

Council Assessment Panel Minutes

17 November 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.*

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

Telephone 8366 4555
Email townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au
Website www.npsp.sa.gov.au
Socials [f /cityofnpsp](https://www.facebook.com/cityofnpsp) [@cityofnpsp](https://www.instagram.com/cityofnpsp)



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

Page No.

1.	COMMENCEMENT AND WELCOME.....	1
2.	APOLOGIES.....	1
3.	CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL ASSESSMENT PANEL HELD ON 20 OCTOBER 2025.....	1
4.	DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.....	1
5.	DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS – PDI ACT.....	2
5.1	DEVELOPMENT NUMBER – ID 24041239 – PAOLO PITEO – 28 COKE STREET NORWOOD.....	2
6.	DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS – DEVELOPMENT ACT.....	24
7.	REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT MANAGER DECISIONS.....	24
8.	ERD COURT APPEALS.....	24
9.	OTHER BUSINESS.....	24
10.	CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS.....	24
11.	CLOSURE.....	24

VENUE Council Chambers, Norwood Town Hall

HOUR 6:30pm

PRESENT

Panel Members Mr Stephen Smith
Mr Mark Adcock
Mr Ross Bateup
Mr Julian Rutt
Cr Christel Mex

Staff Kieran Fairbrother, Acting Manager, Development Assessment
Ned Feary, Senior Urban Planner
Tala Aslat, Administration Officer

APOLOGIES

ABSENT

1. COMMENCEMENT AND WELCOME

2. APOLOGIES

**3. CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL ASSESSMENT
PANEL HELD ON 20 OCTOBER 2025**

Moved by Mr Adcock and Seconded by Mr Rutt
CARRIED

4. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

5. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS – PDI ACT

5.1 DEVELOPMENT NUMBER – ID 24041239 – PAOLO PITEO – 28 COKE STREET NORWOOD

DEVELOPMENT NO.:	ID 24041239
APPLICANT:	Paolo Piteo
ADDRESS:	28 COKE STREET NORWOOD SA 5067
NATURE OF DEVELOPMENT:	Construction of a three-storey residential flat building containing three (3) dwellings, with basement car park, masonry front fence, and swimming pool with associated safety features
ZONING INFORMATION:	Zones: • Established Neighbourhood Overlays: • Airport Building Heights (Regulated) • Prescribed Wells Area • Regulated and Significant Tree • Stormwater Management • Traffic Generating Development • Urban Tree Canopy Technical Numeric Variations (TNVs): • Minimum Frontage (Minimum frontage for a detached dwelling is 9m; semi-detached dwelling is 8m; row dwelling is 6m; group dwelling is 18m; residential flat building is 18m) • Minimum Site Area (Minimum site area for a detached dwelling is 250 sqm; semi-detached dwelling is 250 sqm; row dwelling is 250 sqm; group dwelling is 250 sqm) • Maximum Building Height (Levels) (Maximum building height is 2 levels)
LODGEMENT DATE:	4 March 2025
RELEVANT AUTHORITY:	Assessment Panel at City of Norwood, Payneham & St Peters
PLANNING & DESIGN CODE VERSION:	P&D Code (in effect) Version 2025.4 27/2/2025
CATEGORY OF DEVELOPMENT:	Code Assessed - Performance Assessed
NOTIFICATION:	Yes
RECOMMENDING OFFICER:	Edmund Feary - Senior Urban Planner
REFERRALS STATUTORY:	None
REFERRALS NON-STATUTORY:	Senior Traffic Engineer- Rebecca Van Der Pennen Consultant Hydrological Engineer- Melinda Lutton

CONTENTS:

APPENDIX 1:	Relevant P&D Code Policies	ATTACHMENT 4:	Representation Map
ATTACHMENT 1:	Application Documents	ATTACHMENT 5:	Representations
ATTACHMENT 2:	Subject Land Map	ATTACHMENT 6:	Response to Representations
ATTACHMENT 3:	Zoning and Locality Map		

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:

The key element of the proposal is the construction of a three-storey residential flat building. The building would include one dwelling on each level, with the upper levels accessed via a lift core including stairwell, with a separate pedestrian access from the ground floor dwelling. There is also a basement carpark, which includes three parking spaces for the ground floor dwelling, two spaces for each above ground level dwelling, and one visitor space. The basement also includes a common storage area, as well as a gym and other facilities for the ground floor dwelling.

The private open space for the ground level dwelling includes a swimming pool and a covered alfresco area, as well as a steel arbor over a garden area which sits above the ramp to the underground car park.

A masonry front fence is also included.

BACKGROUND:

The site has been vacant for quite some time, with a series of development proposals made since 2018. Of these, only a 2024 application for the following remains with a valid Planning Consent:

Two storey detached dwelling with undercroft (basement) parking and a swimming pool, together with associated earthworks, fencing and retaining

For reference, while two-storeys, this approved a building height of 9.3m above the kerb level.

At some point between 2020 and 2023, the kerbing adjacent the site was removed, and a crossover created along the entire width of the site frontage. No approval for this could be found.

This application was submitted on the 11th of December 2024, but after further information was required, it was lodged on the 4th of March 2025. A substantial period of negotiations followed to reach the outcome now provided. Public notification occurred from the 19th of September to the 10th of October 2025.

SUBJECT LAND & LOCALITY:

Site Description:

Location reference: 28 COKE ST NORWOOD SA 5067

Title ref.: CT 5826/187 **Plan Parcel:** F139059 AL79 **Council:** THE CITY OF NORWOOD PAYNEHAM AND ST PETERS

Shape:	Rectangular
Frontage Width:	15.24m
Area:	728m ²
Topography:	Mostly flat
Existing Structures:	None
Existing Vegetation:	None

Locality

The locality is considered to involve the entire length of Coke Street from the “Como” development (also known as the Coles site) to William Street. It includes dwellings on both sides of Coke Street, as well as dwellings fronting George Street between numbers 73 and 89.

