

KINGSTON

10 July 2015

Nepean Planning Consultants Pty Ltd 1 364 Main St MORNINGTON VIC 3931

Dear Sir/Madam,

Application No:

KP-519/2012/A

Proposal:

Development for 23 dwellings and associated car parking

Address: 11-33 Narelle Drive, ASPENDALE GARDENS

Thank you for lodging your application to amend the above planning permit. A formal acknowledgement of the withdrawal of the KP558/2014 will be sent separately.

We have undertaken a preliminary assessment of your application, and request the following additional information to complete the assessment:

- 1. A new application to amend a planning permit form identifying:
  - a) a new permit trigger for a car parking reduction
  - b) the land description to include common property as part of the planning application, and
  - the declaration section completed to identify that the owners corporation have been notified of the proposed plans to construct over common property. Ideally minutes from the owners corporation should be provided to demonstrate that they have been notified of the proposed works.
- 2. A revised planning report which discusses:
  - a) the changes to the existing / approved ground floor plan
  - b) the overall dwelling mix within the development
  - c) response to the relevant decision guidelines of Clause 34.01
  - d) details of what works will be undertaken to the existing air conditioning unit P4 currently shown on the endorsed plans
  - e) the substantial increase in intensity of the development. Whilst we understand the background of the VCAT decision on stage 1 and strategic considerations, we feel further justification should be included given the proportional increase in dwellings proposed.
- 3. The provision of an urban context report and design response in accordance with Clause 52.35. This could utilise some of the information provided within the urban design memo prepared by Hansen Partnership.

The report should also further the discussions in the Hansen report, including:

- a) the design and integration of the development in relation to Hickman Street
- b) consideration of how the building form will be read from within the community open spaces such as the basketball courts, and
- c) consideration of daylight for rooms with borrowed light and effect of overhanging balconies.
- 4. Acoustic and technical documents which support the 'assumptions' of the Hansen Partnership in their urban design memo.
- 5. Structural detailing that illustrates any further structural works that may be required within the centre to support construction within the airspace. We understand that such structural works were required as part of stage 1. Council needs to also clarify that no further allotments would be captured by the works.
- 6. Updated WMP which reflects the new dwelling numbers and mix.
- An updated traffic report that includes new traffic surveys as the 2013 surveys are outdated.
  The traffic report should also identify the change in the ramp arrangement outside of the title boundary.
- A sustainable management plan. As discussed at our meeting this can be developed with Moreland Energy Foundation Limited. Our contact at MEFL is Gavin Ashley, who can be contacted on 9385 8513. We note Council will bear the cost of the MEFL process.
- 9. Site layout plans showing:
  - A clear path of access to get the waste bins to the waste truck as the current layout will not work
  - b) The setbacks of the buildings across all levels from all title boundaries
  - c) Dimensions of all circulation corridors and storage cages
  - d) Distances of the six apartments above the loading bay from the mechanical plant on the roof
  - e) Clarification of the number of stackers units proposed within the development and which spaces fall within each system. For example it appears that spaces 1 to 32 are part of one stacker system
  - f) The title boundaries (as noted on the pdf plans provided to Council) and the allotments to which they relate to shown (eg. via shading or notation)
  - g) The location of all external drying facilities and heating cooling units
  - h) The ramp grade of the lower end of the ramp
  - i) Car parking dimensions shown for all spaces
  - j) Dimensions of the new building forms on the ground floor plan
  - k) The existing loading bay associated with the fruit shop
  - The specific location and details of all mechanical plant on the roof including above the loading dock
  - m) Clarification of the D2 details in front of the car stackers

- n) Acoustic treatments nominated on plan including internal (dealing with stacker noise) and external mechanical plant
- o) Corridor widths shown (1.5m with 1.8m indentations are desirable)
- p) Floor levels on site plans to show level changes (eg. Raised courtyard areas)
- q) Clarification of some window details which have not come up clearly on all plans, and
- r) Room and balcony dimensions.
- 10. Elevation plans showing:
  - a) Internal elevation details of the development
  - b) Floor to ceiling levels shown
  - c) The title boundaries of each of the allotments
  - d) Any lift overruns required
  - e) The maximum building height taken to the highest point of the building
  - f) All plans to nominate fixed, operable, obscured glazing treatments, and
  - g) Details of measures to minimise direct internal views between terrace / balcony spaces.
- 11. Section diagrams showing:
  - a) Floor to ceiling levels that will accommodate the waste truck operations, and
  - b) The title boundaries of each of the allotments.
- 12. A concept landscape plan indicating low plantings, shrubs, trees and the like within the communal areas and any within the ground floor areas. Within the communal space, plantings should be considered to contribute to and be balanced with amenity.
- 13. Streetscape elevations showing the built form in the context of Kearney Drive
- 14. Perspective illustrations showing views of the building from:
  - a) The opposite side of the street from Hickman Avenue
  - b) The car park / basketball court of the communal area
  - c) The corner of Narelle Drive and Hickman Avenue
- 15. Shadow diagrams at a measureable scale (eg. 1:500). These should also include details of the adjacent community centre, basketball court etc.
- 16. An A3 and electronic set of all plans requested above.

This information is requested pursuant to section 54 of the *Planning and Environment Act* 1987 (the Act)

All information must be received by 8 September 2015.

