ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL

AGENDA

26 AUGUST 2002
To Councillors

Notice is hereby given that an Ordinary Meeting of the Port Phillip City Council will be held in the Council Chamber, St Kilda Town Hall on Monday, 26 August 2002 at 6.00pm.

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES
2. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST
3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS
   • Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Port Phillip City Council held on 22 July 2002.
   • Minutes of the Special Council Meeting of the Port Phillip City Council held on 29 July 2002.
   • Minutes of the Statutory Planning Committee of the Port Phillip City Council held on 12 August 2002.
4. OBSERVANCE OF A MINUTE SILENCE FOR JOHN MICKLES – FORMER MAYOR, ST KILDA CITY COUNCIL
5. PETITIONS AND JOINT LETTERS
6. SEALING SCHEDULE
7. CORRESPONDENCE
8. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME
9. PRESENTATION OF REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
   • Reports of the Statutory Planning Committee - 12 August 2002.
10. ORDERS OF THE DAY
11. REPORTS BY DELEGATES APPOINTED TO OTHER BODIES
12. URGENT BUSINESS
13. COUNCILLORS QUESTION TIME
14. CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS
   Including reports considered at the Strategy and Policy Review Committee and the Statutory Planning Committee.

David Spokes
Chief Executive Officer
21 AUGUST 2002
4. OBSERVANCE OF A MINUTE SILENCE FOR JOHN MICKLES – FORMER MAYOR, ST KILDA CITY COUNCIL

Councillors, to stand for a minute silence to mark the passing of John Mickles, St Kilda Councillor and former Mayor, in Queensland on 29 June 2002.

John Mickles was a Councillor for St Kilda's South Ward from 1956 -1968 and Mayor from 1961 to 1962.

In 1957, he was one of the Councillors who attended the Commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the first Meeting of the St Kilda Council.
5. PETITIONS AND JOINT LETTERS
6. SEALING SCHEDULE

The following documents are submitted for signature and sealing:

CONTRACT NO. 0615 between PORT PHILLIP CITY COUNCIL and JOHN TORTTER AND SON PTY LTD, for the provision of alterations and additions to the Albert Park Library Redevelopment.
Item previously not considered by Council. This contract has been considered via a report by the Director Infrastructure and Environment under delegate approval.
**Responsible Manager:** Rosa Marguccio, Manager Assets and Environment.

SECTION 173 AGREEMENT between PORT PHILLIP CITY COUNCIL and the DIRECTOR OF HOUSING, Condition 5 of Planning Permit No. 1353/2000 at 306-308 Dorcas Street, South Melbourne, requires a fundamental aspect of this permit that all elements of this approval, particularly the environmental features required under Condition 1(k) are developed as approved by the Responsible Authority.
Item previously considered by Council on 9 July 2001.
**Responsible Manager:** Bruce Phillips, Manager Planning and Building Services.

TRANSFER OF LAND between PORT PHILLIP CITY COUNCIL and JASADAC NOMINEES PTY LTD and JOHN SAUNDERS, for the sale of a right-of-way at 189 St Kilda Road, St Kilda.
Item previously considered by Council on 23 December 1994.
**Responsible Manager:** Robert Palmer, Project Manager Council Liaison & Technical Services.

FUNDING AND SERVICE AGREEMENT between PORT PHILLIP CITY COUNCIL and COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA (represented by and acting through the Department of Family and Community Services), for the provision of City of Port Phillip Child Care support – Supplementary services program (Children’s Services Resource and Development Officer) under the Child Care Support Program.
Item previously not considered by Council.
**Responsible Manager:** Sally Calder, Director Social and Cultural Development.

FUNDING AND SERVICE AGREEMENT between PORT PHILLIP CITY COUNCIL and COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA (represented by and acting through the Department of Family and Community Services), for the provision of City of Port Phillip Home Based Child Care under the Child Care Support Program.
Item previously not considered by Council.
**Responsible Manager:** Sally Calder, Director Social and Cultural Development.

**RECOMMENDATION**
That the Common Seal of the Port Phillip City Council be affixed to the above documents.
7. CORRESPONDENCE

Item 1

A copy of the Confidential List of Registered Correspondence for the Mayor and Councillors between the months of 17 July to 20 August 2002 is attached for information.
8. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME
9. PRESENTATION OF REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

9(A) REPORTS OF THE STRATEGY AND POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE HELD AT THE ST KILDA TOWN HALL ON 5 AUGUST 2002

A1 EXTENSION TO LEASE AREA - SAILS ON THE BAY RESTAURANT

Purpose
Sails on the Bay Restaurant has made a planning application to Council that requires an extension to the current leased area of some two metres by the width of the building.

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION

1. That the report of the Special Project Co-ordinator and Manager, City Works & Services be received; and
   a) Council consents in principle to the extension of the footprint area of Sails on the Bay Restaurant;
   b) That authority to enter into a lease for the additional area only be granted if the current Town Planning Application for the area is successful;
   c) That the Manager, Governance and Risk Management be authorized to prepare and execute the necessary documents.

Note:
*The Director Governance and Council Services to advise Cr Brand via Councillor Notes, of the progress of the Planning Permit and in particular to the design in regards to this development.
A2 SUAI ACTIVITIES REPORT

Purpose
To update council on the recent visit to Suai by the Mayor and the Friends of Suai Coordinator and the key activities of recent ERC and CSG meetings.

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION


2. That Council receive the Covalima District Development Plan 2002 and the Covalima District Profile as attached.

3. That Council receive and note the key issues discussed at the External Relations Committee and Friends of Suai Community Steering Group meetings held since last reported to Council.

4. That Council appoint Cr Brand as a member to the External Relations Committee replacing Cr Hill.
A3 LONG TERM ACCOMMODATION STRATEGY FOR THE CITY OF PORT PHILLIP
(SEE SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT)

Purpose
To consider the report prepared by Macroplan Pty Ltd on the long term accommodation options for the City of Port Phillip and recommend the formation of a steering committee to consider the proposal in further detail.

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION

1. A Steering Committee be established comprising Councillors Johnstone, Logan and Hill to continue the review of Council’s future accommodation requirements.

2. Key staff including the CEO, the Director Corporate Development and the Director Governance and Council Services shall support the work of the Committee.

3. The Steering Committee shall provide a report to Council regarding the long term effective utilisation of Council’s buildings in the November meeting cycle.

4. That revised Terms of Reference be prepared in Consultation with Councillors and presented to Council for finalisation on 26 August 2002.
A4 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES AND DIRECTIONS 2002/03
SEE SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

Purpose
To inform Council on the future environmental issues and priorities that will be addressed over the coming year.

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council note the report and request further advice to Council outlining how the Biosis report will progress the intent of indigenous vegetation and impact on the issues contained within the report.

Note:
*Director Infrastructure and Environment to provide a supplementary report outlining how the Biosis works will inform the management of indigenous vegetation.
A5 SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP (SEAC TO MAKE A SUPPLEMENTARY VERBAL PRESENTATION TO COUNCIL)

Purpose
To review community membership of the Sustainable Environment Advisory Committee.

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that:
   a) Membership remain at 8 community members and the frequency of meetings be reduced to occur every six weeks (as opposed to monthly).
   b) That SEAC be made aware of this Committee’s recommendation and be invited to make any further submissions to Council before 26 August 2002.
Purpose
To note and consider the draft Road User Safety Strategy. To consider placing on public exhibition for the period 7 August - 21 August before further consideration to adopt revised document at full Council on 26 August.

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION

2. That Council place the Draft City of Port Phillip Road User Safety Strategy on public exhibition for the period 7 – 21 August 2002.

3. That a supplementary report be prepared for the ordinary meeting of Council, 26 August 2002, tabling a revised draft Road User Safety Strategy with consideration of community feedback.

4. That the revised Draft Road User Safety Strategy be considered for Council adoption at that time.

5. That all members of the Road User Safety Steering Committee be thanked for their valuable input and time commitment.

A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED.
A7 CABLE RELOCATION - INTRODUCTION OF A SPECIAL RATE
(SEE SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT)

Purpose
To update Councillor on the Cable Relocation Project.

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that Council:
   a) Note the process that has occurred to bring these projects to their current stage of preparation for implementation.
   b) Support in principle the implementation of cable relocation projects in St Vincent Place, South Melbourne and the Ormond Road shopping centre, Elwood.
   c) Agree to receive a Supplementary Report at its meeting on 26 August 2002 containing details of costs and the extent of funds to be raised by a Special Rate.
   d) Council note the unavoidable costs incurred to date in progressing these investigations and requests future advice as to options to reduce these costs and prioritise sites for consideration.
A8 CULTURAL PROGRAMS BOARD REPORT

Purpose
The report provides Council with an overview of the last eight months of the Cultural Programs Board’s activities and its recommendations for arts and cultural programs.

MOVED Crs Hill/Brand


2. That Council request an updated Budget to be provided.

Note:
* The Director Social and Cultural Development to provide further information at the Council Meeting to be held on 26 August 2002, in regards to the Port Phillip Festival Budget.
A9 REVIEW OF THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE CITY OF PORT PHILLIP AND ITS INDIGENOUS COMMUNITY

Purpose
To present a revised Memorandum of Understanding effective from 2002 – 2005.

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council endorse the revised, new MOU with the Indigenous community as at attachment 1, including its themes, principles (as per previous MOU) signatories, and establishment of a new Indigenous Advisory Committee:
   - Themes:
     - Collaboration and Communication
     - Social Justice and Equity
     - Employment and Economic Development
     - Notes that all of the above continue to include existing programs such as arts and culture and the Indigenous Recruitment Strategy.
   - Signatories:
     - Mayor, City of Port Phillip
     - Chairperson, Binjurrum Regional Council ATSIC
     - Chairperson, Ngwala Willumbong Co-operative
     - Elders of the Kulin nation
     - Indigenous Community representative/s
     - Community representatives
     - CEO, City of Port Phillip

2. That Council endorse an Indigenous (Wurundjeri language) name for the document, as proposed by members of the Indigenous project reference group and select from the Indigenous phrase to describe its purpose:
   - Nallei jerring (pronounced Nally jer-ring) - Meaning: Adjoin, to be connected to.
A10  URBAN HISTORY CENTRE CONCEPT - PROGRESS REPORT

Purpose
To present an update on Urban History Centre concept development, funding campaign, and a proposal for formation of an Urban History Advisory Group.

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council notes this report and:

   a) Acknowledge the contribution made by members of the Urban History Centre Reference group, to concept development of the UHC.

   b) Confirm the location of a UHC at the Emerald Hill site, alongside the Emerald Hill Library.

   c) Seek architectural advice on the feasibility of an UHC at the Emerald Hill Library site, including costings of options.

   d) Endorse establishment of an Urban History Advisory Committee with the Terms of Reference to include further discussion on partnerships between the Art and Heritage Unit and Historical Societies and heritage networks.

   e) Request a more detailed project plan for a fundraising campaign be developed.
A11 MIDDLE PARK LIFE SAVING CLUB - BUILDING FUTURE DECISION

Purpose
To provide an update to Council on progress with improvements to the Middle Park Life Saving Club, and seek Council direction on options provided in this report for the next steps.

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council support Stage 1 of the proposed works for improvements to the Middle Park Life Saving Club, being that part of the building to be occupied by the LSC, at a cost of $85,000.

2. a) Council reject Part 9.2 of the Report at this stage.
   b) That Council put on hold Stage 2 of the proposed works, and work with the community and life saving clubs to consider future options for the Harold Alexander Pavilion, consistent with the intent of the Life Saving Club Review.
   c) That further advice be provided in relation to the process to be undertaken to consider these issues in the context of the LSC Review.

3. That Council reconfirm the intent of the Life Saving Club review, with a focus on:
   a) Increasing the viability of clubs.
   b) Integrating/co-locating activities and functions, within existing buildings.
   c) More foreshore open space.
   d) Less foreshore buildings.
   e) Establishing clear priorities for future development of Life Saving Club buildings

4. That Officers report back to Council in February 2003 on options for the implementing the LSC Review.
A12 DRAFT PORT PHILLIP INDUSTRY AND BUSINESS STRATEGY

Purpose

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that Council:


b) Release the Draft Port Phillip Industry and Business Strategy for consultation that shall include:
   - One month public display and submission period for the Draft Strategy, with the document available for viewing at the Town Halls and libraries.
   - Letter and facts sheet to property owners and occupiers in the existing Industrial 1 and 3, Business 3 and Mixed Use Zones and adjacent residential areas, key community groups and other stakeholders (including State Government agencies).
   - Notice in the two local newspapers.
   - Draft Strategy and a facts sheet on Council’s web site.

c) Endorse the Draft Port Phillip Industry and Business Strategy for consultation purposes only and will make a decision regarding the objectives, strategies and actions in the Draft Strategy after the consultation period has closed and after considering any submissions received.

d) Endorse the officer comments with respect to the rezoning requests for the north-eastern corner of Graham Street and Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, 380 City Road, Southbank (and also for 115 Whiteman Street and 412 City Road), 11-31 Montague Street, South Melbourne and 222 Kingsway, included in Section 4 of this report, and authorise the Manager Planning and Building Services to inform the relevant parties of the Council’s resolution.

e) Note the final suggested action on Page 16 of the Consultant Report and request officers to specifically consult with the City of Melbourne and relevant State Government Departments,

f) That a copy of the Draft be forwarded to the Inter Departmental Committee considering Municipal Boundaries for it information.

FURTHER

Council request the Mayor and CEO to issue a Media Statement and take whatever other action necessary to correct the inaccurate and biased reports in both the Sunday Herald Sun, the Emerald Hill Times and Melbourne Times in relation to this matter.
A13 IMPLEMENTATION OF TOLERANCE ZONES – APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM WITHDRAWN.
A14  SERVICE REVIEWS – DIRECT COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Purpose
To update Council on the progress of involving the community in a consultation process related to Service Reviews and Service Levels.

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION

1. Council agrees to establish a community consultation process for Best Value using the focus group methodology as described in Option 3 with this process to commence in August 2002.

2. Council adopts the attached flowchart for Service Reviews incorporating the community consultation process.

3. Council agrees to include feedback from community consultation in the overall service review documentation.

4. Council to receive an update by way of Councillor’s Notes by December 2002 about the progress of the community consultation process and its impact on the overall service review process.
Note: Business Items B1 and B3 were resolved by the Statutory Planning Committee held on Monday, 12 August 2002, in accordance with Section 86 of the Local Government Act 1989.

**B2 71-73 BLESSINGTON STREET, ST KILDA**

**Purpose**
The construction of 6 dwellings with basement carparking.

**COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION**

1. That this item be deferred to seek further advice on matters including:
   a) The impact on the bungalow and the two units adjacent.
   b) Options to further reduce the scale, visual bulk and the impact in particular of the 3rd storey element on Irymple Avenue.
   c) Location of adjacent Heritage Overlays and any impact of this proposal on those Heritage Areas.
   d) Parking restrictions in the vicinity.
**B4 TO REPORT ON SIGNIFICANT PLANNING DECISIONS FROM VCAT**

**Purpose**
To provide a summary of recent VCAT decisions.

**COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION**

1. That Council not the report.
2. Council request the Chief Executive Officer to ensure that notwithstanding VCAT’s unwarranted comments in 184 Heath Street, that no resident or visitor parking permits ever be issued to 54 to 60 Nott Street.
3. Council requests the Chief Executive Officer to ensure a report is presented to Council in the September 2002 meeting cycle that discusses and presents options to ban the issuing of resident and visitor permits for all new development across the city, and also requests advice as to appropriate exemptions.

**Note-**
*Councillor Johnstone requested the Director City Development to consider referring the issue of transport and parking to the list of priority topics for the Corporate Plan.*
B5  DELEGATE REPORT

Purpose
To present Council with a summary of all Planning Permits issued under delegated authority.

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION

That the Council receive and note the report regarding the summary of all Planning Permits issued in accordance with the Schedule of Delegation made under Section 98 of the Local Government Act 1989 and Section 188 of the Planning & Environment Act 1987 adopted by Council on 24 July 1996 for the Port Phillip Planning Scheme.
B6 TOLERANCE ZONES – ESTABLISHMENT OF PANEL

Purpose
Chief Executive Officer to provide a status report on this issue.

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. Reaffirms its support for the AGSPAG package of reforms to manage street sex work.

2. Notes the verbal report of the CEO regarding progress in development of the terms of reference and agrees to the extra time required to allow completion of discussions with the police and other stakeholders.

3. Defers finalisation of the Terms of Reference and the panel process until the further advice from AGSPAG is received.

4. Requests that advice is sought from Victoria Police about the operational feasibility of any proposed sites.

5. Upon receipt of further advice from AGSPAG, council consider referring a staged process to an independent panel to ensure effective community discussion and understanding.

6. Withdraws all sites including the four 'short listed' sites from consideration, in accordance with the above resolutions.

7. Requests that no further action is taken on notification of any sites until the application and interpretation of the criteria is resolved.

8. That an amended communications plan be presented to Council.
10. ORDERS OF THE DAY

ORDER OF THE DAY 1
RAGLAN STREET/INGLES STREET PORT MELBOURNE

(Refer to attached Report).

ORDER OF THE DAY 2
RAGLAN/INGLES/CROCKFORD STREETS PORT MELBOURNE

(Refer to attached Report).

ORDER OF THE DAY 3
IN PRINCIPLE APPROVAL OF THE 2001/2002 ANNUAL REPORT CONTENT

(Refer to attached Report).

ORDER OF THE DAY 4
BEST VALUE VICTORIA REPORT 2001/2002

(Refer to attached Report).

ORDER OF THE DAY 5
REQUESTS AND COMPLAINTS SERVICE REVIEW -UPDATE AND FUTURE ACTIONS

(Refer to attached Report).

ORDER OF THE DAY 6
COMMENCEMENT OF NAMING PROCESS FOR TWO PUBLIC WALKWAYS AT INKERMAN OASIS DEVELOPMENT

(Refer to attached Report).
ORDER OF THE DAY 7
CITY OF PORT PHILLIP’S INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY POWER (CONFIDENTIAL)

(Refer to attached Report).

ORDER OF THE DAY 8
WOODSTOCK ROOMING HOUSE PROJECT – OUTCOME OF TENDER PROCESS FOR ONGOING ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES (CONTRACT 0625) (CONFIDENTIAL)

(Refer to attached Report).
11. REPORTS BY DELEGATES (COUNCILLOR) APPOINTED TO OTHER BODIES
12. URGENT BUSINESS
13. COUNCILLORS QUESTION TIME
14. CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS

A15 EVALUATION OF TENDERS 14/01/0608, 14/01/0607 & 14/01/0612
1. KEY ISSUES

1.1. To adopt a revised Terms of Reference for the Steering Committee established to consider long-term office accommodation options.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. The Strategy and Policy Review Committee at its meeting held on 5 August considered a report regarding long term office accommodation options.

2.2. It was resolved at that meeting that a Steering Committee be established and that the proposed Terms of Reference for the committee be further reviewed and presented to council for adoption.

3. PROPOSAL

3.1. A meeting of the Accommodation Steering Committee was held on 12 August. Included on the agenda for that meeting was the discussion of the draft Terms of Reference.

3.2. The Steering Committee agreed that the following Terms of Reference be presented to the council for consideration:

3.2.1. Identify and confirm current and future issues with the existing accommodation arrangements including:

(1) Community access to council services
(2) Organisational effectiveness
(3) Community access to governance functions
(4) Costs
(5) Building issues
(6) Utilisation of available space
(7) The maximum level of space that can be provided for community use in a sustainable way

3.2.2. Undertake a high-level analysis of any alternative accommodation options developed which would provide a triple bottom line assessment of factors including:

(1) Optimal service delivery to the community
(2) Increased organisational efficiency
(3) Maximise space available for community use
(4) Operational costs
(5) Communication within the organisation

3.2.3. Recommend to council options for the long-term effective utilization of key council buildings. Depending on the outcome of the initial investigations, a range of options may be developed ranging from doing nothing to a substantial redevelopment

4. OPTIONS

4.1. Council can either adopt the Terms of Reference as recommended by the Steering Committee or make modifications as it sees fit.

5. POLICY CONTEXT

5.1. The Steering Committee would operate within the relevant Terms of Reference as adopted by council.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

6.1. Any alternative accommodation options must take into account factors such as but not limited to:

6.1.1. Optimal service delivery to the community;
6.1.2. Increased organisational efficiency; and
6.1.3. Maximisation of space for community use

7. TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE ASSESSMENT

7.1. The Terms of Reference make specific reference to the undertaking of any high level analysis of any alternative accommodation options developed must take into account a triple bottom line assessment of specified factors.

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

8.1. The Steering Committee will be resourced by the CEO, the Director of Corporate Development and the Director of Governance and Council Services.
9. INTERNAL CONSULTATION

9.1. The revised Terms of Reference has been discussed and agreed to by the Steering Committee.

10. EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

10.1. No external consultation has been undertaken at this stage.

11. IMPLEMENTATION

11.1. The Terms of Reference will be effective upon adoption by Council.

12. CONCLUSION

12.1. The following revised Terms of Reference has been discussed and agreed to by the Steering Committee that consists of Councillors Johnstone, Hill and Logan together with Senior Council Officers and is therefore presented to council for consideration.

13. RECOMMENDATION

13.1. That council adopts the following revised Terms of Reference for the Steering Committee established to consider long-term office accommodation options.

13.1.1. Identify and confirm current and future issues with the existing accommodation arrangements including:

- Community access to council services
- Organisational effectiveness
- Community access to governance functions
- Costs
- Building issues
- Utilisation of available space
- The maximum level of space that can be provided for community use in a sustainable way

13.1.2. Undertake a high-level analysis of any alternative accommodation options developed which would provide a triple bottom line assessment of factors including:

- Optimal service delivery to the community
- Increased organisational efficiency
- Maximise space available for community use
- Operational costs
- Communication within the organisation
13.1.3. Recommend to council options for the long-term effective utilisation of key council buildings. Depending on the outcome of the initial investigations, a range of options may be developed ranging from doing nothing to a substantial redevelopment.
1. **KEY ISSUES**

   1.1. Council has requested supplementary information on whether the Natural Habitat Areas Heritage Assessment, undertaken by Biosis, will address the management of biodiversity within the City of Port Phillip.

2. **CONTEXT**

   2.1. The Sustainable Environment Advisory Committee (SEAC) undertook a review of the Sustainable Environment Strategy (SES) and existing environmental programs earlier this year. SEAC identified opportunities for improvement and suggested environmental priorities to Council on 6th May 2002.

   2.2. One prioritised recommendation was that Council should focus on developing a biodiversity strategy.

   2.3. Council has recently commissioned the consultants, Biosis, to undertake a heritage assessment of natural habitat areas for the City of Port Phillip.

   2.4. At the Council meeting of 5th of August, Council requested supplementary information be provided on whether the Biosis report will address SEAC’s concerns over biodiversity.

   2.5. The primary objective of the project is to utilise the Australian Natural Heritage Charter to assess each nominated natural heritage area and to work with all interested community groups, in ranking each site according to its heritage values.
2.6. Seventeen sites have been nominated for assessment and these are provided in Attachment A.

2.7. The heritage assessment of each area has involved detailed flora and fauna inventories and extensive community consultation. The final report will provide recommendations on the development of specific management plans and conservation principles that may be required.

2.8. The draft report as developed by Biosis will be finalised by the end of August.

3. PROPOSAL

3.1. The Biosis report will involve a study of flora and fauna within those sites nominated, outline a blueprint for management for specific sites and is the first step towards the development of a municipal biodiversity strategy.

3.2. A municipal biodiversity strategy would:

- outline Council's commitment towards conserving and improving biodiversity;
- identify what Council programs are currently influencing biodiversity;
- recommend what further actions need to be undertaken.

3.3. The report is not a complete biodiversity strategy, although it provides a basis as to whether a strategy should be developed by Council.

4. OPTIONS

4.1. Council utilize the Biosis report to govern the management of indigenous areas.

4.2. In addition to developing management plans, Council uses the information provided in the Biosis report as a basis to consider the development of a municipal biodiversity strategy.

5. POLICY CONTEXT

5.1. Protecting and improving biodiversity is a key theme of the Sustainable Environment Strategy. Both a biodiversity strategy and the Biosis report complement this strategic direction.
6. **SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

6.1. **Social** - All environmental projects and outcomes aim to enhance community relationships through participation. Protecting and improving biodiversity will ensure a ‘cleaner and greener’ environment for the Port Phillip community and future generations.

6.2. **Economic** – A full municipal biodiversity strategy will require approximately $40K for its development. The implementation of the Biosis report will not require extra resources, as it will govern decision-making and maintenance regimes for the management of natural heritage areas. This will be contained within the existing maintenance contract. Should management plans be required, these will need to be considered through the capital works program.

6.3. **Environmental** – The Biosis report will present a positive approach to supporting effective environmental management, in an aim to reduce environmental impacts from Council operations and the community, whilst striving for positive environmental outcomes.

6.4. **Cultural** – The Biosis report will positively contribute to the city’s physical and cultural environment by the improvement of air and water quality, open spaces and biodiversity. They also actively support the involvement of all members of the community, regardless of demographics.

7. **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

7.1. The implementation of the Biosis report will not require extra resources and is contained within the existing maintenance contracts. Should management plans be required, these will need to be considered through the capital works program. The cost of the report has been approximately $15K.

7.2. A full municipal biodiversity strategy will require approximately $40K will be required for its development, which may be reduced, dependent upon the outcome of the Biosis report.

8. **INTERNAL CONSULTATION**

8.1. Consultation has been undertaken and will continue with:

- All Councilors
- General Management Team (GMT)
- All staff involved in environmental projects
9. **EXTERNAL CONSULTATION**

9.1. External consultation has been undertaken with the Sustainable Environment Advisory Committee (SEAC), local community groups and through Community Satisfaction Surveys.

10. **IMPLEMENTATION**

10.1. The Biosis report will govern the management and decision making process for natural heritage areas. Depending on the results of the study, site-specific management plans may be an outcome for certain areas.

11. **CONCLUSION**

11.1. The Biosis report involves a study of flora and fauna within the sites nominated, and outlines a blueprint for management of indigenous vegetation. It is a sound basis to determine the need for a municipal biodiversity strategy.

11.2. The report is not a complete biodiversity strategy, although it provides a sound basis as to whether a strategy should be developed by Council.

12. **COMMUNICATION**

12.1. The results of the Biosis report will be communicated to key stakeholders such as SEAC and the community groups that have been involved in the consultation process.

13. **RECOMMENDATION**

13.1. That the Biosis report be utilized as a basis to determine the requirement of a future municipal biodiversity strategy.
ATTACHMENT A

SITES NOMINATED FOR ASSESSMENT

The natural heritage areas nominated for assessment are:
- Gasworks Park
- St Kilda Botanic Gardens
- Pt Ormond Reserve
- Tea Tree Reserve
- West Beach
- Balaclava Rail
- Blessington Traffic Treatments
- Blessington Way
- Canterbury Rd (urban forest)
- Evans St – Montague St to Graham St Overpass and Graham St Overpass
- Alma Park (remnants along railway)
- Ferras Place (recreated wetland)
- St Kilda Breakwater (penguins)
- St Kilda Junction (Corroboree Tree)
- Foreshore near the end of Pickles St
- Johnson Reserve.
ORDINARY COUNCIL
26 AUGUST 2002   SUPPLEMENTARY VERBAL REPORT

A5   SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP – SUPPLEMENTARY VERBAL REPORT BY SEAC MEMBERS

KEY RESULT AREA:   BUILDING STRONGER COMMUNITIES
LOCATION/ADDRESS:
RESPONSIBLE MANAGER:   DAVID YEQUART – DIRECTOR ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE
AUTHOR:   STEVE CAVICCHIOLO
FILE NO.:   30/05/10-02
ATTACHMENTS:   NIL.

SUPPLEMENTARY VERBAL REPORT TO BE PROVIDED BY SEAC MEMBERS
1. KEY ISSUES


1.2. To consider the nomination of Cr Hutchens as the City of Port Phillip councilor representative on the Inner Melbourne Community Road Safety Council.

1.3. To consider adoption of the Road User Safety Strategy.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Council at its Strategy and Policy Review Committee of the 5 August 2002 resolved:


That Council place the draft City of Port Phillip Road User Safety Strategy on public exhibition for the period 7 – 21 August 2002

That a supplementary report be prepared for the ordinary meeting of Council, 26 August 2002, tabling a revised draft Road User Safety Strategy with consideration of community feedback

That the revised draft Road User Safety Strategy be considered for adoption at that time

That all members of the Road User Safety Strategy Steering Committee be thanked for their valuable input and time commitment’
3. **PROPOSAL**

3.1. The draft City of Port Phillip Road User Strategy has considered and included the significant majority of the comments outlined in section 10, External Consultation.