The Como building has a significant influence on the locality due to its built form scale, comprising a three level podium, with additional two-storey “townhouses” above the podium, as well as two six-storey residential flat buildings (the building heights for the townhouses and apartment buildings being measured from the top of the podium, rather than ground level). The overall height is therefore of a nine-storey building. The relatively plain exterior of the Como building means that it provides something of a “backdrop” to Coke Street.

Coke Street itself includes a range of building styles, with many row and group dwellings and residential flat buildings from the 1970s-1990s. Only one “original” dwelling remains (constructed circa 1870), immediately to the south of the subject site. Most of the built form in the street is two-storey in nature. There are also notably two dwellings (being semi-detached) on the street which feature undercroft parking.

Coke Street lacks street trees due to a relatively narrow road reserve, but Coke Park at the northern end of the street provides a good degree of environmental amenity. This park includes a series of significant gum trees along with a playground and grass areas. The park is well utilised due to its proximity to The Parade.

Indeed, Coke Street is generally fairly busy due to its proximity to The Parade, and on-street parking turnover is fairly high, as well as relatively high pedestrian traffic.

To the rear of the site, more of the original built form of the area remains along George Street, but even so there are a series of residential flat buildings from the latter part of the 20th century.

The locality has generally more of an urban, rather than suburban, character, given the density of built form, and the relatively small setbacks from Coke Street, particularly along the western side. It exhibits a moderate-high level of amenity, primarily from the contribution made by Coke Park.

CONSENT TYPE REQUIRED:

Planning Consent

CATEGORY OF DEVELOPMENT:

- **PER ELEMENT:**
New housing, Residential flat building: Code Assessed - Performance Assessed
Swimming pool or spa pool and associated swimming pool safety features: Code Assessed - Performance Assessed
Fence: Code Assessed- Performance Assessed
- **OVERALL APPLICATION CATEGORY:**
Code Assessed - Performance Assessed
- **REASON**
P&D Code

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

- **REASON**
Table 5 procedural matters of the Established Neighbourhood Zone - the proposal exceeds two building levels in accordance with DTS/DPF 4.1.
- **LIST OF REPRESENTATIONS**

Given Name	Surname	Address	Position	Wishes to be heard?
John	Dreckow		Opposed	No
Colin	Murray		Supportive, with concerns	Yes
Ashley	Bonython		Supportive	No
Annette	Rothgrew		Supportive, with concerns	No

Jim	Bakopanos		Supportive	No
[unknown]	Martin	Not provided	Opposed	No

- **SUMMARY**

Representors expressed concern regarding building height, particularly in terms of it setting a precedent for future development. Other concerns expressed included:

- Overlooking and visual privacy;
- Car parking;
- Traffic generation;
- Noise from the swimming pool equipment;
- Overshadowing;
- Blocking of views; and,
- Construction disturbance (particularly relating to car parking).

While one representor provided a postal address rather than a residential address, and did not provide a first name, administration is satisfied that they are a genuine representor and thus that their representation is valid.

AGENCY REFERRALS

None

INTERNAL REFERRALS

- Senior Traffic Engineer- Rebecca Van Der Pennen

In reviewing a previous version of the proposal, Council's Senior Traffic Engineer expressed concern regarding manoeuvring in the basement car park, the provision of visitor parking, pedestrian sightlines, waste collection, and the visibility for vehicles entering and exiting the basement at the same time, given the access is only single width.

The applicant has made amendments to the proposal to address these comments, and these are addressed in the Planning Assessment below. In discussing the changes with the Senior Traffic Engineer verbally, it was agreed that there was no need for her to formally review the revised proposal.

- Consultant Hydrological Engineer- Melinda Lutton

Noting that the site is not flood affected, Council's Consultant Hydrological Engineer reviewed the proposal from the standpoint of stormwater management. She identified a series of issues with the Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) that was initially provided by the applicant, which have since been addressed by amendments. This is discussed in detail in the Planning Assessment below.

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 construction of a three-storey residential flat building, including basement car park, swimming pool (and associated safety features), and masonry front fence. It is located in the Established Neighbourhood Zone. Development of this nature is broadly appropriate within the site, locality or in the subject Established Neighbourhood Zone for the following reasons.

- The Zone envisages predominantly residential development, and the proposed development is residential in nature; and,
- The development has a density that is broadly consistent with the locality, given the number of residential flat buildings, group dwellings and row dwellings in the locality;

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 Density

The Established Neighbourhood Zone envisages “predominantly residential development” (PO 1.1), and the proposed development is residential in nature, consistent with the site’s existing use rights.

PO 2.1 speaks to allotment size:

“Allotments/sites for residential purposes are of suitable size and dimension to accommodate the anticipated dwelling form and are compatible with the prevailing development pattern in the locality.”

The associated DPF does not specify a site area figure for dwellings in a residential flat building, but for other kinds of dwelling, the guideline provided is 250m². The proposal would have an average site area of 242.7m².

Residential flat buildings are common throughout the locality at densities relatively consistent with this proposal. This aligns generally with strategic planning principles as to have higher densities closer to services (in this case, The Parade Core and Coke Park).

Thus, the concept of there being three dwellings on this site is generally compatible with the locality. Other considerations outlined in PO 2.1 relate to the appropriateness of the built form, which is addressed below.

Building Height

The proposed development is for three building levels, therefore exceeding the Technical and Numeric Variation for the site of two storeys. No guidance is provided in this TNV as to height in metres, but the default for two storeys is for a height of 9m.

Established Neighbourhood Zone PO 4.1 states:

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

In terms of the height of those nearby buildings, the row dwellings to the north have a roof height of 8.8m, to the north of that 22A and 22B Coke Street have a height of 9.2m, and the row dwellings opposite have a wall height of approximately 6.5m. This is compared to the proposed dwelling which has a height of 10.2m.

