377 ST GEORGES ROAD
FITZROY, VICTORIA 3068

TOWN PLANNING

DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY

- 13 CARPARKS
- 120M² COMMERCIAL
- 8 x 2 BED BATH
- 4 x 3 BED BATH
- 77 APARTMENTS
(CARPARK REQUIREMENTS - 19)
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R1 - RENDER
DULUX: QUARTER HALF
DUCK

MC - BLACK METAL
CLADDING

BR - RED FACE
BRICK

GB - GLASS BALCONY

SC - PRIVACY
SCREENING

G1 - BLACK FRAMED
GLAZING
Attachment 2 - PLN17/0789 - 377 St Georges Road, Fitzroy North - Amended Sketch Plans
Urban design advice has been sought in relation to:
- presentation of the building (including height of the street wall, overall height, integration with the street, colours and materials);
- does the ‘circular’ detail associated with the balconies fit cohesively with the remainder of the building?
- Whether the proposed development provides acceptable interfaces with adjoining lots.

COMMENTS SUMMARY
The intensified redevelopment of this site is supported in principle, but substantial amendments are recommended, including the following:
- reduce the street wall (podium) height to 2 storeys at the front and rear of the building;
- above this podium, the front setback should be at least 5m at all levels and the rear setback of 5.515m should apply to all levels above the podium;
- at the front of the building, the form and design should be rationalised and simplified to create a more coherent composition;
- the proportion of ground floor space allocated to retail (active use) should be increased;
- the ground level interface with the lane should be improved – preferably through the introduction of habitable space with pedestrian access from the lane;
- the depth of the entry recess should be reduced to less than its width;
- provide a more attractive finish to the black side walls;
- alternatively, reduce the overall height to 4 storeys.

Site and Context
Zoned C1Z, the site is sits within a neighbourhood activity centre.

The area is covered by HO327, where Clause 21.08 calls for development to not adversely affect the significance of the heritage place. No other relevant overlays apply.

A 2-storey modern commercial building currently occupies the site, with a similar building to the south. To the north, a single-storey heritage shop and associated house adjoins.
A lane provides access to the rear of the site, with residential development to its west. Despite a predominance of carparking and other service areas, the laneway network has potential to become a positive place due to the presence of trees, bluestone paving and the lack of large buildings abutting the lanes.

Most development along this section of St Georges Rd is 1- to 2-storeys tall. 5-storey buildings are very rare. The one exception visible from the site is at 392-394 St Georges Rd. A 3- to 4-storey building is located at 282 St Georges Rd. Both of these developments stand out in relation to surrounding development. Adjoining open spaces enable both buildings to minimise blank side walls.

**Figure 1:** View from NE, showing neighbouring building and brick boundary wall on the subject site

**Figure 2:** 5-storey building at 392-394 St Georges Rd

**Built Form and Massing**

At the front, the cantilevered Level 2 form is a dominating presence in the streetscape, as shown in the perspectives on TP500 and TP501.
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It is recommended that the massing be amended to provide a 2-storey form to the front boundary (with inset balconies), above which a singular form is set back a minimum of 5 metres to balconies, 6 metres to walls (measured perpendicular to the front boundary). Alternatively, the front setback could be reduced if the overall height is reduced to 4 storeys.

The proposed setback of the blank side walls from front and rear boundaries averages about 9.4m. This is supported (subject to improvements recommended under Building Design and Finishes below), as is the 1.2m indentation of forms which project east and west of those boundary walls.

Presentation to the Lane

Design Guidelines under Clause 22.10-3.3 include: *New development which abuts a laneway should be no higher than 2 storeys.* The proposal includes a third-level balcony which extends out to the west boundary up to a height of about 8.5m for most of the width of the site, above which a 10.2m high canopy extends to within about a metre of the rear boundary (evident on side elevations but not on other drawings). This would have an imposing presence in relation to the lane and also on the dwelling at 227 Barkly St, and it is recommended that height be limited to 2 storeys on the rear boundary. The rear upper-level setbacks (about 5.5m to balconies and 8m to walls) are considered satisfactory, and should be applied to Level 2 as well as Levels 3 and 4. The balconies are roofed and surrounded by vertical fins, providing helpful protection from the western sun, but there is a risk of these balconies becoming fully enclosed in future, which would be undesirable. Consideration should be given to the inclusion of a permit condition to guard against this.

At ground floor level, the development presents a blank frontage, fully occupied by a garage door. Consideration should be given to locating one or two residences with access directly from the lane, contributing to the lane’s activation, attractiveness and safety. As a minimum, an attractive type and finish of door should be adopted, such as a tilt-up door incorporating translucent panels as opposed to a standard colorbond rollerdoor for example.

Street Interface

I support the inclusion of a shop occupying most of the ground floor frontage. To strengthen this activation, consideration should be given to increasing the amount of ground floor space allocated to retail (or, at the rear, residential) as opposed to storage or carparking.

The entry recess should be reduced in depth to minimise the risk of becoming a concealment or entrapment spot. The depth of the recess should be less than its width.

The front awning is supported, providing useful pedestrian shelter. However, it would be preferable to stop the awning short of the north boundary to facilitate views to the heritage façade adjacent. The design of the awning should take account of the existing street tree in front of the site.

Building Design and Finishes

The proposal would be relatively prominent in the street, and therefore warrants correspondingly high design standards. The current design does not achieve that. The disparate design of various different levels results in a lack of cohesion in the building as it presents to St Georges Rd. The design is further complicated by the inclusion of curves in both elevation and plan, in addition to the angled forms generated by the geometry of the site. There is no evident design rationale for the curved forms – particularly in elevation. It is recommended that this composition be simplified in conjunction with the changes to massing recommended above.
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Above the 1- and 2-storey buildings adjoining, the proposal presents extensive blank side walls. These would impact particularly on views from the south, due to the site being angled in relation to St Georges Rd. The blank side walls are proposed to be rendered – a finish considered inferior to the warmth and texture of the existing brick wall visible on the north boundary. Given the visibility of the proposed boundary walls, a more attractive finish is warranted, with consideration given to materiality, texture and pattern. Failing that, they should be reduced in height to a maximum of 4 storeys.

The blank north-facing wall (shown set back 5745 from the front boundary on TP106 but not on other drawings) is not supported.

The use of brickwork for the podium is supported, noting that there is an opportunity to reuse existing bricks. The finish of the louvres, privacy screens and garage door should be stipulated.

The above advice is limited to urban design issues, and does not address ESD, amenity or heritage, for example.
Date: 17 October 2018

Property Address: 377 St Georges Road, Fitzroy North

Application No: PLN17/0789

Urban Design Comments on Section 57A Plans (submitted to Council 12 June 2018).

