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## ONLINE SURVEY

### ACTIVITY CENTRE FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basically agree. Need to manage and specify urban renewal sites carefully and clearly to avoid creating different expectations.</th>
<th>Main consultation page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree with Glen Huntly’s change of status</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please clarify your intentions regarding the protection of local heritage value of buildings that were constructed along these activity centre shopping strips. What are your intentions to protect these structures. Residents are sick of hearing about GROWTH, GROWTH, GROWTH! Plenty of beautiful cities in the world have grown, Paris, Rome without sacrificing their architectural heritage, though somehow areas like Carnegie and Bentleigh have been decimated at the hands of Council. What is your plan to restore this balance and prevent further losses to the amenity of the area because believe it or not, heritage adds to amenity, not just apartment blocks and bike paths!</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main issue re this area is parking and traffic. I prefer a no traffic thoroughfare along the shopping strip in Koornang Rd Carnegie. Therefore more parking close by will be required as train users will also be parking in the area. There is so much foot traffic and pram and wheelie frames that an open street to pedestrians would be such an advantage to traders and consumers. It is a lively, family friendly area that is becoming too congested. Many people walk to the shops as there has been and will be in the future, medium density dwellings. Pedestrians must be catered for if this shopping hub is to continue to be an attraction. The Carnegie Library is also a great draw card to the area and is providing wonderful service to both young and old. Many people use this as an open space for children’s recreation and again with children living in small apartments this must be accessible and free of heavy traffic.</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Huntly Activity Centre</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Glen Huntly is designated as a Major Activity Centre in Plan Melbourne. The local planning polices of the Glen Eira Planning Scheme must be amended to designated its status as a Major Activity Centre rather than a Neighbourhood Centre which it is not.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Future design controls such as Design and Development Overlay should be placed over Glen Huntly Activity Centre (including residential, commercial and mixed use areas) to designate future built form and uses, including reduced setbacks, increased heights, increased site coverage, increased density and increased intensity. This should assist to invigorate Glen Huntly Activity Centre which being at the booked of Glen Huntly Road has always been too low scale and underutilised with many older non-renovated and vacant shops, missing vibrancy and street appeal, absent of activity after 6:00pm (and perceived lack of safety and surveillance) as compared to Elsternwick Activity Centre further west and Carnegie Activity Centre further east.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Draft strategy document incorrectly states that Glen Huntly only has access to Train and Tram services whilst it has direct access to 2 bus services (Bus Route 623 &amp; 624) on Neerim Road only 150 north of Woolworths Supermarket. It is one of only a handful of centres in Glen Eira that has access to all 3 modes of public transport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Investigate repercussions of VC110 onto the General Residential Zone Schedule 1 (GRZ1) surrounding the Glen Huntly Activity Centre. In particular, the recently introduced mandatory 35% mandatory garden areas (for lots over 650m2) as part of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VC110 in a GRZ effectively diminishes opportunity for increased residential density within the Glen Huntly Activity Centre in an area where increased residential density is required. Prior to VC110 building site coverage within a GRZ1 was discretionary and averaged between 60% to 75% whilst now with the mandatory 35% garden areas requirement this has decreased to 40%-45% given basement ramps, paths, verandahs, any under cover areas (including building or balcony overhangs above), vegetation strips less than 1.0m wide and building footprints are all excluded from garden areas calculation. In order to continue to achieve the required growth and increased housing in the Glen Huntly Activity Centre areas of the GRZ1 would need to be rezoned to either Residential Growth Zone or Mixed Use Zone which does not have the 35% mandatory garden areas.

| The activity centre framework seems logical and describes the existing role of the different areas. The key challenge is how to achieve these visions for the different areas. In some cases it is too late. Caulfield Park neighbourhood centre has all but been destroyed by inappropriate development, lack of parking and a mix of retail/services which do not support neighbourhood needs. | Main consultation page |
| Look good | Bentleigh East |
| Strongly supported. | Carnegie |
| Agree that there should not be any changes to the boundaries of Caulfield Park; it should remain as a neighbourhood hub | Caulfield Park |
| This area should remain as it is as a commercial zone for our future generation and local business. People shouldn’t be shortsighted only looking at current property market value of the side. If elected council really serves for locals, should all put their hand up say ‘no’ to the money hungry developers or land owners. | East Village |
| Great initiative | East Village |
| East Village - prefer not to include housing in the proposed change in policy. There is already too much traffic congestion in that area and building more housing will only worsen it. | East Village |
| A leisure centre with public pool would be great | Elsternwick |
| I think your vision for Elsternwick is not specific and I worry that you will commence any inappropriate buildings without full consultation from us residents first. | Elsternwick |
| Overall I agree with the framework. | Elsternwick |
| Good to see Nepean Highway Elsternwick highlighted as opportunity for jobs and housing as part of urban renewal. | Gardenvale |
| Seems to take in the diverse needs of residents. I seem to note that it does not address the needs of young people compared to the number of references made to the elderly - this may be due to the fact that the elderly are more likely to respond to community foraums. | Hughesdale |
| How does this draft translate into specific planning for the Hughesdale rail crossing removal in Poath Road? | McKinnon |
| Seems to highlight the most active parts of the municipality, and realistically explain a vision for each. | McKinnon |
| Lower density needed | McKinnon |
| Make spaces available for local artists to display/show their work or allow external walls and paths to be used as "canvas". | McKinnon |
| I like the inclusion of a village feel so that it is a different feel to Centre and North Road shopping strips. | McKinnon |
| Overall it seems quite common sensed, however I’m not sure how growth can be predicted to fall so dramatically given how many people have piled into the area in the last few years. | Murrumbeena |
| The activity centre concept has been a spectacular failure in Carnegie it is now ugly and rampanty over developed mess. I had to sell my home at great expense to avoid it. | Murrumbeena |
The framework is a step in the right direction.

---

**Murrumbeena**

The document does not indicate the boundaries of each (a) Major Activity Centre, (b) Activity Centre, (c) Neighbourhood Centre, (d) Local Centre and (e) Areas of minimal change, or provide any information as to where the boundaries can be found.

The document attempts to use symbols (squares, triangles, stars, etc., some with differing shading or secondary symbols) to indicate different levels of change, but there is no legend to clearly indicate their meaning and they do not seem to be consistently applied.

This is a serious deficiency as the community is being asked to comment on draft strategy and policy without knowing precisely the areas involved.

---

**Ormond**

Traffic should be slowed on North Road to at least 50kmh. The lane nearest the footpath is particularly dangerous as impatient drivers speed along this lane even when the other lanes are stopped at the lights. Makes entering North Road hazardous. Too much development in narrow streets. The increased parked cars in the area makes it difficult to negotiate the streets. This is of particular concern for access for emergency vehicles.
### THEME ONE: PLACE MAKING AND VISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carnegie's vision statement should not include &quot;growing population&quot; as the whole area is not a new residential area or new suburb but an area undergoing incremental, and hopefully managed, population growth. The words &quot;growing population&quot; in Carnegie's vision statement, compared to others, would create a false impression that Carnegie (but really only the urban renewal areas) would host most of Glen Eira's population growth.</th>
<th>Main consultation page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You have not commented about security and council's plans to guarantee that neighbourhood security and amenity is ensured as you press forward with your vested interests to create &quot;vibrant night time activity centres&quot;. In other cities and towns, there is overwhelming evidence that this draws undesirable elements associated with transforming what were residential family places to live into rabble. This is NOT what we want for our suburb!!!!</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much has already been done to draw residents to the activity centre but no mention of traffic relief.</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place making is crucial as is neighbourhood identity. But many of the smaller centres eg Caulfield Park have lost any identity. Streetscape is non existent. Accessibility is impossible even though the area is well served by trams. A 60kph speed limit makes crossing roads difficult. Crossing to Caulfield Park is dangerous. Speeds should be 40 kph in both directions. There should be benches and trees. There is no night life which should be encouraged. Cafes are closed by 5 pm.</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree that &quot;the identity of each of Glen Eira’s neighbourhoods need to be strengthened and a greater emphasis needs to be placed on making these centres family friendly&quot;. I also agree that “As our local centre become more affected by aglobalised and mobilised markets, it becomes more and more important to create community rich experiences within these centres that cannot be bought online.”</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to pose the question: if the focus is on strengthening the identity of neighbourhoods and creating community rich experiences, is it adequate to formulate a vision that does not include any reference or connection to the present built environment? As this is a planning strategy, shouldn’t there be some reference to what is currently in place and how that is to be treated? If there is no link to the present, in the not too distant future, I believe all shopping strips and streets will look very vanilla. It will be the Metricon and Steller-built designs that are the same whether they are in Carnegie, Elsternwick, Caulfield, Footscray, Cranbourne or Boroondara. If nothing is done to link strategies to the built character of existing places, it will all look the same in the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my submission, the Carnegie vision should read something like: Carnegie will be a vibrant, safe and attractive centre that retained its cherished character. Home to families and singles from around the world, its community welcomed and integrated its fair share of Melbourne’s growing population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The draft vision, to my mind, did not include enough recognition of Carnegie being a family-focused neighbourhood. It also did not include sufficient recognition of the need to protect the character of the shopping strip. In addition, what I would like to see included in the Draft Strategy or related planning documents:  
- Heritage overlays of the facades of the shopping strip  
- Ensuring that someone standing on one side of the street, looking the other way, is still able to see sky above the shops on the opposite side. This is one of the things that – to me- characterises Carnegie as suburban shopping strip. | Main |
| The urban villages must have a corporate plaza developed, which will house corporate / | Main |
government offices located in these plaza.

