Planning Application PL15/025029 at 51-53 Beverley Street, Doncaster East for twelve, three-storey dwellings

Responsible Director: Director Planning & Environment

File No. PL15/025029
Neither the responsible Director, Manager nor the Officer authoring this report has a conflict of interest in this matter.

Land:	51-53 Beverley Street, Doncaster East
Zone	General Residential Zone Schedule 2, Design and Development Overlay Schedule 8
Applicant:	Anne Wang c/-Jiakun Li (designer)
Ward:	Koonung
Melway Reference:	Map 48B2
Time to consider:	19 December 2015

SUMMARY

It is proposed to redevelop a 1527m^2 lot (containing a large dwelling) with twelve, three-storey dwellings in two attached rows. Resident parking in the form of double garages with a central access aisle is to be located at ground level, with some stepping up the site and site cutting. Two visitor parking spaces are also proposed.

A central, two-way driveway will connect to a planned roundabout at the "T" intersection of Beverley Street and Milan Street.

All secluded private open space is to be provided by enclosed balconies and roof-top terraces, with the uppermost roof-top areas being limited to the eastern building row. The proposed site coverage is 65.63% (maximum of 60% recommended).

The application was advertised and 52 objections were received. The main grounds of objection relate to lack of compatibility with the neighbourhood character, inappropriate building form/bulk, excessive density, likely on-street car parking and traffic impacts in local streets.

It is considered that the proposal does not respond sufficiently to the local planning policy aim of achieving two-storey townhouse developments on lots of less than 1800m^2 within Sub-Precinct A (Design and Development Overlay Schedule 8-2).

The proposed architectural design is considered to have various shortcomings and the overall form of the building will be excessively bulky, with insufficient stepping and a dominating upper floor. Vehicular manoeuvring space under the building is tight both for resident parking and rubbish truck access.

The proposed landscaping design for the frontage is also unsatisfactory, while there are inadequate planting opportunities, particularly to the rear of the building. In addition, insufficient care has been taken to ameliorate construction impacts on a neighbour's trees to the north.

It is proposed to not support the application.

1 BACKGROUND

Site Description

1.1 The site (1527m^2) is located on the northern side of Beverley Street, directly opposite the "T" intersection with Milan Street. The lot is generally rectangular and has a frontage of 33.53m and a maximum depth of 45.8m on the eastern side. The rear (northern) boundary has a length of 33.56m, with a slight "dog leg" at the mid-point. The property contains a very large, two-storey, brick dwelling (rendered) with a tiled, roof over the main section.

1.2 The dwelling extends across the site and presents an upper level gable and a gabled porte-cochere to the street. A flat roofed garage (integrated) extends to the western boundary and a screen wall (with door access) extends to the eastern boundary. To the rear, a single storey element extends over the western part of the lot and returns to the east, so as to form a central paved courtyard.

1.3 The site rises to the rear, with the slope being more pronounced over the southern half. There is a diagonal level difference of 3.8m from the south-eastern corner to the north-western corner of the lot. While the frontage falls to the east, the rear boundary is relatively level. A loop driveway connects with crossovers at the eastern and western ends of the frontage. Both crossovers combine with the neighbouring crossover.

1.4 The frontage is defined by a rendered brick fence, with steel picket sections between piers. This fence retains a higher garden area forward of the roofed entry. Solid brick fences (1.9m high) extend along the side boundaries of the front setback. Otherwise, side and rear boundaries are defined by timber fences of not less than 1.65m in height. The fencing along the rear boundary is in poor/fair condition.

1.5 In terms of vegetation, the front yard contains a limited spread of exotic shrubs and a conifer. Dense shrub planting is also located on the nature strip, directly in front of the fence. The rear yard is devoid of trees and shrubs, being largely paved or used for vegetable and ornamental plant cultivation.

1.6 Any higher building on the site has potential to offer good views to the south, especially along the length of Milan Street and over housing. Conversely, any such building will be quite visible from Milan Street which slopes up to the Beverley Street intersection.

1.7 With hipped roofed, two-storey dwellings on either side of the site, the existing dwelling on the site is reasonably well screened when approaching from either direction along Beverley Street. This screening is, however, assisted by the fact that the large existing dwelling on the site is setback a greater distance from the street.

1.8 There is a concrete footpath in front of the site and medium sized tree within the nature strip (located centrally).

Neighbourhood Description

1.9 The following residential properties adjoin or are opposite the site:

Direction	Address	Description
North	54 Franklin Road,	This property adjoins the western half of

Direction	Address	Description
	Doncaster East	the rear boundary of the site and contains a single storey, weatherboard dwelling (tiled/hipped roof) with a rear garage on the western side. The dwelling is positioned approximately 20.0m from the common boundary. The rear yard is open, apart from some established trees along the rear and western boundary. In particular, two large Cypress trees provide dense screening from the site.
	56 Franklin Road, Doncaster East	This property adjoins the eastern half of the rear boundary of the site and contains a two-storey rendered/part weatherboard dwelling (gable/tiled roof) which is setback approximately 25.0m from the common boundary. There are various outbuildings (including an elevated cubby house) along the western side of the rear yard and some tree planting along the southern and eastern sides. There are four Cypress trees and some smaller trees within 3.0m of the common boundary, with a level of screening provided.
South	56 Beverley Street, Doncaster East	This property is on the western side of the Milan Street intersection and contains a two-storey brick and weatherboard dwelling with a front carport and a low brick fence to the street.
	58 Beverley Street, Doncaster East	This property is on the eastern side of the Milan Street intersection and contains a row of single storey, flat roofed units with peripheral tree planting. Several carports present to Beverley Street. The frontage is unfenced.
East	55/55a Beverley Street, Doncaster East	This property is developed with two, two-storey brick dwellings with tiled/hipped roofs (positioned one behind the other). The front dwelling (No. 55) is setback 6.25m from the frontage. The rear dwelling is accessed by a driveway which separates the front dwelling from the site. Several upper level habitable rooms which face directly to the site are obscure glazed. However, several bedroom windows (facing along the property) would have diagonal views. Frontage fencing is in brick and steel

Direction	Address	Description
		picket.
West	49/49A Beverley Street, Doncaster East	This property is also developed with two, two-storey brick dwellings with tiled/hipped roofs (positioned one behind the other). The front dwelling (No. 49) is setback 5.0m from the street frontage. The rear dwelling is accessed by a driveway which separates the front dwelling from the site.There are no upper level habitable room windows with direct views of the site. However, several bedroom windows (facing along the property) would have diagonal views. Frontage fencing is in brick and steel picket.

1.10 Beverley Street is a wide local street (pavement width of 10.0m), with a straight alignment. This section of Beverley Street connects Blackburn Road (to the east) with Devon Drive (to the west). In front of the site, there is a mild slope down to the east. Sight lines are good in either direction.

1.11 There is a broken centre line, as well as painted bicycle lanes along both sides of the street. Parking is allowed in the bicycle lanes and occurs intermittently. There are no parking restrictions adjacent to or in the vicinity of the site and on-street parking is most likely linked to housing. A speed limit of 50kph applies in the street. Traffic flows are light throughout the day, but increase during school pick up/drop-off times.

1.12 A roundabout is scheduled for construction by Council at the Beverley Street/Milan Street “T” intersection. Design work has been completed for this project.

1.13 By road, the site is 330m from shops located within Devon Plaza activity centre on Doncaster Road. This neighbourhood activity centre is anchored by a supermarket and contains a range of shops and food premises. A bus stop associated with various Doncaster Road services is located in front of this centre. The site is also 620m from Doncaster Reserve which includes an oval, indoor basketball facilities and a small playground.

1.14 St. Peter’s and St. Paul’s Primary School is located 440m to the east at 2-16 Beverley Street.

1.15 A significant number of original residential properties in Beverley Street have undergone redevelopment for multi-units and new single dwellings over the past thirty years. Original houses that remain are generally single storey with tiled/hipped roofs. The majority of multi-unit developments are typified by two-storey built form with brick and render finishes and hipped/tiled roofs (often with no eaves). Front entry elements, often with faux balconies and window mouldings are common architectural features. There are often dual crossovers provided, with the front dwelling presenting a double garage to the street. Front setbacks vary.

1.16 Apart from some pine trees generally opposite the site and a spread of larger street trees in this section, most of the local planting is characterised by smaller exotic varieties. Built form is clearly dominant over landscape.

Planning History

1.17 Planning Application No. PL 12/022987 for the construction of a three-storey apartment building (22 dwellings with a basement car park) was lodged with Council on 20 July 2012. The building was to be split-levelled and was to step up the slope of the land. Basement access was via a driveway at the eastern end of the frontage, being the lowest point.

1.18 The application attracted 95 objections. Council made no decision in respect of this application, as the applicant decided to withdraw the application in July 2013.

1.19 Planning Application No. PL14/024481 for a similar development to that under consideration was lodged in July 2014. The plans were prepared by S.K.Y on behalf of a different applicant. The application was advertised and attracted 68 objections. No decision was made in respect of the application, as it was withdrawn in January 2015.

1.20 The current application was lodged on 2 March 2015 and has been amended to remove stairwell projections from above the roof line and also to make adjustments to the front access levels (allowing for the proposed roundabout). The original design company (S.K.Y) is no longer working on the project.

2 PROPOSAL

Background

2.1 The following documentation was lodged in support of this planning application:

- Plans and coloured street perspectives;
- A Town Planning report;
- An Arborist's report; and
- A Traffic Consultant's letter and swept path diagrams for a "Mini-loader" truck (showing how a truck can exit the site in a forward direction) and demonstrating the car turning circles for the garage access.

2.2 The advertised plans and documentation have the following shortcomings which were identified at the report preparation stage-

- Plan sheets are "not to scale";
- The building area and site coverage figures are incorrect;
- The Ground Floor plan of Dwelling 10 contains reference to "Unit 11 GF";
- A bedroom window is missing from the floor plan of the Ground floor "master bedroom" of Dwelling 12 (shown on Eastern elevation);

- There are various drafting errors in respect of en-suites, with some not being provided with vanities and others with doors swinging through vanities.

2.3 The applicant's current designer (Mr Jiakun Li of AD Design) was queried about the floor area calculations and provided revised figures on 2 March 2016. He indicated that the previous designer had made the errors and that he had not picked them up.

2.4 The latest set of figures indicate that the area of land covered by the building is now estimated at 1002.2m^2 which equates to a site coverage figure of 65.63% (this figure includes balcony projections on the western side).

2.5 The following is a comparison between the Floor Areas shown on the advertised plans and the most recent calculations by the applicant-

Floor Level	Advertised plan – Dwelling floor areas	Corrected Dwelling floor areas (2 March 2016)
Ground floor	777m^2	742m^2
First floor	934.6m^2	909.3m^2
Second floor	895.5m^2	684.3m^2
Third floor	122.8m^2	145.2m^2

2.6 The proposed building is of comparative size and scale to an existing three-storey building (containing 12 dwellings) at 282-284 Manningham Road, Lower Templestowe (being generally opposite the "Aldi" supermarket) and also shares some common design elements. This existing building exhibits spatial efficiency and a high standard of finish throughout, but retains a fairly stark, almost "commercial" presentation to the street.

2.7 Its position on a main arterial road, adjacent to a medical centre and generally opposite a "boxey" supermarket building contribute to its suitability in this location.

Description

2.8 It is proposed to clear the site of all buildings and vegetation to allow the construction of a large, three-storey, contemporarily styled building containing a total of 12 dwellings, each with three bedrooms.

2.9 The building will be finished mainly in rendered materials, but with some sections of fibre cement cladding and selected concrete blockwork (Ground floor). The primary colour scheme will be dark and light greys, with white contrast sections. The decked roofs will be in metal sheet and will be concealed behind raised wall parapets. Maximum building height is shown at 9.768m (eastern side of Dwelling 11, towards the rear). This height is taken to the top of the external wall parapet.

2.10 Proposed site coverage has been eventually calculated at 65.63% (considered to be the correct figure). Available permeable surface area is 31.5% (shown as 32% on plan).

2.11 Existing crossovers will be removed and a central access driveway constructed at a width of 5.8m and a grade of 1:9.7. Cutting is required to achieve this grade and there will be retaining walls on either side of the driveway. The driveway is to connect into the western side of the roundabout proposed for the Beverley Street/Milan Street "T" intersection

(clear of the proposed stopping line). This involves the removal of a small street tree which would in any event, need to be removed as part of the proposed roundabout construction.

2.12 Parking will be provided at adjusted grades below the First floor of the proposed dwellings. Three water storage tanks (total capacity of 15,000 litres) are shown below the garage access driveway.

2.13 The dwellings will be arranged in two rows of six along the site, with separation provided at the ground level by the central traffic aisle and by open roof at the Second Floor. The dwelling rows will be attached at the First Floor. All internal access will be provided via stairs.

2.14 Dwellings 1-6 are to be located in the western row, with Dwellings 7-12 in the eastern row. The building is designed so that the same floor levels are achieved between the two rows of dwellings, but with stepping up the site.