3.2. It is now proposed to finalise the City of Port Phillip Road User Safety Strategy based on these comments.

3.3. Copies of the final report will be distributed as required. Implementation has already commenced.

4. **OPTIONS**

4.1. No further comment.

5. **POLICY CONTEXT**

5.1. No further comment.

6. **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

6.1. No further comment.

7. **TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE ASSESSMENT**

7.1. No further comment.

8. **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

8.1. As part of the now completed WalkSafe Program, the City of Port Phillip sought and was approved $80,000 funding at the end of the 2000/01 financial year to fund some labour support to continue implementation of non-engineering based road safety programs in the lead up to the preparation of the Road User Safety Strategy.

8.2. These funds were used to employ Andi Green, Community Development Project Worker – Pedestrian & Road Safety over the past 12 months.

8.3. These remaining funds, supported by approved Council funding will allow for continued work (in a part time capacity) in this area for the majority of this financial year.

8.4. Andi Green leaves the City of Port Phillip this week. It is anticipated that an additional resource will be sought to continue this important component of the Road User Safety Strategy.

9. **INTERNAL CONSULTATION**

9.1. No further comment.
10. EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

10.1. Tools of the public exhibition period, 7 – 20 August 2002 were:-

- Copies of the strategy were placed on display, with feedback forms, at all five Council libraries and at the three town hall front counters;
- The strategy was placed in full on Council’s web site with the ability to lodge comments electronically. Hot link from ‘recent news’ on home page also established;
- A press release resulted in a page 1 cover story in the Leader newspaper (Aug 12) and page 3 in The Emerald Hill Times (Aug 7) covering the release of the draft strategy and key findings;
- An article was also included in the Divercity Weekly column of The Emerald Hill Times (Aug 7).

10.2. A total of eight (8) written public submissions were provided. A similar number of phone calls were also taken.

10.3. Comments can be summarized as follows:-

- A need to consider the general aging of the population, noting that the elderly, particularly pedestrians, are in the high risk category of vulnerable road users;
- Highlight further that the City of Port Phillip is largely a developed municipality with little potential for capacity improvements in the road network and that operational management of the existing system will be the key. An example would be to continue the debate on appropriate service levels for each competing road user;
- Include reference to parking management (enforcement of parking restrictions, etc) as examples of recent and current approaches to road user safety in the City of Port Phillip;
- Close down Luna Park and the Upper Esplanade Art Bank, reduce the number of restaurants by 50%, eliminate all street prostitution for good, adjust the CoPP population targets to 1990 levels, include CoPP planners in the implementation of the Road User Safety Strategy;
- Too many isolated polices in CoPP. Need to coordinate and integrate responses across all relevant strategies;
- Noting projected and accepted population increases, and Council strategies to increase attractiveness of our entertainment and activity centre precincts, will increase the potential for road user causalities – The objective is at odds with other Council strategies/positions;
• Technical corrections relating to location of casualty accidents in the Albert Park area;

• Safety concern with intersection of Coventry Street / Kingsway (east side. Details will be forwarded to City of Melbourne;

• Need to increase communication and information of the availability of the community bus;

• Improve pedestrian safety at tram stops;

• Promote safer driving by older drivers, include specific strategies and actions;

• Install sensor signals at particular pedestrian crossings to be actuated without physical contact (Jewish Sabbath);

• Promotion of schools programs will be critical to the success of this component of the strategy, as curriculums are crowded. Programs need to be user friendly and easy to implement. Promote widely the many resources of the City of Port Phillip;

10.4. A number of other comments have also been received from City of Port Phillip staff and those of our road safety partners. Comments can be summarized as follows:-

• City of Port Phillip to have Councilor representation on the Inner Melbourne Community Road Safety Council (IMCRSC). There are 22 Community Road Safety Councils across Victoria. The Councils membership typically consists of local Councils (officers and councilors), residents, police, VicRoads, specific road user groups and public transport service providers. The IMCRSC includes the geographical areas covered by the Cities of Port Phillip, Yarra and Melbourne. The Road Safety Council’s provide closer and coordinated links with relevant road safety partners and provide an important forum to consider more strategic road safety initiatives from a regional perspective. The group typically meets on a monthly basis for 2 hours (third Monday of the month). Meeting dates may need to be reviewed considering clash with Councilor briefing sessions;

• Need to acknowledge that particular road environments may not technically be considered ‘unsafe’ and therefore no action be considered. The community perception of safety at particular locations is to be an important consideration and evidence that action may be required;

• Include an additional action under the key issue area of ‘Community Road Safety Education’ – ‘Develop and implement a model for a site specific approach to allow the integration of engineering and behavioral / education / communication initiatives.’;
• Include an additional action under the key issue area of ‘Leadership, Coordination & Partnerships’ – ‘Continue to discuss and lobby VicRoads to partially fund Council road safety officers’;

• Council to adopt it’s own Green Transport Plan to show leadership. GMT are currently considering this plan.

• All design work in relation to road areas will provide priority for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users;

10.5. A number of grammatical, terminology and formatting comments have also been provided.

11. IMPLEMENTATION

11.1. Already underway.

12. CONCLUSION

12.1. The public exhibition period provided some very positive feedback to shape the final version of City of Port Phillip’s first Road User Safety Strategy.

12.2. The strategy has been prepared over the past 12 months and represents inputs from many Council officers, Cr Hutchens, local stakeholders, our road safety partners and the general community.

12.3. The strategy is considered to be well balanced and providing for the needs of the various road users while recommending strategies which should increase road safety generally in the City of Port Phillip.

13. COMMUNICATION

13.1. No further comment.
14. RECOMMENDATION

14.1. That Council note comments received during the public exhibition period.

14.2. That Council adopt the Road User Safety Strategy with inclusion of the community comments as outlined in section 3 of this report.

14.3. That Cr Hutchens be nominated as the City of Port Phillip Councilor representative on the Inner Melbourne Community Road Safety Council.
1. KEY ISSUES

1.1. The Strategy and Policy Review Committee on 5 August 2002 resolved as follows:

“It is recommended that Council:

a) Note the process that has occurred to bring these projects to their current stage of preparation for implementation.

b) Support in principle the implementation of cable relocation projects in St Vincent Place, South Melbourne and the Ormond Road shopping center, Elwood.

c) Agree to receive a Supplementary Report at its meeting on 26 August 2002 containing details of costs and the extent of funds to be raised by a Special Rate.

d) Council note the unavoidable costs incurred to date in progressing these investigations and requests future advice as to options to reduce these costs and prioritise sites for consideration.”

1.2. This Supplementary Report contains the details of costs and the extent of funds to be raised by a Special Rate in each of the two project areas and provides advice on reducing the costs of investigations and prioritizing sites for cable relocation.
2. COSTS OF WORKS

2.1. Costs for St Vincent Place, South Melbourne

2.1.1. A total of 106 individual properties are within the project area. Based on a detailed scope of work, costs have been estimated as:

- Street works (including a 5% contingency) $349,700
- Property connections $172,757
- Total project cost $522,457

2.1.2. Based on the agreed formula of contributions from various project partners, the cost breakdown is:

**Street Works** ($349,700)
- Council (10%) $34,970
- CitiPower $50,000
- Powerline Relocation Committee $122,395
- Owners $142,335

**Property Connections** ($172,757)
- Owners $172,757

2.1.3. The total amount payable by property owners is therefore $315,092. For the purpose of the Special Rate, it is proposed that a 10 percent contingency be added to this figure, making it $346,601. Once the Contract for construction is let, the actual charge for each property owner can be re-calculated and the actual value of the Special Rate adjusted accordingly.

Map 1 shows the location of affected properties.

2.2. Costs for Ormond Road shopping centre, Elwood

2.2.1. A total of 179 individual properties are within the project area. Based on a detailed scope of work, costs have been estimated as:

- Street works (including a 5% contingency) $286,682
- Property Connections $32,800
- Total project cost $319,482
2.2.2. Based on the agreed formula of contributions from various project partners, the cost breakdown is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Works</strong></td>
<td><strong>($286,682)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council (10%)</td>
<td>$28,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Energy</td>
<td>$15,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Relocation Committee</td>
<td>$149,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>$82,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Connections</strong></td>
<td><strong>($32,800)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>($32,800)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.3. The total amount payable by property owners is therefore $114,959. For the purpose of the Special Rate, it is proposed that a 10 percent contingency be added to this figure, making it $126,455. Once the Contract for construction is let, the actual charge for each property owner can be re-calculated and the actual value of the Special Rate adjusted accordingly.

Schedule B sets out the cost per property.

Map 2 shows the location of affected properties.

3. **REDUCTION IN COSTS**

3.1. The expenditure of the Optus funds to date has comprised:

- Consultancy fees ($25,500 approximately)
- Preliminary cost estimates for five sites ($1,562)
- Quotations for cost of works in St Vincent Place and Ormond Road ($25,200 approximately) and
  - Direct contribution to works:
    1. Reconstruction of the Fitzroy/Canterbury/Grey intersection ($21,000)
    2. Inkerman Oasis ($22,600 approximately)

3.2. There has been considerable knowledge and experience gained through these processes, and it is considered that future sites will require less investigation and both the most cost effective and environmentally beneficial solution can be readily identified based on the knowledge and information now held.
4. PRIORITISATION OF SITES FOR FUTURE CABLE RELOCATION

4.1. Several factors affect the identification of sites for future cable relocation. An analysis of these factors enables the prioritization of sites to occur.

These factors are:

**Availability of funds from the State Government's Powerline Relocation Committee.** This Committee assesses applications from throughout Victoria and favours locations where the community benefit from relocation would be greatest. Such locations are main roads, heritage areas, locations of visual amenity, civic local points, etc.

**The level of property owner willingness to contribute to the cost of cable relocation.** The ‘Optus funds’ would pay for only a small amount of implementation; it is preferable for these funds to be used for administrative costs and as partial contribution to street works. (For St Vincent Place and Ormond Road, the figure is 10 percent). Therefore implementation of undergrounding, aerial bundling or façade mounting requires a high level of owner support in financial terms.

It is proposed that, now that we are well versed in processes and costings, Council is in a position to invite groups of property owners to ‘petition’ Council to obtain estimates for cable relocation, following which implementation could proceed if owners were largely supportive,

**Streets where aerial bundling (ABC) are identified to have significant visual impact, especially where reduced tree pruning would be able to occur,**

**Streets where trenches are to be dug for other purposes such as installation of tree root barriers or data cabling,**

**Streets where electricity companies need to undertake major refurbishment or replacement of their existing infrastructure.**

A key aspect of the on-going cable relocation program is pursuing future sites based on these factors, and within the financial constraints of the Optus funds. The balance of the Optus funds currently stands at about $18,200 (at 13 August 2002).
5. RECOMMENDATION

5.1. It is recommended that Council:

a) Note the process that has occurred to bring these projects to their current stage of preparation for implementation.

b) Support in principle the implementation of cable relocation projects in St Vincent Place, South Melbourne and the Ormond Road shopping center, Elwood.

c) Agree to receive a Supplementary Report at its meeting on 26 August 2002 containing details of costs and the extent of funds to be raised by a Special Rate.

d) Council note the unavoidable costs incurred to date in progressing these investigations and note the advice as to options to reduce these costs and prioritise sites for consideration.

5.2. Resolve to proceed with the statutory process with the intention of declaring a Special Rate for the purpose of streetscape enhancement by cable relocation and associated works in the St Vincent Place, South Melbourne project area. The amount of the Special Rate is not more than $346,601.

5.3. Resolve to proceed with the statutory process with the intention of declaring a Special Rate for the purpose of streetscape enhancement by cable relocation and associated works in the Ormond Road shopping center, Elwood project area. The amount of the Special Rate is not more than $126,455.

5.4. Resolve that Property owners affected by the Special Rate in each project area are to be offered alternative means of payment, namely:

- One installment upon the signage by Council of the construction contract,

- OR

- Five equal installments (adjusted for interest at 7 percent per annum) over five years,

- OR

- Deferred payment, where hardship can be demonstrated, with payment made at the time of next sale of the subject property.

5.5. Authorise the Director City Development and Manager Financial Services to initiate the required statutory processes, together with a program of consultation and advice, to affected property owners to achieve the Special Rate and to provide a further report to Council in accordance with statutory requirements.
| ORDER 1 | RAGLAN STREET/INGLES STREET, PORT MELBOURNE |
| ORDER 1 | RAGLAN STREET/INGLES STREET, PORT MELBOURNE |
| KEY RESULT AREA: | IMPROVING OUR BUILT ENVIRONMENT |
| ADDRESS: | 20-22, 32-32 Raglan Street, and 35-37 Ingles Street, Port Melbourne |
| PROPOSAL: | Multi-dwelling development of the site for a mixture of two, three, four and five storey buildings and a dispensation from the car parking requirements of the Planning Scheme. |
| WARD: | Sandridge |
| NEIGHBOURHOOD | Sandridge |
| TRIGGER FOR DETERMINATION BY | Over 10 objections |
| APPLICATION NO.: | 96/2002 |
| APPLICANT: | Office of Housing |
| EXISTING USE: | Vacant site - formerly housing |
| ABDUTING USES: | Residential, petrol station, commercial |
| ZONING: | Residential 1 Zone |
| OVERLAYS: | Special Building Overlay |
| AMBIT OF DISCRETION: | Clauses 32.01 and 44.05 |
| PLANNING SCHEME PROVISIONS: | Clauses 21 and 22, 32.01, 44.05 |
| STATUTORY TIME REMAINING FOR DECISION AS AT DAY OF COUNCIL | Expired |
| RESPONSIBLE MANAGER: | Geoff Oulton – Director City Development |
| AUTHOR: | Rebecca Stockfeld and Paul Little |
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The application proposes the development of 64 dwellings on part of the site. The dwellings are to be developed for the Office of Housing for public housing, although use of the site for public housing does not require a planning permit. The section of the site not affected by this proposal is subject to a concurrent application for subdivision with design guidelines to control the future development of Lot 1.

Eighteen objections have been received to the application.

Over the course of the application the applicant has modified the proposal, and has requested that Council assess the modified proposal. The amended plans have been circulated with one objector submitting they consent to the modified proposal.

The development of the land for public housing would support Council’s housing policy replacing the housing stock that has been lost from the site.

The proposal requires a variation from Council policy in regard to building height, where part of the development would have a four storey height. The variation to Council policy is considered appropriate as the proposal is on an island site that has the capacity to accommodate a higher form of development fronting two main roads.

The proposal requires a dispensation from the car parking requirements of the planning scheme, which is considered reasonable, given the size of the dwellings and the likely residential type/car ownership level. Visitor parking would be provided on the street, which would repeat the past situation. This is reasonable where there is no loss of on-street parking as a result of the development.

The impact on the surrounding residences, in terms of overlooking and overshadowing are minimized due to the separation of the site from these areas.

It is recommended that the proposal be approved subject to conditions.

**KEY ISSUES**

1. Building height and bulk.
2. Interface with the abutting parkland
3. Interface with the surrounding residential properties.
2. PROPOSAL

2.1. The application for planning permit proposes the development of 64 dwellings on part of the site. The dwellings would be managed by the Office of Housing as public housing (use of the site for public housing does not require a planning permit). The section of the site not affected by this proposal is subject to an application for subdivision with design guidelines to control the future development of Lot 1 (see separate report).

2.2. Over the course of the application modifications to the proposal have been made including; the provision of a semi-basement car park; an increase in height to Block E; all apartments in Block E facing north; a reduction in the number of crossovers to Raglan Street (from five to four), and; detail of the final building finishes.

2.3. The modifications to the proposal were made in response to objections received and concerns raised by Council Officers. The amended plans have been circulated to all persons originally notified and objectors. All objections received (i.e to the amended and original proposal) will be considered in this report.

2.4. The applicant has requested that Council assess and make a determination on the amended plans, therefore this report will address the amended plans.

2.5. The development comprises five buildings, as follows:

Block A (corner Raglan & Crockford Street – older persons units)

Four storeys

22 x 1 bedroom

3 x 2 bedroom

Total 25 units

8 car spaces located adjacent to the building entry.

0.32 car spaces per unit (1 car space per 3.125 units)

Open space provided at ground level and as balconies for upper level apartments.
Block B (facing Raglan Street)

Two storeys

4 x 2 bedroom units

4 car spaces located in the semi basement.

1 car space per unit.

Open space provided at ground level and as balconies for upper level apartments.

Block C (facing Raglan Street)

Two storeys

4 x 1 bedroom units

4 car spaces located in the semi basement.

1 car space per unit.

A community room would be attached to Block C

Open space provided at ground level and as balconies for upper level apartments.

Block D (fronting Raglan and Ingles Street – family housing)

Three storeys

8 x 3 bedroom units

2 x 4 bedroom units

Total 10 units

3 bedroom units have 1 car space each.

4 bedroom units have 2 car spaces each.

Open space provided at ground level; each apartment is built over three levels.
Block E (facing Ingles Street)

Three/four and-a-half storeys – including the semi-basement

21 x 2 bedroom units

1 car space each located in the semi basement.

Open space provided at ground level and as balconies for upper level apartments.

2.6. The site would contain a total of 49 on-site car spaces.

2.7. The concurrent subdivision proposal would create Lot 1, with an area of 1312 square metres, and would provide design guidelines allowing a site coverage of approximately 70%. The site coverage is determined through the maximum building envelope, and could be less depending on the final proposal.

2.8. Lot 2 would have an area of 5295 square metres and a site coverage of 47%.

2.9. The site overall (Lots 1 and 2) would achieve a site coverage of 52% (51.8%). Site coverage, however, does not indicate the amount of hard surfaces, including paths, driveways and car parks.

2.10. Building Design And Architecture

2.11. Block A would have a flat roof and would be constructed from:

Building Cladding

Pressed brickwork – a variety of subtle earthy tones relating to the panellised / articulated facade elements.

Generally stretcher bond pattern, except for the use of header coursing to the top of parapets and window openings.

A palette of three colours is proposed; red, red-brown and blue-manganese.

Glazed wall to entry foyer and above, consisting of clear glazing with powder coated aluminium framing. Silver colour for framing.

Roofs clad in Colourbond metal decking. ‘Gunmetal’ colour

Add-on Structures

Balcony structures constructed of expressed mild steel CHC sections with a galvanised finish.

Floors to balconies to consist of Webforge steel mesh with a galvanised finish.

Balustrades fabricated from woven steel mesh within mild steel RHS frames, all with a galvanised finish.
Down pipes and rainwater heads to have a painted finish to match brickwork colours.

Moveable sunshade screens to balconies fabricated from anodised aluminium sections and shading mesh.

Entry canopy to have an expressed steel channel fascia with a galvanised finish. Roof cladding to be corrugated Colourbond sheeting. ‘Gunmetal’ colour. Soffit to be galvanised finish perforated steel mesh.

Proposed Hard Landscape Features & Fencing

Low level fencing 1000mm high, dividing front yard areas and along the street boundary, constructed of vertical mild steel pickets on a horizontal mild steel frame above a double course, pressed brickwork plinth. Steelwork to have a galvanised finish.

Coloured concrete and concrete pavers for paths and hard landscaped areas

Blocks B and C would be attached and would have an angled parapet roof form. The building finishes would include:

Building Cladding

Pressed brickwork – a variety of subtle earthy tones relating to the panellised / articulated facade elements.

Generally stretcher bond pattern, except for the use of header coursing to the top of parapets and window openings.

A palette of three colours is proposed. Red, red-brown and blue-manganese.

Glazed walls to entry foyers, consisting of clear glazing with powder coated aluminium framing. Silver colour for framing.

Roofs clad in Colourbond metal decking. ‘Gunmetal’ colour

Add-on Structures

Balcony structures constructed of expressed mild steel CHC sections with a galvanised finish.

Floors to balconies to consist of Webforge steel mesh with a galvanised finish.

Balustrades fabricated from woven steel mesh within mild steel RHS frames, all with a galvanised finish.

Down pipes and rainwater heads to have a painted finish to match brickwork colours.

Vertical and Horizontal sunshade blades to windows fabricated from powder coated aluminium.

Entry canopy to have an expressed steel channel fascia with a galvanised finish. Roof cladding to be corrugated Colourbond sheeting. ‘Gunmetal’ colour. Soffit to be galvanised finish perforated steel mesh.
Proposed Hard Landscape Features & Fencing

Low level fencing 1000mm high, beyond the front facades, constructed of vertical mild steel pickets on a horizontal mild steel frame. Similar fencing along the street boundary to have a double course, pressed brickwork plinth. Steelwork to have a galvanised finish.

High level fencing 1600mm high, beyond the front facades and enclosing the rear yards, constructed of timber framing and lapped palings, compete with timber capping.

Coloured concrete and concrete pavers for paths and hard landscaped areas

2.12. Block D would be attached to Block E and would have an angled parapet roof form. The building finishes would include:

Building Cladding

Pressed brickwork – a variety of subtle earthy tones relating to the panellised / articulated facade elements.

Generally stretcher bond pattern, except for the use of header coursing to the top of parapets and window openings.

A palette of three colours is proposed; red, red-brown and blue-manganese.

Feature wing walls on Ingles Street elevation constructed of pre-cast concrete panels with a random stone textured finish. Natural concrete finish.

Roofs clad in Colourbond metal decking. ‘Gunmetal’ colour

Add-on Structures

Balcony structures constructed of expressed mild steel CHC sections with a galvanised finish.

Floors to balconies to consist of perforated metal sheet with a galvanised finish.

Balustrades fabricated from woven steel mesh within mild steel RHS frames, all with a galvanised finish.

Down pipes and rainwater heads to have a painted finish to match brickwork colours.

Vertical and Horizontal sunshade blades to windows fabricated from powder coated aluminium.

Screen to roof terrace constructed of horizontal steel louvers, with galvanised finish.
Proposed Hard Landscape Features & Fencing

Low level fencing 1000mm high on the Raglan Street side of the units, constructed of vertical mild steel pickets on a horizontal mild steel frame. Similar fencing along the street boundary to have a double course, pressed brickwork plinth. Steelwork to have a galvanised finish.

High level fencing 1600mm high, dividing the rear yards, constructed of timber framing and lapped palings, compete with timber capping piece.

Fencing along the Ingles Street frontage constructed of pre-cast concrete panels. Panels to have a random stone texture and have a natural concrete colour finish. Rear gates to Ingles Street constructed of vertical mild steel pickets on a horizontal steel frame.

2.13. Block E would have an angled parapet roof form. The building finishes would include:

Building Cladding

Pressed brickwork – a variety of subtle earthy tones relating to the panellised / articulated facade elements.

Generally stretcher bond pattern, except for the use of header coursing to the top of parapets and window openings.

A palette of three colours is proposed; red, red-brown and blue-manganese.

Feature wing walls on Ingles Street elevation constructed of pre-cast concrete panels with a random stone textured finish. Natural concrete finish.

Glazed walls to lift lobby, consists of clear and spandrel glazing with powder coated aluminium framing. Silver colour for framing.

Powder coated aluminium louvers and ventilation panels to the semi basement car park. Deep green in colour.

Roofs clad in Colourbond metal decking. ‘Gunmetal’ colour

Add-on Structures

Balcony and pergola structures constructed of expressed mild steel CHC sections with a galvanised finish.

Floors to balconies to consist of perforated metal sheet with a galvanised finish.

Balustrades fabricated from woven steel mesh within mild steel RHS frames, all with a galvanised finish.

Down pipes and rainwater heads to have a painted finish to match brickwork colours.

Screen to passageway windows constructed of a galvanised mild steel frame and anodised aluminium louvers.
Entry canopy to have an expressed steel channel fascia with a galvanised finish. Roof cladding to be corrugated Colourbond sheeting. ‘Gunmetal’ colour. Soffit to be galvanised finish perforated steel mesh.

Proposed Hard Landscape Features & Fencing

Fencing on the Ingles Street side of the building to consist of the following:

- Primarily pre-cast concrete panels. Panels to have a random stone texture and have a natural concrete colour finish.
- Sections of vertical mild steel pickets on a horizontal steel frame, above a two course pressed brickwork plinth. Steel to have galvanised finish.
- Dividing fences between yards, constructed of 1600mm high timber framing and lapped palings, compete with timber capping.

2.14. Building Setbacks:

**Ingles Street**

The buildings have an angles frontage to the street, with a minimum setback of 4 metres at the east end of the proposal and 4.5 metres at the west end.

**Crockford Street**

The walls of Block A would be setback a minimum of 2 metres, with a balcony overhang setback of 1 metre from the street frontage.

**Raglan Street**

- Block A would be setback a minimum of 2 metres.
- Blocks B and C would be setback a minimum of 4 metres.
- Block D, angled to Raglan Street, would have a minimum setback of 4.5 metres.
3. **SUBJECT SITE AND SURROUNDS**

3.1. The site is bounded by Ingles Street, Crockford Street and Raglan Street, Port Melbourne. A small parcel of parkland is located to the east end of the site, which together with the site, form an island from the surrounding developed area.

3.2. The site is relatively flat and contains no building, the former 1960s style walk-up-flats public housing having been demolished approximately two years ago. The site contains a number of mature trees:

- 3 x Robinia pseudoacacia
- 5 x Populus nigra italica
- 1 x Spotted gum – located close to the poplars
- 1 x Iron Bark – located at the eastern end of the site fronting Ingles Street.

3.3. The site is triangular in shape, with a frontage to Ingles Street of 135.50 metres, a frontage to Raglan Street of 168.16 and a frontage to Crockford Street of 75.39. The site has an overall area of approximately 6,608 square metres.

3.4. Two drainage easements transverse the west end of the site – from Raglan Street to Crockford Street. The easements are active Council drainage easements.

3.5. Two vehicle crossings are provided to the site from Raglan Street.

3.6. The site is located at the northern end of the Bay Street commercial area (Crockford Street is an extension of Bay Street), and is a highly exposed site when approaching in either direction along Ingles Street or Crockford Street.

3.7. The site has a number of interfaces, with one and two storey residential terraces to the north-east along Ingles Street and to the south-west along Raglan Street. At the Crockford Street end of the site, the land uses become commercial, with a petrol station on the corner of Crockford Street and Lyons Street and commercial/industrial land uses on the north-west side of Crockford Street. The commercial/industrial buildings range between one and three storeys in height.

3.8. A small parcel of parkland abuts the side to the immediate south-east. The parkland is screened from Ingles Street with a wooden fence and contains a small range of semi-mature vegetation.

3.9. Crockford Street and Ingles Streets are heavily used roadways, with Crockford Street located in a Road zone, and both streets listed as secondary roads within the Melways. Raglan Street is a local road and is disconnected at the east end from the surrounding road network by the park.
4. ADVERTISING/OBJECTIONS

4.1. The application was advertised by placement of signs on site and notices sent to the adjoining and opposite property owner/occupiers. Notices were also placed in the Emerald Hill Times and the Port Phillip Leader local newspapers. A public information session held to explain the proposal on 27 February 2002 to coincide with the advertising period.

4.2. A total of eighteen objections have been received in relation to the original plans.

4.3. A consultation meeting was held on 9 May 2002 attended by local residents, the applicants (planning consultant, architect, officers of the Department of Housing, and a traffic engineer) and a City of Port Phillip Councillor.

4.4. As a result of resident concerns raised during the advertising time and at the consultation meeting, the applicant submitted a revised proposal. The applicant has advised Council that they wish Council to assess and make a determination on the amended plans. A summary of the changes is as follows:

- Introduction of a semi-basement under Block E, removing car parking from the central area of the site and removal of a central roadway.
- Increase in height to Block E due to the semi-basement car park and changes to the frontage of Block E to allow ground level apartments access to the front garden area.
- Reduction in the number of crossovers from Raglan Street – from five to four.
- Realignment of Blocks B and C so that are ‘square-on’ to the street.
- Provision of more detail about external finishes.

4.5. The amended plans and design guidelines for Lot 1 have been circulated to all objectors and persons originally notified. Objectors were advised that unless expressly withdrawn in writing, all previous objections would still be considered by the Council when assessing the application.

4.6. Three responses have been received in relation to the amended plans, one of which consented to the plans. The remaining two letters were objections and did not introduce new grounds of objection.

4.7. The grounds of objection to the original and amended plans are summarised, with the officer’s response in italics:

- Time of application lodgment inappropriate at around election time, given the significance of the site.

_The time the application was lodged is not considered to be a reasonable ground of objection, as Council cannot refuse to receive an application._

_It is noted that the application assessment and re-circulation of plans period has extended long past the Council election time._
• Planning fraud.
  
  *This ground of objection has not been substantiated and is considered unreasonable.*

Car and Traffic

• Object to parking provision where it does not comply with Council policy.

• The development would further strain the current shortage of parking spots, particularly on Ingles Street.

• The traffic reports underestimates the effect of traffic, parking and flow in the area.

• The traffic and available parking on Raglan Street will increase in pressure over the next few years. The amount of car spaces and visitor spaces allocated under the development is insufficient given the number of developments in progress – Raglan Street private construction and Lyons Street and the petrol station.

• An increasing trend in the area is working from home which will bring more pressure on visitor parking during the day.

• Recommend increasing on-site residential and visitor parking.

• There will be significantly increased traffic flow, through a dangerous intersection – traffic congestion with the service station adds to this.

• Number of vehicles exiting the site opposite 47 Raglan Street would result in noise and visual disturbance to this property.

• Unreasonable increase in traffic on Raglan Street, increasing local noise and congestion.

