



6.2 **25 TENNYSON STREET, ELWOOD**

LOCATION/ADDRESS: **25 TENNYSON STREET, ELWOOD**

EXECUTIVE MEMBER: **LILI ROSIC, GENERAL MANAGER, CITY STRATEGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

PREPARED BY: **JESSICA LADLOW, SENIOR URBAN PLANNER**

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 To consider and determine Planning Permit Application P212/2017 for partial demolition and buildings and works to extend an existing apartment building containing nine (9) dwellings to accommodate two (2) additional dwellings and a reduction of four (4) car parking spaces in the Neighbourhood Residential Zone and Heritage Overlay at 25 Tennyson Street, Elwood.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

WARD:	Canal
TRIGGER FOR DETERMINATION BY COMMITTEE:	More than 15 objections
APPLICATION NO:	P212/2017
APPLICANT:	Perkins Architects
EXISTING USE:	Residential
ABUTTING USES:	Residential
ZONING:	Neighbourhood Residential Zone (Schedule 5)
OVERLAYS:	Heritage Overlay (Schedule 7)
STATUTORY TIME REMAINING FOR DECISION AS AT DAY OF COUNCIL	Expired

- 2.1 The application proposes partial demolition and buildings and works to extend an existing apartment building containing nine (9) dwellings and seven (7) car parking spaces to accommodate two (2) additional dwellings and a reduction of four (4) car parking spaces in the Neighbourhood Residential Zone and Heritage Overlay at 25 Tennyson Street, Elwood.
- 2.2 There are seven (7) car parking spaces currently available on the site. While the Plan of Subdivision shows eight (8) spaces, one has been converted into a courtyard and is not accessible. Therefore, for the purpose of this assessment there are seven (7) existing car spaces. The advertised plans for this proposal show six (6) proposed spaces, however the applicant has agreed to provide seven (7) spaces through the incorporation of car stackers (**refer recommended condition 1d**). Accordingly, there would be no loss of car parking for the existing dwellings. The two (2) new dwellings would not be provided with car spaces.



- 2.3 The application was lodged on 23 March 2017, but was not advertised until January 2019 as the applicant requested extensions of time to submit the information required in Council's formal request for further information. When advertised, the application received 16 objections raising concerns primarily with car parking, overlooking, visual bulk, side and rear setbacks, noise, impacts on north facing windows, daylight to existing windows and overshadowing.
- 2.4 A consultation meeting was held on 23 May 2019 and was attended by a Canal Ward Councillor, the permit applicant, Planning Officers and eight objectors. Discussion plans were presented at the meeting which included changes to carparking. The applicant also agreed to plant trees along the rear (western) boundary.
- 2.5 The proposed works, constructed to the rear of an existing three (3) storey apartment building, have been sited to have a minimal impact on the heritage character of the area and to have no unreasonable off-site amenity impacts on neighbouring properties.
- 2.6 The proposed development would display satisfactory compliance with the objectives and standards of Clause 55 (ResCode) thereby ensuring that the amenity of neighbouring dwellings would not be unreasonably impacted upon. Variations to the ResCode standards at B5 (Integration with the street), B12 (Safety), B13 (Landscaping), B15 (Parking Location), B25 (Accessibility) and B26 (Dwelling Entry) are supported. Recommended conditions would ensure that the B30 (Storage) standard is met.
- 2.7 Discussion plans submitted by the applicant propose to install two (2) double car stackers to provide seven (7) car parking spaces that meet current layout and design standards. A reduction of four (4) car parking spaces is supported in this instance, based on the following key factors:
- The site's proximity to various public transport nodes.
 - The site's proximity to pedestrian and cycling networks and car sharing services.
 - The provision of four (4) bicycle spaces.
 - The constraints of the existing parking layout.
 - No loss of on-street parking resulting from the proposal, as the existing crossover would not be modified.
- 2.8 It is considered that the development subject to conditions (modifications) is appropriate and should be supported. It is recommended that the Council issue a Notice of Decision to Grant a Planning Permit.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That the Planning Committee adopt Recommendation "Part A" and "Part B", that:
- I. The Responsible Authority, having caused the application to be advertised and having received and noted the objections, issue a Notice of Decision to Grant a Permit.
 - II. Authorise the Manager City Development to instruct Council's Statutory Planners and/or Council's Solicitors on any VCAT application for review.

RECOMMENDATION "Part A"



3.2 The Responsible Authority, having caused the application to be advertised and having received and noted the objections, issue a Notice of Decision to Grant a Permit for partial demolition and buildings and works to extend an existing apartment building containing nine (9) dwellings to accommodate two (2) additional dwellings and a reduction of four (4) car parking spaces in the Neighbourhood Residential Zone and Heritage Overlay at 25 Tennyson Street, Elwood.

3.3 That the decision be issued as follows:

1. Amended Plans required

Before the development starts, amended 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 an electronic copy must be provided. The plans must be generally in accordance with the plans received by Council on 4 August 2017 and subsequently advertised but modified to show:

- a) Notations on TP08 and TP09 that all windows would be double glazed and whether they are operable.
- b) A tap and drain installed to each second floor balcony.
- c) A cross section of the proposed raingarden.
- d) The provision of 2 x double Quadroparker N4902 car stackers and reconfiguration of the car parking layout, generally in accordance with the Discussion Plans dated 1 July 2019, received by Council on 2 July 2019.
- e) Increased setback at first floor level associated with the ensuite and deck areas at first and second floor level along the northern and southern elevations, generally in accordance with the Discussion Plans dated 1 July 2019, received by Council on 2 July 2019.
- f) A planting schedule of the trees to be planted along the western (rear) boundary including botanical names, sizes at maturity and quantities of each plant.
- g) A minimum of six cubic metres of externally accessible storage for each new dwelling.
- h) The provision of a minimum of seven (7) car parking spaces on the site.

2. No Alterations

The development and colours, materials and finishes as shown on the endorsed plans must not be altered without the written consent of the Responsible Authority.

3. Privacy screens must be installed

Privacy screens as required in accordance with the endorsed plans must be installed prior to occupation of the building to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.