2.15 Some cutting (approx. depth of 1.0m) is required along the western side and centre of the site, with some reduced cutting extending across part of the rear of the building. There will also be excavation across the front of the site to allow the central driveway to connect with Beverley Street with an appropriate grade.

2.16 On this basis, the Ground floor of the proposed building will sit lower than the Ground floor of the existing house on the land.

2.17 The southernmost dwelling within each row (Dwellings 1 and 7) will have a front entry porch extending from the front wall. The western porch will be cut slightly into the ground, while the eastern porch will be elevated, with a requirement for stairs. These dwellings will also have a fenced front yard within the street setback. Brick pier and timber slat fences to 1.2m in height will enclose these spaces, with a street setback of 600mm.

2.18 The western yard will absorb most of the frontage setback for Dwelling 1, while the eastern yard will utilise approximately half of the setback area in front of Dwelling 7. The area between the driveway and the eastern yard will be raised, thus necessitating a retaining wall treatment to a height of 800mm. Front entry paths to the front porches will link directly with Beverley Street.

2.19 The remaining dwellings will be accessed via 1.0m wide, communal pathways along either side of the building. The paths will be set in from the side boundaries, so as to provide planting strips along the fencelines. On the Ground floor plan, the eastern path is shown graded, with no apparent steps. However, based on the steeper slope shown on the Eastern elevation near the frontage, there is likely to be a need for some stairs in this location.

2.20 The western path will have a series of small stairways to deal with level changes. Oddly, the path level will rise from the street, then fall in front of Dwellings 1 and 2 and then rise again, thus creating a sunken section.

2.21 Ten dwelling entries will present to these side paths. Of these, six will not be provided with any porch covering.

2.22 There will be remote controlled, security door at the entry to the under-building parking facilities. The access aisle serving the garages will be roofed by the upper floor, but will be open to the rear, thus allowing for good ventilation and reasonable light penetration.

2.23 The access aisle will be 5.8m wide, with garages being arranged directly opposite each other. An over-bonnet storage shelf (suspended) is proposed within each garage, along with storage under stairways where practical. The suspended storage shelves have a capacity for 3.25m^3 of storage, rather than the 6.0m^3 of storage capacity shown on the floor plans.

2.24 Two visitor parking spaces are provided at the northern end of each garage row, along with a rear path connection to the side paths. A rubbish bin storage area is shown against the northern wall of Dwelling 12.

2.25 It is anticipated that a private rubbish contractor will serve the development with a "Mini-Loader" truck which will drive through to the bin area and turn around, using both of the visitor spaces (which will need to be kept clear on collection day).

2.26 Due to the path and an associated retaining wall, planting opportunities across the rear boundary are limited to a narrow strip of varying width. Wall construction and associated cutting is quite close to several conifers located within 54 Franklin Road. An Arborist's report provided with the application comments on likely impacts.

2.27 There will be varied design between the two rows of dwellings. The western row will be described first.

Dwellings 1-6

2.28 The **Ground floor** of Dwellings 1-6 will contain a bedroom and en-suite with and internal door access to a secure double garage. Dwelling 6 at the rear will have a larger bedroom which will project to the north. As previously described, Dwelling 1 will have use of a front yard.

2.29 The **First floor** of Dwellings 1-6 will contain open plan living space, a kitchen, a laundry recess, a WC and an "inboard" bedroom, with light and ventilation being from a small light court (maximum dimension of 1.7m). The light courts are to contain clotheslines and will have door access. The bedroom of the dwellings at either end of the row will also benefit from external windows, rather than just relying on the light court.

2.30 The living space of Dwellings 1-5 will open to 8.0m^2 balconies (unroofed) which will be fully enclosed by obscure glass balustrading with slatted sight screens (30% transparency) above and to a height of 1.7m (hence no views). Half of the balcony area will project from the western building wall. The living space of Dwelling 6 will have access to an 8.0m^2 roof-top terrace (above the lower bedroom) on the northern side. This space will also be fully screened and is unroofed.

2.31 The **Second floor** of each dwelling in this row will contain another large bedroom (with en-suite), a separate bathroom and a small "lounge" in front of the stair access. Each lounge will have a large west facing window with a "Juliette balcony" in front. Plans do not indicate the purpose or materials of the associated balustrade.

2.32 The bathroom on this upper floor will serve the bedroom on the lower floor which only has immediate access to a WC. The provision of a 3.6m wide gap to the eastern row allows for bedroom windows along the eastern wall. These will be obscure glazed, as will opposite windows.

Dwellings 7-12

2.33 The **Ground floor** of Dwellings 7-12 will contain a bedroom and en-suite with and internal door access to a secure double garage. Dwelling 12 at the rear will have a larger bedroom which will project to the north. As previously described, Dwelling 7 will have use of a small front yard.

2.34 The **First floor** layouts of Dwellings 7-12 consist of two bedrooms with a large, shared bathroom. Oddly, the larger (master) bedroom is "inboard", with use again being made of small light courts for light, ventilation and clothes drying. The two dwellings at either end of the row will also benefit from external windows to the bedrooms that abut the light courts.

2.35 Only Dwelling 12 at the northern end is provided with an external area, being an 8.0m^2 roof-top terrace on the northern side (above the lower bedroom). This space is to be fully screened in the same manner as the other side.

2.36 The **Second floor** of Dwellings 7-12 will consist of open plan living space with kitchens at the western end, a small laundry and a WC. The living space will open to elongated 8.0m^2 balconies/roof-top terraces on the eastern side. These spaces will be fully enclosed by a combination of solid or obscure glass balustrading, with a sight screens above.

2.37 Additional open space opportunities are provided through roof-top terraces above each dwelling. These spaces of approximately 25.0m^2 will be accessed via stairs and a glazed hatch set at a low angle to the roof-top. The hatch is pushed up when a person arrives at the top of the stairs. .

2.38 The roof-top terraces are to be set in 1.8m from the eastern edge of the roof and 1.1m from the southern and northern edges.

2.39 These spaces will be fully enclosed by 1.7m high obscure glazed balustrading and sight screens (as per the majority of balconies). On this basis, there would be no views offered from these areas (not even to the front). An area for services (most likely air-conditioning units) and narrow, peripheral "planter" boxes are shown. Based on the specified levels to the top of the screens, it is estimated that height to NGL is less than 10.0m, except for part of Dwelling 11's terrace which has a screen height of approximately 10.4m.

2.40 No other plant (such as solar panels for hot water) is shown on the roof. Internal hot water units are shown in various locations within the habitable Ground floor areas (including wardrobes).

2.41 Recognising that some balconies project past the outer wall, the following minimum wall setbacks are provided:

2.42 Southern side (front)

- Ground Floor - 5.98m (4.35m setback for the two front porches)
- First Floor - 6.085m
- Second Floor - 6.115m

2.43 Western Side

- Ground Floor - 3.0m
- First Floor - 3.085m
- Second Floor - 5.62m (with projecting framing elements extending into this setback by approximately 800mm)

2.44 Eastern Side

- Ground Floor - 3.0m
- First Floor - 3.115m
- Second Floor - 5.28m

2.45 Northern side (rear)

- Ground Floor - 2.09m (Western end), otherwise 3.1m;
- First Floor - 4.7m
- Second Floor - 4.69m

2.46 Specific ceiling heights are not provided, however, allowing for 300mm between floors (as is the norm), the following ceiling heights are estimated:

- Ground Floor - 2.4m
- First Floor - 2.65m
- Second Floor - 2.4m

2.47 By way of observation, the Second Floor ceiling height is considered low by industry standards and would not usually be provided in respect of living rooms.

3 PRIORITY/TIMING

3.1 The statutory time for considering a planning application is 60 days. Allowing for the time taken to advertise the application, the statutory time lapsed on 19 December 2015.

4 RELEVANT LEGISLATION

4.1 The *Planning and Environment Act 1987 (the Act)* is the relevant legislation governing planning in Victoria. The Act identifies subordinate legislation in the form of Planning Schemes to guide future land use and development.

4.2 Section 60 of the Act outlines what matters a Responsible Authority must consider in the determination of an application. Before deciding on an application, the Responsible Authority must consider:

- the relevant planning scheme, in this case being the Manningham Planning Scheme; and
- the objectives of planning in Victoria; and
- all objections and other submissions which it has received and which have not been withdrawn; and
- any decision and comments of a referral authority which it has received; and
- any significant effects which the responsible authority considers the use or development may have on the environment or which the responsible authority considers the environment may have on the use or development; and

- any significant social effects and economic effects which the responsible authority considers the use or development may have.

4.3 Section 61(4) of the Act makes specific reference to covenants. The subject site is not burdened by any covenant.

5 MANNINGHAM PLANNING SCHEME

Zoning

5.1 The site is included in the General Residential Zone, Schedule 2 (GRZ2) pursuant to the Manningham Planning Scheme. Land to the north, east, west and south is also within the General Residential Zone, Schedule 2.

5.2 A planning permit is required to construct two or more dwellings on a lot in the GRZ2 under Clause 32.08-4.

5.3 The purpose of the General Residential Zone seeks to:

- To implement the State Planning Policy Framework and the Local Planning Policy Framework, including the Municipal Strategic Statement and local planning policies.
- To encourage development that respects the neighbourhood character of the area
- To implement neighbourhood character policy and adopted neighbourhood character guidelines.
- To provide a diversity of housing types and moderate housing growth in locations offering good access to services and transport.
- To allow educational, recreational, religious, community and a limited range of other non-residential uses to serve local community needs in appropriate locations.

5.4 Assessment is required under the provisions of Clause 55 of the Manningham Planning Scheme.

5.5 The purpose of Clause 55 is generally to provide well designed and lifestyle choice for occupants, while at the same time, maintaining the amenity and character of the locality, with particular emphasis on the amenity of adjoining residents.

Overlays

5.6 The site and all adjoining and opposite lots are included in the Design and Development Overlay Schedule 8 (DDO8) under the provisions of the Manningham Planning Scheme.

5.7 The Design Objectives of the DD08 are:

- *To increase residential densities and provide a range of housing types around activity centres and along main roads.*
- *To encourage development that is contemporary in design that includes an articulated built form and incorporates a range of visually interesting building materials and façade treatments.*

- *To support three storey, 'apartment style', developments within the Main Road sub-precinct and in sub-precinct A, where the minimum land size can be achieved.*
- *To support two storey townhouse style dwellings with a higher yield within sub-precinct B and sub-precinct A, where the minimum land size cannot be achieved.*
- *To ensure new development is well articulated and upper storey elements are not unduly bulky or visually intrusive, taking into account the preferred neighbourhood character.*
- *To encourage spacing between developments to minimise a continuous building line when viewed from a street.*
- *To ensure the design and siting of dwellings have regard to the future development opportunities and future amenity of adjoining properties.*
- *To ensure developments of two or more storeys are sufficiently stepped down at the perimeter of the Main Road sub-precinct to provide an appropriate and attractive interface to sub-precinct A or B, or other adjoining zone.*
- *Higher developments on the perimeter of sub-precinct A must be designed so that the height and form are sufficiently stepped down, so that the scale and form complement the interface of sub-precinct B or other adjoining zone.*
- *To ensure overlooking into adjoining properties is minimised.*
- *To ensure the design of carports and garages complement the design of the building.*
- *To ensure the design of basement and undercroft car parks complement the design of the building, eliminates unsightly projections of basement walls above natural ground level and are sited to allow for effective screen planting.*
- *To create a boulevard effect along Doncaster Road and Manningham Road by planting trees within the front setback that are consistent with the street trees.*
- *To encourage landscaping around buildings to enhance separation between buildings and soften built form.*

5.8 There is a range of policy requirements outlined in this control under the headings of building height and setbacks, form, car parking and access, landscaping and fencing.

5.9 Planning permission is required for buildings and works which must comply with the requirements set out in either Table 1 or Table 2 of the Schedule.

5.10 The subject site and adjoining lots are located within **DDO8-2 Sub-Precinct A,** where the maximum allowable building height for land more than 1800m^2 in size is 11.0 metres. For lots of lesser area, the maximum height (also mandatory) is either 9.0m or 10m depending on the slope of the land.

State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF)

5.11 Clause 15.01-1 (Urban Design) seeks to create urban environments that are safe, functional and provide good quality environments with a sense of place and cultural identity. Strategies towards achieving this are identified as follows:

- *Promote good urban design to make the environment more liveable and attractive.*
- *Ensure new development or redevelopment contributes to community and cultural life by improving safety, diversity and choice, the quality of living and working environments, accessibility and inclusiveness and environmental sustainability*
- *Require development to respond to its context in terms of urban character, cultural heritage, natural features, surrounding landscape and climate.*
- *Ensure transport corridors integrate land use planning, urban design and transport planning and are developed and managed with particular attention to urban design aspects*
- *Encourage retention of existing vegetation or revegetation as part of subdivision and development proposals.*

5.12 Clause 15.01-4 (Design for Safety) seeks to improve community safety and encourage neighbourhood design that makes people feel safe. The strategy identified to achieve this objective is to ensure the design of buildings, public spaces and the mix of activities contribute to safety and perceptions of safety.

