Appendix 4 - Response to Objections

Objection	Comment
Neighbourhood character Double storey	It is acknowledged that double storey development in a predominantly single storey area can be considered a departure from the neighbourhood character. However, the land is zoned as Residential Growth Zone and it is anticipated there would be some degree of change to the existing neighbourhood character. The scale, form and design of the dwellings is considered an appropriate response to balancing the existing neighbourhood character and the intensification expected in proximity to an activity centre and in the Residential Growth Zone. Although the immediate area does not contain double storey
development	development, it is seen in the surrounding area such as in Gladstone Grove, Hewson Street and to the east of the site in Church Street. The proposed dwellings do not exceed the predominant building height by more than one storey in accordance with the GS2 area in House Rules.
Overdevelopment	The proposal is considered to be a suitable response to the surrounding area and displays a relatively high level of compliance with ResCode and the purpose of the Residential Growth Zone. It is not considered that the development results in an overdevelopment.
Insufficient car parking	The car parking requirements are contained in Clause 52.06 of the Melton Planning Scheme. The purpose of this clause is "to ensure the provision of an appropriate number of car parking spaces having regard to the demand likely to be generated, the activities on the land and the nature of the locality".
	The provision outlines that one car parking space needs to be provided for every one or two bedroom dwelling; two car parking spaces need to be provided for every three or more bedroom dwelling; and that one visitor car parking space needs to be provided for every five dwellings.
	Each dwelling is provided with two car parking spaces.
	No visitors' car parking spaces have been provided. The applicant has sought a variation to the requirement. The site has excellent access to public transport, with bus stops located on Unitt Street and the Wallace Square bus interchange 250 metres from the site. It is anticipated a greater percentage of trips can be undertaken via public transport, reducing the need for car parking.
	The design and layout of the proposal would also make it difficult to identify a location where visitors' car parking spaces can be appropriately located, so that it can be utilized by all visitors.
Increase in traffic	A variation to the requirement is considered to be acceptable. It is acknowledged there will be an increase in traffic movements along Church Street. However, the proximity to public transport and services in the Melton Town Centre are likely to reduce the need for residents to drive.

	The increase in traffic is presidered to be printed and unlikely to prove
	The increase in traffic is considered to be minimal and unlikely to cause any issues in regards to noise and congestion.
Errors in plans	It is noted there are errors in the plans and reports submitted. The
and reports	applicant has been informed of the errors and has made the necessary
and reports	changes.
Visual bulk	The design response of the proposed dwellings avoids visual bulk by
	providing breaking up the dwellings into five sets of duplex, each set of
	duplex would be physically separated on the ground and first floor.
Front setback	The required minimum front setback is the same distance as the setback of the front wall of an existing buildings on the abutting allotments facing the front street or 9 metres, whichever is the lesser.
	Based on the above the dwellings front Church Street should be
	setback 7.9 metres, and dwellings fronting Unitt Street should be setback 8 metres.
	Dwellings 1 and 2 would be setback 6 metres from Church Street. The proposed setback is considered to acceptable, given, the prevailing setbacks of the area. The dwelling at 19 Lindsay Court (opposite site of the street, fronting Church Street) is only setback about 2 metres from Church Street.
	Dwellings 9 and 10 would be setback 6 metres from Unitt Street. The proposed setback is considered to acceptable, given, the prevailing setbacks of the area. The dwelling at 11 Lindsay Court (opposite side of the street, fronting Unitt Street) is only setback about 2.5 metres from Unitt Street.
	The required minimum front wall of new development fronting the side street of the a corner site should be setback at least the same distance as the setback of the front all any existing building on the abutting allotment facing the side street or 3 metres, whichever is the less.
	Dwellings 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 are setback 3.28 metres from Lindsay Court. The front setback of these dwellings comply with the requirement.
	The required minimum side walls of new development on a corner site should be setback the same distance as the setback of the front wall o any existing building on the abutting allotment facing the side street of 2 metres, whichever is the lesser.
	Dwellings 2 and 10 are setback at least two metres from Lindsay Court The side setback complies with requirement.
	A variation to the requirement is considered to be acceptable, given the prevailing setbacks of the area.
Accessway width	The accessway has a minimum width of 3 metres.
Fencing	There is a mixture of properties with and without front fences. A numbe of objectors have raised that a front fence should be provided. Under the GS2 area of House Rules, high and solid front fencing should
	be avoided and any front fence should maintain the openness of the

	A front fence is not considered necessary and will ensure a more open streetscape.
Overshadowing and poor solar access	The submitted shadow diagrams show that there is limited overshadowing to existing secluded private open spaces and existing habitable room windows. It is considered the proposed dwellings have adequate solar access, particularly as the secluded private open space of each dwelling has direct northern solar access.
Changing demographics	Planning is to anticipate and respond to the needs of existing and future communities. Refusing a proposal on the basis of potential tenants of the dwellings that might change the demographics of the area is not justified.