COMMENTS:

The design of the amended façade has satisfactorily altered the appearance of the building as it addresses the street, and ensures that the balconies above level 1 (not including Level 4) are less prominent than in the previous design.

The amended design provides a more solid finish that references the adjacent streetscape.

Further changes are required to the colour scheme, with the black elements in the upper levels altered to match the off-white render of the boundary walls.

A reduction in scale of the roof above the fourth-floor balcony will also assist in reducing visual impacts.

Treatment/articulation is required for the side boundary walls.

If these alterations are included in the final design, the reduction of one level is not necessary.
City of Yarra
Heritage Advice

Application No.: PLN17/0789
Address of Property: 377 St Georges Road, Fitzroy North
Planner: Patrick Sutton
Yarra Planning Scheme References:
STATE POLICY:
• Clause 15.03 Heritage
LOCAL POLICY:
• Clause 21.05-1 Built Form (Heritage)
• Clause 43.01 Heritage Overlay
• Clause 22.02 Development Guidelines for sites subject to the Heritage Overlay

Heritage Overlay No. & Precinct: HO327-North Fitzroy Precinct (B)
General description: Full demolition for construction of five-storey development.
Drawing Nos.: Set of 18 x A1 drawings prepared by Point Architects, received by Council and date stamped 24 November 2017

DESCRIPTION OF THE HO327 (B) AREA

North Fitzroy Heritage Overlay Area (NORTH OF AND INCLUDING HOLDEN ST) is important:
• For the clear indication of important early land development phases in the suburb as follows: East-west, relatively long and narrow streets originating from private subdivision of the 1839 agricultural allotments that originally fronted Merri Creek;
• The evident effect of the 19th century Boom era when aggressive subdivision coincided with provision of public transport, creating dense late-Victorian development near the Nicholson St cable tram terminus;
• The more generous post-1906 subdivisions (suiting the construction of detached timber villas) representing changed values in land prices, and the relatively new suburban ideal of affordable house and garden lifestyle;
• The slow transformation into a completed residential suburb by WW2, with the last few vacant sites accommodating interwar dwellings, some developed with medium-density housing, duplexes and flats.
• For the consistent and intact streetscapes of late Victorian terrace and row housing in the south-west corner of the area, and Italianate style and Edwardian timber villas, interspersed occasionally with inter-war houses, in the balance of the area;
• For the visual consistency and good period expression of streets in the north and east parts of the area, consistently one-storey, timber construction, decorative detail, and detached siting with consistent garden setbacks;
• For the interwar medium density development pockets, including those contained within Pilkington St and parts of Barkly St, King and Miller Streets, significant for its intactness, form and high quality design;
• It’s landmark Victorian-era buildings, plus intact early 20th century and interwar buildings in both Classical Revival and Moderne styles; and
• For important landscape and vistas, including the view of Merri Creek Bridge framed by palms and mature elms in the Merri Primary School reserve, and mature street plantings of plane trees.

CONTEXT DESCRIPTION:
The subject site is a mostly rectangular allotment with principal frontage to St Georges Road and rear access via a bluestone laneway. It is located on the western side of the street, between Clausen
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Street to the north and Barkly Street to the south. St. Georges Road is a wide Street measuring approximately 15metres footpath to footpath.

The existing building is a two-storey office building with a rendered façade and brick party wall. The MMBW plan from 1905 shows the site, and much of the land surrounding it, as vacant. The 1945 aerial image shows a building on the site. It is possible that an Edwardian or Inter-War era brick structure was on the site and the newer 20th century addition was constructed to the front boundary later.

Immediately adjoining the subject site is an Edwardian-era house with a shop added to the front. Although the sign has a date of ‘1878’, this is more likely a reference to the age of the business rather than the building.

St. Georges Road in the immediate area can be characterised by a combination of Individually significant, Contributory and non-contributory buildings. Contributory buildings are generally single or two-storey, masonry commercial properties, with a small number of residential properties extant. Barkly Street will also be affected by the proposed development. Barkly Street can be characterised by mostly single storey, masonry inter-war, Edwardian and Victorian-era buildings.
Above: Extract from Yarra GIS showing individually significant (pink), contributory (cream) and non-contributory (green) building within the vicinity of subject site. Subject site denoted by red dashed lines.

Above: Subject site as seen from immediately across St. Georges Road.

Above: View to the north-west from immediately across the road from subject site. Subject site denoted by red dashed line.

Above: View to the south-west from immediately across the road from subject site. Location of subject site denoted by red dot.
Below: View toward the rear of the subject site from the southern side of Barkly Street. Rear of subject site denoted by red dot.

**ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED WORKS:**

**Comments regarding proposed demolition:**

The extent of demolition proposed by this application includes full demolition of all the existing built structures on the site.

The key consideration for assessing this aspect of the works is whether the proposed demolition will adversely affect the broader heritage precinct.

Clause 22.02-5.1 of the Yarra Planning Scheme relates to full demolition of a heritage building and states that it is policy to:

- The building is identified as being not contributory.
- The building is identified as a contributory building, and
- new evidence has become available to demonstrate that the building does not possess the level of heritage significance attributed to it in the incorporated document, City of Yarra Review of Heritage Areas 2007 Appendix 8 (as updated from time to time) and
- the building does not form part of a group of similar buildings.

As the subject building has been identified as Non-contributory, full demolition is considered acceptable.

**Comments regarding new development, alterations and additions:**

The extent of new works proposed by this application includes development of a five-storey building with retail use at ground level and residential units above.

The key consideration for assessing this aspect of the works is whether the proposed new development will:

- Be in keeping with the character or appearance of nearby heritage buildings of contributory significance; AND
- Not adversely affect the significance of the broader heritage precinct.

**Setbacks:**

The proposed front setback for the new development at ground level will be zero metres which is consistent with the character of adjacent commercial properties along this part of St Georges Road.

The front setbacks of the floor levels above vary between about 1 metre for level 1, zero metres for level 2 (including the projecting balconies), and about 3.2 metres for levels 3 and 4 (including the projecting balconies).
The proposed side setback for the new development will be zero metres for the majority of the new building except towards the front of the site where deep 1 metre wide side setbacks have been created on both sides of the development above the ground level.

The setback of the level 1 is minimal however together with the ground floor level, it is considered that these two floor levels make an appropriate response to the character of the existing streetscape. (refer to annotated diagram above)

It is considered that the floor levels above level 1 should be well setback from the street boundary so that the orientation and scale of the ground and floor level 1 together make a distinct contribution to the streetscape which is consistent with the scale of the adjacent buildings.

