

PROPOSED MAJOR TOURIST
HOTEL REDEVELOPMENT

MARINA REGENCY HOTEL
6-10 ADELPHI TERRACE
GLENELG NORTH SA 5045

RESPONSE REPORT

Prepared for:
Q Developments

Date:
February 2016

Proprietary Information Statement

The information contained in this document produced by Holmes Partners Australia Pty Ltd is solely for the use of the Client identified on the coversheet for the purpose for which it has been prepared and Holmes Partners Australia Pty Ltd takes no responsibility to any third party who may rely upon this document.

All rights reserved. No section or element of this document may be removed from this document, reproduced electronically stored or transmitted in any form without the written permission of Holmes Partners Australia Pty Ltd.

Document Control

Revision	Description	Author	Date
V1	Draft for Client Review	HD	21/11/2015
V2	Response Report for Submission	HD	10/12/2015

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 SECTION 46 PROCESS	1
2. RESPONSE TO GOVERNMENT AND AGENCY SUBMISSIONS	3
3. DESIGN REVIEW PANEL PROCESS	16
3.1 PROCESS OVERVIEW	16
3.2 PANEL SESSION 1	16
3.3 PANEL SESSION 2	17
3.4 PANEL SESSION 3	19
3.5 CLOSE OUT SESSION	20
4. COMMUNITY SUBMISSIONS	21
4.1 PROPONENT’S COMMUNITY OPEN DAY	21
4.2 COMMUNITY SUBMISSIONS	21
5. CONCLUSION	58

Appendices

<i>Appendix 1. Government Agency Submissions</i>	59
<i>Appendix 2. Council Submission</i>	60
<i>Appendix 3. Government Architect Correspondence</i>	61
<i>Appendix 4. Community Submissions</i>	62

Tables

<i>Table 2.1 Response to Council and Agency Submissions</i>	4
<i>Table 4.1 Response to Public Submissions</i>	22

1. Introduction

This Response Report is prepared in respect to a proposal to redevelop the Comfort Haven Inn Marina Motel site at 6-10 Adelphi Terrace, Glenelg North with a new 12 storey, four and a half star hotel including conference facilities, associated retail, residential apartments and car parking.

This report should be read in conjunction with the Development Report.

1.1 Section 46 Process

The proposal is considered to be one of major economic importance to the State and for this reason this proposal has been declared by the Minister as a Major Development pursuant to Section 46 of the *Development Act 1993*.

Section 46 allows for a declaration to be made in respect of a proposal to enable a specific and rigorous assessment of the proposal against a series of purposefully developed assessment guidelines set by the independent Development Assessment Commission. The assessment must also have regard to the State's Planning Strategy and other key Government Strategic documents, the Development Plan and other relevant policies.

The Authority that will ultimately grant consent or refuse the application is the Governor.

The process to be followed for this project pursuant to Section 46D in accord with this declaration is set out below:

1. The proponent lodges an application with the Minister
2. The application is referred to the Development Assessment Commission (DAC) to establish the level of assessment required and the guidelines for the assessment.
3. The Minister must provide the report of the DAC to the proponent and give public notice of the DAC's determination.
4. The proponent will then prepare a report addressing the guidelines and all other relevant information.

The Development Report must specifically include:

- a statement of the expected environmental, social and economic effects of the development;
- the extent to which the expected effects are consistent with the provisions of any relevant Development Plan (in this case the City of Holdfast Bay Development Plan and specifically the Residential (High Density) Zone and within this Policy Area 15;
- the Planning Strategy;
- the proponents commitment to meeting conditions if any that should be observed in order to avoid, mitigate or satisfactorily manage and control any potential adverse effects of the development on the environment; and
- any other matters required by the regulations or the Minister.

5. The proponent then submits this Development Report to the Minister who will refer it to the Council, other agencies and place it on public exhibition for 15 business days.
6. Following exhibition the proponent is invited to respond to any public, Council or agency submissions and any other matters raised by the Minister in writing. Typically this will take the form of a "Response Report". This is that Response Report.
7. The Response Report is submitted to the Minister and the Minister will then prepare an Assessment Report. This report will be an assessment of the project considering any submissions, the proponent's response, comments from the Council and agencies and any other matters that the Minister thinks fit.
8. The reports are referred to the Governor for a Decision pursuant to Section 48 of the *Development Act, 1993*. The Governor may then approve, approve with conditions and/or reserve matters or, refuse consent to the project and gives notice of his decision by a notice in the Government Gazette.
9. All of these reports, i.e. the Development Report, the Response Report and the Assessment Report are kept as publicly available documents for a time period determined by the Minister.

2. Response to Government and Agency Submissions

Responses were received from the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and the City of Holdfast Bay.

Copies of these submissions are included in full in Appendix 1 (Government Agency Responses) and Appendix 2 (Council's Response).

The project also went through an extensive Design Review Panel Process comprising three sessions with the Panel followed by a close out session. Notwithstanding that this process is in a sense a Government/Agency input, given the extent and importance of this process this is addressed separately at Section 3 of this report.

Table 2.1 below summarises these submissions and the key points raised, provides a response commentary and describes any resultant action arising.

Table 2.1 Response to Council and Agency Submissions

Authority	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
Ms Peta McBride Senior Engineer, Traffic Operations Operational Services Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	<p>Concurs with the traffic assessment and the Council's comments.</p> <p>The impacts on the surrounding road network will be minimal.</p>	Noted	No action required.
The City of Holdfast Bay – Development Assessment Panel.	<p>Application was referred internally to City assets for an assessment of vehicle access, parking and stormwater management.</p> <p>Street trees are not affected by the proposal.</p> <p>Council would like a dilapidation report.</p> <p>Would like it to be a requirement that as part of any approval that the developer will keep Council infrastructure in good condition during construction.</p> <p>Permits will be required for undergrounding of power, stormwater and any hoardings that affect Council's footpaths.</p> <p>DAP advises DAC (sic) (the Minister) that the proposal is challenged by:</p> <p>General Section Design and Appearance PDCs 2 (wall height and length close to a site boundary) and 11 (overlooking) in that the proposed development has a wall in close proximity to 1 Canning Street that is tall and long and that there will be direct views over its rear yard.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A dilapidation report will be prepared in respect of physically adjoining properties.</p> <p>Construction will be managed to avoid damage to Council infrastructure. In the unlikely event of damage; items will be made good.</p> <p>Noted. All legal requirements will be complied with.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the wall height is greater than the three storeys espoused by the Development Plan.</p>	<p>No action required.</p> <p>A dilapidation report to be prepared prior to work commencing on site.</p> <p>Construction will be managed to avoid damage to Council infrastructure. In the unlikely event of damage; items will be made good.</p> <p>All legal requirements will be complied with.</p> <p>No amendments proposed.</p>

Authority	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>Suggests that obscured screening to the balconies of the easternmost hotel units located on level 4 is warranted.</p>	<p>Notwithstanding the proposal has been worked through a Design Review Panel Process to ensure that it is appropriate to the area in terms of its fit to the streetscape and surrounding buildings.</p> <p>Changes have been made along the way to address the external appearance of the building, the materials and finishes. This process also addressed matters such as the building in its context and in particular on Adelphi Terrace, the interface between the building and its neighbours, overlooking and overshadowing.</p> <p>Careful attention has been paid to the external features of the building to ensure the high quality design aesthetic is achieved. Materials and finishes are being selected for the visual amenity qualities, suitability for the locality, durability and low maintenance properties.</p> <p>To ensure that the quality of the design aesthetic is retained and delivered any approval could be conditioned.</p> <p>The interface of the building has been designed with elements to provide a transition between the lower level existing development and the main tower element of the proposal. The proposal will by virtue of its design tie together the locality bringing a link with the Aquarius Towers.</p>	

Authority	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
		<p>The development is set off all boundaries at ground level. Wall heights are the lowest (down to roughly that of a two storey dwelling 8m) along the eastern and southern boundaries as part of the transition. There are no windows in these walls. Pulling the walls off the boundary by varying amounts provides space to maintain the vegetation proposed on these walls and the walls themselves if necessary. These lower levels and the podium reinforce the transition to the tower element.</p> <p>The wall specifically referred to adjacent 1 Canning Street is located off the boundary by up to 1.2m. This wall is approximately 8m high or similar in magnitude to a two storey dwelling. It is proposed to be planted as a green wall. If the adjoining owner wishes to have some other finish this can be negotiated. This position has previously been put to the neighbour.</p> <p>In terms of overlooking design solutions have been explored to minimise the incidence of casual overlooking into neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The walls closest to the boundaries have no openings to rooms and thus there is no prospect of overlooking from the podium.</p>	

Authority	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
		<p>To 1 Canning Street the room are set back behind the podium to further minimise overlooking.</p> <p>Views from the lower tower levels into 1 Canning Street are obscured by the podium itself on account of the large setback (approx. 11m) of the tower component from the shared boundary.</p> <p>The design solution arrived at for the higher levels incorporates a fixed plinth underneath a glass balustrade. This plinth will prevent casual overlooking both from the apartments out and equally importantly from the neighbouring properties into the new apartments.</p> <p>In addition the distance between any vantage points and neighbouring properties is separated by some distance, both horizontally and vertically. The Good Residential Design Guide SA recommends a separation of 15m to prevent direct overlooking.</p> <p>Overlooking only occurs at distances of 30m or greater.</p> <p>As an aside this area is currently overlooked. The occupants of the Aquarius apartments by their own admission currently have unrestricted views over neighbouring properties. In addition some of the lower scale residential properties have a second story that allows unrestricted views into</p>	

