

**Questions:**

How will it be assessed/categorised by the building surveyor?

- Class 1A

Why were the stairs in the existing dwelling not shown?

- Accidentally missed on the plans (Existing stairs to be removed). The existing stairs causes issues for energy efficiency between levels in the existing house.

Could you please elaborate on this statement: "Original kitchen to become a kitchenette due to access to staircase is through the existing kitchen". This doesn't appear to be accurate based on the plans provided.

- Due to access through the kitchen to new staircase. The existing kitchen is being reduced and becomes a thoroughfare.

Why is the existing kitchen being converted to a kitchenette?

- As mentioned in the previous answer.

Conditions are likely to be imposed requiring use of the building to be a single dwelling only/class 1a, compliance with the building envelope, and meeting the western side boundary setbacks as depicted on the plans. Please confirm that is acceptable to you/your client.

- Yes

**Concerns Raised by Representors:***USE*

- The intended use is for multiple dwellings, not a single dwelling, because: there are two kitchens; there is a dining room off the second kitchenette; there is no direct access to the new deck from the new kitchen; a second laundry could be provided; other rooms in the extension could be used as part of a second dwelling; and because of the family arrangements of the current owners.

*The intended use is for a single dwelling, which is why the application is for renovations designed consistently with a single dwelling:*

- *There is a kitchenette and a kitchen with a small living (not dining) area. There is single indoor dining area which opens from the kitchenette into the outdoor dining area.*
- *Direct access to the deck was included in the first draft of the plans provided to council as part of this application, however the extension was lowered to reduce profile and visual bulk of the extension, which has been avoided in order to minimise the impact on visual amenity of neighbours. The deck will be accessed from the new kitchen via the stairs and kitchenette thoroughfare.*
- *There is no second laundry, and no intent or design in the application to cater to one. The laundry is accessed via the new stairs.*
- *The main bathroom remains downstairs with an ensuite upstairs, which is not directly accessible from the main entertaining (dining and deck) area. There are no new bathrooms.*

- *Multi-generational (grandmother, daughter, grandchildren) living amongst a close family is not uncommon.*
- The plans allow for the entry floor level and new deck to be one dwelling, and the extension and lower level to be a second dwelling.

*The plans do not allow separation into multiple dwellings such as strata, while continuing to share common areas such as the laundry, driveway, tool shed, garage/underdeck area, outdoor living (barbeque and dining) deck, main bathroom, and post box. There are no fire rated walls or ceiling/floor in the structural design and doors to a common staircase. Sound, heat, smells will also continue to travel. The design is consistent with a single dwelling, while improving energy efficiency which is not easy in an older dwelling.*

- Given the proposal is actually for two dwellings, it should be advertised and assessed as such.

*The plans are consistent with a single dwelling, not two dwellings (as noted in previous question response).*

- Conditioning an approval to be for single dwelling only is not acceptable, given it creates an unreasonable compliance burden on neighbours and Council.

*Approval conditions are a usual and acceptable method for approving renovations for the intended use. Conversion into multiple dwellings would require further renovations including plumbing for a second laundry, as well as changes to the driveway, backyard garden and fire rated walls and ceiling/floor in the structural design and doors to a common staircase.*

#### TRAFFIC/ACCESS/PARKING

- More off street parking should be provided, especially given the proposal is actually for a second dwelling.

*The proposal is not for a second dwelling. 93 Princes Street will continue to have the same on street parking as other dwellings in the street, and more off street parking via the driveway than many other dwellings currently have. Only car spaces are required in the driveway.*

- The existing driveway is too narrow to accommodate cars for two dwellings.

*The existing driveway does not pose a problem for the design and intended use of the dwelling, and will continue to be suitable.*

- Princes Street is already at capacity in terms of on street parking availability.

*The proposal is not for a second dwelling. 93 Princes Street will continue to have the same on street parking as other dwellings in the street, and more off street parking via the driveway than many other dwellings on the street currently have.*

- Access onto Princes St from dwellings is already hard/dangerous/unsafe.

*It is not accepted that access onto Princes St is already hard/dangerous/unsafe. This situation will not be impacted by this renovation.*

## HERITAGE

- The proposal is out of keeping with the heritage precinct.

*This statement is not accurate. In comparison to recent renovations and extensions to 97 & 99 Princes St, which have a more bulky and modern appearance, this application is more in keeping with the historical characteristic of the precinct.*

- The proposal is out of keeping with other homes in the area.