The floors levels above the ground and level 1 floor levels should be setback from the street frontage and should be re-aligned to respond to the rectangular form of the land rather than the inclined street frontage (refer to annotated diagram below).

Scale/height:

The proposed overall height for the new development will be about 16.5 metres. The extract below demonstrates the degree to which the proposed development will dominate the scale of immediate surrounding properties. On heritage grounds, it is considered that any tall development on the subject site should consist of a two-storey component contributing to the heritage streetscape and one or perhaps two additional floor levels that they are well set back and ‘read’ as a separate development rising up behind the street component to an extent that does not visually dominate the front portion.
Above: Comparative scale of appropriate scale of new development in the subject streetscape

**Appearance:**

Clause 22.02-5.7.1 of the Yarra Planning Scheme encourages the design of new development to:

- Respect the pattern, rhythm, orientation to the street, spatial characteristics, fenestration, roof form, materials and heritage character of the surrounding historic streetscape.
- Be articulated and massed to correspond with the prevailing building form of the heritage place or contributory elements to the heritage place.
- Be visually recessive and not dominate the heritage place.
- Be distinguishable from the original historic fabric.
- Not remove, cover, damage or change original historic fabric.
- Not obscure views of principle façades.
- Consider the architectural integrity and context of the heritage place or contributory element

A contemporary design approach has been adopted for the proposed new building. This approach is not unacceptable provided that adequate respect is given to the heritage character of the surrounding area through details such as external materials, proportions and fenestration.

The surrounding properties are characterised as:
One and two storey commercial strips (i.e. St Georges Road) with some key corner Victorian and Edwardian-era buildings and well preserved inter-war examples

The proposed external materials for the new development will be red face brick at ground and Level 1 with black framed glazing. The floor levels above Level 1 are characterised by black metal screening, glass balustrading and black framing.

As the majority of the adjacent properties are non-contributory, the external materials that characterise the existing immediate streetscape are not considered particularly relevant for reference purposes.

For the purposes of enhancing the heritage character of this part of St Georges Road, it is considered that the proposed render and red face brick materials are appropriate, especially for the façade of the Ground and Level 1 floor levels. On the basis that the upper floor levels are further set back, the proposed appearance of these floor levels will be of less heritage concern that the current proposal.

The appearance of the currently proposed black screening to Level 2 at zero front setback from the street is considered totally unacceptable. The projecting nature of the current proposal does not relate to the character of the street and creates a dominant ‘floating’ element above the two lower floor levels.

The curved form of the projecting balconies at the uppermost floor levels is completely out of keeping with the traditional rectangular forms in the heritage precinct. Such atypical elements are visually distracting to the heritage context. If such forms are desired these should be positioned at the back of the building or sufficiently setback from the street frontage (at least about 8 metres) so that they clearly do not form part of heritage context. Modifying the projecting balconies to a traditional rectangular form would also make them less visually distracting.

Comments regarding the proposed ground level street frontage

Although the proposed building is new, it is considered that the proposed shopfront at ground level should make a positive contribution to the heritage character of the street.

The new frontage should contain no solid wall and the framing elements of the glazed area should be minimized in number and size of members. Glazing should be generally of full width and full height of the structural opening except, where required, for a solid stall to a maximum height of 700mm. A recessed entry should be provided where the shopfront is of fixed glazing.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

On heritage grounds the works proposed in this application may be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. That the front setbacks of the floor levels above Level 1 must be well setback from the street frontage and re-aligned to respond to the rectangular form of the land rather than the inclined street frontage;
2. That the articulation and street appearance of the ground and Level 1 must be redesigned to visually reinforce the predominantly two-storey scale of the street;

3. That the articulation and street appearance of the floor levels above Level 1 must 'read' as a separate and recessive development behind the two-storey street component on the street frontage;

4. That the proposed Level 4 must be deleted to ensure that the scale of the new building does not result in a dramatic change of scale in the heritage streetscape;

5. That the curved form of the projecting balconies at the uppermost floor levels should be positioned at the back of the building or sufficiently setback from the street frontage (at least about 8 metres) so that they clearly do not form part of heritage context;

6. That the proposed shopfront at ground level must be modified to make a positive contribution to the heritage character of the street by introducing wider glazing panels, a solid stall to a maximum height of 700mm and a recessed entry to the shop.

Other comments:

SIGNED:

[Signature]

Diahnn McIntosh

DATED: 20 March 2018
**Date:** 16 October 2018  
**Property Address:** 377 St Georges Road, Fitzroy North  
**Application No:** PLN17/0789

**Heritage Comments on Section 57A Plans (submitted to Council 12 June 2018).**  
Dianne McIntosh

**COMMENTS:**

The original recommendations and the subsequent response within the amended plans are outlined below.

1. **That the front setbacks of the floor levels above Level 1 must be well setback from the street frontage and re-aligned to respond to the rectangular form of the land rather than the inclined street frontage;**

   Whilst this change has not been incorporated into the amended plans, the redesign of the streetwall façade has satisfactorily altered the appearance of the building as it addresses the street, and ensures that the balconies above level 1 (not including Level 4) are less prominent than in the previous design.

2. **That the articulation and street appearance of the ground and Level 1 must be redesigned to visually reinforce the predominantly two-storey scale of the street;**

   The amended design has reinforced the streetwall through the removal of the second floor cantilever, and addition of a smaller-scale brick feature which integrates with the brick façade below.

   The amended design provides a more solid finish that references the adjacent streetscape, with the alterations to the window widths a more suitable outcome.

3. **That the articulation and street appearance of the floor levels above Level 1 must ‘read’ as a separate and recessive development behind the two-storey street component on the street frontage;**

   This outcome has been achieved through the extended use of brickwork for the streetwall, providing a more solid frontage that reads as a separate element.

4. **That the proposed Level 4 must be deleted to ensure that the scale of the new building does not result in a dramatic change of scale in the heritage streetscape;**
Level 4 has not been deleted, however a condition will be added to the Officer recommendation that the black roofing above the Level 4 balcony be deleted, along with the black ‘battens’ and architectural features attached. A roof projecting only 1.5m from the Level 4 façade is acceptable, with this roof to be finished in off-white material to match the side walls. This will reduce the prominence of the upper level to an acceptable degree and allow it to read as a separate element to the street wall.

5. That the curved form of the projecting balconies at the uppermost floor levels should be positioned at the back of the building or sufficiently setback from the street frontage (at least about 8 metres) so that they clearly do not form part of heritage context;

The change to the colour and extent of roof covering as outlined above will result in an acceptable alteration and allow the podium to read as a separate element within the heritage streetscape.

