



Managing Residential Development...Proposed Changes

March 2016

Introduction

It is difficult to know just how much more any State Government can do to destroy the very essence of Stonnington. Lumping the entire municipality into one sub-region is a nonsense when one considers that the municipality is located between 3kms and 14 kms from the CBD. To consider, for instance, that Warrigal Rd. and its environs could be deemed 'Inner Melbourne' is so ludicrous that we wonder from whose deranged mind it emanated. *(If you detect a note of anger in that comment you are indeed perceptive. We have seen so much of this municipality wiped out in the name of 'Urban Consolidation' that we are angry.)*

We accept the need for a Review process but a period of 3 years (at the very least) is required for appropriate assessment.

Re the list of 'Suggested Improvements' we note (FYI) that some are incomprehensible and we wonder if the Minister is aware of what is being done under his 'watch.'

We also note that little if any attention is paid to the role of Commercial 1 Zones. We refer you to the Minutes of the IMAP meeting November 2014 where it is recorded that Jane Monk (Director of MPA) stated that there had been a "tsunami of residential development" in the new Commercial 1 zones and a Port Phillip Councillor at the same meeting said that there had been a "cannabalisation" of one form of development over another.

In other words Commercial 1 zones have become high density housing areas with mere token nods at the fact that their prime purpose is supposed to be COMMERCIAL. The 'commercial' component is usually a café...or perhaps two cafes! Commercial 1 Zones no longer cater for the everyday needs of the local community. They provide few jobs except during construction. Instead they are being used to build below standard one & 2 bedroom apartments *ad nauseum*. We refer you to the area on Dandenong Rd. between Tooronga Rd. and Bates St. Malvern East. This narrow strip was a Small Neighbourhood Activity Centre servicing the abutting residential area to the north. Overnight it became a Commercial 1 Zone and now the scene is high density housing developments ranging from 18 storeys to 8 storeys....some yet to be builtand all with a VCAT Permit. In the words of one eminent Professor of Urban Planning...The commercial zones were "mucked up" and our view is that the most recent State Government has done nothing and is doing nothing to "unmuck" them.

Suggested Improvements to the Residential Zones

- 1. NRZ** Stonnington already has a 9m height limit in NRZ.
- 2. NRZ** Absolutely no more than 2 dwellings on site. Minimum lot size should be included in the schedule.
- 3 NRZ** Mandatory height requirement of 9m.

4. **NRZ** Reduction acceptable if more permeable area is a mandatory requirement.
5. **NRZ** Prohibit sub-division without a Planning Permit.
6. **NRZ** Review necessary for Stonnington. We should have **more** NRZ. Too much is being destroyed outside of the 37.5% of NRZ that we got.
7. **NRZ** As there are more than 82,000 empty now (see Prosper Australia website re Speculative Vacancies) we would think that any Government would consider dealing with those first and then take action to prevent the cause of so many vacant dwellings.
8. **NRZ** No maximum lot size.
9. **NRZ** Including objective is acceptable.
10. **NRZ** Re appropriate development see Council's Neighbourhood Character Policy.
11. **NRZ** No multiple lot sub-division in NRZ.
12. **NRZ** Only allow 2 dwellings on a lot in NRZ even in cases of re-development.
13. **NRZ** NOT CLEAR.
14. **NRZ** No dwelling in NRZ to exceed height of 9m.
15. **GRZ** Any Building Design Guidelines must include mandatory requirements to protect the residential interface to the rear of development sites.
16. **GRZ** WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?
17. **GRZ** WHAT DOES THIS MEAN? Implications of such discussion not clear.
18. **GRZ** Absolutely not!
19. **GRZ** The term "moderate" has different meanings for different people. Planning Schemes are littered with expressions that allow discretion in decision-making.
20. **RGZ** Absolutely not. Mandatory height limit must be retained.
21. **RGZ** No. Amend requirement so of the zone not ResCode.
22. **RGZ** More information required.
23. **RGZ** The expression "within 100m " is an anathema to us and it must NEVER be permitted in any direction.
24. **RGZ** Do not understand this.
25. **RGZ** In the present climate of 'growth at any price and damn the consequences' how could any sane person even consider that there is a possibility of 'under development.'
26. **RGZ** Include as a mandatory requirement the planting of trees on site.
27. **RGZ** Do not remove.