<p>| Looks good | Bentleigh East |
| Sounds like you’ve answered the concerns raised in the survey, just keen to make sure building heights in the suburban streets doesn’t get higher than two stories. | Bentleigh East |
| I strongly endorse the eastern car park option and the green spaces as well as the extension of the tram line. | Carnegie |
| It would be good to include something about sustainability as it promotes the idea of local shopping and there is also the excellent public transport access to Carnegie. The other point is the range of services people can access in close proximity. Walkability is important. | Carnegie |
| Recognising that Glen Eira has the 4th highest housing/population density in Melbourne, perhaps more of the population growth should be focussed elsewhere and the focus in Glen Eira on a modest population growth and quality of housing/life issues. | Carnegie |
| It is an awesome hub as is with many hundreds of residents gathering there throughout the week for various activities; as president of the local junior football (soccer) team my concerns are for the sate of the grounds and that there is not enough &quot;ownership&quot; and pride shown in CP by the tenant clubs nor pride from council about the clubs; there could also be smarter use of the fringe recreational facilities; there could be a more permanent cafe type facility for the park users and that could be run by special needs people; dog poo problem is terrible; there also needs to be thought around the street fencing to minimise potential accidents with balls, children and cars; a need for more dog fountains, poo bag dispensers and rubbish bins; apart from all of that we are extremely lucky to have such a park on our doorstep | Caulfield Park |
| Hopefully you are including Bambra Rd in this vision. We didn’t receive either of the first DRAFTS, so were unable to comment. More footpath trees/shrubbery/greenery would be nice | Caulfield South |
| More green spaces Integrated environment and services | East Village |
| I agree with all of the feedback from recent community engagement: &gt;&gt; Create places for people that are vibrant and have a greater focus on family and vibrancy within our centres. &gt;&gt; Cleaner, greener and better connected centres that are easily accessible for all members of the community. &gt;&gt; The identity of each of Glen Eira’s neighbourhoods need to be strengthened and a greater emphasis needs to be placed on making these centres family friendly. &gt;&gt; Improve car parking conditions and decrease traffic congestion in activity centres. | East Village |
| Virginia Park should remain as a commercial zone! A cancer research centre, a pharmaceutical company, a proper children’s hospital, a retirement village, a age care centre, a supermarket, a sport hub...list could go on. All of these will benefit not only local but also our society. | East Village |
| East village is great opportunity to shape East Bentleigh and Glen Eira community center. It is a once of opportunity to make East Bentleigh unique and special. | East Village |
| The word &quot;innovation&quot; is unclear - please be more specific about what this means or remove it. I disagree with including the term ‘housing affordability’ as it could mean commission/social housing, which is undesirable. | East Village |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would prefer if &quot;housing&quot; was removed altogether. I think it should include &quot;retail&quot;, &quot;hospitality&quot;, &quot;recreation&quot;, &quot;better public transport links&quot; and &quot;useable green open spaces&quot;.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree with philosophy of placemaking. People make places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantastic! I don't mind development in the area but too many flats that look like shoe boxes. Flats should be made with attractive facades that conform to the character of Elsternwick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More focus on preserving heritage buildings and homes rather than just respecting character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We strongly opposed to the word Vibrant which at the time of the meeting you deleted and now you have put back, why? Please advise back to me. We were also not liking the word entertain as we didn't want to be a night long bar hoping type of area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The word 'vibrant' needs to be used carefully as it can be misinterpreted. People using Places make things vibrant … not the other way round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small retail businesses have been the heart of Elsternwick … yet there is not a mention of the importance of retail in this vision. They will be lost if it is not recognised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy making for planning across Glen Eira essential. But what exactly is happening to on the ground planning at Poath Rd Hughesdale Rail removal. What integration is occurring with Monash Council and the Rail Crossing Removal Authority?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on preserving the suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that McKinnon retains its village atmosphere and eclectic collection of retail and food establishments. How this can be done when council entertains ridiculous planning applications remains to be seen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work in the Moorabbin activity centre and would love to see more safety measures taken. It's quite dark and poorly lit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not enough detail here for informed feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capturing or enhancing the identity of a place is important. Activity centres typically attract development for cheap housing to overseas students, very profitable for some but they contribute nothing to the sense of place and completely destroy existing identity. Reinforce and enhance what we have. Small business that support the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As per previous surveys, there is no support for the closure of Neerim Rd and &quot;transition into a pedestrian friendly centre. Why would you close Neerim Rd, why would you divert traffic from the main Rd to the suburban streets. That's what will happen. Business will not survive if Neerim Rd is closed and made into a &quot;mall&quot;. Listen to the residents. Listen to the business's.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The history boat has well and truly sailed from Murrumbeena; the last we saw of it was the wanton destruction of Frogmore. The areas that have remained untouched are an enclave of privilege where residents do all in their power to exclude people from the &quot;village&quot;. Maintenance of a village feel and embracing history would have been a worthwhile goal five years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We hope so, Murrumbeena shopping centre is charming and historic. Please preserve the character and keep the high rise apartments out. Also trees and greenery are always welcome especially when uncluttered with signage, absurd play equipment etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As per previous surveys, there is no support for the closure of Neerim Rd and &quot;transition into a pedestrian friendly centre. Why would you close Neerim Rd, why would you divert traffic from the main Rd to the suburban streets. That's what will happen. Business will not survive if Neerim Rd is closed and made into a &quot;mall&quot;. Listen to the residents. Listen to the business's.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We think the draft shared vision statement for Murrumbeena is a reasonable start “….will be a leafy and green local centre with a strong community and environment focus. It will</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
maintain a safe village feel and embrace its history”. However, as the statement suggests is Murrumbeena known as a “Local Centre”? Due to its size, I consider it should be a Local Centre, and it should not be a Neighbourhood Centre or an Activity Centre.

The document does not really give any detail concerning how the “safe village feel” or “how its history will be embraced”, but I would hope in time these will be expressed with better clarity for further public comment. I hope the tangible results will soon be apparent in building height limits (much lower than Carnegie for example) and design guidelines, including use of heritage appearance construction materials or finishes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although this is a step in the right direction, Play equipment for young children would be a further asset, as many young families will benefit from this over the years to come.</td>
<td>Ormond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So why are you so fixated with car parking?</td>
<td>Ormond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glad to find that North Road will be tree lined. At the moment it is the ugliest shopping centre in Melbourne. All other suburbs seem to have developed tree planting in even the bleakest streets. North Road is an eyesore.</td>
<td>Ormond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THEME TWO: LOCAL ECONOMY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree with concept of working and living locally. Difficult to achieve in Melbourne - maybe greater focus on getting to and from work and home in reasonable time and ease.</th>
<th>Main consultation page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glen Huntly Activity Centre</strong></td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Recommend increasing the commercial and residential intensity of the Glen Huntly Activity Centre and more use of shop top housing given the current under-utilisation of the centre. The can be undertaken by rezoning entire Woolworths and U3A car park from a Mixed Use Zone to a Commercial Zone 1 and applying a Design and Development Overlay that seeks to enable the future redevelopment of the car park, including Woolworths and U3A as a 6-storey retail, office, education and residential mega development with double-basement car parking. Only something this substantial will assist in invigorating this near lifeless and severely under-utilised Major Activity Centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recommend increasing the residential intensity and mixed use intensity of the Glen Huntly Activity Centre. There is under-utilised land directly opposite the primary core of the Activity Centre which is Woolworths and U3A car park. The land is identified as Nos.5, 7, 9, 9A, 11 &amp; 11A Manchester Grove which comprises older 1930’s single dwelling, 1930’s one of a pair dwellings and 1980’s dual occupancy in the same ownership. It would make sense to increase the shopping precinct at its primary core thereby rezoning the aforementioned under developed land to a Mixed Used Zone thereby in turn providing a buffer between the residential and commercial zones of the Activity Centre. This would invigorate the primary core by increasing increase retail activity at ground and providing shop top housing abo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As stated above unless areas are attractive with trees benches businesses that serve local needs and which offer activities in the evenings areas will be dead. Speeds need to be reduced foot paths widened etc if areas are to be vibrant. Car parking is important but not essential if walkability and easy public transport is provided. Bicycle parking is needed too.</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was shocked that Glen Eira is the fourth lowest council across Melbourne to locally employ its own residents. As such, a priority should be increasing local employment opportunities and making 20-minute neighbourhoods a reality. Not 20 minutes to the train station to commute into town, but 20 minutes to work in a local activity centre.</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council is not going to be able to act as employer. But Council has impact on the planning scheme and what is being built in its area. As such, it should introduce vertical zoning to ensure that shopping strips and commercially zoned properties contain more space for businesses than simply the ground floor. Especially in the major activity centres, this should be a must.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The corporate plaza employment planned &amp; developed, housed in each urban village will create sufficient white collar jobs suitable for Urban village communities.</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This shift in jobs, private/Government, to corporate Plaza in urban village will prevent further congestion in Melbourne CBD, and will create local jobs for population in Urban village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks good</td>
<td>Bentleigh East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for small business would be appreciated. Rent hikes are a problem. My rent has almost doubled in 8 years!</td>
<td>Caufield South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning won't benefit local economy. Locals will lost opportunity to work near home. Furthermore locals will suffer from overdeveloped over populated. I can't imagine how</td>
<td>East Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will travel along East Boundary Rd and North to work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an innovation and high tech center to attract international business this will attract more and more quality populations and successful business</td>
<td>East Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a Woolworths or Coles supermarket as the nearest ones to East Village are still too far away. Focus on offices, healthcare, education, retail and hospitality. No need for industrial use.</td>
<td>East Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support traders and keep shops open</td>
<td>Elsternwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not clear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with local economy .. but where is the recognition and focus on ensuring small retail businesses thrive?</td>
<td>Elsternwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working well</td>
<td>McKinnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of commercial/housing is great idea.</td>
<td>McKinnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech industry workers in the area are predominantly employed by banks, Telstra and consulting companies (IBM, Deloitte, Accenture, PWC, Dimension Data). None of these are likely to establish offices in Glen Eira. It would seem that retail, hospitality and potentially education are the most likely to grow.</td>
<td>Murrumbeena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting local businesses that provide for the community's needs is important. Having local businesses such as grocers, butchers, newsagents, green grocers and other retail means people don't need to drive to shop elsewhere. These businesses also provide life and activity, a sense of place and identity. They are also important for the elderly and those who cannot drive. More streets lined with dumpling restaurants and cafes is not what we need.</td>
<td>Murrumbeena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As per previous surveys, there is no support for the closure of Neerim Rd and &quot;transition into a pedestrian friendly centre. Why would you close Neerim Rd, why would you divert traffic from the main Rd to the suburban streets. That's what will happen. Business will not survive if Neerim Rd is closed and made into a &quot;mall&quot;. Listen to the residents. Listen to the business's.</td>
<td>Murrumbeena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the key aspects to supporting the local economy is providing safe bike lanes along north road and grange / Jasper road. Although there are bike storage facilities at ormond station, the roads are too dangerous for many families to consider riding bikes to the main shopping strip and station. The positive environmental impact, health of community and access to shops and work would benefit form dedicated bike lanes.</td>
<td>Ormond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More buildings with mixed use of commercial and housing. But not &quot;dog boxes' for appartments. Please ensure that they are liveable long term and not just suitable for short term use!</td>
<td>Ormond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher. Butcher. Butcher. A neighbourhood centre without all of the weekly needs is not a neighbourhood centre. We need a butcher. And we need to keep our supermarket, baker, pharmacist. All with good pedestrian access. Not just cafes and more cafes.</td>
<td>Ormond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**THEME THREE: HOUSING**

Glen Eira is forecast to grow by 22,000 people, 9,000 dwellings and 9,500 jobs over the next 15 years. This is FAR too many for what used to be a nice quiet place to live. Older members of the community are being forced out by the ever increasing numbers of people and apartment developments.

Your plan does NOT state what it intends to do to protect the local HERITAGE of the areas you seek to develop!!! You have failed to protect heritage in the past. Eg. Frogmore mansion in Whagoo Road Carnegie. This plot remains a vacant lot where once a grande Victorian mansion of significant heritage value once stood. What do you intend to do to protect the NRZ within the allotted activity centres? Keen to get more detail and for Council to be more transparent on these intentions because frankly, we've had a gutsfull!!!

Due to the access to public transport and all required services people are wanting to live in the local area. Apartments must be built with family living in mind. They must be bigger and provide some open space within the boundary of the dwelling. People who are down grading from a large family home also do not want a tiny flat with no external environment. Developers must be encouraged to build larger apartments with outside areas for gardens and green!

### Glen Huntly Activity Centre

1. Increased housing opportunities (i.e. apartments) into the General Residential Zone surrounding the Glen Huntly Activity Centre have been significantly diminished as a result of the recently introduced VC110. In particular, the recently introduced mandatory 35% mandatory garden areas (for lots over 650m²) as part of VC110 in a GRZ effectively diminishes opportunity for increased residential density within the Glen Huntly Activity Centre where increased residential density is required. Prior to VC110 building site coverage within a GRZ1 was discretionary and averaged between 60% to 75% whilst now with the mandatory 35% garden areas requirement this has decreased to 40%-45% given basement ramps, paths, verandahs, under cover areas (even balcony overhangs above), vegetation strips less than 1.0m wide and building footprint are all excluded from garden areas calculation. In order to continue to achieve the required growth and increased housing in the Glen Huntly Activity Centre areas of the GRZ1 would need to be rezoned to Residential Growth Zone or a Mixed Use Zone (where it directly interfaces the commercial precinct) which does not have the 35% mandatory garden areas.

It is crucial to retain the character and amenity that attracted people to an area in the first place. Developer greed has seen large parts of Glen Eira destroyed and replaced by the modern versions of 1960’s flats. Trees in private gardens have been flattened. A tree protection policy on private land is urgently needed. Medium density housing must be carefully integrated not allowed to destroy residential amenity for others. Big brother planning has gone too far. The infrastructure, parks, parking, local streets etc cannot take too many people. Higher density housing should be located near major transport hubs not simply scattered across the area. Preserving larger blocks with individual houses is a benefit for all in the provision of breathing space, trees and greenery.

To ensure housing supply meets the needs of the community, Council should articulate targets around dwelling types.

