



Kingston and Barton Residents Group Inc.
11/1 Sydney Avenue Barton ACT 2604
kingstonandbarton@gmail.com

Morris Property Group
50 Blackall Street Barton ACT
bcomfort@morrispropertygroup.com.au

52-56 LEICHHARDT STREET GRIFFITH - PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT

Thank you for pre-DA consultation Zoom meeting on 23 September 2021 attended by myself, representing the Kingston and Barton Residents Group Inc. Our comments on the proposal at this stage are as follows:

1. Although this proposal is superior to your previous scheme for Block 52 only, we are still concerned that it is an overdevelopment of the site, being 76 units in a **fully 4 storey** high building. In contrast, the building under construction at no. 58 Leichhardt Street is **3 storeys** high for its whole front section (approximately one third of the total length of the building) and is to only contain 11 apartments, on a single house block. Many of your units appear to have quite poor amenity and there has been no attempt to provide significant tree cover.
2. This proposal also fails to respect the character of this locality, as it faces Heritage listed cottages on the other side of the street which are in a low-density RZ1 zone. Other buildings in this section are a mixture of 1-4 storey heights, with variable setbacks and building forms, generally stepping down towards the Leichhardt Street frontage. The buildings in your proposal appear very hard edged and 'commercial' in feeling, in contrast to the soft cottagey forms of the heritage houses opposite with their gable ended elements and terra cotta tiled roofs. The change of colour for the top floor of your buildings, which are not set back as required, does little to disguise their aggressive form and height.
3. Under the Griffith Precinct Code, the site is in RC2 with additional controls as follows:
*"Rule: The **maximum number of storeys is 3**" [the proposal is **4 storeys** - **does not comply**]*
*"Criteria: Buildings are **predominantly 3 storeys, with a maximum height of 4 storeys only where it is not the dominant feature of a street frontage**" - **does not comply.**]*
4. Under the Multi Unit Housing Development Code (MUHDC) **Front boundary setbacks**:
*"Rule: All zones: **6m**" [the proposed setback is only **4 metres** to the face of the balconies – **does not comply**]*
*"Criteria: Front boundary setbacks achieve all of the following: "a) consistency with the desired character" [**inconsistent** with the character of the area – **does not comply**]*

“b) reasonable amenity for residents” [reduced front setback provides reduced amenity in terms of privacy, space for planting etc – **does not comply**]

“c) sufficient space for street trees to grow to maturity” [reduced front setback provides reduced space for street trees – **does not comply**]

5. MUDHC Part B – Additional controls for multi unit housing with 4 or more storeys:

Side and rear boundary setbacks:

“Rule (& Table B1): First 4 storeys – external wall: 3m; – unscreened element: 6m”

Under the Territory Plan Definitions, *“external wall may incorporate any of the following:*

a) windows with sill heights at or above 1.7m from the floor; b) screened decks; c) fixed pane windows with obscure glass; d) awning sashes with obscure glass and with an opening of not more than 30cm to the horizontal; e) obscure glass bricks.”

“Screening device means a permanent structure that comprise one or more of the following:

a) opaque or translucent glazing; b) solid panels; c) perforated panels or trellises with a maximum 25% of openings.”

[Full height living room windows and balconies with movable or semi-transparent screens would be classed as *unscreened elements* so should be set back 6 metres. The proposal, with windows and decks facing and only 3 metres from the northwestern side boundary, does not comply]

“Criteria: Buildings and other structures are sited to achieve all of the following:

a) consistency with the desired character

b) reasonable separation between adjoining developments

c) reasonable privacy for dwellings on adjoining residential blocks”

[The proposal does not appear to comply with those criteria]

6. MUHDC Solar access – apartments:

“Rule: The floor or internal wall of a daytime living area of not fewer than 70% of apartments on a site is exposed to not less than 3 hours of direct sunlight between the hours of 9am and 3pm on the winter solstice (21 June)” **[Your consultants at the briefing indicated only about 60% of the units would meet that standard]**

“Criteria: Daytime living areas have reasonable access to sunlight.” **[Compliance of about 40% of the units appears unlikely]**

7. MUHDC Principal private open space:

“Rule:

“b) has minimum area and dimensions: 8m² x 1.8m **[About 70% of the upper floor level units would not comply]**

“e) is not located to the south, south-east or south-west of the dwelling...” **[About 60% of the upper floor level units would not comply]**

8. Deep soil planting – large trees:

Very little space appears to be available for this, apart from a 2.4m strip along the front.

We look forward to a revised proposal which respects the local character and is fully compliant with the Territory Plan.

Richard Johnston

A/President, Kingston and Barton Residents Group Inc.

September 2021