Authority	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>General Section Interface between Land uses PDCs 3 (need to minimise overlooking and overshadowing of residential properties) and 5 (minimise negative impacts) in that the proposed development will enable views into the garden of 1 Canning Street and adjacent this property there will be a long and tall wall.</p>	<p>neighbouring gardens as shown on photographs included with submissions.</p> <p>Obscuring the balconies on level 4 would be contrary to the design aesthetic and philosophy of the building and would be considered to seriously compromise the design and would also most likely increase the visual impact of the building as the obscure balconies would upset the rhythm and balance of the building drawing the eye to this aspect.</p> <p>It is considered that the issue of overlooking has been carefully addressed and resolved as far as is practicable.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>Overshadowing has been minimised as far as is practicable. The building design was tested to determine if the 'fins and flicks' exacerbated the overshadowing, however the difference was shown to be minimal.</p> <p>Shadow diagrams have been provided for 9am, 12pm and 3pm on the summer and winter solstices (noting the winter solstice is the worst case scenario) and the equinox. The times shown have been selected due to these being the standard times against which shadows are assessed.</p>	<p>No amendments proposed.</p>

Authority	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>Residential High Density Zone Objective 1 (reference to 15% affordable housing) and PDCs 1 (reference to affordable housing) and 17 (reference to affordable housing) and Urban Glenelg Policy Area 15 PDC 19 (development should not have an external wall height of more than 10.5m) in that it does not provide 15% affordable housing and the external wall height exceeds 10.5m.</p>	<p>Properties to the east will have unimpeded morning sun. In the afternoon there is the propensity for shadows to be cast. These diagrams show that all properties will receive sunlight as per the Development Plan minimums.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>Fundamentally this proposal is for tourist accommodation with complementary residential apartments. It is not intended to be a residential development.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the proposal does not seek to provide affordable housing on the basis that the value of the land is such that the location (Glenelg North waterfront) is not an affordable locality and therefore the premium required to be placed on the balance of the development in order to provide product at the affordable price point renders the scheme non-viable.</p> <p>It is further noted that the provision of affordable housing is like every other principle in the Development Plan not mandatory and accordingly when considered on balance against the provisions of the Development Plan the proposal is considered appropriate.</p>	<p>No amendments proposed.</p>

Authority	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>Would like to see more detailed economic modelling of the impacts on existing motels in Glenelg.</p>	<p>Furthermore this proposal is following the assessment path of a major project and as such the Development Plan is only one element to be taken into consideration as part of the assessment process. The specific guidelines set by the DAC as forming the guidelines for the Development Report do not include any reference to affordable housing.</p> <p>This proposal is for a 4.5 star level of accommodation and accordingly the market targeted is a completely different market to that targeted by the motels in the area.</p> <p>In terms of the proposal there is a demonstrated current demand in this market that is not being met. This demand lag will be exacerbated as the Government's tourism strategies are implemented and if appropriate new product is not developed to address this capacity issue.</p> <p>Indeed the undersupply of appropriate accommodation will in fact jeopardise the attainment of the Government's tourism strategy and targets.</p> <p>The proposed development therefore will not impact the operation of existing hotels and/or motels, other than it will raise the profile of Glenelg as a tourist destination to all market segments</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

Authority	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>Suggests that further attention is required in respect to interface issues with the adjoining residential Character Zone to minimise noise, privacy and visual impacts.</p> <p>Council recommends including the following conditions if approved.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Light spill associated with any element of the approved development shall not exceed the limits specified with the Australian standard regulating the effects of obtrusive visual light 4282. 2. Noise associated with any element of the proposed development shall not be audible from within any internal living area of any adjoining dwelling. 3. That no sound shall be emitted from any machinery, equipment or device, or from any other source whatsoever on the subject land, 	<p>which is of benefit to all providers of accommodation.</p> <p>No further modelling is required.</p> <p>It is considered that the interface issues have been examined at length both within and external to the Design Review Process.</p> <p>It is considered that the design solutions as outlined above are suitable and will result in a development that interfaces appropriately with neighbouring developments.</p> <p>Furthermore alterations to the design would not accord with the plans endorsed by the DRP process, and may reduce the design excellence.</p> <p>No objection.</p> <p>This may be difficult to enforce. Nevertheless it is in the interest of the hotel for noise to be managed. The development will need to comply with EPA legislation.</p> <p>Compliance will be required irrespective of a condition.</p>	<p>No amendments proposed.</p> <p>Condition will be applied at the Governor's discretion.</p>

Authority	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>in such a manner as to contravene the Environment Protection Act and Regulations.</p> <p>4. Computer modelling of any potential wind tunneling effects is to be undertaken prior to the commencement of construction with any recommendations incorporated into the 'for construction drawings'.</p> <p>5. Recommendations from LBW regarding the removal and treatment of potential asbestos containing material are to be implemented.</p> <p>6. Recommendations from LBW re disposal of spoil are to be implemented.</p> <p>7. A Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be prepared and implemented to manage site and construction works, and shall address – but not be limited to – the following:</p> <p>(a) Air quality controls: including management of dust.</p> <p>(b) Stormwater management: including erosion and sediment control to ensure water quality is maintained to minimise the transfer of contaminates from the site to receiving waters.</p> <p>(c) Temporary traffic controls – including the management of public parking on the site during construction.</p> <p>(d) Noise: to minimise construction impacts to adjoining owners and occupiers.</p> <p>(e) Occupational health and safety.</p> <p>(f) Water quality controls and monitoring.</p> <p>(g) Use of temporary lighting (and the minimization of light overspill) – if required.</p>	<p>Aureca is satisfied that wind tunneling will not create inappropriate conditions.</p> <p>Agree this advice will be complied with, along with legislated requirements for asbestos removal.</p> <p>Agree this advice will be complied with, along with legislated requirements for asbestos removal.</p> <p>No objection.</p>	

Authority	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>(h) Hours of operation: to minimise amenity loss: level of disturbance to nearby residents.</p> <p>(i) Establishment and maintenance of temporary fencing and hoardings.</p> <p>(j) Waste minimisation, recovery and disposal.</p> <p>(k) Maintenance of existing public road surfaces (i.e. minimise drag-out).</p> <p>(l) Site servicing: amenities and security arrangements.</p> <p>(m) Complaints management procedure and record of events.</p> <p>(n) Storage of chemicals and fuel.</p> <p>(o) Reinstatement of infrastructure.</p> <p>A copy of the CEMP must be provided to the City of Holdfast Bay and the Development Assessment Commission prior to the commencement of site works.</p> <p>8. That a dilapidation survey including written, photographic and/or video filming of the interior and exterior of the building/s located at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apt 1-4, 3 George Street, Glenelg North • Apt 5-8, 1 George Street, Glenelg North • Queen Street, Glenelg North • 1/7 Sturt Street, Glenelg North • 2/7 Sturt Street, Glenelg North • 3/7 Sturt Street, Glenelg North • 4/7 Sturt Street, Glenelg North • Unit 1/7 Canning Street, Glenelg North • Unit 2/7 Canning Street, Glenelg North • 1 Canning Street, Glenelg North • 3 Canning Street, Glenelg North • 5 Canning Street, Glenelg North 	<p>A dilapidation report(s) will be prepared for each site physically abutting the site, i.e. the Ring Bowls Club, 1 Canning Street, and 1 George Street. This will be prepared prior to construction.</p>	<p>It is recommended a condition be imposed requiring a dilapidation report(s) for the properties at 1 George Street, 1 Canning Street, Glenelg North and the ring Bowls Club, prior to construction.</p>

Authority	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>be prepared by a qualified structural engineer and a copy provided to the relevant authority prior to the issuing of the Development Approval. A copy of the survey shall be made available to the owners of each of the above addresses.</p> <p>9. Exhaust from the kitchen must be dispersed in accordance with Australian Standards AS/NZS 1668.1 and AS 1668.2.</p> <p>10. Pedestrian walkways on the subject site shall be adequately lit in accordance with Australian/New Zealand Standard AS/NZS 1158.3.1:1999 "Road Lighting Part 3.1: Pedestrian area (Category P) lighting – Performance and installation design guidelines". Such lighting shall be maintained at all times, to the reasonable satisfaction of the relevant authority.</p> <p>11. Lighting associated with the approved development shall be of an intensity that will not cause an unreasonable light overspill nuisance to adjacent occupiers, or be an undue distraction to motorists, to the reasonable satisfaction of the relevant authority.</p>	<p>No objection.</p> <p>All standards will be complied with.</p> <p>No objection.</p>	

Authority	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>12. Lighting to driveways, parking and manoeuvring areas shall be lit in accordance with the Australian Standard for Lighting for Roads and Public Spaces (AS1158.1 and AS1158.3) during the hours of darkness that they are in use and accessible by the general public. The necessary lights shall be directed and screened so that overspill of light into nearby premises is avoided and minimal impact on passing motorists occurs and to satisfy the Australian Standard for Obtrusive Effects of Outdoor Lighting (AS4282:1997).</p> <p>13. That the proposed car parking layout, ramps, columns and vehicular entry points shall be designed and constructed to conform to the AS/NZS 2890.1:2004 for Off-Street Parking Facilities, AS/NZS 2890.6:2009 Disabled Parking and Australian Standard 2890.2:2002: commercial vehicles to MRV size.</p> <p>14. That all Council, utility or state agency maintained infrastructure (i.e. roads, kerbs, drains, crossovers, footpaths etc) that is demolished, altered, removed or damaged during the construction of the development shall be reinstated to Council, utility or state agency specifications. All costs associated with these works shall be met by the proponent.</p>	<p>All standards will be complied with.</p> <p>No objection.</p> <p>No objection. Further negotiation will occur in this respect. Reinstatement will be to an appropriate fit for purpose standard.</p>	<p>Condition be applied that external infrastructure be reinstated.</p>

3. Design Review Panel Process

3.1 Process overview

The project was presented to three Design Review Panel sessions and a close out session. A summary of each session is provided below.

3.2 Panel Session 1

The consultant team presented the following elements:

- Site Analysis
- Massing Investigations
- Visualisations
- Floor Plans
- Elevations
- Typical Room Layouts.

Discussion

Broadly the scheme was positively received. The design idea was supported but the DRP wished to see the design concept more clearly articulated. Noting the massing of the building is larger than anticipated in the Development Plan, the site is regarded as a catalyst site and as such the scale and height are supported by the DRP/Government Architect provided ongoing design excellence is achieved. The impacts of the development on the surrounding context were questioned but the benefits to the community were also acknowledged.