Urban village like Bentleigh is sufficiently populated by now. There is an urgent need to stop overcrowding in this Urban village to maintain status Quo of quality of living. Over crowding this urban area by apartments will compromise the quality of living of the residents living here for long time, although apartment living will have no effect on the newly arrived residents. Hence, new constructions in Bentleigh Urban village be authorised/ approved for...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse only comprising of three or more bedrooms at a maximum of three levels of height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My main concern that plans do not change to allow buildings higher than 2 stories. It happened in the street I live in without warning. It's only one end of our street and it cannot come down further. It's already traffic congested down the other end due to the High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable but quality housing is key. The trend to 3-5 storey apartments along Neerim Road for example is a blight. Density yes, loss of character NO!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lack of acknowledgement of the multiple roles of housing with gardens including for older people. Benefits include growing vegetables, supporting biodiversity, having a safe place to be outdoors, sharing with neighbours, decreasing flood runoff, minimising urban heat island effects. Instead the document seems to have a not to subtle push to get older people out of their homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The unique and charming Californian bungalow style of Caulfield South, seems to be disappearing to be replaced with box like, uniform housing that has no style or identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't see there's any need to rezoning for housing needed. If you want to call it East Village, please keep it village character. We don't need to build another Shanhai style or elsternwick!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High density and high level buildings (more than 10 stories) large apartments is ideal solution to the demand and the growing population. maximize housing solutions to accommodate professionals resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If new housing is mandatory in East Village, focus on single storey units and aged care, not apartments. The height limit should only be 2 to 3 storeys. Low density only as there is already too much traffic congestion in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality development only. Trees and plants not paved or concrete development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be a specified limit of levels to the definition of ‘tall’ dwellings/ apartments in urban village areas. To ensure against overdevelopment and prevent ghetto like sky scrapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its not clear on Elsternwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Housing along Nepean Highway!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area will expand dramatically over the years - there needs to be more access to apartments and units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be a minimum apartment/dwelling size implemented in Glen Eira, as well as reasonable height restrictions and adequate parking for all new developments to avoid overcrowding of roads, schools, parks and other fundamental facilities. I think most longterm residents bought in the area for the open spaces, tree-lined streets and community feel, with the bonus of having good schools. Slowly, the character of our suburbs is being drained by overcrowded streets and not being able to reverse out of your own driveway!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mixture of housing types to allow people of all abilities and social backgrounds to live in a great neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'd hate to see high rise, high density housing spread into the small local streets. I think it needs to be restricted to the main activity centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing is a great addition to the area. Current house prices are prohibitive for young families; townhouses are not an adequate solution to the problem when they cost almost as much as a detached dwelling but have no access to outdoor space. I would hope that any new development includes requirements for garden space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing is important if it is well designed. The shoddy concrete monstrosities that characterise activity centres condemn and devalue the lives of those who live in them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When they become ghettos those who live in them will do so only out of poverty. Rigorous regulation demanding significantly better build and design quality is required urgently throughout Glen Eira. Reusing existing buildings or construction of new building to scale and designed in sympathy with existing buildings is necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing is okay.</th>
<th>Ormond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A good mixture of housing to ensure that people of all abilities and social economic backgrounds can enjoy the great facilities of the area.</td>
<td>Ormond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing needs to support the neighbourhood centre e.g. design of housing needs to support easy pedestrian access. Not only for the residents of each dwelling but for the whole neighbourhood e.g. no more apartment blocks that are hostile to pedestrians by not providing shade, green space, or are outright dangerous for pedestrian children to pass by hidden, underground parking exits.</td>
<td>Ormond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# OTHER COMMENTS ABOUT THE DRAFT ACTIVITY CENTRE, HOUSING AND LOCAL ECONOMY STRATEGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document provides high-level framing without precise and specific information for areas</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live next to the Elster Canal in Gardenvale. My suggestion is to work with South East Water about the possibility of covering over the canal as they have done along Union St, East Brighton. This could then become parkland with a walking and bicycle path that could be used by the community rather than the present use - undesirables, tagging and destroying the area.</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your plan does NOT state what Council or the vic govt. intends to do to protect the local HERITAGE of the areas you seek to develop!!!! You have failed to protect heritage in the past. Eg, Frogmore mansion in Whagoo Road Carnegie. This plot remains a vacant lot where once a grand Victorian mansion of significant heritage value once stood. What do you propose to do to guarantee heritage preservation and retention of this element of our local amenity. It's been wallpapered over in the past and we've had a gutful!!!</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is understood that Glen Eira is forecast to grow by 22,000 by 2031 and to achieve this an additional 9,000 dwellings are required. The Housing id report indicates that on average 1,600+ new dwellings per annum have been created over the last three years (with potentially up to 2,000 new dwellings this year). It also highlights that there are (at least) 21,695 new dwelling opportunities in Glen Eira. Given this situation, it would appear that Glen Eira will well and truly exceed this growth forecast. My feedback is that the Draft Strategy does not currently provide any commentary on this situation or the potential for excessive population growth and any associated actions. This is a very critical issue for consideration due to the potential impact on sustainability, liveability and maintaining neighbourhood character.</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is great effort. How to actually make things happen which benefit all is the challenge</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My comments are general rather than specific, and centre around the proposed Glen Huntly activity Centre. The heritage of the shopping centre is an important component of this area. Any heritage review is likely to be years behind the other planning, leaving the area open to inappropriate or unsympathetic developments. The sites along the shopping strip that have been developed over the last years have been unsympathetic to the heritage values that give the shopping centre heritage values. Streets around the Glen Huntly rail station have over the last 5 years have become increasingly congested with traffic and parked cars now narrow some streets to one lane. Is there going to be any carparking strategy to help alleviate this growing problem? Proposed increased dwelling density levels of 200 to 20 seem to high. Glen Eira open space levels are the State’s lowest and will only continue to fall per head of population as the population increases. The Draft mentions the provision of public open space within the activity centre, but offers no strategy or method on how this provision of open space could be achieved.</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a resident of Carnegie and also run my consulting business from office space rented on Koornang Road. I have also been involved in planning matters as objector to a number of the developments going in to Carnegie. This has included several appearances at VCAT. I love this neighbourhood and would like to provide feedback on the Draft Activity Centre, Housing and Local Economy Strategy (the “Draft Strategy”). To ensure the strategy is linked to reality “on the ground”, council should track dwelling approvals. This will help with articulating achievement of State Government housing and</td>
<td>Main consultation page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
job targets (p.6 of the Draft Strategy).
I believe the Glen Eira Community has been providing more accommodation in recent years than required to achieve the State Government accommodation targets. This is an important dimension to consider when designing and evaluating housing targets. As we are “ahead of the curve”, there is room to put greater demands (than mere compliance with RESCODE) on developers. Council is the only player in this development process that can put community amenity front and center of the process. The developers won’t and neither will the State Government.

- One way to put the focus on community amenity is to provide monthly reporting on dwelling type approvals, as per p. 23 of the Draft Strategy. This reporting should show how dwelling approvals are tracking for each household type identified.
- In addition, Council should require developers to provide accommodation in proportion the percentage of the projected increase by household type. E.g. of the projected dwelling increase by 2036 of 17,963 dwellings (adding the figures on p.23), apartments are seen as providing a solution to the Lone Person, Groups, Couples without Dependents and One Parent Family household types. Council should have a discussion about what percentage of those they want to see as catered to by apartments, as the figure could range between 5% (if just the “Groups” household type is accommodated in apartments) to 74% (if all other household types’ demands were accommodated in apartments). And after that discussion, articulate what percentage of apartment housing type council would like to see.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please do not allow for increases in the height of buildings amongst our suburban streets. Two stories is enough.</th>
<th>Bentleigh East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As an owner of a property at the corner of Neerim and Koornang Roads I would be keen to see council provide incentives for sustainability initiatives such as roof top gardens etc.</td>
<td>Carnegie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenced dog parks in the area?</td>
<td>Carnegie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To truly encourage local cycling current unsafe conditions that favour car parking over safe more segregated cycling corridors need to be implemented. Koornang Rd is a good example of dangerous cycling conditions.</td>
<td>Carnegie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actually a lot of local who live in the affected area didn't get the chance to attend community meetings which held on 24 May. I believe they lots to say. This area should remain as it is as a commercial zone for our future generation and local business. People shouldn't be short-sighted only looking at current property market value of the side. If elected council really serves for locals, should all put their hand up say ‘no’ to the money hungry developers or land owners.</td>
<td>East Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for the work so far! Elsternwick is a great place!</td>
<td>Elsternwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More focus is needed on greening up Glen eira and examples provided. Eg identifying areas for creating open space and tree planting.</td>
<td>Elsternwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is not specific for Elsternwick which concerns me.</td>
<td>Elsternwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to believe the council has the best interests of its current residents at the heart of this plan.</td>
<td>McKinnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d like to see more cohesive work between Glen Eira, bayside and Kingston councils. It seems most of these strategic plans are developed in isolation. Given the junction between the 3 councils at Moorabbin Activity centre this is more important than ever.</td>
<td>Moorabbin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amongst all the development, I would like to see local infrastructure and open space to be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of high importance. It's great to incorporate high density housing into activity centres, but 
the infrastructure and open space to accommodate the increased density per capital is just 
as important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No, 'nuff said</th>
<th>Murrumbeena</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As per previous surveys, there is no support for the closure of Neerim Rd and &quot;transition into a pedestrian friendly centre. Why would you close Neerim Rd, why would you divert traffic from the main Rd to the suburban streets. That's what will happen. Business will not survive if Neerim Rd is closed and made into a &quot;mall&quot;. Listen to the residents. Listen to the business's.</td>
<td>Murrumbeena</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I expect this draft has taken many weeks, if not months, to prepare and release. It is extremely disappointing and unreasonable that the community has only 14 days to consider and respond. I would have expected such important policy documents should be available for at least 30 days and preferably 60 days to allow for residents who are on holidays, are unwell for a period, or who have heavy work or family commitments, and a host of other reasons, to be given a more reasonable period to digest and understand the document and to develop and express their views.

2. It is quite astonishing that the Stage 3 – Planning Document does not seem to adopt, embrace or discuss all results from the Stage 2 – Planning, as contained in the document “MURRUMBEENA_STAGE_2_CONSULTATION_SNAP-SHOT_30May17”. This document indicates that a substantial majority of respondents are opposed to the "Link Road", and any substantive changes to Neerim Road, Hobart Road, etc. It seems to me the Stage 2 & 3 planning documents are quite independent. We want to know when and how decisions will be made on these road and traffic concepts, and when the community will get a further chance to comment on them before they are finalised?

| Disappointed in Key Action 8 "Introduce tree protection policy for new developments". You already have a tree protection policy and it is blatantly ignored. e.g. In line with your policy I objected to a development on the corner of North Rd and Anthony St where a significant tree was removed one day before the plans were submitted. And my objection was ignored. You don’t need a new policy - you need integrity and the guts to enforce your existing policies. | Ormond |
Hi Aiden

Thanks for your hard work yesterday capturing the comments from the tables in the room about the Structure Plan.

Can I just make the follow-up point that no-one mentioned multi-storey carparks as something that they wanted. There were many good suggestions (no doubt captured by your good self) but there was no support expressed for the multi-storey carpark idea. In my experience with these processes, sometimes lack of support is interpreted as "no opposition".

I appreciate that the Vision was put up as a foil for people to respond to and that certainly worked. We now know that no-one wants vibrancy!!!

But how (in the the draft material issued) you went from that Vision, as a very first step, to a multi-storey car park is still beyond me. Of all the things that come to mind to implement even that flawed draft Vision, multi-storey carparks do not make the grade.

I shall assume that the idea is now well and truly laid to rest.

Thansk again for your efforts.

Regards
Dear Aiden,
You spoke to us (our table) briefly last Wed nite at Elsternwick RSL. Following that meeting, I thought I should make a personal submission (see attached).

My vision for Elsternwick would be copy a European style with;
- reduced parking along Glenhuntly Rd, but increased parking stations in the Gordon/Selwyn area, Stanley St area, Orrong Rd Nth area
- pedestrian & bikes encourage
- Improve the public transport links by expanding the bus inter-change in Horne St & Rippon Grove. Remove the buses from Glenhuntly Rd.
- a place of families to live. Developments should have a significant element aimed a families and social housing.