5.13 Clause 15.01-5 (Cultural Identity and Neighbourhood Character) seeks to recognise and protect cultural identity, neighbourhood character and sense of place. The clause emphasises the importance of neighbourhood character and the identity of neighbourhoods and their sense of place. Strategies towards achieving this are identified as follows:

- Ensure development responds and contributes to existing sense of place and cultural identity.
- Ensure development recognises distinctive urban forms and layout and their relationship to landscape and vegetation.
- Ensure development responds to its context and reinforces special characteristics of local environment and place.

5.14 Clause 15.02-1 (Energy and Resource Efficiency) seeks to encourage land use and development that is consistent with the efficient use of energy and the minimisation of greenhouse gas emissions.

5.15 Clause 16.01-1 (Integrated Housing) seeks to promote a housing market that meets community needs. Strategies towards achieving this are identified as follows:

- *Increase the supply of housing in existing urban areas by facilitating increased housing yield in appropriate locations.*
- *Ensure housing developments are integrated with infrastructure and services, whether they are located in existing suburbs, growth areas or regional towns.*

5.16 Clause 16.01-2 (Location of Residential Development) seeks to locate new housing in or close to activity centres and employment corridors and at other strategic redevelopment sites that offer good access to services and transport. Strategies towards achieving this are identified as follows:

- *Increase the proportion of housing in Metropolitan Melbourne to be developed within the established urban area, particularly at activity centres, employment corridors and at other strategic sites, and reduce the share of new dwellings in greenfield and dispersed development areas.*
- *In Metropolitan Melbourne, locate more intense housing development in and around Activity centres, in areas close to train stations and on large redevelopment sites.*
- *Encourage higher density housing development on sites that are well located in relation to activity centres, employment corridors and public transport.*
- *Facilitate residential development that is cost-effective in infrastructure provision and use, energy efficient, incorporates water efficient design principles and encourages public transport use.*

5.17 Clause 16.01-4 (Housing Diversity) seeks to provide for a range of housing types to meet increasingly diverse needs. Strategies towards achieving this are identified as follows:

- *Ensure housing stock matches changing demand by widening housing choice, particularly in the middle and outer suburbs.*
- *Encourage the development of well-designed medium-density housing which respects the neighbourhood character.*
- *Improves housing choice.*
- *Makes better use of existing infrastructure.*
- *Improves energy efficiency of housing.*
- *Support opportunities for a wide range of income groups to choose housing in well serviced locations.*

5.18 Clause 16.01-5 (Housing affordability) seeks to deliver more affordable housing closer to jobs, transport and services.

Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF)
Municipal Strategic Statement (Clause 21)

5.19 Clause 21.03 (Key Influences) identifies that future housing need and residential amenity are critical land-use issues. The MSS acknowledges that there is a general trend towards smaller household size as a result of an aging population and smaller family structure which will lead to an imbalance between the housing needs of the population and the actual housing stock that is available.

5.20 This increasing pressure for re-development raises issues about how these changes affect the character and amenity of our local neighbourhoods. In meeting future housing needs, the challenge is to provide for residential redevelopment in appropriate locations, to reduce pressure for development

in more sensitive areas, and in a manner that respects the residential character and amenity valued by existing residents.

5.21 Clause 21.05 (Residential) outlines the division of Manningham into four Residential Character Precincts. The precincts seek to channel increased housing densities around activity centres and main roads where facilities and services are available. In areas which are removed from these facilities a lower intensity of development is encouraged. A low residential density is also encouraged in areas that have identified environmental or landscape features.

5.22 The site and all adjoining properties are within "Precinct 2 –Residential Areas Surrounding Activity Centres and Along Main Roads".

5.23 This area is aimed at providing a focus for higher density development and a substantial level of change is anticipated. Future development in this precinct is encouraged to:

- *Provide for contemporary architecture*
- *Achieve high design standards*
- *Provide visual interest and make a positive contribution to the streetscape.*
- *Provide a graduated building line from side and rear boundaries.*
- *Minimise adverse amenity impacts on adjoining properties.*
- *Use varied and durable building materials.*
- *Incorporate a landscape treatment that enhances the overall appearance of the development*
- *Integrate car parking requirements into the design of buildings and landform.*

5.24 Within this precinct, there are three sub-precincts which each stipulate different height, scale and built form outcomes to provide a transition between each sub-precinct and adjoining properties, primarily those in Precinct 1 – Residential Areas Removed from Activity Centres and Main Roads. The three sub-precincts within Precinct 2 consist of:

Sub-precinct – Main Road (DDO8-1) is an area where three storey (11 metres) 'apartment style' developments are encouraged on land with a minimum area of 1,800m². Where the land comprises more than one lot, the lots must be consecutive lots which are side by side same sub-precinct. All development in the Main Road sub-precinct should have a maximum site coverage of 60 percent.

Higher developments on the perimeter of the Main Road sub-precinct should be designed so that the height and form are sufficiently stepped down, so that the scale and form complement the interface of sub-precinct A or B, or other adjoining zone.

Sub-precinct A (DDO8-2) is an area where two-storey units (9 metres) and three-storey (11 metres) 'apartment style' developments are encouraged.

Three-storey, contemporary developments should only occur on land with a minimum area of 1800m^2. Where the land comprises more than one lot, the lots must be consecutive lots which are side by side and have a shared frontage. The area of 1800m^2 must all be in the same sub-precinct. In this sub precinct, if a lot has an area less than 1800m^2, a townhouse style development proposal only will be considered, but development should be a maximum of two storeys. All development in Sub-precinct A should have a maximum site coverage of 60 percent.

Higher developments on the perimeter of Sub-precinct A should be designed, so that the height and form are sufficiently stepped down, so that the scale and form complement the interface of Sub-precinct B, or other adjoining zone.

Sub-precinct B (DDO8-3) is an area where single storey and two-storey dwellings only will be considered and development should have a maximum site coverage of 60 percent. There is no minimum land area for such developments.

5.25 The site and adjoining lots are within **Sub-precinct A (DDO8-2).** Opposite land on the southern side of Beverley Street is within Sub-precinct A (DD08-3).

5.26 Clause 21.05-2 Housing contains the following objectives:

- *To accommodate Manningham's projected population growth through urban consolidation, infill developments and Key Redevelopment Sites.*
- *To ensure that housing choice, quality and diversity will be increased to better meet the needs of the local community and reflect demographic changes.*
- *To ensure that higher density housing is located close to activity centres and along main roads in accordance with relevant strategies.*
- *To promote affordable and accessible housing to enable residents with changing needs to stay within their local neighbourhood or the municipality.*
- *To encourage development of key Redevelopment Sites to support a diverse residential community that offers a range of dwelling densities and lifestyle opportunities.*
- *To encourage high quality and integrated environmentally sustainable development.*

5.27 The strategies to achieve these objectives include:

- *Ensure that the provision of housing stock responds to the needs of the municipality's population.*
- *Promote the consolidation of lots to provide for a diversity of housing types and design options.*

- *Ensure higher density residential development occurs around the prescribed activity centres and along main roads identified as Precinct 2 on the Residential Framework Plan 1 and Map 1 to this clause.*
- *Encourage development to be designed to respond to the needs of people with limited mobility, which may for example, incorporate lifts into three storey developments.*

5.28 Clause 21.05-4 (Built form and neighbourhood character) seeks to ensure that residential development enhances the existing or preferred neighbourhood character of the residential character precincts as shown on Map 1 to this Clause.

5.29 The strategies to achieve this objective include:

- *Require residential development to be designed and landscaped to make a positive contribution to the streetscape and the character of the local area.*
- *Ensure that where development is constructed on steeply sloping sites that any development is encouraged to adopt suitable architectural techniques that minimise earthworks and building bulk.*
- *Ensure that development is designed to provide a high level of internal amenity for residents.*
- *Require residential development to include stepped heights, articulation and sufficient setbacks to avoid detrimental impacts to the area's character and amenity.*

5.30 Clause 21.10 (Ecologically Sustainable Development) highlights Council's commitment to ESD and outlines a number of ESD principles to which regard must be given. These relate to:

- Building energy management
- Water sensitive design
- External environmental amenity
- Waste management
- Quality of public and private realm
- Transport.

Local Planning Policy

5.31 Clause 22.08 (Safety through urban design) is relevant to this application and seeks to provide and maintain a safer physical environment for those who live in, work in or visit the City of Manningham. Building design should provide safe access for pedestrians, with appropriate levels of "natural surveillance".

5.32 Clause 22.09 (Access for disabled people) is relevant to this application and seeks to ensure that people with a disability have the same level of access to buildings, services and facilities as any other person.

Particular Provisions

5.33 Clause 52.06 (Car Parking) is relevant to this application. Pursuant to Clause 52.06-5, car parking is required to be provided at the following rate:

- *1 space for 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings*
- *2 spaces for 3 or more bedroom dwellings*
- *1 visitor space to every 5 dwellings for developments of 5 or more dwellings.*

5.34 Clause 52.06-8 outlines various design standards for parking areas that should be achieved.

5.35 Clause 55 (Two or More Dwellings on a Lot) applies to all applications for two or more dwellings on a lot. Consideration of this clause is outlined in the Assessment section of this report.

5.36 Clause 65 (Decision Guidelines) outlines that before deciding on an application, the Responsible Authority must consider, as appropriate:

- *The State Planning Policy Framework and the Local Planning Policy Framework, including the Municipal Strategic Statement and local planning policies.*
- *The purpose of the zone, overlay or other provision.*
- *The orderly planning of the area.*
- *The effect on the amenity of the area.*

6 ASSESSMENT

6.1 Council has, through its policy statements within the Planning Scheme, and in particular by its adoption of Schedule 8 to the Design and Development Overlay over the subject site and part of this neighbourhood, created a planning mechanism that has started to noticeably alter the long established neighbourhood character. Particular change is evidenced along Doncaster Road and within the immediately abutting streets.

6.2 As articulated by the DD08, Council's planning preference is for higher density, multi-unit developments which can include apartment style developments on larger lots. Higher density housing is thereby envisaged as the "preferred neighbourhood character" guided by the design elements contained within the Schedule 8 to the Design and Development Overlay, in conjunction with an assessment against Clause 21.05 and Clause 55 (Rescode). In DD08 areas, a substantial level of change is generally anticipated from the existing character of primarily single dwellings and dual occupancies.

6.3 As a consequence, the resultant built form is contemplated to comprise a more intense and less "suburban" outcome.

6.4 Notwithstanding the opportunity to increase residential densities in areas well located in relation to public transport and Activity Centres, any design response must have careful and considered regard to its potential impacts to local amenity.

6.5 Given the 1527m^2 site area and the slope of the land, any multi-unit development on the subject land must be limited to a maximum height of 10.0m, with "two-storey townhouses" being the desired form of multi-unit

development under the local planning policy. There is no mandatory site coverage limit, but 60% is seen as a desirable maximum.

6.6 The applicant is seeking to develop the site with a total of twelve (12) attached townhouses, over three levels. The primary design approach appears to have been to maximise dwelling yield and provide relatively large dwellings. By not "sinking" the building into the ground through the use of a basement car park, the applicant would be able to achieve a more cost effective building. However, at three-storeys, there is a basic "tension" with Council's preferred building type.

6.7 As an overview, the size of and shape of the subject lot provide an excellent starting point for a higher density, multi-unit development. With no easements and a relatively even slope, the site has no real physical constraints, apart from a retained level change across part of the frontage and the need to provide safe access in relation to the proposed roundabout to the south. The proximity of neighbour's trees to the rear boundary is, however, an "external" constraint.

6.8 Side driveways associated the rear dwellings of the adjacent properties are located adjacent to the common boundaries, thus providing a generous spacing between the side boundaries. Furthermore, although the property to the east is slightly lower than the site, the front dwelling is set above the footpath level and with a sub-floor, thus maintaining a relatively high built form in relation to the site.

6.9 Beverley Street is also heavily developed with townhouses, many of which are two-storey in height. With two such developments on the lots to the east and west of the site and a very large, two-storey dwelling currently on the land, there can be little debate that the site is a "prime candidate" for a multi-unit proposal.

6.10 A corollary of the extensive level of nearby multi-unit development is that there simply aren't that many original house lots left in Beverley Street and there will be far less housing redevelopment than say along Doncaster Road, due to the higher capital value of the properties that already contain villa units and townhouses.

6.11 On this basis, there is unlikely to be any significant transformation of the primary "fabric" of this street, as a result of the on-going surge in higher density housing.

6.12 A detailed assessment of the proposal will now be made against the following planning controls:

- Clauses 21.05, 21.10, 22.08 & 22.09
- Schedule 8 to the Design and Development Overlay (DD08)
- Clause 52.06 Car Parking
- Clause 55 Two or More Dwellings on a Lot
- Clause 65 Decision Guidelines

Local Planning Policy Assessment

Clause 21.05 Residential

6.13 The development site is situated within Precinct 2 – Residential Areas Surrounding Activity Centres and Along Main Roads, Sub-Precinct A (DD08-2) where high density housing redevelopment is encouraged. Taking into account the slope of the land, a maximum building height of 10.0m is allowed.

