. MATERIALS: ALL MATERIAL SHALL COMPLY WITH THE RELEVANT AUSTRALIAN STANDARDS.
- 24. INSTALLATION OF UNDERGROUND STORMWATER DRAINS SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AS2032:2006 SECTIONS 5 (BURIED PIPES & FITTINGS).
- 25. REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPES AND FIBRE REINFORCED CONCRETE DRAINS SHALL BE CLASS 2 RUBBER RING JOINTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH AS1302 U.N.O.
- WHERE A PIPELINE MAY BE SUBJECT TO ABNORMAL LOADING DURING 26. CONSTRUCTION, TEMPORARY (OR PERMANENT) MEASURES SHALL BE TAKEN TO ENSURE THAT THE PIPELINE IS NOT OVERLOADED.
- DRAIN LAYING: BEFORE COMMENCING DRAINAGE WORK, OBTAIN BY SITE 27. MEASUREMENT THE INVERT LEVELS OF ALL DRAINS TO WHICH CONNECTION IS TO BE MADE. IF THE LEVELS DIFFER FROM THOSE SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS, ADVISE THE SUPERINTENDENT BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE DRAIN LAYING. DO NOT SCALE FROM CIVIL DRAWINGS. OBTAIN ALL DIMENSIONS FROM ARCHITECT OR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT DRAWINGS.
- CONFIRM ALL STORMWATER DRAIN PIPE LEVELS BEFORE COMMENCEMENT OF 28. CONSTRUCTION, WHERE NO LEVELS ARE SHOWN, LAY STORMWATER PIPES AT A MINIMUM GRADE OF 1 IN 100. UNLESS NOTED ON DRAWINGS THE MINIMUM COVER TO DRAINS IS 300mm.
- ALL FILLING MATERIAL, COMPACTION AND CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS TO BE IN 29. ACCORDANCE WITH GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERS REPORT.
- 30. ALL SITEWORK CONCRETE SHALL BE F'c = 32MPa NORMAL CLASS CONCRETE U.N.O. ALL WORK SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AS3600 INCLUDING CURING REQUIREMENTS. THESE NOTES ARE SUPPLEMENTARY TO AND DO NOT REPLACE THE SPECIFICATION
- TO WHICH THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY WITH. REFER TO ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS FOR SETTING OUT DIMENSIONS NOT SHOWN ON SITEWORKS DRAWING. ANY STRUCTURES, PAVEMENTS OR SURFACES DAMAGED, DIRTIED OR MADE 32.
- UNSERVICEABLE DUE TO CONSTRUCTION WORK SHALL BE REINSTATED AND MADE GOOD. 33.
- THE CONTRACTOR SHALL OBTAIN BUILD OVER CONSENT FOR ANY WORKS OVER EASEMENTS. DRAINAGE PIT COVERS SHALL BE LEVEL WITH AND SHALL CONFORM TO SLOPE AND
- CROSSFALL OF THE FINISHED SURFACE. THE FINISHED SURFACE LEVELS SHOWN AT PIT LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE ONLY AND SHALL NOT BE USED FOR THE FIXING OF ANY DRAINAGE PIT COVER.
- UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE, MINIMUM PIPE FALLS SHALL BE: 35. - 1:100 FOR 100Ø/150Ø - 1:200 FOR 225Ø - 1:250 FOR 300Ø - 1:300 FOR 375Ø
 - 1:350 FOR 450Ø
- PREMIXED CONCRETE SHALL BE MANUFACTURED AND DELIVERED IN ACCORDANCE 36. WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF AS1379 CEMENT SHALL BE GENERAL PURPOSE PORTLAND CEMENT TYPE GP IN 37.
- ACCORDANCE WITH AS3972. AGGREGATE SHALL COMPLY WITH AS2758.1
- CHEMICAL ADMIXTURES SHALL COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF AS1478 AND SHALL BE USED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PRACTICES DETAILED IN APPENDIX C OF THAT STANDARD.
- 39. SUPERPLASTICISERS MAY BE USED TO INCREASE WORKABILITY AND TO MAINTAIN MAXIMUM WATER CEMENT RATIOS SPECIFIED, SUBJECT TO ENGINEER APPROVAL.
- REINFORCEMENT SHALL COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF AS1302, AS1303 AND 40. AS1304, AS APPROPRIATE. REINFORCEMENT TO BE SUPPORTED IN ITS FINAL POSITION ON APPROVED BAR CHAIRS SUPPORTED ON PLASTIC DISKS ON A 600 x 600 GRID. FABRIC TO BE LAPPED A MINIMUM OF 2 CROSS WIRES PLUS 50mm.
- LIQUID MEMBRANE FORMING CURING COMPOUNDS SHALL COMPLY WITH THE 41. REQUIREMENTS OF AS3799 AND SHALL BE APPLIED STRICTLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MANUFACTURERS INSTRUCTIONS.

NORWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE

PROJECT NORWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE Page 51 of 71

CLIENT

MATTER

SHEET TITLE **CIVIL NOTES SHEET**

CHECKED BY:	APPROVED BY:	SCALE:	DRAWN DATE:
WE	-	1:100	20/10/2024
PROJECT NO: SHEET NO:		REVISION NO:	
24030 C		(001	03
	CHECKED BY: WE	CHECKED BY: APPROVED BY: WE - SHEET NO: CSK	CHECKED BY: APPROVED BY: SCALE: WE - 1:100 SHEET NO: CSK001



REV. DATE 01 22/10/2024 02 29/10/2024 08/11/2024 03

 \longrightarrow

U.N.O.

 \longrightarrow

BY

S.K. S.K. S.K.

CLIENT NORWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE		SHEET TITLE CIVIL AND STORMWAT
		STORMWAT
PROJECT	MATTER	LEVEL
NORWOOD FAMILY		
PRACTICE		
Page 52 of 71		

GROSS LEASABLE AREA

ROOM	AREA
CONSULT ROOM	15 m
CONSULT ROOM	18 m
PATHOLOGY	11 m
CONSULT ROOM	17 m
CONSULT ROOM	17 m
CONSULT ROOM	17 m
ADMIN ROOM	12 m
CONSULT ROOM	15 m
CONSULT ROOM	15 m
CONSULT ROOM	15 m
NEW CROSS OVER TO CITY	15 m
THE CITY OF NORWOOD,	15 m
PAYNEHA, & ST PETERS DETAIL AND SATISFACTION	183 m

LEGEND - PLANTING

CODE BOTANIC NAME COMMON NAME

PB1	Planting Bed (Type 1) Plectranthus Argentatus Nephrolepis Exaltata Aspidistra Elatior Brunnera Macrophylla Hellebore Ficus Pumila
PB2	Planting Bed (Type 2) Philodendron Xanadu