4. Incorporation of Sustainable Design initiatives

The project must incorporate the sustainable design initiatives listed in the endorsed Sustainable Management Plan (SMP) prepared by Sustainability House dated 4 August 2017, to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

5. Implementation of Sustainable Design Initiatives

Before the occupation of the development approved under this permit, a report from the author of the Sustainable Management Plan (SMP) approved pursuant to this permit, or similarly qualified person or company, must be submitted to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. The report must confirm that all measures and recommendations specified in the SMP have been implemented and/or incorporated in accordance with the approved report to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

6. Incorporation of Water Sensitive Urban Design initiatives

Before the occupation of the development approved under this permit, the project must incorporate the water sensitive urban design initiatives listed in the endorsed Water Sensitive Urban Design Report to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority, and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

7. Maintenance Manual for Water Sensitive Urban Design Initiatives (Stormwater Management)

Before the development starts (other than demolition or works to remediate contaminated land) a Maintenance Manual for Water Sensitive Urban Design Initiatives must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority.

The manual must set out future operational and maintenance arrangements for all WSUD (stormwater management) measures. The program must include, but is not limited to:

- Inspection frequency
- Cleanout procedures
- As installed design details/diagrams including a sketch of how the system operates.

The WSUD Maintenance Manual may form part of a broader Maintenance Program that covers other aspects of maintenance such as a Builder' User's Guide or a Building Maintenance Guide.

8. Car Parking Stacker Maintenance and Provision

The mechanical car stackers are to be maintained in a good working order and be permanently available for the parking of vehicles in accordance with their purpose, to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority



9. Piping and Ducting

All piping and ducting (excluding down pipes, guttering and rainwater heads) must be concealed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

10. No Equipment or Services

Any plant, equipment or domestic services visible from a street (other than a lane) or public park must be located and visually screened to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.

11. Completion of Landscaping

The landscaping as shown on the endorsed Landscape Plan must be carried out and completed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority before the occupation of the development and/or the commencement of the use or at such later date as is approved by the Responsible Authority in writing.

12. Landscaping Maintenance

The landscaping as shown the endorsed Landscape Plan must be maintained, and any dead, diseased or damaged plant replaced in accordance with the landscaping plan to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

13. Time for Starting and Completion

This permit will expire if one of the following circumstances applies:

- a) The development is not started within two years of the date of this permit.
- b) The development is not completed within two years of the date of commencement of works.

The Responsible Authority may extend the periods referred to if a request is made in writing:

- before or within 6 months after the permit expiry date, where the use or development allowed by the permit has not yet started; and
- within 12 months after the permit expiry date, where the development allowed by the permit has lawfully started before the permit expires.

Permit Notes:

• **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 must 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.

- **Days and Hours of Construction Works**

Except in the case of an emergency, a builder must not carry out building works outside the following times, without first obtaining a permit from Council's Local Laws Section:

- Monday to Friday: 7.00am to 6.00pm; or
- Saturdays: 9.00am to 3.00pm.

An after hours building works permit cannot be granted for an appointed public holiday under the Public Holidays Act, 1993.

- **Drainage Point and Method of Discharge**

The legal point of stormwater discharge for the proposal must 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.

- **Noise**

The air conditioning plant must be screened and baffled and/or insulated to minimise noise and vibration to other residences in accordance with Environmental Protection Authority Noise Control Technical Guidelines as follows:

- noise from the plant during the day and evening (7.00am to 10.00pm Monday to Friday, 9.00am to 10.00pm Weekends and Public Holidays) must not exceed the background noise level by more than 5 dB(A) measured at the property boundary
- noise from the plant during the night (10.00pm to 7.00am Monday to Friday, 10.00pm to 9.00am Weekends and Public Holidays) must not be audible within a habitable room of any other residence (regardless of whether any door or window giving access to the room is open).

- **No Resident or Visitor Parking Permits**

The owners and occupiers of the development allowed by this permit will not be eligible for Council resident or visitor parking permits.

RECOMMENDATION "Part B"

- 3.4 Authorise the Manager City Development to instruct Council's Statutory Planners and/ or Council's Solicitors on any future VCAT application for review.



4. RELEVANT BACKGROUND

The following relevant applications have previously been considered for the subject site:

Application No.	Proposal	Decision	Date of Decision
1007/1995	9 Lot Subdivision	Approved	19 December 1995
455/2000	Alterations and additions to existing units including construction of balconies with screens	Approved	14 June 2000

5. PROPOSAL

- 5.1 The application proposes partial demolition and buildings and works to extend an existing apartment building containing nine (9) dwellings to accommodate two (2) additional dwellings and a reduction of four (4) car parking spaces in the Neighbourhood Residential Zone and Heritage Overlay.
- 5.2 The plans which are the subject of this report are those drawn by Perkins Architects entitled “25 Tennyson Street, Elwood”, plan no’s TP011- TP13, dated and Council date stamped 4 August 2017 (these are the full set of plans that were advertised). The key plans form **Attachment 1**.
- 5.3 For clarity, the north-west (side) boundary will be referred to as the northern (side) boundary, the south-west (rear) boundary will be referred to as the western (rear) boundary, the south-east (side) boundary will be referred to as the southern (side) boundary and the north-east (front) boundary will be referred to as the eastern (front) boundary.
- 5.4 Specific details of the application are as follows:

Site Layout and Building Massing

- The two new dwellings would be constructed to the western (rear) elevation of the existing nine (9) unit development.
- The dwellings would be constructed above the existing car parking area, and would comprise an undercroft and stair entryway to the dwellings at ground floor level, with the dwellings constructed over two levels above that.
- The dwellings would be accessed via the driveway along the northern (side) boundary.
- The units would have an overall maximum height of 9m above natural ground level.
- The site area covered by buildings would be 372m² which equates to 59% of the site.
- The permeable surfaces would equate to 15% of site area.
- Four (4) bicycle spaces would be installed along the northern (side) boundary.
- There would be no works undertaken to the existing nine (9) units.