• It is suggested that the private development component not be allowed – this would reduce traffic and parking problems.

• Restrict access to the site from Crockford Street only.

• Objectors have kept a log of cars on Raglan Street – their figures for on-street parking are higher than ARUP’s, and there is a high demand for on-street parking.

• The reality of the last housing development on site is that parking was always a problem in Raglan and surrounding streets. Had hoped this development would address the long standing car park shortfall.

• Car parking is lower than ResCode.

• Potential traffic generation from community room.

• Adopt a more innovative design for on-site car parking and access to these parking facilities.

• Loss of on-street parking by 12 spaces.

• Suggest compensating the loss of on-street parking through the provision on additional on-site parking.
Council would normally require that between one and two car spaces be provided per dwelling, depending on the number of bedrooms provided. In this instance a minimum of one space is provided for each apartment except in Block A, where a lesser rate is provided (1 per 3 units). No on-site visitor parking is proposed.

The parking provided on site is considered appropriate, where a reasonable level of parking is provided for the apartments and resident type proposed to live on the site. It is recommended that the number of crossovers be reduced so that there is no loss of on-street parking.

It is reasonable that visitor parking be provided on street, as was historically the case, subject to there being no loss of on-street parking.

The community room provided for on site is for use by resident’s of the housing. This will be clarified as a condition of permit.

Council’s traffic engineers have considered the issue of traffic generation and have advised that Raglan Street can accommodate the proposed traffic generation.

Form and appearance

- The area is in a heritage overlay, and therefore the proposal is completed inappropriate to the fabric of the buildings in and around the site.
- There is public housing in Cecil Street, South Melbourne in the form of terraces – why not here?
- The scale, form and setback of the proposed development fails to protect the established character of the local neighbourhood. In particular the 3-5 storey development will; over develop the site, dominate the low rise dwellings on Raglan and Ingles Street. Contrary to Clause 22.01 which requires any development to enhance the predominantly single storey scale….and; fundamentally change the local streetscape.
- Have a negative impact on nearby residents in terms of their enjoyment of the local area, the streetscape and property values.
- The layout of the development is not integrated with the bordering streets.
- Defencible space.
- Plans are of a poor quality – housing blocks are large and there are not enough windows, which presents a depressing prospect for both local residents and occupants. The development would be a horrible legacy for decades.
- Over-development of the site – 70% site coverage v’s the 60% norm.
- Can the government guarantee that the new residents will never have the right to buy, and then re-sell? If not the ARUP car parking analysis goes out the window, as the units would be privately owned.
- Overdevelopment – lack of open space.
- Inadequate amenities in the area to support development.
• Excessive buildings on site.
• Proposal fails to acknowledge the heritage value of the area.
• The height of the proposed development has overshadowing and overlooking issues for all nearby residents.
• How does the application meet ResCode?
• The development has not address neighbourhood character particularly with regard to heights and density.
• Do the heights comply with Council policy?
• There has been no attempt to address or interact with Ingles Street. The development turns its back on Ingles Street and creates a “hard edge” residential boundary, effectively cutting off the properties to the north-east.
• High solid fences at ground level discourage any interaction with the street.
• The inclusion of a five storey building in a precinct that consists of maximum two storey dwellings will change the character of the area.
• Intended increase in population is too high for the area to accommodate.
• It does not provide an attractive “Gateway” to Port Melbourne, with a solid building and no greenery.
• The private development could add up to 100 people onto the site – this in unacceptable.
• We are being asked to approve one part of the development without knowing what is happening to the other.
• Lack of greenery and open space – appears a dense, almost institutional development.
• Ingles Street façade looks like a filing cabinet – there has been no attempt to blend with the local neighbourhood and architectures.
• We require detail of the proposed exterior finishes.
• Block A is separate from the remainder of the site and does not provide for interaction between public and private housing.
• Degradation of building appearance of weathering.
• Bold bash appearance of multi-storey building in residential street.
• Loss of attractive and suitable appearance with marries with local Victorian style housing subject to heritage overlay on the south side of Raglan Street.
• Height of the proposal.
• Loss of privacy and residential street atmosphere.
• Loss of city views.
• What is the intended use of the community room – what hours would it operate? Want to make sure it does not become a haven for teenage parties – drinking, drugs. Given the lack of open space planned for the new development, the construction of a safe playground would seem a good idea, but the thought of an unattended building seems to invite trouble.

The site is an island site, and is surrounded by a variety of buildings, including Victorian style one and two storey buildings and commercial style buildings. The site sits in a transition area between commercial buildings and residential buildings, some of which are included in a Heritage Overlay.

The proposal would introduce a new element into the streetscape, which would add to the mixed nature of the building forms in the area.

The scale of the proposal is generally considered reasonable, with the higher buildings facing the main and wider roads (Ingles Street and Crockford Street), and lower scale buildings – Blocks B, C and D at the more sensitive interface along Raglan Street.

The higher elements on site would present to Crockford and Ingles Streets, and it is considered that a higher form of development to these streets is appropriate, given that they are main roads and the site is an island site, having limited context with the surrounding area.

The building form reflects the terrace style pattern of the area, although this is presented in a modern manner through the use of feature walls and angled frontages.

The proposed fencing along Ingles Street is reasonable for fencing to the rear yard area of Block D. The fences have a height of 1.5 metres (eye level), rising to 1.8 metres which provides architectural interest along the street frontage.

The density of development over the site is reasonable, where sufficient open space, landscaping areas and car parking have been provided on the site. The apartments developed on the site are of a variety of sizes, and therefore a higher density would be expected, where one and two bedroom apartments are being proposed rather than three and four bedroom apartments (which would result in a lower density).

Public Housing

• Development represents poor social policy – experience has shown the problematic nature of high density public housing. At the public meeting the Office of Housing acknowledged this to be true but then went onto say that his Office preferred a high density development for reasons of cost.

• Former residents of the site and their rights to first choice of public housing.

• Security – 24 hour security required for public housing as required by former residents.
• The blend of public and private housing on this estate will adversely effect the value of established properties on the precinct.

• The site was initially proposed as a mix of both public and private housing, which objector supported. The current proposal is not mixed – they are quite distinct and separate developments. The issue of social integration does not appear to have been addressed.

• The same number of public housing residents are to be squeezed into a smaller space in order to make room for the large private development.

Public housing does not require a planning permit for its use. Like all housing developments, a planning permit is required for the development only. In this respect Council’s ambit of discretion does not extend to questions of the public/private mix on site.

The issue of allocation of the public housing is a matter for the manager of the site, however it is understood that the Office of Housing intends offering places to former resident’s of the estate.

The issue of security is also a matter for the site manager. It is noted that the site is designed for passive security from the apartments, and appropriate fencing has been provided to define public and private spaces.

Landscaping

• Would like to see more trees and gardens in the development to break the concrete feel of this large development.

• Insufficient trees.

• More trees needed – to replace the trees to be removed and the lost street trees.

• The Ingles Street interface could be improved simply by the introduction of landscaping with mature trees to reduce the apparent scale of the buildings and treating the individual open spaces as front yards rather than rear yards to encourage resident interaction with the street.

• Does not retain the mature trees.

The proposal would require the removal all existing trees from the site. The applicant has submitted reports on the state of the trees, however a review by Council’s arborist indicates that depending on the type of development of the site proposed, some of the trees could be retained. Ultimately, Council has to make an on balance decision between tree retention and a substantially modified development, or the removal of the trees.
This report concludes that the removal of the trees is reasonable because:

Any development in front of the trees would effectively block views of the trees from around the site negating the benefit of retaining the trees.

The replacement trees, both on the street and street tree planting, would have made a greater contribution to the streetscape than the current trees on site. The proposed planting would be appropriate for the area in terms of neighbourhood character, would be visible from around the site, and would form a consistent planting of the site, rather than the sporadic species that exist at present.

The applicant has undertaken to plant new street trees and provide a large number of new trees on site (via their landscape report). This can be specified through conditions of permit and a number of the new trees on site can be provided at semi-mature height, making a satisfactory contribution to the streetscape from the time of planting.

Park
- Would support Council in keeping the area as an open space/park – has this been considered?
- Proposal fails to make a contribution to the local environment as it does not assist with the shortage of local parkland and public open space – it would exacerbate these problems.
- The large scale private development proposed for the corner of Crockford Street and Ingles Street will not assist in creating strong positive identity for the site compared to alternative options such as a local park with water features.
- Use of public parkland.

The site was previously used for public housing and is owned by the Office of Housing, the reuse of the site for housing is consistent with the previous use of the site.

The site is zoned Residential 1 and is therefore legitimately set aside for residential development/land use. The site is not a park and has not been used as one in the past.

Amenity
- Amenity.
- Overlooking.
- Open space
- Size of flats/apartments, ceiling heights, number of rooms.

The provision of on-site amenities, such as reasonable sized balconies has been addressed through conditions of permit.
The proposal does not result in unreasonable overlooking of adjoining areas, given the separation of the site from the surrounding area. Overlooking within the site is restricted through placement of the apartments, where overlooking between the different apartments is restricted through location of the Blocks. The sensitive interface between Blocks B and C and Block E has been addressed through the location of a passageway along the south side of Block E and therefore does not overlooking the private areas of Blocks B and C.

5. URBAN PLANNERS ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES

5.1. Planning Scheme Provisions

5.2. The site is located in a Residential 1 Zone and falls under a Special Building Overlay.

Clause 32.01 - Residential 1 Zone, where permit is required to construct two or more dwellings on a lot.

The development is greater than three storeys in height, and therefore the provisions of ResCode (Clause 55) do not apply to the site.

Clause 44.05 – Special Building Overlay specifies that a permit is required to construct a building or to construct or carry out works.

Melbourne Water is a relevant Referral Authority.

Melbourne Water have advised they have no objection to the proposal, subject to the following conditions and footnotes:

- No polluted and/or sediment laden runoff is to be discharged directly or indirectly into Melbourne Water’s drains or watercourses.

- Unless otherwise agreed in writing by Melbourne Water, finished floor levels must be a minimum of 300mm above the applicable flood level.

- At least 10 days prior to the construction a Site Management Plan, detailing pollution and sediment control measures, must be submitted to Melbourne Water.

Footnotes

If further information is required in relation to Melbourne Water’s permit conditions shown above, please contact Alanna Murphy on telephone 9235 2193, quoting Melbourne Water’s references 79628.

The applicable flood level for the property is 1.4 metres to Australia Height Datum (AHD).
5.3. Standard Roads – crossover

5.3.1. Council’s crossover permits officer provided the following comments on the amended plans:

5.3.2. The proposal to construct a new crossover is acceptable provided the redundant crossovers are removed and the area is reinstated to Council’s satisfaction.

5.3.3. Please advise the applicant that prior to the construction or removal of any crossovers a vehicle crossing permit must be obtained from Council.

5.4. Traffic Issues

5.4.1. Council’s traffic engineers have reviewed the proposal. The comments of the traffic engineers are included in Section 6.2 of this report.

5.5. Public Housing

5.5.1. The site is in a Residential 1 Zone, where use of the land as dwellings does not require a planning permit. The construction of medium density housing requires a planning permit pursuant to Clause 32.01 of the Planning Scheme.

5.5.2. In regards to the housing component proposed, Council’s ambit of discretion is limited to issues of development, and not use.

6. STRATEGIC ISSUES

6.1. Local Planning Policy Framework – Residential Development in Heritage Overlay - assessment of amended plans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Planning Policy Framework</th>
<th>Officers assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect heritage &amp; streetscape character.</td>
<td>Can comply with conditions: The site is an island site, and is surrounded by a variety of buildings, including Victorian style one and two storey buildings and commercial style buildings. The site sits in a transition area between commercial buildings and residential buildings, some of which are included in a Heritage Overlay. The proposal would introduce a new element into the streetscape, which would add to the mixed nature of the building forms in the area. The scale of the proposal is considered reasonable, with the higher buildings facing the main and wider roads (Ingles Street and Crockford Street), and lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ensure high level of amenity & design excellence. | Complies:  
The development will provide a good level of amenity for future residents with each dwelling having a balcony or ground level open space area.  
Resident facilities such as a common room have been provided in Block A and abutting Block C.  
The development would have minimal amenity impacts on the surrounding residential area, given the island nature of the site and is considered to be an appropriate design response given the context of the site, subject to alterations to the finishes and appropriate landscaping, as discussed at Section 6.2 of the report. |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Achieve constant residential population.         | Achieved:  
The public housing component of the site would replace the previous residential land use of the site, and would assist in achieving a constant residential population.  
The private component would allow for |
additional population in the municipality, and would add to the future diversity of housing options in the municipality. The increased housing choice would provide for a stable population, where a range of housing options is provided for in the municipality.

| Encourage retention & construction of larger dwellings & range of housing types. | Complies:  
The site is vacant, therefore there are no dwellings to be retained.  
The proposal includes one, two, three and four bedroom dwellings, which would provide accommodation for a range of household types. |

| Strategies: | Can comply with conditions:  
The site is an island site and would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of nearby dwellings in terms of overlooking/overshadowing.  
The new development represents a modern addition to the area, however reflects elements of the character of the area, such as building setbacks and potential for landscaping in the small front yard areas.  
The scale of the proposal is generally considered reasonable, given that the site is separated from the surrounding built forms and the site sits on two main roads, where a high scale of development could be expected.  
Blocks B, C, D and E, which face residential land uses, reflect the terrace style pattern of the area, although this is presented in modern forms and through the use of feature walls and angled frontages.  
Council's Manager, Urban Design and Architecture has made a number of suggestions to improve the appearance of the building, particularly toward Ingles Street, see Section 6.2 of this report, which would ensure a high quality |
| **Encourage medium density housing on sites with frontage to Main Road or public transport route or within identified growth area on Framework Plan.** | **Complies:**
Crockford Street, at the north-west end of the site, is a Main Road, forming the extension to Bay Street and being included in a Road Zone.

Historically the site has contained medium density housing. The proposal before Council would include additional housing units (through the future development of Lot 1), which is appropriate subject to this and the future application meeting Council’s residential development policies. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encourage energy efficient design.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Complies – see Section 6.7 of this report.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support restoration &amp; retention of older dwellings.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure non-residential uses limited in residential areas &amp; located on Main Roads &amp; which do no result in loss of amenity for residential properties.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **In transition areas, consider affect of landuse on residential opportunities** | **Complies:**
This site sits between a residential area and a commercial area. The land is zoned Residential 1 and the proposed development is consistent with the zoning of the site. |
| **Neighbourhood Character (Municipal Strategic Statement Cl 21.05 – 3)** | **Objective:**
Development to respond to site, its context & to integrate with & enhance the prevailing neighbourhood character.

Can comply with conditions:
The proposed building form is considered to be an appropriate design response given the context of the site. Subject to the alterations suggested by Council’s Manager of Urban Design & Architecture, the development would integrate with and enhance the varied character of this area.

The car parking provided to Block A along Raglan Street would be screened with a fence and 1 metre wide landscaping strip, and at the more transitional end of the site, is considered appropriate.

The car parking spaces provided to Block D are generally not screened from the...
street and does not form a pleasant transition between the site, the residences opposite and the abutting open space area. It is therefore recommended that the car parking to the family housing at Block D be provided at a basement level and the ground level area landscaped accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies:</th>
<th>Complies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect &amp; enhance scale, form &amp; setback of nearby heritage buildings.</td>
<td>The surrounding residential area is within a Heritage Overlay. The site is outside of the heritage overlay, formerly having been developed with four level walk-up flats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The development of the site would provide a contrast the surrounding heritage area, with modern forms and finishes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposal respects the scale and form of the surrounding area, with terrace style buildings and lower buildings to Raglan Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The setbacks provided also reinforce the small scale front gardens found in the surrounding heritage buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retain low rise scale of established residential areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of the development site is removed from the low scale residential area, with a significant separation through Ingles and Crockford Streets. While the houses opposite on Ingles Street are generally one and two storey, it is considered that the site is well separated from these houses and the site would not be viewed in the context of these dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along Raglan Street where the site moves into the residential area, the development is at a two to three storey scale, which is respectful of the one and two storey scale opposite.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complies with conditions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respond to characteristics of adjacent buildings in relation to prevailing scale, orientation, side &amp; rear setbacks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is an island site and opposite a variety of land uses and building scales.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The orientation of buildings to the street is appropriate. The small setbacks provided are consistent with the surrounding area.

The proposal has provided a hard edge to Block D facing Ingles Street, which is appropriate for a building facing a busy street. This results in the buildings having a greater setback from Raglan Street and a number of car spaces provided along the Raglan Street end of Block D. The car spaces to Block D are not consistent with land use patterns in the area, where car spaces are not located within the frontage setback areas of residential buildings. The car parking arrangements at this end of the site also limit the opportunity for landscaping and for a replacement of the mature trees that will be removed as a result of this development. The car spaces would also result in a loss of on-street parking.

It is recommended that the twelve car spaces associated with Block D be deleted and provided at a basement level. This would have a number of positive outcomes for Raglan Street:

- Additional landscaping allowing for a connectivity to the adjoining parkland.
- Reduced number of crossovers and car spaces presenting to the street, presenting a more attractive streetscape environment.
- Maintain the existing number of on-street car spaces.

The scale and form of Block A is considered appropriate for its interface at the more commercial end of the site.

Blocks B and C are considered appropriate in setback, height and form. The Blocks have a two storey height, one storey higher than the Victorian workers cottages opposite, which is a reasonable step up in height. Blocks B and C, on the amended plans, face the street (previously the Blocks were angled to the street) repeating the pattern of dwellings in the areas, where they front the street directly, with a small landscaped setback.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Compliance Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage retention of existing street trees.</td>
<td>Does not comply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current site layout would result in the removal of two street trees. Council’s arborist has noted that the removal of the trees is acceptable provided that the developer pays for the cost of removal and replacement of the trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The location of the crossovers would alter under the revised basement car parking, as the crossover location could be altered. However, given the number of street trees in front of the site it is likely that a revised crossover location would result in the loss of one tree. The loss of a street tree is acceptable, subject to detail of which tree and that the developer will pay for the removal and replacement of the tree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage retention of established trees &amp; vegetation in front &amp; side setback where this is an important part of streetscape character.</td>
<td>Does not comply:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage retention of mature trees on private property.</td>
<td>Does not comply:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site contains a number of mature trees:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 x Robinia psudoacacia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 x Poplus nigra italica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x Spotted gum – located close to the poplars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x Iron Bark – located at the eastern end of the site fronting Ingles Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All these trees would be removed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The removal of the trees is discussed at section 6.8 of this report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In summary however, it is concluded that the trees can be removed, subject to future planting of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Neighbourhood Character Policy (Cl 22.01):</td>
<td>Complies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourage development that adversely affects the character of area or the amenity of adjoining properties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development would have minimal amenity impacts on nearby properties and is considered to appropriately respond to the character of the neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage design responses that</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify &amp; show how contributory heritage buildings outside of the Heritage Overlays have been considered, where they form part of the neighbourhood character.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect &amp; where possible enhance character elements for each of the six local neighbourhoods: Port Melbourne &amp; Garden City:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Predominant single storey scale in established residential areas;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fine subdivision grain &amp; small lot size;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Garden City – uniform lot size, building styles, setbacks &amp; landscaping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complies in part: The site is an island site, and is surrounded by a variety of buildings, including Victorian style one and two storey buildings and commercial style buildings. The site sits in a transition area between commercial buildings and residential buildings, some of which is included in a Heritage Overlay. The proposal is generally respectful of the terrace style pattern of the surrounding residential area, with Blocks B, C, D and E representative of terrace forms. Block A is not representative of the terrace style, having a more modern apartment building style appearance. This is considered appropriate for this end of the site, which forms a transitional area between the more established residential area and the emerging commercial/modern character of Bay Street. Whilst reflecting the terrace style pattern, it is acknowledged that the proposal would introduce a new element into the streetscape, adding to the mixed nature of the building forms in the area. The form is reasonable for an island site, and is considered to be sufficiently vertical in form to reflect the surrounding area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Design (MSS Cl 21.05-4):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complies. The proposal will have minimal impacts on the public realm in respect to wind tunnelling and overshadowing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development to be high quality, enhance streetscape amenity, neighbourhood character &amp; minimise detrimental impact on neighbouring properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can comply with conditions: The proposal achieves all of these objectives by introducing a residential building that responds well to the character of the area and minimise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amenity impacts on nearby residential properties. Alterations are needed to the façade of the building to ensure that the building finishes are of a high quality and use the selected materials appropriately – see comments by Council’s Manager, Urban Design and Architecture at section 6.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with Design and Development Overlay requirements. The site is not in a Design and Development Overlay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage gradual stepping up of built form at interface of existing low rise &amp; proposed higher rise development. Complies: The proposal graduates in height from the highest point on and close to the corner of Ingles and Crockford Streets and stepping down to Raglan Street and the small park. The higher component of Block A is appropriate for its location at the more commercial influenced end of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage energy efficiency. Complies – see Section 6.7 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitively site solar panels, satellite dishes, air conditioning units &amp; other building equipment. Complies. All building plant and equipment would be required to be concealed as architectural features as a condition of permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitively site plumbing &amp; servicing equipment. Complies. See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design Policy (Cl 22.06): Positively respond to neighbourhood context: Performance measure 1: Application accompanied by Site Analysis &amp; Descriptive Statement that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Records character elements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identifies Planning Scheme requirements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analyses opportunities &amp; constraints;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evaluates data which influences design;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Includes three-dimensional potential building envelope. Complies. A detailed site analysis and site context plan have been presented together with a description of the site and surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect &amp; enhance public realm. Can comply with conditions: The apartments have been designed to face the street frontages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no ‘blank face’ areas facing the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGENDA - ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL - 26 AUGUST 2002</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| streetscape.  
The development would not result in unreasonable overshadowing of public areas. A condition of permit will ensure that the presentation of the development to the adjoining park is of a high quality. A condition of permit will also require that the landscaping of the site allows for some consistency with future landscaping of the adjoining park. In this respect the developer will need to consult with Council before a final selection of plan species is made. |

| Preserve visual prominence of key landmarks & maintain/enhance important vistas. | Complies.  
Landmark views and vistas will not be obscured by the proposed development. |

| For major new development: create or emphasise landmarks, views & vistas by carefully responding to site’s context. | Complies:  
The development would relate well to the opposite land uses and developments, although at a higher scale. The higher scale is considered appropriate given the island nature of the site and its separation from surrounding land by main roads. |

| Building frontage design at footpath level to offer visual interest, surveillance, interaction, safety, shelter & convenience.  
Performance Measure 3:  
• Not to exceed three storey next to public space, including a footpath (except as specified in a Design & Development Overlay);  
• Higher elements set back beyond three storey;  
• Respects front adjacent building setbacks & reinforce neighbourhood character;  
• Design does not dominate public spaces;  
• Minimise overshadowing & wind tunnelling. | Does not comply:  
Blocks A and E would present as four storeys (the fourth level is not a recessive element).  
The higher elements on site would present to the Crockford and Ingles Streets, and it is considered that a higher form of developments to these streets is appropriate, given that they are main roads and the site is an island site, having limited context with the surrounding area.  
All the buildings would have direct access from the streets and would offer surveillance of the streets from living rooms and upper level balconies. |

| Discourage blank walls & car park vents onto pedestrian spaces. | Complies with conditions:  
The proposal provides a semi-basement, which results in a 4 ½ storey building. The semi-basement has been treated so that the vents operate within the site, not onto the public streets. Further, terraces and steps from the lower level apartments |
of Block E to the Ingles Street frontage would satisfactorily treat/screen the semi-basement to the street frontage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large sites are to allow pedestrian permeability.</td>
<td>Would not comply: The site has been designed with walkways through for occupants and visitors. These walkways would not be available as footpaths through the site for the general public. Pavement access would be consistent with the current situation around the borders of the site, which is considered reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximise access to sunlight from key public spaces: Performance Measure 4: New development not to further overshadow parkland between 10 am &amp; 4 pm on 22 June (except as specified in a Design Development Overlay).</td>
<td>Does not comply: The site abuts a small local open space area that as a result of this development may be upgraded and expanded in area. The park would receive sunlight throughout the morning and into the early afternoon (around 1.30pm), however after this time would receive shadow from the abutting dwelling. The variation from council policy is acceptable given that the park receives adequate daylight during the morning/early afternoon hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage energy efficiency including techniques.</td>
<td>Complies – see section 6.7 of this report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage architectural quality to: • Express urban grain &amp; subdivision pattern; • Provide facade articulation; • Avoids poor design &amp; inappropriately located reproduction architecture; • Integrates elevations, roof forms &amp; facade treatments; • Defines corners at major intersections; • Side walls detailed to provide interest &amp; reduce visual impacts of blank walls; • Use robust &amp; high quality materials.</td>
<td>Can comply with conditions: The proposal includes contemporary architecture that addresses the street frontages and provides strong elements on the main road interfaces. The facades are modulated through use of balconies and feature walls. The side walls generally have windows which breaks up the expanse of exposed side wall. See section 6.9 of this report for a discussion of the interface with Lot 1 and Blocks A and E side walls. Alterations are needed to the façade of the building to ensure that the building finishes are of a high quality and use the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building facades to allow for external lighting, mechanical equipment &amp; signage.</td>
<td>Complies: The building can accommodate outdoor lighting normal to a dwelling. Signage is not required for a residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage proper resolution of building details, construction joints &amp; junctions.</td>
<td>Can comply with conditions: The alterations proposed by Council’s Manager, Urban Design and Architecture would ensure that the building details, construction joints and junctions were well resolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain existing trees &amp; landscape elements.</td>
<td>Does not comply: All trees on the site are proposed to be removed. See section 6.7 for a discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage landscaping to setbacks, open space &amp; outdoor car parking areas.</td>
<td>Complies with conditions: A landscape plan has been provided detailing planting around the site. A landscape plan will be required as a condition of permit, and will need to be modified from the plans provided with the applicant to show landscaping in the area in front of Block D, which would be available for landscaping after the car parking is located to basement level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to street/public landscaping where appropriate.</td>
<td>Complies with conditions: New street tree planting would occur, as proposed by the applicant on the landscape plan provided. The street planting would provide a positive benefit to the streetscape and the development site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce private open space only where it can be demonstrated that communal open space provided better serves residents needs.</td>
<td>Complies: All dwellings are provided with terraces/balcony area. Communal open space is not proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences to be compatible, relate to building’s architectural style, open space areas, character &amp; amenity of</td>
<td>Complies with conditions: The fences proposed are appropriate for the street interfaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fences proposed along in front of Blocks B, C and D Raglan Street are low steel picket fences, which are acceptable for the scale of Raglan Street. The deletion of the above ground car parking for Block D would result in changes to the fence location along Raglan Street. This will need to be shown on the amended plans prepared for Council.

Council’s Manager of Architecture and Urban Design has advised that the fences along Ingles Street are appropriate for the interface with Block D, where the fence minimum height at 1.5 metres would limit views of cars from the ground level rooms, and the rise in fence height to 1.8 metres is an architectural features. A change to the fence finish has been recommended, and a means to address potential graffiti is also recommended, further discussed at section 6.2.

The fence height in front of Block E is not clearly nominated, and would be required as a condition of permit to have a maximum height of 1.5 metres (this fence is not angled like the fence for Block D).

Fence detail has not been provided for Block A and will be required as a condition of permit.