The taller buildings in the locality have pitched roofs, which limits their impact when compared to the height of the proposed building.

The influence of the Como development on the locality is notable since it is so much taller than anything else in the locality. It is generally expected that taller built form like this will see a transition in heights moving away from the core of that activity. Nonetheless, this site is some 80m away from the Como site; generally towards the edge of where such a transition might usually be expected. Additionally, the proposed building would be taller than the development to the north of the site between the subject site and Como, though only by approximately 1m.

To consider the wording of the Performance Outcomes directly, there are two separate but related parts to this test. Firstly, that development should “contribute to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood”. The idea of what constitutes a “neighbourhood” is not yet well understood through case law, but is generally considered larger than a locality, but smaller than a Zone.

The neighbourhood in this case, if expanded beyond the immediate locality, would likely at least include parts of William Street (generally detached dwellings), Edward Street (similar), and The Parade (being a main street and urban corridor where taller buildings are envisaged). This is to say that the prevailing character is of a mix of building heights.

Case law also generally suggests that a development need not necessarily make a positive contribution; that is to say that its being neutral is sufficient for a proposal to generally be acceptable.

In this case, administration is of the view that while the building is taller than many of the buildings immediately surrounding it (with the very notable exception of the Como development), it is not so much taller than those buildings as to undermine the character of the area.

The other part of the Performance Outcome seeks for development to “complements [sic] the height of nearby buildings”. This involves a relatively similar consideration as above, in that nearby buildings have a mix of heights, and the proposed building height generally does not detract from these.

Representors expressed concern about the development setting a “precedent” for three-storey development in the area. As has been established in case law, there is no such concept in planning decisions as precedent (other than in case law itself), as each application must be assessed on its individual merits. Thus, this would not open up Norwood to *carte blanche* three-storey development. However, each new development will have an impact on its locality (just as the Como development impacts this site), which may change what could be considered appropriate on a given site.

Setbacks, Design & Appearance

This section is split into three parts: site coverage (or building footprint), setbacks, and overall appearance.

Site Coverage

The proposed development would have a site coverage of 52.1%, compared to the “default” guideline in the Established Neighbourhood Zone of 50% (as this area does not have a TNV, as no guideline was provided in Council’s Development Plan for site coverage in the Residential Character (Norwood) Zone). This is generally sufficiently close to achieving the guideline that the departure is considered immaterial.

Building footprints in the locality often take up much of their respective allotments, particularly examples to the north and west, and as a result, the building footprint is considered consistent with the character and pattern of the neighbourhood as sought by PO 3.1.

Setbacks

The proposal includes a front setback of 4.5m, which matches the dwellings to the north. The street pattern is generally fairly tight, and this proposed setback is consistent with the established pattern in the street. The upper levels have been set back further from the front boundary than the ground floor, such that the lift core is in-line with the ridge of the dwelling to the south. This is intended to mitigate the impact of the upper levels on the streetscape, as the view from the south will be less pronounced in comparison with the surrounding development.

For side and rear setbacks, the Established Neighbourhood Zone provides the following guidance:

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. where the wall height does not exceed 3m measured from the lower of natural or finished ground level - at least 900mm ii. for a wall that is not south facing and the wall height exceeds 3m measured from the lower of natural or finished ground level - at least 900mm from the
--	---

	boundary of the site plus a distance of 1/3 of the extent to which the height of the wall exceeds 3m from the lower of natural or finished ground level iii. for a wall that is south facing and the wall height exceeds 3m measured from the lower of natural or finished ground level - at least 1.9m from the boundary of the site plus a distance of 1/3 of the extent to which the height of the wall exceeds 3m from the lower of natural or finished ground level.
PO 9.1 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) private open space d) space for landscaping and vegetation.	DTS/DPF 9.1 Other than in relation to an access lane way, buildings are set back from the rear boundary at least: a) 4m for the first building level b) 6m for any second building level.

Due to the vehicle access being along the northern side of the site, the setback on this side is more generous than on the southern side, and given the additional impact that southern walls can have for overshadowing, this is a key factor considered below.

The ground floor setback on the southern side of 1.5m is relatively generous, although the wall height of 3.8m for this level does make comparison to the DPF challenging since ENZ DPF 8.1 has different metrics for south facing walls exceeding 3m in height. While this height would suggest a “DPF compliant” setback of 2.17m, that is generally designed for upper floor walls, rather than a taller than usual ground floor. The actual impact of this additional height is generally compensated for by the setback provided.

The ground floor rear setback of 3.3m is also a slight shortfall compared to the 4m outlined in ENZ DPF 9.1. Considering PO 9.1, the amount of private open space and landscaping provided are considered below, but as for visual impact, a 700mm shortfall in ground floor rear setback is inconsequential in comparison to the building’s height.

For the upper floors, the southern side setback is 3.8m for most of the building’s length, though the lift core has a setback of only 1.4m. This compares with a “DPF compliant” figure of 4.3m for a wall of this height. The rear setback of 8.165m amply complies with the 6m guideline in DPF 9.1.

To assist in the consideration of overshadowing, the applicant has provided additional shadow diagrams as part of the response to representations, showing shadowing at the equinoxes, and providing a comparison to a DPF compliant dwelling at the winter solstice. These generally show little difference at 9am, with a more pronounced (albeit still not substantial) difference at midday, and a limited difference at 3pm (mainly a small sliver of backyard). As the diagrams are not to scale, no measurement can be provided in this report, but the diagrams can be seen in **Attachment 6**.

The Code provides additional policies relating to overshadowing in the Interface between Land Uses module:

PO 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 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	DTS/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.
---	--

It is noted that the site to the south does not have solar panels, so PO 3.3 of this module has not been considered.