6. That the proposed shopfront at ground level must be modified to make a positive contribution to the heritage character of the street by introducing wider glazing panels, a solid stall to a maximum height of 700mm and a recessed entry to the shop

These changes have been incorporated into the amended shopfront design, with a consistent stallboard added to the bottom of the glazing, referencing details in the heritage façade to the north. The glazing has been amended in line with the above comments.
File Note

Date: 29 October 2018

Property Address: 377 St Georges Road, Fitzroy North

Application No: PLN17/0789

Open Space Comments
Paul Whitten

COMMENTS:

A bond of $5000.00 to the tree is required.

Further tree protection measures to the satisfaction of the RA, most likely solid hoarding, are required.

These measures must be installed and approved prior to any development works taking place on site.

Paul Whitten
Arborist
City of Yarra
PO Box 168 Richmond 3121
To: Patrick Sutton  
From: Artemis Bacani  
Date: 12 January 2018  
Subject: Application No: PLN17/0789  
Description: Mixed Use - Reduction in the Car Parking Requirement  
Site Address: 377 St Georges Road, Fitzroy North

I refer to the above Planning Application received on 13 December 2017 and the accompanying Traffic Impact Assessment report prepared by Ratio Consultants in relation to the proposed development at 377 St Georges Road, Fitzroy North. Council’s Engineering Services unit provides the following information:

**CAR PARKING PROVISION**  
Proposed Development

Under the provisions of Clause 52.06-5 of the Yarra Planning Scheme, the development’s parking requirements are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
<th>Quantity/ Size</th>
<th>Statutory Parking Rate</th>
<th>No. of Spaces Required</th>
<th>No. of Spaces Allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-bedroom dwellings</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 space to each dwelling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-bedroom dwelling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 spaces to each dwelling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential visitors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 space per 5 dwellings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop (Retail)</td>
<td>135 m²</td>
<td>4 spaces to each 100 m² of leasable floor area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site would have a shortfall of 10 spaces consisting four residential spaces, two spaces for residential visitors, and four spaces for the retail use. To reduce the number of car parking spaces required under Clause 52.06-5 (including to reduce to zero spaces), the application for the car parking reduction must be accompanied by a Car Parking Demand Assessment.
Car Parking Demand Assessment
In reducing the number of parking spaces required for the proposed development, the Car Parking Demand Assessment would assess the following:

- **Parking Demand for Three-Bedroom Dwellings.**
  For the average car ownership of three-bedroom dwellings in the Fitzroy North area, the ABS Census data from 2011 for Fitzroy North recorded an average car ownership of 1.5 cars per dwelling. The data also recorded that some 26% of three-bedroom dwellings in Fitzroy North did not own a motor car. This suggests that there is a market for a reduced car parking provision for this size of dwelling. We consider the provision of one on-site space for the dwellings to be acceptable, having regard to the site's very good access to public transport services, shops, facilities etc.

- **Parking Demand for Residential Visitors.**
  Peak parking for residential visitors generally occurs on weekday evenings and at weekends. Given the small scale of the development, the parking demand for the residential visitors would be one space as per the statutory requirement.

  The applicant proposes to accommodate all residential visitor parking off-site, since the site will be containing mechanical parking - not practical for use by residential visitors. For mixed use and multi-unit residential developments that are located along or near activity centres, we would normally encourage applicants to provide some residential visitor parking on-site. In this instance, the proposed car parking arrangement cannot practically allow for residential visitor parking to be accommodated on the property. In the context of the surrounding area, the demand of one residential visitor parking space off-site should not be detrimental to existing on-street parking conditions in the area.

- **Parking Demand for the Shop (Retail).**
  For the shop use, a parking rate of 3.0 spaces per 100 square metres of floor area could be adopted as the premises is located along a commercial area/activity centre. Using this rate would equate to a car parking demand of four spaces. The shortfall of four spaces for the shop use could be accommodated off-site.

- **Availability of Public Transport in the Locality of the Land.**
  The site has direct access to tram services along St Georges Road. Bus services are within walking distance from Holden Street and Miller Street.

- **Multi-Purpose Trips within the Area.**
  Customers and visitors to the site might combine their visit by engaging in other activities or business whilst in the Queens Parade activity centre.

- **Convenience of Pedestrian and Cyclist Access.**
  The site has excellent pedestrian accessibility to shops, businesses, supermarkets, essential facilities and potential places of education and employment. The site also has very good connectivity to the Principal Bicycle Network.

**Appropriateness of Providing Fewer Spaces than the Likely Parking Demand**
Clause 52.06 lists a number of considerations for deciding whether the required number of spaces should be reduced. For the subject site, the following considerations are as follows:

- **Availability of Car Parking.**
  Ratio Consultants had conducted on-street parking occupancy surveys of the surrounding area on Thursday 31 August 2017 between 9:00am and 8:00pm and on Saturday 2 September 2017 between 11:00am and 4:00pm. The survey area encompassed sections of St Georges Road, Barkly Street, and Clauscen Street. The times and extent of the survey are considered appropriate. A parking inventory ranging from 108 to 150 publicly available parking
spaces was identified. The results indicate that on the Thursday, the peak parking occupancy was observed at 12:00pm, with no fewer than 30 spaces vacant within the study area. For the Saturday, the peak parking occupancy was recorded at 11:00am with a minimum of 41 spaces available. The data suggests that any short-stay parking overflow from the site could be accommodated on-street.

- **Other Relevant Considerations.**
  The occupants of the new dwellings will not be eligible to apply for in-street residential and visitor car parking permits.

**Adequacy of Car Parking**
From a traffic engineering perspective, the waiver of car parking for this development is considered appropriate in the context of the development and the surrounding area. The short-stay parking overflow from the site should not adversely impact on existing parking conditions in the surrounding area.

Engineering Services has no objection to the reduction in the car parking requirement for this site.

**TRAFFIC GENERATION**
To determine the traffic generated by the proposed development, the following rates could be adopted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
<th>Adopted Traffic Generation Rate</th>
<th>Daily Traffic</th>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>4.0 trips per dwelling per day (12 dwellings)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings (Allocated with 1 space)</td>
<td>Peak hour volume is 10% of daily volume</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop (Retail)</td>
<td>20 trips per 100 square metres of leasable floor area (135 m²)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The traffic volumes generated are not unduly high and can be easily accommodated in the surrounding road network.