The following aspects were supported

- Design approach, massing, height and building form - contingent on achieving design excellence.
- Mix of uses, upgrade to public realm, maximisation of views and 206 car parks.
- It was noted that the development has the potential to act as 'benchmark for development of this size and type in this part of Glenelg'.

Further information and/or development was requested regarding

- Demonstration of how the building responds to the precinct context in particular more information regarding the improvements to public amenity at street level and the podium interface with Adelphi Terrace and George Street.
- Impacts on amenity of the immediate context – overshadowing, overlooking and visual impacts (3D long views from within the surrounding context).
- Development of the podium to demonstrate a successful relationship to the street and tower.

- Consideration of the distribution of accommodation types, how they might influence the building articulation and how they establish clear addresses on Adelphi Terrace.
- Development of the building cores and servicing strategy.

3.3 Panel Session 2

The consultant team presented:

- Design Concept – to clarify and strengthen the design intent.
- Accommodation distribution diagrams and long corridor precedents – to address concerns regarding the establishment of clear addresses for the different accommodation types and to indicate design intent surrounding the long corridor spaces.
- Development of podium and streetscape – responding to comments in DRP.
- Local context massing – communicating the visual impact of the building on the local context.
- Overlooking and overshadowing diagrams – addressing the request for these from DRP.
- Updated visualisations, floor plans, elevations, sections and material palette.

Response to previous DRP issues

- Demonstration of how the building responds to the precinct context in particular more information regarding the improvements to public amenity at street level and the podium interface with Adelphi Terrace and George Street.
 - » Conceptual images and precedents were developed indicating the design approach to the Adelphi Terrace, George and Canning Street frontages. The addition of retail space at ground level assists with activation of the public realm, new trees, and pavement upgrades create a high quality public space.
- Impacts on amenity of the immediate context – overshadowing, overlooking and visual impacts (3D long views from within the surrounding context).
 - » Overshadowing diagrams indicate that, whilst additional overshadowing is created, a minimum 3 hours of sunlight reaches all properties to the East of the development. Overlooking diagrams show that although the new development will create some overlooking, it is predominantly onto rooftops and only occurs at distances over 30m. Contextual 3D views acknowledge the building is visible from a large range of views, however the high quality design and unique shifting forms create a dynamic facade.

- Development of the podium to demonstrate a successful relationship to the street and tower.
 - » The previous podium, although finely detailed, was monolithic and consistent in its unbroken screen treatment. The design was developed to break down the podium in line with the horizontal design concept. A series of louvres, and shifting glass colours assisted with creating a more articulated form and a scale familiar to the local context.
- Consideration of the distribution of accommodation types, how they might influence the building articulation and how they establish clear addresses on Adelphi Terrace.
 - » A reshuffling of accommodation and addition of penthouses to the upper levels, along with an additional core enabled 3 distinct addresses to be created. Hotel, apartment, and penthouse. Further expression of the accommodation breakdown on the building elevations was investigated however the design intent of shifting horizontal forms was severely diluted. This articulation was abandoned in favour of a clearer articulation of the design idea.
- Development of the building cores and servicing strategy.
 - » An additional core was added to aid building servicing. The long corridor space was shown to be a potential feature through strong precedent images.

Discussion

The discussion was generally positive and the additional information presented was well received. Main concerns revolved around the impacts on adjacent properties, and development of public realm.

The following aspects were supported:

- Overall design approach, height, public realm and mix of uses.
- Natural light, ventilation, ceiling heights, balconies and views from accommodation.
- Clear sense of address and way finding, setbacks and their potential to positively contribute to the civic life of the area.
- Podium roof deck concept and green walls to car parks.

Further information and/or development was requested regarding:

- Demonstration of impact on adjacent properties including view impacts, overlooking and overshadowing. Possible adjustment of overhangs and projections to improve overshadowing.
- Development of exceptional ground level amenity and streetscape.
- Strengthening of horizontal emphasis.
- Exploration of division between apartments.
- Demonstration of long corridor concept.

- Development of apartment layouts.
- Strategy for privacy to the apartments adjacent to the pool.
- Further development of the green wall and landscaped podium roof concepts.

3.4 Panel Session 3

The consultant team presented:

- Contextual site massing, visual impact, overlooking and overshadowing diagrams.
- Green wall concept development.
- Wall studies including apartment divisions.
- Corridor studies and diagrams.
- Selected apartment layouts.
- Streetscape development, visualisations, plans, sections, diagrams, and palettes.
- Landscaped roof and pool deck concept.
- Current plans, elevations and material palette.

Response to previous DRP issues

- Demonstration of impact on adjacent properties including view impacts, overlooking and overshadowing. Possible adjustment of overhangs and projections to improve overshadowing.
 - » Diagrams show the concentration of mass towards the centre of the site, away from boundaries. The 3 storey podium steps down towards the adjacent properties to the east to reduce mass. Offsets from boundaries also reduce impact. Green wall screening improves visual amenity on selected Southern and Eastern Walls. Visual impact diagrams show generally minimal impacts of views to sky from neighbouring properties. The vast amount of outbuilding and screening already present in the adjacent properties results in already mitigated views to the new development. Overlooking diagrams show overlooking will take place but only at distances of 30m and above. This is further reduced by up to 65% by the solid portions of balcony balustrades when occupants are inside their apartments.
- Development of exceptional ground level amenity and streetscape.
 - » A high quality streetscape has been developed taking advantage of the building offset from the boundary and returning this space to the public realm. Key design move include:
 - Clear entries and connections into and out of the site.
 - Provision of new public seating.
 - New 'Green pockets' providing relief from the harsh western sun.

- Removal of 80m of crossover and introduction of 10 new on street car parks.
- Active edges, including retail and cafes.
- Undergrounding of the existing power lines and planting of 22 trees.
- Strengthening of horizontal emphasis.
 - » This was investigated with regard to the division of apartment – see below.
- Exploration of division between apartments.
 - » A concept for graduated fine glass divisions between apartments provides privacy to balconies without creating an ‘egg crate’ effect on the elevation. The graduated glass provides additional visual horizontal ‘banding’ to the façade, strengthening the horizontality concept.
- Demonstration of long corridor concept.
 - » The length of the corridor is unique to the design and the approach is to emphasize this rather than hide it. The corridor concept plays with light, reflectivity and texture. Doors to the accommodation will punctuate the space and provide a rhythm along the corridor.
- Development of apartment layouts.
 - » Selected apartments layouts were developed. Some of the more unconventional spaces were selected to demonstrate that they can work and provide high quality residential accommodation
- Strategy for privacy to the apartments adjacent to the pool.
 - » Careful screening, planting and seating assists with providing privacy to the accommodation adjacent to the pool area.
- Further development of the green wall and landscaped podium roof concepts.
 - » The planted podium roof is conceived as a non-accessible area, rather it provides visual amenity to the occupants (as opposed to looking down onto steel roof deck). Careful sculpting of the form will increase privacy and direct views.

Discussion

The proposal was well received and discussion mainly centred on the importance of the resolution of detail and material selections.

3.5 Close Out Session

At this session, the consultant team provided detail of the final proposal and how it meets the suggestions of the DRP.

This was generally positively received.

A copy of the Government Architect’s response is included as Appendix 3.

4. Community Submissions

4.1 Proponent's Community Open Day

Although not required as part of the formal process prior to the formal consultation period the proponent invited all Councillors and local residents in the vicinity of the site to attend the existing motel to view plans of the proposed development and speak one on one with representatives of the consultant team and the proponent himself.

A number of large scale plans were on display showing the proposed development.

In addition the consultant team were on hand to assist with interpretation of the plans, explanations of the processes (including pointing people to the Government's website) and to answer any questions posed by those present.

Roughly 100 people attended during the three hour open session.

The key issues raised on that day referenced interface issues such as concerns about the prospect of overlooking, overshadowing, and the overall height in terms of the impacts on people's views and the fit of the project within the existing area.

Some people sought clarification around the process.

All people were provided with answers to their questions and the display was left in the Foyer of the existing motel to enable people not able to attend on the day to come in at leisure and examine the proposal.

The issues raised on the day are reflected in the submissions received to the formal consultation process.

4.2 Community Submissions

A total of 16 submissions were received from the community. A copy of each submission is included in full in Appendix 4.

Table 4.1 below summarises these submissions and the key points raised, provides a response commentary and any resultant action arising.