28. **RGZ** We believe that 'commercial creep' into residential areas should not be permitted. (See No. 23.)
29. **RGZ** See nos. 23 & 28.
30. **RGZ** Cl. 55 should be applied to all residential development plus mandatory requirements to build "better apartments." (Whatever happened to those submissions?)
31. **RGZ** There is ALWAYS talk about 'social' housing and rarely is anything actually done. Suggest the Government looks into the matter of the 82,000 plus vacant dwellings in Melbourne.
32. **RGZ** What is meant by CERTAIN applications? Unclear! Advertise all applications.
33. **RGZ** There must be mandatory requirements for applicants to make financial contributions towards infrastructure.
34. **RGZ** For higher density read lower quality. (The "Scape" towers proposal for purpose built student accommodation achieved the lowest common denominator at 12 sq.m per unit.
35. **RGZ** We should be aiming for what you call 'underdevelopment' in the hope that it results in better quality.
36. **RGZ** Everything should be done to protect residential areas from commercial activities.
37. **RGZ** An obscure statement. Explain!
38. **RGZ** Mandatory height limits are vital. We do not want a repeat of an 18 storey Building with 322 apartments in a Small Neighbourhood Activity Centre bang up against single storey homes as we have in Malvern East.
39. **RGZ** This is not addressed at all. The present situation is appalling.(See comment for No. 38.) We recommend that at the rear of Commercial 1 Zones there should NOT be Development to the boundary. Instead developers must leave enough space for a hedge of tree (not shrubs) to provide the green aspect which contributes to physical and mental health of residents. This would also provide some protection for the residents at the interface.
40. **RGZ** Yes.
41. **RGZ** Explanation required.
42. **RGZ** Explanation required.
43. **RGZ** Yes.
44. **RGZ** Yes.
45. **RGZ** Any requirements that will ensure that natural light is provided is supported.
46. **RGZ** Allow Councils and residents to set mandatory height limits.
47. **RGZ** WHO writes these obscure bits?

48. **NRZ & GRZ** What do you mean by “level of appropriateness?” Is ‘appropriateness’ Really a noun?)
49. **NRZ & GRZ** Detail required. As far as we are concerned a requirement for a ‘pocket Park’ would be an appropriate demarcation device. Make provision for trees anywhere.
50. **NRZ & GRZ**
51. **GRZ & RGZ** We would like these zones renamed. There is some confusion. We would like some suggestions. Perhaps re-naming ONE would be sufficient.
52. **GRZ & RGZ** Yes.
53. **GRZ & RGZ** Yes.
54. **GRZ & RGZ** No increase in height limits.
55. **GRZ & RGZ** No more ‘commercial creep’ into residential zones. We have enough of that in Stonnington. Detrimental to residential amenity.
56. **GRZ & RGZ** Mandatory height limits and design that combined have some consideration for the residential interface and hinterland.
57. **NRZ & GRZ & RGZ** Don not bring numbers into the zones.
58. **All Zones** What does this mean?
59. **All Zones** Provide clarity before we can comment.
60. **All Zones** See above.
61. **All Zones.** See above.
62. **All Zones.** Each municipality is large enough to decide for itself. We do not want any more decisions made from the top down.
63. **All Zones.** Unclear.
64. **All Zones.** Allow us to vary ResCode.
65. **All Zones** “Vision”...the term is too general. Means nothing.
66. **All Zones** Maintain the status quo. The amount of development in Stonnington now is ENOUGH. Is the Government on a “seek and destroy” mission?
67. **All Zones** We have intimate knowledge of our own areas. Government Departments do not. Leave us alone.
68. **All Zones** All building should be subject to some controls even if it’s only minimum standards.
69. **All Zones** The meaning of this escapes us.
70. **All Zones** Might be a reasonable consideration.

71. All Zones Who decides the “level of change?” Give us that power.

72 & 73 & 74 NRZ Schedules essential. The word “must” to be included instead of “should” so that they provide CLEAR instructions to applicants, residents, statutory bodies, etc. This would take the ‘guess work’ out of Planning.