Planting Bed (Type 3) *Stachys Byzantina* Nepeta Tuberosa Salvia

Silver Spurflower Sword Fern

Cast Iron Plant Silver Heart Molly's White Creeping Fig

Winterbourn Philodendron

Lamb's-ear Giant Catmint New Blue Moon Love and Wishes

LEGEND - EXTERNAL MATERIALS

IMAGE	CODE	DESCRIPTION
	FC	Profinished Fibre Coment
		(Grey)
	МС	Profiled Metal Cladding (Light grey)
Salad to used	PC	Powdercoat Aluminium Framed Glazing / Fixed Sunshades (Dark grey)
	GL	Glazing (Transparent)
	BL	Masonry Block (Light finish)
	СО	Concrete (Light finish)
	PW	Prefinished Wall System (Light finish)
	PF	Paint Finish (Light finish)
	BIT	Bitumen (Light finish)
	GRV	Gravel (Light finish)

TER GROUND

PROJECT NO:		SHEET NO:	(001	REVISION N	IO:
DRAWN BY: SK	CHECKED BY: WE	APPROVED BY:	SCALE: 1:100	DRAWN DATE: 20/10/2024	







TYPICAL AGGI DRAIN TO PIPE DETAIL 1:10

TYPICAL AGGI DRAIN DETAIL 1:20

NOTE:

Attachment 8





1:10

CLIENT	SHEET TITLE					•
NORWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE	TYPICAL STORMWATER					
	AND PAVING DETAILS					
	AND I AVING DETAILS	DRAWN BY:	CHECKED BY:	APPROVED BY:	SCALE:	DRAWN DATE:
PROJECT		SK	WE	-	1:100	20/10/2024
		PROJECT NO:		SHEET NO	:	REVISION NO:
PRACTICE		2/03	0	CS I	(001	03
Page 53 of 71		2403	U	UUI		03

BGRADE CBR	SUBBASE
2%	220mm CLASS 3 CRUSHED ROCK + 100mm CLASS 2 CRUSHED ROCK
4%	130mm CLASS 3 CRUSHED ROCK + 100mm CLASS 2 CRUSHED ROCK
6%	100mm CLASS 3 CRUSHED ROCK + 90mm CLASS 2 CRUSHED ROCK
≥8%	160mm CLASS 2 CRUSHED ROCK

1:20

LIGHT DUTY TRAFFICABLE ASPHALT DETAIL





Annexure C



Attachment 8^{& Associates}

Consultant Traffic Engineers ABN 67 093 665 680

204 Young Street Unley SA 5061

P: 08 8271 5999 E: mail@philweaver.com.au

File: 24-136

8 November 2024

Mr Luke Minicozzi Project Director Two Fold Projects Pty Ltd

By email: <u>Luke@twofoldprojects.com</u>

Dear Luke

PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO NORWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE – 43 GEORGE STREET, NORWOOD – TRAFFIC AND PARKING ASSESSMENT

I refer to our previous discussions with respect to the proposed alterations and additions to the existing medical centre on the subject land.

As requested, we have undertaken the following review of the traffic and parking related aspects of the subject development.

EXISTING SITUATION

The subject site is located on the western side of George Street, Norwood, between the intersections of this roadway with Harris Street to the north and Webbe Street to the south.

The subject land is located within a *Business Neighbourhood Zone* within the Norwood, Payneham and St. Peters local government area.

The subject site currently accommodates an existing single-storey commercial development operating as a general medical practice.

The existing development on the subject land includes a building set back approximately 4.3 metres from the eastern boundary of the site with an informal at-grade car parking area provided at the rear of the building. This car parking area is accessed via a single width driveway along the southern side of the building serviced by a single width crossover on George Street adjacent to the southern boundary of the subject land.

The rear of the subject land abuts the eastern boundary of the adjacent council car park (Webbe Street Car Park) which provides parking for the general public.

George Street is a collector roadway under the care and control of Council. The subject section of George Street forms the northern leg of a four way intersection with The Parade. Traffic movements into and out of this intersection are controlled by traffic signals.



The section of George Street in the near vicinity of the site i.e. between the intersections of this roadway with Harris Street to the north and Webbe Street to the south includes:-

- A single traffic lane in each direction,
- A bicycle lane on each side of this roadway, and
- Parallel parking embayments on both sides of this roadway.

There is currently a capacity to park at least five cars on the western side of George Street between the intersections of this roadway with Harris Street and Webbe Street. Parking in this area is restricted to two hour periods between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm Monday to Friday and 9:00 am to 12:00 noon Saturdays. Outside of these periods the duration of stay of parking in this area is otherwise unrestricted.

Based upon traffic data obtained from the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volume on George Street to the immediate north of The Parade is approximately 7100 vpd. The volume of traffic directly adjacent to the subject site would be lower given the movement of traffic from Webbe Street onto George Street to travel south to the intersection of George Street with The Parade.

Aerial imagery of the subject site and adjoining locality is provided in *Figure 1* below.



Figure 1: Subject site and surrounding locality

The opening hours of the existing medical centre are currently:-

- 8.00 am to 5.30 pm Mondy to Thursday,
- 8.00 am to 5.00 pm Friday,
- 8.00 am to 12.00 pm Saturday, and
- Closed Sunday.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed mixed-use development is identified on a series of plans including Floor Plans (Project No: 24.0874 Revision B dated 8 November 2024) prepared by Walter Brooke Architects.

Attachment 8

The plans identify that the proposed development will include:-

- Minor internal reconfiguration of the existing ground floor building on the subject site,
- A ground floor building extension to the rear of the existing building,
- reconfiguration of the car parking area at the rear of the site, and
- construction of a first floor building extension between the existing building and the rear boundary of the subject site.

The ground floor extension will accommodate:-

- an additional consulting room,
- a pathology room,
- amenity areas including toilets, and
- a passenger lift and stairs linking this area with the proposed first floor building addition.

The proposed first floor building extension will accommodate:-

- An additional waiting area,
- three additional consulting rooms,
- A staff room,
- An office area accommodating the practice manager,
- An office area accommodating the practice director, and
- Flexible staff area, and
- additional amenity areas including toilets.



The **Floor Plans** drawing prepared by Walter Brooke Architects indicate that the proposed development will provide an overall increase in gross leasable floor area of 183m².

The proposed development will provide a total of seven (7) car parking spaces within the undercroft area at the rear of the building for use by staff of the subject medical clinic. This includes provision of an accessible (disability) parking space and associated shared area.

It is proposed that patients of the medical clinic will park off site given the narrow width of the driveway adjacent to the existing building.

Consequently, the volume of traffic generated to and from the rear car park will remain very low and essentially would be tidal in nature providing predominantly entry movements during morning periods and exit movements in late afternoon evening periods.

It is suggested that signage could be installed at the entrance into the site identifying provision of this car park for staff use as per the example in *Figure 2* below



Figure 2: Example of proposed car park signage



The proposed car parking area has been designed in accordance with a User Class 1A (residential and employee parking) facility, providing 5.4m long and 2.4m wide spaces adjacent to a 5.9m wide driveway aisle.

As identified above vehicular access into and out of the subject development will be provided by the existing driveway along the southern boundary of the site which will widen to 3.0m metres on the approach to the proposed rear car parking area.