**DEVELOPMENT LAYOUT DESIGN**
**Layout Design Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access Arrangements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Doorway Width</td>
<td>Not dimensioned on the drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visibility</strong></td>
<td>A visibility triangle has not been provided at the entrance of the garage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headroom Clearance of Garage Door</td>
<td>The headroom clearance of the garage door is not dimensioned on the drawings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Layout Design Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanical Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Stacker System</td>
<td>The applicant has proposed the Klaus Trendvario 4000-180 and Trendvario 4300-200 parking system. The specification indicates that a minimum floor to ceiling height of 4.05 metres is required for the Trendvario 4300-200 model. The headroom clearance inside the garage must be able to accommodate the specified car stackers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum platform width of 2.4 metres is desirable for a single platform car stacker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The stacker models satisfy Design standard 4 – Mechanical parking of Clause 52.06-9, whereby 25 percent of mechanical parking spaces have a vehicle clearance height of at least 1.8 metres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor to Ceiling Height of Garage</td>
<td>Not dimensioned on the drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Turning Movements</td>
<td>The swept path diagrams for the B85 design vehicle entering and exiting the car stacker platforms off the Right of Way are considered satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Concrete Slab</td>
<td>For any new internal concrete works, the finished floor levels along the edge of the slab must be set 40 mm above the edge of the Right of Way – Council Infrastructure requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design Items to be Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garage Doorway Width</td>
<td>To be dimensioned on the drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>It is recommended for the applicant to provide a convex mirror at the development’s entrance to improve visibility for motorists exiting the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headroom Clearance of Garage Door</td>
<td>To be dimensioned on the drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor to Ceiling Height of Garage</td>
<td>To be dimensioned on the drawings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canopy

The proposed canopy along the St Georges Road road frontage must be setback a minimum of 750mm from the face of kerb.

Design Items to be Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>The Proposed Ground Floor Plan shows an architectural feature at the main pedestrian door which appears to encroach into the footpath. The applicant is to confirm the details of this feature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Architectural feature encroaching into the footpath

IMPACT ON COUNCIL ROAD ASSETS
The construction of the new buildings, the provision of underground utilities and construction traffic servicing and transporting materials to the site will impact on Council assets. Trenching and areas of excavation for underground services invariably deteriorates the condition and integrity of footpaths, kerb and channel, laneways and road pavements of the adjacent roads to the site.

It is essential that the developer rehabilitates/restores laneways, footpaths, kerbing and other road related items, as recommended by Council, to ensure that the Council infrastructure surrounding the site has a high level of serviceability for residents, employees, visitors and other users of the site.

ENGINEERING CONDITIONS
Civil Works
Upon the completion of all building works and connections for underground utility services,

- The footpath along the property’s St Georges Road road frontage must be stripped and re-sheeted to Council’s satisfaction and at the Permit Holder’s cost. The footpath must have a cross-fall of 1 in 40 or unless otherwise specified by Council.
The vehicle crossing servicing the Right of Way is to be reconstructed to the full width of the Right of Way in accordance with Council’s *Infrastructure Road Materials Policy*, Councils Standard Drawings and Engineering requirements.

Prior to the reconstruction of the vehicle crossing, the applicant must liaise with Council’s Open Space unit to manage the pruning of the tree root from the nearby tree in Barkly Street.

### Car Stacker Device
- The car stacker devices must be installed, operated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer’s specifications and requirements.
- No pipes, ducting or protrusions from the ceiling or walls are to be installed above or within the space clearance envelopes for the car stacker devices.

### Road Asset Protection
- Any damaged roads, footpaths and other road related infrastructure adjacent to the development site as a result of the construction works, including trenching and excavation for utility service connections, must be reconstructed to Council’s satisfaction and at the developer’s expense.

### Construction Management Plan
- A Construction Management Plan must be prepared and submitted to Council. The Plan must be approved by Council prior to the commencement of works. A detailed dilapidation report should detail and document the existing and post construction conditions of surrounding road infrastructure and adjoining private properties.

### Impact of Assets on Proposed Development
- Any services poles, structures or pits that interfere with the proposal must be adjusted, removed or relocated at the owner’s expense after seeking approval from the relevant authority.
- Areas must be provided inside the property line and adjacent to the footpath to accommodate pits and meters. No private pits, valves or meters on Council property will be accepted.

### NON-PLANNING ADVICE FOR THE APPLICANT

#### Legal Point of Discharge
The applicant must apply for a Legal Point of Discharge under Regulation 610 – Stormwater Drainage of the *Building Regulations 2006* from Yarra Building Services unit. Any storm water drainage within the property must be provided and be connected to the nearest Council pit of adequate depth and capacity (legal point of discharge), or to Council’s satisfaction under Section 200 of the *Local Government Act 1989* and Regulation 610.

#### Protection of Car Stacker Pit
The Permit Holder/developer is responsible for the management and protection of their building from groundwater.

The developer needs to ensure that the car stacker pit and any portions of the development at or below natural surface level have a level of protection to minimise the seepage of subterranean water (groundwater) or any rainfall run-off from penetrating the walls or floors of the site.
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In the event that any contaminated groundwater seeps through the walls of the car stacker pit, this water must not be discharged into Council’s stormwater drainage system under any circumstances. Any contaminated groundwater that is present within the site must be treated and disposed of in accordance with a Trade Waste Agreement and as per EPA guidelines and Melbourne Water/City West Water guidelines.

It is also the Permit Holder’s onus and responsibility to ensure that rainfall run-off does not enter the property in the event of a heavy storm. Adequate measures should be in place to prevent backwash from entering the property.

Clearances from Electrical Assets
Overhead power lines run along the west side of the Right of Way, close to the property boundary.

The developer needs to ensure that the building has adequate clearances from overhead power cables, transformers, substations or any other electrical assets where applicable. Energy Safe Victoria has published an information brochure, *Building design near powerlines*, which can be obtained from their website:


Regards

Artemis Bacani  
Civil Roads Engineer  
Engineering Services Unit
ESD in the Planning Permit Application Process

Yarra City Council’s planning permit application process includes Environmentally Sustainable Development (ESD) considerations. This is now supported by the ESD Local Policy Clause 22.17 of the Yarra Planning Scheme, entitled Environmentally Sustainable Development.

The Clause 22.17 requires all eligible applications to demonstrate best practice in ESD, supported by the Built Environment Sustainability Scorecard (BESS) web-based application tool, which is based on the Sustainable Design Assessment in the Planning Process (SDAPP) program.

As detailed in Clause 22.17, this application is a ‘large’ planning application as it meets the category Residential 1. Ten or more dwellings.

What is a Sustainable Management Plan (SMP)?