As noted, given that the shadow diagrams are not to scale, verification against these DPFs cannot be carried out, but it appears that the north facing windows of the site to the south would not receive sunlight in accordance with DPF 3.1 whether in a DPF compliant scenario or the proposed development. Sunlight to the rear private open space seems to accord with DPF 3.2.

The other part of ENZ PO 8.1 relates to neighbourhood character. With the number of row dwellings in the locality, there is a fairly tight pattern of upper floor setbacks, so this will not undermine any streetscape character. While its visual impact from the neighbouring properties will be substantial, it does not necessarily detract from the area's "character".

Overall, the setback shortfall is not considered fatal to the proposal.

Appearance

The Established Neighbourhood Zone includes two Performance Outcomes more related to building design, being PO 10.1 and PO 10.2:

"Garages and carports are designed and sited to be discreet and not dominate the appearance of the associated dwelling when viewed from the street."

"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."

Design in Urban Areas Performance Outcome 12.1 is in a similar vein:

"Buildings positively contribute to the character of the local area by responding to local context."

Given that the vehicle garaging is provided via a basement car park, its appearance is somewhat different from usual, and is considered in more detail with reference to the more specific policy below. Nonetheless, the driveway is a relatively limited width, minimising its prominence, particularly when compared to such a substantial building.

As for PO 10.2, it is difficult to discern a "predominant housing stock in the locality". Most dwellings are two-storey, but some have pitched roofs, some are flat, some have gables, some do not. The row dwellings on the opposite side of the road are relatively consistent with a wall height of approximately 6.5m, but this is not "predominant". The proposal draws more contemporary styling from the Como development and the dwelling at 32 Coke Street, but this is also not the "predominant" form. This being the case, it is considered that the proposed design is not unsympathetic to the locality.

Design in Urban Areas Performance Outcome 7.1 relates to the appearance of undercroft garaging:

“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*
- b) screening through appropriate planting, fencing and mounding*
- c) limiting the width of openings and integrating them into the building structure.”*

It is noted that there is existing development involving undercroft garaging in the street, namely at 22A and 22B Coke Street. The protrusion above finished ground level is indeed limited (with the ground floor FFL only being 420mm above top of kerb), and the width of the access is limited at 3.5m. It would also be screened behind the proposed gate. An additional measure not considered in this PO is the use of the arbor to draw attention away from the ramp and up towards ground level. Overall, the negative visual impact is considered suitably mitigated.

The Design in Urban Areas module also includes a series of policies relating to external appearance specific to mid-rise development.

Performance Outcome 12.2 states:

“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.”

The fencing, pillars and lift core, the most visible parts at the lower level, have a stone finish in a relatively warm tone to contribute to this.

Performance Outcome 12.3 states:

“Buildings are designed to reduce visual mass by breaking up building elevations into distinct elements.”

As noted above, the upper floors are set back further than the ground floor to reduce its visual mass. Additionally, the upper floors are broken up into a lift core element and a balcony element which achieves a similar purpose. The open-sided nature of the balcony also breaks up the building's appearance and softens it further.

Performance Outcome 12.5 states:

“External materials and finishes are durable and age well to minimise ongoing maintenance requirements.”

The proposal is for stone and concrete to be the key external materials, both of which are suggested materials in the corresponding DPF.

Performance Outcome 12.6 states:

“Street-facing building elevations are designed to provide attractive, high quality and pedestrian-friendly street frontages.”

Performance Outcome 12.7 states:

“Entrances to multi-storey buildings are safe, attractive, welcoming, functional and contribute to streetscape character.”

The proposed front fencing is 1.4m tall, with breaks in the middle of the site for the gates. This height avoids dominating the pedestrian environment, and allows connectivity between the building (which includes habitable rooms and balconies facing the street) and the street, contributing to these Performance Outcomes.

There are other relevant policies in the Design in Urban Areas module, but only the most relevant have been discussed here for the sake of brevity. These can be seen in full in **Appendix 1**.

Traffic Impact, Access and Parking

Based on the concerns raised by Council's Senior Traffic Engineer, the applicant engaged TMK engineers to provide a response. This included alterations to the basement car park to ensure suitably functional manoeuvring, based on swept path turning diagrams, among other changes. Their advice is included in **Attachment 1**.

The development provides at least two parking spaces per dwelling, in accordance with Transport, Access and Parking Table 1, along with one visitor space.

Since their last revision of the Civil Plan, the applicant has amended the proposed levels, which will have an impact on driveway gradients. The previous version of the Civil Plan did include appropriate gradient transitions, and it is evident that these gradients can be managed appropriately. A Reserved Matter is recommended to provide a final Civil Plan showing the proposed floor levels and driveway levels to confirm that these gradients comply with Design in Urban Areas DPF 23.5 (a).

Council's Senior Traffic Engineer also raised the issue of vehicle sightlines along the ramp, since it is only wide enough for one vehicle, and there is therefore potential conflict in having a vehicle trying to enter and exit at the same time. The applicant has proposed a traffic light system, with the traffic light found in the basement car park. Given the low-traffic, low-speed environment, this solution is generally considered suitable, albeit that further details may be necessary to confirm that is functional. An additional Reserved Matter is recommended for these details.

Another sightlines matter raised by Council's Senior Traffic Engineer was regarding pedestrian sightlines at the property boundary. While the relevant Australian Standard does outline a minimum sight distance for this circumstance, the Planning and Design Code does not, and it is possible to build a 2.1m fence here without any need for approval, which would completely block this sightline. Given the lack of planning policy to the effect of what is sought by the Senior Traffic Engineer in this instance, fencing here does not provide these sightlines.