Table 4.1 Response to Public Submissions

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
<p>This letter has no name or address details recorded. (The DPTI reference is "Gary McDowell")</p>	<p><u>Location of commercial precinct</u> Contends that showing Sturt Street and Tod Street in a commercial/Tourism Designated area is misleading.</p>	<p>Believe this is in reference to Figure 6.1 titled tourism/commercial precinct that was drawn simply to illustrate the interplay of the commercial and tourism precincts in the Glenelg context and in particular the nexus between the commercial areas and the attractions and accommodation provided for tourists in these areas. The plan does not indicate zoning. The plan is considered to appropriately demonstrate the points referenced in Section 6.2.2 of the Development Report and, is not misleading.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
	<p><u>ODPs</u> Would like to know with reference to Section 5.7 which ODP refrigerants are being used as there is nothing commercially available other than hydrocarbons.</p>	<p>Modern air-conditioning units are pre-charged with R410 refrigerant. This is not highly flammable and is categorised as ODP pursuant to the Montreal Protocol.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
	<p><u>Wind Impacts</u> Queries the impact of wind if wind speed exceeds 8-10m/sec</p>	<p>Wind criteria for pedestrian comfort are well established by Lawson, Davenport and MEL Consultants and have been developed internationally. These criteria have been used in Australia for many years and are based on assessing wind speeds with a reasonable likelihood of occurrence. For comfort, wind speeds likely to occur for 95% of the time are considered, while for safety, wind speeds likely to occur for only 0.023% of the time are considered. Obviously wind speeds greater than these will cause increased discomfort or safety issues, but under these extreme storm events the general public would not normally be outside and exposed to these conditions.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p><u>Urban Form/Scale relationship/Height/Overlooking/Overshadowing</u> Suggests development will set a precedent.</p> <p>Concerned about height with respect to existing development. Notes the comparison with Aquarius and suggests this is different due to the small footprint.</p> <p>Suggests other high-rise eg: Holdfast Shores and The Grand are okay because they abut open space and the Aquarius Towers has no balconies facing east.</p> <p>Suggests that overlooking is a major concern. Seeks for the applicant to bear costs of corrective works in the neighbour's property to prevent the perceived overlooking.</p> <p>Concerns that the overshadowing diagrams are misleading because it does not show 6pm.</p>	<p>The building is taller than the surrounding development with the exception of the Aquarius tower.</p> <p>Height of itself is simply how tall a building is and of itself should not be fatal to a proposal. The key issue with height is how it manifests itself.</p> <p>The issue of height manifests principally as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design and appearance; • Scale relationship; • The interface with neighbouring sites; • Overshadowing; and • Overlooking <p>The proposal has been through a rigorous Design Review Panel process with changes being made along the way to address the external appearance of the building, the materials and finishes. This process also addressed matters such as the building in its context along Adelphi Terrace, the interface between the building and its neighbours, overlooking and overshadowing.</p> <p>Design and Appearance Careful attention has been paid to the external features of the building to ensure the high quality design aesthetic is achieved. Materials and finishes are being selected for the visual amenity qualities, suitability for the locality, durability and low maintenance properties.</p> <p>To ensure that the quality of the design aesthetic is retained and delivered any approval could be conditioned.</p> <p>The interface of the building has been designed with elements to provide a transition between the lower level existing development and the main tower element of the proposal.</p>	<p>No further changes proposed.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
		<p>The proposal will by virtue of its design tie together the locality bringing a link with the Aquarius towers.</p> <p>The development is set off most boundaries at ground level. Wall heights are the lowest (down to roughly that of a two storey dwelling 8m) along the eastern and southern boundaries as part of the transition. There are no windows in these walls. Pulling the walls off the boundary by varying amounts provides space to maintain the vegetation proposed on these walls and the walls themselves if necessary. These lower wall heights and the podium form reinforce the transition to the tower element.</p> <p>Overshadowing. Without understanding the address from which this submission emanates the actual impacts cannot be discussed.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, overshadowing has been minimised as far as is practicable. The building design was tested to determine if the 'fins and flicks' exacerbated the overshadowing, however the difference was shown to be minimal.</p> <p>Shadow diagrams have been provided for 9am, 12pm and 3pm on the summer and winter solstices (noting the winter solstice is the worst case scenario) and the equinox. The times shown have been selected due to these being the standard times against which shadows are assessed. Properties to the east will have unimpeded morning sun. In the afternoon there is the propensity for shadows to be cast.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, these diagrams show that all properties will receive sunlight for a minimum 3 hours per day.</p> <p>In terms of overlooking, design solutions have been explored to minimise the incidence of casual overlooking into neighbouring properties. The design solution arrived at incorporates a fixed</p>	

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p><u>Parking</u> Some of the existing homes in the area have no or limited off street parking and consequently are reliant upon on-street parking. Obtaining parking can be difficult and the construction phase will exacerbate this. Would like the issue of permit parking to be pursued.</p>	<p>plinth underneath a glass balustrade. This plinth will prevent casual overlooking both from the apartments out and equally importantly from the neighbouring properties in.</p> <p>In addition the distance between any vantage points and neighbouring properties is separated by some distance, both horizontally and vertically. The Good Residential Design Guide SA recommends a separation of 15m to prevent direct overlooking. Overlooking occur only at 30m or greater.</p> <p>As an aside this area is currently overlooked. The occupants of the Aquarius apartments by their own admission currently have unrestricted views over neighbouring properties. In addition some of the lower scale residential properties have a second story that allows unrestricted views into neighbouring gardens as shown on photographs included with submissions.</p> <p>It is considered that the issue of overlooking has been carefully addressed as far as is practicable. It is not appropriate for the proponent to bear the costs of discretionary improvements on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>MFY has assessed this proposal and deemed the provision of parking to be acceptable.</p> <p>On street parking unless governed by a permit is available on a first come/first served basis.</p> <p>The existing facility generates some of the on-street parking demand. Hence, it contributes to some of the demand on-street but will not generate this demand during construction.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p><u>Viewsheds</u> Would like additional details to demonstrate the impacts on views for people sitting on a second level balcony at say 11 Sturt Street and in particular views on the sky.</p> <p><u>Overall size</u> Suggests that there should be a reduction in the overall size of the development, ie reduced width, and reduced height to make the development acceptable.</p>	<p>During construction there will be some impacts but these will be managed as far as is practicable.</p> <p>Consideration of the issue of parking permits is a matter for the Council but would not be opposed by the Developer if implemented by Council during the construction period.</p> <p>View sheds have been prepared to demonstrate the impact on views from properties generally surrounding the development.</p> <p>There will be some loss of views (the most largely affected view is approximately 25% for the dwelling at 7 Sturt Street), however views of the sky will largely remain and there will still be the feeling of openness as a result.</p> <p>The Development Plan in the Desired Character provides guidance on the issue of views, and puts forward (our paraphrase) that <i>views of the sea or waterfront will not be unduly restricted from the front of any building on adjoining land abutting Adelphi Terrace.</i></p> <p>The building has a minimal impact in this respect and thus is in accord with the view expectations established in the Development Plan.</p> <p>The development has been sized to deliver a product required by the tourism industry. A reduction in height and width will result in a reduced number of rooms that will render the project non-viable.</p> <p>It is therefore not possible to make the project smaller.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>No amendment proposed.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
		It is therefore within the context that 4.5 star tourist accommodation hotels are inherently large buildings that the design has been undertaken with care to optimise the development within the context of the surrounding land uses.	
Mr David and Ms Dianne Zubrinich U3/7 Sturt Street	<p><u>Scale</u> The height and width of the building along Adelphi terrace is excessive.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Notes there will be no sun in the back garden of 3/7 Sturt Street after 1pm.</p> <p><u>Overlooking</u> People will be looking into the back yard.</p> <p><u>Parking</u> Car parking is already an issue</p> <p><u>Height</u> Not against new developments but think this one is too tall.</p> <p><u>Noise</u> There will be noise from the balconies</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>There will be sunlight to the property after 3pm in Summer, and some sunlight until nearly 3pm at the equinox. Sunshine to the back yard will be gone by 3pm on the winter solstice.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>This property is separated from the proposed developed by the Ring Bowling Club site including the clubhouse and green and the open space is tucked in behind a structure.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>The proposed development is essentially a hotel. This will be staffed 24/7. It would not be in the best interests of the hotel for patrons and residents to be noisy as this will derogate from</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p><u>Light Overspill</u> Lights From the complex will be visible at night.</p> <p><u>Economics</u> Wonders if this is more about people making money rather than concerns of the people in the area.</p>	<p>the experience and enjoyment of other guests. Accordingly this will be managed by staff.</p> <p>In respect to noise the hotel is actually likely to have a lesser impact than a purely residential development given the high degree of management provided.</p> <p>External lights will be shielded and shaded to ensure that impacts offsite are minimal. No unnecessary lights will be left illuminated later at night.</p> <p>Lights from rooms would be expected to be turned off as people retire for the night which is no different to the situation with other residential land uses such as Aquarius Apartments. For reasons of privacy it is likely that most residents and guests will not sit in spaces with the lights on and the blinds open.</p> <p>The planning system provides the framework against which new development is assessed and ultimately approved or refused. Matters taken into consideration in assessing a proposal are its social contribution and impacts, its economic contribution and impacts and its environmental contribution and impacts.</p> <p>Taking into consideration the economic contribution of the development is therefore an important component of the assessment with a decision being made balancing and weighing all the factors.</p> <p>Development, whether it be commercial or non-commercial supports the formation and development of communities through the provision of shelter and buildings that provide for the delivery of services and economic benefits.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>No action required.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
		<p>In this case this proposal for a hotel and apartments will provide additional housing in the sought after Glenelg area and accommodation to support the tourism sector.</p> <p>Tourism is a key industry upon which the Government is seeking a focus to foster economic development in a severely economically depressed State. The government has ambitious targets for growth in visitor numbers and expenditure. These targets can only be met if there is additional product to support these visitors.</p> <p>Sites appropriate for tourism development have specific locational attributes with not all land being suitable. Sites for major tourism development in Glenelg are currently limited. This site is eminently suitable being on the doorstep of one of Adelaide and South Australia's primary visitor destinations and in close proximity to the sea with views over the water and the City. The Development Plan contemplates tourism based land uses in this locality.</p> <p>This development has been conceived and planned to support a key sector of the visitor market that is currently underprovided for and consequently not fully represented. This includes the design, form, facilities and services included as part of the proposal seeking to meet the particular expectations of visitors and in particular the 4.5 star Asian visitor market.</p> <p>The Comfort Inn as it stands cannot meet demand.</p> <p>This proposal will provide some 1050 jobs during construction and contribute some \$10.7 in State and Federal Taxes. In addition upon operation the proposal will support 231 jobs in the tourism industry (65 within the complex) and is expected to contribute \$37M per year to the State's economy (\$30M of which is expected to be injected directly into the local Glenelg economy) supporting local business and generating demand for</p>	