Design Proposal



- Each of the two new dwellings would have two bedrooms, an ensuite, a bathroom, and a laundry at the first floor level and an open plan lounge and kitchen, with a 9.8m² deck area at second floor.
- The extension would be setback 2.5m from the northern and southern (side) boundaries, and 2.43m from the western (rear) boundary.
- The 9m overall height would not exceed the height of the existing building on the site.
- The extension would incorporate a raked and flat roof form.
- The extension would be finished in a combination of a grey rendered finish, metal sheet cladding and horizontal timber look cladding.
- At second floor level along the northern and southern (side) elevations, the dwellings would be finished in metal sheet cladding and along the western (rear) elevation, the dwellings would be finished in horizontal timber look cladding with metal sheeting for the roof.
- The roof would be constructed from metal sheeting.
- The windows would be aluminium framed and would comprise a combination of clear glazed or translucent 'reeded' glass screened windows.

Car parking

- The advertised plans for this proposal show six (6) proposed spaces, however the applicant has agreed to provide seven (7) through the incorporation of car stackers (refer **recommended condition 1d**)).
- There are seven (7) car parking spaces currently available on the site. While the Plan of Subdivision shows eight (8) spaces, one has been converted into a courtyard, so for the purpose of this assessment, seven (7) existing spaces are referred to.
- Accordingly, there would be no loss of car parking for the existing dwellings.
- The two (2) new dwellings would not be provided with car spaces.

6. SUBJECT SITE AND SURROUNDS

Description of Site and Surrounds	
Site Area	630m ²
Existing building & site conditions	<p>The subject site is located on the eastern side of Tennyson Street between Milton Street to the north and Hartpur Avenue to the south in Elwood.</p> <p>The land is rectangular and has a frontage of 14.9m and a maximum depth of 42.2m.</p> <p>The land is developed with a three storey detached apartment building comprising nine (9) units that have two bedrooms each. The building has a 'nil' grading within the St Kilda, Elwood, Balaclava and Ripponlea heritage precinct (Schedule 7 to the Heritage Overlay). The building is constructed from cream brick and a tiled roof.</p> <p>The building dates from circa 1960s with the units accessed via a centralised stairway. The driveway is located along the northern (side) boundary, with areas of common property along the southern (side) boundary and eastern (front)</p>



	<p>setback. The building is setback approx. 2.5m from the front and side boundaries, and there is minimal established landscaping on the site.</p> <p>The Plan of Subdivision allocates eight (8) car parking spaces, one each to unit 2-9. However, one has been converted into a courtyard and is not accessible by cars, so for the purpose of this report and assessment, seven (7) existing spaces are referred to hereafter.</p>
Surrounds/neighbourhood character	<p>Surrounding land is residentially zoned and developed, predominantly with blocks of flats or single dwellings on a lot. Many of the buildings have a significant or contributory grading in the St Kilda, Elwood, Balaclava, Ripponlea heritage precinct (HO7). Adjacent interfaces comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northerly (side, along Tennyson St): Three-storey circa 1930s flats that fronts Milton Street (17a Milton Street). This building has an Individual Citation (Citation No. 2063) within the Port Phillip Heritage Review, and is separated from the boundary shared with the subject site by a driveway. • Southerly (side, along Tennyson St): A single storey Edwardian-era dwelling fronts Tennyson Street (27 Tennyson Street) and a two storey dwelling is currently under construction to the rear of the dwelling (approved under Planning Permit 789/2013). • Westerly (rear): Side elevation of the three-storey circa 1960s flats at 17-19 Milton Street, constructed in a similar style to the building on the subject site. The building is separated from the boundary shared with the subject site by a driveway. • Easterly (opposite): Three-storey circa 1970s flats to corner of Tennyson and Milton Street (15 Milton Street), and a two storey Federation 'Arts and Crafts' style dwelling that has an Individual Citation (Citation 936) at 58 Tennyson Street. <p>In this section of Tennyson Street, both sides of the street have unrestricted car parking.</p>

7. PERMIT TRIGGERS

7.1 The following zone and overlay controls apply to the site, with planning permission required as described.

Zone or Overlay	Why is a permit required?
<p>Clause 32.09 General Residential Zone Schedule 1</p>	<p><i>A permit is required to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Construct two or more dwellings on a lot pursuant to Clause 32.09-6.</i> <p><i>A development must meet the requirements of Clause 55. Pursuant to Clause 32.09-15, the minimum garden area requirements of Clause 32.09-4 and the maximum building height and number of storeys requirements of Clause 32.09-9 introduced by Amendment VC110 do not apply to a planning permit application for the construction or extension of a dwelling or residential building</i></p>



	<p><i>lodged before the approval date of Amendment VC110 (approved 27 March 2017).</i></p> <p><i>This application was lodged on 23 March 2017, therefore the transitional provisions apply.</i></p>
<p><i>Clause 43.01 Heritage Overlay Schedule 7</i></p>	<p><i>A permit is required to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Demolish a building and construct a building and carry out works pursuant to Clause 43.01-4.</i>
<p><i>Clause 52.06 Car parking</i></p>	<p><i>Pursuant to Clause 52.06-2, before an existing use is increased by the measure specified in Column C of Table 1 in Clause 52.06-5 for that use the number of car parking spaces required under Clause 52.06-5 must be provided to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.</i></p> <p><i>Further, pursuant to Clause 52.06-5, where an existing use is increased by the measure specified in Column C of Table 1 for that use, the car parking requirement only applies to the increase, provided the existing number of car parking spaces currently being provided in connection with the existing use is not reduced.</i></p> <p><i>There are seven (7) existing car parking spaces on the site for the existing nine (9) x 2 bedroom dwellings. As part of this development, it is proposed to reconfigure the existing car parking spaces to improve their functionality and meet current design standards so that the number of spaces would reduce from seven (7) to six (6). Therefore, car parking across the entire site must be considered as part of this application.</i></p> <p><i>However, the applicant has submitted discussion plans that rearrange the car parking layout to accommodate two (2) double car stackers. This would be required as a recommended condition (refer recommended Condition 1d). This means that seven (7) car parking spaces could be provided. The seven (7) spaces would be sited along the western (rear) boundary and would be allocated to seven (7) of the existing dwellings.</i></p> <p><i>Two new, two bedroom dwellings are proposed. This would mean that the total number of dwellings on the land is proposed to increase to 11 x 2 bedroom dwellings. The car parking rate for a two bedroom dwelling is one car space. Therefore a total of 11 car spaces are required under Clause 52.06. As seven spaces are proposed to be provided, a reduction of four spaces has been sought.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, there would be no loss of car parking for the existing dwellings, while the two (2) new dwellings would not be provided with car spaces.</i></p> <p><i>Visitor car parking is not required under Clause 52.06 as the subject site is located within the Principal Public Transport Network (PPTN).</i></p>

