

25 September 2020

Ms Maria Lasso  
Graduate Town Planner  
City of Launceston  
By email: [maria.lasso@launceston.tas.gov.au](mailto:maria.lasso@launceston.tas.gov.au)

6ty Pty Ltd  
ABN 27 014 609 900

**Postal Address**  
PO Box 63  
Riverside  
Tasmania 7250  
**W 6ty.com.au**  
**E admin@6ty.com.au**

Tamar Suite 103  
The Charles  
287 Charles Street  
Launceston 7250  
**P (03) 6332 3300**

57 Best Street  
PO Box 1202  
Devonport 7310  
**P (03) 6424 7161**

Dear Maria,

**DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION - RESPONSE TO FURTHER INFORMATION REQUEST - DA0412/2020 - 49 AMY ROAD AND 18-20 ELLISON STREET, NEWSTEAD**

I refer to your request for further information dated 24 August 2020. This letter provides information in response to the matters raised within your letter. Responses contained within this letter should be read in conjunction with the following revised drawings:

Project No.	Drawing No.	Issue	Date	Description	Revision
19.257	CP01	02	21.09.20	Building Locations Amended	-
19.257	CP02	03	21.09.20	Building Locations Amended for TW RAI, Revisions for LCC RAI	B
19.257	CP03	01	21.09.20	Planning Approval	-
19.257	Ap01	2	23.09.20	Response to Council RFI	A
19.257	Ap02	2	23.09.20	Response to Council RFI	A
19.257	Ap03	2	23.09.20	Response to Council RFI	A
19.257	Ap04	2	23.09.20	Response to Council RFI	A
19.257	Ap05	2	23.09.20	Response to Council RFI	A
19.257	Ap06	2	23.09.20	Response to Council RFI	A

**Council Requested Item 1**

---

Validity Information - Owners' Consent Form

*Please provide the owners' consent form completed with relevant attachments.*

**6ty° Response**

Form No. 1 issued by the Tasmanian Planning Commission has been completed and accompanies our response to Council's request for information.

**Council Requested Item 2**

---

Application requirements - Clause 8.1.3

Please provide:

- (a) Revised 'Location Plan' and 'Part Site Plan' to include a true north arrow.
- (b) Revised 'Part Site Plan' correcting the label 'Resident parking 6 spaces' to 'Resident parking 5 spaces'. The plan shows five spaces not six.
- (c) Revised 'Part Site Plan' showing the minimum setback between the administration building and the proposed northern boundary of Lot 3.
- (d) Revised Floor Plan at drawing Ap05 showing windows of the communal laundry room and kitchen of the multi-purpose building.
- (e) A boundary-to-boundary south elevation of proposed Lot 2 showing the proposed buildings when viewed from Ellison Street.
- (f) A boundary-to-boundary east elevation of proposed Lot 2 showing Units 8, 9 and 10 and the multi-purpose building in the same elevation.
- (g) Description of the use and operation of the administration building including hours of operation and number of employees.
- (h) If the location of buildings proposed has changed as a result of plans prepared to respond to TasWater's request for further information, please update the application plans accordingly.

## **6ty° Response**

The following response is provided against each of the corresponding sub-points:

- (a) The Location Plan and Part Site Plan have been amended to show a True North arrow.
- (b) The Part Site Plan has been amended to show corrected car parking number labels. The label referred to now annotates 8 car parking spaces because 3 parallel car parking spaces have been incorporated into the western side of the driveway opposite the 90° car parking bay.
- (c) The Part Site Plan has been amended to show the minimum building setback between the administration building and the access strip of proposed Lot 3. The setback will be 0.75m.
- (d) The Floor Plan for the multi-purpose building has been amended to show the windows to the kitchen and communal laundry.
- (e) Drawing Ap06 has been prepared which shows the Ellison Street Section.
- (f) Following a meeting with Council it was determined that this section was not necessary. A new section has been prepared in response to Council Requested Item 4 which is understood to address the intent of the eastern boundary section requested under this item.