While waste collection arrangements were mentioned by Council's Senior Traffic Engineer, as the building has less than five dwellings, waste can be collected via the standard collection in accordance with Council's Waste Management Policy and Waste By-Law. There is sufficient space in the verge adjacent the site to accommodate the six bins necessary for collection.

A representor did raise concerns about increased traffic generation as a result of the three new dwellings, but there is no applicable policy in the Code relating to this (since it is generally considered at the policy/strategy level). The density proposed is generally within what is expected by the Zone, so any increase in traffic movements would be broadly within what is expected by the Code.

Verge Infrastructure

The present crossover (almost the entire width of the site) is, as far as Council is aware, not lawfully implemented, and it is not consistent with any Council standards. Therefore, this would be reinstated to an upright kerb and gutter.

The new crossover shown on the plans may not provide the 500mm clearance that is standard from the Telstra Pit to the north, though this may be possible with permission from the asset owner. Nonetheless, moving the crossover slightly to the south will not adversely affect manoeuvring, so this will be clarified by condition.

No other verge infrastructure is affected by the proposal. Indeed, returning the kerbing to upright kerb and gutter may return a parking space to the street, noting that this section of the street does allow parking on one side (being this eastern side). A condition requiring the reinstatement of the balance of the kerb has been recommended to this end.

Privacy

Windows on the side and rear elevations all include either a sill height of at least 1.5m above floor level, or are shown as being permanently obscured. It is recommended that this be reinforced via condition. The proposed balconies face a public road, therefore orienting themselves away from potential overlooking.

Being a mid-rise building, the usual Performance Outcomes relating to overlooking (Design in Urban Areas modules 10.1 and 10.2) do not apply. Instead, the relevant PO is Design in Urban Areas PO 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:

- 1. appropriate site layout and building orientation*
- 2. 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*
- 3. 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*
- 4. screening devices that are integrated into the building design and have minimal negative effect on residents' or neighbours' amenity.”*

This is not supported by the usual DPFs associated with low-rise buildings.

The proposed development does utilise many of the strategies outlined in this Performance Outcome, including:

- 1) Siting the balconies at the front of the site facing the street;
- 2) Siting the balconies at the approximate mid-point of the dwelling walls to the north, where there are no habitable windows to overlook and making any views into private open space more oblique;
- 3) Setting the balconies back some 10m from the street so that any view into properties on the opposite side of Coke Street is over such a distance that it is no longer “direct overlooking”.

A concern was raised by a representor who lives on Edward Street, some 50m from the subject site. Generally, the Code is concerned by “direct overlooking” which is generally overlooking within a 15m radius. Any view that could be obtained from the proposed balconies into the representor’s property would be challenging due to the distance of the view, meaning that the overlooking is not unreasonable and is consistent with the Performance Outcome outlined above.

Noise Emissions

One concern raised by representors was the impact of noise from the pool filter. The filter would be in an enclosure in the southeast corner of the site (abutting both the side and rear boundaries). It is understood that this is more than 5m from a dwelling on a neighbouring allotment which would accord with the relevant Accepted Development Criteria. Nonetheless, if the noise from the equipment did become a nuisance, then this could be managed through the *Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act*.

Other plant and equipment are located in the basement, which will have an even greater noise attenuation impact, and could similarly be managed under the *Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act* if needed and is therefore unlikely to negatively impact on local amenity.

Waste Management

As the development involves only three dwellings, it would qualify for the standard Council waste collection as per Council’s Waste Management Policy and By-Law. Sufficient space is available in the verge for the six bins that would be needed on any given collection day.

The ground floor dwelling would store its bins behind the proposed masonry fence, meaning that this is screened from public view. The upper floor dwellings would store their bins along the southern side of the lift core, again screened from public view, as sought by Performance Outcome 24.1 of the Design in Urban Areas module.

Landscaping

The site has a total of 104.8 m² of ground level soft landscaping, though of this, 33.1m² is not open to the ground below as it sits above the basement garage, and a further 33.5m² does not meet the usual minimum dimension guideline of 700mm. Thus, one could consider the soft landscaping percentage as 14.4%, 9.8% or 5.2% depending on how strictly the usual criteria might be applied. That said, those usual guidelines (in the forms of Design in Urban Areas PO 3.1 and 22.1) are not applicable as Table 3 of the Established Neighbourhood Zone does not apply them.

The relevant policies for landscaping that are included in Table 3 are outlined below:

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 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	DTS/DPF 13.2 Multi-storey development provides deep soil zones and incorporates trees at not less than the following rates, except in a location or zone where full site coverage is desired. <table><tr><th>Site area</th><th>Minimum deep soil area</th><th>Minimum dimension</th><th>Tree / deep soil zones</th></tr><tr><td><300m²</td><td>10m²</td><td>1.5m</td><td>1 small tree / 10m²</td></tr><tr><td>300-1500m²</td><td>7% site area</td><td>3m</td><td>1 medium tree / 30m²</td></tr><tr><td>>1500m²</td><td>7% site area</td><td>6m</td><td>1 large or medium tree / 60m²</td></tr></table>	Site area	Minimum deep soil area	Minimum dimension	Tree / deep soil zones	<300m ²	10m ²	1.5m	1 small tree / 10m ²	300-1500m ²	7% site area	3m	1 medium tree / 30m ²	>1500m ²	7% site area	6m	1 large or medium tree / 60m ²
Site area	Minimum deep soil area	Minimum dimension	Tree / deep soil zones														
<300m ²	10m ²	1.5m	1 small tree / 10m ²														
300-1500m ²	7% site area	3m	1 medium tree / 30m ²														
>1500m ²	7% site area	6m	1 large or medium tree / 60m ²														
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 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.	DTS/DPF 13.4 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.																
PO 34.1 Soft landscaping is provided between dwellings and common driveways to improve the outlook for occupants and appearance of common areas.	DTS/DPF 34.1 Other than where located directly in front of a garage or building entry, soft landscaping with a minimum dimension of 1m is provided between a dwelling and common driveway.																
PO 34.2 Battle-axe or common driveways incorporate landscaping and permeability to improve appearance and assist in stormwater management.	DTS/DPF 34.2 Battle-axe or common driveways satisfy (a) and (b): a) are constructed of a minimum of 50% permeable or porous material b) where the driveway is located directly																

	adjacent the side or rear boundary of the site, soft landscaping with a minimum dimension of 1m is provided between the driveway and site boundary (excluding along the perimeter of a passing point).
--	--

The proposed development would not achieve any of the DPFs shown above, and thus the relevant PO's must be considered. In general, these policies aim to provide shade, soften the appearance of buildings, and manage stormwater from common driveways.