A minimum vertical clearance of approximately 2.9m will be provided above the rear car park below the floor plate of the first floor building component which would significantly exceed the minimum vertical clearance of 2.5m above an accessible parking space and associated shared area.

It is anticipated that the opening hours of the subject medical centre will remain:-

- 8.00 am to 5.30 pm Mondy to Thursday,
- 8.00 am to 5.00 pm Friday,
- 8.00 am to 12.00 pm Saturday, and
- Closed Sunday.

TRAFFIC ASSESSMENT

Vehicular Trip Generation

The *Trip Generation Surveys Medical Centres Analysis* report produced by TEF Consulting, commissioned by the Roads and Maritime Services of NSW (dated August 2015) identifies a wide range of surveyed vehicular trip generation rates for medical centres. From surveys undertaken at 14 medical centre developments in Metropolitan Sydney, an average peak hour vehicular trip generation rate of 7.4 vehicle trips per 100m² was identified.

It is therefore estimated that the proposed 183m² increase in the floor area of the subject development could generate up to 14 additional weekday peak hour vehicle trips above that associated with the current medical practice.

The majority of the forecast traffic movements generated by the proposed development will not occur to and from the on-site parking areas of the proposed development given that parking on-site will be restricted to staff.

In any event the forecast increase in overall traffic movements traffic anticipated by the subject development would be well within the capacity of the adjoining road network.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development will not result in adverse traffic impacts within the locality, generating levels of additional traffic volumes which will be appropriately accommodated by the adjoining road network. The on-site parking areas and will also provide appropriate design outcomes in terms of on-site manoeuvrability.

Site Accessibility

A series of turning path diagrams have been included within an appendix to this report demonstrating the ability for drivers of cars to access the rear car parking areas. These figures include:-

• *Figure A* which demonstrates the ability for a B99 vehicle to turn into the car parking area at the rear of the site and turn on-site, and



• *Figure B* which demonstrates the ability for a B99 vehicle to turn out of the car parking area at the rear of the site.

PARKING ASSESSMENT

Car Parking

The subject site is located within a *Business Neighbourhood Zone* within 200m of a high-frequency public transport (bus) corridor (The Parade). It is therefore understood the car parking requirements of the proposed would be subject to *Table 2 - Off Street Car Parking Requirements in Designated Areas* within the *Transport Access and Parking Overlay* of the *Planning and Design Code*.

On the above basis, the additional car parking requirements relevant to the proposed development are reproduced in *Table B* below.

Table B: Relevant off street car parking requirements

Class of Development	Number of Required Car Parking Spaces
Non-residential development	Minimum 3 spaces per 100m ²
	Maximum 6 spaces per 100m ²

On the above basis, the additional floor areas associated with the proposed development of 183m² would generate a requirement for a minimum of 6 additional on-site car parking spaces.

Performance Outcome 5.1 of the *Transport Access and Parking Overlay* within the *Planning and Design Code* identifies that *'sufficient on-site vehicle parking and specifically marked accessible car parking places are provided to meet the needs of the development or land use having regard to factors that may support a reduced on-site rate such as availability of on-street car parking, shared use of other parking areas...'*

I consider that such a theoretical increase in car parking demand may be less given the close and convenient proximity to high-frequency public transport, and in any event could be provided off-site particularly given the close proximity of the subject development to the adjoining Webbe Street car park and the on-street car parking provisions in the locality of the subject site.

Bicycle Parking

Table C - Off Street Bicycle Parking Requirements within the *Transport Access and Parking Overlay* of the *Planning and Design Code* identifies bicycle parking requirements relevant to the proposed development as applied in *Table C* below.

Class of Development	Bicycle Parking Rate	Units	Number of Required Bicycle Parking Spaces
Consulting Room	1 space per 20 employees plus 1 space per 20 consulting rooms for customers	20 employees and 10 consulting rooms	1 space plus 0.5 visitor spaces

Table C: Off-street bicycle parking requirements

On the above basis, the proposed development would require a total of 2 bicycle parking spaces.



Such a requirement will be exceeded by the provision of three bicycle racks at the rear of the proposed ground floor building.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we consider that the proposed development will:

- Provide a design standard which is appropriate and essentially meets the requirements of the relevant Australian Standards for off-street parking areas, and
- Not result in unacceptable traffic impacts on the adjacent road network in terms of site accessibility or vehicular trip generation.

Yours sincerely,

Weave

Phil Weaver Phil Weaver and Associates Pty Ltd

Enc: Figures A and B





Ref: 24ADL-1087

7 February 2025

Attachment 9

Adelaide 27 Halifax Street Adelaide SA 5000 08 8333 7999

urps.com.au

ADL | MEL | PER

Ned Feary Senior Urban Planner City of Norwood, Payneham & St Peters 175 The Parade Norwood SA 4531

Sent via email to nfeary@npsp.com.au

Dear Ned

Application ID 24038142 – 43 George Street, Norwood

This letter responds to your email dated 20 January 2025 which sought further information on a couple of elements of the proposed development. We understand that this request was to inform you for your assessment of the proposal.

Our response to the matters raised in your email follows the same sub-headings as your email:

Access from Car Park to Building

You sought clarification on the proposed pedestrian connectivity between the building and the car park.

The rear car park has been designed to provide more off-street car parking spaces than the minimum sought by the Code. Our client acknowledges the challenges of the narrow driveway beside the existing building. This is why the car park will be used by practitioners to limit the number of vehicle movements to and from the site. Access to the car park will also be managed with an automated gate.

While the Code does not require the provision of an accessible space on site, our client has chosen to incorporate one accessible space because of the nature of the existing medical centre. When required, patients could use this accessible space by arranging access with the practice ahead of their appointments. This provides a safe and accessible option for patients should the numerous alternative parking options in the area be unavailable or inaccessible.

We acknowledge the Kaurna People as the Traditional Custodians of the land on which we work and pay respect to Elders past, present and emerging.



https://urpsau.sharepoint.com/sites/Synergy/Shared Documents/Projects/24ADL/24ADL-1087 - 43 George Street, Norwood/Working/URPS Planning Advice/20250207_C1_V2_Response to Council.docx



Noting that the rear access from the car park includes a stepped entry, you sought clarification on why ramped access was not proposed at the rear of the building.

It is important to note that the rear access has been designed primarily for practitioners. Patient access via the rear of the building is not appropriate for a medical centre. Instead, the nature of this business demands a single point of observed entry for security and functional purposes.

The development maintains the existing single entry with integrated ramp at the front of the site for the following reasons:

- Functional a singular entry/exit provides an efficient and logical experience for patients. It also provides oversight and a controlled environment for the business.
- Secure controlled access at the front of the property ensures the business complies with relevant security requirements.
- Safe a controlled, non-discriminatory entry/exit provides a high degree of patient safety and wellbeing. The gradient of the existing ramp at the front of the site does not meet current building code requirements. This will be upgraded as part of the development to provide safe entry.