A condition of permit can require this detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daylight &amp; sunlight into open spaces &amp; onto main living rooms of new &amp; neighbouring development. Performance Measure 5:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Habitable rooms receive sufficient daylight;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No significant loss of daylight to existing habitable rooms in nearby properties;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Main living room windows on existing or nearby residential properties not significantly overshadowed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private or communal open space able to receive 4 hours of sunshine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complies. The orientation of the building provides good solar access and natural light penetration to the majority of dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts of Block A would have a restricted access to sunlight due to the orientation of the block/site. The apartments within Block A that have restricted access to sunlight have been provided with a courtyard space, which allows unrestricted window access to daylight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development would not overshadow any adjoining residential property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between 9am & 3 pm on 22 September.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New open spaces to take advantage of solar access, are reasonably private &amp; of sufficient size: Performance Measure 6:</th>
<th>Does not comply, can be addressed via conditions: Blocks A, B, C and E are provided with balcony level open spaces. Block D would have front and rear open space areas. The balconies provided to Blocks A, C and E (relying on scaling the drawings) do not have a minimum area of 8 square metres. Given the amount of development on site, which would reduce the previous communal open space areas provided in the former public housing, it is considered important that each dwelling have the minimum open space requirement provided. A condition of permit will address this open space shortfall. It is noted that the same requirement was made of the recently approved public housing development in Dorcas Street, where a minimum balcony of 8 square metres was required for single accommodation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Open space is adequate in area &amp; able to be used; • Accessed from main living room; • Respects privacy of surrounding dwelling’s private open space; • Balconies/terraces are: a) Within site boundary or no more that 500 mm beyond property line; b) No more than 2.5m wide if cantilevered; c) Provide legal clearance for vehicles; d) Add visual interest; e) Min area of 8m² &amp; width of 1.6m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limit views into neighbouring private open space & habitable rooms, protect occupants from external noise & contain noise sources: Performance Measure 7:  
• Neighbouring residential properties’ private open space & habitable rooms protected from significant additional direct overlooking by siting, setbacks, building articulation & screening;  
• Minimise noise transmission between buildings & floor levels;  
• If close to noise sources, dwellings are designed accordingly & use noise shielding techniques;  
• Noise sources from new development minimised & consistent with EPA standards. |

| Complies. The site is separated from neighbouring residential properties by wide road reserves. No unreasonable overlooking would be created by the proposed development. The development would be constructed to ensure that there is no transmission of noise between apartments. |

Buildings have safe, manageable & convenient access. Complies: The pedestrian entry points are

Complies.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian accessways within the development are safe, attractive &amp; convenient to use.</th>
<th>Complies: Pedestrian access to the site will be from either Ingles Street, Crockford Street or Raglan Street. The ground level apartments of Block A and E have street access. Each dwelling in Block D has street access from both Ingles and Raglan Streets. The entry points are defined through gateways.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle storage facilities close to vehicle access or entries.</td>
<td>Complies: A bicycle storage area is provided in the basement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle access point from single crossover, or if appropriate existing crossover &amp; enable vehicles to move safely &amp; efficiently between development &amp; street network.</td>
<td>Does not comply: The previous use had two vehicle crossovers. The proposal before Council contains four crossovers. The crossovers would reduce on street parking and would not result in design excellence, particularly at the eastern part of the site abutting the parkland, where the result would be car parks within a frontage setback. It is recommended, as per discussion above, that the parking for Block D be included at a basement level. This has the potential to reduce the number of crossovers to two, which the applicant would be encouraged to achieve. Two crossovers is considered satisfactory, given that this is what was provided previously, and that the on-street parking would be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading facilities on site &amp; do not cause detriment to pedestrian amenity or traffic movement Performance measure 9 Loading facilities:</td>
<td>Not required. A loading facility is not required for a residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allow loading &amp; unloading without disruption to pedestrian or traffic flow;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table:**

- Appropriately separated from the entries to the car parks.
- Pedestrian accessways within the development are safe, attractive & convenient to use.
- Bicycle storage facilities close to vehicle access or entries.
- Vehicle access point from single crossover, or if appropriate existing crossover & enable vehicles to move safely & efficiently between development & street network.
- Loading facilities on site & do not cause detriment to pedestrian amenity or traffic movement Performance measure 9 Loading facilities:
  - Allow loading & unloading without disruption to pedestrian or traffic flow;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not require vehicles to reverse off-site;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located at building rear of area of low pedestrian activity &amp; screened;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screened from street when not in use;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designed to allow loading/unloading to occur wholly within site boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site facilities provide for efficient maintenance &amp; management, meet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupants’ needs, are attractively designed &amp; easily maintained:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage, recycling bin enclosures &amp; collection points should be:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located within the building where possible;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate in size &amp; screened;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveniently accessible &amp; away from residential uses;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designed not to detract from character &amp; amenity of streetscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complies with conditions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block A is provided with a defined rubbish storage area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No rubbish bin storage for Blocks B and C has been shown, which can be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>required as a condition of permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An area within the Ingles Street setback can be used for rubbish bin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storage for Block D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block E has what appears to be a bin storage area, although this is not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defined on the plans. This will be required as a condition of permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well lit main building entries, pedestrian areas &amp; car parks that do not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detract from surrounding properties’ amenity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The location of external lighting will be required as a permit condition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailboxes well designed, conveniently accessible &amp; satisfy Aust Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The location of letterboxes will be required as a permit condition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2. Urban Design/Architecture

The application (original plans, amended plans and additional materials) have been referred to Council’s Manager Urban Design and Architecture who has provided the following comments:

The scheme as now presented reflects a number of comments that we have made at recent meetings and it is a superior proposal than previously. However, there are a number of matters that would benefit from further attention:

Site Planning and Building Envelope

These aspects have been revised to the extent that they are acceptable.

Articulation and External Finishes

The recent revisions have improved the scheme in terms of its address to the surrounding streets. The latest drawings describe external materials but not colours, which will be critical in ensuring that the overall complex presents as a series of elements and not as a monolithic project. Also, it is important that the finishes are of a sufficiently high standard that the public housing does not read as such when juxtaposed with the private development on Lot 1.

The exposed dividing walls between the individual Family Terraces (and to a lesser degree the Family Units) will read as an unrelieved sequence of blank panels when viewed from the east. Some treatment of these walls is desirable; such as openings (above 1600mm above floor level), feature planting of creepers, or different wall colours or finishes. Some architectural treatment of the leading edges of the walls could be devised to create a sculptural illusion when viewed obliquely along Ingles Street.

Interface with surrounding streets

The development is in seven sections around the perimeter of the site, whether built form or open space/car parking. These distinct sections should be expressed in terms of the style of boundary wall or fence treatment. This is described to some degree, but further information should be provided, such that boundary treatments reflect the nature of the land use and building type, as well as the on-road conditions at each section.

The wall to Ingles Street has been designed as textured pre-cast concrete panels. These would be better with some transparency to allow vegetation to soften the hardness of the concrete; steel picket gates would assist in this regard. Where the housing is terraces, and particularly on Raglan Street, low picket fences are preferred (as indicated on the drawings).
The applicant was advised of these comments and provided further detail of the final finishes (as described in this report). Council’s Manager Architecture and Urban Design has provided the following advice on the final finishes:

Generally the proposed finishes are appropriate, with a mixture of brickwork and concrete.

The stone feature walls proposed to Blocks D and E are unclear and appear to be proposed as concrete to look like stone. This is not ‘true’ to the material, where concrete is not stone and the concrete finish should not attempt to imitate a different finish. It is recommended that the concrete finish be reviewed to have a textured finish.

Some colour could be added to the stone feature walls depending on the final texture proposed.

The feature wall panels of Block E are lower than the angled blade feature on the roof. The feature wall provided to each apartment should be raised in height so that it ends in line with the highest point of the angled roof parapet – the vertical element runs through to the height of the blade.

*Officer comment – This would increase the perceived bulk of the development, and would not be considered to be an appropriate solution for the Ingles Street frontage. It is also noted that the blade element in not attached to the angled roof, and a raised blade would sit out uncomfortably against the building.*

The concrete panel fences also appear to be proposed as concrete to look like stone. This is not ‘true’ to the material, where concrete is not stone and the concrete finish should not attempt to imitate a different finish. It is recommended that the concrete finish be reviewed to have a textured finish.

Graffiti is an issue for the concrete fences. In this respect planting that would grow over the fences is recommended. Such planting would not require a large garden bed area (for example a ficus creeper) and could be accommodated within the entrance areas.

*Officer comment – It is recommended that the applicant be given options for addressing graffiti, including planting.*

Detail of the paving in the ‘V’ entrances to Block D and the entrances to Block E is required.

Is planting of a slender tree possible in the ‘V’ entrances along Ingles Street?

The end point of the feature walls along the Ingles Street façade could be detailed in some sort of material that could contribute to urban art.

The face brickwork provided to the Raglan Street frontages seems to be shown in three different ways, which may represent different brick types. This should be clarified as a condition of permit to ensure that the finishes are rational.
The use of colourbond for the roofs is appropriate. What colours would the facia be – condition of permit?

The issues raised by Council’s Manager Architecture and Urban Design can generally be addressed through conditions of permit, except where the recommendation has a specific officer comment (above). It is submitted that the building finishes would be improved with the changes recommended above. The changes recommended above are not major alterations and do not actually change the materials proposed; they ask for final detail and clarification of the materials, which would ensure that the building and finishes are properly resolved.

6.3. Car-parking

Council would normally apply the car parking rates of the Planning Scheme to any new residential development, which in this instance would be between one and two car spaces per dwelling.

Sixty-four public dwellings would generate a total of 128 on-site car spaces if two spaces per unit was imposed. The planning scheme does not provide a reduced rate for older persons accommodation or similar and does not provide a visitor car parking requirement.

The Planning Scheme provides guidance for Council to consider a reduced rate of car parking, where the responsible authority is satisfied that a reduced provision is justified due to:

- Any relevant parking precinct plan.
- The availability of car parking in the locality.
- The availability of public transport in the locality.
- Any reduction in car parking demand due to the sharing of car spaces by multiple uses, either because of variation of car parking demand over time or because of efficiencies gained from the consolidation of shared car parking spaces.
- Any car parking deficiency or surplus associated with the existing use of the land.
- Any credit which should be allowed for a car parking demand deemed to have been provided in association with a use which existed before the change of parking requirement.
- Local traffic management.
- Local amenity including pedestrian amenity.
- An empirical assessment of car parking demand.
- Any other relevant consideration.

Alternative rates that Council could use in considering the proposal include:
Council’s 1998 Car Parking resolution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apartment size</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 one bedroom apt at 1 space/unit</td>
<td>26 car space</td>
<td>26 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 two bedroom apt at 1.5 spaces/unit</td>
<td>42 spaces</td>
<td>25 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 three or more bedroom apt at 2 spaces/unit</td>
<td>20 spaces</td>
<td>12 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor parking at 0.2 spaces/unit</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>63 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall</td>
<td></td>
<td>48 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(rounded from 100.8)

ResCode the following car parking would be required:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apartment size</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54 one and two bedroom apt at 1 space/unit</td>
<td>54 car spaces</td>
<td>37 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 three or more bedroom apt at 2 spaces/unit with one space under cover</td>
<td>20 spaces</td>
<td>12 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor parking – one space for every 5 units</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall</td>
<td></td>
<td>38 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(rounded from 86.8)

The Decision Guidelines of ResCode say that before deciding on an application, the responsible authority must consider:

- The reduction in the demand for on-site parking in rental housing, managed by not for profit organisations, intended for residents likely to have a low level of car ownership.
- The number, type and size of dwellings.
- The availability of public transport and on-street parking.
- The practicality of providing car parking on the site, particularly for lots of less than 300 square metres.
- The reduction of on-street car parking spaces resulting from the provision of car parking on the site, particularly for lots of less than 300 square metres.
- Local traffic and parking management plans and safety considerations.
- Any relevant local planning policy or parking precinct plans.
6.4. **Assessment of Car parking**

6.4.1. A total of 49 on-site car parking spaces have been proposed for the development. Of those provided the following allocation would occur:

Block A (corner Raglan & Crockford Street – older persons units):

- 22 x 1 bedroom
- 3 x 2 bedroom

Total 25 units

8 car spaces located adjacent to the building entry.

0.32 car spaces per unit (1 car space per 3.125 units)

Block B (facing Raglan Street)

- 4 x 2 bedroom units
- 1 car space per unit.

Block C (facing Raglan Street)

- 4 x 1 bedroom units
- 1 car space per unit.

Block D (fronting Raglan and Ingles Street – family housing)

- 8 x 3 bedroom units
- 2 x 4 bedroom units

3 bedroom units have 1 car space each.

4 bedroom units have 2 car spaces each.
Block E (facing Ingles Street)

21 x 2 bedroom units

1 car space per unit.

The provision on on-site car parking is considered acceptable and sufficient for the development of the site as public housing.

It is noted that the provision of car parking for the older persons units (Block A) has risen from the original proposal, where a of 0.28 car spaces/unit was provided to a rate of 0.32 spaces/unit. The original rate was considered to be satisfactory to Council’s Traffic Engineers, who reviewed reports from the Dept of Human Services and data collected by Council’s Community Housing Officer. Council’s Traffic Engineers advised that the original rate of 0.28 spaces would closely align with expected parking demands for residents of the older persons units.

The revised rate of 1 car space per 3.125 units is lower than the rate found acceptable by Council for the recently approved Dorcas Street public housing development, where a rate of 1 car space per 2.27 units was approved. However, the Dorcas Street development was aimed at singles (no age specified) and it is considered that a higher rate of car ownership could be expected on the Dorcas Street site than older low-income persons.

The remainder of the units on site have a minimum of one car space, with the two four-bedrooms dwellings having two spaces. The car parking provided on-site for the one, two, three and four bedroom units was found to be satisfactory to Council’s Traffic Engineers. It is noted that the car parking provision for the singles accommodation (Block C) has increased through the addition of one on-site car space and a reallocation of the car parking, so that each unit would have one car space, rather than 0.5, as originally proposed.

The rate of one car space per unit for all the units, except the older persons units, is considered acceptable. While not applicable, the car parking provided on site for the one and two bedroom dwellings would meet the standards of ResCode, which required one car space for each one and two bedroom dwelling.

ResCode would require two spaces, with one under cover, for the three and four bedroom dwellings. ResCode however, specifically instructs the responsible authority to consider “the reduction on the demand for on-site parking in rental housing, managed by not for profit organisations, intended for residents likely to have a low level of car ownership”.

In this instance, a low level of car ownership would be expected. Data submitted by the applicant from ARUP suggests that the following rates of car parking provision are appropriate for Inner South Properties:

- **Block A - Older Persons**: 0.07 to 0.11
- **Block B – 2 bedroom units**: 0.33 to 0.62
- **Block C – singles**: 0.18 to 0.95
- **Block D – 3 bedroom terraces**: 0.18 to 0.95
  - **- 4 bedroom terraces**: 0.18 to 0.95
- **Block E – 2 bedroom units**: 0.33 to 0.62

The number of on site spaces provided is greater than has previously been provided for Inner South public housing properties. The provision of on-site parking for the dwellings is considered to be appropriate, given the data submitted by ARUP and the likelihood of a low level of car ownership.

The site provides no visitor parking, instead relying entirely on on-street parking spaces. Using Council’s 1998 Car Parking Resolution, a total of 13 visitor car spaces would be required.

Council’s Traffic Engineers have found:

*All 13 (@0.2 per unit) visitor’s parking is proposed to be provided on street, the same as the previous development. The parking demand can be well absorbed into the existing angle parking supply in Raglan Street adjacent to the site.*

*As with the previous public housing, all visitor parking was provided on the street.*

However, it is noted by Council’s Traffic Engineers that the proposal before Council would create new crossovers along Raglan Street which would result in the loss of on-street car spaces, which is considered to be an inefficient design (originally 12 on-street spaces would have been lost).

The loss of on-street car spaces, and the reliance on on-street parking for the 13 visitor car spaces is considered to be an unreasonable imposition in terms of the loss on street parking for existing residents.
The loss of on-street parking would occur under the current proposal (i.e. the amended plans), however for the reasons set out in the matrix assessment above, the parking for Block D would be relocated to a basement and accessed from a single crossover point, which would allow for the retention of the existing on-street parking (as well as an improved residential environment/streetscape). The use of the street for visitor parking is considered reasonable, subject to there being no loss of on-street parking.

6.5. Traffic

6.5.1. The current application has been referred to Council’s Senior Traffic Engineer who has commented that:

*Given that the number of dwellings associated with the public housing portion of the site is the same as the previous use, an negligible change in traffic volume is expected. The proposed private section suggests up to 50 dwellings could be constructed. Allowing 5 vehicle trips per dwelling, an additional 250 movements per day could be expected to use the section Raglan Street from Bay Street through to the proposed access point. Existing traffic volumes in Raglan Street (with the previous use operating) is estimated to be of the order of 500 - 1000 movements per day. Therefore a fully developed site as proposed / mooted could increase traffic volumes to 750 - 1,250 per day, an increase of 25 - 50%. It should be noted that these forecast traffic volumes are still well below the traffic carrying capacity of Raglan Street.*

6.6. Housing Policy

6.6.1. Council’s Housing Policy applies to new residential use and development within the City of Port Phillip.

6.6.2. It is considered that the development meets the objectives of the Housing Policy as the proposed development would add to the range of housing types provided within the municipality, with low income dwellings provided at a range of sizes, i.e. one, two, three and four bedrooms.

6.6.3. The site is considered to be an appropriate location for low income housing, where it is close to community, commercial, retail and public transport facilities on Bay Street.
6.7. **Environmental Assessment**

6.7.1. Prior to the matter being considered by Council, the applicant has been asked to submit detail of environmentally sustainable design elements that have been included in the public housing aspect of the development. The details provided are considered satisfactory.

6.7.2. It is noted that the Design Guidelines for Lot 1 include a section on Environmental Design, requiring that each unit development achieve a minimum of 5 stars when assessed under the “First Rate” scheme operated by the Sustainable Energy Authority of Victoria.

6.7.3. The applicant’s submission:

**Proposed Environmental Features**

The following environmental features are proposed for incorporation within the development, to promote the sustainable use of resources and energy efficiency.

As the application consists of various building types, specific environmental features for building development Blocks A - E are noted.

**BLOCK A - Older Persons Units**

**Siting**

*Located close to public transport and community facilities, reducing reliance on private car use.*

*Length of north facing elevations maximised.*

**Fabric Construction / Building Design**

*Selection of low maintenance / durable external materials.*

*Multi-storey masonry construction.*

*Concrete floor slabs.*

*Recycled aggregate used for concrete structures.*

*Thermally efficient building fabric with R 1.5 insulation provided to walls and R 3.5 insulation to the underside of roof cladding.*

*A minimum four (4) star energy rating will be achieved for all units.*

*20 of the 25 units have access to direct sunlight.*

**Building Services**

*Collection of rainwater from the building roof, into a storage tank located underground and re-used for irrigation of landscape areas.*
The use of light internal paint colours to increase effectiveness of daylight and reduce electricity use.

Selection of energy efficient passenger lift and light fixtures.

Gas fired, high efficiency hydronic panel heating for all units.

Selection of water efficient taps and shower roses

Features

Windows located in the fire escape stairs for natural lighting.

Sun rooms provided for internal cloths drying.

Retractable steel sun screens provided on the external face of balconies for direct sunlight control.

Accommodation provided for the temporary storage of recyclable paper, glass and plastic.

The provision of clear storey windows to the roofs of units 20 & 25 (upper most units on south side of unit block) to facilitate sun light penetration.

The provision of 2 light shafts to the internal access passageway to facilitate natural lighting.

The provision of glass block windows from the units to the internal passageway, to promote natural lighting of the rear of units.

Sun shading devices to windows of all units.

BLOCK B - 2 Bedroom Family Units

Siting

Located close to public transport and community facilities, reducing reliance on private car use.

Private open space areas orientated to north for access to direct sunlight.

Fabric Construction / Building Design

Selection of low maintenance / durable external materials.

Multi-storey masonry construction.

Concrete floor slabs.

Recycled aggregate used for concrete structures.

Thermally efficient building fabric with R 1.5 insulation provided to walls and R 3.5 insulation to the underside of roof cladding.

A minimum four (4) star energy rating will be achieved for all units.
All units have access to direct sunlight.

Provision of car parking spaces in adjacent semi basement car park (refer Block E).

Building Services

Collection of rainwater from the building roof, into a storage tank located underground and re-used for irrigation of landscape areas.

The use of light internal paint colours to increase effectiveness of daylight and reduce electricity use.

Selection of energy efficient light fixtures.

Selection of water efficient taps and shower roses

Features

Windows located in the access stair for natural lighting.

Retractable steel sun screens provided on the external face of balconies for direct sunlight control.

Accommodation provided for the temporary storage of recyclable paper, glass and plastic.

Sun shading devices to windows of all units.

Roofs with 10-15 degree pitches to north, for future installation of solar panels.

BLOCK C - 1 Bedroom Single Persons Units

Siting

Located close to public transport and community facilities, reducing reliance on private car use.

Private open space areas orientated to north for access to direct sunlight.

Fabric Construction / Building Design

Selection of low maintenance / durable external materials.

Multi-storey masonry construction.

Concrete floor slabs.

Recycled aggregate used for concrete structures.

Thermally efficient building fabric with R 1.5 insulation provided to walls and R 3.5 insulation to the underside of roof cladding.

A minimum four (4) star energy rating will be achieved for all units.

All units have access to direct sunlight.
Provision of car parking spaces in adjacent semi basement car park (refer Block E).

Building Services

Collection of rainwater from the building roof, into a storage tank located underground and re-used for irrigation of landscape areas.

The use of light internal paint colours to increase effectiveness of daylight and reduce electricity use.

Selection of energy efficient light fixtures.

Selection of water efficient taps and shower roses

Features

Windows located in the access stair for natural lighting.

Retractable steel sun screens provided on the external face of balconies for direct sunlight control.

Accommodation provided for the temporary storage of recyclable paper, glass and plastic.

Sun shading devices to windows of all units.

Roofs with 10-15 degree pitches to north, for future installation of solar panels.

BLOCK D - 3 & 4 Bedroom Family Terraces

Siting

Located close to public transport and community facilities, reducing reliance on private car use.

Private open space areas orientated to north for access to direct sunlight.

Fabric Construction / Building Design

Selection of low maintenance / durable external materials.

Multi-storey masonry construction.

Concrete ground floor slabs.

Recycled aggregate used for concrete structures.

Thermally efficient building fabric with R 1.5 insulation provided to walls and R 3.5 insulation to the underside of roof cladding.

A minimum four (4) star energy rating will be achieved for all units.

All units have windows to the living areas orientated to north for access to direct sunlight.
Building Services

Collection of rainwater from the building roof, into a storage tank located underground and re-used for irrigation of landscape areas.

The use of light internal paint colours to increase effectiveness of daylight and reduce electricity use.

Selection of water efficient taps and shower roses

Features

Retractable steel sun screens provided on the external face of balconies for direct sunlight control.

Accommodation provided for the temporary storage of recyclable paper, glass and plastic.

The provision of a light shaft at the southern end of the dwelling layout to facilitate natural lighting.

Sun shading devices to windows of all units.

BLOCK E - 2 Bedroom Family Units

Siting

Located close to public transport and community facilities, reducing reliance on private car use.

Length of north facing elevations maximised.

Fabric Construction / Building Design

Selection of low maintenance / durable external materials.

Multi-storey masonry construction.

Concrete floor slabs.

Recycled aggregate used for concrete structures.

Thermally efficient building fabric with R 1.5 insulation provided to walls and R 3.5 insulation to the underside of roof cladding.

A minimum four (4) star energy rating will be achieved for all units.

All units have access to direct sunlight.

 Provision of cars in a semi basement car park, which reduces hard paved footprint on site.
Building Services

Collection of rainwater from the building roof, into a storage tank located underground and re-used for irrigation of landscape areas.

The use of light internal paint colours to increase effectiveness of daylight and reduce electricity use.

Selection of energy efficient passenger lift and light fixtures.

Gas fired, high efficiency hydronic panel heating for all units.

Selection of water efficient taps and shower roses.

Natural ventilation and partial natural lighting of semi basement car park.

Features

Windows located in the fire escape stairs for natural lighting.

Retractable steel sun screens provided on the external face of balconies for direct sunlight control.

Accommodation provided for the temporary storage of recyclable paper, glass and plastic.

The provision of windows to the internal access passageway to facilitate natural lighting.

The provision of glass block windows from the units to the internal passageway, to promote natural lighting of the rear of units.

Sun shading devices to windows.

6.7.4. The applicant has also nominated water storage tank positions on site. The position of the tanks may need to be revised with the additional basement car parking, however sufficient site area would be available for landscaping.
6.8. Tree removal

6.8.1. The site contains a number of mature trees:

- 3 x Robinia pseudoacacia
- 5 x Populus nigra italica
- 1 x Spotted gum – located close to the poplars
- 1 x Iron Bark – located at the eastern end of the site fronting Ingles Street.

6.8.2. Prior to the demolition of the buildings on site Council’s Local Laws Department inspected the trees on site and reported on the significant trees. These comments are provided in this analysis.

6.8.3. The revised plans show the removal of all the trees on site. During the course of the application Council Officers indicated agreement that the Iron Bark, located at the eastern end of the site fronting Ingles Street, could be removed, however the removal/retention of the remainder of the trees needed further exploration.

6.8.4. Prior to demolition Council’s Local Law Department advised that the three Robinia pseudoacacia trees were significant and should be retained.

6.8.5. Council’s Local Law Department also advised (prior to demolition) that the five Populus nigra italica trees were in very good condition and recommended the trees be retained due to their significant nature. The Local Laws Officer’s stated that “all trees in this grove are of very good health and should be kept. Although not rare in Melbourne these trees are some of the healthiest specimens viewed by myself.”

6.8.6. More recently, Council’s Tree Maintenance Contract Officer inspected the poplar trees and also advised on whether these trees could be relocated:

*I have checked the site and found that the Poplar trees should be classed as significant as they are of Significant size, age and are in a healthy condition. This is documented in the report.*

*Trees of this size do not transplant well and with a tree such as a poplar decay can set into root areas and branches easily if pruned or damaged.*

*As for other trees on site I fully endorse the report as all trees within grounds that have been retained are significant trees.*

*Recommended pruning and tree surgery should take place as outlined on Robbinnias if they are to be retained.*

*It should also be noted that 5 Significant trees have been removed from the site and only healthy specimens have been listed for retention.*
I feel to keep the integrity of the Significant Tree Policy we need to retain these trees otherwise we will need to be open to removing all significant trees for Development.

In relation to the removal of the trees and future landscaping, the applicant has submitted a series of reports from Gillespies Australia, which are summarised:

The existing landscape setting of the site is informed primarily by the surrounding streetscape. The quality of the street edges is utilitarian and street trees are dominated by overhead powerlines. As a result, the street trees provide minimal positive impact on the street edge. The site has a small, eclectic mixture of exotic and native trees, which are located towards the western sector of the site. The majority of these trees are generally unfit for retention for various reasons. We have commissioned an independent Arborist to provide a report. This report profiles the condition of the existing trees and speaks to their long-term viability.

We are aware that Council encourages the retention of mature vegetation. Because of this, we offer the following explanations in addition to the arborists report as to why we recommend removing some of the existing trees.

The site and its vegetation don’t make a positive contribution to the local landscape context. The only exception to this is the copse of three Robina on the northwest corner and the Red Iron bark on the north side of the site. These trees provide a backdrop to the site from surrounding streets when in leaf. It is for this aesthetic reason only that the trees have been marked for retention as the Arborist’s report finds them unsuitable for retention for health and structural reasons.

The majority of the trees are at the end of their life for reasons of disease, age or environmental stress. They have been compromised by pruning due to the overhead powerlines, are weak, and will be short lived given the impact of future site development.

The majority of the trees have very poor structure. The structure has been determined in the past by poor pruning techniques, compromised root development, poor site conditions and the harsh urban climate.

The species and size of trees existing are not appropriate to the proposed urban and residential use of the site. The species present are typically large, canopy trees found in groves, suited to rural landscapes. They will not benefit aesthetically or functionally from heavy pruning of the canopy and roots. A tree of smaller, more urban scale would be more appropriate.
The roots of the trees have been compromised in the past due to high soil salinity, building footings and hard landscape features. Additionally, the site clearing for future works will further compromise the root zone, compact the soil, suffocate and kill the tree.

Tree root zones close to the new building footings will be greatly reduced resulting in an off balance tree prone to falling and an insufficient root zone. An adequate root network and zone is necessary if the tree is to survive.

The question of relocating some of the trees has been asked and we offer the following information. The majority of the trees on site are not of a high quality or viable to the extent that they would survive such an operation. As a general rule, the more mature the tree, the less successful they relocate or transplant. Even if one of the trees were of the quality that it should be salvaged, and it actually did survive the transplanting operation, it would most likely decline over a period of about five years and eventually die. One must also consider the high cost of the relocation procedure, the resources necessary and the extensive monitoring and maintenance required after transplanting. As a more sustainable solution, we feel that the site will benefit from the addition of fresh, young, vigorous plants that establish and prosper in appropriate locations.

6.8.7. The evidence submitted and reviewed by Council’s arborist indicates that depending on the type of development of the site proposed, some of the trees could be retained. Ultimately, Council has to make an on balance decision between tree retention and a substantially modified development, or the removal of the trees.

6.8.8. The retention of the significant trees on site limit development of the site given the spread and drip line of the significant trees. In light of the need to remove the trees from the site, the applicant has submitted an additional Landscape Report, which makes the following points:

The context of the surrounding neighbourhood is that of street and canopy trees plantings on the periphery of residential and commercial sites.

The landscape context of the site is that of sparsely planted, poor quality trees. As it sits now the site is out of context with in the surrounding neighbourhood. This is due to its land of mature canopy trees both within the site and on its periphery.

In general, the site with its existing trees is of poor vigour, poor visual landscape quality and offers no use to the community.
The trees existing on site have no cultural, heritage or aesthetic significance to the neighbourhood. The group of Poplars and the Spotted Gum are the only canopy trees within site that lending it the green canopy mentioned previously. Currently, the Poplars and Spotted Gum are more of a liability than an asset for numerous reasons of disease and safety.

The existing soil conditions of the site are far from optimal. There is a very thin layer of topsoil that is filled with urban debris. The soil has a very low nutrient content and requires amendment if any vegetation is to prosper in the future. The trees have suffered from years of poor nutrition and root development as a result of the depleted soil they exist in. Also, the soil is compacted from years of use and little or no air pockets exist between the soil particles for the root zones continued development. Future development around these trees will further compact the soil and delete necessary root zone. Soil cannot be added or subtracted from the root zone of a mature tree without seriously disturbing the trees roots. There is nothing that can be done to improve the soil conditions especially whilst the trees remain. Any efforts made to improve the soil conditions will disturb and destroy fibrous roots and further damage these already declining trees.

