

12 March 2010

Ray Osborne  
Heritage Victoria  
Level 7, 8 Nicholson St  
East Melbourne VIC 3002



Dear Ray,

**RE: Kew Residential Services Site Development  
115 Princess Street, Kew**

**Application for 12 Dwellings on a Lot, (Stage 3A) & Heritage Core**

**Use of land for a food and drink premises (cafe), an indoor recreation facility, a medical centre and place of assembly, a reduction in the required rate of car parking, buildings and works to heritage listed buildings and the removal of two heritage trees.**

I refer to Walker's letter and documentation dated 9 February 2010. Please find documented below concerns in respect to the proposed submission:-

- The proposed development is not in accordance with the approved Walker Development Plan dated November 2007. It would appear that the plans have been modified, that being in relation to the proposed road layout and network and the type of dwellings abutting the heritage core. Furthermore, it appears that the open space areas have been reduced in size as a result of the modifications. Concerns are raised in relation to any reduction in open space as a result of development or road networks.
- Whilst it appears that the type of dwellings abutting the heritage core are of a lower scale, Council considers this an improved design response to higher level apartment buildings and the impact that such buildings may have on the heritage significance of the internal core. Better separation of these dwellings however, would allow for glimpsing views through to the parkland areas and contribute to the openness of the area rather than tightly squeezed together.
- The plans also appears to show the layout of possible future apartment buildings. These should not be shown on the plans and should be removed accordingly as it is considered that these are not part of the consideration applied for.
- No site levels have been provided.
- Details have not been provided in respect to any trenching works and the potential impact on trees to be retained.

BOROONDARA OFFICE

8 Inglesby Road Camberwell Victoria 3124 Telephone 9278 4444 Facsimile 9278 4466

TTY 9278 4848

POSTAL ADDRESS

Private Bag 1 Camberwell Victoria 3124

WEB SITE

[www.boroondara.vic.gov.au](http://www.boroondara.vic.gov.au)



- Lack of visitor parking throughout the development for dwellings and the proposed new uses. Car parking and overflow parking in stage 1 is an issue with current residents residing on the site. There appears to be very minimal areas for visitor parking and Council is extremely concerned that the issues of stage 1 will filter through to all other stages.
- The plans do not clearly show whether any footpaths are to be provided.
- The location of crossovers have not been shown on the plans.
- The documentation should include a whole site plan or a master plan that simply includes all existing, proposed and future stages to show how the current stage will fit within the bigger picture and context. This is a basic requirement for any development if a comprehensive assessment and informed opinion is sought. The landscape plan concept is the only documentation that gives a reference to some of the surrounding buildings and spaces and it hardly has any details. The plan refers to a set of heritage conservation plans and approval that dates back to 2008, which obviously justifies the proposed works to the heritage buildings. However, how this relates to the surrounding development is unclear. A reference is made on the plan to the Walker Development Plan, which should have accompanied the documentation for this stage, and any other stage, to clearly demonstrate the manner in which these works will fit within the broader area plan.
- The 12 dwellings are located adjacent to Park Avenue which is under construction as part of stage 2 of the development of KRS. Therefore it is likely that Park Avenue will become a public highway which is vested in Council during the construction of the dwellings. Therefore the location of the dwellings will be suitable for future subdivision.
- The Community Centre, Health and Wellbeing Centre, Recreational Centre and Cafe all appear to be located within a reserve with no access to the proposed roads. Although the application may justify that patrons will walk to these centres, or can park to the north west, it is unlikely that deliveries can be made on foot, or even that staff access is suitable across the reserve. As a minimum, carriageway easements would need to be created over the reserve, and those easements constructed in a way which is compatible with the reserve and to the standards required by Council's Parks and Gardens. There may also be legal issues with vehicular access across parkland which may need further investigation. Also it is much more likely that patrons will access those buildings from the south east (where there is existing development), so there will be a need for parking along Park Avenue which has not been included in the current plans.
- The application extends along Main Drive and Boundary Road which appear to be existing Roads, then appears to create a new Road to connect Boundary Road with a Road along the north of the Reserve which will provide parking and access to the proposed apartment and the Community Centre, Health and Wellbeing Centre, Recreational Centre and Cafe. Details are required:
  1. On the existing road and it's suitability to be used as a public highway which is vested in Council.
  2. On the new roads to be constructed





3. On the proposed road reserves to be set aside
4. On any proposed access from the road to the reserve and buildings in the reserve, including the apartment which appears to be accessed through the proposed parking bays.