6.14 The applicant is of the opinion that the three-storey proposal provides a satisfactory design response in this neighbourhood, particularly as the building is below the mandatory 10.0m height limit. This approach is contrary to Council's "vision" for the local streets (within Sub-Precinct A (DDO8-2) which are further way from major arterial roads such as Doncaster Road. In such locations, two-storey multi-unit development is encouraged on lots less than 1800m^2 in area.

6.15 The applicant's planning consultant (Melbourne Planning Outcomes) has provided comments regarding this aspect of the planning provisions. These are attached to the officer report as "Appendix A".

6.16 The building offers a contemporary form of architecture, but this is not considered to provide a particularly high design standard or a positive contribution to the streetscape. Side graduation is not a strong feature of the design and there is an overall "squareness" resonating through the design, with a particularly unattractive front elevation and other dominating aspects.

6.17 Choice of colours, the use of various above-roof screens and the envisaged landscaping approach are also questionable elements in terms of an appropriate design response to the streetscape and the neighbouring properties.

Clause 21.10 Ecologically Sustainable Development

6.18 Council's MSS outlines ESD requirements to be incorporated into larger developments within the municipality. The proposal incorporates rainwater collection tanks which are most likely to be used for toilet flushing.

6.19 While other details are vague, Council would have the option of including a condition requiring the submission of Sustainability Management Plan, in the event of an approval being supported.

Clause 22.08 Safety through Urban design

6.20 Council's Local Planning Policy at Clause 22.08 applies to all land in the municipality and therefore has a broad range of objectives and policy requirements in relation to the design of buildings, street layout/access, lighting and car parks.

6.21 A number of the requirements in relation to building design are relevant, including *"Buildings be orientated to maximise surveillance of entrances and exits from streets"* and *"The location of building entrances and windows maximise opportunities for passive surveillance of streets and other public spaces".*

It is considered that the proposal will offer quite good opportunities for internal surveillance in respect of the various access paths.

Clause 22.09 Access for Disabled People

6.22 The Access for Disabled People Policy is based on the Disability Discrimination Act and requires that persons with a disability have the same level of access to buildings, services and facilities as any other person.

6.23 A range of dwellings have front entries which are accessible by persons with limited mobility. The provisions of Clause 55.05-1 of the Manningham Planning Scheme also address this issue.

Schedule 8 to the Design and Development Overlay (DD08)

6.24 An assessment now follows against the design requirements of the DD08:

Design Element	Level of Compliance
DDO8-1 (Sub-Precinct A) • 11 metres provided the condition regarding minimum land size is met. If the condition is not met, the maximum height is 9 metres, unless the slope of the natural ground level at any cross section wider than eight metres of the site of the building is 2.5 degrees or more, in which case the maximum height must not exceed 10 metres.	**Not Met** • Due to the slope of the land, ten metres is the mandatory height limit on this site. • The submitted plans depict building height between natural ground level and the top of wall parapets. The upper screens located around the roof-top terraces have not been included as part of the overall height dimensions. • A provision of Schedule 8 to the Design and Development Overlay lists the type of roof-top elements that are exempted from the building height calculation. While "screening devices" are in this category, there is a clear nexus to "roof-mounted equipment" (say air-conditioning plant or hot water systems). • As the exemption does not include screening for roof-top terraces, it is considered that such screens need to be included in the overall height calculation. • Based on Survey Plan levels for the land directly below the screened areas and the plan height datum, Dwelling 11's roof-top screen is estimated to be 10.39m high.
• Minimum front street setback is the distance specified in Clause 55.03-1 or 6 metres, whichever is the lesser.	**Met** • The required setback under Clause 55.03-1 is 5.8m, therefore this is the minimum requirement. Porches of a height less than 3.6m may encroach up to 2.5m into this setback. • Although the eastern front porch is approximately 4.0m high from finished ground level, when measurement is

	made to NLG, compliance is achieved. The porches have a width of 1.6m. • As the plan provides a minimum front wall setback of 5.98m, compliance is achieved.
Form • Ensure that the site area covered by buildings does not exceed 60%.	**Not Met** • Based on the corrected building area figure provided by the applicant (1002.2m^2), the proposed site coverage is 65.63%. This high site coverage figure is considered to be an indicator of overdevelopment and represents an unsatisfactory response on this property.
• Provide visual interest through articulation, glazing and variation in materials and textures.	**Not Met** • The proposed building finishes are varied and will offer some different textural elements. • Articulation is provided in varying ways, but the overall result is considered to be unsatisfactory, resulting in a building which will be visually dominating and quite bulky from various aspects, especially in comparison to the form of multi-unit developments that are typical of this street. • For a three-storey building to have any chance of gleaning officer support on this land, it is considered that the upper level would need to be far more recessive and hence, far smaller in area. A central break in the linear side presentation and a more sensitive balcony treatment on the eastern side would also offer visual benefit. • In particular, the front elevation is considered to represent a poor level of architectural presentation. One peculiarity of this building design is that the front wall is straight for approximately 27.0m, with no variation in the setback to the street, other than that provided by the two front porches. • Building design is discussed in detail within the Clause 55 assessment.
• Minimise buildings on boundaries to create spacing between developments.	**Met** • There are no walls proposed to side or rear boundaries.
• Where appropriate ensure that	

buildings are stepped down at the rear of sites to provide a transition to the scale of the adjoining residential area.	**Not Met** • The rear elevation of the building will be quite high. While there is some stepping provided by the Ground floor bedroom projections at either end, the effect of this will largely be lost to the rear due to screening from the boundary fence and cutting in. • As proposed, the dark coloured upper floor walls would combine with the First floor walls to present a sheer, dominating presentation to the rear (where not screened by existing trees on neighbouring land).
• Where appropriate, ensure that buildings are designed to step with the slope of the land.	**Met** • The building steps up the slope of the land to the rear. The impact of this slope has been reduced through the proposed site excavation.
• Avoid reliance on below ground light courts for any habitable rooms.	**Met** • There are no "below ground" light courts proposed.
• Ensure the upper level of a two storey building provides adequate articulation to reduce the appearance of visual bulk and minimise continuous sheer wall presentation.	**Not applicable** • The building is at three storeys.
• Ensure that the upper level of a three storey building does not exceed 75% of the lower levels, unless it can be demonstrated that there is sufficient architectural interest to reduce the appearance of visual bulk and minimise continuous sheer wall presentation.	**Not Met** • Based on the latest figures, the Second (uppermost) floor will cover 75.25% of the floor below, with much of the uncovered area being in the form of the elongated rectangular space between the dwelling rows. • Even if Council policy supported a three-storey building on this land, officer support would not be forthcoming. • Main issues of concern with the upper floor relate to the lack of front and rear "stepping in" and the proximity of screened balconies (with an almost continuous length) to the eastern edge of the building. • The wall presentation is also quite plain and "box-like". • A much more sympathetic design in this particular streetscape could have

	utilised the allowable building height to achieve a raked roof line with deep eave elements, for instance. Potentially, this would have reduced contrast caused by the "flat top" appearance of the proposed building.
• Integrate porticos and other design features with the overall design of the building and not include imposing design features such as double storey porticos.	**Met** • The front porches of the building are at an appropriate scale and will not be visually imposing.
• Be designed and sited to address slope constraints, including minimising views of basement projections and/or minimising the height of finished floor levels and providing appropriate retaining wall presentation.	**Met** • Site works are proposed to "sink" the building into the slope as much as practical. The extent/depth of retaining wall construction is relatively mild and poses no unreasonable visual impacts.
• Be designed to minimise overlooking and avoid the excessive application of screen devices.	**Met in part** • The proposed design provides full screening to all balconies and roof-top terraces. It is fair to say that there is a lot of screening and it could be concluded that the designer has opted for this approach rather than seeking alternative architectural solutions. • The extent of habitable room window screening is at a level which is typical for this form of building.
• Ensure design solutions respect the principle of equitable access at the main entry of any building for people of all mobilities.	**Met** • This design element is aimed more at apartment buildings where there is a main pedestrian foyer into the building. • While not offering access standards to individual dwelling entries that would be suitable for persons using a wheelchair, persons with less severe mobility constraints could reasonably gain access along the side paths.
• Ensure that projections of basement car parking above natural ground level do not result in excessive building height as viewed by neighbouring properties.	**Not Applicable**. • There is no basement car parking.
• Ensure basement or undercroft car parks are not visually obtrusive when viewed from the front of the site.	**Met** • The proposed garages will not be visible from the street due to screening provided by the central

	door.
• Integrate car parking requirements into the design of buildings and landform by encouraging the use of undercroft or basement parking and minimise the use of open car park and half basement parking.	**Met** • The proposed use of underbuilding garages would satisfy this design element.
• Ensure the setback of the basement or undercroft car park is consistent with the front building setback and is setback a minimum of 4.0m from the rear boundary to enable effective landscaping to be established.	**Met in part** • The garage parking is contained within the main footprint of the building. • The visitor parking is not "undercroft", as it is fully open. • Despite this, landscaping opportunities within 4.0m of the rear boundary are, constrained by the extent of paving that is proposed (partially associated with the visitor parking).
• Ensure that building walls, including basements, are sited a sufficient distance from site boundaries to enable the planting of effective screen planting, including canopy trees, in larger spaces.	**Met** • Ground floor building walls are setback sufficient distances from site boundaries to allow for the growth of screen planting and some canopy trees. • Constraints are however, imposed at the rear of the building by paving and retaining wall construction.
• Ensure that service equipment, building services, lift over-runs and roof-mounted equipment, including screening devices is integrated into the built form or otherwise screened to minimise the aesthetic impacts on the streetscape and avoids unreasonable amenity impacts on surrounding properties and open spaces.	**Not Met (due to inadequate detailing)** • Details regarding service equipment and roof-mounted equipment are limited. • There is scope to provide electrical and fire service cabinets to the side of the two access paths, but care would be required in order to ensure that the visual result was appropriate in terms of scale and enclosure. • The Third floor plan indicates that some unspecified services will be located in conjunction with the roof-top terraces. • The Roof plan does not detail any other services or plant.
Car Parking and Access • Include only one vehicular crossover, wherever possible, to maximise availability of on street parking and to minimise disruption to pedestrian movement. Where possible, retain existing crossovers	**Met** • A single crossover is provided. • Although construction of the crossover will entail the removal of a street tree, this tree will be removed in any event as a result of works associated with a future roundabout.

to avoid the removal of street tree(s). Driveways must be setback a minimum of 1.5m from any street tree, except in cases where a larger tree requires an increased setback.	
• Ensure that when the basement car park extends beyond the built form of the ground level of the building in the front and rear setback, any visible extension is utilised for paved open space or is appropriately screened, as is necessary.	**Not Applicable** • The underbuilding car park is not a "basement car park". • In any event, there is no projection forward of the upper walls.
• Ensure that where garages are located in the street elevation, they are set back a minimum of 1.0m from the front setback of the dwelling.	**Not Applicable** • This design requirement relates to single garages and should not be applied to this proposal. • The central security door to the underbuilding parking will ensure that the garage rows are not visible from the street.
• Ensure that access gradients of basement carparks are designed appropriately to provide for safe and convenient access for vehicles and servicing requirements.	**Met** • The underbuilding car park is not a "basement car park". • Nonetheless, the indicated driveway levels should provide safe access in compliance with the design standards of Clause 52.06 Car parking (subject to final scrutiny by Council's traffic engineer – see referral comments).
Landscaping • On sites where a three storey development is proposed include at least 3 canopy trees within the front setback, which have a spreading crown and are capable of growing to a height of 8.0m or more at maturity. • On sites where one or two storey development is proposed include at least 1 canopy tree within the front setback, which has a spreading crown, and is capable of growing to a height of 8.0m or more at maturity.	**Met** • There is scope to plant three canopy trees within the front setback. • Planting strips are provided along the side boundaries and there is scope to plant establish rows of screen shrubs, with intermittent medium sized tree planting. • General landscaping provision across the site is discussed in more detail within the Clause 55 assessment.
• Provide opportunities for planting alongside boundaries in areas that assist in breaking up the length of	**Met in part** • Planting strips are provided along the side boundaries and there is scope to

continuous built form and/or soften the appearance of the built form.	plant establish rows of screen shrubs, with intermittent medium sized tree planting. • Planting opportunities at the rear of the building are limited due to the extent of paving and retaining wall construction.

Fencing
• A front fence must be at least 50 per cent transparent.
• On sites that front Doncaster, Tram, Elgar, Manningham, Thompsons, Blackburn and Mitcham Roads, a fence must:
  • not exceed a maximum height of 1.8m
  • be setback a minimum of 1.0m from the front title boundary
and a continuous landscaping treatment within the 1.0m setback must be provided.
	Not Met
	• The proposed fence design does not provide for 50% transparency.
	• This is not necessarily a design concern, given the limited height of the proposed fence.
	• The issue of front fence design is discussed in more detail, as part of the Clause 55 assessment.