The remediation required to retain the existing trees would be extensive and certainly not the best use of the asset of this site. As outlined above, the improvement of the soil is not feasible whilst the trees remain. Trees of this maturity have quite extensive root zones. As a general rule, the root zone of a tree can be calculated to extend two to three times the spread of the canopy or three times the height. If we were to try and retain these trees during development, we would have to set aside the entire west portion of the site to avoid interfering with the existing trees root zones. The pattern the Poplars and Spotted Gum were planted in years ago negates the possibility of retaining a select one or two for the aforementioned reasons. The trees have dramatically overlapping root zones therefore the removal of a select few would cause the death of those chosen to remain.

We propose to make a positive contribution by planting a large quantity of new, healthy, trees on the site that will prosper within their new urban spaces. The proposal will utilise appropriate vigorous tree species to suit the urban conditions as well as the limitations set by the site’s hardscape.
It is important to note that we propose to plant semi-advanced species. By using more mature, nursery grown trees, the proposed landscape will positively contribute to the urban setting of the locale from day one.

Additionally, we propose to benefit the surrounding property by contributing trees to the nature strips. The proposal will employ Council’s “Street Tree Policy” to further link the Raglan Ingles Estate Development with the existing neighbourhood character. This includes ‘infilling’ the existing street tree plantings in Council’s nature strips along the boundaries of the estate (along both Raglan and Ingles Streets) with appropriately selected species from Council’s specifications.

The landscape of the proposed redevelopment respects and builds on the fact that it is adjacent to a public open space. The addition of a new, healthy landscape on this currently fallow site will encourage the residents and general public to participate in and enjoy the neighbourhood and its open spaces. By revitalising the site and creating an active, pleasant, lived-in place, with healthy and vigorous vegetation, the adjacent open space and neighbourhood will be positively enhanced.

The utilisation of semi-advanced trees within the development will help to reinstate the green urban edge and canopy characteristic of the area. Council will receive a positive contribution of immeasurable financial benefit in the form of attractive, healthy, green, landscaped space. The quantity and value of semi-advanced trees planted within the site will more than equal the replacement value of the Poplars and Spotted Gum.

Our proposed development ranges beyond the site limit and contributes to the neighbourhood with infill street tree planting.
6.8.9. In this instance it is considered reasonable that the trees be removed because:

Any development in front of the trees would effectively block views of the trees from around the site negating the benefit of retaining the trees.

The replacement trees, both on the street and street tree planting, would have make a greater contribution to the streetscape than the current trees on site. The proposed planting would be appropriate for the area in terms of neighbourhood character, would be visible from around the site, and would form a consistent planting of the site, rather than the sporadic species that exist at present.

The applicant has undertaken to plant new street trees and provide a large number of new trees on site (via their landscape report). This can be specified through conditions of permit and a number of the new trees on site can be provided in at semi-mature height, making a satisfactory contribution to the streetscape from the time of planting.

6.9. Interface and development of Lot 1 and Lot 2.

6.9.1. The development plan before Council does not show how Lot 1 would be developed, and therefore Council must consider the development of each lot separately. The applicant has advised that the Office of Housing intend to tender the purchase/development of Lot 1 and the construction of Lot 2 as one tender.

6.9.2. However, assuming that the subdivision does not proceed in a timely manner and that the public housing development is completed prior to subdivision of Lot 1, a vacant piece of land would be left of the Crockford/Ingles Street corner.

6.9.3. The Crockford/Ingles Street corner is highly exposed and presentation of a vacant piece of land and incomplete walls to this block would be unattractive. While it is understood that the Office of Housing intend to tender Lot 1 and develop Lot 1 and 2 at the same time, Council needs to be satisfied that in the event of no development, remediation works are possible for the vacant piece of land. It is therefore recommended that the following condition be placed on the development permit, which would only require implementation close to the end of development of the public housing, by which time the development of Lot 1 should be clear:
Three (3) months prior to the completion of the development permitted by this permit amended plans must be submitted to Council, unless otherwise agreed to by Council, detailing:

- alterations to the finishes of the exposed north-east wall of Block A and the north-west wall of Block D to the satisfaction of Council;

- landscaping to the vacant parcel of land on the corner of Crockford Street and Ingles Street;

to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.

These works must be implemented within six (6) months of the completion of the development and maintained to the satisfaction of Council.

6.10. Interface with the park

6.10.1. The site would abut a small area of open space that is currently under landscaped. The redevelopment of this site offers Council the opportunity to review the design of the open space area and for landscaping of the development site to integrate with future landscaping of the park. Council’s Urban Designer has prepared preliminary plans for the open space area which indicate that the area and the abutting roadways (Raglan Street and Esplanade East) can be improved. The applicant is not responsible for landscaping of the park area, which is Council’s land and responsibility. The subdivision report for this site before Council contains recommendations in regard to the parkland.

6.11. Covenants

6.11.1. The title for this property has been checked and there are no covenants on the title.

6.11.2. The land contains two drainage easements located in the area of Block A and Lot 1. The applicant has employed Connell Wanger who have designed a diversion to the two drains. The diversion to the drains would increase the size of the pipes to ensure the same flow.

6.11.3. Council’s Infrastructure Department has given an in principle agreement to the proposal, subject to final detailed drainage plans. Council’s Infrastructure Department have advised that responsibility for payment for the works would fall onto the owner/applicant/developer of the sites. This is reflected in Condition 20 of the recommendation for the Notice of Decision to Grant a Permit.
7. **OPTIONS**

7.1. Approve as recommended

7.2. Approve with changed conditions

7.3. Refuse - on key issues
   - Building height and bulk.
   - Interface with the abutting parkland
   - Interface with the surrounding residential properties.
   - Car parking.

8. **CONCLUSION**

8.1. The development of the land for public housing would support Council’s housing policy and would replace back into the area the housing stock that has been lost from the site.

8.2. The proposal has been assessed against Council’s Policies for development in a residential area and has been found to be consistent with the policies. Areas of non-compliance with the policies, such as open space, can be adequately addressed through conditions of permit.

8.3. The proposal requires a variation from Council policy in regard to building height, where part of the development would have a four storey height. The variation to Council policy is considered warranted as the proposal is on an islands site that has the capacity to accommodate a higher form of development fronting two main roads.

8.4. The proposal requires a dispensation from the car parking requirements of the planning scheme, which is reasonable, given the size of the dwellings and the likely residential type/car ownership level. Visitor parking would be provided on the street, which would repeat the past situation. This is reasonable where there is no loss of on-street parking as a result of the development.

8.5. The impact on the surrounding residences, in terms of overlooking, overshadowing, are minimized due to the separation of the site form these areas.
9. **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Council (having caused the application to be advertised) and having received and noted eighteen objections, is of the opinion that the proposed development of multi-dwelling development of the site for a mixture of two, three, four and five storey buildings and a dispensation from the car parking requirements of the planning scheme will not cause material detriment to any person other than the applicant.

That a Notice of Decision to Grant a Planning Permit be issued for the purposes of multi-dwelling development of the site for a mixture of two, three, four and five storey buildings and a dispensation from the car parking requirements of the planning scheme.

That a Notice of Decision to issue a planning permit be issued subject to the following conditions:

1. Before the use and development starts, plans to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the plans will be endorsed and will then form part of the permit. The plans must be drawn to scale with dimensions and three copies must be provided. The plans must be generally in accordance with the plans submitted with the application but modified to show:

   a) The development generally in accordance with the amended plans numbered ‘TP 05 through to TP 023 ‘Revision A’, prepared by Peddle Thorp Architects, and dated ‘June 02’, but modified to show additional alterations as required in Conditions 1b-1o below.
   
   b) The ground level car spaces provided to Block D (total twelve spaces) to be deleted and provided as full basement car spaces, and the ground level landscaped.
   
   c) The total number of on site car spaces must not be reduced as a result of the required basement Block D car parking.
   
   d) Locations of the water storage tanks in light of the new basement parking area provided.
   
   e) Each balcony provided to Block A, B, C and E must have a minimum area of 8 square metres.
   
   f) Rubbish bin storage areas to be provided for Blocks B, C and D, located so that they are screened from view from the surrounding streets.
   
   g) Letterbox facilities to be shown for each Block.
   
   h) The feature walls provided to Blocks D and E to have a textured finish, and colour detail of the wall provided.
   
   i) Architectural/art treatment to the leading edge of the feature walls provided to Blocks D and E.
   
   j) The solid fences provided along the Ingles Street frontage to have a textured finish, and colour detail of the fences provided.
   
   k) The solid section of the Ingles Street fences to incorporate measures to address graffiti. This may include planting to grow over the Ingles Street side of the fence.
   
   l) Detail of the landscaping (paving and any planting) in the ‘V’ entrances to Block D and the entrances to Block E.
   
   m) Elevation plans for all fences on site.
   
   n) All wall and parapet heights above natural ground level to be nominated on the plans.
o) Details of environmental features within the development which would promote energy efficient use of resources and energy efficiency

2. Prior to the commencement of development a schedule of finishes (2 coloured copies to be provided), detailing materials and colours of main external surfaces, including roofs and facias, walls, windows, doors and fences must be submitted to and approved by the responsible authority.

3. Prior to the commencement of development on the site a landscape plan for the site and abutting pavement area prepared by a person suitably qualified in landscape design shall be submitted to the responsible authority. The plan must show all proposed trees, shrubs and ground cover, including botanical names and sizes at maturity of all plants and the location of all areas to be covered by grass lawn or other surface material to be specified. The plan must include the planting of a minimum of 30 semi-mature trees on the site (planting height of at least 3 metres), and street tree planting.

4. Three (3) months prior to the completion of the development permitted by this permit amended plans must be submitted to Council, unless otherwise agreed to by Council, detailing:

   alterations to the finishes of the exposed north-east wall of Block A and the north-west wall of Block D to the satisfaction of Council;
   landscaping to the vacant parcel of land on the corner of Crockford Street and Ingles Street;

to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.

   These works must be implemented within six (6) months of the completion of the development and maintained to the satisfaction of Council.

5. No equipment, services and architectural features other than those shown on the endorsed plan shall be permitted above the roof level of the building unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the Responsible Authority.

6. Landscaping works must be carried out as shown on the endorsed plans and must be maintained in a proper, tidy and healthy condition to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.

   • The Councils Planning Inspector shall be advised of the completion of the landscaping so that a site inspection can be carried out. A further inspection will be carried out six (6) months after completion of the landscaping to ensure that species have been adequately maintained.

7. The garden areas shown on the endorsed plan and schedule shall only be used as gardens and shall be maintained in a proper, tidy and healthy condition to the satisfaction of the responsible authority. Should any tree or shrub be removed or destroyed it will be required to be replaced by a tree or shrub of similar size and variety.

8. Once the development has started it must be continued and completed to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.
9. The development as shown on the endorsed plans must not be altered without the written consent of the Responsible Authority.

10. The common rooms provided may only be used in association with activities carried out on or on behalf of residents of the site.

11. Outdoor lighting must be designed, baffled and located to the satisfaction of the responsible authority to prevent any adverse effect on adjoining land.

12. Exposed walls shall be cleaned and finished in a manner to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

13. All piping and ducting shall be concealed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

14. All basic services to the property including water, electricity, gas, sewerage, telephone and telecommunications (whether by means of a line or cable) must be installed underground and located in a position approved by the Responsible Authority.

15. The legal point of stormwater discharge for the proposal shall be to the satisfaction of the responsible authority. Engineering construction plans for the satisfactory drainage and discharge of stormwater from the site must be submitted to and approved by the responsible authority prior to the commencement of any buildings or works.

16. The development of the site shall not cause nuisance or be detrimental to the amenity of the neighbourhood by the emission of noise. In this regard noise from construction and/or demolition activities should comply with the Environment Protection Authority guidelines for “Construction and Demolition Site Noise”.

17. Before the use starts, areas set aside for parked vehicles and access lines as shown on the endorsed plans must be:

   a) Constructed to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.
   b) Properly formed to such levels that they can be used in accordance with the plans.
   c) Surfaced with an all-weather sealcoat to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.
   d) Drained and maintained to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.
   e) Line marked to indicate each car space and all access lanes to the satisfaction of responsible authority.

18. Parking areas and access lanes must be kept available for these purposes at all times.

19. In areas set aside for car parking, measures must be taken to the satisfaction of the responsible authority to prevent damage to fences or landscaped areas.
20. Vehicular crossings shall be constructed in accordance with the endorsed plans to the satisfaction of the responsible authority, before the use is commenced or building occupied:

   a) standard vehicular crossings shall be constructed and/or widened at right angles to the road to suit the proposed driveways incorporating bluestone pitchers or suitably shaped and coloured concrete kerb and channel to match the existing laneway or kerb and guttering (as appropriate),

   b) any redundant crossing (or part thereof) shall be removed and the footpath and kerb reconstructed incorporating bluestone pitchers or suitably shaped and coloured concrete kerb and channel to match existing kerb and guttering (as appropriate) to specifications to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and at no cost to the Responsible Authority. Any new car space(s) created along the street frontage of the site as a result of the removal of the crossing must be line marked to the satisfaction of the responsible authority. Any surplus bluestone pitchers must be returned to Council's depot, at cost to the applicant or owner.

   c) any proposed vehicular crossing shall have satisfactory clearance of any side-entry pit, power or telecommunications pole, manhole cover or marker, or street tree. Any relocation, alteration or replacement required shall be in accordance with the requirements of the relevant Authority and shall be at the applicant's expense.

21. The Applicant/Owner shall do the following things to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority:

   a) Pay the costs of all relocating/alterations/reinstatement of Council and Public Authority assets necessary and required by such Authorities for development.

   b) Obtain the prior written approval of the Council or other relevant Authority for such relocation/alterations/reinstatement.

   c) Comply with conditions (if any) required by the Council or other relevant Authorities in respect of reinstatement.

22. Street trees must only be removed by Citywide Service Solutions, Council's nominated tree maintenance contractor, unless otherwise agreed with the Street Tree Coordinator.

_**Melbourne Water Conditions**_

23. No polluted and/or sediment laden runoff is to be discharged directly or indirectly into Melbourne Water's drains or watercourses.

24. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by Melbourne Water, finished floor levels must be a minimum of 300mm above the applicable flood level.

25. At least 10 days prior to the construction a Site Management Plan, detailing pollution and sediment control measures, must be submitted to Melbourne Water.

26. Any increase in floor level height(s) that is required due to Melbourne Water or Council flood requirements must not result in any increase in wall height or building height (i.e. the raised floor level must be accommodated within the original floor to ceiling and building heights).
27. This permit will expire if one of the following circumstances applies:

a) The development is not started within 2 years of the date of this permit.
b) The development is not completed within 4 years of the date of this permit.

The Responsible Authority may extend the periods referred to if a request is made in writing before the permit expires or within three months afterwards.
FOOTNOTES:

**Building Approval Required**
- This permit does not authorise the commencement of any building construction works. Before any such development may commence, the applicant must apply for and obtain appropriate building approval.

**Building Works to Accord With Planning Permit**
- The applicant/owner will provide a copy of this planning permit to any appointed Building Surveyor. It is the responsibility of the applicant/owner and Building Surveyor to ensure that all building development works approved by any building permit is consistent with this planning permit.

**Due Care**
- The developer shall show due care in the development of the proposed extensions so as to ensure that no damage is incurred to any dwelling on the adjoining properties.

**Vehicle Crossing Approval Required**
- A cross-over permit must be obtained from Standard Roads (contact 9209.6684) prior to the carrying out of any vehicle crossing works.

**Melbourne Water**
- If further information is required in relation to Melbourne Water’s permit conditions shown above, please contact Alanna Murphy on telephone 9235 2193, quoting Melbourne Water’s references 79628.
- The applicable flood level for the property is 1.4 metres to Australia Height Datum (AHD).

Note

That the Council has made this decision having particular regard to Sections 58, 59, 60, 61 and 62 of the Planning & Environment Act 1987.
Appendix 1.

Arborist report prepared by NJr and Associates Arboricultural & Environmental Consultants:

Trees Left after Demolition of Walk-Up Units Raglan and Ingles Streets Estate, Port Melbourne

BACKGROUND.

We have been requested to review the remaining vegetation on the site of the previous Walk-up units at the Raglan – Ingles Street Estate. The buildings have been demolished leaving fences and a levelled site with three areas containing various numbers of trees.

The request from the Local Authority was for an Arborist’s report that addressed to the existing condition, life expectancy and suitability of these trees in regard to redevelopment of the site. It is proposed that all the trees be removed to allow for the construction of a multistorey building with basement car parking.

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS.

The trees established on the site are a result of original landscape planting of Tucker Reserve and that associated with the original construction of the Walk-Ups in the mid to late 1960's.

The Poplars were located in Tucker Reserve, but it is not clear how long ago these Poplars were planted. These trees could well have been 30 or more years old at the construction time. It appears that the rest of the trees remaining on this site were planted subsequent to the development.

Root distribution of the trees on this site has been determined by a number of factors including underlying salted water table, building footings and hard landscape features such as paths and walls.

The crown of the trees have formed in response to the microclimate generated by the buildings and the hard and soft landscaping.

This site has now been cleared and a veneer of topsoil placed across it. The degree of root disturbance from the demolition must be considered to be extensive due to the close proximity of the Walk-Ups to the trees and the confined area of the site. Traffic over the root systems of all of these trees, would also have been extensive, leading to considerable damage to the top section of their roots.

These trees are all in various stages of deterioration due to past improper pruning practices and general neglect. Unfortunately landscape plantings are seldom, if ever, maintained, let alone properly maintained. Public Authorities, Commercial and Private plantings are undertaken with limited or no appropriate maintenance budget being provided, particularly in the formative years.
Trees are planted in the landscape as individuals, whereas in nature they would be part of a collective. This individual planting style provides the tree with an unnatural amount of space. The consequence of the abnormal space is to allow the tree to spread out horizontally. Large spreading branches develop that are structurally poor and often have weak unions between the limbs and the trunk.

The configuration of the crown of these trees has also been determined by the microclimate that results from the buildings. Thus all the trees were largely protected from south-westerly Winter and northerly Summer storms. The root system of these trees has also developed differently as a result of the protection afforded by the buildings.

The structural development of the above and below ground sections of these trees has taken decades, but the demolition only took days. The rapid nature of man made environmental change is totally incongruous to climax vegetation as typified by these trees. These rapid changes have significant and often catastrophic implications for such trees.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A detailed tree report is set out in Appendix I at the rear of this report.

Summary

The trees on this site are structurally poor and generally in poor health and condition. The poor condition of these trees is substantially due to improper and inadequate maintenance and lack of early formative pruning. However, site conditions and age have compounded these maintenance issues.

Poplars

The proposed “Improvement To Tucker Reserve” plans of 1947 do not clearly show the Poplars. It is possible that trees of this size could be about 80 to 100 years old. However, given the rich swampy nature of the soil these trees could possibly have grown to this size in half the time. What is important is their current condition.

The trunk of each tree was drilled and indicated wetwood infection after 25 mm of sapwood. Wetwood is a protective stage that will spontaneously stop, with subsequent very rapid deterioration of tissue strength leading to catastrophic and sudden failure, usually in association with regular storm events.

The Poplars have previously been pollarded and significant and extensive decay is evident high in the crown. The tissue present in the tree at the time of wounding is now wound altered and wetwood affected. The results of this wounding impact have spread throughout the trees.

These trees are covered in sprout shoots indicating significant level of stress and decline. It is likely that the roots of these trees at the bowl are significantly decayed and the new exposure could result in sudden catastrophic failure at this point.
These trees are not treatable and are not suitable for retention, even if the site was not being redeveloped.

**Spotted Gum**

This tree has a significant root disorder, possibly caused by high salt affected water table. The tops of the roots have, most likely, been significantly damaged by traffic on the site during the demolition process.

The exposure this tree will now experience and the root problems could reasonably be considered to render this tree hazardous.

**Black Locust**

These trees have a number of very poor bark included unions and pose a significant and immediate hazard to the adjacent powerlines, Ingles Street and footpath.

The weak unions in these trees could be artificially treated by utilising a combination of recognised cable and rod bracing techniques. The cost of such treatment would be about $1,000 per tree. However, cables will require replacement every 5 years at a similar cost and it would be a significant risk to assume that this ongoing replacement requirement will occur, particularly given the past low levels of maintenance expenditure.

Branches have been lopped from the northern side of these trees to accommodate the three levels of electrical reticulation. These wounds and other improper cuts within the trees are showing large numbers of borer exit holes.

Test drilling of the trees indicated a very hard dry core typical of wound altered wood. One improperly cut branch stub was also drilled revealing a hollow of some 250 mm deep behind the dry crust of the branch stub.

These are common trees, notorious as branch shedders and fast to decay. The location and condition of these trees suggests it would not be prudent to retain them.

**Red Iron Bark**

This tree is the best on the site, however, it has a number of poorly attached trunk and limb sections. The tree is less than half-grown and its close proximity to the road and ultimate size makes it unsuitable for retention.

**LIKELY IMPACT FROM DEVELOPMENT**

These trees would not survive for the long term after redevelopment of this site, even if so-called protection areas were provided. The simple fact is that these trees have taken decades to establish. They have evolved into their present form as a result of a complex set of interactions of both the root systems and the crown.
The inadequacy and improper maintenance is common with all Public, Commercial and Private trees. The lack of awareness of the maintenance needs of plants, and inadequate maintenance allowances, continue to diminish the health and safety of trees. This is often particularly the case with trees retained on development sites.

To successfully retain a tree that has its environment disturbed requires an intensive and extensive amount of support while it re-establishes in its new environment. It must be realised that it will take trees such as these on a development site 20% or more of current age to re-establish. Thus a 50 year-old tree will require significant and regular maintenance and support for over 10 years if it is to survive the development and live out its life expectancy.

When re-establishing an old tree on a development site, it must also be considered that during this time the tree may not respond adequately or may not have the required energy reserves to survive, even given the best efforts. Further, the pruning requirements or dieback that the tree suffers may disfigure it so as to change its shape or form, thereby adversely diminishing or destroying its natural attraction.

The problem with retaining large old existing trees on development sites is that it is often purely tokenism as the trees are unsuitable or could not tolerate the environmental changes. If the trees are potentially capable of retention then considerable funding must be made available to re-establish the trees in their new environment. These large sums of money, though often very small amounts compared with the total project cost, are seldom expended, consequently more often than not the trees die prematurely, often within 10 years.

RECOMMENDATIONS

History has shown that it is much better to replant suitable vegetation that is capable of successfully establishing within the new environment. This enables the new built environment to have a new planting that is in harmony with the new land use. This also offers the opportunity of retaining age diversity with the local plant community.

The greatest limiting factor to the success of the new landscape at development sites is the inadequate attention to the appropriate preparation of the planting site and the selection of plant materials. These basic horticultural inadequacies include areas such as

Soil Problems;

- Unsuitable or degraded soils used in the planting site,
- The lack of adequate drainage of planting sites,
- Incompatible soils dumped into planting sites,
- Wrong pH or impoverished soils,
- Inappropriate or inadequate irrigation,
- Improper mulches, applications or depths.
Plant Problems

Plants with poor root systems due to poor nursery practice
Plants with poor genetic structural characteristics, ie tendency to bark included unions,
Wrong Genera, species or Provenance for the site,
Improper planting techniques.

Addressing these issues in the planning process, as well as providing adequate funding for the retention of worthy large old trees, should be the future aim of all planners and developers.

CONCLUSION.

The trees on this site are not in a suitable condition to warrant the considerable expense, in excess of $50,000 in today’s dollars, required to try and retain them.

The Poplars are clearly committed to death. No amount of money will extend their life expectancy or reduce the hazard they pose.

The Spotted Gum, though above ground it has some merit, the significant root problem precludes this tree being considered for retention.

The Black Locus have substantial internal decay, borer damage and included bark branch unions. These trees are consequently hazardous. Treatment is feasible but will have to be repeated every 5 years without fail. The risks associated with cable bracing trees adjacent to the high, medium and low voltage distribution is significant and realistically unacceptable.

The Red Iron Bark has inadequate space for its eventual size - approximately twice that of its current size. It has a number of weak unions that would also require cable and rod bracing. Being within a metre of the footpath and above the third level of electrical distribution this tree must be considered as an unsuitable plant for this location.
APPENDIX I.

*Populus nigra* “Italica” – Lombardy poplar

Five (5) trees in a rough semicircle approximately 17 m high with an average breast height diameter of about 800 mm. These trees have been pollarded some 15 years ago. As a result of this inappropriate practice extensive decay has set in at the lopping sites. Additional other wounding has, over the years, been inflicted on these trees. Drilling of the trees indicated 25 mm of sapwood then bacterial wetwood through the core of the tree.

Bacterial wetwood infection is a protective reaction initiated as a result of severe or extended periods of wounding. The infection spontaneously appears and remains until at some time in the future it spontaneously disappears. When the wetwood infection disappears, the wood within the tree rapidly looses structure and strength. Within a very short period of time the entire internal tissue takes on the consistency of a “Sponge Cake”.

The change from one state to the other is generally highlighted by the sudden catastrophic failure of the tree, often at ground level. This failure can occur during storm events that are rated at less than severe.

These trees are completely covered with dormant bud sprout shoots. These are normally initiated as a result of stress. The trees are clearly not thriving and the deadwood throughout the crown clearly shows they are in decline.

Trees in this condition are often afflicted by significant root disorders. This is often pathogenic in cause, the end result is that the roots are completely rotten, except for a thin layer of live tissue perhaps only 10 mm thick. Test boring indicated that it is likely that these trees are suffering from such root decay. This is common with this species of Poplar and given its height and exposure must be considered of great concern.

These trees are all committed to death. I believe they exhibit enough symptoms to be considered hazardous and because of their height and exposure should be removed. As it is now Autumn the crown will thin and wind resistance will drop. This may defer the possible failure of these trees until next Spring when the tree leafs up. This is the time of greatest concern as the centre of gravity moves well up the tree and the wind load further strains the tree’s structure.

I recommend these trees be removed before next Spring.

*Eucalyptus (now Corymbia) maculata* – Spotted Gum

This tree is about 20 m high with a breast height diameter of approximately 700 mm. The tree consists of a substantially straight trunk to about 9 meters where it divides into two main trunks that form the crown.

The crown appears to be healthy with some quite large deadwood at various locations. Some of these dead spars are located at direction changes of the trunks. These were originally the growing apexes but for some now obscure reason a side lateral became dominant.
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The problem of having large dead spars at such structurally critical points is that they will have extensive decay within the live trunk. The branch collar has been occluded by the trunk growth increment. This causes the dead spar to be wrapped by the bark of the trunk by each growth increment. The interface between the bark and the dead spar is moist, high in oxygen and rich in food for decay organisms. This provides the decay fungi with ideal conditions in which to grow.

Some wood decay organisms are more benign than others. In the case of Eucalypts as a generic term they are often colonised in such decay areas by Brown Rot fungi. Brown Rots are particularly nasty as they digest the cellulose leaving the rigid and hard lignin. Thus they appear hard and strong but in fact are brittle and weak.

Brown Rot fungi cause what is known as summer branch drop. They cause this by preferentially taking moisture from the surrounding healthy wood. The removal of moisture has the effect of causing the adjoining healthy tissue to become brittle leading to sudden branch failure at that point. This enables the Brown Rot organism to generate new space for its development and spread. It is good for the pathogen but not for the tree, the people or assets below.

This is a significant concern with this tree, however it is far less of a concern than the highly fluted base of the tree. Fluting or root valleys are caused by the underside of the roots of a tree growing significantly less than the top of the root. All roots of trees effectively unwrap from one cylinder, being a root, to form in combination with each other a cylinder, which is the tree trunk. Clearly the top of the root joins directly to the trunk but the underside spreads out to either side to meet the underside of the root on either side of it.

The root and trunk grow each year. If this growth is even all around the root then the trunk is substantially round at the base. Where the root grows more on the top than the bottom the diameter of the root trunk interface grows somewhat larger each year than the underside between the top of each root, therein forming valleys. This phenomenon is to do with a pathogen attack on the less vigorous underside of the roots, environmentally unsuitable conditions in the lower soil or a structural adaptation.

The degree of valley development in this tree is excessive and well outside the level of asymmetric growth exhibited by some phenotypes of this species. I believe that the extent to which this tree has developed these valleys indicates a root pathogen or particularly inhospitable soil condition, such as a lack of oxygen and/or salt below the tree root system.

I recommend the removal of this tree on safety grounds, both as a result of apparent root and crown disorders.
Robinia pseudacacia - Black Locust.

Three (3) trees located at the Ingles and Crockford Street corner. These trees are approximately 17 m high with an average breast height diameter of 700 mm. All three trees have been improperly pruned on a number of occasions. This improper pruning is mostly associated with line clearing operations for the adjacent three level; high, medium and low power distribution.