Nevertheless, where the accessible parking space is used by patients (or practitioners) it satisfies the following relevant provisions in your email:

Design in Urban Areas – General Development policy

- PO 2.3 Buildings are designed with <u>safe</u>, <u>perceptible and direct access from public street</u> frontages and vehicle parking areas.
- PO 7.3 <u>Safe, legible, direct and accessible pedestrian connections are provided between</u> parking areas and the development.

Transport, Access and Parking – General Development Policy

- PO 4.1 Development is sited and designed to provide <u>safe</u>, <u>dignified and convenient</u> <u>access for people with a disability</u>.
- PO 6.4 Pedestrian linkages between parking areas and the development are provided and are safe and convenient.

(Underlining added)

In summary these provisions all seek to provide access which is direct, safe and dignified. This is achieved by:

- Direct the accessible space has been located at the end of the driveway and is visible from the street. This means there is a direct line of sight along the path between the parking space and access point.
- Safe the existing gravel driveway will be sealed as part of the development. The driveway also features a uniform level to provide a safe surface.





The accessible space is provided on-site behind a secure gate and use of the space would be prearranged with the business. This means the path of access between the accessible car space and the building is within a highly controlled, safe environment. Vehicle movements within the shared environment will be severely limited in both volume and time of day. The total number of car parks and their being limited to practitioners means a total of six cars would enter and exit the site each day.

• Dignified – maintaining existing ramped access at the primary entrance provides dignified entry for all patients directly from the public street frontage.

Further to this, you have asked whether the client had considered providing a ramp to the rear entrance for practitioners. As detailed above, the primary reason for maintaining ramped access at the front of the building is because of the functional and security requirements of our clients' business. There is no requirement in the Code to provide multiple access points for persons with a disability and the provisions which deal with this (above) have been satisfied.

Nevertheless, we can offer some detail on why a second ramped access point is not proposed. While it may initially appear like ramp access could be provided to the rear of the building as well, this is not practical because:

- The addition of a ramp with a compliant gradient to account for current site and finished floor levels would severely reduce the provision of car parks on site. The width of the property and narrow driveway limits the possibilities for turn paths and car park locations on site. Our client has sought to maximise the provision of on-site car parks which we understand is supported by Council.
- As an alternative, earthworks would be required to raise the car park level by 200mm to provide a compliant gradient for a ramp to the rear entrance. This is due to the existing variation between the building level and car park/driveway level. Increasing the level at the rear of the site and introducing a transition in level to the street would introduce other issues on site. This is not a practical outcome because:
 - 200mm of fill across approximately 315m² is 94.5 tonnes of clean fill. The width of the driveway limits access to the rear of the site. Narrow earthmoving equipment would need to be used for an incremental delivery of fill on site. This would require significant disruption to George Street for the delivery of this volume of fill as there are no alternative locations for a put down/storage area.
 - The change in level at the rear of the site would mean a change in level along the driveway and additional retaining walls along the southern boundary. This would introduce a gradient to the existing flat driveway point, changing the safety of the shared pedestrian and vehicular environment.





- Depositing fill around the existing footings of the building would also require reinforcement of the existing slab and additional works to prevent
- The fill would also require increased retaining works along the northern and western boundaries. It would also require minor reconfiguration to internal floor levels between the existing building and proposed extension. This would result in a minor increase to the building height of the development as well.
- The proposed stormwater strategy would also require adjustments to account for the level change.

Rear Setback and Interface with the Carpark

You raised concern about passive surveillance to the Council-owned public car park to the rear of the site.

Following your email, a site inspection was conducted with you on Friday 24 January. This confirmed that Council's ramp has existing lighting (both high and lower-level) and active surveillance with an existing CCTV camera which provides full coverage to the ramp.

While the ramp does not immediately adjoin the boundary, you highlighted the potential for graffiti on the rear wall. While the wall will feature a high-quality external finish which will limit the potential target for graffiti, in response to your concerns the plans now confirm that the wall will also include a graffiti-resistant treatment.

Miscellaneous

You also sought the following general information:

- Mech boxes Walter Brooke has provided amended elevations which confirm the position of MECH boxes within the car parking area. These are affixed to the wall and provide suitable clearance to avoid any interference with car and bicycle parking.
- Manoeuvring clearance –swept path diagrams have been provided by Phil Weaver and Associates Pty Ltd. These include the clearance envelopes and B99 turn paths and is attached as **Annexure A**.

Conclusion

I trust that the above information satisfies the questions raised in your email and enable you to finalise your assessment of the application.

I can be contacted on 8333 7999 if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely





Ulfreer

Matilda Asser Consultant





Annexure A






- 6. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS DEVELOPMENT ACT
- 7. REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT MANAGER DECISIONS
- 8. ERD COURT APPEALS

9. OTHER BUSINESS

9.1 COUNCIL ASSESSMENT PANEL UPDATED MEETING PROCEDURES

COUNCIL ASSESSMENT PANEL – UPDATED MEETING PROCEDURES

REPORT AUTHOR:MCONTACT NUMBER:83FILE REFERENCE:q/ATTACHMENTS:1	lanager, Development & Regulatory Services / Assessment Manager 3664567 A131059
--	---

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report seeks the endorsement of revised and updated Meeting Procedures for the Council Assessment Panel.

BACKGROUND

The Council Assessment Panel previously considered and endorsed updated Meeting Procedures at its meeting held on 19 June 2023.

Since that time the composition of the Panel has changed, and it is considered consistent with the practices of good governance to conduct a periodic review of the Meeting Procedures.

Prior to the last review of the Meeting Procedures, the Meeting Procedures and Terms of Reference for the Council Assessment Panel were combined in one (1) document. Based on legal advice, the documents were split. The Terms of Reference for the Council Assessment Panel were considered and endorsed by the Council (on 1 May 2023), while the Meeting Procedures were considered and endorsed by the Council Assessment Panel.

During the last review, over twenty (20) changes were made to the Meeting Procedures to ensure they are up-to-date and reflect best practice.

DISCUSSION

The applicable legislation (in this case the *Planning, Development & Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017),* clearly anticipates that the Council Assessment Panel itself will be responsible for setting its own procedures where those procedures are not specified in the legislation:

18 – Other Matters

Except insofar as a procedure is prescribed by the Act or these regulations, the procedures of an assessment panel in relation to the conduct of its business will be as determined by the assessment panel (and an assessment panel is accordingly a specified body for the purposes of section 246(6)(d) of the Act).

In late 2024, Members were provided with a copy of Meeting Procedures and were asked to consider any changes that may be appropriate. Council's Assessment Manager has also reviewed the Meeting Procedures.

Attached to this report is a "tracked change" version of the Meeting Procedures. Only two (2) changes are proposed, as follows:

- A change to the date of endorsement (to reflect the fact that the Panel will consider (and potentially endorse) the Meeting Procedures at the meeting to be held on 17 February 2025; and
- A change to Clause 5.6.5 to note that, where a person is nominated to speak on behalf of a group of people, a maximum time of 10 minutes will be permitted (instead of 15 minutes which is noted in the current Procedures). However, this does not fetter the discretion of the Presiding Member to grant

additional time should that be required or appropriate in the circumstances (and words to this effect remain within the clause).

