

Melbourne 2030 Audit Submission

Name	Ann Reid & Ban Wee
Organisation	Malvern East Group (MEG)
Address	c/o 14 Chanak St
Suburb	Malvern East
Postcode	3145
Phone	03 9572 3205
Email	annmreid@hotmail.com

Please provide a summary of the key issues and themes raised in your submission.

Notes on Key Initiatives of M2030

Growth around Activity Centres: Growth not limited to Activity Centres.

Transit Cities: No positive results

New Major Centres: Some developed, primarily with "McMansions" - little infrastructure - no public transport - no community centres, no sporting grounds - little or no green canopy.

Improve Transport at 'stand-alone' Centres: No tram or train links to most of these. Smart Bus orbital system supposed to start in late 2008 (refer to DSE April 2005 update.)

New Strategic Developments: Councils hampered by excessive bureaucratic control. - DSE actions re Local Planning Scheme Amendments & Structure Plans are obstructive. (See Stonnington's Neighbourhood Character Study... a carefully planned Amendment to the Planning Scheme with intensive community involvement and approval, submitted in December 2006... stopped by DSE. ...Council is not permitted to exhibit the Amendment.)

Protection of Existing Suburbs: Opportunistic in-fill, ad hoc development... systematically destroying 'valued suburban streetscapes' and the green canopy through the non-prescriptive ResCode and the claim that M2030 promotes urban consolidation at any cost. A prescriptive code required and all planning authorities must be informed that M2030 actually seeks to protect the established suburbs.

Services in the Outer Suburbs: Totally inadequate infrastructure for outer suburbs. Houses are built first and infrastructure not following. Infrastructure must come first.

Urban Growth Boundary: Boundary has been altered. In 2002, Govt. announced that the line drawn round the city to protect farmlands from development would be moved outwards. Contrary to M2030's aim of development occurring primarily around the Activity Centres, the actual growth has been on the fringe...2006 census shows that development in those areas has risen to 59% of the total. See reports "Age" Sept.22/07 re developers stock-piling land.

Protection of Green Wedges: Development inroads into Green Wedges is insidious. Kew Cottages is in a Green Wedge zone...a disaster. See recent request for re-zoning by developer of Green Wedge land at Point Cook. See Macedon Ranges.

Networking with Regional Cities: Population growth in terms of volume remains in Melbourne. Limited growth in regional cities.

Building on our Economic Strength:

Economic growth is based almost entirely on construction. What exactly are we building on?

Strengthening our Port Facilities: The dredging of the Bay has grave ecological implications and the Panel Hearing has been seriously compromised by the refusal to allow objectors to question expert witnesses. Prominent Planning QC Chris Canervan was forced to withdraw

from representing the Port Authority on a matter of principle because of this embargo. Development of Port facilities at Hastings has huge community opposition and serious ecological implications.

Safeguarding our Airports: In the process.

A Connected City: In the process - highly dependent on Federal initiatives and legislation.

Greater Energy Efficiency: Developer demands to reduce costs have compromised this initiative.

Major New Parks: This has not been done.

A Great Place to be: Cannot be measured.

Improved Supply of Affordable Housing: Clearly this initiative has been found to be unsustainable. Middle income families can only afford to buy on the fringe & in doing so incur considerable debt. Low income families cannot afford to buy at all. Public housing has a 12 year waiting list. No initiatives to supply more are evident. Amount is decreasing. Note demolition of 13 public housing blocks in Carlton and proposed development of private housing there with only 20% of total development as public housing. (See comprehensive report re developers stock-piling land ...Age Sept;22/07.)

A Safer City: This is not evident. Centres such as Chapel St/ Prahran are becoming more unsafe by the minute. See information re newly formed community group in Stonnington... "Reclaim the Streets." See report in Sunday Age Sept.23/07 re gang of 40 youths bashing people in city streets and parks.

Better Transportation Links: Orbital bus system supposed to start in late 2008 (refer to DSE April 2005 update.) Public transport is slower, more unreliable, more unsafe, more expensive ... totally inadequate.

Outline what has worked well in relation to implementation of *Melbourne 2030*?

Development of old industrial sites has provided the basis of something we can work with. Basic problem in environmental terms is the lack of both public open space and green canopy in these developments as these sites are developed.