Regards,
SUBMISSION

GLEN-EIRA PLANNING SCHEME REVIEW 2016

Name: [REDACTED]
Organisation (if applicable): [REDACTED]
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Suburb: [REDACTED] Postcode: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

COMMENTS

Please refer to Glen Eira Planning Scheme — A Discussion Paper, which can be found online at www.gleneira.vic.gov.au/psr for planning themes that you may wish to comment on. Comments on other planning issues are also welcome.

SUBMISSION

Having attended the public meeting at Elsternwick PS on 19 January 2017, I wanted to make this submission to the Elsternwick Structure Plan.

1) Elsternwick already has many great features:
   - Parks and open spaces
   - Arts and entertainment
   - Schools and education
   - Good retail and some commercial
   - Good public transport links
   These features should be enhanced.

2) Elsternwick has problems with
   - Parking
   - North/South access
   - Junction East/West along Glen Huntly Rd
   - No height restrictions on development, say maximum of 7 storeys.
1) Elsternwick Vision should incorporate:
- Being an area that caters for families.
- Should include social housing.
- Being an area that encourages retail, commercial, cultural, expansion.
- This provides employment.
- Being an area that strives to emulate European cities whereby pedestrian & bike usage around the activity centre is encouraged and vehicle traffic discouraged.

2) Ideas to meet Elsternwick Vision.

2.1) Improve parking:
- Improve & increase parking.
- Create good access from parking to retail, leisure, commercial activities.
- Build a fresh park or new laneways and their connection to surrounding areas.
- Remove parking from Campbell Rd.
- Create a recreational strip along the railway line from Caulfield to Elsternwick so they are connected via pedestrian walk paths.

end your completed submission to:
Glen Eira Planning Scheme Review
Strategic Planning Department
Glen Eira City Council
3 Box 42
SULFIELD SOUTH VIC 3162

*any personal information requested on this form is required to contact you about upcoming meetings regarding the Glen Eira Planning Scheme Review 2016.

*will only be shared with officers directly responsible for providing that service. If you do not provide the information, you may not be able to assist you with your request.

*the information you provide will be used for the purpose of the Glen Eira Planning Scheme Review 2016 and may be placed in

*publication. if you would like to know more about privacy at Glen Eira City Council, including your right to seek access to your personal information, contact Council's privacy officer on 9524 3333. Council's Privacy Policy can be downloaded at www.glenelga.council.vic.au/privacy
4.3) Create a new park, to be kind and community oriented, in part of the Richmond Park lands that adjoin the railway line.
   On top access to the sea front to the South.

4.4) Develop the ABC Garden St site into a mix of residential housing and retail.

4.5) Develop the ABC Selwyn St site to incorporate a new library and community hub.

4.6) The current Extra-Harms Library site to become site to expand pre-school / kindergarten facilities.

4.7) Create a new vehicle access to Chelmsford from the South.
   Build a bridge between Riddell Rd and Davenport Rd via existing streets.

4.8) All new developments to have bike facilities for each dwelling.
Dear Aiden,

Further to the public meeting on 17/05 re above.

Two ideas from that meeting were:

1. Create a recreational strip along railway lands from Gardenvale to Ripponlea and incorporate pedestrian, bike, jogging paths etc.
2. Improve vehicle, bike, pedestrian access to Elsternwick from the South.

I recently noted the property at 1 Riddell Pde (triangle shaped block that abuts the railway line) is on the market & to be auctioned soon (Briggin & Scott).

If council purchased this property, the development of the above two ideas would be significantly enhanced.

Over to you or to the appropriate council person to seriously consider.

Regards,

27 May 2017

Dear Tess,

I have forwarded you the below email, as maybe it should have been directed to you rather than Aiden.

I feel the purchase of the below property by the council, would be a strategic important asset in fulfilling the Elsternwick vision.

The property is scheduled to be Auction 4 June 2017.

If the property is purchased by a developer, there will likely be lots of difficulties in getting an appropriate development approved due to:

- Triangle land dimensions
- Abuts railway line
- Heritage overlay
- Etc

Purchase by the council will avoid all these planning issues & disputes.

Regards,
My Vision for East Village

1. Mandatory height limits – 4-6 storeys

2. Number of apartments containing 3 bedrooms made mandatory along with social housing

3. Open space not to be smaller than 800 square metres

4. Council to exact land contribution instead of cash for open space

5. Bus route changes

6. Provision of visitor car parking mandatory and not in stackers

7. Number of dwellings specified and made mandatory – no more than 2000

8. Ensure that development plans are set in concrete and can't be changed as with the Caulfield village

9. Limit height of school building and ensure adequate playing fields for school without taking any open space that already exists in Glen Eira

10. ESD provisions spelt out fully and not based on minimalist standards as currently proposed
Although a “brown field” site, to ensure future development results in a sustainable, socially and economically viable community that enhances the surrounding area, the site should be viewed as “green field”. Vehicular and pedestrian access to the site and the site’s facilities, are key to determining the viability of the redevelopment. The creation of precincts (ie. designated areas within the site that provide various community oriented facilities or business focuses) is good, however, determining the location and heights/densities of precincts based on the site’s existing internal road network may not result in a desired community outcome.

Vision for Site

- Building Heights/Densities – ranging from 2 to a “core height” of 8 stories.
Refer to below illustration (previously presented in November, 2016 presentation) for clarification on heights/densities.

- Core of Village to comprise
  - Retail and Commercial areas, including shops and stores as per planning definitions (GE Planning Scheme - Clause 72)
  - Public transport connections
  - Open Space provisions (ie. communal areas and playground)
  - Potential location for Retirement Village

- Buildings
  - All buildings above 2 stories to have graduated setbacks to reduce building dominance
  - All residences to have private open space (eg. courtyard at ground level, balconies at higher levels)
  - Density levels defined and applied to site.
  - Diversity of housing types (townhouses vs. apartments) and sizes (1, 2, 3 bdr). Ratio specifying no. of 3 bdr to 1 & 2 bdrs dwelling defined and applied.
  - Mandatory requirement for inclusion of social housing.
  - ResCode parking requirements applicable across site (no waivers granted)
  - Below ground basement carparks areas not to exceed above ground building envelope

- Precincts/Areas differentiated by architectural variations and landscaping.

- Proposed bus route
- Road accommodating bus route to accommodate bus stops without impacting traffic (vehicle and cyclist) flow.

- Road network
  - Vehicle movements to/from site impact on existing traffic congestion in North and Boundary Roads to be minimized.
  - To include free, time restricted on/off street parking provisions
  - Possible inclusion of paid off street parking

- Pedestrian connectivity
  - Safe pedestrian connectivity between all precincts/facilities and adjoining parkland (Mariboro Reserve and Virginia Park)
  - If shared pedestrian vehicular connectivity, separation between vehicles and pedestrians provided (e.g. kerbing, bollards)

- Proposed School
  - Provision of vehicle drop off/pick up points
  - Proximity to public transport to be considered
  - Height limits (consistent with surrounding precincts/areas) to be defined and applied if proposed school does not eventuate

- Proposed Retirement Village
  - One on-site car park provided for each unit, on-site visitor parking to be provided
  - Height limits (consistent with surrounding precincts/areas) to be defined and applied if proposed retirement village does not eventuate
  - Possible location in "core" precinct/area to be considered

- Vegetation
  - Mature canopy trees to be planted in ground (not above ground planter boxes) – refer requirement for below ground basement carparks not to exceed above ground building envelope

- Open Space
  - Given the magnitude of the site, medium density development will generate a substantial increase in the demand for, and usage of, surrounding parkland. The proposed Open Space Levy of 6% (being marginally higher than that charged for smaller developments – 5.7%), is felt to be inadequate to meet the open space needs of the future residents. A more appropriate levy would be 8-10%.
  - Within the site, open space (grassed areas and playgrounds) to be provided in accordance with forecast demographics
Hello,

I would like to make a comment in regard to the Draft Council and Community Plan particularly in relation to the proposed "Ormond Sky Tower" to be erected over Ormond Station.

I would like to see Council commit to much stronger advocacy, partnering and putting in place measures to ensure:

- that any such development is in keeping with the local heritage and character of the area by ensuring it is kept within a reasonable height limit (no more than 5 stores high). If not, how will we maintain the village-like quality that the Plan notes as a positive for our City?

- That the people living in and around such a redevelopment have access to internal space, daylight, natural ventilation, quietness, outdoor space.

- that social and affordable housing options are sufficiently moderate in terms of size, and supported to integrate with the present community rather than introduced ad hoc and in numbers that will threaten community cohesion, and safety.

- that there been full and fair consideration of social sustainability - how will this affect the local community in terms of economy, environment, security, liveability, social equity, education, social inclusion?

- that plans are made to limit any further traffic congestion around this area as it is already struggling to cope.

- that capacity for community and shared common spaces, parks, services and infrastructure are fully taken into account when such development proposals are suggested. For example - sporting clubs are already struggling to find space for kids to play. How will the area cope if the proposed Sky Tower is built? Rubbish on the surrounding streets is a constant problem now - this will only increase if a massive development is added in this area. Lets not create more people who experience the condition of 'nature-deficit'. Its not just about growing a few more trees.

- that every opportunity is taken for Council to show the lead in what transparent community inclusive planning, sustainable, long term, quality, integrated and harmonious increased density living can look like in Glen Eira.

Here is a chance for the council to look at innovative, sensitive ways to approach planning and creating higher density living, rather than standing by whilst a huge, unwanted and divisive tower is plonked in our midst that will create an eyesore that we all have to live in or beside for years to come.
SUBMISSION 6

City Future’s Department
City of Glen Eira,
Corner Glen Eira & Hawthorn Roads,
Caulfield 3162,

28 May 2017

Dear Future Department,

Re: East Village

My input into your new East Village Structure Plan is detailed below. It is totally different to that which has been put forward until now, and should be considered in part or as a complete alternative.

It is of interest that the combined size of the property is almost the same as that of Riverside South, Manhattan, New York City: a largely residential complex of 23 ha overlooking the Hudson River. This project inspired some of my ideas below:

• Contrary to local requests for low-density housing, my vision is to construct hi-rise towers graduating downwards to medium-rise with as many views of Packer Park as possible. These towers should be built to suit family life with large apartments, in contrast to the small 7 sq dog boxes that dot the City of Glen Eira. It is possible to spread and connect medium-rise apartments over an area and top some of them with high rise towers.

• There could be a restaurant on each top floor of the hi-rise towers, facing the park.

• Recreational facilities are already on the doorstep with sporting facilities already invested in.

• Parking and truck delivery areas should be underground, enabling the whole area to be pedestrian and cyclist friendly.

• The centre of the project should include community facilities.

• Supermarkets can be built into the first floor of the towers.

• A shopping atrium can be a feature of one or more of the towers, including banks and services such as hairdressers and shops.

• There is a new development that should be watched closely: it is called Masdar City in Abu Dhabi (Emirates.) They have built a personal rapid transit system by Podcar which is a point to point transport solution that runs with automotive electric powered vehicles. This system could ring the property and deliver residents and visitors to public transport, shopping, community areas and even under North Road to Packer Park.

• A high-tech secondary college, rather than an extension of another local one should be built on the property, again high rise to enable maximum use of space. The location of this college should be adjacent to the bus depot to minimize foot traffic throughout the project. Again, recreational facilities are immediately opposite at the park. Roof space could be used for lunchtime and recess, with a gym and hall created within the building.

• Office space will be a necessity both to replace the existing office facilities on the site, and to provide employment.

• A bus depot should be at the far end of the property, away from Packer Park with bus stops at all sides of the property. Currently there is insufficient public transport in the area. The bus depot can include eateries and possibly a supermarket.

• The success of the project will depend upon keeping the quality of residents clean-living. “Affordable housing” should not be an invitation to mix in families who will bring drug and crime issues into the area.

• Accommodation for the elderly and community facilities for them should be an important part of the project.