Other changes are not suggested at this time, but in the course of conducting the review of the Meeting Procedures, several others matters arose and I have outlined those below together with advice about why the corresponding changes are not being suggested to the Meeting Procedures.

- Meeting Commencement Time The Meeting Procedures do not typically specify meeting start times. The Panel determines the meeting dates and start times for the following year at the December meeting.
- Acknowledgement of Country The Council's position is that an Acknowledgement of Country is only
 performed at Council Meetings and significant civic events. Accordingly, the Council does not suggest
 the Meeting Procedures reflect the requirement for an Acknowledgement of Country. There is
 however no reason why the Presiding Member cannot continue to perform an Acknowledgement of
 Country at the commencement of Panel meetings.
- Development Act clauses Perhaps surprisingly, the Council still has several Development Act files which are active. Accordingly, it is suggested the clauses in the Meeting Procedures related to the Development Act remain.
- Casting Vote Clause 7.3.10 in the Meeting Procedures notes:

Where a decision is by the casting vote of the Presiding Member, it shall be recorded as "Carried on the casting vote of the Presiding Member".

The *Planning Development & Infrastructure (Genera) Regulations 2017* do not specify that the use of a casting vote has to be recorded and it is therefore up to the Council Assessment Panel to determine whether it is appropriate to do so.

The advice from Council's Governance Team is that it is good practice to record the use of a casting vote from a decision-making transparency perspective. At this stage, the clause remains within the Meeting Procedures pending the Panel's consideration.

- Minutes – The minutes for the Council Assessment Panel currently contain a full record of the meeting, inclusive of the complete agenda item, the original recommendation, and the resolution. This does mean the minutes are often a document of some length.

The inclusion of the original agenda item in the minutes is done so deliberately on the advice of Council's Governance Team as it provides for an easier approach than having to review both the original agenda and the minutes. By including all information, a person can open only the minutes document, and easily understand the context, matter that was considered, recommendation and resolution.

The Meeting Procedures do not currently specify this level of detail, but it is suggested as appropriate in the interests of transparency and consistency.

CONCLUSION

The suggested changes to the Meeting Procedures minor in nature.

As the Panel is responsible for adopting its own Meeting Procedures, a recommendation is listed which allows for endorsement and finalisation of the updated Meeting Procedures.

If the recommendation is adopted, the administration will arrange for an updated version of the Meeting Procedures to be uploaded to the Council website.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Council Assessment Panel endorses and adopts the updated Council Assessment Panel Meeting Procedures as noted in Attachment 1.

Attachment 1



City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

COUNCIL ASSESSMENT PANEL

MEETING PROCEDURES

Adopted 19 June 2023 17 February 2025

These Meeting Procedures should be read in conjunction with:

- The meeting procedures contained within the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure* (*General*) *Regulations* 2017 (**Regulations**); and
- The Council Assessment Panel's Policy for the Review of a Decision of an Assessment Manager.

All meetings of the Council Assessment Panel (CAP) will be held in public except for that portion of the meeting where the CAP resolves to exclude the public in accordance with the provisions of Regulation 13(2).

1. COUNCIL ASSESSMENT PANEL MEETINGS

Ordinary Meetings

- 1.1 The business and meetings of the CAP will be coordinated by the Assessment Manager, in consultation with the Presiding Member.
- 1.2 Subject to clause 1.3, ordinary meetings of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters CAP will be held at such times and places as determined by the CAP.
- 1.3 The time and place of the first meeting of the CAP following its establishment will be determined by the Assessment Manager. The Assessment Manager must give notice of the first CAP meeting to the CAP and the public in accordance with clauses 1.5 and 1.6.
- 1.4 Notice of an ordinary meeting will be given to all CAP Members by the Assessment Manager not less than 3 clear days prior to the holding of the meeting in accordance with clause 1.5.
- 1.5 Notice of a meeting of the CAP must:
 - 1.5.1 be in writing;
 - 1.5.2 set out the date, time and place of the meeting;
 - 1.5.3 be signed by the Assessment Manager;
 - 1.5.4 contain or be accompanied by the agenda and any documents and/or reports that are to be considered at the meeting (in so far as practicable); and
 - 1.5.5 be given to a CAP Member personally, by post to a place authorised in writing by the Member or by other means authorised by the Member as being an available means of giving notice;
 - 1.5.6 where attendance at the meetings is able to occur by electronic means (in whole or in part), include details of how to connect to the meeting; and
 - 1.5.7 where the meeting is to be live streamed for viewing by members of the public, include details of how to access and/or connect to the live stream.

- 1.6 A notice that is not given in accordance with clause 1.5 is taken to have been validly given if the Assessment Manger considers it impracticable to give the notice in accordance with that clause and takes action the Assessment Manager considers reasonably practicable in the circumstances to bring the notice to the attention of the Member.
- 1.7 A copy of the agenda (including the attachments to the reports) for all meetings of the CAP will be available for viewing by the public on the Council's website and at the Council's offices as soon as practicable after the time that notice of the meeting has been given to CAP Members.
- 1.8 The Assessment Manger may, with leave or at the request of the Presiding Member, include in the agenda an item to be considered at the meeting to which the agenda relates after notice of the meeting has been given to CAP Members. In such instance, the Assessment Manger shall provide an updated agenda and any documents and/or reports relating to that item to be considered at the meeting to Members as soon as practicable. The Assessment Manager will also make an updated agenda available to the public.
- 1.9 Members are encouraged to provide any questions or requested amendments to recommendations to the Assessment Manager prior to the commencement of the meeting.
- 1.10 The Presiding Member may adjourn a CAP Meeting to a future date and time, unless the CAP resolves to continue the meeting.
- 1.11 Meetings of the Panel shall conclude at 11.00pm. In the event that matters are outstanding the meeting will be adjourned to reconvene on the fourth Monday of the month or as determined by the Council's Assessment Manager in consultation with the Presiding Member. However, the Presiding Member may use his/her discretion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes, provided that all Panel Members are in agreement to extend the meeting and provided that, in the opinion of the Presiding Member, there is a reasonable chance that the Panel's business will be concluded by 11.15pm. Any decision to conclude the meeting is subject to consideration of the Assessment timeframes that may be applicable and should be made in conjunction with the Assessment Manager.

Special Meetings

- 1.12 The Presiding Member, or two or more CAP Members, may by delivering a written request to the Assessment Manager require a special meeting of the CAP to be held. The written request must be accompanied by the agenda for the special meeting.
- 1.13 On receipt of a request pursuant to clause 1.12, the Assessment Manager must determine the date, time and place of the special meeting and give notice to all CAP members at least 4 hours before the commencement of the special meeting.
- 1.14 The Assessment Manager may, in consultation with the Presiding Member, require a special meeting of the CAP to be held to consider such urgent or important business that may warrant such a meeting.