6.25 Having regard to the above assessment against the requirements of Schedule 8 to the Design and Development Overlay, it is considered that, on balance, the proposed design fails to provide a suitable design response within the subject streetscape.

6.26 Being a relatively prominent, in-fill site at the head of a "T" intersection, the site demands a high standard of architecture. It is considered that this has not been provided and if constructed in the proposed form, the building would present as incongruous and excessively large.

6.27 It is considered that for a building of this type to "work" successfully on this land, the dwelling yield would need to be reduced. A third storey may be acceptable, but any building footprint on this level would need to be far more recessive from the outer walls of the lower floor and offer more than "plain box" design elements. Upper, roof-top terraces would also need to be removed or designed to present less dominant screening elements.

Clause 52.06 Car Parking

6.28 Prior to a new use commencing or a new building being occupied, Clause 52.06-2 requires that the number of car parking spaces outlined at Clause 52.06-6 to be provided on the land or as approved under Clause 52.06-3 to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

6.29 This clause requires resident car parking at a rate of one space for each dwelling with one or two bedrooms and two spaces for each dwelling with three or more bedrooms.

6.30 Visitor car parking is required at a rate of one car parking space for every 5 dwellings.

6.31 In terms of provision, the proposal complies with the number of resident and visitor car parking spaces required by the Planning Scheme.

6.32 The following table provides an assessment of the proposal against the seven (7) design standards at Clause 52.06-8:

Design Standard	Met/Not Met
1 - Accessways	**Met.** The driveway access is of an appropriate width and a suitable visibility splay for egressing vehicles can be achieved. Sufficient headroom is provided for underbuilding vehicular circulation.
2 – Car Parking Spaces	**Not Met.** The internal dimensions of the garages and the size of the visitor parking spaces are satisfactory. The reversing distance between opposite garage openings is 5.8m which is 600mm less than the standard requirement of 6.4m. This reduced distance is considered to be quite restrictive and likely to result in inconvenience for persons using garages, especially if there are two cars parked inside and larger vehicles are utilised. With this reduced distance, it is inevitable that cars will occasionally be reversed into the opposite garage door or column sections. Turning circles and comments provided by the applicant's Traffic Consultant indicate that vehicular access will be constrained but "workable" in a forward direction, but it would be easier to reverse into the garages. Overall, it is considered that a 5.8m separation between opposite garage doors is insufficient to allow ease of movement for larger vehicles, especially cars which may have a wider turning circle. Furthermore, it is considered that the garage of Dwelling 1 will be difficult to use due to the sharp turn required from the front entry and obstruction caused by the central intercom installation. It is considered that there should be a greater level of separation between the main opening and the door of this garage and perhaps an alternative intercom arrangement.
3 - Gradients	**Met (subject to confirmation of final level detailing)** Council officers supplied the applicant with construction plan details for the proposed roundabout, in order for a crossover/driveway connection to be designed. With a sloping section of nature strip in this location and a step up to the front of the site due to the higher front yard, it

	was vital for correct levels to be properly established. Several versions of finished levels were supplied to Council prior to plans being advertised. At one point, plan levels translated to an untrafficable crossover slope of 1:3 between the footpath and the frontage. The applicant's current designer had to match two different sets of height datum through a process of calculation. Council engineers have not verified whether these calculations are correct and have indicated that further plan detailing would be required at the approval stage. On face value, access grades and transitions appear to be generally satisfactory (based on the levels provided). Some degree of caution, is however warranted by the prevalence of plan errors. Further details would also be required in relation to the transitioning to garage openings.
4 – Mechanical Parking	**Not applicable.**
5 – Urban Design	**Not Met** The front wall of the building will screen the parking area from the street and there is potential for landscaping in front of the two wall sections. It is considered that the central opening to the underbuilding garages is potentially a dominating visual element due to its "focal point" position and the fact that it is slightly higher than the front footpath level. The approach driveway is also wide, straight and edged by retaining walls, thus further emphasising the door. It is, however, recognised that the row design of this proposal does not allow for the options that would occur with say a basement car park, whereby the opening would generally be at the lower end of the frontage and sunken partially below footpath level. In this case, it is considered that a better streetscape result could be achieved if the door had been recessed back under the building to achieve some "shadow depth" to the opening. This would, however, have impacts on garage layout and hence, the dwellings above. The actual garages will not be visually obvious from the street and the southern walls of the southernmost garages are provided with windows which match with upper windows.

6 – Safety	**Met** There will be little pedestrian movement within the garage access aisle, with most activity being limited to residents walking to and from the rubbish storage area. Visitors who enter the area will have easy access to the side paths. There is no likelihood of pedestrian/vehicular conflicts. The area will be lit at night and will receive varying degrees of natural light during the day.
7 – Landscaping	**Not Applicable** This design standard relates mainly to open car parks where there is a need for landscaping and water sensitive urban design. Some issues regarding the treatment of levels and fencing within the front setback are raised in other sections.

6.33 It follows from the above assessment that the proposal has some shortcomings relating to the parking layout. It could be concluded that convenient parking access (at a wider dimension) may have been "sacrificed" to achieve ground level bedrooms.

6.34 Had these rooms been limited to smaller studies, with options for some "built-in" storage (rather than inconvenient overhead storage shelves in the garages), it would have been possible to provide the normally adopted reversing distance between the opposite garages and more "pedestrian friendly" garages (no obstructions).

Clause 55 Two or More Dwellings on a Lot

6.35 This clause sets out a range of objectives which must be met. Each objective is supported by standards which should be met. If an alternative design solution to the relevant standard meets the objective, the alternative may be considered.

6.36 The following table sets out the level of compliance with the objectives of this clause:

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
55.02-1 – Neigbourhood Character To ensure that the design respects the existing neighbourhood character or contributes to a preferred neighbourhood character. To ensure that development responds to the features of	**Not Met** As outlined in the assessment of the proposal against the policy requirements of the Schedule 8 to the Design and Development Overlay (DD08), it is considered that the proposed development on balance, fails to contribute to the preferred neighbourhood character and does not adequately respect the surrounds, particularly the Beverley Street streetscape.

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
the site and the surrounding area.	
55.02-2 – Residential Policy To ensure that residential development is provided in accordance with any policy for housing in the State Planning Policy Framework and the Local Planning Policy Framework, including the Municipal Strategic Statement and local planning policies. To support medium densities in areas where development can take advantage of public transport and community infrastructure and services.	**Not Met** The application was accompanied by a written statement that explained how, in the view of the permit applicant, the development accords with State, Local and Council policy. Council's assessment has concluded that whilst a preferred neighbourhood character contemplates higher densities with this substantial level of change area, the proposal has not satisfactorily accommodated a number of the local planning policy requirements with respect to addressing external amenity impacts.
55.02-3 – Dwelling Diversity To encourage a range of dwelling sizes and types in developments of ten or more dwellings.	**Not Met** This Objective applies to the proposal, as more than ten dwellings are proposed. There is some limited variation in dwelling size, but all dwellings are to contain three bedrooms and will be at three levels. There are, however, internal set out and open space variations between the dwellings in either row.
55.02-4 – Infrastructure To ensure development is provided with appropriate utility services and infrastructure. To ensure development does not unreasonably overload the capacity of utility services and infrastructure.	**Met** The site has access to all services. In the event of an approval, the applicant will be required to provide an on-site stormwater detention system to alleviate pressure on the drainage system. There is no evidence of service capacity issues in this location.
55.02-5 – Integration With Street To integrate the layout of development with the street.	**Met** The proposed development provides appropriate pedestrian and vehicular links with the frontage/street. The fact that two dwelling entries will face the street

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
	is a positive design feature.
55.03-1 – Street Setback To ensure that the setbacks of buildings from a street respect the existing or preferred neighbourhood character and make efficient use of the site.	**Met** As there is no setback distance within the schedule to this zone, the required minimum setback under Standard B6 of Clause 55.03-1 is 5.8m (an average of the front setbacks of adjacent dwellings). Other newer developments assessed under the DDO8 provisions would generally be set back 6.0m. The proposed minimum setback of 5.98m is therefore satisfactory. The wide front wall of the building will, however, have no stepping, so this setback will be maintained.
55.03-2 – Building Height To ensure that the height of buildings respects the existing or preferred neighbourhood character.	**Not Met** Standard B7 requires that the maximum building height should not exceed the maximum height specified in the zone, schedule to the zone or an overlay that applies to the land. In this case, it is the overlay that is relevant, with a maximum height of 10.0m being specified (having regard to the site's slope). While the overall building height (measured to NGL) is less than the 10.0m, It is apparent that the three-storey built form conflicts with the preferred two-storey form for townhouses, expressed in the overlay provisions. The proposal does not therefore respond appropriately to either the existing or proposed neighbourhood character, both of which were considered as part of Amendment C96.
55.03-3 – Site Coverage To ensure that the site coverage respects the existing or preferred neighbourhood character and responds to the features of the site.	**Not Met** There is no maximum site coverage specified in the schedule to the General Residential Zone, so on this basis, Standard B8 recommends a maximum site coverage of 60%. This figure is in line with the maximum site coverage recommended by a design standard of the Overlay. As an overview, all multi-unit housing in the immediate neighbourhood would have a site

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
	coverage which is lower than this figure. This is by way of the fact that dwelling density is much lower (on a comparative site area basis) and there are typically, driveways extending to rear of properties, as well as ground level secluded private open space. With an indicated site coverage of 65.63%, the proposal clearly exceeds the recommended maximum, with much of the area not covered by building being characterised by hard standing (paths, visitor parking/vehicular access). This figure is considered to be excessive in this "local street" location, especially given the fact that the existing housing fabric of the street is unlikely to change significantly (to higher density development) in the future. The proposed building also exhibits a bulky and dominating architectural character and there are limited landscaping opportunities especially along the rear of the site. On this basis, the Objective is not met.
55.03-4 – Permeability To reduce the impact of increased stormwater run-off on the drainage system. To facilitate on-site stormwater infiltration.	**Met (with condition)** In the event of an approval, a condition would require the installation of an on-site stormwater condition to reduce the impact of increased stormwater run-off. The proposal has 32% of site area as a pervious surface which is greater than the 20% minimum amount recommended by the relevant Standard. All of the pedestrian paths and the visitor parking spaces are shown as "permeable paving", so these areas have not been deemed by the applicant to be impervious.
55.03-5 – Energy Efficiency To achieve and protect energy efficient dwellings. To ensure the orientation and layout of development reduce fossil fuel energy use and make appropriate use of daylight and solar energy.	**Met in part** The proposed dwellings will be required to comply with State Government required energy ratings at the Building Permit stage. It is considered that the building will be relatively efficient from a thermal mass perspective, however, there are likely to be poor outcomes in respect of cross-ventilation to those bedrooms on the Ground

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
	floor, especially as they will rely on awning windows. In addition, cross ventilation will be lacking in respect of the First floor "back" bedrooms which rely on ventilation from doors and small windows in the light courts. Persons using these bedrooms may also be reluctant to leave sliding doors open to the light court due to the proximity of a similar opposite bedroom door of the neighbouring dwelling (the only separation being a timber paling fence between the adjacent courts). The flat roof design would provide opportunities for solar water heating and/or energy generation, but plans do not indicate any such provision and proposed roof-top terraces on the eastern module will largely prevent such installations.
55.03-6 – Open Space To integrate the layout of development with any public and communal open space provided in or adjacent to the development.	**Not applicable** There is no communal open space provided and no public open space adjacent to the site.
55.03-7 – Safety To ensure the layout of development provides for the safety and security of residents and property.	**Met subject to a condition on any planning approval** Access to the underbuilding parking area and the side pedestrian paths will be controlled by way of a security door and gates. The side security gates would need to be linked to an intercom system to each dwelling, otherwise anyone could walk along the side paths and enter the underbuilding area from the rear. Each front entry door is provided with side glazing panels to allow observation of the front landing.
55.03-8 – Landscaping To encourage development that respects the landscape character of the neighbourhood. To encourage development	**Not Met** It is considered that only the first and third Objectives relate to this site and development proposal. It is recognised that a development of this nature will require the clearing of the whole site to achieve

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
that maintains and enhances habitat for plants and animals in locations of habitat importance. To provide appropriate landscaping. To encourage the retention of mature vegetation on the site.	the necessary level adjustments and to provide construction access during the building process. This is not an issue, as there is no significant vegetation. Such work may impact on trees within neighbouring yards to the north and because of this, the applicant was required to provide an Arborist's Report. In terms of landscaping opportunities, it is considered that with some adjustment to finished levels and fencing within the front setback, there is adequate space to provide a basic landscaping outcome, including the installation of some canopy trees. The potential to achieve a high quality overall presentation will, however, be lessened by the wide central driveway which will bisect the areas of planting. The proposed "fencing off" of private yard areas within the front setback will also reduce the opportunity for a dense planting treatment across the front of the building. As the proposed landscape treatment shown on the AD Design Plan (provided with the application) incorporates a substantial area of grass within the frontage area, it is considered that this design would not provide a suitable or effective landscape result in front of such a prominent, wide building. Another factor to take into consideration is the placement of the stormwater detention system, as a location within the front setback (other than under the driveway) would further limit planting opportunities. The linear side areas provided for landscaping are of uniform width. The proposed landscaping plan proposes some small shrubs along the paths with a wide spacing of deciduous trees (Ornamental Pears). However, the stairs and porches required to access the eastern side entries reduce the available space for landscaping along the building interface. This approach will offer very limited side screening to immediate neighbours and the use of larger screen shrubs and a greater density of trees would