Dockland has possibilities... has a tram link, but is environmentally deficient.

What do you consider to be the biggest challenges in implementing *Melbourne 2030*?

- Get the community on side by demonstrating that the Government wants to protect what residents' value.
- Cease the imposition on the community of DSE's employees' values.
- Reform of VCAT is vital. It must become a body which reviews process and must no longer operate as the State's Planning Authority.
- Adequately fund a cohesive, efficient Public Transport system.
- Protect Melbourne's suburbs by designating areas for development & cease the opportunistic infill which comprises 30% of development. Declare Heritage Overlays and our valued suburban streetscapes as 'no go' zones.
- Replacement of the ageing drainage systems. (Melbourne Water's reticulation system leaks more water in one day than we can save.)
- Review of ResCode to provide, with community support, a prescriptive document that will **protect** rather than destroy valued parts of our suburbs.
- Address the 'green' issue & climate change.
- Restore the green canopy. At present we lose 5% of the canopy each year.
- Recycle water, including recycling of sewage.
- Address the health issues that are directly related to over-development...e.g. SAD syndrome due to loss of light, depression due to claustrophobic effects of dominating

new development, increase in stress-related illnesses in residents under enormous pressure when opposing inappropriate development, increase in reported cases of allergic responses due to increased pollution.

Outline which aspects of *Melbourne 2030* implementation you consider to be vital for Government and/or Councils to focus on in the next five years.

Government MUST address the following issues:-

- Development of an appropriately funded public transport system.
- Provide interim controls for development in and around activity centres until community-approved Structure Plans are in place.
- Introduce a prescriptive Planning Code to protect 'valued suburban streetscapes.' This must not to be a 'one size fits all' code. (See M2030 Doc. pages 1, 2, 3, 9, 12, 31, 92, 98)
- Actively discourage 'out of centre' opportunistic infill.
- Start recycling water, including recycling of sewage.
- Curb support for wholesale immigration and provide a plan with incentives to redirect population to regional Victoria. Population should be directed to where there is adequate water supply. Melbourne net growth is now much higher than M2030 projection.
- Embark on a vigorous tree planting program to combat pollution and attract rain.
- Bring in measures to protect **all** public open space from development.
- Actively protect the 'lungs of the city.'
- Draw a definite boundary for each activity centre and involve the community in doing this.
- Ensure that single houses require a Planning Permit so that residential amenity & environmental issues can be dealt with under a prescriptive Planning Code.
- Address the issue of provision of public housing
- Address the issue of affordable housing for low and middle income earners.
- Address the issue of sub-standard unit development. (Sunday Age Sept.23/07)
- Employ planners with vision...ones who could plan a city outside Melbourne that is at least as exciting and as accessible as the central city is. This would satisfy the planners' pro-development attitude and the community could keep what's left of our valued environment.
- Demand figures from DSE re...
 1. number of Local Planning Scheme Amendments awaiting permission to exhibit
 2. number of Local Planning Scheme Amendments approved as submitted.
 3. number of Structure Plans submitted....list municipalities.
 4. number of Structure Plans approved as submitted
 5. number of municipalities which have not yet submitted Structure Plans.

Are there any issues particular to your local area relevant the Audit of *Melbourne 2030* that you wish to highlight?

We have attached a list of our "serious concerns" which we presented to Minister Madden on July 27/07 when 30 groups in the "Planning Backlash" coalition met with him for 2 hours at the College of Surgeons. Groups were requested to keep our submission to him to one page in dot point form so the attached list is very much an abbreviation of the disastrous effects of the ad hoc development taking place in this middle suburb and what is being replicated in what was once Melbourne's pride and joy..."the leafy suburbs"...those suburbs that kept Melbourne clean and green.

The government has not introduced any degree of protection for areas outside the 121 listed Activity Centres and the 900 unlisted Neighbourhood Activity Centres nor has it drawn a line around any of them. Because of this municipalities such as Stonnington which have one Activity Centre running into the next end up with no area at all that is worthy of any degree of protection. The entire municipality is targeted for development. When we try to protect our environment by being intensely involved in a Neighbourhood Character Study, we are stopped by DSE.