An SMP is a detailed sustainability assessment of a proposed design at the planning stage. An SMP demonstrates best practice in the 10 Key Sustainable Building Categories and:

- Provides a detailed assessment of the development. It may use relevant tools such as BESS and STORM or an alternative assessment approach to the satisfaction of the responsible authority; and
- Identifies achievable environmental performance outcomes having regard to the objectives of Clause 22.17 (as appropriate); and
- Demonstrates that the building has the design potential to achieve the relevant environmental performance outcomes, having regard to the site’s opportunities and constraints; and
- Documents the means by which the performance outcomes can be achieved.

An SMP identifies beneficial, easy to implement, best practice initiatives. The nature of larger developments provides the opportunity for increased environmental benefits and the opportunity for major resource savings. Hence, greater rigour in investigation is justified. It may be necessary to engage a sustainability consultant to prepare an SMP.

Assessment Process:

The applicant’s town planning drawings provide the basis for Council’s ESD assessment. Through the provided drawings and the SMP, Council requires the applicant to demonstrate best practice. The following comments are based on the review of the architectural drawings, prepared by Point Architects (Rev B 24.11.2017) and the accompanying SMP, prepared by SBE (V2 11.09.2017).
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Assessment Summary:

Responsible Planner: Patrick Sutton
ESD Advisor: Euan Williamson
Date: 08.01.2018
Planning Application No: PLN17/0789
Subject Site: 377 St Georges Road, North Fitzroy, VIC
Site Area: Approx. 485m²
Site Coverage: 100%
Project Description: Five storey building comprising 12 dwellings, ground floor shop.

Pre-application meeting(s): None.

The standard of the ESD largely meets Council’s Environmental Sustainable Design (ESD) standards. Should a permit be issued, the following ESD commitments (1) and deficiencies (2) should be conditioned as part of a planning permit to ensure Council’s ESD standards are fully met. Furthermore, it is recommended that all ESD commitments (1), deficiencies (2) and the outstanding information (3) are addressed in an updated SMP report and are clearly shown on Condition 1 drawings. ESD Improvement opportunities (4) have been summarised as a recommendation to the applicant.

(1) Applicant ESD Commitments:
- Minimum 7 Star average NetHERS Star rating for dwellings.
- Daylight access is good to most habitable rooms.
- A STORM report will a 112% STORM score that demonstrates best practice has been submitted that relies on ~311m² of roof connected to 10,000 litre rainwater tank connected to all apartment toilets for flushing.
- Centralised 5 star gas water system with a minimum 25% solar contribution.
- 8 hanging bike spaces and 6 on-ground spaces for residents and staff.
- Energy efficient heating/cooling and lighting.
- Water efficient fixtures and taps.

(2) Application ESD Deficiencies:
- Most dwellings have modest glazed areas exposed to summer sun angles, and shading through balcony overhangs, but there are significant areas of north facing glazing exposed to summer sun angles. BESS report includes a sample of dwellings with cooling loads beneath the 30MJ/m² threshold. Protect all north, east and west facing glazing from summer sun angles with exterior adjustable shading blinds, fins, louvres, etc. or demonstrate that all dwellings will have cooling loads beneath the 30MJ/m² threshold.

(3) Outstanding Information:
- All dwellings will have good cross ventilation provided that all habitable rooms have an operable window. Ensure that every habitable room has an operable window clearly marked on plans to enable cross ventilation.
- The SMP states the thermal energy efficiency standard will be only 6 Stars, but the BESS report states 7.1 Stars. Please update the SMP to be consistent.

(4) ESD Improvement Opportunities:
- Consider a solar PV array on the roof to contribute to onsite electricity consumption.
- Consider that all timber to be certified by FSC as sustainable.
- Consider providing landscaping and productive gardens to improve the ecological value of the site.
- Consider electric vehicle charging infrastructure.
- Consider recycled concrete component and low embodied energy steel.
- Consider recycled materials in building components such as insulation.
- Recommend providing a composting system for dwellings.
- Consider including a green roof, wall or façade.
- Consider providing a roof top terrace for residents.
- Recommend comprehensive commissioning and tuning of all major appliances and building services.
- Recommend providing a Building Users Guide explaining optimal usage of building services and sustainability features within the development including rainwater tanks, energy systems, etc.
- Recommend that an Environmental Management Plan be developed by the building contractor to monitor and control activities undertaken during construction.

**Further Recommendations:**
The applicant is encouraged to consider the inclusion of ESD recommendations, detailed in this referral report. Further guidance on how to meet individual planning conditions has been provided in reference to the individual categories. The applicant is also encouraged to seek further advice or clarification from Council on the individual project recommendations.
1. Indoor Environment Quality (IEQ)

Objectives:
- to achieve a healthy indoor environment quality for the well-being of building occupants.
- to provide a naturally comfortable indoor environment will lower the need for building services, such as artificial lighting, mechanical ventilation and cooling and heating devices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Applicant’s Design Responses</th>
<th>Council Comments</th>
<th>CAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Ventilation and Night</td>
<td>All dwellings will have good cross ventilation provided that all habitable rooms have an</td>
<td>Ensure that every habitable room has an operable window clearly marked on plans to</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purging</td>
<td>operable window.</td>
<td>enable cross ventilation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylight &amp; Solar Access</td>
<td>Daylight access is good to most habitable rooms.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Views</td>
<td>External views from all dwellings.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials and VOC</td>
<td>Low VOC paints, adhesives and sealants and carpets. Low formaldehyde content in all engineered products.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal Comfort</td>
<td>Good thermal comfort is determined through a combination of good access to ventilation,</td>
<td>Please refer to section on, NCC Energy Efficiency Requirements Exceeded and Effective Shading</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>balanced passive heat gains and high levels of insulation. The application proposes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Good access to natural ventilation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some shading to most dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Good thermal efficiency standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Council Assessment Ratings:

1 – Design Response is SATISFACTORY; 2 – Design Response is NOT SATISFACTORY
3 – MORE INFORMATION is required; 4 – ESD IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

References and useful information:
SDAPP Fact Sheet: 1. Indoor Environment Quality
Australian Green Procurement [www.greenprocurement.org](http://www.greenprocurement.org)
# 2. Energy Efficiency