2. DEPUTY MEMBERS

- 2.1 If a CAP Member is unable or unwilling to attend a meeting or part of a meeting, he or she must use his or her best endeavours to notify the Presiding Member or Assessment Manager at his or her earliest opportunity.
- 2.2 If notification pursuant to clause 8.1 is given, the Assessment Manager/Presiding Member may request a Deputy Member attend the meeting in place of the CAP Member for the meeting or part of the meeting.
- 2.3 Unless the context otherwise requires, a reference to a Member in these Meeting Procedures includes a Deputy Member.

Attachment 1

3. ELECTRONIC MEETINGS

- 3.1 One or more CAP Members may attend a meeting via electronic means.
- 3.2 A CAP Member attending a meeting via electronic means is taken to be present at the meeting provided that the CAP Member:
 - 3.2.1 can hear all other CAP Members who are present at the meeting;
 - 3.2.2 can hear all representors (or their representatives) and applicants (or their representatives) who speak at the meeting;
 - 3.2.3 can be heard by all other CAP Member present at the meeting;
 - 3.2.4 can be heard by the person recording the minutes of the meeting.
- 3.3 Where an entire meeting occurs via electronic means, it will (to the extent that the public is not able to physically attend the meeting, and subject to technological capability) be live streamed.
- 3.4 Where a meeting is being live streamed, the live stream must be disconnected only during those parts of the meeting during which the public has been excluded from attendance pursuant to Regulation 13(2) of the Regulations.
- 3.5 Where the public has been excluded from attendance pursuant to Regulation 13(2) of the Regulations, the Assessment Manager or a person nominated by the Assessment Manager must ensure that all parties except for the CAP Member disconnect from, or are disconnected from, the meeting.

4. COMMENCEMENT OF MEETINGS

- 4.1 Subject to a quorum being present, a meeting of the CAP will commence as soon as possible after the time specified in the notice of a meeting. A quorum is three (3) members for a CAP of five (5) members.
- 4.2 If the number of apologies received by the Assessment Manager or Presiding Member indicates that a quorum will not be present at a meeting, the Presiding Member may adjourn the meeting to a specified day and time.
- 4.3 If at the expiration of thirty minutes from the commencement time specified in the notice of the meeting a meeting a quorum is not present, the Presiding Member may adjourn the meeting to a specified date and time.
- 4.4 In the event that the Presiding Member is absent from a meeting, the Assessment Manager, or such other person as nominated by the Assessment Manager, will preside at the meeting until such time as the meeting appoints an Acting Presiding Member.

5. ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

The procedures in Part 5 of these Meeting Procedures relate only to the CAP's assessment of development applications under Part 7 of the Act and Part 4 of the Development Act NB: The procedures for determining an application for review of an Assessment Manager's decision are contained in the Assessment Manager Review Policy.

- 5.1 The Assessment Manager/Presiding Member may in his or her discretion exclude:
 - 5.1.1 a representation or response to representation(s) which is received out of time;
 - 5.1.2 a representation in relation to Category 2 development from a person who was not entitled to be given notice of the application; or

- 5.1.3 a representation or response to representation(s) which is otherwise invalid.
- 5.2 The Assessment Manager/Presiding Member may in his or her discretion accept and allow to be considered by the CAP any new or additional material submitted by a representor or applicant. The CAP may defer consideration of the application to enable full and proper assessment of the further information.
- 5.3 Any material to be considered by the CAP pursuant to clause 5.2 must be provided to the applicant and/or representor(s) (as the case may be) in a manner directed by the Assessment Manager and those parties be provided with an opportunity to respond, either in writing or verbally, at the discretion of the Presiding Member.
- 5.4 In relation to each application it considers, the CAP must:
 - 5.4.1 determine whether the proposal is seriously at variance with the Development Plan or the Planning Rules (as relevant) and provide reasons for its determination; and
 - 5.4.2 provide reasons for refusing development authorisation (if relevant).
- 5.5 If the CAP determines that a proposal is seriously at variance with the Development Plan or the Planning Rules (as relevant), it must refuse Development Plan consent to the application.
- 5.6 In relation to each application to be considered and determined by the CAP:
 - 5.6.1 a person who has lodged a representation in relation to a Category 2 or 3 application under the Development Act or an application for which notice must be given under the Act, which has not been excluded pursuant to clause 5.1 and who has indicated that they wish to be heard on their representation is entitled to appear before the CAP and be heard in support of their representation, in person or by an agent;
 - 5.6.2 where one or more representors are heard by the CAP, the applicant is entitled to appear before the CAP to respond to any relevant matter raised by a representor, in person or by an agent;
 - 5.6.3 The CAP will hear representors in support of their representations first, and then the applicant's response to the representations;
 - 5.6.4 where no representors appear at the meeting, the Presiding Member may, in his or her discretion, allow an applicant to address the CAP, for the purpose of answering any questions that the CAP may have;
 - 5.6.5 representors and applicants will be allowed five minutes each to address the CAP. The Presiding Member may allow a party additional time at his or her discretion. Where a person is nominated to speak on behalf of a group of people, a maximum of 105 minutes will be granted. In such circumstances the applicant will be granted the same amount of time as the group to respond;
 - 5.6.6 all persons presenting to the CAP shall adhere to the *Guidelines and Protocols for Council Assessment Panel Meetings* and the *Presentation Procedures* as outlined in Attachments A and B;
 - 5.6.7 representors and applicants must avoid raising new material that has not been raised in their written submissions when appearing before the CAP. In rare circumstances where it is necessary for new information to be presented it should be forwarded to the Assessment Manager at least 5 business days prior to the meeting to allow distribution to relevant parties and CAP Members;
 - 5.6.8 at the discretion of the Presiding Member and in consultation with CAP Members and the Assessment Manager, any new information presented by any party at the CAP meeting may or may not be considered. The decision of the Presiding Member is final in this regard;

- 5.6.9 CAP members may question and seek clarification from a representor or applicant who has addressed the CAP at the conclusion of their address; and ask questions of planning staff;
- 5.6.10 representors will not be allowed a further opportunity to address the CAP once the applicant has concluded their response;
- 5.6.11 following addresses from representors and the applicant, the Presiding Member will invite all Members to speak on any matter relevant to the application;
- 5.6.12 at the conclusion of the CAP discussion, should the CAP defer a decision on the development, when the development is considered at a subsequent CAP meeting the applicant and representors will not be heard again by the CAP unless the application has been re-advertised and a new hearing of representations is to be held. However, the Presiding Member may allow CAP Members to ask questions of the applicant or representor, who must limit their response to the question raised;
- 5.6.13 Clause 5.6.1 to 5.6.4 are satisfied is a representor or applicant or their agent (as the case may be) appears via electronic means. The Presiding Member may require that such appearance be via electronic means.