- (g) The proposed administration building will be used to service and support the proposed 15 new dwellings and will complement the functions of the existing office building to be contained on proposed Lot 1. It will be supported by a maximum of 2 full time equivalent employees. Activities will include laundry services, staff meetings and support service meetings.

Employees will occupy the building between 8:15am and 5:30pm Monday to Friday and 9:15 and 5:30pm on weekends and public holidays which will be the same as the existing operation. On call workers operate remotely between 5:15pm and 8:15am (9:15am on weekends and public holidays).

- (h) All plans have been updated to reflected changes that have been required in response to TasWater's request for additional information.

### **Council Requested Item 3**

---

#### *Building height, setback and siting - Clause 17.4.1 P2*

*Please provide revised plans showing vegetation to be removed and vegetation to be retained as well as landscaping proposed (if any).*

#### **6ty° Response**

The Part Site Plan has been updated to annotate that existing vegetation within the frontage setback of proposed buildings will be retained.

### **Council Requested Item 4**

---

#### *Building height, setback and siting - Clause 17.4.1 P3*

*A revised site plan identifying uses and buildings of adjoining properties to the easter: No. 11/67A and 12/167A Punchbowl Road, 9 Balaka Place and 11 Balaka Place including:*

- (a) Setbacks of buildings to the common boundary.*
- (b) Location of habitable windows.*
- (c) Location of private open space.*
- (d) Contour levels across 10m to the east.*

#### **6ty° Response**

Following a meeting with Council it was determined that the main property of concern regarding clause 17.4.1 P3 was Unit 12/167A Punchbowl Road. The Part Site Plan has been amended to show the indicative location of the habitable rooms windows of the unit and the setback of the unit to the common boundary. The main area of private open space is located on the western side of the unit. The amended plan also shows the total separation distance between the unit and proposed Unit 8.

Drawing Ap06 has been prepared which includes a section of the unit and proposed Unit 8 inclusive of a 2.1m high solid paling fence.

### **Council Requested Item 5**

---

#### E6.6.3 Pedestrian Access A1

*The proposed administration building and fence could affect the sight distances of vehicles using the driveway over proposed Lot 2. Please provide a statement and relevant annotations on plans demonstrating how the proposed driveway servicing the aged care home complies with acceptable solution A1.1 under E6.6.3 and if required, how it complies with the relevant performance criteria P1.*

### **6ty° Response**

Clause E6.6.3 relates to pedestrian access within car parking areas. Proposed Lot 3 will contain the existing aged care facility. The facility comprises the building and an established car parking area. The proposal seeks to relocate the driveway leading to the facility. No changes to the car parking area within the facility is proposed.

Accordingly, the current application does not affect issues dealt with by clause E6.6.3 directly with respect to the carparking area to be contained in proposed Lot 3, and it does not apply to the specific matter in accordance with clause 7.4.2(b) of the Scheme.

### **Council Requested Item 6**

---

#### Parking and Sustainable Transport Code - Clause E6.5.1 A1

*Please amend the planning submission to reflect a variation of 15 car spaces rather than 12 car spaces.*

### **6ty° Response**

Section 5.5 of the planning submission has been amended.

### **Council Requested Item 7**

---

#### Parking and Sustainable Transport Code - Clause E6.5.1 A2

*Please provide:*

- (a) A statement demonstrating how the proposal complies with the requirements of acceptable solution E6.5.1 A2 including further annotations on plans as required by the NCC.
- (b) A statement demonstrating compliance with Acceptable solutions E6.6.2 A1.2, A1.3 and A1.4.

## 6ty° Response

It is anticipated that the proposed development will be categorised as a Class 3 building under the National Construction Code 2019 (NCC). Table D3.1 of the NCC (General building access requirements) requires 2 accessible Class 3 sole-occupancy units to be provided where a group of buildings of between 11-40 Class 3 sole-occupancy units are proposed. In this instance, 3 accessible units are proposed which exceeds the minimum requirements of Table D3.1. They are proposed Units 4, 5 and 9.