• A hotel could be considered.
• There should be a walkway to the park – preferably underground with escalators.
• Architects for the project should concentrate upon alternative energy, environmental sustainability and clean technology.
• Ugly installations such as the power installation which is there at present should be surrounded by trees or moved to the southern end of the project.
• Flora and fauna should make the project a showcase.
• The name: “East Village” is inappropriate. We are looking forward to this and next century with this project. Village connotes a European-type small-thinking spot on the map. Something such as “GREEN CITY”, “EAST PARK CITY” “PARKSIDE CITY” or similar would be more appropriate.

FUNDING OF THE PROJECT
1. The School: Funded in total by the State Government including upkeep.
2. Accommodation for the Elderly: Rental only not purchase – funded by the Council, religious and community organisations.
3. Retail Space, Supermarket & Atrium: High rentals paid to Council. Note: Council to retain commercial properties when agreements are made with investors to keep rentals in perpetuity to recoup investment in the whole project.
6. Hotel: fully funded by a hotel chain.
7. Infrastructure and community buildings: Applications for funding to State and Government. There are already multiple roads leading into the property, plus other services.

ALTERNATIVE FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS
There could be the right for residents of Glen Eira only to purchase units of shares in the development of both residential buildings and commercial offices, with a view to profit once these are sold or rented. Local residents could also be offered first right of purchase once apartments and offices become available. If 10,000 residents invested $5,000 each this would total $50m (or multiples thereof) which would help begin the project; to this could be added institutional, Australian and overseas investors.

The way that I have submitted my project is dependent upon quality and large-sized apartments. There are very few open blocks of land overlooking a park with full facilities in inner Melbourne. I do understand that the surrounding population would prefer single or double-storey homes with grassy back yards, but that mentality can be well served throughout the rest of the City of Glen Eira.

Presently there is an unmet demand in Glen Eira for 3 – 4 bedroom apartments within easy reach of the inner-Melbourne work-places, an ageing population require accommodation close to their families in this area and this is an opportunity to build the next-generation city adjacent to a beautiful park, close to GSAC and with the space to set this up as a showcase for quality living.
Dear Tess Angarane,

My wife and I attended the first meeting on the 17th of May to get involved with the exciting new developments of Elsternwick.

I’ve lived in [REDACTED] for 15 years and lived in the area for nearly 30 years. My profession is a graphic designer, so a large part of my job is visualisation and concept development.

Over the last few years I’ve noticed the intersection of Staniland Grove / Glenhuntly Rd / Carre Street has become very hectic and quite concerning at busy times of use.

With the age of digital phones I have noticed more and more people frequently cross these intersections without looking up from their screens - assuming cars will stop for them. Cars often won’t leave a clearway because they too have their head down distracted by phones.

When exiting from Staniland grove and Carre Streets into Glenhuntly Road it does take a little skill (with eye contact) from motorists and pedestrians to merge into traffic flow. I think its just a matter of time before an accident happens.

I believe we need to close these concerning intersections to create a green Mall which can also segway across to the new proposed community centre and green space where Staniland Grove car park is.

I think the community of Elsternwick needs a square or a Mall to create a central focal point and green hub for the area similar to the new development next to Bang Bang.

I’ve taken the liberty of putting some ideas down to create this idea, using some images as inspiration to generate a look and feel of what it could look like.

I would appreciate if you could please take the time look over my idea’s,

Best Regards [REDACTED]
REFERENCE IMAGES FOR THE MALL CONCEPT FOR STANILAND GROVE AND CARRE STREETS ELSTERNWICK
Hello Tess,

Thank you for the Summary document. It was hard reading and at the conclusion I did not get any sense of what the possible direction would be from a traffic standpoint.

Could the team provide a clearer indication of what the survey has concluded from a traffic standpoint please.

Regards
SUBMISSION 9

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 30 May 2017 3:15 PM
To: Tess Angarane
Subject: Carnegie town centre

Hi Tess,

I have been speaking to some of my older relatives who are originally from the Carnegie, Ormond, Murrumbeena area. They mentioned that one of the good things about Carnegie was that it had its own cinema, as did Ormond and Bentleigh. You can still see the façade of the old cinema in

I'm thinking something that might add a bit more life to the town centres would be those old school arthouse style cinemas. The sort where you get away from the mainstream and see films that are otherwise only played at the Astor or the Classic during the film festivals.

The Classic cinema is probably the best example of the older style cinema in this area. Maybe something similar to the Classic but smaller would be a good addition to the community?

Just a thought.

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 1 June 2017 2:23 PM
To: Tess Angarane
Subject: Something else for the list.

Tess,

More community feedback.

Have heard from many men in the Community that they are going all the way to the Bentmoor Men’s Shed because there isn’t one in Glen Eira.
Has this come up in discussions yet with the community?

By the way, the one in Moorabbin, Bentmoor isn’t close to the train station and the fellows are catching a train and then a bus to get there.
Hi Tess,

I note planning options are unchanged and are really just 3 minor modifications of closing off or partially closing off shopping strip at Murrumbeena to traffic.

I've already expressed my dismay.
It will kill off traders in Neerim Rd. strip at junction to Murrumbeena Rd.
People will not be able to access by car. It will be deserted at night & unsafe for train travellers.
The whole purpose of raising the rail line is improving traffic flow!! - why compound with these improvements until tested??
Finally there is no co-ordinated planning with Rail Authority, and no indication where or size of new parking for rail commuters & local shoppers will park their cars??
Hi Tess,

Thanks for the update. I note that the majority of respondents do not support closing Neerim road to traffic, and I am hoping that the council will make future plans taking residents wishes into account.

On a slightly related note, who do we speak to about the changed traffic at the corner of Ardyne and Kangaroo? As residents of [redacted], we have had our access to home significantly restricted by these changes and are surprised that we were not consulted, or at least notified prior to the changes.

As we regularly need to access home from the East, these changes force us to use other local streets (Gerald, Inellan, or round the back of Murrumbeena park e.g. Erin Avenue etc), because obviously until the grade separation, Murrumbeena road is often blocked past Kangaroo road so entering M’beena road from Kangaroo road with a view to turning immediately right into Thomson Avenue is frequently difficult.

If the council did traffic modelling on this, how did they propose residents of Thomson Avenue and Burns Avenue in particular were to access their streets when coming from work, school etc east of home? There may need to be "Keep clear" signs on Murrumbeena road in future so that we can turn right into our street if it was intended that we head up to Murrumbeena road instead of turning right into Ardyne, as the lights at Kangaroo road mean traffic now blocks our access.

I would appreciate knowing who is the relevant person to discuss this with,

Thanks
Dear Sir/Madame,

I am writing to strongly object to the proposal to close Beavis Street and have trucks servicing Coles to use Orrong Rd. I live at [redacted], Elsternwick and I believe this would have a very negative effect for residence in Maysbury Avenue and Orrong rd residences.

Orrong Rd is very congested as it is and having trucks leaving and entering will make this worse. I understand residents in Beavis st may not like the trucks but it is not a main Rd as is Orrong rd and causes much less disruption. Moving the trucks will only create a much bigger problem for a different set of Glen Eira residents & road users.

I would hope council would look closely at the traffic flow in Orrong Rd as being a T intersection and pedestrian crossing turning right into Glenhuntly Rd does not flow well causing congestion, also at school times it becomes particularly congested with horns frequently blowing everyday as people become frustrated. In addition people trying to turn into Coles causes congestion,

I strongly object to this proposal and hope you will consider the ramifications for Orrong Rd residences and Maysbury Avenue residents.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]
SUBMISSION 13

From: 
Sent: Monday, 5 June 2017 5:16 PM
To: Glen Eira City Council
Subject: Neighbourhood Centre, Bentleigh East.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my thoughts regarding Council’s plans for the future.

In Volume 227 of Glen Eira News you have presented a map (of proposed activity centre types) which includes mention of

Neighbourhood Centre on the corner of Centre Rd and East Boundary Rd.

What is a neighbourhood centre? Is it another name for the suburb of Bentleigh East?

How does your description of an activity centre differ from a neighbourhood centre?

Could you explain what you have in mind for this corner currently taken up by the Boundary Hotel?

How does it differ from what’s there already?

What tangible, visible changes to this area, designated neighbourhood centre, will make nearby residents rejoice?

What proportion of funding will be allocated to transforming this particular suburb into a neighbourhood centre?

Cheers,

[Name Redacted]
Thankyou for your email.
Council has been busy sending out for comment proposals for transforming Murrumbeena and its environs. Of particular interest were the alternatives for the Link Road options with the completion of the Sky Rail.
There were various alternatives for amended traffic flows put forward for consideration which in part examined prevention of rat running between Dandenong Road and Kangaroo Road.

As far as we are aware from published information that’s all this is - "proposals".

So, it has come as a real surprise to us that within the last couple of weeks, amended traffic flows have already been implemented at the Kangaroo Road intersections with Ardyne St and Second Avenue. There are overtones of decisions having already been made in advance of whatever other arrangements, yet to be finalised, regarding traffic flows in the area.

We’re interested to know why it is that these changes mentioned have already been implemented without consultation and in advance of every other decision affecting traffic in this area.
Obviously, the redirection of traffic has consequences for other streets in the surrounding area.

Your detailed response to the matters we have raised is sought.

Murrumbeena
Dear Madam / Sir,

I am a resident of Carnegie and also run my consulting business from office space rented on Koornang Road. I have also been involved in planning matters as objector to a number of the developments going in to Carnegie. This has included several appearances at VCAT.

I love this neighbourhood and would like to provide feedback on the Draft Activity Centre, Housing and Local Economy Strategy (the “Draft Strategy”).

To ensure the strategy is linked to reality “on the ground”, council should track dwelling approvals. This will help with articulating achievement of State Government housing and job targets (p.6 of the Draft Strategy).

I believe the Glen Eira Community has been providing more accommodation in recent years than required to achieve the State Government accommodation targets. This is an important dimension to consider when designing and evaluating housing targets.

As we are “ahead of the curve”, there is room to put greater demands (than mere compliance with RESCODE) on developers. Council is the only player in this development process that can put community amenity front and center of the process. The developers won’t and neither will the State Government.

- One way to put the focus on community amenity is to provide monthly reporting on dwelling type approvals, as per p. 23 of the Draft Strategy. This reporting should show how dwelling approvals are tracking for each household type identified.
- In addition, Council should require developers to provide accommodation in proportion the percentage of the projected increase by household type. E.g. of the projected dwelling increase by 2036 of 17,963 dwellings (adding the figures on p.23), apartments are seen as providing a solution to the Lone Person, Groups, Couples without Dependents and One Parent Family household types. Council should have a discussion about what percentage of those they want to see as catered to by apartments, as the figure could range between 5% (if just the “Groups” household type is accommodated in apartments) to 74% (if all other household types’ demands were accommodated in apartments). And after that discussion, articulate what percentage of apartment housing type council would like to see.

Proposed Activity Centres Framework

I agree with classifying Carnegie as Urban village, but would like to ensure that the existing zones are maintained (i.e. not further expansion of the residential growth zone).
Theme One: Place-Making

I agree that “the identity of each of Glen Eira’s neighbourhoods need to be strengthened and a greater emphasis needs to be placed on making these centres family friendly”. I also agree that “As our local centres become more affected by globalised and mobilised markets, it becomes more and more important to create community rich experiences within these centres that cannot be bought online.”

I would like to pose the question: if the focus is on strengthening the identity of neighbourhoods and creating community rich experiences, is it adequate to formulate a vision that does not include any reference or connection to the present built environment? As this is a planning strategy, shouldn’t there be some reference to what is currently in place and how that is to be treated? If there is no link to the present, in the not too distant future, I believe all shopping strips and streets will look very vanilla. It will be the Metricon and Steller-built designs that are the same whether they are in Carnegie, Elsternwick, Caulfield, Footscray, Cranbourne or Boroondara. If nothing is done to link strategies to the built character of existing places, it will all look the same in the future.

In my submission, the Carnegie vision should read something like:

Carnegie will be a vibrant, safe and attractive centre that retained its cherished character. Home to families and singles from around the world, its community welcomed and integrated its fair share of Melbourne’s growing population.