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
		<p>higher order services to which the local people can avail themselves.</p> <p>These are valid and important considerations in assessing the merits of this proposal.</p>	
Mr Graham Leyson	<p><u>Traffic</u> Report contains an error of fact of p3 appendix 7 in that it states Adelphi Terrace is a collector road with two lanes of traffic in each direction when Adelphi Terrace is only single lane in each direction.</p> <p>Report quotes old traffic data – 2012.</p> <p>Since 2012 there has been a visible increase in the traffic along Adelphi Terrace.</p> <p>Adelphi Terrace and an important alternative traffic route in the event of an incident at Adelaide Airport.</p> <p>The development has the potential to generate huge safety and traffic issues by further increasing traffic on a road restricted to one lane of traffic in each direction.</p> <p>Will significantly increase the risk of serious road and footpath accidents.</p> <p><u>Does not support the proposal.</u></p>	<p>The representor has correctly identified typographical error in the traffic report. It should have read “The road comprises two traffic lanes, <u>one</u> in each direction”. Nonetheless, the assessment was based on the actual road configuration and status.</p> <p>Traffic data from 2012 provide an appropriate indication as to the status of the road. The relevant volume to consider in the assessment is the peak hour. Even in the event that the volume has grown by 10% (which exceeds the average annual growth rate in Adelaide), there would still be adequate capacity in the street and an even lesser relative impact associated with the subject development.</p> <p>It is noted that DPTI concurs with the traffic assessment by MFY, and believes that impacts on the surrounding network will be minimal.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>No action required.</p>
Ms Pauline Middlemiss	<p><u>Urban Form</u> Proposal scale and lack of setback to Adelphi Terrace does not respect the exiting patterns of development.</p>	<p>The proposal is set back from the front property boundary to Adelphi Terrace by up to 3m at ground level. The tower component is set back from Adelphi Terrace, typically by up to 6m.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p><u>Public Realm</u> Does not make any contribution to the local streetscape and public realm.</p> <p>There is no landscaping in the public realm.</p> <p><u>Overlooking and Overshadowing</u> The building will have unacceptable impacts on neighbours due to the scale and orientation.</p> <p>There is an unacceptable loss of afternoon sun. Suggest shade modelling be undertaken.</p> <p><u>Parking</u> The applicant needs to demonstrate that car parking has been provided in accord with Table HoB/1 and that visitor parking is designed and located so as to be accessible 24 hours per day.</p>	<p>The ground level setback has allowed for new outdoor spaces and a significant widening of the footpath (with reduced vehicle crossovers) that in turn enables a much improved public realm.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Disagree on both counts. The proposal significantly improves the Adelphi Terrace frontage by reducing the length of crossovers and thus potential pedestrian and vehicle conflict points and increasing the width of the footpath to accommodate more landscaping, street furniture, improving the connectivity to the park across the road and generally activating what is currently a big driveway.</p> <p>Shadow modelling has been undertaken.</p> <p>Afternoon sun is not impacted to 14A Sturt Street until mid-afternoon on and around the winter solstice. At these times the proposed new building will create a shadow over the front portion of the dwelling only.</p> <p>Shadowing over the back garden on the winter solstice remains as a result of the existing dwelling.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>The report by MFY has assessed traffic conditions in the area and in particular the car parking demand generated by the proposed development. This included a sensitivity analysis incorporating weekend demands.</p>	<p>No action required nor changes proposed for planning purposes.</p> <p>Applicant will continue negotiations with the Council in respect to achieving high quality public realm.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>No amendments proposed.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
		<p>This assessment concluded that the car parking provided would be adequate to service the land uses on the site when operative.</p> <p>The assessment used for the development was comparable to the methodology used for the Wallis matter that was considered by the ERC Court. Importantly, the forecast on-street demand following completion of the development will be lower than the current situation.</p> <p>As an aside, as a major project assessment this project is assessed against a suite of policies and considerations of which the Development Plan is one. The Development Plan does not have the primacy that would apply pursuant to an alternative assessment process that is not required to be assessed against the specific additional assessment criteria for a major project assessment as were set by the Development Assessment Commission.</p>	
S.M. Melville	<p><u>Project</u> The design of the proposal is attractive.</p> <p>The proposal will bring life to Adelphi Terrace.</p> <p><u>Design Elements</u> Balconies – could consideration be given to reducing the height of the solid base of the balcony to enable the balconies to be 60:30 glass to solid.</p> <p>Apartment floor plans. Is it possible to reconfigure the floorplans to maximise rooms with sliding doors to the balcony and increase the size of the kitchens.</p> <p>Materials and Finishes – a choice of finishes in the apartments would be advantageous.</p>	<p>Noted and agree.</p> <p>Appreciate comment and agree with sentiment.</p> <p>The base of the balcony however, is designed to a) provide a strong horizontal element that is an essential part of the character of the design; and b) to minimise casual overlooking.</p> <p>The balcony design has been very carefully achieved through input with the Design Review Panel and it to minimise overlooking.</p>	<p>No action required.</p> <p>No changes proposed at this time.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p><u>Management</u> Would appreciate it if the format and costs for the Strata Corporation could be documented for intending purchasers.</p>	<p>This was an issue of key importance in securing support from the DRP.</p> <p>Overlooking also is a key issue raised in the majority of the representations.</p> <p>These matters are considered to be very important and accordingly whilst the sentiments are supported it is not proposed to amend the balconies in any material manner.</p> <p>The floorplans will require further detailed design. The philosophy employed to date is to seek to ensure the amenity of the spaces is as high as possible. Detailed design matters have been discussed as part of the Design Review Process. The floorplans will be evolved through detailed design and these suggestions will be considered along with the inputs from the DRP.</p> <p>Internal finishes is not a matter that is addressed through the planning assessment process.</p> <p>Noted this is not a matter for planning.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>Zhong Ang</p>	<p><u>Project</u> Glenelg North is ready for this project.</p> <p>Visiting acquaintances from overseas can be recommended to stay at the new hotel.</p> <p><u>Economics</u> The proposed hotel will be of financial benefit to the Local Economy</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree.</p>	<p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p><u>Design Elements</u> Apartment floorplans - suggests that glass walls are wasted on bedrooms, should be reserved for living rooms.</p> <p>Entry should bypass bedrooms and bathrooms.</p> <p>Bathrooms look too generous and could be reduced in size.</p> <p>Could solid base of the balcony be reduced in size to achieve a better balance and improve views.</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>Detailed design will continue.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>No action required for planning assessment stage.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>
Ms Vicky and Mr Michael Corcoran	<p><u>Project</u> The project is long overdue to attract increased tourism.</p> <p><u>Design elements</u> Floor plans – the bedrooms could have standard walls rather than glass walls. This would enable living rooms and kitchens to be positioned in areas with glass walls.</p> <p>Plumbing for the kitchen, laundries and bathrooms should be considered at an early stage.</p> <p>Bathrooms are rather spacious could be reduced in size with space being added to living spaces.</p> <p>Attention be paid to the entry, the width, light and views and additional storage could be included in this area.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>	<p>No action required.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	Additional glass doors would aid with ventilation especially in residential apartments. Natural cream colours throughout would be of benefit.		
Ms Aime Bowers 7/4 Adelphi Terrace	<p><u>Process</u> Strong objection to the Council assessment process being overridden.</p> <p><u>Urban Form/ Overlooking</u> The proposal infringes the existing planning regulations on many aspects including in respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Windows • Privacy for the building across the street which directly faces its windows over this site • Use of clear glass breaches the Privacy Act • The building is 15 floors • Blocks out sunlight 	<p>The <i>Development Act 1993</i> provides that where a proposal is for of significant social, economic or environmental significance that it should be assessed pursuant to a major project process with specific assessment criteria to be set to guide the assessment by the Government’s independent Development Assessment Commission.</p> <p>It is noted that this process does not require an assessment against the Development Plan alone and there are no third party appeal rights. However it should be noted that there are no appeal rights for the applicant either. In addition the assessment is more rigorous as it must include a detailed assessment of the proposal against the criteria established by the Development Assessment Commission; criteria specifically developed to enable a full analysis of all issues to be undertaken.</p> <p>This project is of major economic significance and the decision to assess it pursuant to Section 46 is completely appropriate and warranted.</p> <p>The claim that the building is 15 storeys is simply not correct. The building is ground floor plus 12 levels which is a 12 storey building.</p> <p>The <i>Privacy Act 1988</i> does not deal with matters of window glazing.</p> <p>The overshadowing modelling shows that for a short period of time around noon during winter days there will be some overshadowing to the Northern façade of the Aquarius</p>	<p>No action required.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p><u>Viewsheds</u> Impacts on the views obtained from the Aquarius Tower which has 360 degrees and this is the major selling point.</p> <p><u>Traffic</u> The proposal will cause chaos. Infringes on the actual road. Pushes the bike lane on the road.</p> <p><u>Design Elements</u> 205 units crammed into a small space is unbelievable.</p> <p><u>Procedural matters</u> Concerned at the process for this application in the context of and given the timing of and process for the proposed Development Plan Amendment</p>	<p>apartments. However, either side of noon sunlight will be unobscured.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>The apartments are designed to be an appropriate size for the function and accord with market requirements.</p> <p>The Authority is required to assess applications as per the provision of the <i>Development Act 1993</i> and accordingly this application should be assessed and a determination made.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the Government has a policy of seeking to encourage development within existing built up areas and to this end has already rezoned areas to support higher density development.</p> <p>The Government's contemplation of further rezoning, including this area, is an indication that this area is suitable for higher density development.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>No action required.</p>
Advantage Planning on behalf of Units 1 and 2, 7 Canning Street	<p><u>Procedural Matters</u> A hotel is non-complying in the Residential High Density Zone</p>	<p>This proposal is being assessed as a Section 46 application and therefore is not non-complying.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p><u>Community benefit</u> None of the proposed land uses will serve the community but will impact upon amenity.</p> <p><u>Urban form/overlooking/overshadowing</u> The proposal is above the height limits envisaged.</p> <p>The Aquarius Towers is taller however it pre-dates the current controls and its smaller footprint results in it being acceptable development. Overlooking, overshadowing will be worse from the proposed development due to its height and intense mixture of land uses.</p> <p>Reducing the height will reduce the impacts of overshadowing.</p> <p><u>Parking</u> The proposal does not meet the standards set out in Table HoB/1.</p> <p>There is a current shortage of on-street car parks.</p>	<p>It is nevertheless possible for approval to be granted for an application falling within the non-complying category and thus an application should not be refused only on the basis that it is designated as non-complying development. The assessment should be made on the impacts of the proposal not its designated status.</p> <p>The shops and café will benefit the community.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>The mixture of land uses will have negligible impact on the issues raised.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>	<p>No action required.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>
<p>AECOM on behalf of Scott Salisbury 15 Cygnet Court.</p>	<p><u>Development Plan Assessment/ Urban Form/Scale relationship/Height/Overlooking/ Overshadowing</u> The proposal is more significant than envisaged by the zone.</p> <p>The proposed development is higher.</p>	<p>The proposal actually accords quite closely with the provisions of the Zone. It is taller but on balance even the Council's own assessments shows the proposal to closely accord with the majority of the provisions of the Zone. When tested against the assessment criteria set by the Development Assessment</p>	<p>Refer above.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
		of the fact that it provides accommodation for additional visitors to stay on the doorstep of the Jetty Road traders.	
Mr Paul Paterson, 1 Canning Street	<p><u>Urban Form/Scale relationship/Height/Overlooking/Overshadowing</u></p> <p>Only a limited amount of sunlight will be available to the garden. There were plans to install solar panels however advice is that there will no longer be adequate sunlight.</p> <p>Concerned about the wall on the boundary, access and maintenance and failure of the wall.</p> <p>Concerned about privacy.</p> <p><u>Economics</u> Neighbouring properties will be devalued.</p> <p><u>Construction Impacts</u></p>	<p>It is noted that Mr Paterson would like the proponent to purchase 1 Canning Street. Should a fair market rate be established this could occur.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>The overshadowing modelling indicates that morning sun will be unimpeded year round. From early afternoon sunlight access will be impacted.</p> <p>The wall referred to is located off the boundary by 1m. This wall is approximately 8m high or similar in magnitude to a two storey dwelling. It is proposed to be planted as a green wall. As has been previously put to the owner of 1 Canning Street, if he wishes to have some other finish this can be negotiated.</p> <p>As a green wall the offset from the boundary enables maintenance of the plants and any maintenance of the wall that may be required.</p> <p>In terms of overlooking the balconies to this area are set back reducing the incidence of overlooking. This is in addition to the techniques discussed earlier.</p> <p>Experience suggests that new development would rarely create any devaluation in land values and indeed quite the reverse in that surrounding property values actually increase.</p> <p>This would be the expectations under this scenario.</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>No action required.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>How will pollution be controlled during construction?</p> <p><u>Current Impacts</u> Claims of ivy cuttings thrown into property, dirty laundry left outside the roller door of 1 Canning Street and guests of the motel throwing rubbish over the fence.</p> <p>Noise of air conditioners at 82dBA at the rear door of 1 canning Street.</p> <p>Waste collection is occurring at 4.30am.</p> <p><u>Noise</u> Requests advice as to whether or not there will be time restrictions on the use of the loading doc.</p> <p><u>Parking</u> On-street parking is limited. Does 204 car parks guarantee on-street parking will be available for residents?</p>	<p>A Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) will be prepared to demonstrate how the project will be managed to ensure the Duty of Care pursuant to the <i>Environment Protection Act 1993</i> is met.</p> <p>None of these claims have been able to be substantiated.</p> <p>It is unclear how laundry could be left outside number 1 Canning Street as all material for laundering is loaded into a vehicle wholly within the site of the motel.</p> <p>Guests will be reminded that rubbish should be placed in appropriate receptacles. Car parks will be more enclosed under the redevelopment scenario.</p> <p>The plant will be contained in a plant room and this will contain noise. In addition modern plant is generally less noisy than older style equipment.</p> <p>Waste collection will be wholly contained within the plant/waste room. Collection will be undertaken in accord with EPA policies and requirements.</p> <p>Loading and unloading will need to be managed to meet the requirements of the <i>Environment Protection Act 1993</i> and its Noise Protection Policy.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>	<p>A CEMP will be prepared prior to construction.</p> <p>Guests will be reminded of duties to neighbours.</p> <p>Understand need to abide Environment Protection Noise policy.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>
<p>URPS on behalf of the Ring Bowls Club Queen Street.</p>	<p><u>Ring Bowls Surface</u> The traditional surface for Ring Bowls is grass. The club is unaware of the sport being played on any other surface.</p>	<p>The Ring Bowls club was represented at the community information day hosted by the proponent. The issue of turf was raised on that day and we understand that the</p>	<p>The proponent remains prepared to discuss the provision of artificial turf</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>Advice from Turfwise Consulting suggests that increased afternoon shading will impact the condition of the turf and that it will need extended periods of closure to allow for recovery, increased length to increase photosynthetic activity of the turf, artificial lighting or alternative species that may not be as acceptable as a playing surface may need to be considered along with synthetic turf.</p> <p>Concerned that the issue of turf might impact the club negatively financially to the point of no longer being economically viable.</p> <p><u>Procedural Matters</u> Concern that the application has been lodged ahead of the Development Plan Amendment Process.</p> <p><u>Development Plan Assessment/ Urban Form/Scale relationship/Height/Overlooking/ Overshadowing</u> The observation of URPS and/or Ring Bowls Club that the majority of land that enjoys possible vantage points to water views and is close to the waterfront strips and commercial centres is zoned to support tourist accommodation. Not all accommodation needs to be in the form of high rise development and it is the view of the author(s) of the submission that this is what the zone is seeking to achieve.</p> <p>This will be the largest building on Adelphi Terrace with significant overshadowing.</p> <p>One or two smaller towers more like the character of high-rise in the immediately locality may overcome the concerns.</p> <p><u>Land Use</u></p>	<p>representative of club in speaking with the proponent noted that the turf is sensitive and that there is currently a patch where the turf does not grow. The representative questioned whether or not the proponent would be open to assisting the club with artificial turf. The response at the time was that the proponent would be pleased to enter discussions in respect to the provision of artificial turf. This remains the position of the proponent.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>The suggestion of a smaller scale of development or two smaller towers is noted.</p> <p>A design with multiple smaller towers was explored at the outset of the design of the project. The result was a taller building(s) in order to fit the equivalent amount of accommodation. Adjacent towers also allow for direct overlooking from one tower to another at close range which compromises amenity and privacy for its occupants. The reduction in overshadowing as a result of the multiple tower option was not significant.</p>	<p>for the Ring Bowls rink further with representatives of the club.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	No objection to the range of uses proposed.	Noted.	No action required.
Ms Jenny and Mr Gavin Newman, 5 Canning Street	<p><u>Development Plan Assessment/ Urban Form/Scale relationship/Height/Overlooking/ Overshadowing</u> The height is seriously at odds with the provisions of the current Development Plan and 12 stories is considered to be excessive. Every additional floor compounds the impacts of the proposal (noise, traffic, overlooking, overshadowing and the overbearing nature of the proposal.</p> <p><u>Noise</u> Unclear how neighbouring properties will be impacted by noise emanating from the car park, the plant and the swimming pool deck.</p> <p>Orientating the apartments to all face west would eliminate noise from balconies to those properties to the east. Notes this would have the benefit of reduced overlooking.</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Aurecon assessed the noise from the car park and concluded that with an appropriate surface the noise would be essentially contained and would have no greater impact than the current situation.</p> <p>Aurecon has not identified any issues from aircraft noise. Indeed the site is located beyond the ANEF20 contour.</p> <p>The design of the pool deck is such that noise will be concentrated to the main pool area by directing people to the pool and denying access to the areas of the pool deck level close to the edges of the building and thus adjoining properties.</p> <p>It is not practicable to orientate all dwellings and rooms to the west. This would result in an inefficient building with a one sided corridor and more importantly would impact</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>The detailed design phase will incorporate appropriate surfacing materials.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p><u>Form</u> Suggests that the length of the building is an issue as the height runs the full length. Provides some alternative form responses.</p> <p>Seeking a copy of the ODASSA Advice.</p> <p>The mass of the proposal from the east remains immense.</p> <p>The proposal makes no attempt to bridge the scale difference between the proposal and the adjacent residences.</p> <p><u>Overlooking</u> Overlooking from balconies over residences to the east is an issue of concern.</p> <p>Options to address this could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orienting the rooms to the west • Providing opaque or angled screen or thickened profile balustrade to the outer face of the balustrade to prevent downward views • Provide an opaque balustrade to a minimum height of 1.1m above floor level. <p>Other buildings i.e. the Oaks Pier Plaza and the Platinum orientate rooms towards public space and provide utilitarian non-habitable areas to the adjacent residential.</p>	<p>dwelling/room amenity and access to natural light as rooms would be very long and narrow.</p> <p>The alterations to the form as proposed as part of this submission will reduce the capacity of the proposed development and thus undermine the integrity of the facility to meet the needs of the target visitor market.</p> <p>In order to maintain a similar amount of accommodation, and thus the feasibility of the development, the tower components indicated in the sketch would need to be significantly taller than the proposed 12 storeys.</p> <p>A copy of the advice emanating from the Design Review Panel Process is included as Appendix 3 to this report. A summary of the session is included in the preceding section.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>As demonstrated in the attached diagrams, the proposed solid portion of the balustrade already reduces downwards views by up to approximately 60% for a person 1m inside the façade line or sitting in the ‘pocket’ balcony. The addition of screens, opaque glass or higher solid balustrades to the outside of the balustrades would severely compromise the proposed façade and would do little to prevent downwards views from the balcony edge. Noting again that an overlooking occurs only at distances greater than the 15m recommended in the Good Residential Design Guide SA</p> <p>Noting the comment above in respect to the difficulties in reorienting the rooms all to the West, the current design of the proposed development does not have a ‘back façade’. There has been significant effort to locate the cores within the building to ensure an active edge to the entire perimeter. To create a ‘back’ façade to the East would result in a less active,</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p><u>Viewsheds</u> Concerned that the impact of the viewshed would be akin to looking at the liberty towers from Colley Reserve.</p> <p><u>Economics</u> Would prefer a residential development than a mixed use development.</p> <p>Concerned that value of property will be reduced by approximately \$100,000.</p> <p><u>Suggested conditions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the recommendations of the PT stormwater report be adopted. • That a dilapidation report including written and photographic/video footage of the internal and 	<p>less dynamic face to the adjacent residential, likely with a lower degree of articulation.</p> <p>This approach is not desired by the proponent as it is considered to undermine the design approval and philosophy.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Unlike the proposed development, the Liberty towers has little to no setback from Colley Terrace. The proposed Marina Regency Hotel development on the other hand has a 6m setback to the main part of the tower from Adelphi Terrace and between 8m – 30m from the Eastern boundaries. Additionally, the Liberty towers do not offer an active street frontage, rather private walled apartments. Retail and café spaces make up the street level frontage to Adelphi Terrace, Canning and George Streets as well as a high quality streetscape offering increased public amenity.</p> <p>The proposal is primarily a tourist venture to provide 4.5 star accommodation to the International visitor market.</p> <p>The economic analysis was not undertaken solely to demonstrate major project status (although it is noted that the economic impact will be of significance to the State) but was more simply a reflection of the underlying economics of a proposal designed to specifically meet a niche tourism market in accord with current government policy.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>No objective – advice will be followed.</p> <p>Dilapidation report will be prepared as outlined above.</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Conditions to be applied at the Governor’s discretion.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>external of the adjoining residences including 5 Canning Street be prepared by a qualified structural engineer and provided to the assessing authority prior to the issuing of Development Approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the green wall and all landscaping proposed be established within 3 months of completion of the project and 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 relevant authority. • That all external lighting of the proposal including car parking and buildings shall be located, directed, shielded and of an intensity so as not to cause nuisance or loss of amenity to any person beyond the site to the reasonable satisfaction of the relevant authority and shall not exceed the limits specified in the relevant Australian Standards. • That all adjoining residents be informed should asbestos be located within the existing building and notified in advance of when the asbestos removal work is taking place. • All deliveries to and from the site (including waste collection) shall be restricted to the following times: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 7.00am-7.00pm 7 days a week • The hours of operation of the function room associated with the hotel shall be restricted to the following times: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 7.00am-11.00pm 7 days a week 	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>No objection.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>This has the potential to cause undue fear. Asbestos to, if located, be responsibly removed in accord with all legislated obligations.</p> <p>Deliveries will be internal to proposal so conditions appear unnecessary.</p> <p>The property will be managed and, so an 11pm finish is considered unduly early.</p>	