The development does relatively little with regard to shading, with sufficient space available for planting in accordance with the Urban Tree Canopy Overlay (which would require planting three small trees each with their own soil area of at least 10m² and a minimum dimension of 1.5m), and while some additional trees are shown in these planting areas, there is limited other opportunity and very few deep soil zones.

The development does somewhat better on the appearance of landscaping, with most of the landscaping being oriented to the front of the site. This includes four small trees shown in the front of the site, a segment of landscaping in front of the proposed masonry fence, planter boxes on the balconies, and a strip of landscaping (approximately 600mm wide) along the driveway.

Rather than providing 50% of the common driveway area as permeable material (since doing so on a slope can be challenging, though not impossible), the applicant has instead provided a Stormwater Management Plan outlining how peak flows will be managed with the ramp. This does not "incorporate permeability" as sought by PO 34.2 above, but it does "assist in stormwater management".

On the whole, there are some variances from these policies, but not variances so substantial as to make the development entirely inappropriate.

A Reserved Matter is proposed to clarify the details of the planter boxes. The floor plans show planter boxes on the roof above the ground floor component, but on the three-dimensional renderings provided, planter boxes are shown between the Level 1 and Level 2 balconies. Moreover, the plans do not show the depth of these planter boxes, and the position of these on outside of the balconies would make traditional watering challenging. Therefore, the Reserved Matter intends to clarify the planter boxes' capacity to sustain the life of appropriate plants. A condition is recommended to enforce the broader landscaping proposed.

Stormwater Management

The applicant has provided a Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) which provides calculations showing that the proposed development would not increase the amount of runoff in a 1% AEP event compared to the development previously on the site. This also includes a pump for stormwater from the ramp into the basement car park.

There are three separate assessment considerations with respect to stormwater on the site:

- 1) The mandatory condition as required under the Stormwater Management Overlay;
 - a. This requires 4000L of retention plumbed into at least a toilet and the laundry outlets, and 1000L of detention with a 20-25mm diameter slow-release orifice;
- 2) Management of stormwater on the driveway ramp;
 - a. A pumping system is necessary to ensure that rain falling on the driveway would not flood the proposed basement;
- 3) To account for the relatively high level of impervious surfaces on the site, the applicant has elected to provide additional storage (detention) to ensure that there is no increase in runoff during a 1% AEP event;
 - a. There is no formal policy requiring this, and the calculations for this must be in addition to any storage required under the Stormwater Management Overlay above.

Council's Consultant Hydrological Engineer raised a series of issues with the proposed SMP and Civil Plan.

Chief among these is that the proposed rainwater tank arrangement did not comply with the Stormwater Management Overlay, and only related to the detention required to achieve point (3) above. The Reserved Matter for the final Civil Plan will clarify that this plan must include a tank which complies with these requirements as well. The relevant conditions specifying compliance with this can then be applied if/when the Reserved Matter is resolved.

Another matter raised by the Consultant Hydrological Engineer was that the assumed "Council requirements" were not Council's standard requirements (which are that a development should detain the post-development 1% event at the discharge rate of the pre-development 20% event), and that it was calculated based on the site impermeability of a development which had been demolished some time ago. However, this requirement is what is typically applied for large scale development where the Code's standard requirement (i.e. the Stormwater Management Overlay) does not apply. In this case, the Stormwater Management Overlay does apply as the development involves less than 5 dwellings, and the requirement provided by the applicant is more so out of goodwill and compensating for the limited infiltration on-site. Thus, there are no "hard and fast" requirements for these calculations, and the assumptions are considered generally reasonable.

The final issue was an inconsistency between the calculations for the pump system and the Civil Plan particularly with regard to the capacity of the storage for the pump. The calculations show a required volume of 13.3m³ but only 3m³ is shown on the Civil Plan. The recommended Reserved Matter for the final Civil Plan also specifies that this should be clarified. At such a time as this Reserved Matter is resolved, conditions would be applied to ensure the ongoing maintenance and functionality of the pump.

Private Open Space

For dwellings in a residential flat building, Table 1 of the Design in Urban Areas module provides the following guidance:

Dwellings at ground level:	15m ² / minimum dimension 3m
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	15m ² / minimum dimension 2.6m

The ground floor dwelling provides substantially more than this, and the upper floor dwellings (each of which has three bedrooms) each provide a street facing balcony of 16.6m² and a minimum dimension of 3m. Each of these areas are directly accessible from a living room.

Thus, the provision of private open space complies with the relevant guidelines of the Code.

Dwelling Functionality and Occupant Amenity

The Code includes a variety of policies in the Design in Urban Areas module relating to medium rise (i.e. more than two storey) development that are not generally considered for other development.

Many of these policies (from PO 26.1 onwards) are aimed at ensuring occupant amenity, in matters such as orientation and size, and the proposed development generally achieves these. This section of the assessment report does not seek to go through each of these policies individually, but they can be seen in **Appendix 1**. Instead, the more notable of these policies are elaborated upon.