**Objectives:**
- to ensure the efficient use of energy
- to reduce total operating greenhouse emissions
- to reduce energy peak demand
- to minimize associated energy costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Applicant's Design Responses</th>
<th>Council Comments</th>
<th>CAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCC Energy Efficiency Requirements Exceeded</td>
<td>Minimum 7 Star average NatHERS Star rating for dwellings.</td>
<td>The SMP states the thermal energy efficiency standard will be only 8 Stars, but the BESS report states 7.1 Stars. Please update the SMP to be consistent.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Water System</td>
<td>Centralised 5 star gas water system with a minimum 25% solar contribution.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Energy Demand</td>
<td>Peak demand reduced through various initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Shading</td>
<td>Most dwellings have modest glazed areas exposed to summer sun angles, and shading through balcony overhangs, but there are significant areas of north facing glazing exposed to summer sun angles. BESS report includes sample dwellings with all cooling loads beneath the 30MJ/m² threshold</td>
<td>Protect all north, east and west facing glazing from summer sun angles with exterior adjustable shading blinds, fins, louvers, etc. or demonstrate that all dwellings will have cooling loads beneath the 30MJ/m² threshold from Clause 58.63.01 standard.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient HVAC system</td>
<td>Energy efficient 4 Star reverse cycle systems to dwellings and heating/cooling within one star of best available, or 85% or better EERs/COPs of the most efficient available.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient Lighting</td>
<td>Energy efficient lighting in shop to be 20% improvement on the NCC minimum requirements. Dwelling's to be 4W/m² lighting power density. Internal lighting and external lighting to have motion sensor controls.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity Generation</td>
<td>No information has been provided.</td>
<td>Consider a solar PV array to contribute to onsite electricity consumption.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Council Assessment Ratings:*

1 – Design Response is SATISFACTORY; 2 – Design Response is NOT SATISFACTORY 3 – MORE INFORMATION is required; 4 – ESD IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

**References and useful information:**

SDAPP Fact Sheet: [2. Energy Efficiency](#)
Window Efficiency Rating Scheme (WERS) [www.wers.net](http://www.wers.net)
3. Water Efficiency

Objectives:
- to ensure the efficient use of water
- to reduce total operating potable water use
- to encourage the collection and reuse of rainwater and stormwater
- to encourage the appropriate use of alternative water sources (e.g. grey water)
- to minimise associated water costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Applicant’s Design Responses</th>
<th>Council Comments</th>
<th>CAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimising Amenity Water Demand</td>
<td>Water efficient taps and fittings throughout, including:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Star toilets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Star topware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Star showers &lt;7.5 litres/min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water for Toilet Flushing</td>
<td>10,000 litres of rainwater storage connected to toilet flushing.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Meter</td>
<td>Water metering for individual dwellings &amp; shop</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Irrigation</td>
<td>No information has been provided.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Council Assessment Ratings:
1 – Design Response is SATISFACTORY; 2 – Design Response is NOT SATISFACTORY
3 – MORE INFORMATION is required; 4 – ESD IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

References and useful information:
SDAPP Fact Sheet: 3. Water Efficiency
Water Efficient Labelling Scheme (WELS) [www.waterefficient.gov.au](http://www.waterefficient.gov.au)
Water Services Association of Australia [www.wasa.asn.au](http://www.wasa.asn.au)
## 4. Stormwater Management

**Objectives:**
- to reduce the impact of stormwater runoff
- to improve the water quality of stormwater runoff
- to achieve best practice stormwater quality outcomes
- to incorporate Water Sensitive Urban Design principles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Applicant's Design Responses</th>
<th>Council Comments</th>
<th>CAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STORM Rating</strong></td>
<td>A STORM report will a 112% STORM score that demonstrates best practice has been submitted that relies on ~311m² of roof connected to 10,000 litre rainwater tank connected to all apartment toilets for flushing.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge to Sewer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Diversion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Detention</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Treatment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Council Assessment Ratings:
1 – Design Response is SATISFACTORY; 2 – Design Response is NOT SATISFACTORY
3 – MORE INFORMATION is required; 4 – ESD IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

**References and useful information:**
SDAPP Fact Sheet: 4. Stormwater Management
Environmental Protection Authority Victoria [www.epa.vic.gov.au](http://www.epa.vic.gov.au)
Water Services Association of Australia [www.wssa.asn.au](http://www.wssa.asn.au)
5. Building Materials

Objectives:
- to minimise the environmental impact of materials used by encouraging the use of materials with a favourable lifecycle assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Applicant’s Design Responses</th>
<th>Council Comments</th>
<th>CAR*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reuse of Recycled Materials</td>
<td>No information has been provided.</td>
<td>Consider recycled materials in building components such as insulation.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embodied Energy of Concrete and Steel</td>
<td>No information has been provided.</td>
<td>Consider recycled concrete component and low embodied energy steel.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Timber</td>
<td>95% of timber used will be certified AFS plantation or another forest certification scheme and CoC certificate.</td>
<td>Consider that all timber used onsite is certified by FSC as sustainable.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design for Disassembly</td>
<td>No information has been provided.</td>
<td>Consider a small pallet of materials and construction techniques that can assist in disassembly.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVC</td>
<td>90% or more of PVC will meet best practice guidelines for PVC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Council Assessment Ratings:

1 – Design Response is SATISFACTORY; 2 – Design Response is NOT SATISFACTORY
3 – MORE INFORMATION is required; 4 – ESD IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

References and useful Information:
- SDAPP Fact Sheet: Building Materials
- Good Environmental Choice Australia Standards [www.qeca.org.au](http://www.qeca.org.au)
- Forest Stewardship Council Certification Scheme [www.fsc.org](http://www.fsc.org)
- Australian Green Procurement [www.greenprocurement.org](http://www.greenprocurement.org)
6. Transport

Objectives:
- to minimise car dependency
- to ensure that the built environment is designed to promote the use of public transport, walking and cycling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Applicant’s Design Responses</th>
<th>Council Comments</th>
<th>CAR*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimising the Provision of Car Parks</td>
<td>Car sleeking parking has been proposed.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Parking Spaces</td>
<td>8 hanging bike spaces and 6 on-ground spaces for residents and staff.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Trip Facilities</td>
<td>No information has been provided.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share Facilities</td>
<td>No information has been provided.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric vehicle charging</td>
<td>No information has been provided.</td>
<td>Consider electric vehicle charging infrastructure.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Council Assessment Ratings:

1 – Design Response is SATISFACTORY; 2 – Design Response is NOT SATISFACTORY
3 – MORE INFORMATION is required; 4 – ESD IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

References and useful information:
SDAPP Fact Sheet: 6. Transport
Off-setting Car Emissions Options www.greenfleet.com.au
Bicycle Victoria www.bv.com.au
7. Waste Management

Objectives:
- to ensure waste avoidance, reuse and recycling during the design, construction and operation stages of development
- to ensure long term reusability of building materials.
- to meet Councils’ requirement that all multi-unit developments must provide a Waste Management Plan in accordance with the Guide to Best Practice for Waste Management in Multi-unit Developments 2010, published by Sustainability Victoria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Applicant’s Design Responses</th>
<th>Council Comments</th>
<th>CAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Waste Management</td>
<td>A minimum 60% recycling/ reuse target for construction and demolition waste.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Waste Management</td>
<td>Space for general waste and recycling bins on ground floor and kitchen joinery will include an under-sink dual bin system.</td>
<td>Recommend providing a composting system for dwellings</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Species for Recycling and Green Waste</td>
<td>Area for bins and hard waste can be identified on the plans.</td>
<td>Ensure that the waste bins sizes and system is adequate.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Council Assessment Ratings:
1 – Design Response is SATISFACTORY; 2 – Design Response is NOT SATISFACTORY
3 – MORE INFORMATION is required; 4 – ESD IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

