

27th April 2018



Launceston City Council
Town Hall
Launceston
Tasmania, 7250

Michael Bernacki
Registered Architect

PO Box 147
Launceston
Tasmania
Australia 7250

Attention: Planning Department

Mobile: 0417541646

Email: mbernacki@honedarchitecture.com

Subject:

Response to 8 query's by Representors for a single dwelling located at 217 St John Street, Launceston.

To whom it May Concern:

1. The removal of 2 car parking spaces to allow for the additional crossover on St John Street. This will impact the availability of on-street car parking for surrounding residents and visitors. It was also questioned why the site needed so many car parks;

Please note our drawings and proposed design only removes 1 car park from the St John Street. Through discussions with Launceston City Council Infrastructure department, 217 St John street is a detached dwelling. Its main service lines and residential address is off St John Street. LCC Infrastructure department supports the removal of the 1 car park as they believed it is entitled to have a driveway like all other rate paying detached dwellings within the street. We wish to highlight the southern neighbour parking arrangement briefly, 1 car park was removed off St John Street for their off street parking from St John Street allowing 2 cars to park off St John Street as well as their double garage off Thomas Street for an additional 2 car parks.

At 217 St John street, we believe additional off street parking should be made available where possible, we do not wish to add congestion to the street. We wish to remove visitors cars from the street, we are being highly considerate of and to the neighbours by having visitors visiting this residence remove their cars from the street and allowing for on site parking. Thus we have recessed the garage under the residence to allow for 2 additional cars to park in front of the garage, door clear of the foot path. There is also an allowance for a further 2 cars to be able to park off Thomas Street. If we did not allow this, there would be a further 4 cars potentially to be parked in the street actually causing congestion. We are being considerate to the neighbours without proposed design.

The number of car parking spaces proposed to be provided on-site matches the requirement which applies to residential use not in the General Residential zone under Table E6.1 of the Parking and Parking and Sustainable Transport Code.

2. The dwelling will overlook surrounding and adjoining properties. Privacy issues. The second storey courtyard will overlook;

The proposed residence at 217 St John Street will not over look the southern neighbour. There are no clear glass windows on the southern facade. All glass is solid white glass. The southern external stair case has a privacy screen to meet LCC planning guidelines.

In regards to the northern neighbour, we have once again white glass windows to the locations of all adjoining windows to the adjacent northern terrace for complete privacy to all. We strongly believe through our considered design our proposed design of the living room and courtyard space do not overlook the northern neighbour. Their terrace is west, fronting St John Street and not adjacent to this area. Through investigations the northern neighbour has a private open space sunken down into their own courtyard not visible from any angle for complete privacy. They will not lose this amenity.

3. The design is too modern and along with its size and bulk, does not fit in with the streetscape. No consideration has been given regarding the character of the street. It is an overdevelopment, proven by its site coverage exceeding 50%;

217 St John Street is not a heritage listed residence and is not required by the LCC to reflect heritage design in its appearance.

The size and bulk of the building is consistent with new surrounding residential projects within the suburb. I highlight for example 90 Balfour Street and 10 James street, recently approved by LCC, their size, bulk and site coverage is far greater than our proposed design. When we look at size and bulk. The northern terraces size and bulk is far greater than our proposed from the street frontage. The southern neighbour is far wider and broader in stance and position. Our proposed design is deemed an 'infill lot' by LCC planning scheme and we have design our proposed design to balance between them both.

When addressing architecture, the northern neighbouring terraces architecture is a totally different era of architecture to the southern neighbour. One must ask, how does four bricked 2 storey high density terraces character reflect to a single storey weather board detached house of the southern neighbour. These are two total opposites in architecture, size, mass and bulk.

When addressing the site coverage, both the northern and southern neighbours site cover far exceeds our proposed.

A specific standard applicable to streetscape integration and appearance is provided in Clause 11.4.20 of the planning scheme. The proposed dwelling complies with this standard in having a front door and a window that faces a road. Otherwise, the relevant planning scheme standards require that regard is to be given to the qualities of the streetscape. However, in most instances no particular desired outcomes are articulated. The key exception is Clause 11.4.1 'Setback from a frontage for single dwellings' which requires setback from a frontage to assist in the integration of new development in the streetscape. The proposed dwelling will be setback from each frontage within the range of minimum and maximum setbacks on each of the adjoining lots and therefore meets the acceptable solution for this standard. It will extend between the two frontages and the site coverage has therefore been determined accordingly. There is no specific requirement for dwellings to integrate with the streetscape with respect to their appearance, scale and bulk which perhaps is a reflection of the range of building styles that existing in inner city areas

4. Concerns regarding stormwater drainage. Too many impervious areas;

All storm water will be collected and drained to meet Australian standards, the national building code, plumbing regulations and to meet with the LCC infrastructure requirements. This is not a planning matter but will be co ordinated during the building application stage.

