

24 December 2010

Ms Angela Meinke
Group Manager Planning
Bayside City Council
PO Box 27
SANDRINGHAM VIC 3191



Beaumaris Conservation Society Inc.

Association Number A00348878

PO Box 7016

Beaumaris Victoria 3193

T 9589 1753 F 9589 5194

info@beaumarisconservation.net

www.beaumarisconservation.net

Dear Ms Meinke,

Planning Application 29 Beach Road Beaumaris No. 2010/723/1

Beaumaris Conservation Society Inc. refers to the Planning Application No. 2010/723/1 for 29 Beach Road, Beaumaris, located in a Design and Development Overlay **DDO1**, in a Vegetation Protection Overlay **VPO3**, and in Precinct H4 of the **Bayside Neighbourhood Character Policy**, and lodges its objection to this application detailed below. The Society's reasons for its objection are set out below.

Sextuple Occupancy: The Society regrets the rapid slide of Beaumaris from being a place where dual occupancy began to intrude in the 1990s to a place where a sextuple occupancy of a residential lot is now being given consideration. This proposal would replace a two storey structure with one with four floors, as there will be occupants regularly moving between the basement and the attic floors.

Design and Development Overlay **DDO1:** The Design Objectives of this important overlay include:

- (a) To protect and enhance the foreshore environment and views of Bayside from Port Phillip Bay.
- (b) To maintain consistency with urban design and development objectives in the **Bayside Coastal Strategy 1997** and the **Victorian Coastal Strategy 2002** (since superseded by the **VCS 2008**).
- (c) To manage the increased pressure for higher buildings along the coast.
- (d) To protect the amenity and privacy of residential properties.

The structure proposed would be a gross overdevelopment of the site. It would be a massive increase in scale from what has ever occupied the site, or other sites along most of Beach Road. It would be much higher and bulkier than the existing large single dwelling on the site, and also buildings on either side.

(a) The **existing building is** already conspicuously visible from Port Phillip Bay, and particularly from its coastal reserve and beaches for a large distance from the south, so that permitting a replacement building higher than the existing building on the site – which was **built before** the area was subject to a planning scheme – would undesirably intrude much more into the skyline view of the vegetated cliff top in front of 29 Beach Road, Beaumaris, than the existing building, or those next to it.

It is not surprising that wanting to squeeze six dwellings onto a site that has never had **more than one dwelling** will be much more intrusive to its surroundings. That intrusiveness is extended greatly when the building would be conspicuous kilometres away on Mentone's beaches, foreshore and nearby sea.

That striking view from Beaumaris Bay and the Mentone beaches to the south of the cliff top shows:

- the highest part of the continuous Port Phillip coastline between Frankston and Point Lonsdale,
- the longest section of the Bayside Council coastline that is treed, without buildings or car parks, and
- the only section of the Bayside Council coastline that appears on the Register of the National Estate.

(b) The Bayside Coastal Strategy 1997, a Bayside Planning Scheme Incorporated Document, lists as one of its five key principles, Community Benefit, which is to *“enhance the enjoyment of the foreshore by the wider Bayside and Melbourne community rather than benefit particular individuals or groups.”* The Victorian Coastal Strategy documents above stress the need to protect coastal landscape and views.

(c) The Design Objective above to manage the increased pressure for higher buildings along the coast is most definitely not accomplished by permitting a residential lot that has, like most along Beach Road, only ever accommodated a single dwelling with only two floors above ground level to be allowed to instead accommodate a structure with three floors above ground level.

(d) That much increased height and bulk would not only be adverse to the public interest in retaining a pleasant Australian coastal ambience around Port Phillip Bay in one of the relatively few areas such as this site where such retention is still possible, but it would also work against the final Design Objective above, which is *“To protect the amenity and privacy of residential properties.”* The public interest is mainly threatened by the aspect from Beach Road, the foreshore reserve, and Port Phillip Bay and its relatively little overlooked fine beaches to the south, but the aspect of the proposed structure seen from each of the three residential sites adjacent to it, would be such that their amenity and privacy would be greatly reduced.

Vegetation Protection Overlay VPO3: BCS Inc. understands that the native vegetation proposed to be removed does not include the large Coast Banksia (*Banksia integrifolia*) tree at the front. BCS Inc. would most definitely oppose removal of that substantial indigenous tree. New plantings should be of indigenous vegetation.

BCS Inc. notes that development above ground is not proposed to intrude into that Banksia's **14 m diameter canopy footprint**, but the large underground basement for car parking, a 20 kL rainwater tank, and theatre rooms for Apartments 1 and 2 will unacceptably remove a very big underground soil water storage reservoir for that large tree, and will add significantly to the severe restriction that it suffers from deprivation of its former natural large underground soil water storage caused by the underground garage already permitted for the adjacent property.

Neighbourhood Character Policy for Precinct H4: The first Character Element listed in Bayside City Council's Precinct Guidelines [document for Precinct H4](#), where the above property is situated, is “Vegetation”. Here the Objective is *“To enhance the bayside vegetation character of the area through the planting of indigenous coastal species”* and the Design Response includes the applicant's being enjoined to *“Retain large, established trees and provide for the planting of new trees and shrubs wherever possible (locate footings outside root zone.”*. The comments under VPO3 above apply here, but the large footprint of the proposed structure would leave very little room for the planting of new trees.

The second Character Element is “Siting”, where the Objective is *“To maintain the rhythm of spacious visual separation between buildings.”*, and the Design Response injunction is that *“Dwellings should be sited to create the appearance of space between buildings and to accommodate substantial vegetation.”* The elevation plans submitted fail dismally in creating the appearance of space between buildings and in accommodating substantial vegetation.

The third Character Element is “Building Height and Form”, where the Objective is *“To ensure that new buildings and extensions do not dominate the streetscape.”*, and the Design Response recommends applicants *“Incorporate building elements and details that contribute to a lightness of structure including balconies, verandahs, glazing and light transparent balustrading.”* The huge dark roof that is employed to get the highest floor to qualify as an “attic”, and thus evade the prohibition on a third storey, certainly does not “contribute to a lightness of structure”, and is an element that should disqualify the proposal.

The fourth Character element is “Materials and Design Detail” where the Objective is *“To use lighter looking building materials and finishes that complement the bayside setting.”* See criticism of the heavy, dark roof device above. That heavy, dark roof is obviously at odds with Council’s desire for lighter looking building materials and finishes that complement the bayside setting.

The above property definitely comes within the scope of the last Character Element “Beach Road Environs” in this Bayside City Council guidance document. The Objective of that Character Element is stated as, *“To create a visually interesting and attractive built form interface with the foreshore reserve, on properties fronting Beach Road and visible from the reserve.”* The first Design Response listed for that element is stated as, *“Where the properties front to both Beach Road and another street, ensure the dwellings present visually interesting elevations on all faces visible from the public domain.”* The elevations are not visually interesting because they are nearly all of a structure, with little setting left.

Yours sincerely,

Chris Sutton
President
Beaumaris Conservation Society Inc.