The proposed administration building is anticipated to be categorised as a Class 9a building under the NCC.

Table D3.5 (Accessible carparking) of the NCC requires accessible car parking spaces to be provided at the following rate:

To be calculated by multiplying the total number of carparking spaces by the percentage of -

- (i) accessible sole-occupancy units to the total number of sole-occupancy units.

The equation is:

*accessible sole-occupancy unit* = 3  
*total sole-occupancy unit* = 15  
*total car parking spaces* = 17

$$(3 \div 15) \times 17 = 3.4$$

Table D3.5 requires accessible car parking spaces to be provided at a rate of 1 space for every 100 car parking spaces.

Accordingly, Part D of the NCC requires a total of 4 accessible parking spaces (rounded to the nearest whole number) to be provided for the proposal. In this instance a total of 4 accessible car parking spaces are proposed. Accordingly, clause E6.5.1 A2 is met.

With respect to with Acceptable solutions E6.6.2 A1.2, A1.3 and A1.4, the following is noted:

- all accessible parking spaces are located closest to the main entry point to each building that they are intended to serve.
- all accessible parking spaces will be designated with a surface sign.
- all accessible parking spaces have been designed to comply with the dimensions and clear areas required by *AS/NZ2890.6 – 2009 Parking facilities - Off-street parking for people with disabilities*.

---

## Council Requested Item 8

Parking and Sustainable Transport Code - Clause E6.5.2

Please provide revised plans with annotations of the location, type and number of bicycle spaces proposed in accordance with standards under clause E6.6.6. If the number of bicycle spaces provided are less than six, a statement addressing the performance criteria (P1) under Clause E6.5.2 will be required.

**6ty° Response**

The Part Site Plan has been amended to show a six space bicycle rack located adjacent to the car parking bay and driveway at the front of proposed Unit 15.

**Council Requested Item 9**

---

Parking and Sustainable Transport Code - Clause E6.6.1

Please provide:

- (a) Revised plans showing annotations of the maximum gradient required for the construction of access roads and parking areas for Lots 2 and 3. If the gradient required is greater than 10% and reliance on performance criteria is required, please provide the following:
- i. A section of the access way proposed for Lot 2 and Lot 3 from the centre of Ellison Street to the end of the parking areas, including annotations of changes of grade and any transitions required, particularly across the footpath.
  - ii. A statement demonstrating compliance with E6.6.1 (P1)

**6ty° Response**

The Proposed Subdivision Services Layout Plan (Project No. 19.257 CP02 Rev. B) shows the grade of the three main sections of the driveway. They are:

- between Ellison Street and the end of proposed Unit 4
  - 23.4m in length with a grade of 7.38%
- between the end of proposed Unit 4 and the start of proposed Unit 15
  - 32.2m in length with a grade of 8.05%
- between the start of proposed Unit 15 and the start of the end car parking bay
  - 12.2m in length with a grade of 2.46%
- the length of the end car parking bay
  - 19.6m in length with a grade of 3.83%

All sections of the proposed driveway will have a gradient of less than 10% as detailed in the planning submission.

**Council Requested Item 10**

---

Parking and Sustainable Transport Code - Clause E6.6.2

Please provide:

- (a) A1.1 (b) requires internal access widths to comply with the requirements of Table E6.2. Please provide details on plans and a written statement on how the proposal complies with the requirements of Table E6.2.
- (b) The proposal relies on performance criteria as the proposed car parking spaces do not comply with the requirements of Table E6.3. Please provide dimensions on plans of the proposed parking areas and a statement addressing compliance with AS 2890 as per item (g) of P1.