The draft vision, to my mind, did not include enough recognition of Carnegie being a family-focused neighbourhood. It also did not include sufficient recognition of the need to protect the character of the shopping strip.

In addition, what I would like to see included in the Draft Strategy or related planning documents:

- Heritage overlays of the facades of the shopping strip
- Ensuring that someone standing on one side of the street, looking the other way, is still able to see sky above the shops on the opposite side. This is one of the things that – to me – characterises Carnegie as suburban shopping strip.

Theme Two: Local Economy

I was shocked that Glen Eira is the fourth lowest council across Melbourne to locally employ its own residents. As such, a priority should be increasing local employment opportunities and making 20-minute neighbourhoods a reality. Not 20 minutes to the train station to commute into town, but 20 minutes to work in a local activity centre.

Council is not going to be able to act as employer. But Council has impact on the planning scheme and what is being built in its area. As such, it should introduce vertical zoning to ensure that shopping strips and commercially zoned properties contain more space for businesses than simply the ground floor. Especially in the major activity centres, this should be a must.

Theme Three: Housing

To ensure housing supply meets the needs of the community, Council should articulate targets around dwelling types.
Background

Before adopting the Strategy, I would ask that Council see if the 2016 census figures change some of the calculations around population growth and dwelling types.

Additional ideas to increase community amenity

- Require all developments that combine lots to provide a minimum area of publicly accessible micro park at ground level. This is especially important for the residential growth zone.
- Council should purchase strategically placed vacant lots and also consider purchasing a strategically placed shop or shops on Koornang Road to demolish and turn into a micro-park.
- Introduce a 100-year (full life of the building) planning cycle. Whilst our world will look very different, human needs remain. It’d be great to be living in a municipality that really looked at what the constant, connecting, enduring characteristics of communities are. And then built something that people in 100 years will still love coming to and calling home.

Thank you for the opportunity of contributing to the development of our local community.

Kind regards,
13 June 2017

Mr Aidan Mullen
Manager City Futures
Glen Eira City Council
Corner Glen Eira and Hawthorn Roads
CAULFIELD VIC 3162

Dear Aidan,

**ACTIVITY CENTRE, HOUSING AND LOCAL ECONOMY STRATEGY SUBMISSION**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

Continue to act on behalf of [redacted] with regard to the land at [redacted] (referred to as the [redacted] from this point forward), Elsternwick and have been instructed to lodge a submission to the draft Activity Centre, Housing and Local Economy Strategy: Draft May 2017.

Our client is generally supportive of the abovementioned strategy being prepared and commends Council on undertaking this task. However, it is considered that there should be stronger emphasis on retail uses being located on sites in proximity to public transport and an existing / future activity hub i.e. in proximity to Glenhuntly Road.

This submission discusses the various themes and includes recommendations as appropriate.

2. **SUBMISSION**

The draft Activity Centre, Housing and Local Economy Strategy contains three themes, being:

- Place-making
- Local Economy
- Housing

Our feedback on these themes is discussed below.

Our client generally supports the identified policy direction for Major Activity Centres, with strong support for the recognition that local economies should provide for the weekly needs for the community, inclusive of a minimum of approximately 2 supermarkets.

Within the liveability section of the policy direction, it is considered that a supermarket should be included as a service that should be provided for the wider community. In addition to local shops such as butchers, bakeries etc. supermarkets perform a vital service to the immediate and wider community.
not only to meet their weekly shopping needs, but also for employment opportunities as well as attracting people to the area.

It is recommended that the policy directive for major activity centres under liveability (page 32) reads: Typically, centres should provide services for the wider community, including a range of the following: a library, a community hub, an entertainment complex, maternal child health care services, child care, at least one full-line supermarket, medical centres, and a chemist.

2.1. PLACE-MAKING

Our client agrees with Council that the Elsternwick Activity Centre should be identified as a Major Activity Centre and is generally supportive of the vision statement.

2.2. LOCAL ECONOMY

Our client is supportive of major retailing as having been identified to be located within major activity centres (page 21), however request clarification as to the acceptable proximity and access of a site to train stations which Council would consider as being focussed around the train station. We also consider that sites with good access to public transport i.e. in proximity to Glenhuntly Road, should also be considered as a major / high focus for employment intensity for retail uses.

Sites which have good access via public transport will help to encourage the community to use alternate means other than a car to access the area and will help to implement council’s vision of reducing car dependency. Additionally, enabling retail activity along public transport routes will help to encourage increased activity and attract people to the area.

Our client also agrees that major retailing and convenience stores should be located within major activity centres around train stations and across all ground floor premises opportunities.

Given the nature of Elsternwick and the variety of uses along Glenhuntly Road, the surrounding area and the area is considered that there is the potential for true mixed-use developments to occur. In doing so, it will help enable and encourage Elsternwick to be developed to create a vibrant hub which also has activity outside of the standard business hours.

It is recommended that the outcome 2.3.3 be updated to read ‘Ensure key community needs are provided in each centre (such as banks, post office, grocers, butchers, supermarket and bakers).’

It is recommended that an additional outcome be included to encourage mixed-use developments where there is access to public transport and would help bring activity to the area and could read something like: Locate mixed-use developments (with one or more of retail, commercial, entertainment, or hospitality at ground floor) in areas close to public transport and is in proximity to an existing / future activity hub.

It is recommended that strategic sites within major activity centres be identified as sites, under the retail use, as either a major focus for employment intensity; or high focus for employment intensity.

2.3. HOUSING

Our client is generally supportive of what council is proposing, but considers it would be appropriate to slightly alter the description in the explanation to ‘apartment - mixed use’ to read ‘Taller buildings with a mix of residential, office, retail and/or commercial uses’.
3. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following recommendations are made with respect to the Activity Centre, Housing and Local Economy Strategy and include that:

- The policy directive for major activity centres under liveability (page 32) be slightly altered to read: "Typically, centres should provide services for the wider community, including a range of the following: a library; a community hub; an entertainment complex; maternal child health care services; child care; at least one full-line supermarket; medical centres; and a chemist."

- The outcome 2.3.3 be updated to read "Ensure key community needs are provided in each centre (such as banks, post office, grocers, butchers, supermarket and bakers)."

- An additional outcome be included (on page 36 under local economy) which reads "Locate mixed-use developments (with one or more of retail, commercial, entertainment, or hospitality at ground floor) in areas close to public transport and is in proximity to an existing / future activity hub."

- Strategic sites within major activity centres be identified as sites, under the retail use, as either a major focus for employment intensity, or high focus for employment intensity.

4. **CONCLUSION**

Our client commends Council on their forward thinking and taking the initiative to undertake the process to undertake an activity centre, housing and economic strategy.

With respect to what has been proposed the [Redacted] presents an excellent opportunity for a mixed-use development which can help to service the needs of the community, as appropriate and in doing so help to attract visitors to the area and invigorate the area. Encourage retail uses to be located on sites close to public transport and in areas in proximity to existing / future activity hubs would go a long way to achieving this.

Our client would be open minded to entering discussions with Council around place making, local economy and housing.

As with any development, any future development of the [Redacted] will need to consider its surrounding environs and the character of the area. Our client has established a working relationship with and has been liaising with the current Jewish facilities representatives in the area.

Should you have any queries or wish to discuss any of the above please don’t hesitate to contact the undersigned on [Contact Information].

Yours sincerely,
Dear Sir / Madam,

To quote from the Draft Activity Centre, Housing and Local Economy Strategy:

"3.1 PROVIDE HOUSING FOR ALL

It is likely that by 2031, an additional 9,000 dwellings will be required within Glen Eira. These additional dwellings should be best considered as 'homes' that are proactively planned for to address the future needs of the community.

Young family households are the fastest growing household in Glen Eira, increasing by 22.6 per cent between 2001 and 2011. The established family home is therefore in high demand and new apartment developments are limited in the range of household types that they attract.

By prioritising a greater supply of medium density three-bedroom townhouses, a range of household types can be accommodated, including young families.

We must plan for the housing needs of the community and ensure that diverse housing options are made available to accommodate all situations and aspirations.
"

2017 - 2031 is a 14-year period
9,000 additional dwellings are required over 14 years
This means that 643 additional dwellings are required in Glen Eira every year
Glen Eira is 38.7 square km in area
For this exercise, we divide Glen Eira into two zones:
the highest-growth 20% (7.7 sq km)
the lowest-growth 80% (30.9 sq km)

**Scenario 1:** All growth occurs in the highest-growth 20% zone, as has been the emphasis in recent years. No growth occurs in what is currently called the NRZ.
Additional dwellings required per sq km per year: 83.5
Additional dwellings required per hectare per year: 0.835

**Scenario 2:** No growth occurs in the previously highest-growth 20% zone, the opposite of the emphasis of recent years. All growth occurs in what is currently called the NRZ.
Additional dwellings required per sq km per year: 20.8
Additional dwellings required per hectare per year: 0.208
The above 2 scenarios are for illustrative purposes - obviously growth will occur as a combination of both scenarios.

Those in favour of high-density growth will tend to smokescreen the above scenarios by stating that parks, industrial areas, roads etc need to be factored in. I invite them to assume only 50% of NRZ is habitable (deliberately underestimated), and double the 0.208 additional dwellings required per habitable NRZ hectare per year to 0.416.

It’s still less than a dwelling per hectare per year.

It’s not Tokyo is it?

Both the above scenarios, and all combinations in between - Illustrate that we could probably stop building apartments now. Ok - let’s be reasonable - slash apartment building by 90%.

Additionally the statement "By prioritising a greater supply of medium density three-bedroom townhouses, a range of household types can be accommodated, including young families." correctly highlights the fact that many families who have lived in their free-standing houses in Glen Eira for years are being driven out of their home suburb by (unnecessary) lot consolidation.

Glen Eira’s recent growth has been off the top of the scale due to high-density development in areas like Carnegie. This has been primarily for the benefit of developers and real estate agents.

Many Glen Eira residents - particularly in Carnegie - feel betrayed by previous councils. They have had their homes rezoned without their consent (I have yet to meet anybody in Mimosa Rd who was consulted about the rezoning of the houses north of #86 years ago), and have been given nothing to redress this.

Glen Eira Council has the numbers - it counts dwellings and it collects rates after all. The census data has been available since April this year, so Glen Eira Council needs to come clean on how we are tracking for both absolute population numbers, and for population density. It then needs to take back control of what we build, and for whom.

Yours sincerely,
Attn: City Futures Department

I am very concerned about what the strategy has planned for the urban village and immediate surrounds in Carnegie. My interpretation is that Carnegie is being sacrificed to preserve the other suburbs.

The vision statement for Carnegie is the shortest of all suburbs and rings alarm bells:
“Carnegie will be a vibrant, safe and attractive centre that is welcoming to all and supports the growing population.”

This statement along with other mentions of Carnegie in the document implies that Carnegie will support the majority of growth in Glen Eira including for affordable housing.

I strongly object to this for the following reasons:
- The Carnegie activity centres cannot support further growth. This now needs to be shared across the neighbourhood zones.
- The parking and traffic is becoming impossible in Carnegie because there are too many residents in the activity centre with cars parked permanently on the streets and car parks.
- How can you ensure the amenity of existing residents if you allow further ridiculous growth?

The need for a better transition of density and giving respect to existing streetscapes was an important finding from the surveys which is not sufficiently tackled in the strategy. Why not?

- The strategy only mentions preserving the character in neighbourhood zones not in activity centres. Carnegie residents, like myself, who live just on the boundary of the urban zone are having our interests ignored yet again.
- How council are going to ensure that VCAT cannot ignore its’ housing guidelines in respect of existing streetscapes and neighbourhood character in all zones? This is not articulated in the strategy.

3) The biggest increase in the population will be young families as the strategy states
“Young family households are the fastest growing household in Glen Eira, increasing by 22.6 per cent between 2001 and 2011. The established family home is therefore in high demand and new apartment developments are limited in the range of household types that they attract.”

- Why then, does the strategy fall short of stating that apartments will actively be discouraged?
- Will there be changes to the planning policy in this respect? This is not articulated in the strategy and it should be.