Robinia are medium dense timbered trees, however, the wood rots rapidly when the wood tissue is exposed. This is a particular problem with improper pruning wounds that do not close rapidly.

These trees are notorious for shedding limbs. This is due to included bark unions that form on many branches and trunks within the crowns on almost every tree. These trees have many such included bark unions throughout the crown.

Reaction wood can be seen on large areas of the trunk indicating significant structural degradation. Reaction wood is a differentiated tissue laid down by the cambium. This type of tissue is produced at areas of localised weakness that allows abnormal and excessive movement. The abnormal movement of cambial tissue leads to the production of reaction wood in order to try and compensate for the weakness.

If the reaction tissue resolves the localised weakness, then normal cambial growth within the area returns and the outward appearance of the bark takes on the normal character. In this instance the reaction tissue area and rate is obviously continuing as indicated by abnormal bark formation. Given the location of these trees to the powerlines, footpath and roads, they must be considered as hazardous.

The trees were all drilled using a 7/64” diameter drill bit 12” long. The drill showed they had about 25 mm of sapwood. The tissue beyond this was abnormally dry and hard indicating the altered condition of the tissue.

A number of lower improper unclosed pruning wounds were inspected and these were also drilled. The surface of the wounds had a hard crust with many boring insect exit holes. Once the drill passed through this hard dry cap it fell into a cavity some 250 mm deep.

Remedial treatment in the form of crown reduction and cable bracing and bolting is possible. However this type of treatment requires an ongoing commitment to replace the cables every 5 years and the bolts as required. The cost of works of this nature, on these trees would be at least $1,000 per tree per treatment. Because the cable effectively fools the tree into thinking it is structurally strong the tree becomes totally dependent on the cable. Cables of this type deteriorate, particularly this close to the sea, so regular replacement is imperative.

I recommend these trees be removed.
**Eucalyptus tricarpa – Red Iron Bark**

This tree is about 17 m tall with a breast height diameter of some 600 mm. It starts as a single trunk dividing into two trunks at about 7 meters. The branch union at this point appears sound, however, it is not structurally ideal due to the twisted nature of the grain. The trunk that extends over the road divides at one point into a number of sub-branches. This union is structurally unsatisfactory.

The tree is adjacent to Ingles Street being less than a meter from the footpath. It has been cut back by the power authority as it is above the high, medium and low voltage distribution lines.

This tree is only about half grown and it has already run out of available space. Clearly this tree is unsuitable for this location given the electrical assets, footpath and roadway. The tree should not be retained. More suitable plantings should be incorporated into this new site development.

The reports submitted by the applicant have been reviewed by Council’s arborist, who has commented:

I have read the arborist report and must agree that the Robinnias are a problem and should be removed due to Defects.

The other trees though are of good health and the report is obviously pointed towards removal of all trees per developers want.

Although you have a significant tree report another from a specific non biased company would auger well (we use Tree Logic as a consultant at present). Some of the findings seem of poor judgement to me especially the root problems found with the spotted gum.

There was previously a large open area for the poplars and Spotted gum to develop in when the units were still standing so root disturbance from demolition would have been minimised. As well there should have been a protection zone around each tree to protect the trees per the significant tree report.

I feel if the open space could be retained around the poplars and Spotted gum then they would continue to grow well.

The iron bark is situated in a poor area due to High voltage powerlines and will in time become poorly structured due to the requirements of constant pruning near Overhead powerlines.

Maybe if you can allow removal of the robinnias and Iron bark they can redesign the project.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDER 2</th>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBLE MANAGER:</td>
<td>Geoff Oulton – Director City Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR:</td>
<td>Paul Little and Rebecca Stockfeld</td>
</tr>
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</table>
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This application proposes the subdivision of the subject site bounded by Raglan, Ingles and Crockford Streets in Port Melbourne. The subdivision of the subject site has been lodged in conjunction with application 0096/2002 for the development of the site for the purpose of public housing. This application includes the provision of design guidelines for one of the lots.

The subdivision application has received 16 objections. The concerns raised by objectors relate to the subdivision layout, provision of design guidelines for the development of the site and resulting appearance and form of the proposed development of Lot 1.

It is considered that the content of the design guidelines will successfully guide the future development of Lot 1 in association with a planning permit application.

It is recommended that the proposal be supported subject to conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Raglan / Ingles Development
Port Melbourne

Design Guidelines – Lot 1

July 2002

Prepared by Peddle Thorp Melbourne Pty Ltd
Level 28
140 William Street
MELBOURNE VIC 3000
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1. Introduction

a. These Design Guidelines comprise the following text and the building envelope diagram (Drawing BE 01, refer Attachment B) prepared by Peddle Thorp Architects.

b. These Design Guidelines are in addition to requirements of Victorian State Laws and Building Regulations.

c. Further Planning Permit approval is required from the responsible authority for the development of Lot 1 within the building envelope.

2. Objectives

The objectives of these Design Guidelines are:

a) To ensure that future building development of Lot 1 is designed and constructed to a high standard with respect to urban design elements, consistency of built form, appearance and the use of appropriate high quality materials.

b) To ensure the development sits comfortably within the surrounding urban environment, and is visually integrated with the development of Lot 2. (Town Planning Permit 99/2002, refer Attachment C).

c) To ensure an attractive residential environment is achieved for all the residents within the completed development - both now and in the future.

3. Planning Control Framework

a) The site is located within the Municipal Boundaries of the City of Port Phillip. Use and development of the land is therefore controlled by the Port Phillip Planning Scheme.

b) The Port Phillip Planning Scheme includes the site within a Residential 1 Zone. The purpose of this zone is:
   - To provide for residential development at a range of densities with a variety of dwellings to meet the housing needs of all households.
   - To encourage residential development that respects neighbourhood character.
   - In appropriate locations allow educational, recreational, religious, community and a limited range of other non-residential uses to serve local community needs.

c) The northern edge of the site is partially affected by a Special Building Overlay. The Croxford Street frontage, extending east along the periphery of the Ingles Street frontage is the broad area subject to this control. The primary purpose of the overlay is:
   - To identify land in urban areas liable to inundation by overland flows from the urban drainage system as determined by, or in consultation with, the floodplain management authority.
   - To ensure that development maintains the free passage and temporary storage of floodwaters, minimises flood damage, is compatible with the flood
hazard and local drainage conditions and will not cause any significant rise in
flood level or flow velocity.

d) The site is surrounded, but not included within the Heritage Overlay – Area 1.

e) In addition to the zone and overlay controls outlined in points a) to d) inclusive,
relevant planning controls affecting the site are contained in the State Planning
Policy Framework and Local Planning Policy Framework, including the Municipal
Strategic Statement and Local Planning Policies, contained within the Port Phillip
Planning Scheme.

f) Use and development of the site is to be in accordance with these Design
Guidelines and associated building envelope. These Design Guidelines are to be
used in conjunction with the relevant strategic and statutory planning controls
outlined in points a) to e) inclusive.

g) Compliance with the Design Guidelines and Building Envelope does not exempt
use and development of the land form requiring a planning permit. A planning
permit must be obtained from the City of Port Phillip for the use and development
of this land, as described in Section 16 of these Design Guidelines.

h) Where there is a discrepancy between the controls contained within the Design
Guidelines and the strategic and statutory planning controls referred to in points a)
to e) inclusive, the Design Guidelines take precedence.

4. Surrounding Urban Environment

The surrounding urban environment can be summarised as follows:

a) Generally, single and double storey residential buildings with localised examples
of up to four-storey residential developments.

b) Residential dwellings are generally late 19th and early 20th century working men’s
cottages, which have been generally renovated or extended for modern living.

   Characteristics of these buildings are:

   - Expressed roof forms, with or with-out parapets,
   - Rendered or wire-cut brick external wall finishes,
   - Corrugated steel roof sheeting, or concrete roof tiles,
   - 2-3 metre street set-backs,
   - Individual address frontages, which include fences, soft landscaping, letter
     boxes, pedestrian entries and front courtyards.

c) Commercial uses along Crockford Street are less characteristic and generally
consist of glazed shop/office fronts, and/or office warehouse/service area layouts.

5. Dwelling Density

a) The total yield shall not exceed 50 dwellings.

b) The dwelling yield shall result from an appropriate response to the requirements
of these Design Guidelines.
6. Building Form

a) The building envelope diagram indicates a maximum building envelope in which a development can be constructed. (Refer Attachment B).

b) Development shall be limited to the maximum Australian Height Datum Levels (AHD) indicated on the building envelope diagram.

c) The development within the building envelope shall be restricted to four levels above natural ground. A fifth level may be permitted within the envelope indicated, subject to the demonstrated design response and performance against the Design Guidelines.

d) Allowable structures beyond the envelope include, sunshade devices, canopies, balconies and lift / stair over-runs.

e) Development shall not be permitted beyond the lot boundaries.

7. Building Design

a) The development of Lot 1 encourages an innovative contemporary design approach, which makes a positive contribution to the varied character of the streetscape.

b) The characteristics of the surrounding urban environment, as described in Section 3, are to be used to inform the building design response on this lot.

c) The elevations of the building are to be articulated to create a visually interesting addition to the neighborhood character.

d) Roof and wall lines should be articulated to compliment the surrounding urban character and scale.

e) The design of any fifth level is to have a visually 'light weight' appearance and an expressed roof form.

f) The building form shall address the adjacent street frontages and intersection, in particular the design of the building corner shall be expressed as a prominent feature.

g) Balconies shall not extend beyond the building line by more than 500mm in depth and 2500mm in length.

h) Dwellings shall be provided at natural ground level to address the street frontages, and shall be provided with pedestrian access direct to the street.

8. Car Parking

a) Car parking shall be provided for occupants at the following rates:

- One space for each one or two bedroom dwelling
- Two spaces for each three or more bedroom dwelling

Studies or studios that are separate rooms must be counted as bedrooms.

b) Car parking shall be provided for visitors at the rate of one space for every five dwellings.

c) All required car parking spaces shall be located within Lot 1.
9. Wall Materials
   a) Preferred materials include:
      - Rendered finish over masonry
      - Stone
      - Textured finished pre-cast concrete
      - Pressed face brickwork
      - Pre-finished metal sheeting to no more than 15% of a building elevation.
   b) Unfinished fibre-cement sheeting and wire cut or tumbled bricks shall not be permitted.

10. Roof Materials
   a) Preferred materials include profiled pre-coloured steel sheeting, copper sheeting and concrete tiles.
   b) Highly reflective materials such as Galvanised or Zinckalume finished steel sheeting shall not be used.

11. Colours of External Materials
   a) External finishes shall be in muted tones, to harmonise with the surrounding streetscape and urban environment.

12. Fences / Street Interfaces
   a) The design of street fencing and associated built elements shall visually integrate with the adjacent Lot 2 treatment and building design. (Refer Attachment C).
   b) Street fencing and interfaces shall be at least 50% transparent.

13. Visual and Acoustic Privacy
   a) To protect the private amenity of residents within this development and of adjoining properties, the design of dwellings shall comply at a minimum with the techniques described in Rescoda.
   b) The use of screening devices, obscured glass, raised sill heights to windows or other design considerations may be required to satisfy these techniques. The scope of response will depend on the specific dwelling design and its proximity to adjoining and neighbouring properties.

14. Energy Efficiency
   a) Each dwelling shall be designed to promote energy efficiency and shall achieve a minimum of 4.5 Stars when assessed under the “First Rate” scheme operated by the Sustainable Energy Authority of Victoria.
   b) The following techniques shall be used:
      - Protect windows from direct summer sun and allow access to winter sun.
      - Major living areas to have access to north sun at midday in winter.
      - Provide an area for the storage of recyclable material.
- Maximise permeable areas within the open space areas of the lot.
- Provide for the collection of stormwater run-off from 50% of the total roof area of buildings on the lot. Water collected to be used for the purpose of garden watering. To be stored in a discretely located tank.
- Utilise roofs for open space areas.
- Open fireplaces are not permitted.

15. Refuse Storage

a) Provision shall be made for the storage of refuse within the building envelope, enclosed and screened from view from any dwelling within or neighbouring the lot.

16. Bicycle Storage

a) Provision shall be made for one secured bicycle store / rack per unit within the building envelope.

17. Landscape Design

The landscape design for Lot 1 is to compliment and continue the landscape design approach documented for Lot 2 (Refer Attachment C).

18. Planning Permit Application Requirements

Development Plan documentation shall be submitted as part of the required Town Planning Permit application. The Town Planning Permit application shall include the documentation required by the Planning Scheme, which shall include, but not be limited to:

a) A dimensioned site layout plan, including an illustration of how the proposed development relates to the building envelope;
b) A landscape plan and planting schedule;
c) Dimensioned plans at 1:100 scale, of all building levels, including the internal room layouts of all dwellings;
d) Dimensioned elevations of all sides of the proposed building at 1:100 scale, including an illustration of how the proposed building relates to the building envelope;
e) A description of proposed external building materials, finishes and colours;
f) Diagrams showing the shadow cast by the proposed buildings and works at 9am, 11am, 1pm and 3pm at the equinox;
g) Diagrams showing the shadow cast by the proposed buildings and works between 10am and 4pm at the winter solstice.
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2. PROPOSAL

2.1. The application proposes the subdivision of the subject land into two (2) lots and creation of a carriageway easement and includes the provision of design guidelines for Lot 1 of the proposed subdivision plan.

2.2. Lot 1 would comprise the north corner of the site at the intersection of Ingles and Crockford Streets. The proposed lot has a frontage of 30.31 metres along Ingles Street and a frontage of 33.35 metres along Crockford Street, and a total area of 1314m².

2.3. No plans for the development of Lot 1 have been received at this stage.

2.4. Lot 1 is proposed to be developed for private sector residential development which will be governed by design guidelines which will set the parameters for details such as building envelope, maximum building height, building articulation, building materials, maximum yield, provision of car parking and associated on site amenity details. The design guidelines are attached to this report and contain:

   2.4.1. Objectives for the development of Lot 1.
   2.4.2. Setting a dwelling density for the development of Lot 1.
   2.4.3. Objectives and directives relating to the building form and design.
   2.4.4. Provisions for car parking to be fully contained within the area of Lot 1.
   2.4.5. Specifying objectives and directives relating to the colours and materials for the roof and exterior walls.
   2.4.6. Provisions and directives relating to Visual and Acoustic Privacy.
   2.4.7. Objectives and scope relating to the provision of energy efficient design principles.
   2.4.8. Statements relating to the provision of refuse and bicycle storage.
   2.4.9. Objectives relating to landscaping and design.
   2.4.10. A list of requirements for lodgment of a planning permit application for the development of Lot 1.
   2.4.11. A plan of the proposed building envelope and specifying to the maximum building heights.

2.5. Lot 1 would have vehicle access via the creation of a 5 metre wide carriageway easement accessed from Raglan Street.
2.6. Lot 2 would occupy the balance of the site and is the subject of planning permit application 0096/2002 for the development of public housing, including provision of older person, singles and family accommodation with multi-dwelling development of the site for a mixture of two, three, four and five storey buildings and a dispensation from the car parking requirements of the Planning Scheme.

2.7. Lot 2 is proposed to occupy the entire Raglan Street frontage of 167.48 metres with a frontage to Ingles Street of 96.62 metres and a frontage to Crockford Street of 41.93 metres. The total area of Lot 2 is proposed to have an area of 5295m2.

2.8. The subdivision application also proposes removal of two existing drainage easements, which traverse the western end of the site. It is proposed to relocate the easements around the periphery of the site, as per submitted engineering drawings.

3. SUBJECT SITE AND SURROUNDS

3.1. The site is bounded by Ingles Street, Crockford Street and Raglan Street, Port Melbourne. A small parcel of parkland is located to the south east end of the site, which together with the site, form an island from the surrounding developed area.

3.2. The site is relatively flat and as existing contains no building, the former 1960s style walk-up-flats public housing having been demolished approximately two years ago. The site entire contains a number of mature trees:

- 3 x Robinia psudoacacia.
- 5 x Populus nigra italica.
- 1 x Spotted gum – located close to the poplars.
- 1 x Iron Bark – located at the eastern end of the site fronting Ingles Street.

It is noted that the only trees affected by the proposed building envelope anticipated by the design guidelines for Lot 1 are the 3 Robinia psudoacacia and 5 Poplus nigra italica.

3.3. The site is triangular in shape, with a frontage to Ingles Street of 135.50 metres, a frontage to Raglan Street of 168.16 and a frontage to Crockford Street of 75.39. The site has an overall area of approximately 6,608 square metres.

3.4. Two drainage easement transverse the west end of the site – from Raglan Street to Crockford Street. The easements are active Council drainage easements.

3.5. Two vehicle crossings are currently provided to the site from Raglan Street.
3.6. The site is located at the northern end of the Bay Street commercial area (Crockford Street is an extension of Bay Street), and is a highly exposed site when approaching in either direction on Ingles Street or Crockford Street.

3.7. The site has a number of interfaces, with one and two storey residential terraces to the north-east along Ingles Street and to the south-west along Raglan Street. At the Crockford Street end of the site, the land uses become commercial, with a petrol station on the corner of Crockford Street and Lyons Street and commercial/industrial land uses on the north-west side of Crockford Street. The commercial/industrial buildings range between one and three storeys in height.

3.8. A small parcel of parkland abuts the site to the immediate south-east. The parkland is screened from Ingles Street with a wooden fence and contains a small range of semi-mature vegetation.

3.9. Crockford Street and Ingles Streets are heavily used roadways, with Crockford Street located in a Road zone, and both streets listed as secondary roads within the Melways. Raglan Street is a local road and is disconnected at the east end from the surrounding road network by the park.

4. ADVERTISING / OBJECTIONS

4.1. The application was advertised by placement of signs on site and notices sent to the adjoining and opposite property owner/occupiers. Notices were also placed in the Emerald Hill Times and the Port Phillip Leader local newspapers. A public information session held to explain the proposal on 27 February 2002 to coincide with the advertising period.

4.2. A total of sixteen objections have been received in relation to the proposed subdivision. Fifteen objections were received to the originally advertised subdivision plan. Following the re circulation of amended plans one further objection was received.

4.3. A consultation meeting was held on 9 May 2002 attended by local residents, the applicants (planning consultant, architect, officers of the Department of Housing, and a traffic engineer) and a City of Port Phillip Councillor and Council Officers (Urban Planers, Traffic Engineer, Urban Designer).

4.4. As a result of resident concerns raised in the objections received and at the consultation meeting, the applicant submitted revised plans for the public housing development. Changes were also made to the content of the design guidelines for lot one and are summarised as follows:

   Modified building envelope to meet urban design advice.
   Specific statement requiring the submission of development plans for the eventual application to develop lot 1.
   A framework of planning controls, which affect the site, located at the beginning of the guidelines.
   The inclusion of the plan of subdivision and copy of permit for the development of lot 2 as appendix to the guidelines.
A statement addressing possible differences in the controls of the guidelines and Planning Scheme controls.
Changes to the grammar and expression of the guidelines for consistency.
The specifying of a visitor parking rate of 1 space per 5 dwellings to be located on lot 1.
Maximum heights nominated on the building envelope plan as above the AHD of the site.
Nomination that any fifth level would be considered on the basis of design excellence and responsiveness.
A statement to the effect that the design and landscaping of lot one should be informed by the existing and surrounding neighbourhood character.

Reference to fences and interfaces, which are to be 50% transparent.

4.5. The amendments extended to the provision of a building envelope plan for a lot 1 which indicated maximum heights above AHD levels and setbacks from the street and minimum setback of the fifth level from the fourth. It is noted that the building envelope plan is an attachment to the design guidelines.

4.6. The plan of subdivision of the site relating to the area’s of each lot and the location of the carriageway easement were not altered.

4.7. The grounds of objection to the original and amended design guidelines and building envelope plan are summarised, with the officer’s response in italics. It is noted that the majority of objections contained in the objectors submissions related to the development of Lot 2 for the purpose of Public Housing. It is noted that only the grounds relevant to the application to subdivide the site are considered below.

4.8. Original plans:
• Time of application lodgment inappropriate at around election time, given the significance of the site.

_The time the application was lodged is not a relevant ground of objection, as Council cannot refuse to receive an application._

_It is noted that the application assessment and re-circulation of plans period has extended long past the Council election time._

• Planning fraud.

_This ground of objection has not been substantiated and is considered unreasonable._

• The layout of the development is not integrated with the bordering streets.

• How does the application meet ResCode?

• The inclusion of a five storey building in a precinct that consists of maximum two storey dwellings will change the character of the area.
• Intended increase in population is too high for the area to accommodate.
• It does not provide an attractive “Gateway” to Port Melbourne, with a solid building and no greenery.
• The private development could add up to 100 people onto the site – this is unacceptable.
• We are being asked to approve one part of the development without knowing what is happening to the other.
• We require detail of the proposed exterior finishes.
• Height of the proposal.
• Loss of city views.

The site is an island site, and is surrounded by a variety of buildings, including Victorian style one and two storey buildings and commercial style buildings. The site sits in a transition area between commercial buildings and residential buildings, some of which is included in a Heritage Overlay.

The layout of the proposed subdivision has considered the interplay of the surrounding street network and existing development. The plan of subdivision will allow for an appropriate high density apartment development on Lot 1 subject to an application for planning permit and the application of the design guidelines to inform the development.

The application for subdivision will be assessed against Clause 56 (ResCode) at section 7 of this report.

The character of the local area has been carefully considered in the compilation of the design guidelines as well as the development of Lot 2 under planning permit application 0096/2002. The proposal would set guidelines for the future introduction of a new element into the streetscape, which would add to the mixed nature of the building forms in the area.

The design guidelines have been complied to set a clear path for the future development of Lot 1 and include performance measures to set maximum, yield, building envelope and building height on the site.

The guidelines set a maximum number of 50 dwellings for Lot 1. It is considered that this is a maximum yield for the site.

The guidelines will allow a maximum of five stories, with any fifth storey required to be recessed by a minimum of 3.5 metres behind the four storey envelope and recessed a minimum total distance of 6 metres from the street frontage. It is considered by officers that the design guidelines allow for appropriate flexibility whilst ensuring that the development of Lot 1 will be controlled to be site and location responsive.
Landscaping

- Would like to see more trees and gardens in the development to break the concrete feel of this large development.
- Insufficient trees.
- More trees needed – to replace the trees to be removed and the lost street trees.
- Do not retain the mature trees.
- The proposal would require the removal all existing trees from the site.

The applicants have considered the removal of the mature trees within the envelope of the proposed development of Lot 1 as fundamental. It is noted that provision of landscaping plans within Lot 1 is required to be consistent with the endorsed landscaping plan of Lot 2 as directed by the design guidelines.

The trees that will be affected are the 3 Robinia psudoacacia and 5 Populus nigra italica. The applicant has submitted reports on the state of the trees, however a review by Council’s arborist indicates that depending on the type of development proposed, some of the trees could be retained. Ultimately, Council has to make a balanced decision between tree retention and a substantially modified development, or the removal of the trees.

This report concludes that the removal of the trees is reasonable because:

Any development in front of the trees would effectively block views of the trees from around the site negating the benefit of retaining the trees.

The replacement trees, both on the street and street tree planting, would make a greater contribution to the streetscape than the current trees on site. The proposed planting would be appropriate for the area in terms of neighbourhood character, would be visible from around the site, and would form a consistent planting of the site, rather than the sporadic species that exist at present.

Park

- Would support Council in keeping the area as an open space/park – has this been considered?
- Proposal fails to make a contribution to the local environment as it does not assist with the shortage of local parkland and public open space – it would exacerbate these problems.
- The large scale private development proposed for the corner of Crockford Street and Ingles Street will not assist in creating strong positive identity for the site compared to alternative options such as a local park with water features.

The site is zoned Residential 1 and is therefore legitimately set aside for residential subdivision/development/land use. The site is not a park and has not been used as one in the past.
It is considered that the proposed development of Lot 1 is adequately addressed via the inclusion of the design guidelines. These guidelines will be applied in association with a planning permit application for the development of Lot 1.

It is noted that the future further subdivision of lot 1 would attract a requirement for an open space contribution. It is considered in this instance that a monetary contribution of 5% would be an appropriate rate. It is further considered that details of the open space contribution should be specified in the form of a Section 173 Agreement along with the incorporation of the Design Guidelines. (See 8.4)

Officer’s consider that an opportunity to allocate the open space contribution to the existing area of under maintained open space located to the south of the site. This would ensure that the benefit of the funds is maintained in close proximity to the subject development and also benefit the existing local residents.

There is no clear means by which the Planning Scheme can be used as a tool to facilitate this process, however it is raised in this report as a means of advising the Council of such a possibility.

5. URBAN PLANNERS ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES

5.1. Planning Scheme Provisions

5.2. The site is located in a Residential 1 Zone and falls under a Special Building Overlay.

Clause 32.01 - Residential 1 Zone, where a permit is required to subdivide land.

An application for subdivision must meet the requirements of Clause 56.

Clause 44.05 – Special Building Overlay specifies that a permit is required to subdivide land.

Melbourne Water is a relevant Referral Authority.

6. EXTERNAL REFERRALS

6.1. Pursuant to the requirements of Section 55 of the Planning & Environment Act, the plan was referred to relevant Public Authorities for comment, the following responses have been received:

Melbourne Water Requested that requirements be placed for the provision of main drainage facilities.

South East Water Requested that requirements be placed for the provision of water supply and sewerage.

Multinet Gas No objection.

CitiPower Requested that requirements be placed for the provision of electrical services. The requirements have since been satisfied and there is no need for conditions on the permit.
6.2. The relevant referral authorities raised no objection to the proposed subdivision. The following conditions were required by Melbourne Water and South East Water:

MELBOURNE WATER

(a) Prior to Certification, the Plan of Subdivision must be referred to Melbourne Water, in accordance with Section 8 of the subdivision Act 1988.

(b) No polluted and/or sediment laden runoff is to be discharged directly or indirectly into Melbourne Water’s drains or watercourses.

SOUTH EAST WATER

The certified Plan of Subdivision should show a 2.0 metre wide sewerage easement centrally located over the sewer, to be in favour of South East Water Limited pursuant to Section 12(1) of the Subdivision Act.

7. CLAUSE 56

7.1. The application is relevant to Clause 56 of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme which relates to the subdivision of land. Outlined below is a summary of the relevant Res Code requirements under Clause 56 of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme.

56.01 SITE AND CONTEXT DESCRIPTION AND DESIGN RESPONSE

An application must be accompanied by:

• A site and context description.
• A design response.

ASSESSMENT

The application was submitted with a Neighbourhood Character Description and Site Description plan to satisfy the requirements of Clause 56.01-1 and Clause 56.01-2.

56.02 COMMUNITY DESIGN

56.02-1 Residential character and identity objective

To design residential areas that promote community development through the creation of neighbourhood focal points and a sense of local character and identity.
Standard C1

Subdivision layouts should give a residential environment a strong and positive identity by responding to site characteristics, its setting, landmarks and views, and through the street and open space networks.

Neighbourhood identity should be reinforced by locating focal points for community and retail facilities within reasonable walking distance of most residents.

Subdivision layouts:

_ Must respect the existing neighbourhood character or achieve a preferred neighbourhood character consistent with any relevant neighbourhood character objective, policy or statement set out in this scheme.

_ Must respond to and integrate with the surrounding urban environment.

_ Should encourage development to front major streets, through the use of service roads or side or rear access.

ASSESSMENT

The particular subdivision layout proposed by the application is considered to be appropriate based upon the fact the site is proposed to be partly use and developed for the purpose of Public Housing on Lot 2 (see 0096/2002) with the remainder of the site to be sold off to the private sector for development in accordance with Development Guidelines.

56.02-2 Planning for movement objective

To provide a movement network that establishes good internal and external access for residents, maximises safety, encourages public transport patronage and minimises the impact of through traffic.

Standard C2

The movement network should be designed to:

_ Ensure vehicles are able to move in a convenient, logical, safe and efficient manner.

_ Provide a high level of access within a residential area and have good connections to external routes.

_ Slow traffic within residential areas and divert through traffic to desired routes.

_ Respect the existing or preferred neighbourhood character and maximise residential amenity.

_ Provide a safe, accessible, convenient, efficient and logical pedestrian and bicycle network.

_ Provide opportunities for public transport.
Ensure emergency and service vehicle access to all developments.

ASSESSMENT

The subdivision of the subject land has considered issues of mobility to and from the subject site. It is considered that the creation of a carriageway easement will facilitate convenient access to the future development of Lot 1.

The future development of Lot 1 has been considered under the provision of design guidelines which make specific reference to specific mobility issues such as car parking, bicycle storage and disability access.

56.02-3 Environmental sustainability objective

To facilitate an environmentally sustainable approach to urban development by minimizing fossil fuel use, protecting environmental assets and providing for higher densities.

Standard C3

Street layouts and lot densities should be designed to minimise fossil fuel use by reducing local vehicle travel distances, maximising public transport effectiveness and encouraging walking and cycling to daily activities.

Street and lot layouts should enable efficient provision of physical services.

Street and lot dimensions should facilitate the siting and design of dwellings to minimize fossil fuel use and maximise use of passive solar energy.