Your application will lapse if all information is not received on or before this date. You may request an extension of time to provide the information. This request must be made on or before the above date. The Act does not allow you to make a request to extend the time for providing this information after the above date.

Note: Requirements pursuant to Section 54(1)(B) of the Act.

We advise that the proposal has moved forward since our original discussions and the inclusion of internal courtyard spaces provides for improved amenity opportunities on site. The building form has also moved forward in a positive direction and we provide the following comments to further refine the development in order to move to a mutually acceptable outcome.

## Development in common property

In this instance Council suggests that consent to construct over common property is obtained prior to moving the project further as the design and layout is dependent on the utilisation of these spaces to deliver the proposal. Council would like to be confident that the building footprint is supported by the Owners' Corporation, as if this is not the case, our discussions could be futile.

### **Built form**

We suggest that the protrusions into common property should be reconsidered to improve the connections between stage 1 which is wholly contained within the site boundaries. The projected balconies do not appear to relate to stage 1 and create a presentation of a mass that sits atop a small scale neighbourhood centre.

If the application continues to include common property, we believe that an opportunity to improve the 'fit' of the new and existing developments could be achieved by revising the existing canopy treatment of the centre. Given the application includes common property, this could further visually integrate the forms. The same could be said for landscaping opportunities within the car park, with greenery providing visually softening finishing of the whole site.

Opportunities to 'ground' the south-east elevation of the ramp where it does not impede car parking spaces. This should improve the relationships of the building forms and limit the large voids that erode the building form along the south-east elevation.

Architectural detailing of the grey band enclosing lower section of the car park should be reconsidered to provide a high quality architectural treatment that results in greater interest and creates and opportunity to relate the proposal with the existing forms.

The architectural detailing also appears to change where the building faces the LL Stevenson Reserve and assocaited buildings. We seek to ensure that a high quality design treatment is achieved as any taller forms will be visible along all elevations.

#### Impact on existing commercial areas

We still suggest that the built form over the loading area contributes to an extensive and excessive form an length. We suggest that these dwelling are removed from the plan. We also have concerns that the support structure will effect and constrain the operations of this area. Given the primary purpose of the Commercial 1 Zone, residential development should not compromise commercial uses (particularly where constructed outside of the title boundary of lot S2).

# Traffic and car parking

There are strong concerns with the functionality of the car parking area including not achieving two way access into stage 2, the use of 'small' car parking spaces, relevant turning clearances not being achieved, reduced accessway widths and the need to undertake multiple movements to enter and egress from parking spaces. Given an application for reduction is proposed, the floor plate of the building (plus extensions into common property are proposed) and the area is not proximate to alternative transport it is considered that the site constraints do not warrant trade-offs in compliance with Clause 52.06 and the Australian Standard.

Noting concerns with borrowed light to dwellings on this level, the area of the car park could be increased, with the dwellings reduced in depth and widened to achieve a better level of internal amenity.

Pedestrian safety within the car park should be further reviewed given the need for occupants of Stage 2 to enter Stage 1 for storage and waste needs.

## Internal Amenity

We ask if there is further opportunity to improve the day and sunlight access to the southern courtyard which is encumbered by access corridors and roofs above. Is there an opportunity to 'flip' the arrangement with a corridor on the south-east and provide for north oriented open space? Further to this we ask if there are opportunities to include glazing above entrance doors where benefitting from the internal communal space where daylight / ventilation gains could be achieved?

We note that the suggestions of Hansen Partnership reading daylight have not been adopted and Council would not recommend options including borrowed light and an alternative arrangement should be sought to deal with the constraints. We identify that this portion has been provided for 14 of the 16 dwellings on the first floor of Stage 2.

It is our position that borrowed light is a poor amenity option and that dwellings should be designed to achieve direct daylight access to all habitable spaces. Saddleback arrangements should also be avoided where the light corridor length is extensive and in further affected by any overhanging built form.

The design of open spaces, terraces and the like should have consideration of opportunities to physically connect with communal open space. Also, the encroachments of services such as air conditioning units and clothes drying facilities should be considered when looking at usable space. These should also be considered in the overall design to ensure that they hidden from view. We suggest that all balconies and terraces should achieve a minimum depth of 2m, which appears to be achieved for a number of dwelling typologies.

# **Circulation Spaces**

Circulation spaces on level 1 of Stage 2 have no opportunity for natural light or ventilation. Opportunities to improve these lengthy corridors should be considered to create a pleasant experience within these spaces.

#### Services

The proposed location for mailboxes is hidden and it is unclear as to whether Australia Post would service this space. Further a better level of protection and amenity should be achieved as this area serves as a second entrance to the development.

The lobby should be also considered at the car parking level as the second lift is hidden in amongst the bin storage and storage cages creating a very confined pedestrian space.

We also suggest that 6m³ externally accessible storage provided for each dwelling and over bonnet storage avoided.

The above concerns are best addressed prior to any formal advertising of the application.

You can track the progress of your application on-line at Kingston's planning register which you can find at, <a href="www.kingston.vic.gov.au/link/planning">www.kingston.vic.gov.au/link/planning</a>.

If you have any queries, or would like to make an appointment to discuss the abovementioned concerns please contact Tara Bell on 03 9581 4888 or email: tara.bell@kingston.vic.gov.au

Yours faithfully.

Tara Bell

Principal Planner - Statutory Planning