- In relation to the future ownership of the buildings, questions must be raised in relation to who will own the proposed heritage buildings in the future and be responsible for the general day to day maintenance of these facilities.
- Furthermore, the proposed uses within the buildings themselves need to comply with any requirements set by the State Government.
- Concern is raised in relation to the lack of car parking provided for each of the proposed uses. A cafe alone, with a total of 40 seats requires a minimum of 24 car spaces to be provided. The site is not considered to be within reasonable walking distance to public transport ie: tram line along High Street and therefore Council considers that the majority of users would come from either inside the estate itself or via private vehicles externally. Furthermore, a medical centre with four practitioners, requires a total of 20 car spaces to be provided. Again, concern is raised in relation to lack of parking. A place of assembly requires a total of 10 spaces per 100 square metres of floor area. The proposed design and layout only provides for a total of 24 car spaces to service all these proposed uses. This is not considered to be an acceptable number on the basis that the proposed uses are likely to generate large volumes of vehicular traffic and generate a substantial demand for car parking.
- It is Council's view that trees should be protected at all costs.

### **12 Dwellings on a Lot**

- Clarification is required in respect to the "proposed walkways" and their potential use for either pedestrian only or a combination of pedestrian and limited vehicle access. Should access to these paths be provided for vehicles, then it is considered that the dwellings should provide for appropriate side street setbacks.
- A number of the dwellings do not comply with the minimum front setback requirements - lots 131, 132, 133, 136.
- The proposal does not comply with ResCode in respect to side and rear setbacks, walls on boundaries, secluded private open space, street setbacks and solar access to secluded private open space.
- A number of the dwellings do not comply with the minimum street setback requirements - lots 131, 132, 133, 136.
- In respect to side and rear setbacks, at both ground and first floor level, the proposal does not provide for the minimum required setback as specified by ResCode - Lot 125, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136.
- The height of a new wall constructed on or within 150mm of a side or rear boundary should not exceed an average of 3 metres with no part higher than 3.6 metres unless abutting a higher existing or simultaneously constructed wall. All





lots with walls on boundaries do not comply. In addition, some of the dwellings exceed the length of wall on boundary allowable by ResCode - 128, 129, 130, 135, 136.

- Insufficient areas of secluded private open space has been provide to lot 125, with the minimum provision of 21 square metres.
- In respect to overshadowing of secluded private open space, a number of dwellings do not provide for adequate sunlight provision - lot 132, 133.
- Visitor car parking has not been provided for the development. In addition, it is difficult to ascertain whether on street parking is provided at all. Information in relation to road widths has not been provided.
- Concern is raised in regards to the location of the boundary fences and trees. It is considered that at least a minimum, 2 metres clearance should be provided from the edge of the tree trunk to the fence line for maintenance and growth purposes. Furthermore, trees in close proximity to decking etc... is not considered to be an ideal situation with the potential for owners to cut back branches which overhang into their property. Lot 131 has an unusual boundary alignment as a result of attempting to keep the tree within the public domain. It may be better to remove a dwelling to improve the dwelling alignment.
- Coloured photomontages showing the proposal in relation to the heritage buildings is also critical to the assessment of the development and to establish whether it complements the existing streetscapes or competes with it, which often is the case when new built form is proposed to older historic sites and buildings. Note that colours and materials have a great effect on the overall outcome and can effectively soften or sharpen any differences between the old and new. A sample board should therefore be requested to demonstrate the compatibility of the two within the broader context of the site and area.

