proUrban
Better development outcomes

ABN 25 600 688 604
Level 2
22 Kings Place,
South Melbourne, VIC 3205
pro-urban.com.au

6 June 2024

Georgia Kay
Senior Planner
Planning Facilitation
Department of Transport and Planning
Level 7, 8 Nicholson Street
East Melbourne VIC 3002

Via email: georgia.kay@delwp.vic.gov.au



Dear Georgia,

## 11 BEACH STREET, FRANKSTON | DFP-310

## PLANNING PERMIT APPLICATION – COVER LETTER

proUrban Advisory, Planning & Management ('proUrban') act on behalf of CAAMCo ('the applicant') in relation to the land at 11 Beach Street, Frankston ('the Site').

The attached documentation comprises a planning permit application to the Department of Transport and Planning (DTP) for development of the land for an affordable housing development. The application is made pursuant to Clause 53.23, under Category 3.

The application documents include:

1. Metropolitan Planning Levy Certificate
2. Written Advice from CEO, Invest Victoria & Acceptance Letter from Minister Kilkenny
3. Town Planning Report and BADs assessment prepared by *proUrban*
4. Architectural Plans and Urban Context Report prepared by *Caleb Smith and James Harbard Architects*
5. Traffic Impact Assessment, Green Travel Plan, and Waste Management Plan prepared by *Traffix*
6. Sustainability Management Plan prepared by *Integrated Group Services*
7. Arborist report prepared by *Homewood*
8. Significant Ground Disturbance Assessment prepared by *Landskape*
9. Structural & Civil Engineering Memo prepared by *Norman Disney & Young* & Build Over Easement Approval
10. Wind Report prepared by *MEL Consultants*
11. Landscape Plan prepared by *John Patrick Landscape Architects*

## Response to OVGA Design Workshop

In addition to outlining the application documents, this covering letter provides a brief overview of the proposal and how it responds to feedback provided in the OVGA Design Workshop that was held on 29 November 2023.

As a response to this was previously provided to the Development Facilitation Program (DFP), the following response seeks to capture any items which were to be addressed at a later date or as part of the formal submission of the application.

| OVGA Comments / Themes | Response |
|---|---|
| **Context and urban design** | |
| *Is the building type and location an appropriate neighbourhood fit:*<br>• *Reduction in car parking* | The updated design proposes the removal of one level of basement resulting in a total of 20 cars spaces.<br>• The proposed Community Housing Provider (CHP) has been consulted on their carparking requirements and it was confirmed that 20 car spaces is appropriate for their needs.<br>• We have previously provided a supporting letter from the CHP regarding this.<br>• Bike parking area has been relocated from mezzanine level to ground floor to improve accessibility and encourage bike usage.<br>• The proposed parking rate has been reviewed by our traffic engineer (Traffix) and is in-line with carparking rates on other similar community housing projects. |
| *Will the form and external appearance of the design improve the quality and amenity of the public realm and streetscapes:*<br>• *Extent of street façade dedicated to cars/services* | The extent of street façade that is available for driveway and services is somewhat restricted due to the narrow frontage of the site to Beach Street. Notwithstanding, a number of design changes have been implemented:<br>• Reduction to single-lane vehicle entry off Beach Street.<br>• The location of the substation has been pushed "inboard" to avoid the room directly abutting the street frontage.<br>• The provision of a "shopfront" within the frontage of the building where the ancillary office/administration space is located and is to be occupied by the Housing Provider helps improves activation.<br>• The fire hydrant assembly is located on the street frontage as required by the fire brigade. The booster is not built into a cupboard rather left open to the air and area directly behind the booster assembly is glazed to improve activation. |
| *Does the design fit into local networks including pedestrian, cycle, car and service access and circulation requirements, including contributing to neighbourhood permeability:* | The design has been adjusted to improve access to the bike store and create further activations of the pedestrian laneway as follows:<br>• Bike store has been moved from mezzanine to ground level. This provides directly at-grade access from Beach Street to the bike parking, avoiding the inconvenience of needing to use the BOH lift access to the store. |