References and useful information:
SDAPP Fact Sheet: 7. Waste Management
Construction and Waste Management www.sustainability.vic.gov.au
Preparing a WMP www.epa.vic.gov.au
Waste and Recycling www.resourcesmart.vic.gov.au
8. Urban Ecology

Objectives:
- to protect and enhance biodiversity
- to provide sustainable landscaping
- to protect and manage all remnant indigenous plant communities
- to encourage the planting of indigenous vegetation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Applicant’s Design Responses</th>
<th>Council Comments</th>
<th>CAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On Site Topsoil Retention</td>
<td>There is no productive topsoil on this site.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining / Enhancing Ecological Value</td>
<td>No specific information has been submitted.</td>
<td>Consider providing landscaping and productive gardens to improve the ecological value of the site.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat Island Effect</td>
<td>No specific information has been submitted.</td>
<td>Some features proposed will partially address UHI.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Roofs, Walls and Facades</td>
<td>No specific information has been submitted.</td>
<td>Consider including a green roof, wall or façade.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal Spaces</td>
<td>No specific information has been submitted.</td>
<td>Consider providing a roof top terrace for residents.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Council Assessment Ratings:

1 – Design Response is SATISFACTORY; 2 – Design Response is NOT SATISFACTORY
3 – MORE INFORMATION is required; 4 – ESD IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

References and useful information:
- SDAPP Fact Sheet: A Urban Ecology
- Department of Sustainability and Environment: [www.dse.vic.gov.au](http://www.dse.vic.gov.au)
- Australian Research Centre for Urban Ecology: [www.arcue.botany.unimelb.edu.au](http://www.arcue.botany.unimelb.edu.au)
- Greening Australia: [www.greeningaustralia.org.au](http://www.greeningaustralia.org.au)
9. Innovation

Objective:
- to encourage innovative technology, design and processes in all development, which positively influence the sustainability of buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Applicant's Design Responses</th>
<th>Council Comments</th>
<th>CAR*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Enhancement to the Environmental Performance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Social Improvements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Technology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Design Approach</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Council Assessment Ratings:

1 – Design Response is SATISFACTORY; 2 – Design Response is NOT SATISFACTORY
3 – MORE INFORMATION is required; 4 – ESD IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

References and useful information:
SDAPP Fact Sheet: [9. Innovation](#)
Victorian Eco Innovation lab [www.ecoinnovationlab.com](http://www.ecoinnovationlab.com)
10. Construction and Building Management

Objective:
- to encourage a holistic and integrated design and construction process and ongoing high performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Applicant’s Design Responses</th>
<th>Council Comments</th>
<th>CAR*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Tuning</td>
<td>No specific information has been submitted.</td>
<td>Recommend comprehensive commissioning and tuning of all major appliances and building services.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Users Guide</td>
<td>No specific information has been submitted.</td>
<td>Recommend providing a Building Users Guide explaining optimal usage of building services and sustainability features within the development including rainwater tanks, energy systems, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor has Valid ISO14001 Accreditation</td>
<td>No specific information has been submitted.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management Plan</td>
<td>No specific information has been submitted.</td>
<td>Recommend that an Environmental Management Plan be developed by the building contractor to monitor and control activities undertaken during construction.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Council Assessment Ratings:
1 – Design Response is SATISFACTORY; 2 – Design Response is NOT SATISFACTORY
3 – MORE INFORMATION is required; 4 – ESD IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

References and useful information:
SDAPP Fact Sheet: 10. Construction and Building Management
ASHRAE and CIBSE Commissioning handbooks
International Organization for standardization – ISO14001 – Environmental Management Systems
Applicant Response Guidelines

Project Information:

Applicants should state the property address and the proposed development's use and extent. They should describe neighbouring buildings that impact on or may be impacted by the development. It is required to outline relevant areas, such as site permeability, water capture areas and gross floor area of different building uses. Applicants should describe the development's sustainable design approach and summarise the project's key ESD objectives.

Environmental Categories:

Each criterion is one of the 10 Key Sustainable Building Categories. The applicant is required to address each criterion and demonstrate how the design meets its objectives.

Objectives:

Within this section the general intent, the aims and the purposes of the category are explained.

Issues:

This section comprises a list of topics that might be relevant within the environmental category. As each application responds to different opportunities and constraints, it is not required to address all issues. The list is non-exhaustive and topics can be added to tailor to specific application needs.

Assessment Method Description:

Where applicable, the Applicant needs to explain what standards have been used to assess the applicable issues.

Benchmarks Description:

The applicant is required to briefly explain the benchmark applied as outlined within the chosen standard. A benchmark description is required for each environmental issue that has been identified as relevant.

How does the proposal comply with the benchmarks?

The applicant should show how the proposed design meets the benchmarks of the chosen standard through making references to the design brief, drawings, specifications, consultant reports or other evidence that proves compliance with the chosen benchmark.

ESD Matters on Architectural Drawings:

Architectural drawings should reflect all relevant ESD matters where feasible. As an example, window attributes, sun shading and materials should be noted on elevations and finishes schedules, water tanks and renewable energy devices should be shown on plans. The site's permeability should be clearly noted. It is also recommended to indicate water catchment areas on roof- or site plans to confirm water re-use calculations.
MEMO

19 December 2017

The waste management plan from Ratio Consultants, dated 12th September 2017 for 377 St Georges St, Fitzroy North is unsatisfactory from a City Works Branch's perspective. This includes, but may not be limited to:

1. A kerbside collection will not be suitable due to the potential traffic obstruction during collection. A private, internal service must be utilised from the rear access point with swept path diagrams to prove feasibility.
2. No explicit comparison between available bin room space and bin sizes, in meters squared.
3. No detail regarding the party responsible for bin cleaning.
4. A new waste management plan is required to be submitted

Addendum to these comments – 23 October 2018

On-site collection will not be required if a condition can be added to the permit to ensure that private waste collection occurs from the laneway, and the bins are collected and put away immediately by the contractor. This ensures there will be no bins left in either the laneway or on the street.

Patrick Orr
Contract Management Officer
City Works
Yarra Operations Depot, Clifton Hill