There is no minimum area of pervious surfaces which is to required be provided. The applicable requirement in Clause 11.4.2 P1 requires areas to be retained for the absorption of rainwater into the ground. The garden areas identified on the landscape plan included with the application will fulfil this requirement.

5. Visual bulk when viewed from adjoining properties;

Please see the previously address above comments.

The height and bulk of the proposed dwelling is compatible with the buildings on the adjoining lots, which each have a differing building styles. It will not be as prominent as the terraces to the north. The visual impact of the proposed dwelling when viewed from the adjoining lots is therefore reasonable.

6. Overshadowing of adjoining properties habitable rooms, courtyards, and private open space. Shadow diagrams were confusing;

Naturally all southern neighbours on any project would be concerned due to solar orientation. Through a total redesign of the previous proposed design we have increased all solar aspects to the southern neighbour. As shown in our proposed Development Application with a highlight red line, the previously design verse our proposed design. Our revised design allows a greater amount of natural light to the southern neighbour. We strongly believe they are misreading the drawings.

On the 21st June 2017 we were present on site at 217 St John Street and documented the existing southern residence does not receive sun within their courtyard. These photos are featured within our Development Application. This is also highlight and supported but the southern neighbours own shadow studies provided by their independent draftsmen.

Our Shadow studies are accurate and identify we are actually increasing the amount or sun light into the southern neighbouring property rather than the existing conditions.

The southern neighbour also has multiple alternative private open spaces throughout their property such has the north eastern back yard of their property adjacent to their swimming pool.

The north facing windows of habitable rooms and private open space areas within the adjoining lot to the south are already overshadowed across the entire day in mid-winter by buildings and vegetation within the adjoining lot itself, the side fence on the shared boundary and the existing dwelling within the subject site. The proposed dwelling will increase the overshadowing in mid-winter, however the degree of increase is not unreasonable having regard to the orientation of the lots in this inner city location.

The lots are developed to a relatively high density and their longer (side) boundaries face north, which means they are generally overshadowed to a greater degree than that which occurs in suburban locations. Therefore, the subject site itself is already significantly overshadowed in mid-winter by the terrace to the north. It is also noted that the shadow diagrams depict a worse case scenario given they relate to mid-winter, and better solar access would exist during the summer months

7. The impact the dwelling will have on the bluestone wall along the northern boundary. An independent geo report states it is already unsafe and potential development may cause it to collapse;

An independent evaluation of this blue stone wall has indicated it could collapse with or without development. This is not a planning matter but will be addressed throughout the Building Application and protection of works process. Earth retaining structures are required to resist lateral load from soils, hydrostatic pressures and surcharge loads from activities behind the back of the wall. Surcharge loads are caused by vehicles, people and activities such as construction machinery and materials, albeit with load limitations appropriate for the wall. In this case the wall has found to be structurally inadequate and unable to support loads it is expected to do so. The wall has no structural integrity and does not satisfy any performance criteria required for retaining structures listed in the relevant Australian Standard. A sound retaining wall would be able to accommodate construction on adjacent property (with appropriate limitations), however this is not possible for this wall as it has failed. Therefore, replacement is the advised action to ensure the safety of occupants of both properties.

8. Not enough green space or gardens on site. This will affect the stormwater flows and is not keeping with the character of the area.

We have significantly increased the green space and gardens on site. All storm water will be collected and drained to meet Australian standards, the national building code, plumbing regulations and to meet with the LCC infrastructure requirements. This is not a planning matter but will be co ordinated during the building application stage.

There is no minimum area of private open space or gardens required to be provided, taking account that the zone allows for increased residential densities. The applicable requirement in Clause 11.4.2 P1 requires useful areas of open space for gardens and outdoor recreation purposes. The proposed dwelling will include a balcony adjacent to north of the internal living/dining area and another smaller balcony facing St John Street. These areas will useful areas for outdoor recreation whilst garden areas will be provided outside the building envelope as identified on the landscape plan. The application therefore fulfils the relevant requirements.

I trust that the contents of this letter and the attached Development Application is satisfactory and does address the query's raised by the representors

If you require any further information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact myself.

Thank you once again.

Kind Regards



Michael Bernacki / Honed Architecture + Design.