

Referral Comments

<i>Type of Referral</i>	<i>Responses</i>
Internal	
Engineering Services	<p>The submitted proposal does not contain enough information to assess engineering requirements fully as clearly stated in the traffic report from TTM Consulting Pty Ltd.</p> <p>The following comments are based on the information provided in the proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Car parking requirements and arrangements can only be assessed once the floor areas are nominated for each type of proposed uses and also a detailed lay out plans are submitted. 2. Traffic generation and its impact assessment are not presented in the traffic report. It is understood that this is not possible at this stage. 3. A detailed traffic report that addresses the traffic treatments of the development's access points must be submitted to Council's Engineering Services for assessment 4. Detailed lay out plans should be submitted. 5. Council engineering prefers the proposal to work within the existing access points to the site. (One from the Caroline Springs Boulevard and the other from Lakeway close).
City Design Department	<p>Given the subject site's 'gateway' location and review of the information provided we would request further information in the form of a detailed design response be provided to assist our review of the proposal.</p> <p>This detailed design response must clarify from an urban design perspective the site responsiveness of the proposal with its surrounding context and at a minimum provide clarification on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings Architectural Form – Clarify the buildings visual presentation, including architectural style, height and measures to address articulation and building mass; • Siting Provisions – Building / Landscaping Setbacks & Building Envelopes;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Floor Plans – Layouts providing details of all proposed uses; • Car Parking & Bicycle Storage Layout (feasibility of basement car parking); • Loading / Waste Storage Locations; • Interface Treatments – External architectural treatments, landscaping treatments & measures to maintain existing vistas; and • Internal and external pedestrian links <p><u>House Rules</u></p> <p>As previously detailed during the pre-application stage Council had concerns that the layout and height of the proposal would not be in keeping with the neighbourhood character of the surrounding area and recommended that future development accord with the preferred character outcomes and requirements of Council's Housing Character Assessment and Design Guidelines (House Rules).</p> <p>While it is noted that the current proposal now excludes residential uses and therefore assessment against Council's Housing Character Assessment and Design Guidelines (House Rules) does not strictly apply in this circumstance, however it is felt that given as House Rules provides useful guidance on the preferred outcomes for the surrounding areas neighbourhood character, it should be considered in this context.</p> <p>Under House Rules the subject site has been identified as Masterplanned Suburban 3 Area (MP3) character area and it is felt that the proposed development would not be consistent with number of preferred outcomes for this character area, including:</p> <p><i>Building Heights</i></p> <p>Guidelines relating to 'Height and Form', require maximum building heights in MP3 areas should not exceed 9 metres, and development should avoid buildings that exceed by more than one storey the predominate building height of the street, and large boxy buildings with unarticulated wall surfaces'.</p> <p>Given the heights proposed and review of the surrounding context, it is felt that that the</p>
--	---

	<p>a reduction in height for the development is warranted and it is recommended that the height of development be reduced to height of three storeys in areas adjacent to the ornamental lake in the south transitioning down to two storeys to areas adjacent to the existing residential properties fronting Lakeside Close to the north.</p> <p>It is felt that these reduced heights would be more consistent with the prevailing neighbourhood character of the surrounding area and would provide a more site responsive design approach better addressing issues such as building mass on the sites more sensitive residential interfaces.</p> <p><i>Street Trees & Vehicle Access</i></p> <p>There is concern that the proposed secondary vehicle access point north of the existing access point on Caroline Springs Boulevard would likely require the removal of one or more existing street trees located on the western side of Caroline Springs Boulevard.</p> <p>A key objective under Guidelines for 'Vehicle Crossing' seeks to 'maintain the continuity of nature strips, and allow regularly spaced street tree avenues to be planted and retained' and guides recommend that only one vehicle crossing be provided per frontage and the removal of existing street trees be avoided.</p> <p>While the removal trees is subject to Council's Tree Removal Policy and it is recommended that Council's Parks Department be consulted, it is however felt that given these existing street trees form a key landscape element that directly establishes and reinforces the landscape character of Caroline Springs, City Design would not be supportive of any erosion of this strong landscape character through tree removal at this important gateway site, and this will likely require review of the vehicle access arrangements.</p> <p><u>Other Issues</u></p> <p><i>Building Bulk</i></p>
--	--

	<p>There is concern that proposed site coverage, building heights, general consistency of upper floor setbacks and absence of mid block breaks within the layout of the Development Plan could potentially lead to impressions of building bulk which is not considered in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.</p> <p>This could be addressed in part through the incorporation of additional building setbacks between upper floors to create additional articulation and the incorporation of mid block breaks to break up the mass of the structure and to maintain and reinforce existing vistas to the adjoining parklands.</p> <p><i>Landscape</i></p> <p>The proposed Development Plan seeks to maximize development across the entire site with three of the four interfaces potentially allowing for zero setbacks and the sensitive northern interface only having minimal landscape provision.</p> <p>This not considered a side responsive design approach and it is felt that greater consideration of existing site characteristics and those of the surrounding area should be employed (prevailing setbacks & existing vistas).</p> <p>At a minimum it is recommended that that the following landscape setbacks be applied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Minimum 5m wide landscape setback along Caroline Springs Boulevard (east); ○ Minimum 5m wide landscape setback along Lakeside Close (north); and ○ Minimum 15m wide landscape setback along adjoining park land (west) <p><i>Carparking</i></p> <p>The proposed three levels of car parking is not supported as it felt that it would likely be highly visible and is deemed not in keeping with existing or preferred character of the surrounding area.</p>
--	--