**6ty° Response**

The previous internal access driveway accommodated a minimum width that complied with Table E6.2 which was detailed in the planning submission. However, due to the amendments made to the Part Site Plan to accommodate an extended internal footpath to the frontage, the internal driveway adjacent to the northern end of proposed Unit 4 has been narrowed to a width of approximately 5m measured to the back of kerb. This width does not comply with Table E6.2. All other sections of the driveway have a minimum width of 5.5m and provides for two way traffic.

The planning submission has been revised to reflect the amendment.

**Council Requested Item 11**

---

Parking and Sustainable Transport Code - Clause E6.6.3

Please provide a statement demonstrating compliance with the acceptable solutions or the relevant performance criteria (if needed). This statement must be accompanied with relevant dimensions and annotations.

**6ty° Response**

The Part Site Plan has been amended to show a continuous 1.2m wide footpath between the end parking bay and the frontage along the eastern side of the internal driveway.

**Council Requested Item 12**

---

Infrastructure and Assets Department

- (a) The footpath proposed within the site does not extend to the property boundary and the public footpath. This means residents and visitors must walk on the driveway to access the public street. An extension to the internal footpath is recommended and should be shown on an amended plan.

- (b) Unit 4 encroaches into the pathway leaving a clear width of approximately 500mm, being half the minimum width of a footpath prescribed in the Scheme. The planning submission states that a 1300mm wide footpath is proposed however this is not reflected in the plans. Clarification is required to address the inconsistency. A redesign is recommended to ensure that the internal footpath has a minimum width of 1000mm.*
- (c) While delineation of the footpath from the driveway by way of a raised kerb is supported, additional detail is required to demonstrate that the accessible spaces shown will comply with AS2890.3 as it is necessary for the shared space and the parking space to be on the same level. This also applies to the unmarked shared space required behind the parking space.*
- (d) The car parking spaces are not dimensioned. The planning submission states that while the spaces do not meet the requirements of Table E6.2, they meet the application requirements of AS2890.1. This should be justified with a dimensioned plan.*
- (e) The planning submission acknowledges the shortfall of parking spaces for the development and states that any overflow parking can be accommodated on the adjoining site because it is to be operated by the same party - there is not mechanism proposed to legally facilitate this (such as a parking easement). If this is proposed as a solution to the parking shortfall the creation of a parking easement or right of way or other mechanism is required. While it is reasonable to assume that many of the resident may not have vehicles - administrative staff, carers and visitors will.*
- (f) The site is designed with a turning bay that it is assumed to cater for the onsite collection of waste and potentially recycling. No swept paths are shown to demonstrate a collection vehicle can turn. The applicant is required to specify the design vehicle and demonstrate its ability to turn on site.*

## **6ty° Response**

The following response is provided against each of the corresponding sub-points:

- (a) The internal footpath has been extended to the frontage.
- (b) The amended internal footpath will have a uniform width of 1.2m.
- (c) The footpath will be shaped to a level grade where it is adjacent to an accessible car parking space to comply with by AS/NZ2890.6 – 2009 *Parking facilities - Off-street parking for people with disabilities*. Detail design of the proposal has not been undertaken because planning approval has not been obtained. Notwithstanding, the proposal has been designed to comply with the Australian Standard. A building permit is not able to be issued if accessible parking spaces do not comply with the Australian Standard. Subsequently, they will comply with the Australian Standard.
- (d) All car parking bays have a dimensioned car parking space.



- (e) Following discussions with Council, it is understood that the two lots will not be tied together by a formal mechanism.
- (f) Drawing CP03 has been prepared which illustrates the turning paths for an 8.8m service vehicle.

**Council Requested Item 13**

---

Flooding Impacts

*Please provide revised finished floor levels in accordance with the table provided by Council's engineers.*

**6ty° Response**

Finished floor levels have been revised to reflect Council's recommendations.

Please contact me should Council require any further information.

Yours faithfully

**6ty° Pty Ltd**



George Walker  
Director/Planning Consultant