8. PLANNING SCHEME PROVISIONS

Planning Policy Framework (PPF)

8.1 The following State and Regional Planning Policies are relevant to this application:



- Clause 11: Settlement, including:
 - Clause 11.01-1R1: Settlement – Metropolitan Melbourne
 - Clause 11.02: Managing Growth
- Clause 15: Built Environment and Heritage, including:
 - Clause 15.01-1S: Urban Design
 - Clause 15.01-1R: Urban Design – Metropolitan Melbourne
 - Clause 15.01-2S: Building Design
 - Clause 15.01-5S: Neighbourhood Character
 - Clause 15.01-1: Built Environment
 - Clause 15.02-1: Sustainable Development
 - Clause 15.03: Heritage
- Clause 16: Housing, including:
 - Clause 16.01: Residential Development
 - Clause 16.01-1S: Integrated Housing
 - Clause 16.01-2S: Location of Residential Development
 - Clause 16.01-3S: Housing diversity
 - Clause 16.01-3R: Housing diversity - Metropolitan Melbourne
 - Clause 16.01-4S: Housing affordability
- Clause 19: Infrastructure, including:
 - Clause 19.01-1S: Energy supply
 - Clause 19.01-2S: Renewable energy
 - Clause 19.01-2R: Renewable energy - Metropolitan Melbourne
 - Clause 19.03: Development Infrastructure
 - Clause 19.03-4S: Stormwater
 - Clause 19.03-6S: Waste and resource recovery

Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF)

8.2 The following provisions of the Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS) are relevant to this application:

- Clause 21.03: Ecologically Sustainable Development, including
 - Clause 21.03-1: Environmentally Sustainable Land Use and Development
 - Clause 21.03-2: Sustainable Transport
- Clause 21.04: Land Use, including
 - Clause 21.04-1: Housing and Accommodation
- Clause 21.05: Built Form, including



- Clause 21.05-1: Heritage
- Clause 21.05-2: Urban Structure and Character
- Clause 21.05-3: Urban Design and the Public Realm

- Clause 21.06: Neighbourhoods, including
 - Clause 21.06-2: Elwood and Ripponlea

8.3 The following local planning policies are relevant to this application:

- Clause 22.04: Heritage
- Clause 22.12: Stormwater Management (Water Sensitive Urban Design)
- Clause 22.13: Environmentally Sustainable Development

Other relevant provisions

8.4 Other relevant general and particular provisions are:

- Clause 52.06 Car Parking
- Clause 55 Two or More Dwellings on a Lot and Residential Buildings (ResCode)
- Clause 65 Decision Guidelines

9. REFERRALS

Internal referrals

9.1 The application was referred to the following areas of Council for comment. The comments are discussed in detail in Section 9.

Heritage Advisor

9.2 The application was referred to Council's Heritage Advisor who did not raise concern with the proposed development as it would not be visible from the principal streetscape (Tennyson Street).

Transport Safety Engineer

9.3 The applicant was referred to Council's Transport Safety Engineer who provided the following advice in relation to the plans under assessment (not the discussion plans):

Car Park Layout:

Access ways:

- *Vehicle access is proposed via existing internal accessway from Tennyson Street. Plans provided indicate accessway dimensions of 2.4m which have not been provided in accordance with the planning scheme, noting a minimum of 3m width is required. Given no changes are proposed to the accessway, and any extension to width would require significant works to the original building, the reduced accessway width is considered acceptable in this case.*



- *A site inspection reveals that pedestrian sight triangles are currently provided adjacent the existing crossover to Tennyson Street. Plans provided by the applicant indicate that no sight triangles will be provided adjacent the crossover to Tennyson Street, this represents a very poor design outcome. **Please ensure that if any modifications are made to the existing front and side fence adjacent the crossover, that at a minimum, sight triangles must be provided as per existing conditions.***

Car parking spaces:

- *Car parking spaces have been provided in accordance with planning scheme requirements and are considered acceptable.*
- *Additional 300mm clearance has been provided adjacent to any walls/columns and columns have been located outside door opening envelopes. This is considered acceptable.*
- *The traffic report has provided a swept path assessment showing a B85 can enter and exit each space in a forward's direction, however, several swept paths show that when exiting the site they either scrap the existing building wall or boundary fence.*
- ***Can the applicant please update the swept path assessment to show that a B85 vehicle is able to enter and exit the site with suitable clearance from the existing building and boundary fence (noting that the swept paths do not clearly show the boundary fence).***

Headroom:

- *Plans provided by the applicant do not show height clearance above the parking spaces.*
- ***Can the applicant please provide elevation plans, noting that a minimum 2.1m height clearance is required above each parking space.***

Bicycles

- *Bicycle parking is not required under the planning scheme.*
- *It is proposed to provide an additional 12 off-street bicycle parking spaces, this exceeds the planning scheme requirement and is considered acceptable.*

Loading and Waste Collection

- *A Loading Zone is not required in the planning Scheme.*
- *Waste Management plan to be referred to Council's Waste Management department for assessment.*

Traffic Generation and Impact:

- *Typical residential developments generate a daily traffic rate of between 4-7 vehicle movements per dwelling, with peak hour rates 10% of daily volumes. Based on these rates, the development is expected to generate an additional 10 vehicle movements a day and 1 vehicle movement during the peak hours.*
- *Overall the expected traffic generation of the proposed development is expected to have a negligible impact on surrounding local streets and intersections.*



On Street Parking:

- *The existing on-street parking is generally unrestricted with relatively low turnover.*
- *Parking surveys shown in the traffic report that on-street parking in the area is nearing capacity, with occupancy during typical residential peak periods over 80%.*
- *Existing residents/visitors of 25 Tennyson Street and future residents of both 25 Tennyson Street and the new development will not be eligible for resident/visitor parking permits and will need to abide by on-street parking restrictions.*
- *It is proposed to utilize the existing crossover to the site, with no impact expected to the number of existing on-street parking spaces. This is considered acceptable.*

Parking overlay and parking provisions:

- *Clause 52.06 of the planning scheme requires 2 additional off-street parking spaces to be provided for the proposed land uses. Including the original 7 off-street spaces which was previously approved, this equates to a total of 9 off-street parking spaces in total.*
- *The applicant is seeking a waiver in car parking provisions and proposes to only provide 5 off-street car parking spaces.*
- *Noting that the assessment for the appropriate rate for car parking provision lies with Statutory Planning. Reference should be made to CoPP's Sustainable Parking Policy. We also suggest comparing previous approved parking provision rates of adjacent developments as part of the Planning team's assessment / determination.*

Other:

- *Any redundant crossovers must be reinstated to Council satisfaction.*
- *Any proposed crossovers must be installed to Council satisfaction.*

Planning officer response

- 9.4 There would be no changes to the front fence.
- 9.5 As the accessway is an existing condition and cannot readily be altered without making substantial changes to the existing building, there is no requirement to provide updated swept path diagrams.
- 9.6 The revised (for discussion purposes) elevation plans detail that there would be a minimum clearance of 2.4m to the car parking spaces.
- 9.7 The Traffic Engineer's report submitted by the applicant incorrectly states that five (5) car parking spaces would be provided. Six (6) car parking spaces are proposed, as shown on the plans. However, the applicant has submitted discussion plans which show the provision of seven (7) car parking spaces, by accommodating two (2) x double car stackers, in response to concerns raised by Council and objectors. Car parking provision is discussed further at Section 11 of this report.
- 9.8 The Discussion Plans were subsequently referred to Council's Traffic Engineer to provide comment on the reconfigured car parking layout to accommodate the car stackers. Council's Traffic Engineer outlined that:

Car stackers typical require even more manoeuvring room to enter/exit than typical spaces, as you need to line up directly behind them instead of just swinging in. Therefore, the applicant would need to be able to demonstrate via a swept path assessment that a B85 vehicle can firstly get into the car stacker spaces, then leave the site in a forwards direction with suitable clearance from the building and the existing fence line.

Also the proposed car stacker system Wohn – Parklift 340-155/150 (295), can only support cars up to 150cm on the upper level and 154cm on the lower level. This does not meet the planning scheme standards which state that at least 25% of the mechanical car parking spaces must accommodate a vehicle height of at least 1.8m.

- 9.9 The manoeuvrability of cars entering and exiting the car stackers has been demonstrated by the applicant's Traffic Engineers, who have submitted updated swept path diagrams and an accompanying report detailing that the cars would be able to enter the car stackers then exit in a forward direction in a reasonable number of movements.
- 9.10 It is not considered necessary to require car stackers that can accommodate a vehicle of 1.8m in height, as three (3) of the car parking spaces would continue to be at grade level, accommodating vehicles above 1.8m in height. The allocation of car parking spaces could be determined by the vehicle specifications of the residents.
- 9.11 On balance it is considered acceptable to vary the standard (which would require one of the four spaces have a height of least 1.8 m in height) in this instance.

Sustainable Design Advisor

- 9.12 The applicant was referred to Council's Sustainable Design Advisor who provided the following advice:

The proposed ESD measures are acceptable relative to the scale of development proposed, subject to the following being addressed:

The provision of bike parking is supported. However, given that it will be in the car park and visible from the street down the driveway, could a lightweight enclosure be constructed to serve two purposes;

- *provide weather protection and*
- *enhance security.*

The following items must be included on the endorsed plans in order to ensure consistency with the commitments set out in the SDA:

- *Item no. 3 updated on the materials legend on drawings TP08 & TP09 that the aluminium framed windows will be double glazed.*
- *Notation provided on plans showing the operability of habitable room windows.*



- *Notation provided on the second floor plan that a tap and drain is installed on each balcony.*
- *Provide a cross section for the raingarden.*

Planning officer response

- 9.13 The car parking area is constrained by the existing building's footprint and accommodating a bicycle enclosure would further constrain car manoeuvrability. Therefore the recommended bicycle enclosure is not considered feasible in this instance.
- 9.14 Recommended conditions require the incorporation of the other recommendations pertaining to the windows, provision of drainage and a tap and the cross section of the raingarden (refer **recommended Conditions 1a), b) and c)**).

External referrals

- 9.15 The application was not required to be externally referred.

10. PUBLIC NOTIFICATION/OBJECTIONS

10.1 It was determined that the proposal may result in material detriment therefore Council gave notice of the proposal by ordinary mail to the owners and occupiers of surrounding properties (92 letters) and directed that the applicant give notice of the proposal by posting 1 notice on the site for a 14 day period, in accordance with Section 52 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.

10.2 The application has received 16 objections. The key concerns raised are summarised below (officer comment will follow in italics where the concern will not be addressed in Section 11):

- Neighbourhood character
- Traffic impacts along Tennyson Street
- Car parking
- Lack of visitor car parking

Visitor car parking is not required to be provided under Clause 52.06 (Car Parking) as the subject site is located within the Principal Public Transport Network (PPTN).

- Lack of landscaping.

*The applicant has agreed to plant trees along the western (rear) boundary of the subject site. This would be required as a recommended condition (refer recommended **Condition 1f)**).*

- Noise from air-conditioning units and entertainment areas.

The noise emitted from the air conditioning units would not be expected to be excessive, particularly as they are located centrally within the proposed deck areas, away from neighbouring sensitive interfaces. Regardless, a note of permit will require that the noise emitted from any air-conditioning units must comply with EPA mandated noise levels.



The noise emitted from the proposed decks is not expected to exceed typical residential noise levels.

- Submitted planning documentation does not adequately document the existing site conditions, particularly in relation to 27 Tennyson Street.

A second dwelling is being constructed to the rear of 27 Tennyson Street. The application was lodged in March 2017 but the application was not advertised until November 2017. At the time of the lodgement of the planning application, construction works to the second dwelling had only just commenced, and only an outline of the building was shown on the plans. Regardless, Council has endorsed plans for the second dwelling (Planning Permit 789/2013) and these have been taken into consideration in the assessment of this application.

Additional discrepancies in relation to the description of the neighbourhood character have also been noted by the Planning Officer.