	<p>Consideration should be given to minimizing the impact of car parking either through 'sleeving' car parking areas with active uses or exploring the use of basement car parking arrangements.</p> <p><i>Interfaces</i></p> <p>While noting that active frontages are proposed on the developments southern and eastern interfaces, there is however concern that appropriate architectural and landscape measures have not been clearly established for sensitive and highly visible northern and western interfaces.</p> <p>At a minimum we would request that appropriate articulation treatments such as modulation of built form, fenestration and variation of materials, in association with landscape treatments be employed to reduce expanses of blank wall. The provision of uses such as carparking, loading and waste storage along these interfaces is strongly discouraged.</p> <p><i>Uses</i></p> <p>Given the concerns detailed above, consideration should be given to incorporating a residential component within the development which could assist with providing a better transition of uses between sensitive interfaces to the west and north of the site, and provide a greater variety of uses within the site.</p>
City Strategy	<p><i>Retail Strategy Assessment</i></p> <p>The Mixed Use Zone site at 1-7 Caroline Springs Boulevard, is not identified in the City of Melton Activity Centre Hierarchy identified in the <i>Melton Retail and Activity Centres Strategy</i> and proposed Clause 21.05 that is currently on exhibition through C171. The Strategy and the proposed policy at 21.05 and 22.06 strongly discourages development that is not within a nominated activity centre in the Melton Activity Centre Hierarchy.</p> <p>The Market Assessment by Essential Economics (2016) included in the application identifies the site as a potential local activity centre. The assessment has identified on</p>

Item 12.11 DP1998/03 - Amended Development Plan for a proposed Mixed Use development including a new multi level building with a range of retail, food and drink premises and other commercial uses At 1-7 Caroline Springs Boulevard, Caroline Springs

Appendix 5 Referral Comments - undated

	<p>page 4 that the total retail floor space would not exceed approximately 2,500m². There is however no sufficient information within the application that provides a breakdown of the proposed floor space of the proposed commercial activities, and therefore no way to ensure this proposal would even qualify for a local activity centre which in the Retail Strategy is identified as being 'less than 1,000m² and more typically in the range of 300m² to 800m².</p> <p>City Strategy would consider an application for a local activity centre if it was less than 1000m².</p> <p>At this stage, City Strategy does not support the proposal for a local activity centre on this site.</p> <p>The site at 1-7 Caroline Springs Boulevard is located in the character area known as Master Planned Suburban 3 (MS3) in the assessment and design guidelines. The site is located in an established residential area, and is surrounded by the General Residential Zone, Schedule 1 (GRZ1).</p> <p>As the proposal does not include any residential uses within the plans but is surrounded primarily by the General Residential Zone it is useful to assess the proposed plans in consideration with the preferred character of MS3, as the purpose of the mixed use zone is to 'encourage development that responds to the existing or preferred neighbourhood character of the area."</p> <p>The Preferred Character Statement for MS3 as identified in the assessment and design guidelines is as follows:</p> <p>"The Masterplanned Suburban 1, 2 and 3 areas will retain its unique qualities by maintaining into the future the following key characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Distinctions between the styles of public realm landscaping in each „village".
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscaped features such as open spaces and landscaped water bodies. • The high quality of public realm landscaping generally. • Generally well-managed vehicle access and accommodation that allows for minimal interruption of nature strips and front garden landscaping, and avoids domination of front elevations by car storage (e.g. garages and car ports must be located behind dwelling façade). • Consistency in the site and massing of dwelling types. <p>In Caroline Springs, medium density housing types such as villa units, duplexes, dual occupancy dwellings, and townhouses should respect the existing neighbourhood character and reflect the design characteristics of the area.”</p> <p>As identified in the above preferred character statement, the proposed five storey building would not be consistent in the site and massing of surrounding dwelling types under the general residential zone. Further to this more information is needed to accurately determine the interfaces with surrounding residential areas and open spaces and water bodies which are key components in the preferred character statement above.</p> <p>Final Response</p> <p>Due to the reasons outlined above City Strategy do not support the proposed Development Plan for endorsement in its current form as it is not consistent with the <i>Retail and Activity Centres Strategy</i> and there is a concern that the built form as described in the application appears to be at odds with the neighbourhood character of the surrounding area as described in the <i>Housing Character Assessment and Design Guidelines</i>.</p>
--	---