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hours of operation of the retail units be restricted to the following times: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 8.00am-6.00pm 7 days a week • All loading and unloading of vehicles associated with the proposal shall be carried out entirely upon the subject land. • All industrial and commercial vehicles visiting the site shall enter and exit the site in a forward direction. • That should, in the opinion of a qualified telecommunications engineer, the development result in the shadowing of adjacent properties' TV antenna/signals, suitable antennae upgrades be offered by the proponent and all costs borne by the proponent. • That all odours from the site (for example from kitchen/laundry/waste areas/retail units/swimming pool equipment etc) be emitted at roof level to avoid impacts on adjoining neighbours. • That a final schedule of materials be submitted and approved prior to issuing of Development Approval demonstrating materials selected are not reflective and likely to cause nuisance to adjoining neighbours. • That signs be installed in the car park and at exits from the building reminding the building's users that they are in a residential area and requesting courtesy and quiet. • That construction shall take place between 7am and 7pm Monday to Saturday and not on Sunday or public holidays. All such work shall be undertaken in such a manner so as not to, in the reasonable opinion of the assessing authority, cause any nuisance or annoyance to any of the occupiers of buildings within the locality. Any 	<p>This is unduly restrictive for a café for example. Furthermore, extended trading provides for extra vibrancy and passive surveillance. No objection.</p> <p>No objection.</p> <p>Beyond scope of Development Approval.</p> <p>Odour will be managed in accord with EPA legislation.</p> <p>No objection.</p> <p>No objection.</p> <p>Construction will occur in accord with EPA legislation.</p>	