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
	be appropriate. Had the building been provided with a central "indentation" on either side, much more effective screen planting could have been incorporated within the wider sections. The landscaping along the sides of the building would be strengthened through conditions, if the application was to be approved. Proposed planting across the rear of the site is essentially a row of common Lilly Pillies. The indicated variety has the potential to grow to a height of 15.0m, with a wide spread, if not cut back. However, the species responds to pruning and can be used as a high hedge (with obvious maintenance implications). It is considered that these trees will not grow particularly well within the shadow and root zone of the neighbouring conifers at 54 Franklin Road and there is insufficient space available for such trees where the peripheral planting strip narrows substantially over the western half of the rear boundary. It is agreed that the installation of a vigorous screen trees across the rear boundary is advisable, but such trees should be allowed to develop without impacting on the boundary fence or requiring constant trimming to maintain path access to the bin area. On this basis, it is considered that insufficient width is provided for planting development across the rear boundary. The Arborist's report indicates that the proposal needs to be modified so as to greatly reduce the impact of the development on the conifers located at the rear of 54 Franklin Road. As the advertised plan shows quite deep cutting and wall/path and stair construction within the critical root zones of these trees, it is apparent that the advice provided by the applicant's own consultant has not been followed. These issues strengthen the conclusion that the building is too large and in particular, too close to the rear boundary (allowing for the pedestrian access requirements and bin enclosure across the rear of the building).

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
55.03-9 – Access To ensure the number and design of vehicle crossovers respects the neighbourhood character.	**Met subject to conditions on any planning approval** The position of the proposed crossover/driveway is considered to be satisfactory from a traffic engineering perspective and will allow two-way traffic movement (see referral comments in Section 8.2). Two redundant crossovers would be removed and the nature strip reinstated.
55.03-10 – Parking Location To provide convenient parking for resident and visitor vehicles. To avoid parking and traffic difficulties in the development and the neighbourhood. To protect residents from vehicular noise within developments.	**Not Met (Second Objective)** On the basis that a more appropriate aisle width was achievable, the proposal would provide convenient parking for residents, especially as there is direct access into each dwelling from the garage. As proposed, there would be parking difficulties resulting from the inadequate separation distance between the garage rows. Visitor parking is easily accessible. Although the two visitor spaces are not readily visible from the approach, signposting would overcome this issue. Most visitors would also be advised where to park by residents. Vehicular noise transfer from the parking level to the Ground lkfloor is not anticipated to be an issue of concern.
55.04-1 – Side And Rear Setbacks To ensure that the height and setback of a building from a boundary respects the existing or preferred neighbourhood character and limits the impact on the amenity of existing dwellings.	**Met in part** As there is no minimum distance specified in the schedule to the zone, Standard B17 provides a method of determining the minimum wall setbacks from the rear or side boundaries. Such setbacks are not particularly generous and do not in all circumstances provide sufficient separation distance to ensure that existing amenity is not adversely affected. Increasingly, however, the distances specified by the Standard have become the “norm” for designers to follow. In this case there is comfortable compliance with the wall height/setback standard on the western side of the building. Wall heights (to NGL) are also reduced due to cutting and because there is no

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
	sub-floor element at the southern end. The upper floor walls are also setback 5.62m as compared to 5.28m on the eastern side. It is considered, however, that the extent of balcony projection on this side is excessive. The result is five fully screened, First floor balconies located between 1.618m-1.625m from the western boundary. This is considered to provide an inadequate setback from a general amenity perspective, as the projecting built form will tend to "crowd" the adjacent property. On the eastern side of the building, the external walls are higher than on the western side, especially when the "back" walls of the roof-top stairways are factored in. Although the wall heights comply (and slightly exceed) the minimum requirements, it is considered that the combination of wall height and high balcony screens set to the outer edge will have an imposing and unresponsive impact in this streetscape and when viewed from the adjoining property. The rear setbacks clearly exceed the minimum requirements at each level.
55.04-2 – Walls On Boundaries To ensure that the location, length and height of a wall on a boundary respects the existing or preferred neighbourhood character and limits the impact on the amenity of existing dwellings.	**Not applicable** There are no building walls built to boundaries.
55.04-3 – Daylight To Existing Windows To allow adequate daylight into existing habitable room windows.	**Met** Standard B19 sets out certain minimum requirements for daylighting. These are easily met, as there are no existing habitable room windows within close proximity to the site boundaries.

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
55.04-4 – North Facing Windows To allow adequate solar access to existing north-facing habitable room windows.	**Met** There are no existing north-facing habitable room windows near the site and hence, there can be no adverse solar access impacts.
55.04-5 – Overshadowing Open Space To ensure buildings do not significantly overshadow existing secluded private open space.	**Met** As demonstrated by the submitted shadow diagrams, at the control period (September Equinox), there will not be any unreasonable overshadowing of adjoining properties to the east and west. Because of the north/south orientation of the site, off-site shadow impacts will be largely limited to early morning and late afternoon periods, with shadow predominantly covering driveway areas and not impacting on secluded private open space. On this basis, both Standard B21 and the Objective are met.
55.04-6 – Overlooking To limit views into existing secluded private open space and habitable room windows.	**Met subject to a condition on any planning approval** The applicant's planning report indicates the use of a *"fixed shelf detail to prevent downward views"* from upper level balconies (with a purpose to allow more distant views without screen enclosure). This statement is incorrect. On the plans, every balcony or roof-top terrace is provided with external screening to a height of 1.7m. Habitable room windows with the potential for overviewing are provided with fixed obscure glass up to a height of 1.7m. The design of the aluminium privacy screens to be mounted above the obscure glazed balustrades has not been detailed, other than to indicate a transparency level of 30%. Such screens tend to be constructed with either horizontal slats (spaced) or angled louvres which prevent downward views. The extent of "transparency" can therefore vary depending on the adopted design. While Standard B22 recommends a maximum transparency of 25% in respect of *"perforated*

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
	panels or trellis", this figure would not relate to a louvre system, but could be reasonably applied to a horizontal slat system. In the event of an approval, a condition outlining suitable performance requirements could be included. The lesser transparency rate of 25% would be appropriate for a slat system. North-facing habitable room windows are to be screened to a height of 1.7m above floor level (fixed glazing), as are the various First floor habitable room windows on the western side of the building. Second floor habitable room windows on the western side of the building do not appear to be screened (vague detailing of "Juliet balcony"). There are considered to be no significant overlooking issues associated with these six windows, as they are set back from a parapet and only serve a minor lounge space.
55.04-7 – Internal Views To limit views into the secluded private open space and habitable room windows of dwellings and residential buildings within a development.	**Met** Appropriate levels of internal privacy are provided in respect of secluded private open space within the proposed development. However, the placement of Ground floor bedroom windows along the side walls and quite close to the communal access pathways is not ideal, as occupants would most likely feel inclined to keep the windows screened and closed for security reasons. The provision of planting between the path and the windows may assist to some extent.
55.04-8 – Noise Impacts To contain noise sources in developments that may affect existing dwellings. To protect residents from external noise.	**Met** Noise associated with vehicular movements to and from the garages and associated door use is not likely to generate any unreasonable noise impacts. The only source of mechanical noise is likely to be from domestic air conditioners, if they are installed. Such units would need to comply with relevant Australian Standards in terms of noise output. Plan details showing the location of plant can be required as a condition of any planning approval. The use of the balconies and roof-top terraces for normal recreational purposes is unlikely to be the

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
	source of unreasonable noise disturbance to neighbours, provided normal behavioural protocols are followed. Any abnormal noise would also affect persons residing within the subject building and would be a matter for the Owners' Corporation to address.
55.05-1 – Accessibility To encourage the consideration of the needs of people with limited mobility in the design of developments.	**Met** The related standard clarifies that to meet this objective- *"The dwelling entries of the ground floor of dwellings and residential buildings should be accessible or able to be easily made accessible to people with limited mobility."* Notwithstanding the mild language of the objective *"to encourage consideration"*, it is evident that when read together with Standard B25, this clause of the planning scheme requires designers to consider how a dwelling can be or may be, made accessible for those of limited mobility. It does not require disabled access which is in the realm of the building code. Nor does it specifically require the dwellings to be made accessible at the time of first development, only that access to the ground floor may be easily made accessible. The majority of dwellings have front access doors that are either accessible or could be made accessible for persons with limited mobility. The nature of the townhouses (with multiple internal stairways) would of course make them unsuitable for occupation by a person of limited mobility, unless electric stair-chairs were installed.
55.05-2 – Dwelling entry To provide each dwelling or residential building with its own sense of identity.	**Not Met.** The entries to the two front dwellings are easily identifiable. Visually, the path approach to Dwelling 7's porch could be improved by raising the yard level and thus having less steps at the porch. The use of side access paths to dwelling entries located along the side walls of townhouse developments such as this is common. A well lit path and suitable landscaping are, however, prerequisites to "comfortable" pedestrian access.

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
	These can be provided. A sense of personal address and the provision of shelter are also relevant design issues. With side entry doors being "flush" to the external wall and a total of six entries having no weather protection, it is considered that the overall result is poor. In addition, there is no privacy separation between the adjacent porches on the eastern side of the building. On this basis, the Objective has not been met.
55.05-3 – Daylight to new windows To allow adequate daylight into new habitable room windows.	**Not Met** Each external habitable room window within the proposed dwellings will receive an adequate level of daylight. There are, however, eight bedrooms that rely entirely on daylight from central lightcourts. Standard B27 requires a lightcourt of not less than $3.0m^2$. Although each court for the individual dwellings is less than $3.0m^2$ in area, the combined area of the two abutting courts will exceed this requirement. Nonetheless, the combined areas of adjacent light courts is considered to be still quite limited. For instance a similar townhouse development at 282-284 Manningham Road provides individual lightcourts of $6.23m^2$ (to kitchens). Given the affected bedrooms within Dwellings 8-11 will function as the "main" bedroom, the reliance on only a small lightcourt for daylight is a poor design response.
55.05-4 – Private open space To provide adequate private open space for the reasonable recreation and service needs of residents.	**Not Met** Standard B28 provides a range of open space options for multi-unit development. These include ground level private open space, balconies or a roof-top terrace. Attached townhouse developments can be designed with ground level open space at the side of each dwelling, but this design approach usually requires any under-building parking level to be in the form of a basement (so as to allow direct connection to the external areas from the Ground floor). As the applicant has opted not to sink the parking level into the ground (to any significant degree) this

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
	option is not available, hence any secluded private open space must be elevated. In respect of Dwellings 1-6 on the western side, each has an 8.0m^2 balcony which is the minimum size under the Standard (each is accessible from a living space). The proportions of these balconies are satisfactory, but the overall amenity is reduced due to the full enclosure of the spaces and in the case of four balconies by the full attachment to another balcony. In the case of Dwelling 2 and 4, access to the balcony is via a sliding door located at the top of a stair to the lower floor. This is not an ideal arrangement in terms of safety. In respect of Dwellings 7 to 12 on the eastern side, the main area of secluded open space is provided by a roof-top terrace which is accessed from the lower living room via stairs and a hatch. This arrangement is not as convenient as walking out to a balcony. Narrow "planters" shown around the perimeter of the roof-top terraces are to be placed in front of glass balustrading which is a peculiar design approach. The row of Second floor balconies on the western side are accessible from living space, but are fully screened with only minimal (1.0m) separation provided in two locations.
55.05-5 – Solar access to open space To allow solar access into the secluded private open space of new dwellings and residential buildings.	**Met** It is considered that acceptable levels of solar access would be achieved to the various balcony and roof-top open space areas. Being on the southern side of the building, the two front yards which are proposed would not receive much sunlight throughout the year, however, this is not seen as a concern due to the fact that these spaces are not private/secluded and are unlikely to attract much use by occupants.
55.05-6 – Storage To provide adequate storage facilities for each dwelling.	**Not Met** The "above-bonnet" storage facilities do not provide for the recommended minimum volume of 6.0m^3 and are considered to represent a poor storage