6. DECISION MAKING

- 6.1 Each Member present at a meeting of the CAP, including a Deputy Member who has been requested to attend the meeting or part of the meeting in place of a Member who is unable or unwilling to attend the meeting, is entitled to one vote on any matter arising for decision. If the votes are equal, the Presiding Member is entitled to a second or casting vote. Additional Members appointed to the CAP to provide expert advice and assistance are not entitled to vote.
- 6.2 Subject to a Member of the CAP having a direct or indirect personal or pecuniary interest, each Member present at a meeting of the CAP must vote on a question arising for decision.
- 6.3 Matters arising for decision at a meeting of the CAP will be decided by a majority of the votes cast by Members present at the meeting and entitled to vote.
- 6.4 The Presiding Member may adjourn a meeting in the event of a disruption or disturbance by any person (including a CAP Member, applicant, representor or other member of the public) to a specified date and time.
- 6.5 The Presiding Member may ask a member of the public (including an applicant, representor or other member of the public) to leave a meeting where he or she is, in the opinion of the Presiding Member:
 - 6.5.1 behaving in a disorderly manner; or
 - 6.5.2 causing an interruption or disruption to the meeting.
- 6.6 Where the Assessment Manager Review Policy so allows, and where a person is entitled or has been requested to appear before the CAP in relation to an application for review of an Assessment Manager's decision (including the Assessment Manager or delegate), the person may appear via electronic means. The Presiding Member may require that any such appearance be via electronic means.
- 6.7 Prior to calling for a motion, the Presiding Member in facilitating comment/discussion, will utilise his/her discretion, to allow discussion of any matter and to conclude the opportunity for discussion/comment only after each Panel Member present at the meeting, has been provided with the opportunity to speak.
- 6.8 An outcome to comment or discussion must be given effect by and shall only be valid when presented as a motion by a mover and seconder.

6.9 A motion will lapse if it not seconded at the appropriate time.

7. MINUTES AND REPORTING

- 7.1 The CAP must ensure that accurate minutes are kept of all meetings.
- 7.2 The Assessment Manager, or a person nominated by the Assessment Manager, will take minutes of all meetings.
- 7.3 The minutes will record:
 - 7.3.1 the names of all Members present;
 - 7.3.2 the names of all Members from whom apologies have been received;
 - 7.3.3 the name and time that a Member enters or leaves the meeting;
 - 7.3.4 the name of every person who makes a representation in relation to a development application;
 - 7.3.5 methods of attendance by all Members present and by every person who makes or responds to a representation;
 - 7.3.6 the name of every person who appears in relation to an application for review of any Assessment Manager decision (including the Assessment Manager or delegate);
 - 7.3.7 in relation to each development application:
 - 7.3.7.1 the determination of the CAP as to whether the proposal is seriously at variance with the Development Plan or Planning Rules (as relevant); and
 - 7.3.7.2 the reasons for refusing development authorisation (if relevant); and
 - 7.3.8 in relation to each application for review of an Assessment Manager decision:
 - 7.3.8.1 the determination of the CAP as to whether the proposal is seriously at variance with the Development Plan or Planning Rules (as relevant); and
 - 7.3.8.2 the reasons for the CAP's decision under Section 203(4) of the Act; and
 - 7.3.9 where a decision is made by majority vote, the decision and its mover and seconder, but not each Member's vote;
 - 7.3.10 where a decision is by the casting vote of the Presiding Member, it shall be recorded as *Carried on the casting vote of the Presiding Member*;
 - 7.3.11 if an application is not determined by the CAP, the deferral of the application and the reasons for the deferral;
 - 7.3.12 a decision to exclude the public from attendance pursuant to the Regulations;
 - 7.3.13 any disclosure of a direct or indirect pecuniary interest in any aspect of a development or anybody associated with any aspect of a development made by a Member in accordance with Section 83(1)(g) of the Act, and the nature of the interest;
 - 7.3.14 any disclosure of a conflict of interest made by a Member pursuant to the Code of Conduct adopted by the Minister under Clause 1(1)(c) of Schedule 3 of the Act (**Code** of **Conduct**), and the nature of the interest; and
 - 7.3.15 if a meeting is adjourned by the Presiding Member, the reason for the adjournment and the date and time to which the meeting is adjourned.

7.4 All minutes must be confirmed by the Assessment Manager in conjunction with the Presiding Member as being accurate prior to, or at the commencement of, the following CAP meeting.

8. ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES

- 8.1 Insofar as any procedure to be followed by the CAP is not prescribed by the Act and Regulations (and, during the transition to the Act and Regulations, the Development Act and *Development Regulations 2008*), the CAP's Terms of Reference, the Code of Conduct or these Meeting Procedures the CAP may by resolution determine the procedure for itself. Any such determination may be added to these Meeting Procedures.
- 8.2 The CAP may call for and consider such professional assistance from the Assessment Manager and, in consultation with the Assessment Manager, other professional advisors as it deems necessary and appropriate from time to time.
- 8.3 Members of the media and public are not permitted to use a recording device to record any part of the meeting process unless authority is provided from the Assessment Manager and Presiding Member. A request to use a recording device to record deliberations of any part of a CAP meeting shall be made to the Assessment Manager and Presiding Member prior to or at the commencement of, the meeting. The Presiding Member may ask for a resolution or comments from CAP members to assist him or her in their decision.
- 8.4 An applicant may not defer a development application from the meeting agenda after the agenda has been sent to CAP Members, unless the deferral is agreed to by the Assessment Manager in consultation with the Presiding Member. The applicant must make this request in writing to the Assessment Manager with reason(s) for their request for deferral prior to the meeting.
- 8.5 Should a CAP Member receive by post, email, or other means information in relation to a development application being assessed by Council development assessment staff which may be referred for decision to CAP at a future time, then the CAP Member should immediately forward the information received to the Assessment Manager. The CAP Member should not acknowledge receipt of the information not enter into discussion with the sender about the information received.
- 8.6 A CAP Member may, where they feel circumstances warrant such, request a site inspection for the Panel of a particular site. The request should be made in writing to the Assessment Manager a minimum of 3 days prior to the meeting, and the decision to conduct a site inspection will be made by the Presiding Member in consultation with the Assessment Manager.

Nothing in these Procedures limits the opportunity for a CAP Member to inspect a site for a proposed development that forms part of an upcoming agenda in isolation ahead of a CAP Meeting, provided they do not engage in discussion with any person about the matter and they only view the site from the public realm.

- 8.7 By lodging a development application or submitting a representation, representors and/or applicants acknowledge that the documentation they submit may form part of the published CAP agenda and will be available for viewing by the general public.
- 8.8 The CAP has delegated many of the functions and powers associated with matters/applications for which it is the relevant authority. The CAP is entitled to make a decision on a matter/application before it on the presumption that the matter/application has been processed correctly. Any allegation of incorrect processing associated with a matter/application should be directed to the Assessment Manager. Nothing in this clause however prevents CAP from making a decision to defer a matter/application should the CAP deem that course of action appropriate.
- 8.9 The CAP will exclude the public from attendance and meet in camera when receiving, discussing or considering potential compromises in respect to appeals which are before the Environment Resources and Development Court.