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>work outside of these hours requires the written approval of the Department.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That dust emissions from the site shall be controlled by a dust suppressant or by watering (subject to any relevant water restrictions) regularly to the reasonable satisfaction of Department. • That the builder shall at all times provide and maintain a waste receptacle to the reasonable satisfaction of the Department on the site in which and at all times all builder's waste shall be contained for the duration for the construction period and the receptacle shall be emptied as required. • That all hard building materials, waste and litter on site be stored in a manner that secures it on site during the construction works. • That all mechanical plant and equipment including swimming pool filters and air conditioners, should be selected, designed and installed to comply with the relevant EPA Noise Policy. • That no sound shall be emitted from any machinery, equipment or device or from any source whatsoever on the subject land in such a manner as to contravene the EPA and regulations. • The hours of operation of the pool bar/deck be restricted to the following times: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 9.00am-9.00pm 7 days a week and shall not incorporate amplified music. • That an additional acoustic report shall be provided for consideration and approval, prior to Development Approval being issued assessing the effect of noise emanating from balconies and pool deck area, the effect of noise reflected by the building (such as aircraft noise etc) and any treatments required to reduce all acoustic impacts on adjoining properties to acceptable levels. 	<p>Dust will be managed in accord with CEMP.</p> <p>As per CEMP.</p> <p>As per CEMP.</p> <p>Compliance with EPA legislation is required.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>This is considered to be unduly restricted. Management will ensure noise is minimised.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>It is considered that the design response in addition to the management of the facility will adequately manage noise from</p>	

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That no amplified sound shall be emitted from any device on the subject land so as to impinge upon the enjoyment of adjoining residents. • That all ease facing windows shall be double glazed (75mm-100mm cavity) to minimise noise impacts from the apartments/rooms on the adjoining residents. • Noise associated with any element of the approved development shall not be audible from within any internal living area of any neighbouring dwelling. • That the applicant provide a Management Plan to the assessing authority prior to issuing Development Plan Consent which clearly demonstrates the procedures which are to be put in place to avoid noise impacts on neighbours such as limiting numbers of guests, signs placed throughout the development reminding patrons and residents that they are in a residential area. • That the balustrading to the Level 03 eastern edge is a minimum of 1.7m above finished floor level and lined on the inner face with an opaque sound absorbing material. • That the landscaped areas shown on level 03 beyond the balcony and pool deck areas are accessible for maintenance only and not for general use and that the details of fencing/balustrading be supplied to satisfy the assessing authority. • That opaque balustrading be provided to a height of 1100mm (or at the very least 700mm) above finished floor level to all east facing balconies and a height of 1.7m above finished floor level to the eastern end of the Level 03 pool area. 	<p>the site such that it will be similar to domestic noise generation.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Glazing will be as per approved drawings.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>This would be contrary to DRP recommendations. Not supported.</p> <p>These areas will not be accessible. Fences are not proposed.</p> <p>This would be contrary to DRP recommendations. Not supported.</p>	

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
<p>Ms Jenny Cameron and Mr Jeff Vernon, 26 Sturt Street.</p>	<p><u>Economics</u> Noting South Australia is contracting in almost every market sector and therefore question the need for this development.</p> <p>Suggest Glenelg is well serviced with tourist accommodation already.</p> <p>Lack of demand for restaurants and shops on Jetty Road is evident due to the high turnover in premises.</p> <p>Nothing to demonstrate that this proposal is a logical extension to the Holdfast Bay Precinct as distinct from the Marina.</p> <p>At the time of writing this submission there were 35 apartments for sale in the Holdfast Promenade and about 80 in the wider Glenelg area. These will be less conveniently located.</p> <p>The development has foreign investment. What guarantees are there that this investment will remain in Australia and that local people will be employed in the jobs created?</p>	<p>This proposal is to fill a specific gap in the market and to provide product that will support the Government’s tourism policy to attract an increased share of international visitors from Asia and in particular China, where our proportion of visitors nationally is below our pro rata share, and yet our attractions are the most closely aligned to visitor desires and expectations.</p> <p>In addition Glenelg is underserved with high end accommodation. Even at the three star level the Comfort Inn is turning patrons away during the peak period as it has insufficient capacity.</p> <p>This proposal will assist to provide additional patrons to support local traders and businesses.</p> <p>Refer to Section 6 of the Development Report. This demonstrates the linkages and relationships between this site and the wider holdfast Bay area and Jetty Road in particular.</p> <p>This product is being developed with knowledge of the market in mind. These will be new contemporary apartments that are in a desirable location. They will add to the product available in Glenelg. Marketability is not really a planning issue.</p> <p>The proponent’s own building company located in the western area of Adelaide will be constructing the development and therefore construction jobs will be local.</p> <p>As a tourism based development this project will by its nature attract money from overseas into the local Glenelg economy as was detailed above and in the Development Report.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>Contend other operators are selling off accommodation units to private investors and there is no proof there is demand for this development.</p> <p>The property at Sturt Street will be devalued by approximately \$100,000.</p> <p>No-one other than the proponent will feel disadvantaged if this project does not proceed.</p> <p><u>Environment</u> There may be asbestos in the building.</p> <p>Why is there no solar?</p> <p><u>Concerned about reflections from the building.</u></p> <p><u>Noise</u> Concerned about noise from plant and people in the building.</p>	<p>The analysis provided in the Development Report has been undertaken based on publicly available tourism data. This can quite easily be verified.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>This is a very significant project for South Australia at a time when the economy is in serious decline, with South Australia exhibiting poorer economic indicators in some areas than any other state. This is in significant contrast to other State's with recovering economies.</p> <p>If asbestos is present in the building this will be removed by a licensed operator in a safe manner that will cause no impacts on or offsite.</p> <p>This will be further investigated during design development. Opportunities exist for the inclusion of solar panels and will need to be worked through with the building services engineers as part of the overall ESD strategy for the development.</p> <p>Materials will be selected to minimise reflectivity. Reflection is minimal on the southern façade as the sun does not shine from the south.</p> <p>Refer above. The plant is contained inside the shell of the building.</p>	<p>No action required.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	It is highly implausible that noise impacts will not increase.	Peoples' behavior will be monitored and managed on part of the hotel's operations.	
	Want hours of operation for various aspects to be provided.	Few elements of the site will be operated before 9am or after 11pm.	No action required.
	<u>Procedural matters</u> Concern that the application has been lodged ahead of the Development Plan Amendment Process.	Refer above.	Refer above.
	<u>Traffic and Parking</u> Adelphi Terrace is not two lanes in each direction. Therefore whole traffic assessment is questioned.	Refer above.	Refer above.
	Local Residents have minimal off-street parking and rely un on street parking for visitors and second cars.	Refer above.	Refer above.
	Reduced number of crossovers will surely impact traffic given it is to be funneled down one side street. George Street and Sturt Street will not cope with additional traffic.	Refer above.	Refer above.
	<u>Crime Prevention</u> Passive surveillance equates to more disturbance of foot traffic and lighting.	Disagree. Passive surveillance is in part about numbers of people but these people don't necessarily walk everywhere after dark.	
	<u>Development Plan Assessment/ Urban Form/Scale relationship/Height/Overlooking/ Overshadowing</u> Seventy balconies will overlook the property	Refer above.	Refer above.
	The shadow diagrams only indicate shadows for times that people are not home	Refer above.	Refer above.
	The building scale is not consistent with the locality.	Refer above.	Refer above.
	<u>Viewsheds</u>		