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
	option for these large dwellings. The lengths of the storage racks are such that they would obstruct pedestrian access to and from the internal doorway when two cars are parked in the garage (drivers would have to walk to the rear of cars and then move along a side and front wall to access to the door). Another issue is that cars would have to be reversed and parked partially in the access aisle, so as to gain access to stored items. The Applicant's traffic consultant has also indicated that it would be easier for residents to reverse into some garages, but the lockers would prevent some cars (with a back door) from fitting underneath. A better option would have been to provide a recessed area at ground level adjacent to the parking area.
55.06-1 – Design Detail To encourage design detail that respects the existing or preferred neighbourhood character.	**Not Met** The following Decision Guidelines are required to be considered by Council- • Any relevant neighbourhood character objective, policy or statement set out in this scheme. • The design response. • The effect on the visual bulk of the building and whether this is acceptable in the neighbourhood setting. • Whether the design is innovative and of a high architectural standard. The proposed design is predicated on two modules with a distinct "break" between at the upper level. The side walls are long and basically "unbroken". Being of a contemporary design and with no roof projection, the design will clearly contrast with the typical built form of this street and nearby streets. However, contrast is not necessarily a bad thing in terms of multi-unit presentation, provided the design is executed in such a manner as to achieve a high standard of architecture and with appropriate response elements incorporated. The visual prominence of the existing house on the site and its significant visual exposure from along

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
	Milan Street demonstrate the impact a large, high building can have in this location. For a contemporary building design to "work" on this prominent site, it should be of such an architectural standard, as to make it a benchmark of good design. It is considered that the proposal does not come close to "making the grade" and presents as a building which is aimed more at maximising dwelling yield/floor size, rather than one which has been crafted to a high architectural standard. With a Council policy statement encouraging the use of two-storey built form and with a predominance of local buildings at this scale, the fact that the applicant has opted to pursue a three-storey built form immediately creates some "tension". The applicant's design philosophy seems to have been, if the overall height is in compliance, then the number of storeys should not be an issue. In this case, the incorporation of a third storey is certainly a planning issue and in the context of assessing "visual bulk" in the "neighbourhood setting" is of considerable relevance. The visual impact of the third storey is particularly noticeable across the front of the building. As can be seen from the front wall setback figures of the three floors, there is virtually no variation between the floors (refer to Paragraph 2.42). The result will be sheer three-storey presentation over the two module sections. Ground Floor articulation is provided mainly by two porch elements which project into the front setback and some quite shallow framing features which extend to the second floor. The upper floor walls are plain and "boxey". The result will not be a good one in this local street. With the local planning policy aim of two-storey built form, it is unacceptable that no attempt was made to at least make the upper floor more recessive/attractive and hence, less visually dominating from the street. A much more sympathetic design in this particular streetscape could have utilised the allowable building height to achieve a raked roof line with

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
	deep eave elements, for instance. Potentially, this would have reduced contrast caused by the "flat top" appearance of the proposed building. Another observation in respect of the front elevation is the fact that there has been no attempt to "lighten" its form and increase visual interest through the incorporation of recessed First floor balconies. Clearly, a design opportunity presented itself here, but was not taken up due to the impact on internal space. Such an approach would have also opened up views to the south for future residents and created more synergy with the street. The side elevations depict quite long, straight walls with some stepping up to the rear. This stepping helps to create a level design interest, but the overall form is very "solid" and linear. The presentation would have benefited from some deep recessing/stepping and a spatial break at any third level, but the rigid adherence to similar floor plans has prevented this. The western elevation is considered to be "superior" to the eastern elevation, as it provides a greater degree of articulation through the use of balconies. Although, these balconies are partially recessed into the floor space of the respective dwellings, they nonetheless, project quite close to the side boundary. With side boundary setbacks of between 1.618m and 1.63m and with full screening to a height of 1.7m , it is considered that these elements have too much projection beyond the main wall and will be quite obtrusive to the neighbours on this side. On the eastern side, there will be little articulation on the Ground Floor apart from shallow "framing" elements which provide minimal projection (8.5mm) to dwelling entries. At the Second Floor, the extent of stepping is limited to 415mm over three sections. This is considered to be inconsequential and of little design benefit over a wall length of 33.5m. At the upper floor, three elongated pairs of balconies extend over almost the full length of this wall, with only 1.0m spacings provided between. With screening provided to a height of 1.7m to the sides and outer edges and with only marginal stepping back from the lower floor, these design elements will be quite bulky and visually dominating.

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
	In terms of the rear elevation, it is considered that this presentation to the secluded private open space of neighbouring homes will be quite dominating and is not a good design response. The First floor wall is quite long and lacks articulation or material variation, while the use of dark colour to the upper wall and the lack of stepping back will create a very "heavy" design presence which will tend to "crowd" the adjoining back yards. As with other elevations, the height and proximity of the high screening to the roof-top space will be highly visible from the rear. It is also noted that not one of the habitable room windows within this northern elevation is provided with any form of solar protection from impacts of the Summer sun. Overall window design and proportions are considered to be appropriate. In terms of the general finishes, although a dark grey colour scheme with white contrast is a relatively popular choice for multi-unit housing at present, it is considered that this scheme will not "sit well" in this streetscape. The dark colour is not responsive to the more earthy tones depicted by the predominantly face brick finishes of nearby townhouses and will tend to emphasise the excessive bulk and height of the building. The proposed use of slatted sight screens above glass balustrading is considered to be a peculiar design feature which will not present all that well. The use of the more solid and darker element at the upper part will also draw attention to the roof-top screens and further emphasise the height of this building. Several front perspectives of the building show the extent of which the Southernmost balustrade/screening system will be visible from the street and this is considered to demonstrate just how inappropriate these elements would be. Internally, there are considered to be some odd design features. What could be described as the "best" bedrooms in Dwellings 7-12 (in terms of size and storage) are "inboard" and rely on light and ventilation from constrained light courts (with clotheslines erected within). These bedrooms do not have exclusive use of a bathroom and would

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
	share their facilities with the other bedroom on this floor. With a sliding door to bathrooms adjacent to the Bedroom 1 door, a certain degree of coordination would be required. In addition, the single First floor bedrooms within Dwellings 1-6 have access to a shared toilet, but no shower/bath facilities on this floor. The front porches of Dwellings 1 and 7 each have a semi-enclosed "dead" space at one end which may attract general storage. This outcome would not be attractive from the side communal paths. Comment has been made in the Clause 52.06 Car parking assessment regarding the central door opening to the parking area. As stated, it would be beneficial to step this door back from the front wall, so as to reduce its visual dominance from the street.
55.06-2 – Front Fences To encourage front fence design that respects the existing or preferred neighbourhood character.	**Not Met** The front of the site is to be defined by a brick pier/timber slat fence and what is assumed to be a rendered masonry retaining wall. The slat sections will extend to the ground. The proposed design could be made more responsive to the streetscape by utilising a solid wall section as a base element and by incorporating vertical metal slats or rails, rather than horizontal timber slats. Improvement could also be made by reducing the yard size of Dwelling 1 to that of Dwelling 7 and removing the frontage and driveway fencing to what would best be communal garden space, forward of Dwelling 1's garage. The use of a wall section (with a retaining function) to the frontage of Dwelling 7's front yard would also enable this space to be raised to reduce the abruptness of the elevated front porch and the associated set of stairs, while also reducing the grade difference in relation to the retained garden area to the west.
55.06-3 – Common Property To ensure that communal open space, car parking,	**Met subject to a condition on any planning approval** The only "communal open space" will be several areas dedicated to lawn or garden planting. These

OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE MET/NOT MET
access areas and site facilities are practical, attractive and easily maintained. To avoid future management difficulties in areas of common ownership.	areas will be maintained by a future Owners' Corporation. The parking aisle, pathways and the rubbish store will also be maintained by the Owners' Corporation. The only foreseeable difficulty could come from any poor management of the waste storage area which is positioned below and forward of Dwelling 12's rear balcony. In the event of an approval, a maintenance condition could be applied in relation to this area.
55.06-4 – Site Services To ensure that site services can be installed and easily maintained. To ensure that site facilities are accessible, adequate and attractive.	**Met subject to a condition on any planning approval** The side setbacks will enable convenient installation of services to the individual dwellings. A stormwater detention system will be required and this will be maintained by any future Owners' Corporation. Allowing for the slope of the land, such a system is likely to be within the lower part of the site. Allowing for the need to achieve a high quality landscaping result across the front of the building, such a system should not be located within the front setback. Details regarding electrical service cabinets and fire services are vague. There is likely to be a requirement for duplication of services for either building row and cabinets would best be positioned, so as not to visually dominate the adjacent paths. The slope/required stairs of the eastern path would also be a design constraint in respect of cabinet installation. The plans show internal hot water units (some fully enclosed and some in wardrobes) which suggest the use of electric units. The Planning Consultant's report indicates that "solar panels" for electricity and hot water will be provided, but plans do not show such panels. No explanation was provided about the nature of the internal units. The only shared facilities would be letterboxes. These are shown facing onto the side paths. Such an arrangement is unlikely to be acceptable to Australia Post (direct "postie" access from the street footpath is the preference).

7 CONSULTATION

7.1 The application was advertised in October 2015 and 52 objections were received. Details are as follows:

Affected Property
3/15 Beverley Street, Doncaster East
1/27 Beverley Street, Doncaster East
2/27 Beverley Street, Doncaster East
35 Beverley Street, Doncaster East
40 Beverley Street, Doncaster East
41 Beverley Street, Doncaster East (2 objections from this address)
41A Beverley Street, Doncaster East
43 Beverley Street, Doncaster East (6 objections from this address)
2/47 Beverley Street, Doncaster East
47 Beverley Street, Doncaster East
2/48 Beverley Street, Doncaster East
49 Beverley Street, Doncaster East
49A Beverley Street, Doncaster East (2 objections from this address)
1/54 Beverley Street, Doncaster East (2 objections from this address)
1/55 Beverley Street, Doncaster East (2 objections)
55A Beverley Street, Doncaster East
56 Beverley Street, Doncaster East (6 objections from this address)
2/59 Beverley Street, Doncaster East
1/60 Beverley Street, Doncaster East
2/60 Beverley Street, Doncaster East
1/62 Beverley Street, Doncaster East
68 Beverley Street, Doncaster East
70 Beverley Street, Doncaster East
15A Devon Drive, Doncaster East
2/48 Franklin Road, Doncaster East
56 Franklin Road, Doncaster East
57 Franklin Street, Doncaster East
1/59 Franklin Road, Doncaster East (2 objections from this address)
42 Frederick Street, Doncaster (NB. owner has no property interest in the vicinity of the site)
26 Hamilton Crescent, Doncaster East
104 Leeds Street, Doncaster East
2 Mantell Street, Doncaster East
1/6 Mantell Street, Doncaster East
2/6 Mantell Street, Doncaster East (3 objections from this address)
1/2 Milan Street Doncaster East
43 Morna Road, Doncaster East

Affected Property
5 Robertswood Close, Doncaster East

7.2 The following is a summary of the grounds upon which the above properties have objected to the proposal:

Planning Controls

- Local planning policy encourages only two-storey development on a site of this size (being less than 1800m^2);
- The planning scheme wording relating to the desired built form in Sub-precinct A (DDO8-2) should be altered, so as to be more specific regarding what may be constructed (in terms of height/number of storeys) especially in relation sites of less than 1800m^2;
- The proposed site coverage exceeds 60% and may have been understated;

Response

- It is recognised that mandatory height limits in this location are not directly linked to a particular number of storeys and there can be differing views expressed regarding what may be a suitable built form (several conflicting VCAT decisions have highlighted this issue);
- Building site coverage does exceed 60% and is considered to be excessive.

"Sense of fit"

- A three-storey building of this size is out of character with the local housing type and is too high;
- Local buildings have pitched roofs and the proposed flat roof is not compatible;
- Presents more like an apartment building, rather than townhouses;
- The majority of lots in Beverley Street have already been developed for multi-units and this development will be contrary to the prevailing form of multi-units;
- More suited to a location like Doncaster Road where road width helps to negate impact of building height;
- Overdevelopment of the land;
- Fewer dwellings are required to achieve an appropriate design and a suitable landscaping provision;
- Equivalent to 6 dwellings on each lot, when the norm is for less in this locality;
- Building is too bulky when viewed from neighbouring yards and lacks sufficient articulation;

Response

- The proposal is considered to be an overdevelopment and there are officer concerns about various design aspects of the building;
- The form of the building is bulky and it is understandable that comparison is made to an apartment building;
- Inadequate wall articulation is a recurring theme in the officer's analysis;
- The use of a "flat" roof type has enabled the designer to achieve a third storey within the mandatory height limit of 10.0m;
- A reduction in dwelling density is most likely called for to achieve a suitable design response.

Traffic/on-street parking

- Driveway gradients are non-compliant;
- Visitors will park in Beverley Street and add to congestion;
- Will increase traffic flows in Beverley Street and adjacent streets to the detriment of local road safety;
- Increased traffic into an intersection;
- No right turn is allowed from Beverley Street into Blackburn Road;
- Increased on-street parking could make it difficult for emergency and Council service vehicles to access the street;
- On street parking demand will extend into other nearby streets;
- Safety concerns relating to school children and elderly who pass the site;
- Beverley Street is already congested with school traffic at certain times;
- Vehicular access to a future roundabout is inappropriate and will generate issues for service vehicles;
- Contactors will park in the street during construction;
- Rubbish collection truck may block roundabout and general traffic flow.