Subdivision layouts should:

- Retain significant vegetation and habitat areas.
- Incorporate natural and cultural features.
- Minimise soil erosion.
- Encourage on-site water retention.
- Avoid inappropriate development on floodplains.
- Use drainage methods that protect and enhance streams.

ASSESSMENT

The subdivision of the site will result in the loss of existing vegetation located on the site, however, it has been demonstrated by the applicant that the existing vegetation cannot be maintained on the basis of the development as proposed. The applicant has chosen to continue with the selected building envelopes as referenced in the design guidelines and it is considered that subject to the incorporation of a landscaping plan that the Council is required to decide if the site should be subdivided with development guidelines which proposed a building envelope at the expense of some existing trees on site.
The remaining issues associated to environment sustainability are addressed by the design guidelines under Energy Efficiency, which proposes that each of the new dwellings occupying Lot 1 will have a 4.5 star energy rating.

56.02-4 Residential diversity objective

To provide residential areas that meet the diverse needs of the community with a wide choice in housing and associated public and commercial uses.

Standard C4

The design of neighbourhoods should:

- Provide for a variety of housing types and other compatible land uses.
- Be arranged to encourage provision of local services, facilities and employment, in a manner that minimises land use conflicts.

A mix of lot sizes should be provided within neighbourhoods that includes smaller residential lots and lots suitable for integrated medium density housing in areas close to services, public transport and public open space.

ASSESSMENT

The application includes the provision of Design Guidelines for Lot 1, which allow for the development of a maximum of 50 dwellings within a specified building envelope. It is noted that the development of Lot 2 under Planning Permit 0096/2002 has provided for a range of dwelling types to suit the needs of diverse group of Public Housing users.

The context of the subject site that a variety of dwelling within the development of Lot 1 is not appropriate and that the provision of a high density development is an appropriate solution for Lot 1.

56.02-5 Public open space objective

To provide a public open space network, including appropriate land for recreation, that can meet the diverse needs of today’s residents and be adapted to the needs of future users.

Standard C5

Public open spaces should be located and designed to:

- Improve the legibility and character of the development.
- Provide for a range of uses and activities.
- Promote on-site infiltration of stormwater run-off.

ASSESSMENT
The proposal to subdivide the subject land is considered relative to the need to create or enhance areas for public open space. It is noted that the recommendation relating to this application includes the provision of a Section 173 Agreement which will specify that where there is a future subdivision of Lot 1 that a Open Space Contribution of 5% of the value of the land will be payable to the City of Port Phillip. The S173 Agreement will also reference the provision of Design Guidelines for the development of Lot 1.

56.02-6 Safety and security objective

To enhance the safety and security of residents and property in residential areas by reducing the potential for crime and vandalism.

Standard C6

Subdivision layouts should:

- Provide for public surveillance of streets and public open spaces by:
  - Orienting lot frontages to streets and public open spaces.
  - Providing streets on public open space boundaries.
  - Locate open space and community facilities at focal points that are easily observed by surrounding and passing residents.
  - Locate pedestrian and bicycle paths along streets fronted by dwellings.
  - Avoid creating areas of poor surveillance on routes to and from public transport.

**ASSESSMENT**

The subdivision of the subject site is considered have a limited impact upon the potential safety of the subject site. It is noted however the site is an island site and therefore the surveillance of the perimeter and internal areas of the site will be generally good.

It is considered that the location of the carriageway easement has considered issues of safety relevant to the ingress and egress from the site that a suitable location has been selected to provide sufficient clearance from intersections and other vehicle movement hubs.

56.02-7 Environmental constraints and bushfire hazard objective

To ensure that the design of residential areas takes into account environmental constraints including soil erosion, flooding and bush fire hazard.
Standard C7

Subdivision layouts should:

- Avoid inappropriate development on land subject to flooding.
- Minimise soil erosion.
- Retain significant vegetation and habitat areas.
- Incorporate natural and cultural features.
- Encourage on-site water retention and use drainage methods that protect and enhance streams.

The layout of subdivisions abutting long term non-urban areas or conservation areas that are of high bushfire hazard should ensure that:

- Streets are located, connected and designed to allow safe and efficient movement of fire emergency vehicles.
- Lots are configured to facilitate siting and design of dwellings incorporating bushfire protection measures.

ASSESSMENT

The subdivision of the site is applicable to the referral of the application to Melbourne Water given its location within a Special Building Overlay. Melbourne Water responded by offering no objection subject to the inclusion conditions, which will form part of the recommendation to Council.

56.03 MOVEMENT NETWORK

56.03-1 Street network objectives

To provide a network of streets with clear physical distinctions between traffic routes and residential streets based on function, legibility, convenience, traffic volumes, vehicle speeds, public safety and amenity.

To provide acceptable levels of accessibility, safety and convenience for all street and road users in residential areas, while ensuring acceptable levels of amenity and minimising the negative impact of through traffic.

To orient the street network to facilitate the production of lots with high solar access potential and integrate the street network with natural drainage and open space systems.
**ASSESSMENT**

The proposed subdivision of the land allows for the creation of a carriage way easement which applies convenient and suitable access to and from the site. There is no proposal to develop an internal street network.

56.03-2 Street network detail objectives

To provide acceptable levels of accessibility, safety and convenience for all street and road users in residential areas, while ensuring acceptable levels of amenity and minimising the negative impact of through traffic.

To discourage residential streets from operating as through traffic routes for externally generated traffic, while limiting the length of time local drivers need to spend in a low speed environment.

To provide the basis for cost effective design and construction of the street network.

**ASSESSMENT**

Not applicable, no internal street network proposed.

56.03-3 Intersection objective

To ensure street intersections are safe, convenient and appropriate for the type of street.

**ASSESSMENT**

Not applicable, no internal street network proposed.

56.03-4 Controlling speed objective

To provide accessibility, safety and convenience for all street users in residential areas by ensuring that the speed of traffic is appropriate for the type of the street.

**ASSESSMENT**

Not applicable, no internal street network proposed.

56.03-5 Local accessibility objectives

To provide a safe, convenient and legible movement network for pedestrians and cyclists along streets and paths to points of attraction within and adjoining the development.

To provide a movement network that contributes to limiting the use of fossil fuels.
Standard C12

The street network should:

- Facilitate walking, cycling and the use of public transport for access to daily activities.

- Enable relatively direct local vehicle trips within the neighbourhood and to local activity points.

The street network and paths should provide a movement system for pedestrians and cyclists that is efficient, cost effective and substantially capable of visual surveillance by residents.

Links should be provided to facilitate major pedestrian or cyclist movement where cul-desac heads abut other streets or public open space.

**ASSESSMENT**

*There is no internal street network proposed; however the site is bounded by Ingles, Crockford and Raglan Streets. The site is well located for safe and convenient access to alternative means of transport.*

56.03-6 Public transport objectives

To provide for bus routes that are accessible from all dwellings and activity centres and efficient to operate.

To provide a movement network in the vicinity of fixed rail that is focused towards passenger stops.

To establish a movement network that provides convenient linkages to activity centres and local facilities either within or adjoining the development.

**ASSESSMENT**

*Not applicable, no internal street network proposed. See above.*

56.04 PEDESTRIANS AND CYCLISTS

56.04-1 Pedestrian and cyclists objectives

To provide a safe, convenient and legible network of on-street and off-street paths for pedestrians and cyclists to points of attraction within and beyond the development.

To design and develop new residential communities to promote walking and cycling to daily activities.
ASSESSMENT

Not applicable, no internal street network proposed. Existing pedestrian access around the perimeter of the site will remain.

56.05 PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

56.05-1 Shared usage objective

To encourage the efficient use of public open space to meet diverse community needs.

Standard C15

Public open space should be designed:

- To encourage its use for a variety of purposes.
- To encourage shared use with other community facilities.

ASSESSMENT

There is no designated private open space proposed under the plan of subdivision. It is noted that the future developer of Lot 1 will be required to pay and open space contribution of 5% of the value of Lot 1 if it is subdivided. This will be ensured via the requirement of a Section 173 Agreement. (See 8.4)

56.05-2 Public open space provision objectives

To ensure that public open space of appropriate quality and quantity is provided to contribute towards meeting the recreational and social needs of the community in convenient locations.

To incorporate natural and cultural features in the design of public open space where appropriate.

ASSESSMENT

See above.

56.05-3 Public open space design objectives

To ensure that public open space of appropriate quality and quantity is provided to contribute towards meeting the recreational and social needs of the community in convenient locations.

To incorporate natural and cultural features into areas of public open space, where appropriate.

To ensure that public open space is designed and located to provide a safe environment for users and abutting and adjacent residents.
ASSESSMENT

See above.

56.06 LOT SIZE AND ORIENTATION

56.06-1 Lot diversity objective

To provide a range of lot sizes to suit a variety of dwelling and household types, with an area and dimensions that meet user requirements.

Standard C18

Lot sizes should be provided to meet the projected requirements of people with different housing needs, and to provide for housing diversity and choice.

Lots should be designed to have the appropriate area and dimensions to enable the siting and construction of a dwelling and associated outbuildings, the provision of private open space, and convenient vehicle access and parking.

ASSESSMENT

The proposed subdivision allows for the creation of two lots for the development of high density residential development. The typical considerations of lot size are not specifically relevant given the unique circumstances of this site.

56.06-2 Solar orientation objective

To orient lots to reduce fossil fuel use and make best use of solar energy.

Standard C19

At least 70 per cent of lots should have appropriate solar orientation, unless there are significant constraints that limit the achievement of this target.

Lots have appropriate solar orientation when:

_ The long axes of lots are within the range N20 degrees west to N30 degrees east, or E20 degrees north to E30 degrees south.

_ Dimensions of lots are adequate to protect solar access to the lot, taking into account likely dwelling size and the relationship of each lot to the street.

ASSESSMENT

The subdivision of the land into two relatively large lots allows the designers of buildings which will occupy the site the opportunity to maximize the benefits of the solar orientation that the site enjoys.

56.06-3 Site constraints and features objective

To provide lots with an area and dimensions that protect environmental features and take account of site constraints.
Standard C20

Lots should be designed to have an area and dimensions that enable dwellings to be sited to:

_ Protect natural or cultural features.

_ Take into account site constraints including soil erosion, poor drainage, saline soils or bushfire risk.

**ASSESSMENT**

*The proposed subdivision of the site allows for the creation of two relatively large lots and a carriageway easement. The dimensions of the two proposed lots are considered appropriate for the development of both Lot 1 and Lot 2.*

56.06-4 Lot area and dimensions objective

To provide lots with area and dimensions to enable the appropriate siting and construction of a dwelling, private open space and vehicle access and parking.

Standard C21

An application to subdivide land that creates lots of less than 300 square metres should be accompanied by information that shows:

_ That the lots correspond with a development approved under this scheme, or

_ That a dwelling may be constructed on each lot in accordance with the requirements of this scheme.

Lots greater than 450 square metres in area should be capable of containing a rectangle measuring 10 metres by 15 metres.

Lots of between 300 square metres and 450 square metres:

_ Should contain a rectangle measuring:

_ 10 metres by 15 metres, or

_ 9 metres by 15 metres if a boundary wall is nominated as part of a building envelope.

_ Should contain a building envelope:

_ Which meets the requirements of this scheme and the Building Regulations, or

_ Which does not meet the requirements of:

_ Standards A10, A11, A13 of Clause 54, or

_ Standards B17, B18, B20 of Clause 55,
provided that the building envelope is noted as a restriction affecting abutting lots using a Section 173 agreement under the Act, or under Section 23 of the Subdivision Act 1988.

If lots of an area of between 300 square metres and 450 square metres are proposed to contain semi-detached dwellings, the long axis of the lots should be within 30 degrees east and 20 degrees west of north unless there are significant physical constraints that limit the achievement of this standard.

**ASSESSMENT**

*The respective areas of the proposed lots are 1314m2 for Lot 1 and 5295m2 for Lot 2. It is considered that these areas are suitable based upon the proposed construction for each Lot.*

56.07 STREET DESIGN

56.07-1 Streetscapes objectives

To provide attractive streetscapes that contribute to the creation and enhancement of neighbourhood character and amenity.

To provide sufficient carriageway and verge widths to enable streets to perform their designated functions within the street network.

To encourage use of residential streets by pedestrians and cyclists and allow cars, buses and other users to proceed safely and without unacceptable inconvenience and delay.

To provide a safe, distinct and pleasant environment for residents and other users.

**ASSESSMENT**

*Not applicable, no internal street network proposed.*

56.07-2 Street width objectives

To provide sufficient carriageway and verge widths to allow streets to perform their designated functions within the street network.

To encourage use of residential streets by pedestrians and cyclists and allow cars, buses and other uses to proceed safely and without unacceptable inconvenience and delay.

**ASSESSMENT**

*Not applicable, no internal street network proposed.*

56.07-3 Street alignment objective

To provide street geometry that is consistent with the needs of the street function, physical land characteristics and safety.
ASSESSMENT

Not applicable, no internal street network proposed.

56.07-4 Street function objectives

To provide sufficient carriageway and verge widths to allow streets to perform their designated functions within the street network.

To provide street geometry that is consistent with the needs of the street function, physical land characteristics and safety.

To accommodate public utility services and drainage systems.

ASSESSMENT

Not applicable, no internal street network proposed.

56.07-5 Emergency vehicle access objective

To provide appropriate emergency vehicle access.

Standard C26

Street carriageways must be designed to accommodate the passage of emergency vehicles.

Emergency vehicles should have easy access to all dwellings in a residential area.

Street carriageways abutting areas of high bush fire hazard comprising the long term urban edge or conservation areas should be designed to the requirements of the relevant fire authority to provide adequate access to fire emergency vehicles under conditions of poor visibility.

ASSESSMENT

Not applicable, no internal street network proposed.

56.07-6 Intersections and turning objective

To ensure that intersections are designed to provide safe and convenient vehicle movements.

ASSESSMENT

Not applicable, no internal street network proposed.

56.08 STREET CONSTRUCTION

56.08-1 Pavement construction objectives

To provide street pavement and edges that reinforce the function and amenity of the street.
To construct streets of appropriate strength to enable the carriage of vehicles at a minimum total cost to the community.

**ASSESSMENT**

*Not applicable, no internal street network proposed.*

56.08-2 Pavement edge objective

To provide a pavement edge that is appropriate for the control of vehicle movements, performs any required drainage function and is structurally adequate.

**ASSESSMENT**

*Not applicable, no internal street network proposed.*

56.08-3 Path construction objective

To ensure the geometry and construction of footpaths and bicycle paths is appropriate.

**ASSESSMENT**

*Not applicable, no internal street network proposed.*

56.09 DRAINAGE SYSTEMS

56.09-1 Minor drainage layout objectives

To prevent stormwater damage to property.

To provide a stormwater system that can be maintained economically.

To minimise the occurrence of traffic accidents during minor storm events.

To minimise increases in stormwater run-off and protect the environmental values and physical characteristics of receiving watercourses from degradation by urban run-off.

**Standard C31**

The design of drainage systems should use recognised hydrologic, hydraulic and residential parameters and design methodology.

The minor drainage system must ensure that any overflow is directed to the major drainage system without causing damage to property or affecting the safety of people.

The minor drainage system should be designed to ensure that existing downstream flows are restricted to pre-development levels unless otherwise agreed to by the responsible drainage authority.
The minor drainage system must enable the safe passage of vehicles at reduced speeds on streets that have been affected by run-off from an Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) of 50 per cent.

The drainage network should be accessible and designed for easy maintenance.

Drainage networks should minimise the potential for accumulation of silt and debris, and provide for collection and removal at accessible locations.

Drainage networks must ensure that there are no hidden flow paths that could reduce the effectiveness and operation of failsafe mechanisms.

Where a portion of the drainage system lies within a lot, access must be available for maintenance.

**ASSESSMENT**

*It is noted that part of the application to subdivide the site allows for the realignment of an existing drainage network with incorporates two drainage pipes which transverse the north west area of the site.*

*The applicants have engaged appropriately qualified engineers to undertake a plan of diversion, which has been viewed and generally supported by Councils Portcon department. It is noted that a condition relating to the providing more detailed plan relating to the legal point of discharge for the proposed subdivision will be required by conditions.*

56.09-2 Minor drainage design objectives

To prevent stormwater damage to property.

To contain nuisance flows to a level that is acceptable to the community.

**Standard C32**

Materials used in drainage networks must be durable, maintainable and cost effective to the community.

The design of the minor drainage system:

- Should be based on Australian Rainfall and Run-off - A guide to flood estimation, Australian Institute of Engineers, 1987 and cited references.

- Should be based on a coefficient of run-off for impervious areas of 0.9, and for pervious areas, a coefficient derived from Australian Rainfall and Run-off - A guide to flood estimation, Australian Institute of Engineers, 1987 or from locally based research.

- Should have the capacity to control stormwater flows under normal operating conditions for an AEP of 50 per cent, except where overland flows exceed 0.4 square metres per second in this case piping to 20 per cent AEP should be provided. In this standard control means the management of the flows to ensure the system will act in a predetermined manner under a specific rainfall event.
_ Should be based on a rainfall intensity based on the AEP as follows:

_ For suburban residential areas, an AEP of 50 per cent, except where the gap flows create a situation where the mean flow depth (d) multiplied by the mean flow velocity (Vave) exceeds 0.4 square metres per second.

_ For residential lots with gross densities less than 20 lots per hectare, an AEP of 20 per cent.

_ For residential lots with gross densities greater than 20 lots per hectare, an AEP of 10 per cent.

The minor drainage system should prevent ponding for a prolonged period from a stormwater flow of an AEP of 50 per cent, which is ponding for longer than 1 hour after cessation of rainfall.

Swale drains on access places or access streets should be designed so that:

_ Ponding for greater than 1 hour after cessation of rainfall is unlikely,

_ Operating flow velocities are less than 1.5 metres per second, and

_ The turf used is resistant at operating flow velocities to scour and erosion and tolerant of submersion.

**ASSESSMENT**

_ The proposed subdivision allows for the diversion of the existing drainage infrastructure and its replacement at the cost of the applicant. It is noted that a plan will be required which will nominate the details of the diversion, which will be assessed by Council's engineers.

**56.09-3 Minor drainage discharge objective**

To prevent stormwater damage to property.

**Standard C33**

Dwelling drainage should be directed to the front of the lot and discharged into the street gutter or legal point of discharge unless the topography of the lot makes it necessary to do otherwise.

Where soil permeability is adequate for on-site filtration, a soak pit may be provided.

Where the topography of the lot makes it necessary to discharge to the rear of the lot, interlot drainage designed to accept the run-off from impervious areas should be provided.

**ASSESSMENT**

_ Appropriate conditions will address this standard of Clause 56.

**56.09-4 Drainage pits objective**
To protect the environmental values and physical characteristics of receiving watercourses from degradation by urban run-off.

**Standard C34**

Drainage pits should be spaced at intervals of no greater than 90 metres, to assist maintenance programs.

Drains should be placed so that the minimum depth below the top of the kerb is 0.75 metres to top of pipe, and in lots the minimum depth is 0.3 metres from top of pipe to the finished surface (except where plastic pipes are used, when the minimum depth is 0.45 metres).

Drainage pits should be designed for the collection and retrieval of silt, debris and litter provided at locations nominated by the responsible drainage authority.

Culverts and piped drains should operate with flow velocities between 0.6 and 0.8 metres per second under normal conditions providing that it can be demonstrated that the culvert or drain will remain serviceable at high velocities.

Culverts and piped drains should operate under head during a designed flow, providing that a detailed hydraulic grade line analysis demonstrates that no section of the drainage network is surcharged to the extent that stormwater will leave the piped drainage system and discharge overland except by design.

Culverts and pipes should comply with the appropriate Australian Standard for their manufacture and installation.

**ASSESSMENT**

_The application has been referred to Melbourne water for their assessment and they have advised that they have no objection to the proposed subdivision on the basis that conditions relating to storm water discharge are included in any planning permit to subdivide the land._

56.09-5 Major drainage system objectives

To prevent flood damage to the built and natural environment and prevent both short term and long term inundation of dwellings.

To contain nuisance flows to a level that is acceptable to the community.

To ensure the street system operates adequately during and after major storm events.

To provide a stormwater system that minimises erosion and utilises open space in a manner that does not detract from its principal function.

To protect the environmental values and physical characteristics of receiving watercourses.
ASSESSMENT

The application has been referred to Melbourne water for their assessment and they have advised that they have no objection to the proposed subdivision on the basis that conditions relating to storm water discharge are included in any planning permit to subdivide the land.

56.10 UTILITIES PROVISION

56.10-1 Shared trenching objective

To provide public utilities to each lot in a timely, efficient and cost effective manner.

To maximise the opportunities for shared trenching and reduce constraints on landscaping within road reserves.

Standard C36

The reticulated services for water, gas, telecommunications and electricity should be provided in shared trenching wherever practical to minimise construction costs and land allocation for underground services.

ASSESSMENT

Details of public utilities locations and trenching details will be addressed when the development application for lot 1 is made.

56.10-2 Sewerage objective

To provide a sewerage system that is adequate for the maintenance of public health and the disposal of effluent in an environmentally friendly manner.

Standard C37

Provision must be made for the treatment and disposal of sewerage wastes to the satisfaction of the responsible authority or relevant servicing authority.

Sewerage should be disposed of by a reticulated system.

Sewerage facilities should be designed in accordance with the requirements of the relevant servicing authority.

ASSESSMENT

Details of the sewerage plan for the site would be required at a building permit stage and are not detailed under the proposed subdivision plan.

56.10-3 Water supply objective

To provide an adequate, reliable, safe, efficient and potable supply of water.
Standard C38

An adequate supply of water must be provided to all lots in the development to the satisfaction of the responsible water supply authority.

ASSESSMENT

Access to clean and safe water supply is available from existing infrastructure.

56.10-4 Electricity, telecommunications and gas objective

To provide public utilities to each lot in a timely, efficient and cost effective manner.

Standard C39

The electricity supply system should be designed in accordance with the requirements of the relevant electricity supply agency.

The telecommunications system should be designed in accordance with the requirements of the relevant telecommunications servicing agency.

The reticulated gas supply should be designed in accordance with the requirements of the relevant gas supply agency.

ASSESSMENT

Access to electricity, gas and telecommunications is available from existing infrastructure. See referrals and conditions.

56.10-5 Public lighting objective

To provide public lighting to ensure safety of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

Standard C40

Public lighting should be provided to streets, footpaths, public telephones, and to major pedestrian and bicycle links likely to be well-used at night to provide safe passages for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

The street lighting should be designed in accordance with Australian Standard AS1158.1.1-1997, Road lighting, Vehicular traffic (Category V) lighting - performance and installation design requirements.

The lighting of public areas should be designed in accordance with Australian Standard AS1158.3.1-1999, Road lighting, Pedestrian Area (Category P) lighting - performance and installation design requirements.

ASSESSMENT

Lighting details have not been specified, however it is considered that they will be addressed via the lodgment of a planning permit application for the development of Lot 1.
8. STRATEGIC ISSUES

8.1. Appropriateness of the Subdivision Layout Plan

The application proposes the subdivision of the subject land into two lots. The respective lots have areas of 1414m² for Lot 1 and 5295m² for Lot 2. The subdivision of the site should be considered relative to the development of the site for the purpose of public housing on Lot 2 and a private residential development on Lot 1 as per the design guidelines.

The site is generally rectangular in shape and it is considered that the subdivision layout plan has considered the important opportunities and constraints of the site including its appearance and location relative to adjoining land uses and development.

The subject site is unique within the City of Port Phillip and could be classified as a greenfield island site. Whilst this is the case the historic use and development of the land has been for the purpose of public housing, which will be maintained in principle.

The creation of two lots will inevitably result in the sale and development of Lot 1 for a private development in accordance with the design guidelines. It is considered that the remaining public housing development of Lot 2 as proposed under application 96/2002 will provide appropriate public housing on the site with a new private development. In this regard it is considered that the design guidelines will provide for an appropriate interface between the two lots.

The plan of subdivision has considered the interface of the site to the adjoining street network and on the basis of the design guidelines has allowed a building envelope which will provide symmetry for the overall development of the site.

Details of access to Lot 1 are provided on the subdivision plan, which clearly shows provision for a 5 metre wide carriageway easement, which will facilitate vehicle ingress and egress from Lot 1. It is considered that the location of this easement and the associated vehicle crossing are appropriate in terms of safety and general convenience, and in particular will not have an unreasonable impact upon traffic, movements in Raglan Street.

8.2. Diversion of Existing Underground Infrastructure

The proposed subdivision of the site in association with the provision of design guidelines for the development of Lot 1 will require the diversion of existing underground storm water infrastructure on the site.

The applicants have engaged Connell Mott McDonald Pty Ltd as their engineers for the diversion of the existing infrastructure. A preliminary diversion plan has been submitted with the application and final engineering details are in the process of being finalised.

It is noted that Councils PortCon department have been in discussions with the applicant engineer relating to the proposed works. PortCon have advised officers that subject to the final engineering drawings being approved by Council the diversion is possible and suitable.
It is noted that the diversion of the existing drainage infrastructure will be fully at the expense of the applicant.

On this basis it is considered that any permit should include a condition to the effect of requiring the final engineering drawings to be approved by the Responsible Authority.

8.3. Design Guidelines

The scope of the proposed subdivision of the subject site must be considered in the context of what is being sought by the applicant. It is noted that the issue of a subdivision permit is normally linked to an approved planning permit for the development of the lots. In this example the applicant is asking Council to consider an application for the subdivision of the subject site into two lots with design guidelines directing the future construction of Lot 1.

The design guidelines have been through an extensive process of review and modification. It is considered that the subdivision of the site into two lots should only be supported where development plans for Lot 2 and appropriately compiled design guidelines for the development of Lot 1 are provided.

In this instance Council officers have been through the process of seeking advice from the Manager of Urban Design in relation to the proposed building envelope, building height and building setbacks. The advice has led to modifications to the building envelope plan, which is an attachment of the design guidelines. The specific changes have related to the increased setback of any fifth level (see building envelope plan) and the inclusion of statements within the guidelines which will result in a design, informed by the existing and surrounding neighborhood character.

The design guidelines allow for a street frontage height of four storeys to generally match the height of the public housing development of Lot 2. It is noted that a fifth floor may be a possibility depending on the responsiveness of the design to the design guidelines and surrounding urban environment.

It is considered that the development of Lot 1 can accommodate four and possibly a recessive fifth floor element. The proposed heights are considered appropriate on the basis that there are several examples of similar height buildings in nearby Bay Street and also based upon the Island nature of the subject site.

The design guidelines will specify the maximum heights and setbacks of the building envelope for the development of Lot 1. It is noted that the development of Lot 1 will also be subject to the planning permit process which determine the final and appropriate heights for the development of Lot 1 relative to the design responsiveness and detail of the submitted development plans.

The setbacks proposed for the development of Lot 1 also reflect those approved for the development of Lot 2. Particularly where the building is proposed to adjoin to the Ingles Street and Crockford Street frontages.

The car parking rates required for the development of Lot 1 have been specified in the design guidelines at a rate which is consistent other like developments within the City of Port Phillip.
The design guidelines were reviewed by Council’s solicitors to ensure that the content of the guidelines is legally accurate and seek advice as to the best means to incorporate the design guidelines to the development of Lot 1.

In this instance it was advised that the design guidelines should be included as part of a Section 173 agreement between the applicant and the City of Port Phillip.

There are three minor changes, which are included as conditional requirements under this recommendation. The changes relate to including additional and modified text within the guidelines relating to the following;

It is considered that a statement to the effect of ensuring the designers of the proposed building consider the appearance of the building to occupy Lot 1 and particularly an appropriate means of locating vehicles on the site. In this regard it is considered that a full basement would be the preferred solution given the sites prominent and exposed position relative to the corner of Ingles and Crockford Street. This would also ensure an active street frontage at ground level.

Provisions for visual and acoustic privacy measures for the building proposed to occupy Lot 1. It is considered that these details should be provided on any plan for the development of the site. This will ensure that visual and acoustic screening measures are considered to protect the amenity of residents of Lot 1, Lot 2 and outside of the subject site.

It is considered that the assessment planning permit application required for the approval of a development plan for Lot 1 should include perspective drawings of the proposed building. This will ensure that council planning and urban design officers are able to make an informed and realistic appraisal of how the proposed building will appear from outside of the site particularly from Ingles and Crockford Streets.

The design guidelines aim for a private development of Lot 1 for residential purposes. The design guidelines set the framework for a development which will physically relate to the development of Lot 2 and provide good synergy between the two respective developments.

The design guidelines are clear, concise and flexible whilst ensuring that that the eventual development of Lot 1 will be one, which displays design excellence and environmental best practice.
8.4. **Open Space Contribution**

The Subdivision Act 1998 specifies that an open space contribution may be required at this stage or at the stage of further subdivision of Lot 1. Officers recommend that accepting the open space contribution at stage when the further subdivision of Lot 1 is sought is acceptable as this is when the substantive increase in density will occur. This can be achieved as follows.