Several policies relate to privacy within the development site, in terms of both visual and acoustic privacy. Given the orientation of the dwellings, visual privacy is easily accounted for. Acoustic privacy is covered by PO 28.6:

"Attached or abutting dwellings are designed to minimise the transmission of sound between dwellings and, in particular, to protect bedrooms from possible noise intrusions."

The applicant has outlined that they will use concrete slab construction between levels which is sufficiently dense that it will prevent unreasonable acoustic impacts between levels.

PO 28.4 seeks that:

“Dwellings are provided with sufficient space for storage to meet likely occupant needs.”

For three-bedroom dwellings, the associated DPF seeks 12m³ of storage space to be provided per dwelling. Storage space is provided in each unit, with additional storage space in the basement car park.

PO 28.7 states:

“Dwellings are designed so that internal structural columns correspond with the position of internal walls to ensure that the space within the dwelling/apartment is useable”.

The applicant has consulted with a structural engineer to ensure that this is the case.

PO 35.2 states:

“Provision is made for suitable external clothes drying facilities.”

While the applicant has included clothes drying areas in the basement, and on the southern side of the ground floor dwelling, it is noted that sufficient space is available on the balconies of each dwelling for a clothes horse, to allow for air drying in a more private and convenient space.

PO 14.2 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.”

The amended design provided by the applicant includes 600mm deep eaves along the northern side to provide shade to the north-facing windows in summer. Additionally, the west-facing balcony includes a roof over its full depth, minimising the time of day when western sun would hit these windows.

It is noted that representors expressed concerns regarding a series of other matters which have not been addressed above. First of these is the development blocking views of the hills. While this may have some impact on the amenity of the public and private realms, no Code policy is applicable to this concern, and it is therefore not considered relevant to this assessment.

Further concerns were raised regarding disturbances during the construction process, particularly with relation to car parking. While a Construction Environment Management Plan can be required to clarify matters such as tradespeople parking, there is no planning policy related to this. In any event, there is ample parking available in the Como development, and it is therefore considered that such a Plan would not be necessary in this instance.

CONCLUSION

While the development is above the height guideline for the area in terms of the number of building levels, these guidelines are not policies in themselves, and instead development must be assessed against the relevant Performance Outcomes, considering the context of the development. In this case, the impact of the taller development along The Parade, and the relatively compact nature of the existing development in the locality, is such that the additional height of the proposed development, which is only 900mm taller than the dwelling which was previously approved on the site, is not so foreign to the locality as to compromise its character.

While the southern side setback is slightly short of the guideline provided by ENZ DPF 8.1, the impact of this on the neighbouring property is relatively limited.

The landscaping provided on the site is somewhat lacking, but the proposal does contribute to some, though not all, of the outcomes sought from these policies.

Overall, the proposal is finely balanced, but is considered to sufficiently accord with the Planning and Design 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 24041239, by Paolo Piteo is granted Planning Consent subject to the below conditions and reserved matters.
3. Resolution of the reserved matter(s) and the imposition of any additional conditions is delegated to the Assessment Manager:

RESERVED MATTERS

Planning Consent

Pursuant to Section 102(3) of the *Planning, Development & Infrastructure Act 2016*, the following matter(s) shall be reserved for further assessment prior to the granting of Development Approval.

Reserved Matter 1

An updated Site Drainage Plan shall be prepared and provided to the reasonable satisfaction of the Assessment Manager that:

- Confirms the Finished Floors Levels of the proposed building nominated at 7.54 for the basement and 10.24 for the ground floor;
- Confirms the gradients of the proposed driveway including appropriate transitions in accordance with Design in Urban Areas DPF 23.5(a);
- Includes rainwater tank storage consistent with the requirements of the Stormwater Management Overlay;
- Includes sufficient storage to ensure that the post-development stormwater runoff in a 1% AEP storm event is no greater than pre-development conditions;
- Includes an appropriate stormwater pump and storage system to manage stormwater from the proposed driveway ramp;

NOTE: Further conditions may be imposed on the Planning Consent in respect of the above matters.

Pursuant to Section 127(1) of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, the power to impose further conditions of consent in respect of the reserved matter(s) above is delegated to the Assessment Manager.

Reserved Matter 2

Details regarding the system of traffic management for the proposed car park ramp are to be provided to the reasonable satisfaction of the Assessment Manager.

NOTE: Further conditions may be imposed on the Planning Consent in respect of the above matters.

Pursuant to Section 127(1) of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, the power to impose further conditions of consent in respect of the reserved matter(s) above is delegated to the Assessment Manager.

Reserved Matter 3

Details of the planter boxes proposed to the western and northern sides of the Level 1 and Level 2 balconies and to the top of the lower-level roofs adjacent (as shown on the herein approved Floor Plans prepared by Piteo Architects (Job N0. 2305, Dwg No. PA02, dated 08/09/2025) shall be provided to the reasonable

satisfaction of the Assessment Manager. This detail shall demonstrate that these are suitable to allow for the growth and maintenance of appropriate plantings. In particular, such details shall clarify:

- 1) Internal and external dimensions of the planter boxes;
- 2) Construction materials;
- 3) Details of ongoing irrigation; and
- 4) Species to be planted in these planter boxes.

NOTE: Further conditions may be imposed on the Planning Consent in respect of the above matters.

Pursuant to Section 127(1) of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, the power to impose further conditions of consent in respect of the reserved matter(s) above is delegated to the Assessment Manager.

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

Tree(s) must be planted and/or retained in accordance with DTS/DPF 1.1 of the Urban Tree Canopy Overlay in the Planning and Design Code (as at the date of lodgement of the application). New trees must be planted within 12 months of occupation of the dwelling(s) and maintained.

Condition 3

Council's specifications require the driveway crossover between the back of kerb and the property boundary to be shaped to provide a verge slope no greater than 2.5% fall towards the road where a footpath is present and a maximum 5% where no footpath is present. Any gradient required to accommodate vehicle access that exceeds the Council specifications shall be accommodated entirely within the boundaries of the subject land.

