



Malvern East Group

MEG Supports *PLANNING BACKLASH*

C/- 14 Chanak Street,
Malvern East Vic 3145
Phone/Fax 9572 3205
Email meg@chezsamuel.com
Web <http://www.chezsamuel.com/meghome.php>

Urban Design Framework...Amendment C75 Waverley Rd. Malvern East

Preliminary Statement

We support in principle Council's purpose in proposing a Structure Plan for the Waverley Neighbourhood Activity Centre but we consider that certain issues need further attention.

We believe the issue of height and the number of storeys indicated for each height limit requires clarification. For example, the suggested height limit for the corner of Dandenong & Tooronga Rds. is 18.5m and Council states that this is 5 storeys. We believe that this is clearly 6 storeys. We are aware of the figures in the Notice Paper April 21/08 re the height of the ground floor, etc. but we do not believe that Council can enforce the ceiling heights in a Planning Application. We cite the example of the application for 949 Dandenong Rd. which is a 4 storey building with a height of 11.9m to Dandenong Rd. If 4 storeys is 11.9m it follows that 18.5m. is 6 storeys. An extra storey makes a great deal of difference in terms of what is allowed on the site. For instance if the proposal is for Student Accommodation it is acceptable for the ceiling heights to be considerably reduced, allowing for more storeys... i.e. more sub-standard accommodation... and as the Monash/Caulfield proposal (which includes student accommodation) is now 'on hold' indefinitely one can expect that applications for such accommodation to proliferate in this area.

1. It is of concern to us that the area of the proposed amendment has been extended to include the area bounded by John & Boardman Sts, Dandenong & Tooronga Rds. and on the eastern boundary of the proposed Plan it has been extended from Emo Rd. to The Grange. These extensions were not included in the Community Consultation Workshop conducted in 2006. It would seem that proper process has not been followed in this arbitrary extension of the area covered by the proposed Amendment. It is ironic that the extension to Tooronga Rd. without notice includes the greatest heights in the entire UDF.
2. We consider the 18.5m (which the consultants deem to be 5 storeys and which is, in fact, 6 storeys) to be excessive. It seems that any corner on the edge of Stonnington and another municipality can be designated as a "gateway" and therefore greater heights are to be permitted.
3. The proposed "prescriptive" 2 storey limit on John & Boardman Sts is acceptable if there are designated setbacks and that the upper storey is also set back. These are 2 narrow residential streets primarily comprising single storey residences. We realise that the interface at the Residential and Business Zones is always a difficult planning situation but what is proposed for this triangle is excessive. There are monumental traffic and parking issues in John and Boardman Sts now. To allow the sort of developments the consultants propose (without the appropriate consultation) is unacceptable.

4. Re the Ecologically Sustainable Design...We applaud Council's proposals in this area though we query whether these initiatives can be enforced. How does Council envisage that these can be made mandatory?
5. Re the design of student housing...We all know that these are built with the sole aim of maximising site yield with no attention given to the prevailing Neighbourhood Character. We note that Council wants them designed so that they can be adapted for other uses in the future. What "other uses" would be envisaged for this sub-standard housing? Can Council specify?
6. We applaud the notion of specific housing for older people. With shops and public transport so accessible it is an ideal area for such development. How could Council encourage this?
7. Landscaping. We would like landscaping to be mandatory for developments in the strip. We were appalled to see the destruction of all but one of the multi-trunked trees around the Dan Murphy site and further appalled to note the inadequate replacements. Where landscaping is not possible on a site, applicants can be required to plant a street tree. (Let's not have another Forrest Hill Precinct.)
8. We believe that the residential areas in the designated area should have a height limit of 2 storeys (6-7m) with the upper storey setback to limit the impact on the streetscape and with adequate setbacks to allow for at least one canopy tree.
9. Parking is a significant issue in this area particularly in the residential streets and Waverley Rd. from John St. to Tennyson St. Planning Permits which include a car parking dispensation should not be allowed. If waivers for car parking requirements is given for each proposal as has occurred in Prahran and Sth Yarra the result will be the same in this area. Chapel St. should not be replicated in this strip.
10. Traffic Issues...A number of MEG members have expressed concern about the significant increase in traffic movements on Waverley Rd. and foresee a greater increase if developments in this area proceed as proposed. We realise that Council can do little (if anything) to counteract that and we acknowledge that at present most of it is through traffic. If more development occurs in this strip the further increase is likely to be local traffic rather than through traffic and more bottlenecks will occur. At certain times now there are bottlenecks, particularly at the hotel corner extending into Dandenong Rd. and the Burke/Waverley intersection.

Ann Reid (MEG Convenor)