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	Will see virtually nothing other than the proposed building.	Refer above. Views of the sky and all other view alignments will be retained.	Refer above.
URPS for Starat Corp 5463 Inc (Aquarius)	<p><u>Development Plan Assessment/ Urban Form/Scale relationship/Height/Overlooking/ Overshadowing</u></p> <p>Stark contrast in height at the interface with Canning Street.</p> <p>Over-development of the site.</p> <p>Recommend that the number of apartments be reduced.</p> <p>The proposal is not clear as to shadowing and is unacceptable to some neighbours.</p> <p>Two smaller towers more like the Aquarius apartment would be preferable, or greater setbacks.</p> <p><u>Viewsheds</u> The proposal compromises the views from the Aquarius Apartments. This view is concurred by Tectvs Architects. The 'kick' in the built form to reduce the impact on other residents is considered to exacerbate this matter.</p>	<p>It is a convenient argument to suggest that a proposal that is over the height set by zoning is an over-development above the site.</p> <p>An overdevelopment of a site would be indicated not by height or yield alone but by unmanageable impacts.</p> <p>The proposal sits comfortably on this site with a good management of interfaces to older lower scale development and is not an overdevelopment of the site.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above. The setbacks largely accord with the provisions of the Development Plan.</p> <p>The design idiom employed and the Design Review Process has resulted in a building of a superior quality, with a strong horizontal form.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	The swing (kick) on the southern end should be removed.	This would severely comprise the design integrity of the proposal and would increase the impacts on adjoining neighbours to the south.	No amendment proposed.
	<u>Traffic</u> Suggests traffic should enter the site from Adelphi Terrace.	Refer above.	No amendments proposed.
	Question the MFY assumptions and loading dock vehicle numbers.	MFY is a highly experienced traffic consultancy with solid local knowledge. MFY study shows the current configuration for traffic is appropriate. The access arrangements have been negotiated with Council and will improve safety on the road network as a result of reduced conflict points. All assumptions are justified. The assessment has not been based on assumptions per se but rather demonstrated traffic and parking rates for comparable developments. The rates adopted are based on assessments completed at similar developments by MFY and other consultants, as documented in traffic engineering manuals. DPTI concurs the MFY report and findings.	No action required.
	New access in Canning Street provides a noise source to the Aquarius apartments.	This is not a 'new' additional access point. In any case, it will be for deliveries only that will be unloaded within the site. Vehicle numbers will be low.	No action required.
	Questions sightlines from loading access	These have been verified by MFY.	No action required.
	Can a vehicle enter the site in a forward direction while another vehicle is in the loading bay?	A vehicle could enter the site in a forward direction while another vehicle is in the loading bay. It could then store on-site while waiting for the vehicle being unloaded to exit the site before entering the loading facility, as illustrated in Figures 2a and 2b (refer to attached).	

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>Facilities – there appears to be no laundry on site is it in the loading dock?</p> <p><u>Parking</u> Parking for staff should be clarified, is there sufficient parking overall.</p> <p>Impacts for on-street parking as residents compete for spaces.</p> <p><u>Procedural matters</u> Concern that the application has been lodged ahead of the Development Plan Amendment Process.</p> <p>Contends that the proposal would be seriously at variance with the Development Plan if part of a conventional assessment.</p>	<p>As noted in the Development Report, it is expected that movement numbers will be low at five per day or less.</p> <p>Laundry is dealt with offsite removed via collection through the loading dock.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Disagree. Except in respect to height, the proposal is quite consistent with the intent of the Zone. In any case this is an academic view.</p>	<p>No action required.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>No action required.</p>
Dr J Miller owner 1/7 Sturt Street including submission from URPS on behalf of Dr Miller	<p><u>Development Plan Assessment/ Urban Form/Scale relationship/Height/Overlooking/Overshadowing</u> Lives in Aquarius Apartments and can overlook five houses in Sturt Street therefore occupants of the proposed development will also be able to overlook Sturt Street. Additional overlooking is considered unacceptable. Tenant has moved out and cannot re-let property.</p> <p>Over-development of the site</p> <p>Proposal should be reduced in size.</p> <p><u>Overlooking</u></p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>Not an issue able to be addressed through the planning system.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>The property will be overlooked irrespective of the distance from the proposal to the dwelling.</p> <p><u>Proposal overshadows</u></p>	<p>This property is separated from the proposal by the Ring Bowling club.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>There will be sunlight to the property after 3pm in Summer, and some sunlight until nearly 3pm at the equinox. Sunshine to the back yard will be gone by 3pm on the winter solstice.</p> <p>The back yard is currently in shadow at 3pm on the winter solstice due to the shadow cast by an existing structure.</p>	<p>Refer above.</p>
	<p><u>Economics</u> The property will devalue</p> <p>The stated demand for tourist accommodation is no justification for this development at this height and density.</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>Disagree. Refer above.</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>
	<p>Exiting land owner expectations should take precedence.</p> <p><u>Procedural matters</u> Concern that the application has been lodged ahead of the Development Plan Amendment Process.</p>	<p>Expectations if based on planning policy should be considered on balance with all other key issues.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>	<p>No action required.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>
	<p><u>Parking</u> Would prefer basement parking</p> <p>On street parking is at a premium.</p>	<p>Noted however the proponent's preference is for above ground parking.</p> <p>Basement parking would not reduce the height of the building.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>
	<p>Contends the tram at 500-600m away is too far away. This form of development should be in the District Centre Zone.</p>	<p>500-600m is an acceptable distance for public transport especially in the form of a tram.</p>	<p>Refer above.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p><u>Noise</u> Concerned about noise impacts especially from the pool bar and car parking.</p> <p><u>Traffic</u> Changes in traffic and access arrangements for the worse.</p> <p>Notes a new access to Canning Street</p> <p>Questions the assumptions of MFY</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Access to Canning Street is not 'new'/additional. It is simply a relocation</p> <p>While the proposal will include a new access to Canning Street, it is proposed to close an existing access. This access will only service deliveries for the site and, hence, traffic movements will be low and such movements will be able to enter and exit the site in a forward direction. In terms of traffic volumes on Canning Street the proposal will have no appreciable change to the existing situation.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>MFY supports the amended access as an improvement. The access arrangements for the site will significantly reduce potential conflict points. Additional traffic volumes associated with the development will be readily accommodated on the adjacent road network.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>
<p>Dr John Miller owner/occupier of Aquarius Apartments</p>	<p><u>Development Plan Assessment/ Urban Form/Scale relationship/Height/Overlooking/ Overshadowing</u> The height is inconsistent with the overwhelming one and two storey locality.</p> <p>Completely incompatible.</p> <p>Will overlook via all glass walls.</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>Actually meets policy relatively closely.</p> <p>Not 'all glass' wall. Overlooking has been managed. Refer above.</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>

Address	Summary of Submission	Comments	Response
	<p>Will overshadow</p> <p>Desired Character reference to higher degree of overshadowing and loss of privacy is not supported.</p> <p>Locality is described as beachside and it is not and there is little commercial or tourism development.</p> <p><u>Procedural matters</u> Consultation period only three weeks</p> <p><u>Viewsheds</u> View will be curtailed.</p>	<p>Refer above. Will not impact Aquarius towers between 9am and 3pm. Shadow impact on Aquarius will be minimal if at all.</p> <p>Refer above. Position set by Development Plan.</p> <p>Disagree it is generally a beachside location overlooking the Patawalonga and the ocean. It is in proximity to short stay accommodation, restaurants and well connected and conveniently located to Jetty Road.</p> <p>This is a statutory timeframe.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>

5. Conclusion

The consultation has largely raised known issues, bright, overlooking, overshadowing, traffic, noise and design fit.

These issues have been carefully worked through as part of the Design Review Process.

The design has been modified as a result of DRP inputs and is considered to be an appropriate addition to the Adelphi Terrace streetscape. The building design incorporates a podium to transition to the exiting lower scale development whilst enabling an appropriate taller tower element to facilitate the development of a much needed tourist accommodation facility in a prime tourism destination that will support current Government tourism strategies and targets.

The design is of a high quality and materials and finishes equally will be a high quality appropriate to this high end location. The design includes balconies with plinths to minimise overlooking and the setback tower negates close views.

Overshadowing will occur over some properties in the afternoon, however all properties will have access to a minimum three hours of sunlight at the winter solstice.

Car parking spaces have been provided on site to support the development. These have been subjected to a sensitivity analysis. It is noted that on-street parking is at a premium during summer, however this relates to the tourist demand for the immediate locality and is an existing situation. Of relevance, is that MFY has identified that the subject proposal will reduce the demand for on-street parking associated with the subject site and this provides additional capacity to cater for the high summer demand. Further, the MFY analysis has confirmed that the proposal will not negatively impact on traffic capacity of the adjacent road network and will result in improved safety benefits for Adelphi Terrace.

As a hotel, the site will be managed 24/7. This management regime will ensure noise is not an issue as this would be detrimental not only to neighbours, but to the hotel itself.

Overall, this is a much needed proposal that is locationally specific. It will contribute positively to the local and state tourism industry and will not create undue impacts the existing neighbouring developments. The proposal will result in a positive addition to Adelphi Terrace, create employment and support local business and attractions and warrants approval.

Appendix 1. Government Agency Submissions

Appendix 2. Council Submission

Appendix 3. Government Architect Correspondence

Appendix 4. Community Submissions