

Town Planning Reports 15 03 March 2014 OM251 10.1 Town Planning Application - 70 Armstrongs Road, Seaford 264/2013/P - To construct two (2) double storey dwellings to the rear of the existing dwelling (three (3) dwellings)

Officers' Assessment

On-Site Amenity and Facilities

With the exception of the existing dwelling, none of the proposed dwellings cater to people of limited mobility as the kitchen and living areas are proposed on the first floors. The private open space for the existing dwelling will not have direct access from a living area, rather it is accessed from the dwelling entrance which is not considered to be a desirable outcome.

Each dwelling is to be provided with 6 cubic metres of storage.

Detailed Design

As discussed previously the design detail is not considered to be in keeping or sympathy with the existing and preferred pattern of development for the area, with a double storey built form that is not visually compatible with the development in the area.

The extent of built form does not provide any reasonable opportunities for landscaping to soften the development.

Clause 52.06 - Car Parking

The planning scheme requires two (2) car parking spaces for a three or more bedroom dwelling. The proposal has provided the sufficient number of car spaces and the plans state that the dimensions and access of the car parking spaces are satisfactory.

Council's Traffic Engineers have viewed the proposed development and raised concerns with the proposed uncovered car parking area for the existing dwelling. It is considered that the proposal fails to comply with Design Standard 2 – Car Parking Spaces as at least one (1) car space must be covered when two or more car parking spaces are provided.

The development fails to satisfy Design Standard – 5 Urban Design as the proposed car parking for the existing dwelling within the front setback is not considered to be an appropriate response as it will be visible to the streetscape and this area should be used for additional landscaping.

The proposal fails to comply with Design Standard – 6 Safety as all dwellings do not provide surveillance of the entrances and common driveway areas.

It is considered that the location of the proposed car parking for the existing dwelling within the front setback is inappropriate and does not respect the preferred neighbourhood character as there are no existing developments in the immediate area that has such a car parking arrangement. The limited landscaping opportunities to soften the appearance of all the car parking areas as a result of the large hard surface areas, fails to satisfy, Design Standard 7 – Landscaping.

Council's Visitor Parking Guidelines

Frankston City Council has adopted a visitor car parking guideline associated with residential development based on assessment of three key issues:

- The number of dwellings proposed to be constructed on the site which have a shared / common access way;
- The street type (determined by the width of the carriageway); and
- The number of vehicles able to be parked on the street directly in front of the subject site.

As the site is located at the end of a no through road, there is no opportunity for on-street parking directly in front of the site due to access to the east side to the Seaford Wetlands.

The policy requires two (2) visitor car spaces be provided on site for this proposal. The proposal does not provide a visitor car parking space and is therefore not compliant with the policy. There are opportunities to modify the common driveway design to provide one (1) visitor car space.

Consultation

Objectors concerns

The objectors concerns have been addressed throughout the report in relation to neighbourhood character, amenity, State and Local policy, planning controls and Seaford Wetlands.

Cultural Heritage Management Plan

The subject site is located within an Aboriginal Affairs Victoria Cultural Heritage Area and the proposed development is a high impact activity. The preparation of a Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP) is required pursuant to the Aboriginal Heritage Regulations 2007. An

approved copy of the CHMP prepared by Laurinda Dugay-Grist dated 18 April 2013 was approved by Aboriginal Affairs Victoria on 16 May 2013.

Conclusion

Overall, it is considered the proposal does not satisfy the requirements of:-

- The State and Local Planning Policy Frameworks, including the Municipal Strategic Statement and Clause 22.08 – Neighbourhood Character Policy;
- Clause 32.01 – Residential 1 Zone;
- Clause 52.06 – Car Parking;
- Clause 55 – Two or More Dwellings on a Lot and Residential Buildings; and
- Clause 65 – Decision Guidelines

The design and siting of the proposed development is not considered to be compatible with the surrounding area; and will have a detrimental impact on surrounding properties as discussed throughout this report.

On balance, the proposal is inappropriate for the site and should be refused.

Recommendation (GMDevelopment)

[That Council resolves to issue a Notice of Refusal to Grant a Planning Permit in respect to Planning Permit Application number 264/2013/P to construct two \(2\) double storey dwellings to the rear of the existing dwelling \(three \(3\) dwellings\) at 70 Armstrongs Road, Seaford subject to the following grounds:](#)

1. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives of the State and Local Policy Framework of the Frankston Planning Scheme, including:

- a) Clause 11 – Settlement
- b) Clause 12 – Environmental and Landscape Values
- c) Clause 13 – Environmental Risks
- d) Clause 15 – Built Environment and Heritage
- e) Clause 16 – Housing
- f) Clause 21.03 – Vision and Strategic Framework
- g) Clause 21.04 – Settlement
- h) Clause 21.05 – Environmental Risk
- i) Clause 21.06 – Environmental and Landscape Values
- j) Clause 21.07 – Housing
- k) Clause 22.08 – Neighbourhood Character

2. The proposal does not satisfy the objectives of Clause 55 of the Frankston Planning Scheme, in particular:

- a) Clause 55.02-1 - Neighbourhood Character
- b) Clause 55.03-3 – Site Coverage
- c) Clause 55.03-7 – Safety
- d) Clause 55.03-8 – Landscaping
- e) Clause 55.03-10 – Parking Location
- f) Clause 55.05-1 – Accessibility
- g) Clause 55.05-4 – Private Open Space
- h) Clause 55.06-1 – Design Detail

3. The proposal does not achieve the objectives of the Neighbourhood Character Policy (Clause 22.08 of the Frankston Planning Scheme), and the objectives of Seaford Precinct 5.

4. The proposal does not satisfy the objectives of Clause 52.06 Car Parking of the Frankston Planning Scheme, in particular:

- a) Design Standard 2 – Car Parking Spaces
- b) Design Standard 5 – Urban Design
- c) Design Standard 6 – Safety
- d) Design Standard 7 – Landscaping

5. The proposed development creates excessive visual bulk throughout the site, neighbouring property and surrounding environs.

6. The proposal fails to provide adequate visitor car parking in accordance with Council's Visitor Carparking Guidelines.