*This statement is not accurate. In comparison to recent renovations and extensions to 97 & 99 Princes St, which have a more bulky and modern appearance, this application is more in keeping with the historical characteristic of the other homes in the area.*

- If all dwellings extended their dwellings like this it would undermine the character of the area.

*This statement is not accurate. In comparison to recent renovations and extensions to 97 & 99 Princes St, this application will strengthen the character of the area as it is more in keeping with historical design.*

## AMENITY

- The proposal will have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity due to visual bulk, loss of light/overshadowing, and loss of privacy.

*The proposal will not have a detrimental impact by nature of its lowered design relative to nearby dwellings at 89, 97 & 99 Princes Street. The application is consistent with privacy requirements and will have an extremely low privacy impact by nature of the lower profile design and siting of windows either shuttered or on a ground floor level.*

- The proposal for shutters on the windows for privacy is not adequate, and opaque glazing should be required instead by condition.

*Screening is a common, reasonable and standard approach, and complies with relevant requirements.*

- The use of timber for the shutters is not appropriate given the maintenance it would require.

*Products that do not require maintenance will be used such as Modwood or aluminium. This is a common, reasonable and standard approach and complies with relevant requirements.*

- The proposal is outside the building envelope.

*The proposal is within the building envelope, consistent with relevant requirements.*

- Although within the building envelope and meeting side boundary setbacks (just) the proposal will still have an unreasonable impact on neighbours' amenity.

*The proposal is within the building envelope, consistent with relevant requirements. Impact is minimal, within usually expected standards, and below those of recent renovations at 97 & 99 Princes Street.*

- The 1.51m setback from the western side boundary is 'convenient', complying with the permitted standard by 1cm.

*The proposal is within the building envelope, consistent with relevant requirements.*

- A similar design to other dwellings in the area would be preferable to ensure impacts on neighbours are more reasonable/acceptable.

*The proposal is within the building envelope, consistent with relevant requirements, and the design is similar to other dwellings in the area. Impact is minimal, within usually expected standards, and below those of recent renovations at 97 & 99 Princes Street.*

- If approved, landscaping on the boundary should be required by condition.

*Landscaping is not part of the conditions.*

## STORMWATER

- The stormwater solution does not appear feasible.

*This objection is not supported by verifiable or identifiable evidence. The stormwater solution is feasible, meeting all requirements and supported by design principles, height and volume.*

- The existing stormwater system is not large enough to cater for the additional volume of water created by the extension.

*This objection is not supported by verifiable or identifiable evidence.*

## MISCELLANEOUS

- Owner details on title show Janet and Alice Thorp. Owner details on the plans show Alice Thorp only as owner. Why aren't both owners listed?

*This is an administration issue (or typo) and is not relevant to the merit of the application.*

- A set of stairs in the existing dwelling are not shown.

*Note missed on plans (Existing stairs to be removed).*

- Neighbouring properties are not all shown.

*The extension is within planning requirements so the surrounding houses are not required to be shown.*

- No shadow diagrams provided.

*Not required as not breaching the building envelope.*

- No survey plan is provided in the advertised documents.

*Contour plan shown on the site plan.*

- The laundry opens directly onto the driveway – is this a safety issue?

*This is not a safety issue, it is not a high traffic area. Primary access to the laundry is internal. This design is consistent with requirements and other dwellings on Princes Street.*

- Any new fencing should be 2.1m high.

*The applicants are happy to discuss this with neighbours and agree to 2.1m fences, in particular for the very old backyard fences that will require replacement.*

- The owner hasn't consulted with neighbours.

*Neighbours have been approached previously.*

- Concern about proximity of development to neighbours' existing in ground private services.

*Does not breach TasWater setback to sewer main.*

*The development is within boundaries and setbacks. The applicant are not aware of any particular in ground private services that would be impacted by the development.*

- This is the second attempt at a second dwelling. A previous application for a physically separated dwelling was withdrawn after receiving 16 objections.

*This is not an application for a second dwelling, as established previously and supported by the design.*

- If approved as proposed, any future changes to the side boundary setback should not be approved as either substantially in accordance with the approval, or as a minor amendment, given it changes the proposal from being compliant to being non-compliant with the permitted building envelope.

*Complies with council setbacks.*