- Inhibits view lines and daylight/sunlight access to 17A and 17-19 Milton Street

Inhibiting view lines is not a relevant amenity assessment within the provisions of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme. Regardless, the property at 17-19 Milton Street would continue to receive adequate daylight and sunlight access by virtue of the overall separation between the buildings (minimum 5m separation). The proposal complies with Standard B17 (Side and rear setbacks) and Standard B19 (Daylight to existing windows) of Clause 55.

- Site coverage

The proposed site coverage would be 59%, which does not exceed the maximum 60% site coverage prescribed under Standard B8 (Site coverage).

- Overlooking

The submitted plans show that all habitable and non-habitable room windows would either have a minimum sill height of 1.7m above the finished floor level or would comprise non-operable translucent 'reeded' glass to 1.7m above the finished floor level. The western (rear) elevation of the second floor deck would contain translucent 'reeded' glass to 1.7m above the finished floor level, while the northern and southern (side) elevations of the deck would comprise metal sheet cladding all to a minimum height of 1.7m above the finished floor level.

- Overshadowing secluded private open space and incorrect shadow diagrams

Due to the orientation of the site and neighbouring site conditions, only the area of secluded private open space of 27 Tennyson Street would be additionally overshadowed by the proposed development. As this property has a second dwelling under construction under Planning Permit 789/2013, the Planning Officer has calculated shadow impacts based on the endorsed site plans which shows that the area of secluded private open space of Lot 1 of 27 Tennyson Street (the dwelling fronting Tennyson Street) would be 57.5m². The additional overshadowing would fall over this yard at 2pm and 3pm, however between 9am-2pm, a minimum of 40m² of the area of secluded private open space would maintain sunlight access, in accordance with Standard B21 (Overshadowing).

The dwelling that is currently under construction to the rear of 27 Tennyson Street (Lot 2) has an area of secluded private open space within the eastern (front) and western (rear) setbacks (the side setbacks do not constitute secluded private

open space as the minimum dimension is less than 3m) and a rooftop terrace, which have a combined area of 73.45m². Additional shadow would only fall over the ground floor areas of secluded private open space between 11am-3pm. However, between 9am-3pm, a minimum of 40m² of the area of secluded private open space would maintain sunlight access, in accordance with Standard B21 (Overshadowing).

- Non-compliance with Standard B17 (Side and rear setbacks)

The Planning Officer has verified that compliance with Standard B17 (Side and rear setbacks) would be achieved, and the B17 side and rear setbacks depicted on Advertised Plans TP08 and TP09 are accurate.

- Impact on north facing windows

In order to be considered a north-facing window for the purposes of Standard B20 (North-facing windows) the windows must be oriented north 20 degrees west to north 30 degrees east. The habitable room windows located opposite the development at 27 Tennyson Street (currently under construction) has three habitable room windows which face the subject site. These windows have an orientation of north 34 degrees east. Therefore they are not north-facing windows for purposes of this assessment, and Standard B20 does not apply.

- Daylight and sunlight to existing windows

Standard B19 (Daylight to existing windows) assesses daylight impacts to existing habitable room windows. The proposal would comply with the Daylight to existing windows objective and standard at B19.

Specifically, at first floor level along the southern (side) elevation, the incremental building height would be 7.29m and would have an overall separation of 4.25m from the habitable room windows located opposite. The second floor western elevation wall would incorporate a raked wall, to an overall height of 9m, which would have a separation between 4.25m-5.61m from the habitable room windows of Lot 2, 27 Tennyson Street, thereby meeting Standard B19. Along the remaining western (rear) and northern (side) elevations, the proposed built form would have a maximum height of 9m and a minimum 6.5m setback across all levels from the habitable room windows located opposite.

- Construction noise

This is not a relevant consideration at the planning permit stage, however the applicant will be required to seek all relevant construction and Local Laws related permits from Council's City Permits Unit, and also abide with the relevant noise requirements of Councils Local Laws and EPA regulations.

- 10.3 A consultation meeting was held on 23 May 2019. The meeting was attended by a Ward Councillor, applicants, objectors and Planning Officers. The applicant submitted Discussion Plans that were presented at the meeting, which included changes to carparking (reconfiguration of the layout to include 2 x car stackers) and increased side setbacks, which would be required by recommended conditions of permit (refer **recommended Conditions 1d) and e)**). The applicant also agreed to plant trees along the western (rear) boundary, which would be required through **recommended Condition 1f)**. The discussion plans were circulated to all objectors following the consultation meeting.



- 10.4 As a result of the discussion plans, two objectors submitted further objections raising the following additional issues:
- Visual bulk and noise associated with the car stackers
 - *Two car stackers are proposed, that would be located at opposite ends of the rear boundary. Each would only accommodate two vehicles and so would not be in continual operation. The stackers are designed with a basement component, so that one car would sit underground with the other one at ground level. The structure would be a maximum height of 2.4 m, and the cars would not be visible from the adjoining sites, except for when a car was entering or exiting the stacker (when a car on the upper level could be raised to allow the other car to drive into the stacker).*
 - *For these reasons there would be no unreasonable amenity impacts from the two stackers, from both noise or visual bulk, to the adjoining dwellings.*
- 10.5 It is considered that the objections do not raise any matters of significant social effect under Section 60 (1B) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.

11. OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Neighbourhood Residential Zone (NRZ5)

- 11.1 Schedule 5 to the Neighbourhood Residential Zone details that the neighbourhood character objective is *"to maintain the distinctive garden suburban character including larger lot sizes with generous landscaped front and side setbacks"*. The existing site conditions do not feature a landscaped character, as the area where the development is proposed to be constructed is a hard-surfaced car parking area. However, the applicant has offered to plant trees along the site's western (rear) boundary to go some way to satisfying this objective, compared to the site's existing conditions.
- 11.2 Moreover, as detailed in Section 7 of this report, transitional provisions apply and the application is not required to meet the minimum garden area requirement or mandatory height limit. The mandatory garden area requirement of the NRZ at Clause 32.09-4 and the maximum height limit at Clause 32.09-9 do not apply if the application was lodged prior to the introduction of Amendment VC110 on 27 March 2017. The application was lodged on 23 March 2017, therefore, the garden area requirement and height limits do not apply to this application.
- 11.3 Notwithstanding the above, it is noted that the proposal would comply with the mandatory height requirement, being an extension to an existing building that does not exceed the building height of the existing building or contain a greater number of storeys than the existing building.