Condition 4

The existing vehicular crossover on Coke Street shall be reinstated to kerb and gutter so as to match the existing adjacent kerb and gutter profile, within one (1) week of occupation of the development to the reasonable satisfaction of the Assessment Manager. All associated costs shall be borne by the owner / applicant.

Condition 5

Rainwater tank(s) must be installed in accordance with DTS/DPF 1.1 of the Stormwater Management Overlay in the Planning and Design Code (as at the date of lodgement of the application) within 12 months of occupation of the dwelling(s).

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

The upper floor windows to the side and rear elevations of the building herein approved 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, within one (1) week of 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 8

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@npsa.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

If excavating, it is recommended you contact Before You Dig Australia (BYDA) (www.byda.com.au) to keep people safe and help protect underground infrastructure.

Mr Murray addressed the Council Assessment Panel from 6:32pm until 6:37pm

Mr Troncone addressed the Council Assessment Panel from 6:40pm until 6:42pm

Mr Piteo addressed the Council Assessment Panel from 6:42pm until 6:44pm

Moved by Mr Rutt

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 24041239, by Paolo Piteo is granted Planning Consent subject to the below conditions and reserved matters.*
3. *Resolution of the reserved matter(s) and the imposition of any additional conditions is delegated to the Assessment Manager:*

RESERVED MATTERS

Planning Consent

Pursuant to Section 102(3) of the Planning, Development & Infrastructure Act 2016, the following matter(s) shall be reserved for further assessment prior to the granting of Development Approval.

Reserved Matter 1

An updated Site Drainage Plan shall be prepared and provided to the reasonable satisfaction of the Assessment Manager that:

- *Confirms the Finished Floors Levels of the proposed building nominated at 7.54 for the basement and 10.24 for the ground floor;*
- *Confirms the gradients of the proposed driveway including appropriate transitions in accordance with Design in Urban Areas DPF 23.5(a);*
- *Includes rainwater tank storage consistent with the requirements of the Stormwater Management Overlay;*
- *Includes sufficient storage to ensure that the post-development stormwater runoff in a 1% AEP storm event is no greater than pre-development conditions;*
- *Includes an appropriate stormwater pump and storage system to manage stormwater from the proposed driveway ramp;*

NOTE: *Further conditions may be imposed on the Planning Consent in respect of the above matters.*

Pursuant to Section 127(1) of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, the power to impose further conditions of consent in respect of the reserved matter(s) above is delegated to the Assessment Manager.

Reserved Matter 2

Details regarding the system of traffic management for the proposed car park ramp are to be provided to the reasonable satisfaction of the Assessment Manager.

NOTE: Further conditions may be imposed on the Planning Consent in respect of the above matters.

Pursuant to Section 127(1) of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, the power to impose further conditions of consent in respect of the reserved matter(s) above is delegated to the Assessment Manager.

Reserved Matter 3

Details of the planter boxes proposed to the western and northern sides of the Level 1 and Level 2 balconies and to the top of the lower-level roofs adjacent (as shown on the herein approved Floor Plans prepared by Piteo Architects (Job NO. 2305, Dwg No. PA02, dated 08/09/2025) shall be provided to the reasonable satisfaction of the Assessment Manager. This detail shall demonstrate that these are suitable to allow for the growth and maintenance of appropriate plantings. In particular, such details shall clarify:

- 1) Internal and external dimensions of the planter boxes;*
- 2) Construction materials;*
- 3) Details of ongoing irrigation; and*
- 4) Species to be planted in these planter boxes.*

NOTE: Further conditions may be imposed on the Planning Consent in respect of the above matters.

Pursuant to Section 127(1) of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, the power to impose further conditions of consent in respect of the reserved matter(s) above is delegated to the Assessment Manager.

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

Tree(s) must be planted and/or retained in accordance with DTS/DPF 1.1 of the Urban Tree Canopy Overlay in the Planning and Design Code (as at the date of lodgement of the application). New trees must be planted within 12 months of occupation of the dwelling(s) and maintained.

Condition 3

Council's specifications require the driveway crossover between the back of kerb and the property boundary to be shaped to provide a verge slope no greater than 2.5% fall towards the road where a footpath is present and a maximum 5% where no footpath is present. Any gradient required to accommodate vehicle access that exceeds the Council specifications shall be accommodated entirely within the boundaries of the subject land.

Condition 4

The existing vehicular crossover on Coke Street shall be reinstated to kerb and gutter so as to match the existing adjacent kerb and gutter profile, within one (1) week of occupation of the development to the reasonable satisfaction of the Assessment Manager. All associated costs shall be borne by the owner / applicant.

Condition 5

Rainwater tank(s) must be installed in accordance with DTS/DPF 1.1 of the Stormwater Management Overlay in the Planning and Design Code (as at the date of lodgement of the application) within 12 months of occupation of the dwelling(s).

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

The upper floor windows to the side and rear elevations of the building herein approved 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, within one (1) week of 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 8

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@npsa.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

If excavating, it is recommended you contact Before You Dig Australia (BYDA) (www.byda.com.au) to keep people safe and help protect underground infrastructure.

Seconded by Mr Bateup
CARRIED

6. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS – DEVELOPMENT ACT

7. REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT MANAGER DECISIONS

8. ERD COURT APPEALS

9. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr Fairbrother noted that concerns raised by the representor for Item 5.1, about traffic/parking volumes in Coke Street and parking restrictions not being enforced regularly, will be passed on to Council staff in Regulatory Services and Traffic teams for consideration.

10. CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS

11. CLOSURE

The Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 7:23pm.

Stephen Smith
PRESIDING MEMBER

Kieran Fairbrother
ACTING MANAGER, DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT