5.1 670 - 672 HIGH STREET ROAD, GLEN WAVERLEY - DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF A DOUBLE STOREY OFFICE BUILDING WITH BASEMENT CAR PARK ANCILLARY TO THE EXISTING EDUCATION CENTRE (WESLEY COLLEGE), MULTI DWELLING DEVELOPMENT (84 APARTMENTS) UP TO FOUR STOREYS WITH BASEMENT CAR PARK INCLUDING REDUCTION IN APPLICABLE CAR PARKING RATE, REMOVAL OF DRAINAGE AND SEWERAGE EASEMENT (BL - COLOUR CODE BLUE) ON LOTS 1, 98, 99, 100, 101 AND 102 ON LP013623, AND REMOVAL OF EXISTING VEGETATION

(TPA/39749:JH:HM)

Ward: Glen Waverley
Responsible Director: Paul Kearsley
Reason for Council Consideration: Cost of Development
Cost of Development: $27.2 Million
Statutory Processing Date: 21 November 2011
Pre-Application Meeting: Yes

RECOMMENDATION

Council having caused notice of planning application No. TPA/39538 to be given under Section 52 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 and having considered all the matters required under Section 60 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 decides to refuse the application for the planning permit under the provisions of the Monash Planning Scheme in respect of the land known and described as 670 – 672 High Street Road, Glen Waverley, for the development and use of a double storey building with basement car park ancillary to the existing education centre (Wesley College), multi dwelling development (84 apartments) up to 4 storeys with basement car park including a reduction in applicable car parking rate, removal of drainage and sewerage easement (BL - colour code blue) on Lots 1, 98, 99, 100, 101 and 102 on LP013623, and removal of existing vegetation, on the following grounds:

1. The proposal is not consistent with the objectives and strategies of Clause 15.01 of the Monash Planning Scheme with regard to context, the public realm, safety light and shade, internal amenity and architectural quality;

2. The proposal is not consistent with the Council’s Residential Development and Character Policy being Clause 22.01 of the Monash Planning Scheme;

3. The proposal is not consistent with the purpose and decision guidelines of Clause 52.06 of the Monash Planning Scheme with regard to the proposed vehicle access arrangement and its impact on the surrounding road network;

4. The proposed development is considered out of character with existing development in the area in particular with regard to bulk and form, materials and finishes proposed;

5. The proposal is considered to be inappropriate and premature having regard to the absence of a Master Plan for all land holdings of the School, including the 3.0 hectares of vacant land on the west side of Rose Avenue,
which holistically needs to consider an integrated approach to the development of this land and adjacent vacant land owned by the Uniting Church of Australia having regard to key areas including design objectives, maximum heights and building envelopes, open space design, traffic impact and management of the existing road network, infrastructure design, car parking, and retention of vegetation;

6. The proposal would compromise and/or set an undesirable precedent for the development of the remaining vacant land to the south in terms of traffic impacts, and safety, tree retention, internal amenity and drainage;

7. The proposal in its own right it would produce unacceptable traffic levels within the local road network, and increase the likelihood of vehicle accidents at side street intersecting with High Street Road;

8. The internal amenity of the proposed dwellings is considered to be substandard with respect to natural light to habitable room, size of common open areas, disabled access and storage;

9. The proposed removal of remnant native vegetation is not considered appropriate or justified;

and directs that the Applicant and each objector be given a notice of the Council’s decision to refuse the permit.

BACKGROUND

The subject site is located at the south west corner of High Street Road and Rose Avenue in Glen Waverley. The subject land includes 9 titles and was at one time owned by VicRoads for the purposes of a road reservation. The land forms part of lots located on the west side of Rose Avenue stretching half a kilometre from High Street Road to the north and the Glen Waverley Railway line to the south. The land comprises of 26 titles totalling over 3 hectares in area is currently under the ownership of the Uniting Church of Australia associated with Wesley College.

The subject land is regular in shape having a frontage to High Street Road of approximately 57 metres and a frontage to Rose Avenue of approximately 118 metres. The site has a total area of approximately 6,727m². A sewerage easement is located centrally in a north-south orientation along the rear of the properties with frontage to Rose Avenue.

The land is currently vacant but has been used to stockpile soil. The land is generally flat with a slight fall across the site from south-east to north-west of approximately 2 metres.

The landscaping on the site comprises 10 existing trees including indigenous species. There are existing vehicular crossovers to Rose Avenue or High Street Road for the subject land.

No master plan exists for this land.
The following provides a description of the nearby properties:

**North**
The properties to the north, on the opposite side of High Street Road, comprise detached dwellings with frontage to High Street Road.

**East**
The properties located on the east side of Rose Avenue comprise detached dwellings with frontage to Rose Avenue. A petrol station is located at the south east corner of High Street Road and Rose Avenue. Vehicle access arrangements for the petrol station include entry and exit to both High Street Road and Rose Avenue.

**South**
To the south are further titles owned by The Uniting Church as a part of the Wesley College site.

**West**
The subject land adjoins an existing hockey pitch and car park forming part of Wesley College to the west.

Beyond this immediate context, the site is located within an area which comprises a range of uses including residential development, Wesley College (Glen Waverley Campus proper) and the local strip shopping centre fronting High Street Road. The site is located within convenient access to a range of existing physical and social infrastructure, including local shops, education facilities, public open space and other community facilities. The site has good access to public transport including several bus services on High Street Road and is within walking distance of Glen Waverley and Syndal railway stations.

**PROPOSAL**
The application proposes the development and use of a double storey school administration building with basement car park, 84 dwellings within a 2-4 storey apartment building with basement car park including a reduction in the applicable car parking rate, the removal of the drainage and sewerage easement and the removal of existing vegetation.

More specific details of the proposal are as follows:

**School Administration (Office) Building**
- Office component to be ancillary to existing education centre (Wesley College);
- Double storey office building located on the western portion of the subject site orientated to High Street Road;
- Setback 7.6 metres to High Street Road;
- Net leasable office floor area of 1161.6m² over two levels;
• Basement car parking comprising of 45 car spaces (3.9 car spaces per 100m² of net leasable floor area);
• Basement car park level accessed via the existing internal road network within the Wesley College;
• The main entry of the office building is oriented to the west and pedestrian access to the office building is provided from the existing Wesley College grounds;
• The architectural expression is contemporary and incorporates a range of modern materials and finishes.

Residential Apartments
• Two to four storey apartment building comprising 84 dwellings;
• Each apartment will comprise of 2 bedrooms having an area of 62-68m² per apartment;
• Semi-basement car-park providing for 101 car parking spaces including 84 resident car parking spaces and 17 visitor car parking spaces. Access to the apartment car park is via Rose Avenue. Storage units for each dwelling, bin/waste storage, communal gym and bicycle parking is provided for within the semi-basement;
• Ground and first floor levels consisting of 28 two bedroom dwellings each, setback 7.6 metres from High Street Road, and Rose Avenue and common communal open space area;
• Second floor level consisting of 16 two bedroom dwellings, setback 17.9 metres from Rose Avenue;
• Third floor level consisting of 12 two bedroom dwellings, with rooftop open space, also setback 17.9 metres from Rose Avenue;
• The rear ground floor level apartments are provided with private open space in the form of ground level courtyards with an area ranging from 24-96m²;
• The front ground level and upper level apartments are provided with private open space in the form of a balcony with an area of 8m²;
• Total high of approximately 14.8 metres.
• The architectural expression is contemporary and incorporates a range of modern materials and finishes, and includes flat and angular roof forms
• Removal of the existing sewerage/drainage easement and existing trees on site is proposed.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Zoning and Overlays
The land is zoned Residential 1 Zone under the provisions of the Monash Planning Scheme. The land is not subject to any overlay controls.

The purpose of the Residential 1 Zone is to:
• To implement the State Planning Policy Framework and the Local Planning Policy Framework, including the Municipal Strategic Statement and local planning policies.
- To provide for residential development at a range of densities with a variety of dwellings to meet the housing needs of all households.
- To encourage residential development that respects the neighbourhood character.

Pursuant to the requirements of Clause 32.01-4 of the Monash Planning Scheme a permit is required to construct two or more dwellings on a lot.

An education centre (school) is a Section 2 use within the Residential 1 Zone. Pursuant to Clause 32.01-1 and 32.01-6 a permit is required for the development and use of the proposed school administration building.

State Planning Policy Framework
The following sections of the State Planning Policy Framework are relevant in consideration of this application
- 11 - Settlement
- 11.04 - Metropolitan Melbourne
- 14.02-1 - Catchment planning and management
- 15 - Built environment and heritage
- 16 - Housing
- 16.01-2 - Location of residential development
- 16.01-3 - Strategic redevelopment sites
- 16.01-4 - Housing diversity

Clause 15.01-2 (Urban Design Principles) objectives seek to:
To achieve architectural and urban design outcomes that contribute positively to local urban character and enhance the public realm while minimising detrimental impact on neighbouring properties

The design principles relevant to this proposal include context, the public realm, safety, landmarks, views and vistas, pedestrian spaces, light and shade, energy and resource efficiency and architectural quality.

Clause 16.01-2 (Location of Residential Development) seeks:
To locate new housing in or close to activity centres and employment corridors and at other strategic redevelopment sites that offer good access to services and transport

Strategies to achieve this include:
Increase the proportion of housing in Metropolitan Melbourne to be developed within the established urban area, particularly at activity centres, employment corridors and at other strategic sites, and reduce the share of new dwellings in greenfield and dispersed development areas
Encourage higher density housing development on sites that are well located in relation to activity centres, employment corridors and public transport

Facilitate residential development that is cost-effective in infrastructure provision and use, energy efficient, incorporates water efficient design principles and encourages public transport use

Local Planning Policy Framework
Clause 21: Municipal Strategic Statement
The Garden City Character of the municipality is identified in the Municipal Strategic Statement as a core value held by the community and Council as a significant and important consideration in all land use and development decisions.

Clause 21.02-6 specifically draws attention to:

Neighbourhood character is an important element of the residential areas within the City of Monash. Competing interests of the need for housing diversity and maintenance of existing neighbourhood character require careful planning to ensure that development outcomes are of a high quality design standard and are sympathetic to the preferred neighbourhood character and streetscape. An important element contributing to neighbourhood character in most areas is the Garden City Character, which describes the tree-lined and vegetated aspect of the municipality.

Clause 21.04: Residential Development

The City of Monash is experiencing a change in the housing structure and dwelling requirements of its population, with a noticeable shift towards increased density forms of housing, generally characterised by multi-unit dwellings.

Council's goal is for residential development in the City to be balanced in providing a variety of housing styles whilst remaining sympathetic to existing neighbourhood character.

Clause 22.01: Residential Development and Character Policy
This policy is intended to provide that certainty and will ensure that new development is successfully integrated into existing residential environments, with minimal streetscape or amenity impact, and designed to achieve outcomes that enhance the Garden City Character of the area.

Particular Provisions
- Clause 52.02 - Easements, restrictions and reserves
- Clause 52.06 - Car Parking
- Clause 52.17 - Native Vegetation
- Clause 52.34 - Bicycle Parking
- Clause 52.35 - Urban Context Report and Design Response for Residential Development of Four or More Dwellings
- Clause 52.36 - Integrated Public Transport Planning

General Provisions
Clause 65 – Decision Guidelines.

CONSULTATION

Notification
Notice of the application was given pursuant to the requirements of Section 52 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987. The application was advertised extensively, including notifying owners and occupiers of adjoining land and a significant number of properties within the surrounding vicinity. Three (3) large signs were erected on the land. A public information session was held on 5 October 2011.

A total of 147 objections have been received to date.

Issues raised within the objections can be summarised as:
- Increased traffic and poor vehicle access;
- Increased pedestrians;
- Lack of onsite parking provision;
- Neighbourhood and streetscape character;
- Loss of significant vegetation;
- Noise;
- Loss of property values;
- Lack of housing variety/diversity;
- Scale, built form and increased density;
- Undesirable precedent;
- Future development on the site;
- Construction management;
- Inadequate communal open space;
- Overlooking and loss of privacy;
- Waste management;
- Increased social nuisances;
- Attract undesirables (students, shared housing, renters, non families etc);
- Loss of views;
- Overshadowing;
- Overdevelopment;
- Extent of notification;
- Energy efficiency;
- Inadequate drainage and sewerage infrastructure;
- Increased pollution;
- Poor access for emergency services;
- Exacerbated traffic accidents and congestion associated with the existing service station;
- Loss of green space;
- Changing demographics;
- Private open space and communal open space provision;
- Poor internal amenity outcomes;

**Internal Referral**
Traffic- significant concerns that the proposal will result in increased traffic impacts and an exacerbation of the already significant amount of car accidents between the side streets and High Street Road.

Drainage- generally no objection to the proposal subject to standard conditions being included on any planning permit to issue.

Waste Management- generally no objection to the proposal, however, advice has been provided that an amended waste management plan needs to be submitted by condition of permit.

**External Referral**
The application was formally referred to Melbourne Water, Yarra Valley Water and the Department of Transport pursuant to the referral requirements of the Monash Planning Scheme.

Melbourne Water - no objection to the proposal.

Yarra Valley Water - no objection to the proposal, subject to conditions.

Department of Transport - no objection to the proposal.

VicRoads were provided details of the application for comment. It should be noted that no statutory referral of the application is required to VicRoads. VicRoads raised concerns that the proposal would result in parking on the east side of Rose Avenue, and resulting queuing on High Street Road for cars attempting to enter Rose Avenue. VicRoads objected to the proposal unless parking on both sides of Rose Avenue, to the north of the proposed site access was removed.

**ASSESSMENT – STRATEGIC ISSUES**

**Broad Strategic Justification**
In principle, the concept of developing the subject site for medium density housing and ancillary education uses is considered to be consistent with the broader, strategic directions of the SPPF and LPPF of the Monash Planning Scheme identified in the ‘Policy Implications’ section of this report.

Clause 11.01-2 (Activity Centre Planning):

“Encourages a diversity of housing types at higher densities around an activity centre”
Strategies of Clause 16.01-2 (Location of Residential Development) seek to: -

- Increase the proportion of housing in Metropolitan Melbourne to be developed within the established urban area, particularly at activity centres, employment corridors and at other strategic sites...
- Facilitate higher density housing development on sites that are well located in relation to activity centres, employment corridors and public transport
- Facilitate residential development that is cost-effective in infrastructure provision and use, energy efficient, and encourages public transport use...

In principle, the concept of developing the subject site for medium density housing is also considered to be supportive of various areas of the MSS, including Clause, 21.04, as it provides for the development of housing in an appropriate location where increased densities can be accommodated, subject to design and traffic considerations.

**Absence of a Master Plan**

Notwithstanding the broader strategic justification for increased density residential development of the subject land, a range of issues and circumstances support the need for a master plan for the site and the adjacent vacant land owned by the Uniting Church of Australia located to the south of the subject site.

Master plans are a common planning tool used by schools, hospitals and the like where large vacant land holdings exist under one ownership, development expansion is expected, and where there is potential for impacts on residential interfaces and the local community.

It is a document which is based on a sound planning analysis and related investigations, which declares to all relevant parties, including the local community, the future intention of developing and/or using land.

Plans are usually formalised in the Planning Scheme by the introduction of an Incorporated Plan Overlay (IPO) over the relevant sites. An IPO to varying extents ‘lock in’ the form and conditions of future use and development.

These can include design objectives, maximum heights and building envelopes, open space design, traffic impact and management of the existing road network, car parking, infrastructure design and retention of vegetation. The master plan would allow Council and surrounding residents to consider development of the site holistically As opposed to the piece meal approach adopted here and in the past.

A Master Plan and an Incorporated Plan Overlay (IPO) has been in place for a number of years for the Oakleigh Greek Orthodox College in Hughesdale. It has been a successful tool for ensuring appropriate development and use outcomes and it continues to be supported by the Department of Planning and Community Development as an appropriate planning tool.

The issues and circumstances which indicate that the approval of any development of the site prior to the preparation of a Master Plan would be premature and inappropriate, include the following:
Traffic Impacts and Safety

Councils Traffic Engineers have provided the following specific advice:

- There is concern that the existing petrol station traffic already creates significant traffic congestion in and around the northern end of Rose Avenue and its intersection with High Street Road which traffic from this development may exacerbate.

- Crash statistics indicate that right turns from Rose Avenue into High Street Road are the predominant crash type with type 3 injury accidents occurring over the past 5 financial years.

- An increase in traffic and congestion at the High Street Road/Rose Avenue intersection may mean that drivers may become impatient with longer traffic queues in Rose Avenue and choose shorter gaps in High Street Road traffic, increasing the likelihood of a crash.

- As a consequence of the above factors, development traffic may be diverted to using other local streets to access High Street Road...contributing to a noticeable increase in development ‘passing’ traffic also Rose Avenue, Adams Avenue and Myers Avenue.

The design solution for all residential traffic to enter and exit onto Rose Avenue and associated side streets therefore is considered to be inappropriate. Indications are that this would result in noticeable increased traffic flows to residential streets and potentially an increase in the frequency of serious traffic accidents.

VicRoads comments also acknowledge that the High Street Road/Rose Avenue intersection is not without its problems.

A logical alternative, which needs investigation, is to integrate the land holdings with the majority of traffic to run along an internal road along the western edge of the vacant sites, which then exits at a signalised intersection at High Street Road. This is not an unrealistic proposition given the land holdings all being in control of the school. There is an existing signalised intersection located further west providing access to the Wesley School site.

The appropriate planning tool to investigate and implement appropriate vehicle access to the sites, under the circumstances, is the development of a Master Plan and associated Planning Scheme controls.

Community Expectation

Given the large number of objections raised, there is clearly significant community concern for what the implications of the proposal are and the implications for the remaining sites. Some of the key concerns raised have been found to have significant merit, such as the traffic implications, scale and form of the building particularly having regard to height but primarily form through unsympathetic material selection.

Irrespective, it is considered there is an onus on the School to take some responsibility in declaring its intentions and taking a proactive lead in detailing a Master Plan to address these concerns and provide the framework for the appropriate development of the site including the remaining vacant land parcel to the south.
**Design and Precedence**

The proposed design of the buildings raises a number of issues of concern. These include traffic and safety, vehicle access, waste management, removal of vegetation, and some areas of substandard internal amenity, some of which are impossible to resolve via amended plans condition.

The approval of the proposal would therefore set an inappropriate standard and a precedent for similar approvals on the remaining sites, providing for poor planning and design outcomes.

**Authority Involvement**

Authorities with a statutory or other interest in the development of the sites including VicRoads (Traffic) Melbourne Water and Yarra Valley Water (Easement and drainage) and the Department of Transport (Public Transport) need to be involved in discussions regarding the overall development of all the vacant sites.

The development of a Master plan with input from these authorities would provide for a cohesive and upfront approach which could identify and address any issues of concern.

**Drainage**

Council’s Drainage advice notes that if the development is approved, stormwater drainage work is required for at least 1900sqm of land to the south of the subject site. This indicates that the drainage of the sites needs to be investigated and addressed in an integrated manner.

The preparation of a master plan and associated planning scheme amendment would therefore ensure that all of these issues are addressed in a cohesive manner having regard to the all vacant sites, and that appropriate outcomes can be sought from all party’s perspectives.

The approval of any development on the site in the absence of a master plan would be inappropriate and premature at this stage given the 3 hectares of vacant land along the western side of Rose Avenue.

**ASSESSMENT – DESIGN ISSUES**

The requirements of Clause 55 (Rescode) do not apply to residential development of four storeys or more. Clause 15.01-2 specifies design principles relating to context, the public realm, safety, landmarks, views and vistas, pedestrian spaces, heritage, consolidation of empty sites, light and shade, energy and resource efficiency, architectural quality and landscape architecture for residential development not subject to the requirements of Clause 55. “Design Guidelines for Higher Density Residential Development” (Department of Sustainability and Environment, 2004) are also relevant in assessing the design and built form of residential development of four or more storeys.

The application is assessed with regard relevant design principals as further detailed below:
Context - Development must take into account the natural, cultural and strategic context of its location.
The development fails to acknowledge specific locational issues including existing traffic congestion and management issues that will only be further exacerbated as a result of the proposed development.

Context - A comprehensive site analysis should be the starting point of the design process and form the basis for consideration of height, scale and massing of new development.

The proposed development does not have adequate or appropriate regard to the existing built form of the immediate surrounding area comprising predominantly of modest, detached dwellings.

The attached form of the proposal is out of context within the surrounding area which is dominated by detached dwellings with varied setbacks, well landscaped front gardens and a more traditional suburban form.

The architectural styling of the proposal is somewhat commercial being dominated by solid concrete and cladding elements which are a monotonous presentation to the street and surrounding vicinity. The design of the proposal is very blank in façade presentation and lacks visual interest. The visual bulk of double storey blank sheer wall elements are not consistent with surrounding residential form. The lack of meaningful vertical and horizontal articulation elements and no variation in setback to the street further exacerbates the bulk and mass of the proposal and poor integration of the development with the surrounding streetscape along Rose Avenue.

It is considered that a design response for the site could better integrate new residential development with the more appropriate regard for the existing and preferred character of the area. Variation in street setback, greater articulation, a more individual sense of address to dwellings orientated to Rose Avenue and the inclusion of varied, less monotonous materials and finishes, more attune to the surrounding residential built form would better integrate any development on the land with the character of the surrounding area.

The public realm - the public realm, which includes main pedestrian spaces, streets, squares, parks and walkways, should be protected and enhanced.
Greater areas of communal open space could be provided for a development of this scale.

Safety - New development should create urban environments that enhance personal safety and property security and where people feel safe to live, work and move in at any time.
As discussed above, the proposal raises significant concern with regard to vehicle access and potential access issues for emergency services in the surrounding area.

Landmarks, views and vistas - Landmarks, views and vistas should be protected and enhanced or, where appropriate, created by new additions to the built environment.
The double storey scale of the proposal is generally appropriate given the immediate adjoining residential interface. A relatively good transition in height to four storey
interface adjoining Wesley College is provided; however the bulk and design is inappropriate. In principle the form and appearance however remain a problem and it is considered the elevations and materials need reconsideration.

**Pedestrian spaces** - Design of interfaces between buildings and public spaces, including the arrangement of adjoining activities, entrances, windows, and architectural detailing, should enhance the visual and social experience of the user. Greater investigation and detail is required on the plans, in the context of further development to the remaining vacant sites.

**Light and shade** - Enjoyment of the public realm should be enhanced by a desirable balance of sunlight and shade. This balance should not be compromised by undesirable overshadowing or exposure to the sun. Internal light access is poor to some dwellings. Many internally orientated habitable rooms require reliance on minimal light courts resulting in poor internal amenity outcomes for future residents. Internal overshadowing of the central communal and secluded private open space areas also raises concern with regard to internal amenity. Many internal balconies and courtyards receive minimal or in some cases no sunlight throughout the day.

**Energy and resource efficiency** - All building, subdivision and engineering works should include efficient use of resources and energy efficiency. Energy efficiency objectives include a naturally ventilated car park, on-site stormwater detention and irrigation for landscaping, and energy efficient design.

**Architectural quality** - New development should achieve high standards in architecture and urban design.

As previously noted the proposed design response poorly integrates with the built form of the surrounding area. The scale of the development rising to up to four storeys in height is at odds with the modest and unassuming nature of existing dwellings along Rose Avenue. The visual impact of the southern elevation is a poor architectural and urban design response to the established residential form of the surrounding area. Any design response should have appropriate regard for the existing neighbourhood character.

**Built form and scale**

The proposed 2 to 4 storey heights and built form are not necessarily considered to be inappropriate in principle, especially given the size of the site and its proximity to the Glen Waverley Principle Activity Centre. However greater work is required taking into account an integrated approach to built form and scale on all sites including what could potentially occur on the balance of the land to the south.

The sheer size and scale of the proposed southern façade is an inappropriate design response and interface to the adjoining traditional suburban form located to the south. The blank façade treatment further lacks visual interest and further exacerbates the bulk and dominance of the façade. A more graduated building height design response would result in a more appropriate and sympathetic transition between the surrounding residential form and the subject site. Greater façade articulation and utilization of varied materials and finishes in keeping with the form of the surrounding area would further improve the transition.
The semi-basement proposed effectively increases the overall height of the development by additional half storey/level resulting in a 2.5 storey building presentation to Rose Avenue, and up to 4.5 storey building height approximately 14m in high along the western facade (orientated to Wesley College). Whilst a semi-basement results in some construction cost benefit and lesser basement ventilation requirements, there appears no reason why basement car parking can’t be fully excavated into the ground, reducing the overall building height and visual impact on the surrounding area.

**Car Parking**

The proposal provides the following in respect of car parking:
- 84 residential car spaces (1 car space per dwelling) plus 17 visitor car spaces;
- 45 office car spaces at a rate of 3.9 spaces per 100sqm.

Clause 52.06 is applicable to this application and requires 2 car spaces per dwelling. An application can be made to reduce or waive this requirement. The provision of 1 car space per 2 bedroom dwelling, and 1 visitor car space per 5 dwellings in line with the Clause 55 (Rescode) car parking rate is generally considered to be appropriate for medium density residential development within a metropolitan context. The provision of car parking in accordance with the Clause 55 (Rescode) requirement has been generally accepted and adopted by VCAT and Council on development of this scale.

The table below details the relevant car parking requirement and provision of car parking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Area/No</th>
<th>Applicable Requirement</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings (39)</td>
<td>84 x 2 bed</td>
<td>1 per dwelling</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>1 per 5 dwellings</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1161m²</td>
<td>3.5 per 100m²</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>146</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in providing a sufficient number of on-site car spaces to accommodate the proposed development.

**Open Space**

Balconies have been provided which are generally in accordance with the typical Rescode requirements – these being a minimum of 8sqm with a width of 1.6 metres.

However, communal open space area sizes are considered to be ‘tokenistic’ and could be significantly improved.
Removal of Vegetation

The Arborist report submitted with the application notes that two large native canopy trees located in the front setback to Rose Avenue could be retained. The proposal notes that these trees are to be removed, with no justification provided.

Internal Amenity

A number of issues relating to internal amenity are present which are substandard. These include:

- A number of dwellings with insufficient light courts to bedroom windows;
- Poor internal common open space and other areas;
- No disabled pedestrian access from the street;
- Poor provision of storage areas;
- Poor Waste Management provision.

Objectors Concerns (not previously addressed in body of report)

Objectors greatest concerns related to existing traffic management and congestion issues within the surrounding area and a lack of foresight and detail with regard to future development of the balance of the site.

Issues raised regarding to noise impacts, construction management and increased pollution could be addressed through appropriate permit conditions should a permit issue.

Objections regarding increased social nuisances and the potential to attract undesirables (students, shared housing, renters, non families etc), loss of property values and changing community demographics are not relevant considerations in the planning process.

CONCLUSION

Whilst the concept of developing the subject site for higher density housing and ancillary education may be considered to be generally consistent with the broader, strategic directions of the SPPF and LPPF of the Monash Planning Scheme, there are a range of issues both on a strategic and specific assessment of this application which indicate that the approval of any development on the site would be inappropriate and premature.

A Master Plan for the School and in particular the 3 hectares of vacant land along the western side of Rose Avenue needs to be undertaken prior to any consideration of planning permit approval. A holistic assessment of the entire site under the ownership of the Uniting Church of Australia (including Wesley College) will allow a full and proper assessment to be undertaken.

The development as presented provides a number of challenges as outlined in this report that lead to the recommendation for refusal. The applications design deficiencies including lack of appropriate vehicle access arrangement and associated traffic impact on the surrounding local road network, poor regard for neighbourhood character, design detail, unacceptable scale, visual bulk and mass, and poor internal amenity outcomes
for future residents in addition to the lack of an appropriate Master Plan being in place to guide future development on the land.

Given these circumstances, it is considered pertinent to refuse the application.