| | |
|---|---|
| • *Sunlight to pedestrian/bike laneway*<br>• *bike store location*<br>• *bike/pedestrian circulation* | • The suitability of the landscape planting selections in the laneway has been considered by the landscape architect and are appropriate for lighting conditions.<br>• The community meeting room has been re-located to the north-west corner adjacent to the bike store and can be accessed via the main lobby or by the pedestrian laneway. This increases the passive surveillance of the laneway area.<br>• The rear elevation of the bike store to the northern boundary has been revised with a scalloped mesh screen that allows for natural ventilation, a balance of passive surveillance and security, and layer architectural expression rear wall.<br>• There is opportunity to continue the pedestrian laneway in the adjoining lot to the north in the future however this is subject to the adjoining property creating a reciprocal plan. At this stage, there is no agreement for access into the adjoining private carpark. |
| *Are heights, street frontages and interfaces at ground level appropriate:*<br><br>• *Street frontage*<br>• *Northern façade & laneway*<br>• *Community terrace to L1* | The limited street frontage is challenging as access in and out the property needs to occur safely. The design team and traffic engineers have sought to reduce the vehicle access point to a single lane entry. This will assist in increasing the proportion of active frontage on Beach Street and still maintains appropriate vehicle access to the site and basement.<br><br>The design of the northern façade has been further developed with changes in the program as follows:<br><br>• Apartments are now located at level 2 and part of level 1.<br>• Communal areas are located at ground and part of level 1<br>• The bike store has been relocated to ground floor<br>• A communal meeting room is now located at the north west corner of the ground floor<br><br>The rear elevation has been revised to reflect these changes which has increased the activation of the northern façade. The design elements of the Beach Street façade have now been adopted for the rear elevation to improve the presentation of the elevation to the carpark. |
| Architectural design | |
| *Is the building bulk, massing and modulation successful:*<br><br>• *Overall height, L13 treatment*<br>• *Wind mitigation zone* | Level 13 design revised:<br><br>• The communal spaces have been relocated from level 13 down to ground and level 1. This aligns with the brief from the CHP for communal spaces to be located as close to ground level as possible.<br>• The northern side of level 13 contains the plant and equipment for the building.<br>• The southern side of level 13 is converted to an apartment. The design of the apartment is somewhat flexible in that it is suitable as a 2.5 bedroom layout (e.g. young family with smaller "kids" bedroom) or a more generous 2 bedroom layout that achieve LHA Platinum rating. The CHP have confirmed their preference for this layout. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | The design of the wind mitigation level has been explored further and notes as follows:<br>• The future occupation of the floor is possible once adjacent sites are built up and provide screening from the wind effects. Provision for services connections, plumbing etc can be allowed for so that future retrofitting is possible.<br>• The services and equipment are proposed to remain at level 13 so that the future resident use of the venting level is achievable (rather than using it for services from the outset)<br>• Our Wind Engineers have reviewed the wind tunnel results and the venting is necessary to achieve street level wind conditions that are safe. Other strategies have been considered such as an "oval" shape floor plan however this is not viable given the limited footprint of the site. The oval shape also results in problematic internal layouts due to the curving geometry compromising the usability of the rooms.<br>• Dropping the tower by one level is not sufficient to achieve the wind safety criteria at street level. It would be necessary to drop the tower by 4 or 5 levels which would be well below the preferred height and also make the project not viable.<br>• We agree that the detailing of the venting level is criteria and proposed a façade detail strategy condition is included so that the design team can develop the detailing and then submit detailed drawings for approval.<br>• The fire rating / engineering of the venting level has been reviewed by our Fire Engineer. The current venting design would require a performance solution with opening being located on the boundary. The performance solution would include additional sprinklers, review of the proposed materials, fire rating of the floor above / below the vent. The fire engineering design would then allow for the future adaption of the space as the surrounding area develops. This would take the form of a fire rated wall along the side boundaries to provide the required fire separation of any apartments located in the redundant vent level. |
| *Are there acceptable relationships with other nearby buildings in terms of separation, setbacks, amenity and urban form:*<br><br>• *Daylight modelling for future development*<br>• *North setback & façade*<br>• *Amenity* | • The amenity of the north facing apartments and communal areas has been considered and is in line with the structure plan requirements of a 5m setback from a rear boundary. A reciprocal setback on the adjoining property would result in 10m building to building separation.<br>• Further response under amenity heading below. |
| *Is the architectural design approach, materials and detailing appropriate:*<br><br>• *High quality materials*<br>• *Boundary wall treatment*<br>• *Planter box detail* | • Further definition / description of the materials has been included in the updated materials schedule. Material codes are clearly reflected on plans and elevations. We confirm that physical samples can be provided if needed to provide certainty on the proposed materials and finishes. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Architectural renders are also provided in the Urban Context to visually demonstrate the high-quality material finishes adopted in the final design.<br>• Planter box detail is included in the Landscape Plan prepared by John Patrick. |
