EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
This application seeks approval of the proposed Development Plan for the former Clayton West Primary School site at 10 Alvina Street in Oakleigh South.

The Development Plan proposes a broad master plan for the future development and use of the land for residential purposes. The Development Plan is required pursuant to the provisions of the Development Plan Overlay 5 (DPO5) provisions in the Monash Planning Scheme.

The application was the subject of extensive community consultation including notification by mail to all owners and occupiers of properties within a 1 kilometre radius of the site. A public information session was also held on 17 June 2015 and was attended by over 100 residents. A total of 214 submissions to the proposal have been received.

Key issues to be considered relate to the proposed density of development and level of change proposed, loss of vegetation on site, the scale of buildings proposed along Alvina Street, and impact on the amenity of abutting residential dwellings.

This report assesses the proposal against the provisions of the Monash Planning Scheme including the relevant state and local planning policy framework and the provisions of the Development Plan Overlay 5 (DPO5).

The submitted Development Plan does not adequately satisfy the requirements of DPO5 and should not be supported.
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10 Alvina Street, Oakleigh South
RECOMMENDATION:

That Council resolves to advise the applicant that the submitted Development Plan (Planning and Property Partners) for 10 Alvina Street, Oakleigh South is not satisfactory based on the following grounds.

1. The submitted development plan does not satisfy the requirements and decision guidelines of schedule 5 to the development plan overlay.
2. The development plan poorly integrates with the neighbourhood character of the surrounding area.
3. The scale and density of the submitted development plan is excessive.
4. The development plan does not provide for appropriate inclusion and retention of existing vegetation.
5. The development plan is inconsistent with Council’s Residential Development and Character Policy.
6. No risk assessment has been provided given the proximity of the site to the former Huntingdale Quarry.

BACKGROUND:

History
The Clayton West Primary School operated from this site, opening in May 1962 and closing in December 2006. In 2014, the former State Government rezoned the former school site to General Residential Zone 1 and included the site within a Development Plan Overlay (DPO5) (Amendment GC05).

No previous planning applications or planning permits apply to the site.

Title Details
The site is described in two separate Certificates of titles, each encumbered by covenant restrictions. Details are as follows.

1. Certificate of Title Volume 08271 Folio 519 being Lot 1 on TP 232530M (Southern half of site). Covenant 1003639 is registered on title and prevents quarrying and noxious trade on site. The current proposal does not contravene the covenant. A small section of the title is encumbered by a drainage easement which extends across the entrance to the pedestrian pathway to Scotsburn Avenue.
2. Certificate of Title Volume 08271 Folio 535 being Lot 1 on TP 232531K (northern half of site). Covenant 0980547 is registered on title and prevents quarrying and noxious trade on site. The current proposal does not contravene the covenant. A 1.8 metre wide drainage easement extends along the southern and eastern edge of the title boundary.

Site Context

The Site

Alvina Street is a local residential street ending in a ‘No Through Road’ at its southern end. The subject site is located on the eastern side of Alvina Street at its southern end. It is a large rectangular lot with a combined site area of approximately 2.04 hectares. A section of the site’s western boundary has a direct street frontage to Alvina Street of approximately 86 metres with the remainder of the western boundary directly abutting the former Huntingdale quarry site (south west corner of site). Apart from a 3.4 metre wide pedestrian path extending east to Scotsburn Avenue, the site is essentially landlocked by existing low scale residential development along the entirety of its north, south and east boundaries. The only opportunity for vehicle access to the site is via Alvina Street.

The site has been cleared of all buildings. A number of established trees remain on the site, primarily located around its perimeter, with smaller numbers of trees scattered though the centre of the site. The site falls gently from the north east to the south west by approximately 3 metres.

Surrounding Residential Neighbourhood.

Alvina Street and Sinclair Street form part of an established post war, residential neighbourhood characterised by double fronted, regular shaped housing lots, generally ranging between 600 to 950 square metres in area. Single storey, detached brick dwellings, capped with hipped tiled roofs prevail throughout the neighbourhood. Medium density housing developments, generally in the form of town house style developments are scattered throughout the neighbourhood, but in smaller numbers. Housing lots are all provided with on site car parking provision. Front gardens are generally visible from the street, set back behind low front fences, and containing established vegetation reflecting the general age of the neighbourhood.

Alvina Street itself is characterised by a narrow road reserve, medium sized nature strips and a mix of small to medium size street trees of various species. It is a quiet residential street containing a total of 13 residential frontages/sideages. No kerb side parking restrictions apply along the length of the street, and its ‘No Through Road’ status means that it is used predominantly by local residents only. Having said this, the property at 16 Sinclair Street (Corner of Alvina Street opposite the subject site) is used as a Church (Place of Assembly).
Sinclair Street is a short, local residential street characterised by its consistent street tree planting and quiet nature. Like Alvina Street, it is also a local road servicing local residents.

Features of adjoining land are as follows:

**North:** Residential properties fronting Alvina Street and Coombs Avenue directly abut the northern boundary of the lot. Abutting dwellings are all single storey in scale, and all are located fairly close to the common boundary of the subject site. A large Greenhouse (non-residential in use) is located at the rear of 9 Coombs Avenue, setback approximately 3 metres from the common boundary to the lot.

**South:** The back gardens of 7 residential properties in Ashbrook Court abut the southern boundary of the lot. Established trees located on the subject site currently obscure views to the site to some degree.

**East:** The back gardens of 10 residential properties fronting Scotsburn Avenue abut the eastern boundary of the subject site. Dwellings on these lots are generally setback around 20 metres from the common boundary of the lot.

**West:** Alvina Street and Sinclair Street residential neighbourhoods interface with the site along the northern part of the site’s western boundary. The old Huntingdale Quarry site abuts the remainder of the western boundary.

**Broader Neighbourhood Context**
The site is located in an established urban area with access to a range of established community facilities and public transport options.

The site is located approximately 2.2 kilometres west (driving distance) of the Clayton Shopping Centre which is identified as a Major Activity Centre under the Monash Planning Scheme and approximately 2 kilometres from the Huntingdale Road local shopping strip (to the north).

Good public open space options exist in the surrounding neighbourhood, including Davies Reserve Athletics Track (200 metres east of site), Talbot Park (800 metres south of subject site on Centre Road), Clayton Reserve (1.1 kilometres to east). A range of private golf courses, and sporting clubs such as lawn bowls, tennis, swimming centres are also located within close proximity to the site.

The site is located within walking distance of existing public transport infrastructure including Huntingdale Railway Station located approximately 2 kilometres to the north of the site.
Bus Routes 703 (Middle Brighton to Blackburn South) and 733 (Oakleigh Station to Box Hill Central) are available along Centre Road approximately 600 metres south of the site. Bus Route 704 (East Clayton to Oakleigh) runs along Scotsburn Avenue.

PROPOSAL:

The application seeks approval of a Development Plan as required by Clause 43.03 (Development Plan Overlay DPO5) of the Monash Planning Scheme.

The submitted Development Plan proposes that the site will be developed for 108 attached townhouse style dwellings, comprising:

- Sixty two (62) x three storey, 3 bedroom town houses (identified as product M, E, E1 and C), and
- Forty six (46) x two storey, three bedroom townhouses (identified as product C1, D, E2, F, and K).

Eight out of ten dwellings fronting Alvina Street will be three storey townhouses. The majority of dwellings abutting the Quarry Site will also be three storey in scale. All dwellings proposed around the perimeter of the development abutting existing residential properties are proposed as double storey.

Key elements of the proposed development plan include:

- All proposed dwellings are three bedrooms.
- All dwellings will be provided with, 2 off-street car parking spaces in either a single garage and tandem car space or a tandem garage arrangement (i.e. C, C1, D, E, E1, E2, F).
- Lot sizes have not been specified, however will generally be between 84 square metres and 140 square metres.
- All vehicles will enter the site from Alvina Street via a new access road located opposite number 16 Sinclair Street. Access to each dwelling within the development will be from an internal loop road. Only five dwellings are proposed to have direct vehicle access from Alvina Street (i.e. dwelling type k and 3 x dwelling type E).
- The existing pedestrian path extending through to Scotsburn Avenue will be retained and upgraded (i.e. with landscaping and security lighting). This pathway forms part of the title to the land and is not a public walkway.
- A central open space area is proposed in the heart of the site, however the application states that ‘It is not intended to incorporate any publicly accessible areas within the site’. It is proposed that the entire site will remain in private ownership, with communal spaces for its residents, landscaping, roads and access ways to be managed by a future owners corporation.
A 10.5 metre front setback (approximately) is proposed along the Alvina Street frontage. The setback is required to protect the health of an established tree along the Alvina Street frontage.

Attachment 1 details plans forming part of the application.

**PLANNING SCHEME PROVISIONS**

**Zoning**
The site is zoned General Residential 1 (GRZ1). The purpose of the zone is;

‘To implement the State Planning Policy Framework and the Local Planning Policy Framework, including the Municipal Strategic Statement and local planning policies.

To encourage development that respects the neighbourhood character of the area.

To implement neighbourhood character policy and adopted neighbourhood character guidelines.

To provide a diversity of housing types and moderate housing growth in locations offering good access to services and transport.

To allow educational, recreational, religious, community and a limited range of other non-residential uses to serve local community needs in appropriate locations.’

The renewal of the site for residential purposes is generally consistent with the stated purposes of the General Residential Zone.

A more detailed assessment of the design components of the development plan is provided throughout the report.

**Development Plan Requirements**
The Development Plan Overlay – Schedule 5 (DPOS) affects the site.

The purpose of the Development Plan overlay is, among other things;

‘To implement the State Planning Policy Framework and the Local Planning Policy Framework including the Municipal Strategic Statement and local planning policies.’

Pursuant to the provisions of the Development Plan Overlay, ‘a permit must not be granted to use or subdivide land, construct a building or construct or carry out works until a development plan has been prepared to the satisfaction of the responsible authority’.

Schedule 5 of the overlay sets out the requirements for the development plan applicable to this site. These are:
• Where residential uses are proposed, provide a range of dwelling types to cater for a variety of housing needs.
• Where non-residential uses are proposed, details of the nature of the proposed use, including hours of operation, staff and visitor numbers, and traffic and parking management plan.
• Incorporate sustainable design features to address water and waste management, solar access and energy saving initiative, to deliver lower living costs for future residents.
• Create a composition of varied building forms and heights across the site.
• Provide for a high quality of internal amenity for future residents.
• Respect the amenity of adjoining interfaces for providing for a maximum of 2 storey built form adjacent to or opposite any existing single storey residential development.
• Any taller buildings across the balance of the site should be carefully graduated with reference to analysis of shadow, visual amenity impacts and the character of the area.
• Apply appropriate buffer treatments at the interface with any non-residential uses on adjoining properties.
• Create opportunities for improved local permeability through provision of new pedestrian/cycle pathways or new local street networks where appropriate.
• Incorporate any significant native vegetation into the design of the development.

Attachment 3 details the zoning and overlays applicable to the subject site and surrounding land.

CONSULTATION:

Display of the Development Plan
Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4 of DPO5, the submitted Development Plan was displayed for public comment.

The owner(s) and occupier(s) of properties within a 1 kilometre radius of the site were notified of the proposal. The formal consultation period ran from 10 June 2015 to 10 July 2015.

A copy of the documentation forming part of the Development Plan was made available to view on Council’s website, as well as hard copies for viewing at the Glen Waverley Civic Centre throughout the consultation period.

Public Information Session
A public information session was held at the Clayton Community Centre during the consultation period. The session was held between 5.00 pm and 8.00 pm on Wednesday 17 June 2015 and was attended by in excess of 100 residents.

Council Officers and representatives for the applicant were in attendance to provide information and answer questions about the proposal.

**Community Submissions**
A total of 214 submissions have been received. Key issues raised in the submissions include;

- The Development Plan does not comply with the requirements of the DPOS in relation to the retention of trees on site.
- The narrow walkway to Scotsburn Avenue is unsafe.
- Lack of diversity in housing types with all dwellings proposed being 3 bedrooms.
- Does not satisfy certain requirements of clause 56 (Subdivision) of the Monash Planning Scheme.
- Overdevelopment.
- Additional traffic and road congestion. All traffic associated with the development will have to access the site from Alvina Street.
- Narrow width of internal streets.

Attachment 4 details the location of properties which have made a submission to the proposal within the nearby surrounding area.

**Referrals**

**Internal**
The application was referred internally to the following departments:

- Drainage engineers.
- Traffic engineers.
- Strategic Planning.

Relevant comments from these departments form part of the assessment of the application.

**External**
There is no requirement to refer the Development Plan application to external referral authorities.

**DISCUSSION:**

**Consistency with State and Local Planning Policies**
Plan Melbourne is the Metropolitan Strategy that planning authorities must consider when assessing applications for planning permits. The key directions that are of particular relevance to the proposal are:

“Understand and plan for expected housing needs.”
“Reduce the cost of living by increasing housing supply near services and public transport.”
“Facilitate the supply of affordable housing.”

Initiatives seek to locate a substantial proportion of new housing in or close locations that offer good access to services and transport and employment areas.

The draft of State Planning Policy relevant to the current proposal all promote the:

- provision of a diversity of housing types that meets community needs (Clause 16.01-4);
- encouragement of housing types at higher densities in and around activity centres (Clause 11.01-2);
- location of new housing in or close to activity centres, employment corridors and areas that offer good access to services and transport (Clause 16.01-2 and clause 11.04-2);
- provision of housing that recognises and protects neighbourhood character and achieves architectural and urban design outcomes that contribute positively to local urban character (Clause 15).

The Local Planning Policy Framework seeks to expand on these broader state objectives and in doing so, identifies the ‘Garden City Character’ as a core value held by the community and Council. Garden City Character policy objectives are significant and important considerations in all land use and development decisions throughout the municipality.

Clause 21.04 (Residential Development Policy); seeks to balance residential development within the city by providing a variety of housing styles whilst remaining sympathetic to existing neighbourhood character.

Council’s Residential Development and Character Policy (Clause 22.01) aims to ensure that new development is successfully integrated into existing residential environments with minimal streetscape or amenity impact and to achieve outcomes that enhance the Garden City Character of the area.

It is acknowledged that increased residential density and dwelling diversity is sought by state and local policies, however the proposed development is considered inconsistent with the local planning policy framework in respect of its impact on neighbourhood character and housing diversity objectives. The development plan should be designed to better respond to the context of the surrounding area. The subject land is not located in close proximity to an activity
centre and while the site is in close proximity to the bus service that runs along Scotsburn Avenue, the site is about 2 kilometres from the nearest train station. Given this, there is little strategic policy justification for a development of this intensity. The density and design response of the proposal is at odds with the established built form of the surrounding area and poorly responds to residential policy objectives relating to neighbourhood character and built form outcomes. Whilst the site does provide an opportunity for infill medium density development and increased density, the design response needs to have better regard for the surrounding context and applicable residential development policy.

Council’s Tree Conservation Policy (Clause 22.05) also contains objectives designed to maintain, enhance and extend the Garden City Character throughout the municipality.

The submitted development plan responds poorly to Garden City Character and Vegetation Retention Policy objectives by virtue that minimal vegetation is proposed to be retained on this site.

**Assessment against Development Plan Overlay Schedule 5 (DPOS) Housing Diversity**

The submitted Development Plan proposes 108, three bedroom attached dwelling of 2-3 storey(s) in scale. Although the proposal envisages varied architectural themes with nine (9) different housing layouts on offer, there is no option for single storey homes which would suit those with limited mobility or the elderly who may be looking to downsize. There is also no option of a larger site(s) which may be attractive to young families.

**Neighbourhood Character and Design Response**

The concept of developing the site for townhouse style development is considered appropriate, however the proposed bulk, mass, and scale of the development together with the small lot sizes, is at odds with the neighbourhood character of the surrounding area, which generally comprises single-storey dwellings on lots of approximately 600 square metres to 900 square metres in area.

All dwellings proposed adjacent to the north, east and south boundaries of the lot are double storey in scale except for two Dwelling Type M lots which are 3 Storey in scale and will be located opposite a single storey dwelling at 13 Sinclair Street. This is contrary to the provisions of DPO5 recommends a maximum of two storey built form adjacent to or opposite any existing single storey residential development.

In relation to the internal streetscape design, it is noted that garages and car parking dominate the ground floor levels of most dwellings and internal streetscapes. For example, the northern east-west road extending between
dwelling types F and E will be dominated on both sides of the street by garages and vehicle crossovers. The eastern (rear) facades of dwelling types E, E1 and E2 extending along the western boundary of the lots are also heavily dominated by ground floor garages with no habitable rooms existing at ground floor level. The extent to which ground floor garages and car parking will dominate internal streetscapes is considered inappropriate.

Proposed three storey built form has been located centrally on site, away from side and rear boundaries. The location and extent of this three storey built form is considered appropriate in the context of the site and its graduation in built form within the site and into the surrounding area. However, a large percentage of the site’s interface to Alvina Street will also be developed with three storey built form, which is not considered to be sympathetic to the broader street and neighbourhood character. Although issues of overshadowing will not arise as a result of this, the three storey scale of the buildings proposed along Alvina Street, coupled with the building mass resulting from their attached nature, raises questions about whether the development will contribute to the streetscape or whether it will dominate to an unreasonable degree. After considering the various elements which combine to define the character and amenity of Alvina Street and Sinclair Street environs, it is considered that the scale and mass of buildings proposed at this location represents too great a change for a quiet, local residential street and the proposed built form needs to be lowered in height (to two storey), broken up more and setback further from the street.

**Built form and scale**

Issues of built form and scale are key issues with the current proposal. The proposed built form represents a marked change to the immediate neighbourhood, with large continuous building modules proposed throughout the site and around its perimeter. The lack of separation in built form further compounds the scale and mass of the buildings.

The DPO5 requires any proposed Development Plan to “create a composition of varied building forms and heights across the site.” In this regard, a mix of two and three storey built form is proposed across the site in the form of attached townhouse style dwellings, grouped together in building modules. Although it is acknowledged that this is a large infill site and it has the ability to carry a higher yield of development than the surrounding neighbourhood, it is considered that a less intense built form, scale and mass than that proposed, would be more appropriate for this site.

This may include breaking the larger three storey building mass into smaller building modules to break the lineal mass of the buildings across the site and in doing so, create more opportunity for soft landscaping between dwellings. This would also provide a more pervious feel to the site from the adjoining neighbourhood as well as within the site itself. For example, if the building
module of Type E dwellings was to be broken up into modules of two or three, this would allow dwellings Type F and D to be better integrated with the site, allowing views through the site to the central park area and beyond. Buildings fronting Alvina Street as well as dwelling types C would also benefit from a similar treatment.

Double storey development proposed around the perimeter of the site generally respects the single storey scale of adjacent dwellings. While the contemporary architectural theme proposed for the site is supported, the level of articulation proposed to rear facades of these dwellings does not however provide a reasonable level of relief from the continuous facade. It is considered that building masses should be broken up into smaller modules throughout the site.

A 4.5 metre setback is proposed around the south, east and northern boundaries of the lot. This is considered minimal, given the extent of continual built form proposed, and an increase in side and rear setbacks should be explored. Increased setbacks will allow greater opportunity for significant screen planting to be accommodated around the perimeter of the site and the common boundaries with sensitive residential abuttals.

It is considered that in its current form, the Development Plan does not go far enough in terms of varied building form. On-site amenity, as well as the streetscape interface, could be greatly improved if the proposed building mass was reduced. A minimum setback of 6.5 to 7 metres would be more appropriate.

**Street Setback**
The proposed townhouses facing Alvina Street to the north of the site’s entrance will be setback 10.5 metres from the street, and will roughly sit in line with the existing dwelling at No. 8 Alvina Street. This is considered an appropriate design response. This setback will also preserve the health of the significant tree located along this boundary.

A street setback of 4.5 metres is proposed for the dwellings located to the south of the site’s entrance along Alvina Street. This setback is minimal, especially given the scale and mass of the built form proposed at this location, and should be increased.

**Landscaping and Retention of trees**
In accordance with Part 3 of DPO5, a development plan is required to include a Landscape Plan which shows the landscape concept for the site, and ‘incorporates any significant vegetation including trees rated as ‘moderate’ or ‘high’ in the 2013 Tree Logic assessment.

The current Development Plan and the landscape plan which forms a part of the submitted development plan proposes to retain only 4 existing trees (out of 100 trees located within the title boundary) on the site. The proposal does not
incorporate all the trees rated as ‘moderate’ or ‘high’ in the 2013 Tree Logic assessment.

Putting aside the issue of compliance with DPO 5 for the moment, there appears to be no justification to remove all these trees other than to maximise on site yield. It is considered that at the very least, further consideration should be given to revising the design to support the retention of existing vegetation on the site. The importance of trees, and their retention was clearly signalled in the relevant planning controls and should have been obvious to any purchaser of the site. Similarly at a more general level the importance to retain vegetation should have been considered at the time of purchase.

The submitted development plan includes an "indicative" landscape concept plan for the site. The landscape scheme for the site includes a mix of native and exotic planting across the site.

The minimal street setbacks, closely located vehicle crossovers, small sized ground level secluded open spaces and minimal provision of nature strip spaces results in limited areas for meaningful landscaping and canopy tree provision. One of the main concerns with the current proposal is the lack of soft landscaping opportunities available throughout the site due to the high yield of dwellings proposed which has resulted in large building footprint being proposed.

Putting the requirements of DPO5 to one side for the moment, the submitted development plan should incorporate increased landscaping areas throughout the site and greater retention of existing vegetation to better complement and integrate the site with the surrounding area.

As noted earlier, the officer position on DPO 5 is that a submitted development plan must include a landscape plan; the landscaping plan must incorporate any vegetation that is significant; and the landscape plan must also incorporate those trees rated as ‘moderate’ or ‘high’ in the 2013 Tree Logic Assessment. The submitted development plans fail to provide an appropriate response to the issue of vegetation retention and opportunities for planting new vegetation generally and also fail to meet the requirements of DPO 5 in relation to the incorporation of significant vegetation.

Sustainable Design Features

Many of the design features of the proposed buildings on site will be considered as part of the planning permit application stage and building permit stage, however, Water Sensitive Urban Design Initiatives and Environmentally Sustainable Design will be adopted. The concept Landscape Plan prepared as part of the Development Plan includes rain gardens, stormwater harvesting and storage (underground rainwater water tanks). Given this, it is considered that the proposal satisfies the requirements of DPO5.
The internal amenity of dwellings will be more closely scrutinised during the planning permit application process, once a Development Plan for the site has been approved. Having said this, the indicative dwelling layouts submitted with the application indicate that in general, an acceptable level of internal amenity will be achieved, however it is noted that dwelling Type E2 proposes an upper floor bedroom which will rely on borrowed light. This element of the design is not considered acceptable.

**Car Parking, Access and Traffic Impact**

The proposal provides for the requisite number of resident and visitor car parking spaces pursuant to Clause 52.06 as detailed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of dwellings</th>
<th>Clause 52.06 requirement</th>
<th>Car spaces required</th>
<th>Car spaces provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 bedroom dwellings</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2 spaces per dwelling</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor parking</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1 space per 5 dwellings</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total provided</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>237</strong></td>
<td><strong>238</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Development Plan provides for sufficient on-site car parking provision to satisfy clause 52.06 requirements.