#### Engineering Comments:-

- Insufficient details on the plans provided.
- No dimensions on plans provided.
- No level details on the plans so drainage characteristics and nature strip profiles cannot be determined.
- Council advises that the minimum pavement width (face of kerb to face of kerb) is 5.5 metres. Whilst 5.5 metres is the minimum width, Council has received numerous complaints from residents currently residing in Stage 1 in respect to the minimal road widths and lack of visitor parking in the area – that being provision of on street parking or indented parking facilities.
- Concern is raised in regards to whether sufficient kerbside areas between driveways have been provided to cater for garbage/recycling bins.
- Lack of provision for nature strip planting with the proposed zero lot lines appears to be the case (needs clarification).
- Footpath requirements are not clearly identified.
- Parking for each allotment is not shown (on-street/off-street). Concern is raised in regards to vehicle/garbage truck access if cars are parked on-street. Is there indented parking for the dwellings?
- Ability for service vehicles (garbage/recycling trucks) to negotiate the layout needs to be determined and confirmed.
- Commercial facilities are to be serviced by commercial waste collections with a waste management plan to be submitted for consideration. Concern is raised in





relation to how large scale vehicles enter and exit the commercial facilities in respect to waste management service provision and the potential conflict of pedestrian vs vehicle walkways.

### Landscape Comments

#### General direction on landscape design

Council's Environment Policy identifies that "*The City of Boroondara is committed to benefiting present and future generations through the practice of sustainability*". Council encourages landscape design that improves biodiversity and is environmentally sustainable.

Factors to consider in the preparation of a landscape plan include:-

- Site responsive design – landscape plans should respond to soil conditions, existing slope & drainage, solar exposure, local climate and existing vegetation.
- Planting drought tolerant plant species to reduce water use.
- Including rain water tanks to supply water to irrigate plants that are not drought tolerant.
- Using recycled/reused materials where ever practical eg: recycled timber for garden edging, decking etc.
- Consider the embodied energy and carbon miles that a landscape product represents. Local, not highly processed landscape materials have a lower impact on the environment and climate change compared to materials that have required large energy inputs to create and that are then transported long distances to reach the garden.
- Plant indigenous and native vegetation to promote biodiversity and create habitat for native animals and insects.
- Consider the use of some native Australian plants from the Boroondara area, especially those in danger of disappearing due to development.
- Investigate the potential for Water Sensitive Urban Design features to be incorporated into the landscape design (for more information on Water Sensitive Urban Design see the next page).
- Do not propose large areas of impermeable paving under the canopy of existing trees to be retained, refer to Council's tree protection laws (refer Council's website).

Speaking directly to the Landscape Concept Plan provided as part of the application:-

For Landscape and Design to provide more than a general comment on the landscaping proposed for this stage of the project we will require further information in addition to that provided on the Landscape Concept Plan:

1. Indicate by note or detail the soil preparation methods proposed for lawn and garden areas.
2. Minimum installation size of trees is a 300mm pot size, with trees to the garden areas visible from the street (and in the public realm) preferred to be a minimum of 2.5 metres tall at time of planting.
3. Indicate botanic names, height and canopy spread of existing trees on or next to the site and if they are proposed to be removed or retained.
4. Indicate title boundaries, any retaining walls on site (plus heights), driveway and parking areas and building footprints.



5. Provide fence details.
6. Show the names of the adjacent street(s).
7. Indicate existing site contours and proposed contours or spot levels on plan. Indicate areas of cut and fill proposed. Use sections as necessary to illustrate levels.
8. All landscape plans are to provide a plant schedule outlining proposed plants. Ensure that the plant schedule includes all the required information.
9. Ensure that the proposed plants are not weed species.
10. We encourage the use of local plant species <http://boroondara.vic.gov.au/our-city/trees/personal-involvement/indigenous-plant-list>

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to contact either myself on 9278-4447 or Amy Hodgen 9278-4842. Alternatively, we may be contacted by email at [Fiona.Beard@boroondara.vic.gov.au](mailto:Fiona.Beard@boroondara.vic.gov.au) or [Amy.Hodgen@boroondara.vic.gov.au](mailto:Amy.Hodgen@boroondara.vic.gov.au)

Yours faithfully



Fiona Beard  
**CO-ORDINATOR STATUTORY PLANNING**

cc. Brad Evans  
Teresa Rados  
Lorenz Pereira  
John Hawker