8.10 Where the CAP excludes the public from attendance pursuant to clause 8.7, the Presiding Member may, in his or her discretion, allow an applicant to address the CAP prior to being excluded from attendance, for the purpose of answering any questions that the CAP may have.

9. AUTHORISATIONS

9.1 The CAP authorises the Assessment Manager or his or her delegate to attend to the conduct of all administrative tasks associated with appeals to the Environment Resources and Development Court, including but not limited to appearing on behalf of the CAP at conferences and directions hearings in the Court and engaging legal representation and experts to represent the Panel.

10. DEFINITIONS

The following definitions apply in relation to these Meeting Procedures:

- 10.1 *connect* means able to hear and/or see the meeting by electronic means, including via a live stream;
- 10.2 *disconnect* means to remove the connection so as to be unable to hear and see the meting;
- 10.3 *electronic* means includes a telephone, computer or other electronic device used for communication;
- 10.4 *live stream* means the transmission of audio and/or video from a meeting at the time the meting is occurring.

10. ATTACHMENT A

Guidelines & Protocols for Council Assessment Panel Meetings

The Council, pursuant to Section 83 of Planning Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 has established a Council Assessment Panel known as the Norwood Payneham and St Peters Council Assessment Panel (hereafter referred to as "the CAP"). The CAP functions as a relevant authority.

Where the CAP hears representors and/or the applicant

- (1) This should not be a debate but an opportunity for persons to summarise and/or respond to representations and to answer any questions that the CAP may have. The purpose of such representations and submissions is to ensure that the CAP is informed about any relevant planning issues with respect to any particular matter. The Presiding Member will restrict submissions and questions to the planning/relevant issues related to a particular matter.
- (2) Representors to the CAP, or their nominated spokesperson, will speak first followed by the applicant who will be invited to respond to the points made by the representors. Either party may speak on their own behalf or seek assistance from other persons such as lawyers, planning consultants or other advisors/persons. Representations are to be limited to a maximum of 5 minutes per party but the Presiding Member has discretion to extend this.

Where a person is nominated to speak on behalf of a recognised group of people (e.g. a resident's association or community group), then the Presiding Member shall upon request from such a group, have the ability to grant such a person more time as deemed appropriate (a maximum of 15 minutes) to speak in support of their representation. In such an instance the applicant shall be granted the same amount of time as the group to respond to representations.

- (3) Members of the CAP may ask the representors or applicant questions to clarify points of a planning nature only. Members of the CAP acknowledge that they should not use 'leading questions'. Questions will only be initiated through the Presiding Member.
- (4) If all information is before the CAP, a decision will usually be made at the time the matter is considered. However, on occasions the CAP may defer the matter for whatever reason (e.g. to enable a site visit to occur or to seek further information to be obtained to fully address matters raised during consideration of the proposal). The development assessment staff may also require further time to complete the assessment where further information is sought. Assessment timeframes will be a relevant consideration.
- (5) The CAP will then deliberate on each item in public (unless it is a confidential matter pursuant to the provisions of Regulation 13(2) of the Planning Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017).
- (6) At the conclusion of the Hearing of Representations and the applicant's address, the CAP may either resolve to approve, refuse or for whatever reason, defer a decision on the application. When the application has been deferred and then brought back before the CAP for consideration, the applicant and representor(s) will not again be heard by the CAP unless the application has been readvertised and a new Hearing of Representations is to be held. However, the Presiding Member may allow CAP Members to ask questions of the applicant or the representor who must limit their response to the question raised.
- (7) Where notice is given to representors in accordance with the requirements of the PDI General Regulations 2017 and the representor is not present at the scheduled meeting when the matter is to be considered, the CAP will not defer consideration of the matter to enable the representor to be present. Further, in the event the matter is deferred as contemplated in point (6) above, then the representor shall not have a right to be heard at the meeting where the matter is further considered.
- (8) Each matter of development assessment, whether it be an application for consent or the imposition or variation of conditions should be considered and determined individually upon its own merits.

Council Assessment Panel Meeting Procedures



- (9) The role of the CAP is not one of mediator or arbitrator for parties expressing divergent views but is as a decision maker charged with the responsibility of assessing each proposal (as presented) against the relevant Planning Rules or Development Plan provisions. It is a role that is inquisitorial rather than adversarial and may explore reasonable solutions to issues related to the proposal that affect other interested parties or third parties. However, the does not extend to redesigning or redefining a proposal or, finding alternative locations for a development. The CAP does not therefore have a role as a mediator or arbitrator at its meetings or otherwise between an applicant and representors.
- (10) Where a representor/applicant has questions following a decision of the CAP, such questions should be directed to Council's administration the following business day.

11. ATTACHMENT B

Presentation Procedures

All persons presenting to the CAP shall adhere to the following Presentation Procedures when addressing the Council Assessment Panel (CAP):

- (1) Persons addressing the CAP shall, upon request, give their full name, location of their property in relation to the applicant's property, and an indication as to whether they are speaking on their own behalf or for another person or a group. When responding to questions or providing information to the CAP, persons should address the Presiding Member and confine their response to the question.
- (2) The order of presentations will be as follows:

(a) The Presiding Member will introduce the item;

(b) The representors to the application or their nominee will make their submissions followed by questions from the CAP;

(c) The applicant or their nominee will make his/her submission, followed by questions from the CAP.

- (3) The representors and applicant are permitted a maximum of 5 minutes each for their presentations (although the Presiding Member amy allow additional time at his or her absolute discretion), and should allow time for questions from the CAP. Persons presenting to the CAP shall be succinct, avoid repetition and focus on key points remembering the members of the CAP have a copy of their submission. The applicant will then be given an opportunity to respond to the representations made to the CAP. Where a person is nominated to speak on behalf of a recognised group of people (e.g. a resident's association or community group), then the Presiding Member shall upon request from such a group, have the ability to grant such a person more time as deemed appropriate (maximum of 15 minutes) to speak in support of their representations. In such an instance the applicant shall be granted the same amount of time as the group to respond to such representations.
- (4) The CAP will then deliberate on the matter and make its determination to approve, refuse or for whatever reason defer a decision on the application.
- (5) It should be noted that the CAP will not tolerate any inflammatory, derogatory or racist comments and persons presenting to the CAP are requested to restrict their submissions to planning matters only.
- (6) It should also be noted that a petition cannot be accepted by the CAP, and should be submitted to the Council for consideration at its next available ordinary meeting.
- (7) The use of slides, maps, videos, in addition to written and verbal submissions is permitted (subject to technological capability). It should be noted by persons presenting to the CAP that a copy of any information, photos, maps, plans, videos etc. presented to the CAP on the night is required for Council records. Persons requiring the use of audio-visual equipment shall advise staff at least three (3) days before the scheduled meeting of their audio-visual requirements in order to facilitate the provision of these resources (subject to technological capability).
- (8) Representors are provided with only one opportunity to address the CAP. If a decision on a proposal is deferred by the CAP after the hearing of representations, advice of the new meeting date will be provided in writing but no further opportunity to address the CAP is available.

10. CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS

11. CLOSURE