Response

- The proposal complies with the statutory parking requirement;
- Despite the on-site visitor parking, there is likely to be occasional on-street parking generated by the residents of the development, however, such parking is lawful and of no concern in this wide street;
- The traffic generated by the proposal would easily be absorbed into the existing traffic flows, without detriment;
- There are no safety concerns relating to passing pedestrians;
- Council's Traffic Engineer is satisfied with the position and general design of the proposed driveway access;

- Council's Traffic Engineer has not identified any concerns regarding additional traffic flow in local streets or any adverse impacts due to current intersection design;
- Rubbish collection will occur on the site and provided "Mini Loader" trucks exit the site in a forward direction, there would be no adverse impacts on the operation of the proposed roundabout;

Amenity Impacts

- Increased noise and dust from building activity;
- Domestic noise impacts from multiple air conditioning units which will most likely be on side balconies;
- Possible noise disturbance from persons using side balconies;
- Will have an adverse impact on an adjoining property due to shadowing;
- Will generate unreasonable overlooking of an adjoining property from windows, balconies and roof-top terraces;
- Will be visually dominating to adjoining properties which are at a lesser scale;
- Rubbish collection will cause noise and odour impacts;
- Twenty-four rubbish bins on the nature strip may extend to adjoining frontages;
- Extent of screening to habitable room windows does not satisfy the 25% transparency requirement;
- Loss of views.

Response

- It is recognised that construction activity can cause disturbance to immediate neighbours and associated complaints are dealt with under the appropriate legislation;
- In the event of an approval, a Construction Management Plan could be required by way of condition;
- Domestic noise associated with the proposed dwellings is not a matter for planning consideration;
- In the event of an approval, any plant equipment would have to be located in accordance with appropriate permit conditions;
- There should be no adverse shadowing impacts (assessment made under Clause 55 provisions);
- The potential for overlooking is minimal (assessment made under Clause 55 assessment);
- Rubbish storage is likely to be via large, four wheeled bins (with lids) and there are unlikely to be any amenity impacts to neighbours;
- Screening details would normally be specified as part of any permit conditions, but it is agreed that 25% transparency would be insufficient for slats;
- There is no "right to a view" in suburban locations such as this and planning arguments based on this issue inevitably fail at VCAT.

General Issues

- Driveway gradients and access to car parking spaces do not comply with planning requirements;
- No apparent provision for persons with limited mobility;
- Dwellings have excessive internal stairs resulting in limitations on who may reside in the dwellings;
- Limited dwelling variety;
- Three-storey dwellings are hard to sell due to access constraints;
- Reduction of local property values;
- Existing brick wall to the side boundary should be maintained in order to minimise potential damage to adjoining planting;
- Possible drainage impacts;
- Too many “flats” in an area can cause social issues.

Response

- There are considered to be design shortcomings in respect of garage access, but access from the street but working from the levels that have been provided, the access appears to be satisfactory;
- The range of dwelling size is limited, but different floor plans are proposed;
- Stair access over three levels is reasonable and has been supported by Council in respect of other developments. It is up to individuals to decide if this arrangement suits them;
- “Loss of property value” is not a valid planning concern. Of more relevance are the amenity factors that may contribute to the perception;
- The proposed removal of a brick wall on the side boundary is reasonable, as it is to be replaced with new paling fencing;
- Stormwater run-off would largely be directed to an on-site detention system and no off-site drainage impacts have been identified;
- Council policy encourages higher density multi-unit development in this location.

8 REFERRALS

8.1 There were no external referrals authorities for the application.

8.2 The application was referred to a number of Service units within Council and the following table summarises the responses:

Service Unit	Comments
Engineering & Technical Services Unit (Drainage)	• Outfall drainage is available. • An on-site stormwater detention system is required.
Engineering & Technical Services Unit (Vehicle Crossing)	• A future roundabout at the intersection of Beverley Street and Milan Street is proposed under the Council's Capital Works Program. • As part of any approved plan for the development, the applicant must refer to Council's finalised construction plans for the roundabout at the intersection of Beverley Street and Milan Street. • Reduced levels (AHD) in these plans require to be referred to amend the subject site's plan including proposed crossover levels and footpath level. Any changes to the footpath in front of the subject site require to be approved by Council's Asset Maintenance division. • The east side of the crossover has a narrow width compared to the west side. Accessway grade to be reviewed in accordance with the crossover levels and foot path levels due to the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Beverley Street and the Milan Street (a detailed longitudinal section at an appropriate scale must be provided). • The proposed accessway serves 26 car spaces. The proposed crossover markings have been revised so that the stopping line for the west - east bound traffic along Beverley Street is not impacted. • Two existing crossovers must be removed at the applicant's expense. • Sight lines at the entry/crossover will be satisfactory. • A replacement street tree should be provided on the nature strip in front of the site.
Engineering & Technical Services Unit (Access and Driveway)	• Current plans are not drawn to scale. • Two-way access is defined by locating the intercom system in the middle of the accessway within 5.0m from the street frontage. • Vehicle manoeuvres of Unit 1 and Unit 7 car spaces are obstructed by the

Service Unit	Comments
	reduced accessway width due to the location and frame of the main entrance door of the development. This aspect needs to be reviewed. • It is recommended the applicant widen the underbuilding accessway width to 6.4m providing more straight forward entering/exiting vehicle manoeuvres. • Adjacent garage level differences of 200mm are proposed along the accessway. Any approved plans must demonstrate how to achieve and manage these garage level differences at the boundary of each garage. • Visitor parking requires signposting.
Engineering & Technical Services Unit (Parking Provision and Traffic Impacts)	• Garage and visitor space dimensions are satisfactory. • Parking provision is satisfactory. • There are no traffic issues having considered the proposal in the context of the local traffic conditions and the surrounding street network.
Engineering & Technical Services Unit (Construction Management	• A Construction Management Plan is required.
Engineering & Technical Services Unit (Waste Management)	• Private waste collection is required based on a Waste Management Plan which provides safe and convenient turning for rubbish trucks at the northern end of the access aisle. • Swept path analysis dated 08th April 2015 proposed by TTM Traffic for the waste truck appears to be too tight and is considered to be unsafe. • As the Applicant proposes to accommodate waste truck turning over the visitor parking spaces on waste collection days, parking restrictions would need to be applied to the spaces on waste collection days (sign to be displayed at the entrance).
Engineering & Technical Services (Easements)	• Build over easement approval is not required.
Economic and	• The development, particularly the upper

Service Unit	Comments
Environmental Planning (Urban Design)	levels, is excessively bulky and would benefit from (a combination of) physical breaks between units at first and second floor levels, and from the stepping (in and out) of unit footprints from the east and west boundaries of the site to provide visual relief increased physical separation; both internally, and from neighbouring properties to the east and west. • Elevations and plans provided show the upper levels of the two rows of townhouses extending over and covering the communal driveway. This physical join will screen the vehicle way from view, but I am concerned that building over the driveway creates a very long and monotonous building façade when viewed from the street. This approach also removes the opportunity to get appropriate levels of natural daylight and ventilation into the residential level above. • The small lightcourts are likely to result in poor internal amenity to the reliant rooms. • The site coverage is excessive, with no opportunity provided for secluded private open space at ground level, and very constrained opportunity for boundary landscaping and shade trees. • Dwelling entries on the eastern and western facades of the development have a poor sense of address. • The development proposes the use of black, white and grey concrete blockwork and rendered walls, and silver aluminium cladding. These materials are suitable for use in more urban locations, but are not responsive to the existing neighbourhood character in this location. • If approved, this development should be required to incorporate brickwork, timber and render finishes with a “warm” colour

Service Unit	Comments
	palette.

9 CONCLUSION

9.1 It is considered appropriate to refuse the application. The building design appears to have been predicated on a desire to maximise dwelling yield and floor area.

9.2 The overall architectural presentation is not suited to a local street such as this and the building will be bulky and quite dominating in this well established streetscape, especially due to the impacts from the sheer front walls and its lack of linear articulation.

9.3 The inclusion of a third floor has not provided any notable architectural contribution, but instead detracts from the streetscape and the amenity of neighbouring properties (increased building bulk), while roof-top screening will be a discordant visual element above the main roof line.

9.4 Internal amenity for future residents could most likely be improved by a more thoughtful design approach.

9.5 Parking access arrangements are constrained and there are insufficient landscaping opportunities across the rear and sides of the site. The proposed landscape/fencing treatment of the frontage is also unsatisfactory.

9.6 Objector concerns that the building will not "fit in" to this streetscape are supported.

RECOMMENDATION

That having considered all objections, a REFUSAL TO GRANT A PERMIT be issued in relation to Planning Application No. PL 15/025029 for the development of Nos. 51-53 Beverley Street, Doncaster East for the construction of twelve, three-storey dwellings on the following grounds-

1. **The maximum height of Dwelling 11's roof-top terrace screen is greater than the mandatory 10.0m height limit imposed by the provisions of the Design and Development Overlay Schedule 8-1.**
2. **The three-storey built form of the proposed building provides an inappropriate design response to the immediate neighbourhood and is considered to be excessively bulky and visually dominant, taking into account the limited or inconsequential "stepping in" of parts of the "boxey" upper floor, the prominence of screening to upper level, roof-top terraces, the visual severity/limited articulation of the front elevation, the visual dominance of balconies and the linear form along the sides (non-compliance with the objective of Clause 55.06-1 Detailed design and various architectural design objectives of Schedule 8 to the Design and Development Overlay of the Manningham Planning Scheme).**
3. **Having regard to the visual bulk of the proposed building and what is considered to be an inappropriate design response for this site, the proposed site coverage is excessive, being a result of a repetitive dwelling setout/design approach aimed at achieving large dwellings**

(non-compliance with the objective of Clause 55.03-3 Site coverage and the maximum site coverage recommendation of the relevant design objective of Schedule 8 to the Design and Development Overlay Manningham Planning Scheme).

4. **The specified colour scheme of the proposed building is not suitably responsive to the streetscape character of Beverley Street and would emphasise the bulk of the building (non-compliance with the objective of Clause 55.06-1 Detailed design of the Manningham Planning Scheme).**
5. **The proposal offers no secluded private open space at Ground level and is totally reliant on fully screened balconies and roof-top terraces (with only hatch access) which offer no external outlook and hence, relatively poor amenity for future residents of the proposed three-storey dwellings.**
6. **The proposal is vague in respect of proposed energy efficiency features, especially any associated plant that may be required in roof-top locations and offers no solar protection from summer sun to north-facing habitable room windows (non-compliance with the objectives of Clause 55.03-5 Energy efficiency of the Manningham Planning Scheme)**
7. **The proposed placement of the First Floor main bedrooms in an "in board" arrangement with sole reliance by eight dwellings on compact and potentially unattractive light courts for daylight and ventilation is a poor design response which would lower the amenity of future residents through poor outlook, poor cross-ventilation and possible noise impacts from opposite door openings.**
8. **The majority of dwelling entries have a poor sense of private address and lack weather protection (non-compliance with the objective of Clause 55.05-2 Dwelling entry).**
9. **The proposed landscaping layout and fencing within the front setback are unsatisfactory and do not provide a suitable design response in respect of the limited space which is available (non-compliance with the objective of Clause 55.03-8 Landscaping and Clause 55.06-2 Front fences of the Manningham Planning Scheme).**
10. **The proposed landscaping layout within the rear setback is insufficient to provide a suitable planting regime, taking into account the proximity of proposed planting to paths, retaining walls and boundary fencing (non-compliance with Clause 55.03-8 Landscaping of the Manningham Planning Scheme and the "landscaping around buildings" design objective of Schedule 8 to the Design and Development Overlay of the Manningham Planning Scheme).**
11. **The proposed site cutting and retaining wall/path construction close to the rear boundary is likely to have an adverse impact on the health of existing conifer trees located adjacent to the boundary within 54 Franklin Road, Doncaster East.**
12. **Side path design is linear and monotonous and insufficient garden width is available centrally to create a suitably landscaped "break" in respect of the side presentation of the building.**
13. **The proposed Ground floor layout provides inadequate vehicular manoeuvring space in respect of garage access and would result in inconvenience from multiple vehicular movements to future residents**

and damage to opposite garage doors (non-compliance with Clause 52.06-8 Design standard 2 – Car parking spaces of the Manningham Planning Scheme).

14. **The proposed Ground floor layout provides inadequate manoeuvring space in respect of the "Mini rear loader" rubbish trucks that would be required to service the proposed dwellings, with expected difficulties in turning the trucks, so as to egress the site in a forward direction.**

15. **The proposed "above bonnet" storage shelves within garages will reduce pedestrian accessibility within the garages and do not provide sufficient storage opportunities in order to meet Standard B30 (non-compliance with the Objective of Clause 55.05-6 Storage of the Manningham Planning Scheme).**

"Refer Attachments"

* * * * *