

Requests to be Heard

14 March 2023

Planning and Amenity
Delegated Committee Meeting

Requests to be Heard

14 March 2022 Planning and Amenity Delegated Committee Meeting

Item 4.5 312 Balcombe Road, Beaumaris	Objector (O) Supporter (S) Applicant (A)
Requests to Speak	
1. Mr Mick Meyer (for ZKAP 1 Pty Ltd c/o Urbis Pty Ltd)	(A)

Item 4.6 4 Orlando Street, Hampton	Objector (O) Supporter (S) Applicant (A)
Requests to Speak	
1. Mr Nicholas Saunders	(O)

Item 4.8 10 Norwood Avenue, Brighton	Objector (O) Supporter (S) Applicant (A)
Written Statements	(Page 4)
1. Dr Noella Kershaw	(O)
Requests to Speak	
1. Mr Halli Moore	(O)
2. Mr James Stuart-Menteth	(A)

WRITTEN STATEMENTS

Item 4.8 10 Norwood Avenue, Brighton	Objector (O) Supporter (S) Applicant (A)
1. Dr Noella Kershaw	(O)
<p>Councillors,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to submit a written statement in support of our objection to Application 5/2022/243/1 at 10 Norwood Avenue, Brighton 3186.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Roof Terraces, in this area, are primarily built to obtain bay views and to a lesser extent city skyline views. Therefore, views to the North and West are prized. Views to the East and South do not add to the amenity of the terrace, except that they may increase the “feeling” of openness on the terrace.</p> <p>The proposed roof terrace is approximately 16.8 metres long and 4.65 metres wide. A total area of approximately 78 square metres.</p> <p>This is significantly larger than the other roof terraces cited in the “Town Planning Report” submitted by Ask Planning Pty Ltd, in support of the proposal. This report stamped by Council on 18 October 2022 cites roof terraces at 3 and 4B Kinane Street and 1A and 3 Gould Street. Another roof terrace that could have been cited is 2B Kinane Street, which is much closer to 10 Norwood Avenue than those cited in Gould Street.</p> <p>All these terraces are considerably smaller than the roof terrace proposed for 10 Norwood Avenue.</p> <p>Our objection is based on two criteria – Overlooking and Overshadowing</p> <p>1. Overlooking</p> <p>As previously stated, the proposed roof terrace is approximately 16.8 metres long. The large size of this terrace would seem to indicate that it is designed so that a large number of people would be able to use this area at any one time. If this were the case there may also be an issue with noise created by a large gathering.</p> <p>A person, or people, standing on the eastern side of the roof terrace will have a clear view of the private open space and pool area of the rear private open space of 12 Norwood Avenue.</p> <p>There is also a clear view into both the kitchen and dining area on the ground floor and the main bedroom on the first floor, through the windows in the extended rear semi-circular Georgian style design of the rear of 12 Norwood Avenue.</p>	

2. Overshadowing

The building, proposed at 10 Norwood Avenue, presents a first-floor eastern facade to 12 Norwood Avenue that is approximately 12 metres long and 3.1 metres high. The roof terrace adds another 1 metre to the overall height.

This length is measured from the rear corner of the building at 12 Norwood Avenue.

The large mass of this building basically eliminates the views of sky and sunlight from the western side of the rear open private space of our property for the major part of the day.

The eastern side of the proposed building at Number 10 is sloped away from their western boundary, whereas the eastern side is vertical, and so offers no visual relief to the property on their eastern boundary (12 Norwood Avenue).

We also note that the vertical nature of the eastern side of their building impinges on the Bayside setback rules. Thereby adding further weight to our argument regarding the vertical bulk of the eastern side of their building.

Added to this is the roof terrace which adds further height to the building, exacerbating the overshadowing.

3. Conclusion

The proposed roof terrace is over-sized.

The terrace should be shortened considerably. Also, the width could be reduced by moving the eastern edge of the terrace 1 metre to the west. This will assist with both overshadowing and overlooking to 12 Norwood Avenue.

If either of these measures are not adopted, I suggest that the roof terrace needs to have an obscure glass barrier of 1.7metres in height on both eastern and southern sides of the terrace, to overcome the overlooking issues for adjoining properties to the south and east.