Local Policy

- 11.4 The subject site is located within an established residential area, within 800 metres of the Carlisle Street Major Activity Centre Retail precinct and 350 metres of fixed rail public transport.
- 11.5 The subject site falls within the lowest tier of the five-tier housing growth hierarchy at Clause 21.04-1 and is defined as follows:



Minimal Residential Growth Areas: Established residential areas within a Heritage Overlay where new development will be minimised in order to retain recognised heritage values.

- 11.6 The character of the surrounding area is diverse, including numerous examples of medium scale infill unit developments that are concentrated around the Milton and Tennyson Streets intersection. Lot sizes in the area are typically large and have been developed with walk-up-style apartments.
- 11.7 Based on the number of two and three storey apartment blocks located around the subject site, an incremental increase in dwelling density in this location is acceptable subject to the design being sympathetic to the existing heritage context and neighbourhood character of the surrounds.

Neighbourhood character and built form

- 11.8 Clause 21.06-2 Elwood and Ripponlea provides guidance about the features which new development is encouraged to respond to:
- *Detached dwellings on large allotments with generous front, rear and side setbacks that allow for attractively landscaped large open space areas with established trees.*
 - *The consistent architectural character of many areas created by the predominance of Federation and inter-war dwellings with hip or gable roof forms.*
 - *Low building heights ranging from 1 — 2 storeys for single residences and 2— 3 storeys for flats.*
- 11.9 The proposed development is generally responsive to the existing and preferred neighbourhood character. The retention of the three-storey building at the front of the site would effectively screen the new extension from the street. The proposed development would not exceed the height of the existing building nor project beyond its existing side setbacks.
- 11.10 Clause 21.05-2 (Urban Structure and Character) provides further guidance regarding built form, stating:
- *In a streetscape with a consistent building scale, the height of any new residential development is the same or no more than 1 storey higher than the lower of the adjoining dwellings, with a maximum building height of 3 storeys. The additional storey should be sited and massed so that it does not dominate the streetscape or cause any adverse amenity impacts.*
- 11.11 The three- storey building would be consistent with this policy.
- 11.12 The Port Phillip Design Manual (2000) describes the neighbourhood character as:

Developed with a number of large houses during the 1850's. Further subdivision to create house allotments and apartment buildings occurred during Edwardian and inter-war periods with the most recent redevelopment during the 1960's and 1970's replacing many houses with two and three storey flat blocks. The succession of development phases



has created a rich mixture of housing type, style and scale which is an important element of its present character. However, the post-Second World War flat buildings are less sympathetic.

- 11.13 The development would be located in the rear portion of the site, and the changes cannot be seen from the principal streetscape.
- 11.14 The neighbourhood character is partially derived from the prevalence of two and three storey block of flats representing various architectural styles. The proposed three storey scale would be consistent with those buildings which abut the subject sites northern and western boundaries. The design response has introduced elements such as a variation of materials, fenestration and recessed setbacks to provide visual interest.
- 11.15 The first floor western (rear) setback would be largely consistent with the immediately adjoining side setback of the adjoining building at 17 Milton Street (north) and the rear setback of 27 Tennyson Street (south). The second floor would adopt an increased setback from the western (rear) boundary due to the location of the deck along the western (rear) elevation of the proposed extension, remaining consistent with the pattern of development of existing built form.
- 11.16 The existing site layout contains a landscaped area within the front setback only. The proposal would not substantially change the extent of hard surfacing in the rear where the car parking area is. Therefore, the provision of tree planting along the western (rear) boundary which the applicant has agreed to would be an improvement on the existing landscaping conditions (refer recommended **Condition 1f**).

Heritage impacts

- 11.17 The front half of the subject site is located in Schedule 7 to the Heritage Overlay – the St Kilda, Elwood, Balaclava and Ripponlea precinct. However, it has a nil grading within the Heritage Overlay. Properties to the north and west (17A, 17-19 Milton Street) and south (27 Tennyson Street) have significant gradings.
- 11.18 The proposed redevelopment would not have a detrimental impact on the heritage value of the surrounding significant buildings as the works to the rear would not be visible from the streetscape. Council's Heritage Advisor does not raise any concerns for this reason.

Amenity – Clause 55 (Rescode)

- 11.19 The proposed development satisfies the relevant ResCode Standards B1 (Neighbourhood Character), B2 (Residential Policy), B4 (Infrastructure), B6 (Street Setback), B7 (Building Height), B8 (Site Coverage), B9 (Permeability), B10 (Energy Efficiency), B14 (Access) B17 (Side and rear setbacks), B19 (Daylight to Existing Windows), B20 (North Facing Windows), B21 (Overshadowing) B22 (Overlooking), B23 (Internal Views), B24 (Noise Impacts), B27 (Daylight to New Windows), B28 (Private Open Space), B29 (Solar Access to Open Space), B31 (Design Detail) and B34 (Site Services). Variations have been sought as follows:

B5 (Integration with the street)

- 11.20 Given that the existing building would be retained on the site, and the proposed development would be constructed to the rear of the existing building, there are no opportunities to improve the integration between the proposed development and



Tennyson Street. This is because the primary pedestrian access cannot be relocated from its current position so access would remain via the communal driveway, which is acceptable.

B12 (Safety)

11.21 The windows which face the driveway provide opportunities for passive surveillance of the accessway. While the obscured location of the dwelling entries is not ideal, it is an existing condition and is therefore acceptable in this instance. The safety objectives would be met.

B13 (Landscaping)

11.22 The proposed inclusion of additional trees to be planted along the western (rear) boundary would provide additional landscaping to the site (refer recommended **Condition 1f**). Therefore the objective would be met in this instance.

B15 (Parking Location)

11.23 The parking would not be secure; however, it would be fully functional when compared to the existing parking layout. The applicant has submitted discussion plans showing the incorporation of 2 x double car stackers which would increase the current car parking layout from 6 spaces to 7 spaces. Parking is discussed below.

B25 (Accessibility)

11.24 It is not reasonable to require a lift given the existing conditions of the site and limited increase in density proposed. Furthermore, ground floor level apartments already exist on the site. For these reasons, the objective would be met.