A Traffic Engineering Analysis prepared by Traffix Group (December 2014) was submitted as part of the Development Plan submission providing an assessment of all car parking, access, traffic generation and impact, waste collection (accessibility) and bicycle storage facilities. The Development Plan and supporting Traffic advice was considered by Council’s Traffic Engineering Department who have provided the following comments (summarised):

- The proposed provision of visitor parking throughout the site is considered satisfactory.
- In general, footpaths are too narrow and should be increased from 1.2 metres to a minimum of 1.4 metres in width.
- Minimum radius at each roadway change of direction is required to be 8 metres to enable larger vehicles including Council or private waste collection vehicles to negotiate the development site.
- It is unclear how waste bins will be collected as there doesn’t appear to be sufficient space on street frontages.
- Visitor parallel spaces are to be lengthened in increased in length from 6.3 metres to 6.7 metres to comply with the Planning Scheme.
- Similar medium density developments have experienced issues with on-street parking demands greater than the development’s parking provision. As a consequence, drivers have taken to parking on nearby reserves. It is recommended that bollards at appropriate spacing be installed at the proposed reserves to discourage this behaviour and prevent damage to the reserves.
• Vehicle crossings in Alvina Street should be converted to double crossings where the crossings are within 1:50 metres of each other. In addition, a minimum of 5.5 metres is required in between the turning point of adjacent vehicle crossings in Alvina Street to ensure that vehicle access to properties is unimpeded.

• The predicted traffic generation of 702 vehicle trip-ends/day will be a significant increase to the existing traffic volume of 261 vehicles/day in Alvina Street and is likely to be noticeable to nearby residents. However, the existing road network has sufficient capacity to cater for the expected traffic volumes and in general, there is expected to be minimal impact on the local traffic network.

• It is also noted that tandem car spaces within driveways should be at least 5.5 metres in length to ensure that vehicles do not overhang footpaths within the development.

Storage facilities to each dwelling will be provided within the garage of each dwelling or elsewhere within the dwelling envelope.

It is not considered by the optimal for such a large number of dwellings to rely on a tandem car parking arrangement. The current proposal shows Dwelling Type M (representing 5 out of 108 dwellings) to be the only dwelling to be afforded a double car garage.

Although it appears that the existing local road network will be able to cater for the expected increase in traffic volumes, the amount of additional traffic that will be funnelled through Alvina Street and Sinclair Street and the level of change imposed on the local residents who have, for a number of years, been used to a quiet residential street remains a concern. Having said this, it is acknowledged that the site was used as a primary school and would have generated fairly high volumes of traffic during drop off and pick up times, as well as generating a demand for kerb side parking along both Alvina Street and Sinclair Street.

Pedestrian Links and Permeability
The existing pedestrian path leading to Scotsburn Avenue will be retained and upgraded. This path will provide convenient access to the bus service along that street, as well as providing convenient access to Centre Road to the south.

Risk assessment given proximity to a nearby landfill
The DPOS requires the Applicant to undertake and submit to Council a risk assessment detailing the risk of landfill gas migration from nearby landfills. The risk assessment must be conducted by a suitably qualified professional, having regard to the relevant EPA Publication to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.
Instead, the applicant has submitted a ‘Report on Environmental Due Diligence Review and Advice’ prepared by Golder Associates Pty Ltd dated April 2009. This report was prepared for the Victorian Urban Development Authority (Vic Urban).

The report was prepared in excess of 6 years ago and it is considered appropriate that the current application should be supported by an updated study.

**CONCLUSION:**

The current proposal represents a significant change to the neighbourhood in terms of housing density and building mass and scale. Although it is envisaged that sites such as this will ultimately accommodate more intense development than the surrounding neighbourhood, the scale and mass of buildings, and the density of dwellings proposed on this site is considered inappropriate. The site is also located within an established residential neighbourhood away from Major and Principal Activity Centres and local services.

The scale and mass of buildings is very different to its immediate neighbourhood, proposing large building masses which, even with some articulation at upper floor levels will read as one large building when viewed from adjacent backyards and streets. While it is considered that the site can accommodate a built form up to three storeys in height, the current proposal is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site.

Also of concern is the lack of dwelling diversity proposed to be provided, as all dwellings comprise three bedrooms. While there is some diversity in the appearance of dwellings, the car parking arrangement and other aspects, there is no real diversity in the type of dwelling to be provided.

The proposed development plan also proposes to retain only a few mature trees on the site, contrary to the objectives of the Development Plan Overlay.

In light of the above assessment, in its current form, the Development Plan for the former Clayton West Primary School site is not supported.
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