- has clearly shown some sympathy with the residents of Carnegie and Bentleigh so the strategy should actively embrace this to try and protest us from this uncontrolled and unsustainable apartment development.

4) Affordable housing – Carnegie activity centre has also been targeted for this again but is this just because everything undesirable in other areas is dumped on Carnegie?
- I very much hope that a double standard will not be applied with this not being supported in Caulfield and so now being pushed into Carnegie.
- I very much oppose affordable housing in the Carnegie activity centre as this implies the promotion of further apartments as well as potentially a lowering of quality to achieve affordability.
- Affordable housing would be best accommodated in areas highlighted for promotion of community spirit rather than in an overcrowded activity centre.
Although at first glance the strategy looks attractive and it certainly does promise some improvements, I am extremely disappointed that there is no commitment to protect Carnegie and its’ residents. Carnegie activity centre is at risk of becoming an undesirable area with its concentration of everything that no one else wants in their suburb.
Hi Aidan,

Was nice to meet you and discuss about East Village and the future development plans in our area.

As discussed please find attached letter to formally apply for a rezoning of our property and the East Village Opportunity & Vision presentation we went through.

Looking forward to your reply,

Best regards,
20/06/2017

Att:
Mr Aidan Mullen, Manager City Futures
Planning and Place - Glen Eira City Council

Subject: Rezoning of [redacted]

Dear Sir,

We the undersigned are the owners of [redacted]
The property is currently Zoned Neighbourhood Residential (NRZ1)

The purpose of this letter, following discussions with Council, is to formally apply for a rezoning of the property to Mixed Use (Schedule 1)

1. Background.

   a. The property is located on the south east corner of North Rd and Cobar St East Bentleigh.
   
   b. North Rd is now a divided major arterial road with 2 lanes in each direction and carries high levels of traffic.
   
   c. In addition, following earlier road widening, the southern boundary of North Rd is very close to the front of our dwelling at [redacted] (address).
   
   d. The western boundary of the property also fronts Cobar St which, together with its extension via Griffith Ave, provides access to the commercial, industrial and car parking usage on land bounded by North Rd, East Boundary Rd, Cobar St and Virginia Park to the south.
   
   e. The land opposite across Cobar St is in an industrial zone but is more generally used for commercial premises including a substantial Honda car dealership on the south west corner of North Rd and Cobar St.
   
   f. South of [redacted] and the 3 adjoining properties along Cobar St, the land also comprises extensive commercial properties.
   
   g. It is apparent therefore that even at this time [redacted] is not suitable as a low density neighbourhood zone where development "respects the identified neighbourhood character" and which is a "minimal change area."

2. East Village.

2.1 A major planning process is under way to support the proposed large scale development of the land opposite [redacted] identified above as being bounded by North Rd, East Boundary Rd, Cobar St and Virginia Park to the south. The East Village Master Plan envisages:

   a. A mixed-use neighbourhood providing a range of residential types and sizes to cater for changing demographic needs of the area
   
   b. A community and education site allocation for a potential community and education facility or associated with an existing education facility
   
   c. A lifestyle, retail and services general zone to accommodate this need with a focus on open space
• An innovation and employment precinct including a dedicated area for modern employment plus:

• Aged care as part of a mixed-use residential area.

2.2 Building heights in the proposed East Village plan are indicated as being from 3-8 levels with the core area of the proposed development being at 6-8 levels.

2.3 McKinnon College has already indicated a potential plans to locate a new campus as part of the development.

2.4 Clearly there will be a major intensification of uses at East Village including high employment and visitor numbers together with traffic intensification, including along Cobar St which is designated as a key access point to the project.

Proposed Zoning

3.1 Clearly NRZ is not suitable now as a zoning for East Bentleigh and this situation will increasingly be the case as East Village develops, either under the current Masterplan, if approved, or via alternative development if it is not approved, given that many uses on the existing East Village property have outlived their effective life.

3.2 A Mixed Use Zone is considered as appropriate for because it allows for a range of uses compatible with the existing uses to the west of Cobar St and the uses proposed in the current East Village Masterplan.

3.3 Schedule 1 to the Mixed Use Zone is also considered as appropriate because it will enable flexibility in building height, including the possibility of residential over commercial uses, and thus assist in creating a transition area to the east of Cobar St as East Village proceeds.

We request your favourable consideration of this proposal.

Sincerely yours,
The Opportunity

The Vision

MAKE EAST VILLAGE BENTLEIGH EAST AUSTRALIA Number 1 International Innovation and Technology Centre

Click here ➔ Innovation statement: PM Malcolm Turnbull calls for 'ideas boom' as he unveils $1b vision for Australia’s future

Click here ➔ Melbourne-ranked-top-tech-city-Australia

Click here
The Vision
What are the Benefits?

Better employment  Sustainable employment hub for the 21st century
Better Education  Integrate the need for education and community facilities
Better Traffic and Transport  Add Traffic options and Improve Traffic flows *
Better Housing  Housing and community service opportunities *
Better work Life balance  Development of the precinct to address community needs and priorities

Click here → EAST VILLAGE MASTER PLAN NSW

Best place to live in
Make Bentleigh East the Number One premium suburb!
How to achieve the Vision?

Engage the community
Engage the Federal Government
Engage Local and International Investors
Engage Research Institutes and The Chief scientist
Engage professionals and experts to make it happen
Engage at least one first world class Technology Organization

Encourage startups entrepreneurs young technology companies to operate and to BE in East Village

Provide Framework and Services to support INNOVATION

Provide Framework and Services to support INNOVATION
One stop shop innovation center to include all under one roof
Employment Hub
High-tech Industrial park and technology greenhouse
International Convention and Congress Centre
Governments offices chief scientist
Commerce law and legal firms
Training and Professional education
Travel and logistics services
Financial and accounting services
ICT Engineering Design and planning services
Commerce business development and Marketing
Retail shops restaurants and cafes
Sport and leisure facilities
Easy clean Transportation
Local and International Technology parks

*Click here* → ISCAR Kfar Vradim **ISRAEL**

*Click here* → Tefen Industrial Park and the Open Museum

The Industrial Parks are, in effect, incubators for the development of young and established industries. The primary goal of the Parks is to support and encourage the development of business ideas and initiatives, geared towards innovation and technology.

---

**Technology parks around the world**

- **Technology Park Bentley WA** - West Australia
- **China’s high-tech innovation industry** - China
- **Singapore Science Park** - Singapore
- **Matam Park** - Israel
- **Norway’s Cancer Innovation Park** - Norway
- **Docklands Innovation** - Ireland
- **Kanagawa Science Park** - Japan
“Everything begins with an idea” Earl Nightingale

Science Museum Along green areas

Interactive Garden, Skateboarding plaza

Booran Reserve

Free LI-WI (New wi fi) Zone, Bluetooth MUSIC and information points

Aged care and schools to establish Mutual Young and Senior programs

Local Radio\TV station

Fruit and vegetables garden, Indoor Vertical garden, roof top gardens, recycle rain and wastewater, generate solar power to sell electricity back to the grid

Click here \ Extend Duncan McKinnon reserve over North Road and Get traffic under or over

Create a continues green corridor by connecting Packer park, Duncan McKinnon Reserve, Marlborough Street Reserve, Virginia park and Bailey Reserve
Traffic -- Traffic -- Traffic

Engage VPA -- VICROADS -- GE council -- DPC -- Traffic and infrastructure authorities

- Shuttle bus on North road towards Ormond, Gardenvale, Murrumbeena and Carnegie stations.
- Autonomous vehicles / buses (Long term)
- Encourage carpooling by giving benefits to drivers and passengers.
- Provide underground parking under east village site.
- Provide direct access to underground parking from main gateways
- Connect Frankston line and Pakenham line by Light Rail transit (LRT) along Murrumbeena Rd - East Boundary Road - Rowans Road.

What else we want to see in the precinct

- Second McKinnon secondary campus
- More options for after school activities and Education support services
- Music and Art Centre Conservatorium Centre
- Supermarket restaurants and specialized retail shops
- Underground parking
- Train or Tram station and Shuttle Buses
- More options for night life such as Cinemas Theater, Culture Centre, Dance studio, multimedia studio
- Community Centre to provide place to segments with unique needs
- Teenagers and Youth faculties
- Closed off leash dog park and theme shop
- Circular path for jogging, walking or cycling along the connected parks
SUBMISSION 20: PETITION WITH 123 SIGNATURES

To Whom It May Concern

We are writing this letter with regard to the proposal of Virginia park rezoning plan. As our elected local councillor for Tucker Ward, we wish that you could represent all of the residents signed on this letter and pass on our proposal to the decision maker of Virginia Park / East Bentleigh Village redevelopment project.

WHAT WE DO NOT WANT:

1. **Worsen local traffic congestion.**

   The proposal concentrate on providing a revamped business park with multiple housing and significantly increment of local population. This will worsen the already overloaded traffic. Current traffic flow of North Road, East Boundary Rd and Murrabeena Rd have reach its maximum capacity. Any plan to add regular or permanent resident will cause peak time traffic chaos.

2. **Another new secondary school.**

   There is no need for a new secondary school in this area. There are four state high schools and a few independent and private schools in the areas. Most of schools haven’t reach their capacity yet. There are mature transport networks for students to reach to these schools. Use these resources wisely! New secondary school is not needed in this small village! School causes significant traffic during two peak times and potential safety concerns for problem the commuters on these busy roads. Even the newly built childcare center on Bentleigh East had caused multiple traffic accidents, it is extremely dangerous for students to go to school built on a busy road during peak hours.

   Please don’t put our children in danger.

   As per our discussion with hundreds of locals signed here, most of them thought the plan would include a new campus of McKinnon secondary college. Would that eventually happen? What if there is no new campus? Please note no one would like to send their kids to a new school without any reputation.

3. **Less business, less work opportunities.**

   Rezoning will cause local residents to lose their opportunities to work locally. Why can’t we keep something for our future generation?

   There are several businesses currently operating as usual in Virginia Park, I know that there are local people who work there. What will happen to them after rezoning? Shouldn’t we encourage people to work closely to their homes to provide more efficiently work hours? Please also consider the future employment opportunities for our children. A sustainable business is the basis of a community development. The last piece of land in this area for commercial industrial/business is about to turn into a housing jungle. Do we really want that happen?

   On the contrary, keep this area for commercial use only will create more job opportunities for the local community.
4. **Overpopulated community**

According to the newly published "Activity Centres Snapshot", this area is already overpopulated. We don’t want to live in the jungle of residential properties. We need to correctly plan and use this commercial site to serve locals better.

As seen in the "activity centres snapshot comparative measurement" published on February 2017, the so called "East village": There is a 0.98% land use for commercial, while the population is 6909. Based on the 2011 census data, We are overcrowded already. Look at the population in this area now. Look at how many new subdivisions are in this area! We don’t need any new residential properties built in this area. We are longing for a better commercial/ business side to serve locals better.

**What we expect in the East village:**

1. A new shopping district / supermarket so the current Bentleigh East residents don’t need to drive to Bentleigh or Carnegie to shop for a bottle of milk or a loaf.
2. A community hub. The facility can be shared by locals, local primary and secondary schools. Especially for McKinnon Secondary College, a sport center is required for school sport.
3. More companies , business, more job opportunities.
4. Retirement village / Age care.
5. Local medical Service – Children, Elderly, Emergency and etc.

Please provide more transparency on the plan progression and status. Every household in the area should be clearly informed if this plan goes ahead and of how it will affect their livelihood.

Only few of us have attended a community meeting for the so called "East Village" which is actually Virginia Park on 24 May 2017. There are still a lot of us who did not attend the community meeting, because some of us don’t know what the "East Village" is really about? The meeting minutes published online is actually not very accurate.

Thank you for taking your time to read this email. Please forward this to any relevant departments or persons. More importantly, I wish that you could vote "NO" to the rezoning proposal. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Kind Regards,

Please see attached signature from our local residents to support our proposal states here.
Dear planner:

this is regarding the development of east village. I currently am working in overseas so I could not attend the community session yesterday.

I have to object to the development.