B26 (Dwelling Entry)

11.25 As the existing building would be retained, there is no opportunity to reorient the proposed entry's street. Given that the accessway is adequately wide to ensure safety and security concerns of the residents accessing the two rear dwellings, a variation to this standard is considered appropriate in this instance.

B30 Storage

11.26 Although storage is shown to be included underneath the stairwell, the minimum 6m³ is not noted on the plans. This would be included as a recommended condition (refer **recommended Condition 1g**).

Traffic and Parking

11.27 As outlined at section 7.1 of this report, a reduction of four car parking spaces is sought under Clause 52.06 Car parking. This is based on the submitted discussion plans that rearrange the car parking layout to accommodate a total of seven (7) car parking spaces (refer **recommended Condition 1d**).

11.28 A Traffic impact report prepared by Ratio has been submitted in support of the application and sets out justification for the car parking provision. This includes an assessment of car parking demand and car ownership data for this area, the deficiency associated with the existing use and the need to create safe, functional and attractive parking areas. The key justification provided was:



- The parking supply and demand survey undertaken found that, on the days surveyed, there was a high parking occupancy rate between 64%-84%, with a minimum of 32 car parking spaces available in the immediate area.
- There are a number of car sharing services within close proximity of the site.
- The site offers a clear, safe and direct link to the surrounding pedestrian and cycling network, which provides a viable means of active transport that would reduce future reliance on private motor vehicles for residents and some visitors to the site.
- The site is proximate to various public transport nodes. This includes being located within a five minute walk (400m) of tram route 67 and bus route 623 operating along Brighton Road and a 10-15 minute walk to Ripponlea Train Station (750 m) and the Balaclava Train Station (850m). It also includes being located within a 5-10 minute walk of tram routes 3/3a, 78 and 16 and bus routes 600, 606, 922 and 923.
- The existing car parking provided on the site does not meet current layout and design standards, and can only accommodate a maximum of six (6) car parking spaces. The car parking area therefore currently operates with reduced functionality.

11.29 In addition to these factors, there are several other aspects of this proposal that support a reduction in parking:

- The proposed seven (7) car parking spaces would be provided in accordance with the design standards of Clause 52.06 (Car Parking).
- Currently seven (7) car parking spaces are provided for nine (9) units, so there is an existing shortfall of two car parking spaces (a rate of 0.78 spaces per dwelling). This proposal for 11 units and seven (7) car parking spaces requires a reduction of four spaces (a rate of 0.64 spaces per dwelling).
- The two new dwellings would not have car parking spaces. The seven (7) car parking spaces would be allocated to seven of the existing dwellings, which is the same situation that currently exists on site.
- The proposal would not result in any loss of on-street parking, since the existing crossover would not be modified.
- Four (4) bicycle spaces would be provided, reducing further dependence on the cars. These could be allocated to the four dwellings that would not have a car parking space.
- This side of this section of Tennyson Street currently does not have any on-street parking restrictions. However, should they be introduced in the



future, under Council's parking permit policy, none of the residents of this development would be eligible for on-street parking permits.

- 11.30 Subject to the provision of the car stackers as shown in the discussion plans (dealt with through **recommended Condition 1d**) and for the key reasons outlined above, a reduction of the standard car parking requirement is acceptable in this instance.
- 11.31 Council's Traffic Engineer has reviewed the proposed parking access, and while they have raised concerns with the proposed width of the accessway, as it is an existing condition and cannot be widened without making considerable changes to the existing building. Council's Traffic Engineer has otherwise advised that the layout arrangement is generally satisfactory.
- 11.32 Council's Traffic Engineer has also reviewed the proposed traffic impacts associated with the vehicles using the site and has advised that there would be no unreasonable impacts on the existing street network, particularly given car parking in the street network is nearing capacity.

Bicycle Parking

- 11.33 No bicycle parking is required pursuant to Clause 52.34 Bicycle Facilities, however four secure bicycle spaces would be provided, which is supported.

Sustainable Design and Water Sensitive Urban Design

- 11.34 The applicant has submitted a Sustainable Design Assessment (SDA) and a WSUD response to meet the policy objectives detailed in Clause 22.12 and Clause 22.13. Subject to **recommended Conditions 1a)-c) and 4-7** which address the issues raised by Council's ESD Officer and ensure the implementation and retention of the outlined initiatives, the proposed development would satisfy the policy objectives.

12. COVENANTS

- 12.1 The applicant has completed a restrictive covenant declaration form declaring that there is no restrictive covenant on the titles for the subject site known as Lots 1-9 on Plan of Subdivision 348956R [Parent Title Volume 10275 Folios 155-163].

13. OFFICER DIRECT OR INDIRECT INTEREST

- 13.1 No officers involved in the preparation of this report have any direct or indirect interest in the matter.

14. OPTIONS

- 14.1 Approve.
- 14.2 Approve with changed or additional conditions.
- 14.3 Refuse.

15. CONCLUSION

- 15.1 The proposed development has been sited and designed to minimise amenity impacts on neighbouring properties.
- 15.2 The proposed development would have limited visibility from Tennyson Street and would therefore have no impact on the heritage streetscape.



- 15.3 The proposed development would be responsive to the neighbourhood character of the area, which comprise a mix of architectural styles and includes numerous examples of three storey multi-dwelling developments with relatively high site coverage.
- 15.4 The proposed development, subject to some modifications, would display satisfactory compliance with the standards of Clause 55 (ResCode) thereby ensuring that the amenity of neighbouring dwellings would not be unreasonably impacted upon. Variations to B5 (Integration with the street), B12 (Safety), B13 (Landscaping), B15 (Parking Location), B25 (Accessibility) and B26 (Dwelling Entry) are supported.
- 15.5 The incorporation of the car stackers as detailed in the discussion plans (and required as by **recommended Condition 1d**) would provide for seven (7) car parking spaces that meet current layout and design standards. A reduction of four (4) car parking spaces is supported for the reasons outlined in the report.
- 15.6 It is recommended that the Council support the proposal by issuing a Notice of Decision to Grant a Planning Permit, subject to conditions.

TRIM FILE NO: PF17/267594

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Advertised Plans**
- 2. Discussion Plans**
- 3. Objector Map**