There are particular concerns around the Chadstone Principal Activity Centre. The neighbourhood character of the streets around the centre is comprised of one and two storey housing. How can one protect this particular neighbourhood character as M2030 proponents wish when M2030 says that the area around an Activity Centre is suitable for medium to high density development? The whole document is so flawed that the need to rewrite it becomes more and more evident.

There is also the issue of a large part of Malvern East being on the edge of the municipality of Glen Eira which has Major Activity Centres situated around Caulfield Station and the campus of Monash/Caulfield and Carnegie. M2030 indicates that our area comes within the parameters of these centres. The implication is that unbridled development can take place on the north side of Dandenong Rd. (Stonnington) as well as the area to the south (Glen Eira). There is no escape.

Is there anything else you would like to add in relation to implementation of *Melbourne 2030*?

It's time that commonsense prevailed. The pro-development stance of Government and of our planners must be curbed. The unrestrained growth which is promoted by Government must be modified. If this dogma of growth is to prevail there will be an inevitable breakdown of the environment. Before this happens the implementation of M2030 in a modified form can take place if planners would accept a role that is different from their being mere facilitators of development.

As there are no prescriptive codes even at local level and no hard drawn boundaries for areas classified as activity centres or green wedges, the planning application process encourages litigation. Developers will always try their luck at VCAT as they have more financial capacity to do so. This is a waste of resources at all levels and creates unnecessary financial and emotional stress on residents and those impacted by new developments.

Included are 2 attachments.

Attachment 1

With reference to VCAT we wish to make the following statements:-

VCAT members are unelected, unaccountable and untouchable.

VCAT is an appeal body. It should not be making planning decisions.

VCAT as an appeal body should ensure that the process has been legal and just.

VCAT acts as a de facto planning authority. It considers each matter as if it were a new application.

VCAT allows amended plans to be considered rather than having the applicant return to the Responsible Authority with a new application.

VCAT decisions are often dependent on ""who you get.""

VCAT members do not necessarily have the right qualifications, resources or experience to make the decisions they do.

As an example, we draw your attention to an article in The Age Sept. 13/07. It was reported that Sam Cimino (VCAT member) ruled against the National Trust, Arts Deco Society and Yarra Council and agreed to the demolition of an historic art deco tram depot so that it could be replaced by a 14 storey office building. Mr. Cimino is not a heritage expert.

Attachment 2

Malvern East Group (MEG) presentation to Minister Madden on July 27/07:-

Malvern East Group (MEG) Serious Concerns of Members With Respect to Melbourne 2030

- 1. Loss of valued suburban streetscapes.** M2030 (p.31) states that it will protect valued streetscapes, but provides no means of doing so. In case after case, VCAT ignores this requirement and fails to protect streetscapes. Stonnington's Neighbourhood Character Study gathers dust on a desk at DSE while we await the bureaucrats' permission to exhibit the amendment.
- 2. Loss of open space and pollution-absorbing vegetation as:**
 - Sites are moonscaped for development
 - "Opportunistic infill" proliferates
 - Single dwelling "McMansions" are built with no planning controls (or with token controls over facades within Heritage Overlays)
- 3. Endless applications for dual occupancy.** No lift in any of them (nor even in the medium density 3-storey blocks) and therefore suitable only for the fit and able - so much for "A Fairer City"!
- 4. Increased pollution** due to increase in traffic density and congestion and loss of vegetation.
- 5. Chadstone Stand-Alone Principal Activity Centre:** Increased pollution as thousands of cars descend upon, the carpark capital of the world. Requires a tram or train link (as per Council's conditions for expansion) to ease congestion in surrounding residential streets, not a hub for polluting buses. Residents can wipe the pollution off their houses.
- 6. Monash Caulfield Principal Activity Centre** (on the south-western edge of the suburb opposite Chadstone): proposed towers with all third party rights removed.
- 7. Development can take place everywhere** since Neighbourhood Activity Centres are located throughout the area between the two gems above (Chadstone and Caulfield).
- 8. Ugly and sub-standard student accommodation.** Proliferation of the stark "dog-boxes" for student accommodation. See reverse for an example: a square, grey concrete box enmeshed in steel chain. No free parking for students' cars further aggravating congestion of our roads.
- 9. Residential streets clogged with students' and commuters' cars** around Monash/Caulfield and Holmesglen.

The planning policies of the Bracks Government are destroying middle suburbs like ours and calling it urban consolidation (the great urban con).