It is the recommendation of officers that a rate of 5% of the land value at the time of subdivision of Lot 1 be specified by way of a Section 173 Agreement. This will ensure that when there is an application to subdivide Lot 1, the open space contribution and the rate of contribution is already set.

The inclusion of a specified rate of open space contribution via a section 173 Agreement will ensure that potential purchases are aware of and can consider the open space contribution in their decision to purchase and develop Lot 1.

The site abuts a parcel of under landscaped parkland. While the open space contribution from the development of Lot 1 cannot be directed to be spent on the parkland, it is recommended that Council consider the allocation of part of the Capital Works Budget for 2003/2004 to upgrading of the Raglan Street Park given the intensification of residential land use abutting the park. This solution will provide an overall benefit to the existing and future residents of the subject site and surrounding residential area.

The Officer recommendation of this report contains a Part B recommendation for Council to direct upgrading of the Raglan Street Park abutting the site.

8.5. **Future Development of the site**

The subdivision of the site cannot guarantee the development of Lot 1. The subdivision allows for the application of design guidelines, which reference the future development, and design of the building to occupy Lot 1 has been set by the application of design guidelines. It is considered by officers that the design guidelines, subject to minor changes will ensure that the development of Lot 1 occur in a respectful and appropriate way in conjunction with a planning permit application to develop the site which will be subject to the provisions of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme.

The guidelines set the parameters and expectations for the site and serve the purpose of informing potential purchases of Council's expectations for the eventual development of the site. The guidelines also provide a level of assurance for the Office of Housing with regard to the future development of the site in relation to what impacts the future development may have upon the development of Lot 2 for the purpose of public housing.
9. OPTIONS

9.1. Approve as recommended

9.2. Approve with changed conditions

9.3. Refuse - on key issues

9.3.1. The appropriateness of the Subdivision of the land into two lots.

9.3.2. The design guideline content for the development of Lot 1.

9.3.3. The appropriateness of the subdivision plan relative to the prevailing subdivision pattern of the surrounding area.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1. The subdivision of the land for the purpose of creation of two lots with a carriageway easement has been considered relative to the policies of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme and as discussed throughout this report is considered to be satisfactory.

10.2. There are several key issues, which have been raised within the content of this report, and it is considered that applying conditions to address these key issues is appropriate in this instance.

10.3. The application allows for the provision of design guidelines for the development of Lot 1, which will be tied to the title of the site via a Section 173 Agreement. It is considered that the design guidelines apply appropriate design solutions to aid the appropriate formulation of concept and development plans for the construction of Lot 1.
11. RECOMMENDATION - A

That the Council (having caused the application to be advertised) having received and noted 16 objections, is of the opinion that the proposed subdivision of the land into two (2) lots, creation of a carriageway easement, removal of two drainage easements and provision of design guidelines for one of the lots created will not cause material detriment to any person other than the applicant.

That a Notice of Decision to Grant a Planning Permit be issued for the purposes of subdivision of the land into two (2) lots, creation of a carriageway easement, removal of two drainage easements and provision of design guidelines for one of the lots created.

That a Notice of Decision to issue a planning permit be issued subject to the following conditions:

1. The level and location of the lots as shown on the endorsed plan of subdivision shall not be altered or modified without the consent of the Responsible Authority.

2. Any like plan of subdivision submitted for certification under the provisions of the Subdivision Act 1988, shall be to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

3. The plan of subdivision shall be lodged with the Registrar of Titles within five (5) years of its Certification by the Responsible Authority. Once lodged at the Titles Office, the Plan of Subdivision shall not be withdrawn without the written consent of the Responsible Authority.

4. This permit will expire if one of the following circumstances applies:

   (a) The subdivision is not started within two (2) years of the date of this permit as evidenced by the Plan of Subdivision being certified by Council within that time.

   (b) A Statement of Compliance has not been issued by Council within five (5) years of the date of the Plan Of Subdivision being Certified by Council.

The Responsible Authority may extend the periods referred to if a request is made in writing before the permit expires or within three (3) months afterwards.

5. A copy of this permit and the endorsed plan (and any subsequent approved variation) shall form part of the documentation to any Contract of Sale or Lease for any part the site after the date of this permit.
6. Before the certification of the subdivision plan, design guidelines to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. The design guidelines must be generally in accordance with those prepared by Peddle Thorp Melbourne Pty Ltd, dated July 2002 but modified to show:

a) Inclusion of 8 (d) to read as –

(d) The car parking for lot 1 to have limited visibility from around the site and or provided in a full basement arrangement.

b) Substitution of 13 (a) to read as –

(a) To protect the private amenity of residents within this development and of adjoining properties, the design of the dwellings shall employ the following;

- Open space areas located with respect and consideration to possible views into adjoining private open spaces or habitable room windows.
- Measures to protect overlooking which may include the use of obscure glazing, louvers, raised cill heights or any other means to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.

c) The inclusion of 18. (h) to read as –

(h) Perspective / Axiomatic diagrams of the proposed building as viewed from Ingles and Crockford Streets.

7. The owner of the land must enter into an agreement with the Responsible Authority pursuant to Section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 which must provide that:

a. Design guidelines prepared by Peddle Thorp Melbourne Pty Ltd as approved under Condition 1 apply to the development of Lot 1.

b. When Lot 1 is further subdivided the applicant or owner must provide to the Council an amount equal to 5 per cent of the site value of all of the land contained in Lot 1 pursuant to Section 18 of the subdivision Act 1988. This amount may be adjusted pursuant to Section 18 of the Subdivision Act 1988. The payment shall be made no less than 7 days prior to the issue of a statement of Compliance.

The Section 173 Agreement shall be registered on the title to the land pursuant to Section 181 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987. All costs associated with the preparation and registration of the agreement shall be at the applicants cost.

8. The diversion of existing underground drainage infrastructure must be completed in accordance with plans prepared by a qualified engineer to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
9. The legal point of stormwater discharge for the proposal shall be to the satisfaction of the responsible authority. Engineering construction plans for the satisfactory drainage and discharge of stormwater from the site must be submitted to and approved by the responsible authority prior to the commencement of any buildings or works.

10. The Applicant/Owner shall do the following things to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority:

   a) Pay the costs of all relocating/alterations/reinstatement of Council and Public Authority assets necessary and required by such Authorities

11. The subdivision as shown on the endorsed plans must not be altered without the written consent of the Responsible Authority.

Melbourne Water

12. Prior to Certification, the Plan of Subdivision must be referred to Melbourne Water, in accordance with Section 8 of the subdivision Act 1988.

   No polluted and / or sediment laden runoff is to be discharged directly or indirectly into Melbourne Water’s drains or watercourses.

South East Water

13. The certified Plan of Subdivision should show a 2.0 metre wide sewerage easement centrally located over the sewer, to be in favour of South East Water Limited pursuant to Section 12(1) of the Subdivision Act.

14. Permit conditions 6, 7, 10 and 13 must be satisfied prior to the issue of a statement of compliance.

12. RECOMMENDATION – B

### ORDER 3

**KEY RESULT AREA:** ENSURING A SUSTAINABLE ORGANISATION  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** N/A  
**RESPONSIBLE MANAGER:** DAVID GRAHAM - DIRECTOR GOVERNANCE AND COUNCIL SERVICES  
**AUTHOR:** LISEL THOMAS, CORPORATE SUPPORT CONSULTANT & JILL HENNESSY, MANAGER GOVERNANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT  
**FILE NO.:** 68/02/04-06  
**ATTACHMENTS:** DRAFT CONTENTS FOR THE 2001/2002 ANNUAL REPORT

#### 1. KEY ISSUES


1.2. Approval of the financial statements, performance statement and best value report are being dealt with in separate processes.

#### 2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Production of an annual report and the inclusion of certain items in the report is a statutory requirement.

2.2. City of Port Phillip reports over the past few years have evolved to emphasise reporting against the corporate plan and specific performance measurement.

2.3. An annual report summary, the annual review, will be prepared (as in the last two years) for distribution with ‘Diversity’ and in direct mail-out to non-resident ratepayers.
3. PROPOSAL

3.1. The next logical step for the City of Port Phillip is an increase in reporting on corporate and community governance.

3.2. New sections to be included in the 2001/2002 annual report: highlights, disappointments, future directions, risk management, freedom of information, employee relations, training and development, occupational health and safety, and a "plain English" financial overview.

3.3. For future years, an annual reporting task force, comprising of: Jill Hennessy, Manager Governance and Risk Management; Dave Filmalter, Manager Finance and Investment; Anita Lange, Coordinator Corporate Planning and Strategy; a representative from the Communications area and a representative/editor from Corporate Projects will be convened at quarterly intervals (October, January, April, July) for the purposes of determining the themes to be reported in future reports, developing the annual reporting structure and ensuring that data and relevant information is being recorded.

3.4. The emphasis in future years, aligned with reporting on delivering initiatives outlined in the Corporate Plan, shall more heavily focus on - what we said we would do, what we did, disappointments, and what we are going to do about addressing our disappointments and meeting future challenges.

3.5. Timelines very tight as report must be to Minister by 30 September and production requirements mean that contents must be finalised by the end of August.

4. OPTIONS

4.1. Council must produce an annual report and submit it to the Minister for Local Government by 30 September each year.

4.2. Council is not required to produce an annual review, but this document is considered to be an important communication tool for council.

5. POLICY CONTEXT

5.1. Council does not have a specific policy regarding annual reporting.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

6.1. Production of the annual report and annual review will utilise recycled paper and, where feasible, environmentally sensitive printing techniques.

7. TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE ASSESSMENT

7.1. Access to the information in the report for people with sight difficulties is being addressed through the production of an 18 point font version of both documents.

7.2. Economic and environmental issues are addressed elsewhere in this report.
8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

8.1. The total budget for production and distribution of the 2001/2002 annual report and annual review is $40,000.

9. INTERNAL CONSULTATION

9.1. Managers and officers across the organization have provided information and data for the 2001/2002 annual report.

9.2. The General Management Team has reviewed the report in detail.

9.3. The Chief Executive Officer and Mayor have been consulted about the report’s format and its contents.

10. EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

10.1. Direction has been sought from the Office of Local Government, Municipal Association of Victoria and the Victorian Ombudsman’s Office to ensure that the content of the 2001/2002 annual report is statutorily compliant.

11. IMPLEMENTATION

11.1. Once ‘in principle’ approval of the contents of the 2001/2002 annual report is given by council, officers will proceed with the design, printing, publication and distribution of the annual report and annual review.

12. COMMUNICATION

12.1. The annual report will be available on council’s website, in the libraries and at each of the town halls. Copies will also be available to people by contacting ASSIST.

12.2. Whilst the annual report is an important document, what is ultimately reported in the annual review is more likely to be read by the ratepayers of City of Port Phillip.

12.3. The annual review will be a major communication tool targeted at the community at large, highlighting overall financial performance and achievements compared to commitments made.

12.4. The annual review will be distributed with ‘Diversity’ and in direct mail-out to non-resident ratepayers.

13. CONCLUSION

13.1. Council must give ‘in principle’ approval to the contents before the publication of the report can proceed.
14. RECOMMENDATION


14.2. That an annual report task force be convened quarterly to develop the themes to be reported in future reports and ensure data and relevant information is being recorded.
## ORDER OF THE DAY

**ORDER 4**  
**BEST VALUE VICTORIA REPORT 2001/2002**

**KEY RESULT AREA:**  
**IMPROVING OUR SERVICE AND CAPABILITIES**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**
**RESPONSIBLE MANAGER:**  
**DR STEPHEN O’KANE – DIRECTOR CORPORATE DEVELOPMENT**

**AUTHOR:**  
**CHRIS SMITH**

**FILE NO.:**

**ATTACHMENTS:**  
**BEST VALUE VICTORIA REPORT 2001/2002**  
**LETTER TO THE HON. BOB CAMERON MP MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT**  
**COPY FOR INSERTION INTO CITY OF PORT PHILLIP ANNUAL REPORT**

### 1. KEY ISSUES


1.2. Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) results for the year ended 30 June 2002.

1.3. Making the full report available to the community via council’s website and hardcopies for distribution if requested.


### 2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Pursuant to clause 6 of the Best Value code, councils are required to report on progress of Best Value to the Minister for Local Government on an annual basis.

2.2. Guidelines do not exist to clearly outline a standard reporting format.

2.3. The City of Port Phillip was congratulated by the Department of Infrastructure on its submission of the 2000/2001 annual report format of which has been used as an example by the Department of Infrastructure to other councils as a guide.

2.5. The Best Value report provides for a summary of Service Review outcomes to date; an overview of the Best Value process at the City of Port Phillip; a timetable detailing reviews completed to date and those services to be reviewed; KPI's; and service delivery and the Best Value principles.

3. PROPOSAL

3.1. That Council endorse the proposed Best Value annual report of 2001/2002 and approve the copy for inclusion in the City of Port Phillip Annual report.

4. OPTIONS

4.1. That council endorse the attached report

4.2. That council revise the attached report and suggested copy (extract) to be published in the Annual report.

5. POLICY CONTEXT

5.1. Council’s Best Value – badged ‘Sustainable Value Program’ at the City of Port Phillip is committed to the Best Value principles.

5.2. Local Government Act.


6. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

6.1. The report itself will not result in environmental impact however; strategies detailed in the Service Reviews do outline particular environmental strategies.

7. TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE ASSESSMENT

7.1. The report itself will not result in social, economic or environmental impacts however; strategies detailed in the Service Reviews do outline particular strategies.

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

8.1. Nil.
9. INTERNAL CONSULTATION

9.1. GMT provided input into the selection of KPI’s and have reviewed and approved the report.

9.2. Managers managing services reviewed have contributed to the KPI’s and consulted in providing the results.

9.3. Governance and Council Services have been advised of the proposed copy (extract) for publication in the City of Port Phillip Annual report.

10. EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

10.1. Discussions held with responsible officer at the Department of Infrastructure as to the desired report format.

10.2. Comments in the report relating to Best Value principles are comments made by the respective Service Review Panels; Panel membership includes external representation.

11. IMPLEMENTATION

11.1. Liaise with internal Units regarding the communication strategy outlined below.

11.2. To be completed by 26 September 2002.

12. CONCLUSION

12.1. The Best Value report 2001/2002 provides a detailed and easily understood update to the community on the progress of Best Value. Key highlights include improvements made to services and provides for an overview of performance standards and results for the past twelve months.

13. COMMUNICATION


13.3. Publish the proposed extract of the Best Value Report 2002/2001 in the City of Port Phillip Annual Report and refer to availability of full report.
14. RECOMMENDATION

14.1. That Council endorses the attached Best Value report 2001/2002 – subject to final amendment by CEO.

14.2. That Council endorses the attached suggested copy (extract) to be published in the Annual report – subject to final amendment by CEO.
ORDINARY COUNCIL
26 AUGUST 2002

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ORDER 5
REQUESTS AND COMPLAINTS SERVICE REVIEW - UPDATE AND FUTURE ACTIONS

KEY RESULT AREA:
IMPROVING OUR SERVICE AND CAPABILITIES

LOCATION/ADDRESS:
N/A

RESPONSIBLE MANAGER:
DR STEPHEN O'KANE - DIRECTOR CORPORATE DEVELOPMENT

AUTHOR:
PAULINE MAGEE - MANAGER SERVICE ACCESS AND PERFORMANCE

FILE NO.:

ATTACHMENTS:
1. GMT RESPONSE AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
2. SYSTEMS TO DRIVE SERVICE IMPROVEMENT
3. PRINCIPLES AND STANDARDS FOR REQUEST AND COMPLAINT HANDLING
4. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC ACROSS THE ORGANISATION

1. KEY ISSUES

1.1. The Requests and Complaints Service Review (Sustainable Value Program) findings and GMT implementation plan were presented to Council in August 2001.

1.2. Council agreed to adopt the implementation plan and a further report to be presented in February 2002 detailing KPI's and service standards for the organisation. This was not possible due to the extensive consultation, workshops and process redevelopment taking place. These processes were required in order to ensure that any KPI's developed would be meaningful and measurable over time.

1.3. The cycle for reporting to Council following a service review is usually 12 months. This report presents council with a summary of the achievements to date as well as outlining future actions to further improve this service.
2. BACKGROUND

2.1. The Requests and Complaints Service Review, completed in May and reported to Council in July 2001 made many recommendations, which were endorsed by GMT and these have been updated in the attached document.

2.2. There are a number of underlying issues that impact strongly on this review and on the future development of a sustainable, responsive customer service culture at the City of Port Phillip. These are:

- The service culture of the organisation
- Staff training, support and empowerment
- Available tools to support the requests and complaints service function
- Feedback from the community which informs service improvement

2.3. Actions to address these underlying issues include: development and implementation of service culture workshops attended by over 400 staff and contractors during the period November to February; over 50 Service Improvement Projects developed and underway across the organisation and a greater commitment to achieving higher standards in the management of requests and complaints across the organisation.

2.4. Improvements to date

These can be summarised as follows:

- Greater penetration of the tracking system across the organisation with all departments and contractors now utilising the system
- Greater awareness of the requirements of residents and others in relation to requests and complaints and increased contact between action officers and residents
- Increased tracking capacity due to departments reviewing and adding categories to the system
- Improved system tools and reporting to GMT and others on a regular basis
- Heightened sense of responsibility for problem resolution and service improvement
- Improved after hours services and a contract with South East Water who supplies these services
- Assist targets are consistently met with 85% of calls being resolved by Assist staff at first point of contact
- Greater accountability for the resolution of requests and complaints across the organisation
- All staff are involved in a Service Improvement Project in their area
3. **PROPOSAL**

3.1. It is now proposed to continue with implementation of other aspects of the recommendations as well as continuing to maintain a high profile for service culture improvements in the next twelve months. There are a number of key factors related to this continuing improvement as listed below.

3.2. **Staff and process improvement**

The Market research has continued to identify issues related to the problem solving ability of staff as well as speed of response and timeliness – a number of recommendations have been made in relation to improving this area over the next 3-6 months as follows.

The ability to be responsive and to problem solve is dependent on a range of attitudes, resources, training skills, systems, and processes as follows:

- The organisational culture supports staff empowerment, creativity, flexibility and innovation
- Clearly documented processes underpin decision-making, staff are clear about the processes used and are confident in explaining these to a service user. The development and implementation of standard operating principles and procedures for requests and complaints handling was recommended by the Service Review Panel, these are attached to this report.

3.3. **Replacement of the Vitesse Tracking System**

The implementation of the Pathway Customer Tracking System will require concentrated effort from all areas of Council. A project steering group has been established and has met; a full implementation plan is in development. In implementing this new module, council is moving towards a totally integrated system for requests and complaints that is an inherent part of all other activities (see attached diagram) related to people and property, not just people alone as in the Vitesse system.

The new system will also provide enhanced reporting ability as well as the ability to track problems related to streets and neighbourhoods thus giving us a better picture of matters such as flooding, noise etc. This in turn should lead to proactive problem resolution over time.
Timelines for the implementation of the replacement system are lengthy, (proposed total implementation date of May 2003) as we do not want to replicate the current system with all its faults; rather we want to create a system that is responsive to the organisation’s needs into the future. All departments will be required to review and update workflows and processes to ensure that the tracking system provides council with the information required and the community with outcomes in the way of timely, responsive resolution of their requests and complaints.

3.4. Key Performance Indicators

KPI’s for customer service have been included in the Corporate Plan and are attached to this report. A questionnaire has been developed in conjunction with Newton Wayman Chong that focuses on the areas relating to KPI’s and installation of the appropriate software and training of staff will commence in August/September. The questionnaire is focused on the four agreed Key Performance Indicators and once the system is installed monthly reporting of results to GMT will be initiated against the KPI’s.

4. OPTIONS

4.1. Council can adopt the revised implementation plan as attached to this Report. The revised implementation plan presents the most achievable scenarios for each item and has been developed in conjunction with other departments as well as external providers.

4.2. Council can modify the revised implementation plan or refocus the outcomes.

5. POLICY CONTEXT

5.1. The outcomes of the service review reflect the outcomes required within KRA 5 – Improving our service and capabilities particularly the following goal: “We will listen and respond to the needs of the community and strive to reduce the gap between community expectations and our performance”.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

6.1. The implementation plan itself will not result in environmental impact however; strategies related to the management of environmentally related requests and complaints do impact.
7. TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE ASSESSMENT

7.1. The implementation plan affects the overall culture of the organisation in terms of its willingness to provide excellent responses to requests and complaints. The underlying culture has been addressed in the actions taken to date in response to the Service Review outcomes.

7.2. Strategies and actions for responding to requests and complaints impact the social fabric in that Council must be able to respond and be accessible to all community members whether they are disabled, of Non English Speaking Background or require special assistance.

7.3. The ability of Assist to manage 85% of inbound calls reduces the impact on the organisation and its separate departments thus freeing up staff to respond to issues requiring professional, technical or legal expertise.

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

8.1. All of the initiatives detailed in the attached implementation plan have been included in the 2002/3 budgets including capital expenditure to upgrade the telephone system.

9. INTERNAL CONSULTATION

9.1. The following groups have had input into the development and refinement of the implementation plan, principles and standards, Key Performance Indicators and community information provision:

- GMT and SLG
- Pathway requests and complaints implementation group
- Assist staff
- Corporate Communications
- Office of Mayor and Councillors
- Councillor Liaison Officers
- Information Management Group
- Vitesse Steering Group

10. EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

10.1. External advice and services have been provided by: Glen Barnes, Breakthrough Consulting, Benchmarking Plus, evalue, Newton Wayman Chong, GEAC Corporation and Vitesse.

11. IMPLEMENTATION

11.1. Implementation timelines are detailed in the attached plan.
12. CONCLUSION

12.1. The Service Review process presented Council with a comprehensive picture of the need for improvement in the handling of Requests and Complaints

12.2. The implementation plan has been revised and updated to take account of changing organisational needs

12.3. Additional focus and attention has been given to the underlying service culture of the organisation, as this is one of the main drivers in the move towards improved outcomes for the community.

12.4. The ability to obtain feedback and comment from the community in relation to our management of requests and complaints will also drive further improvement which will be incorporated into the action plan over time

12.5. The implementation of the principles and standards for the handling of requests and complaints will ensure that all departments are accountable for the standards of service provision to the community in managing requests and complaints

13. COMMUNICATION

13.1. The key messages to the community about requests and complaints handling at the City of Port Phillip are:

   We encourage residents to make requests and complaints,
   We will respond to them within a reasonable time frame and
   We will keep them informed of the progress of actions taken

13.2. Brochures will be prepared and distributed via Council’s public buildings and services. A Divercity article will appear in the next edition highlighting Requests and Complaints Internet information will also be made available
14. RECOMMENDATION

14.1. Council adopt the revised implementation plan as attached

14.2. Council note the principles and standards to be applied to the management of requests and complaints across the organisation

14.3. Council agree to the provision of public information detailing our undertakings in relation to the management of requests and complaints

14.4. A further report to be presented to Council in 12 months time that will further updating progress against the implementation plan with particular emphasis on the implementation of a replacement tracking system and additional Internet solutions for the future.
1. **KEY ISSUES**

1.1. To commence procedures to name the two public walkways in the Inkerman Oasis development.

1.2. As stage one of the project, containing the southern three buildings, the east-west walkway and part of the north-south walkway, is due to be completed late 2002 and the naming process can take 2-3 months, commencement of the naming process is required after the Council resolution.

2. **BACKGROUND**

2.1. The Inkerman Oasis development is a ‘joint venture’ between the City of Port Phillip and Inkerman Developments Pty. Ltd. Under the terms of the Contract of Sale and associated section 173 Agreement, in return for the transfer of the former St. Kilda depot site, Inkerman Developments is to return to Council a package of design deliverables including 28 community housing units, best practice grey and storm water recycling, a series of other ESD, an integrated art program, high quality architecture and urban design and two public walkways. The final design was approved by Council in June 2000 prior to settlement of the Contract of Sale.

2.2. The two walkways are to remain public walkways under the terms of two section 173 Agreements between the City of Port Phillip and Inkerman Developments Pty. Ltd. The two Agreements are treated as covenants and are registered on title. The first agreement binds Inkerman Developments to the terms of the Agreement and requires Inkerman Developments to execute the Agreement for the Body Corporate when Inkerman developments is the sole registered member of the Body Corporate at its establishment.
2.3. The terms of the Agreements with Inkerman Developments, which was executed in October 2001, are:

2.3.1. Requirement that Inkerman Developments comply with the terms of the Funding Agreement between Council and Environment Australia, which expires on 30 September 2002, and its requirement for development and installation of recycling treatment plant which is located in the two walkways.

2.3.2. Requires compliance with the Council planning permit conditions.

2.3.3. Requires that public access is maintained in an unrestricted manner at all times.

2.3.4. Requires the Inkerman Developments to indemnify Council against liability for use and maintenance responsibility of the walkways and grey water recycling tanks.

2.3.5. Requires Council consent for any works (excluding general maintenance) to the grey water recycling tanks.

2.4. The terms of the Agreement with the Body Corporate, which will be executed at the establishment of the Body Corporate, are:

2.4.1. For the east-west walkway reserve (shown as Reserve No. 1 on the Plan of Subdivision), this will be Council owned as the 5% open space contribution. However, there will be no Council liability for the use of the walkway and the Body Corporate will have maintenance responsibility and be required to keep it in a clean and tidy condition at all times.

2.4.2. For the north-south walkway, shown as Easement E-3 on the Plan of Subdivision, this will be owned by the Body Corporate and liability for use and maintenance responsibility is also to reside with the Body Corporate as per the east-west walkway.

2.4.3. For both walkways, public access is to be unrestricted. This is aimed at preventing future gating without Council consent.

3. PROPOSAL

3.1. In March 2001 Inkerman Developments requested a Council letter of support for two walkway names it selected from its own naming process involving a competition between the consultant team. The selected names were:

3.1.1. Sarsparella Way for the north-south walkway easement. This is a native creeper (Hardenbergia violacea) featuring in the landscaping of this part of the development.

3.1.2. Firewheel Lane for the east-west walkway reserve. This is the common name of a small native tree (Stenocarpus sinuatus) to be used in the landscaping of the southern part of the development and is also suggestive of the circular cone and grate assembly of the former municipal incinerator that operated in the Destructor Building which is located at the intersection of the two walkways.
3.2. Both names are supported by the Housing Development Officer as they reflect the native and indigenous landscaping which is an element of the project’s ecologically sustainable design.

3.3. Following initial advice from the Corporate Division, a request was provided in the 22 March 2001 Councillor Notes for Councillors to indicate if they were happy with the proposed names or preferred a public naming process occur, given that the walkways were not standard gazetted roads or lanes. No indication was provided and Inkerman Developments was subsequently informed that there was no objection to the proposed names. However, recent advice from Statutory Functions is that a formal naming process is required following a report to Council.

4. OPTIONS

4.1. That alternative names be selected which relate to local history/historical figures as per Council policy. This will be assessed under the forthcoming process.

4.2. That the walkways not be named. This is not recommended as public connecting spaces are increasingly being named and names help give housing off the walkways individual identity.

5. POLICY CONTEXT

5.1. The naming of the lane will be undertaken in accordance with Council policy, the Geographic Place Names Act 1998 and the Local Government Act 1989.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

6.1. There is no environmental impact from the naming process.

7. TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE ASSESSMENT

7.1. The naming process also has no specific social, economic, environmental and cultural impacts under Council’s four pillars of sustainability, except for use of names which link to local history and its consequent, positive cultural impact.

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

8.1. Costs associated with the naming include advertising, staff time and the erection of walkway signs.

9. INTERNAL CONSULTATION

9.1. Consultation has occurred with the Director Governance and Council Services and Statutory Functions.
10. EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

10.1. The current property owner and project developer is aware of the names as it proposed them. The Port Phillip Housing Association has also been consulted and is not opposed to the names.

11. IMPLEMENTATION

11.1. The naming processes will be as follows:

11.1.1. Assessment against Council place name policy.

11.1.2. Notification of the proposal to the Registrar of Geographic Names for assessment against the Guidelines for Geographic Names.

11.1.3. Assessment against the requirements of the Local Government Act.

11.1.4. Provision of a further report to Council with the outcome of the assessment and recommended names for adoption.

11.1.5. Assignment of names when Council endorses the Plan of Subdivision. This formally registers the name.


11.1.7. Provision of signage at completion of the construction of each stage of the development.

12. CONCLUSION

12.1. The commencement of the naming process is appropriate given the public access nature of the two walkways.

13. COMMUNICATION

13.1. Any communication will occur in accordance with policy associated with place naming. This will include public advertising to determine if there are any public submissions.
14. RECOMMENDATION

14.1. That Council authorize staff to commence the appropriate procedures to name the following lane in accordance with Council policy, the Geographic Place Names Act 1998 and the Local Government Act 1989, as follows:

14.1.1. The east west walkway known as Reserve No. 1 on the Plan of Subdivision 438902Q which reconnects the formerly discontinued ends of Blanche Street, St. Kilda.

14.1.2. The north-south walkway known as easement E-3 on the Plan of Subdivision 438902Q which connects Inkerman Street, St. Kilda with the east-west walkway.

14.2. That a further report be provided to Council in relation to this matter once public consultation has been completed.