| Amenity | |
| *Are there environmental impacts, including sustainable design, overshadowing, visual and acoustic privacy, noise, wind and reflectivity:*<br><br>• *ESD performance not ambitious enough*<br>• *Further work required* | • The initiatives proposed in the workshop to improve the BESS score have been implemented by our ESD Engineer (IGS) into the SMP.<br>• The development now achieves a BESS score of 64%. |
| *Are layouts functional and accessible with enough space, storage, light, outlook, fresh air and comfort:*<br><br>• *Shared spaces, moving communal spaces*<br>• *Lift lobby arrangement* | • The proposed relocation of the communal spaces from the rooftop to ground floor and level 1 has been developed in consultation with the CHP since the OVGA workshop.<br>• The communal spaces are now proposed as a continuation of the main lobby extending the full length of the western boundary. The revised layouts are detailed in the attached design report.<br>• The vertical stair linking with level 1 has been further developed and shown in the concept renders in attached design report. The stair extends only to level 1 to limit unwanted access to the level 2 where there are no communal facilities. The void space linking ground and level 1 creates a sense of generosity connection the pedestrian laneway, lobby, bike access and communal space. The design is aligned with CHP's requirements.<br>• The design team has considered an alternative tower lift lobby arrangement which is possible, however, it is the project team and the CHP preference to retain the current arrangement.<br>• It is our view that the current design is most efficient with connection to the basement and ground floor. The current design, apartment types and product mix are most successful in meeting the CHP brief with greater efficiencies and amenities.<br>• The alternate lift lobby arrangement would offer greater ocean views but increased heat loading from the west, which considered on balance is not our preferred approach. |
| *Apartments*<br>• *Ensure full compliance with BADS*<br>• *Lightwells and outlook*<br>• *Light levels in bedrooms*<br>• *Roof garden/landscape at bottom of wells*<br>• *AC units* | • Apartment layouts have been refined to achieve full BADS compliance with the objectives and minor variations sought for some standards. See attached revised drawings and accompanying BADS assessment from proUrban and the project architect.<br>• The dining areas within the apartment are appropriately sized (and use 'real-world' furniture sizes). Minor adjustments to the position of the dining table in plan will provide sufficient clearance.<br>• Storage within apartments is maximised while still allowing for the circulation required for BADS accessibility and LHA |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Silver to all apartments. Dedicated external storage is provided in the podium (Level 2) and not reliant on carpark or over-bonnet storage.<br>• The wind conditions on the balconies have been analysed in the Wind Report.<br>• The AC condenser units on the balconies are concealed with a perforated screen as per the image in the materials schedule.<br>• The design team has considered the light well design further with the following changes:<br>  ○ The design of the bedroom windows facing into the lightwell has been revised to remove the screening and adopt a larger window to admit more daylight. The privacy between apartments is provided by careful placement of fluted glass at key sightlines, while clear vision glass is used to maintain outward views.<br>  ○ The removal of the screening and slab overhang opens up the lightwell and increases the perception of its size. The area that is open to the sky is also increased thus improving daylight at the lower levels.<br>  ○ Planting species have been selected to be tolerant of low light levels. Each lightwell will have varying conditions. I.e. they face both east and west. Therefore, until development comes forward for neighbouring sites available light levels will be higher than the eventual expectation. This creates a complex micro climate situation in which plants will need to be tolerant of some sun and wind while also being suitable for the eventual fully enclosed position. For this reason we have selected a range of exotic species shown to be tolerant of such conditions.<br>  ○ The apartments at levels 3 and 4 on the eastern side have been revised to increase the internal amenity as shown in the attached design report. This change will assist to future proof the amenity in the event the neighbours develop to the common boundary.<br>  ○ The daylight modelling conducted by IGS as detailed in the SMP, demonstrates strong compliance with BESS in both the original and future built form context. Daylight modelling analysis conducted by Caleb Smith Architects is also included in the Urban Context report. Both were conducted utilising different modelling software's but have achieved highly consistent results. On this basis we consider that IGS have validated the initial work done by the project architect to demonstrate the developments |

| | |
|---|---|
| | capability of achieving compliance with daylight standards in BESS. |
| *Is landscape integrated into the design:*<br>• *Integrate planters into design drawings* | • Co-ordination with the landscape architect has been undertaken to ensure that planters and soil depth are consistent between the architectural plans and Landscape Plan. Detailed design of planters is provided in the Landscape Plan prepared by John Patrick Landscape Architects. |

The assessment concludes the proposal is consistent with the relevant State and Local policy provisions of the Frankston Planning Scheme and responds to the desired future character of the area.