Shopping centre:
I believe it is not possible to have a Coles/Woolworths supermarket, though many people may like them to come. other small chain, like IGA are very expensive, and there is already one on the corner of Centre Rd/ E Boundary Rd. small grocery shops are too hard to survive, 2 minutes drive to north or south, there are already existing shops. I live on east boundary for years, and I usually go to Oakleigh/Chadstone, two shopping centre are very well developed, many shops and restaurants, easy for people to meet and stay. otherwise I go Bentleigh, not far at all. there is no buses/train on E Boundary Rd.

New School:
new is school is good idea, however, if it is not a migration of McKinnon SC, then I can’t support the idea, we want good school, not new school. it take years to build that reputation. I have spend all my savings to live in the school zone, that zoning means my kid’s future. can’t agree with re-zoning McKinnon SC zone? unless it is the same school, same teacher, same principal. we have already so many townhouses and various developments in the area, and parking is already big issue in the area. big apartment is not acceptable to me. it is not necessary, developers only care about sales income, not the load on the community and infrastructure.

So leave it as it is:
i use the pool gym in virginia park, my kids go to train martial arts and play at kids place. we like it as it. affordable. we don’t need underground parking in the suburb. if government want to create jobs and help business, i think building a better business park, a workplace and attract more people work on the site is much better direction. office building and industrial site is ok. more jobs is asset, more resident is a debt.

Regards
Submission to the Glen Eira Community Plan and Activity Centre, Housing and Local Economy Strategic Review, made on behalf of the Caulfield Community by the Caulfield Community.

Glen Eira Council has emphasized, correctly in our opinion, that Community Consultation is the successful path to good governance, and it is currently preparing a 2017-2023 Community Plan. The Caulfield Commerce Association, by organizing a forum to discuss the future of its area, supported this premise and on 24 April some 50 concerned residents, tenants and property owners were introduced to Council’s CEO, Ms. Rebecca McKenzie. She discussed the Community Plan, and the introduction of a City Futures Department whose officers are undertaking, for the first time in Glen Eira, a comprehensive Structure Plan. Following expressions of concern she offered to “look beyond the city’s five major activity centres” to other areas, and to Caulfield in particular as being particularly suitable for higher density commercial development.

This concern is the focus of our submission.

At the forum participants expressed anxiety that Caulfield was treated as ‘second rate’. It is rated in “Vision – 2031” as “no change”, while Glen Huntly, Caulfield Station, East Village and Moorabbin are quietly elevated in status. We draw your attention to Caulfield’s ranking as having the fifth greatest area of floor space dedicated to retail – refer to Council’s “Activity Centres Snapshot” page 6.

We believe we deserve Activity Centre status.

Over the past thirty years we have watched as Council invested time and money in Elsternwick, and ignored Caulfield. Last month Council debated support for Elsternwick’s traders during redevelopment of their supermarket, including parking and a rate levy to help promote the centre. Caulfield’s request for a special rate scheme was rejected thirty years ago. Since then all four banks have closed, along with two newsagents and two greengrocers - only to be replaced by a plethora of cafes and restaurants – and empty spaces.

Caulfield recently lost an opportunity for a supermarket whereas two are presently on the drawing board for Elsternwick. We are fortunate to have retained ‘anchors’ such as the primary Post Office, the Caulfield Primary School, Penhalluriack’s and quality pharmacies, but Caulfield also has many large sites just waiting to be developed. We don’t want to see our ‘anchors’ close just to be replaced with three-level apartments – those “little boxes made of ticky-tacky” that Pete Seegers’ warned us about back in 1963.

We would like to see new buildings that accommodate people at work. This would encourage “shop local” and eliminate the need for our dormitory community to travel to Elsternwick or Glen Huntly.

Over many years locals have invested emotionally and financially in this area. They have made long-term investments in homes for their families, and created life-styles and employment in shops and offices. Many feel bitterly disappointed.
Caulfield has many significant consolidated land-holdings in excess of 2,000m². We would like to see a planning scheme that rewards larger sites, and encourages discretionary (not mandatory) development. This will return real benefit to the community – and that is also what our community wants.

We do not like playing second fiddle to Elsternwick and Glen Huntly, and we strongly recommend that council’s planners takes a holistic view, and zone our two tram-lines as longitudinal business zones, with emphasis placed not just on housing but on facilities that ‘both serve and service the local community’.

Caulfield has an important tram-junction that provides north-south access along Hawthorn Road and which has exciting potential to develop commercially, providing employment opportunities and encouraging local businesses to provide for the needs of residents living in the many new apartments in our area.

We also have excellent public transport and infrastructure, but have somehow been left adrift in the middle section of Glen Huntly Road, between the two railways.

We would like to nominate a member of the [insert name] to represent our community on any Committee, and to be actively involved in the strategic planning and future development of this as a commercial area.

Finally, you will notice we have used the name Caulfield throughout this submission. We feel this better reflects the community that we represent and for whom we speak. Melway indicates that Caulfield covers both the north and south sides of Glen Huntly Road, from Kooyong Road in the west to Grange and Booran Roads in the east, and as far north as the Town Hall on Glen Eira Road.

For your kind consideration please,

12th June 2017
Although a “brown field” site, to ensure future development results in a sustainable, socially and economically viable community that enhances the surrounding area, the site should be viewed as “green field”. Vehicular and pedestrian access to the site and the site’s facilities, are key to determining the viability of the redevelopment. The creation of precincts (i.e. designated areas within the site that provide various community oriented facilities or business focuses) is good, however, determining the location and heights/densities of precincts based on the site’s existing internal road network may not result in a desired community outcome.

requests that the following points be considered

Building Heights/Densities – ranging from 2 to a “core height” of 8 stories.

Refer to below illustration (previously presented in November, 2016 presentation) for clarification on indicative heights/densities.

Core of Village to comprise
Retail and Commercial areas, including shops and stores as per planning definitions (GE Planning Scheme – Clause 72). To become a centrally located, vibrant village hub.

Public transport connections
Open Space provisions (i.e. communal areas and playground)
Potential location for Retirement Village

Buildings
All buildings above 2 stories to have graduated setbacks to reduce building dominance
All residences to have private open space (e.g. courtyard at ground level, balconies at higher levels).
Density levels defined and applied to site.
Diversity of housing types (townhouses vs. apartments) and sizes (1,2, 3 bdr). Ratio specifying no. of 3 bdr to 1 & 2 bdr dwelling defined and applied.
Mandatory requirement for inclusion of social housing.
ResCode parking requirements applicable across site (no waivers granted)
Below ground basement car park areas not to exceed above ground building envelope
Precincts/Areas differentiated by architectural variations and landscaping.
Proposed bus route
Road accommodating bus route to accommodate bus stops without impacting traffic (vehicle and cyclist) flow.
Road network
Vehicle movements to/from site impact on existing traffic congestion in North and Boundary Roads to be minimized.
To include free, time restricted on/off street parking provisions
Possible inclusion of paid off street parking
Pedestrian connectivity
Safe pedestrian connectivity between all precincts/facilities and adjoining parkland (Marlboro Reserve and Virginia Park)
If shared pedestrian vehicular connectivity, separation between vehicles and pedestrians provided (e.g. kerbing, bollards)
Proposed School
Provision of vehicle drop off/pick up points
Proximity to public transport to be considered
Height limits (consistent with surrounding precincts/areas) to be defined and applied if proposed school does not eventuate
Proposed Retirement Village
One on-site car park provided for each unit, on-site visitor parking to be provided
Height limits (consistent with surrounding precincts/areas) to be defined and applied if proposed retirement village does not eventuate
Possible location in “core” precinct/area to be considered
Vegetation
Mature canopy trees to be planted in ground (not above ground planter boxes) – refer requirement for below ground basement car parks not to exceed above ground building envelope
Open Space
Given the magnitude of the site, medium density development will generate a substantial increase in the demand for, and usage of, surrounding parkland. The proposed Open Space Levy of 6% (being marginally higher than that charged for smaller developments – 5.7%), is felt to be inadequate to meet the open space needs of the future residents. A more appropriate levy would be 8-10%.
Within the site, open space (grassed areas and playgrounds) to be provided in accordance with forecast demographics
From: [REDACTED]  
Date: 6 July 2017 at 3:53:32 pm AEST  
To: <amullen@gleneira.vic.gov.au>  
Subject: City future development  
Dear Aiden  

I have just received an email from the President of the Caulfield Commerce Association.  

He, and nearly all the traders of the South Caulfield Shopping Centre believe that our centre and the businesses that we operate within the centre are under threat.  

Our shopping centre is the 4th largest in the City of Glen Eira has been designated as a fallen down structure ie NOT WORTHY OF COUNCIL’S FUTURE ATTENTION. It has been declared as an area of NO CHANGE  

Apparently this is a conclusion reached by council after community consultation. As a rate payer of several properties within the City of Glen Eira I have not been consulted at all. Therefore I am not sure what consultative process you have undertaken. Secondly as a business owner I find your conclusions that our shopping centre which has been designated as a “fallen down structure” and not worthy of council attention to be reprehensible and very short sighted.  

We are part of the city that YOU work for and I would expect that the COUNCIL and its COUNSELLORS work for all the inhabitants and rate payers of the City of GLEN EIRA rather than some at the expense of others  

IF you consider our shopping centre to be fallen down WHY should we continue to pay rates and taxes.  

I am sure that I speak for the vast majority of rate payers that they would want their rates to be spent on their area of investment  

Once again I think this pending decision is intolerable and I will do the utmost in my power to try to get the COUNCIL to do the MORALLY RIGHT thing and invest in our shopping centre as well.  

Your course of action has the potential to send many good people down the path of ruin  

Yours  

[REDACTED]  

I would appreciate a call so that we can discuss this very important matter
An important message from [redacted]

Dear Neighbour,

Council has plans to downgrade what can be built in our area, and concentrate development in Elsternwick, Glen Huntly, Carnegie and around Caulfield Station. (The proposed Virginia Estate and the Caulfield Station/Phoenix/Monash University and the Melbourne Racing Club’s development north of Station Street will together contain thousands of new multi-story dwellings.)

As a ratepayer (landowner or tenant) of the Caulfield/Caulfield South area it is in your interest to demand that your Council actively encourages significant development of our strip.

[redacted] made a submission through a public meeting on 24 April when speakers requested equal status with Elsternwick and Glen Huntly. Despite attendance by Members of Parliament, Councillors and Council Officers [redacted] has not translated into action. Subsequently the [redacted] made a formal submission, which is attached.

We suggest, since you are part of the Glen Huntly Road axis, that you make your personal feelings known by ringing or writing to:
Ms Rebecca McKenzie,
CEO, City of Glen Eira,
r.mckenzie@gleneira.vic.gov.au
9524 3333
P.O. Box 42,
Caulfield South 3162.


To view the full strategy visit: www.gleneira.vic.gov.au/planningforthefuture

A table showing the proposed ranking of Glen Eira’s commercial districts is shown on page 2. That table says it all ... Caulfield South “NO CHANGE”! Sorry Councillors/Council Officers, that’s just not good enough.

3 July 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Current policy status</th>
<th>Reason for proposed change in policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caulfield Station Park</td>
<td>Phoenix precinct</td>
<td>Updated position with stronger focus on job and education growth anchored off university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed activity centre type — health, education and innovation precinct with urban renewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Village</td>
<td>Affected by Minimal Change Area Policy</td>
<td>Updated position to realise the needs of future smart industry, within a mixed precinct of jobs, housing and retail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>though nominated as an employment hub within Council's Municipal Strategic Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed activity centre type — emerging health, education and innovation precinct with urban renewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>Urban village</td>
<td>Due to its proximity to Dandenong Road, there are greater opportunities for housing and job growth through urban renewal along Dandenong Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed activity centre type — major activity centre with urban renewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ettamogah</td>
<td>Urban village</td>
<td>Due to its proximity to Nepean Highway, there are greater opportunities for housing and job growth through urban renewal along Nepean Highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed activity centre type — emerging major activity centre with urban renewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorabbin Junction</td>
<td>Neighbourhood centre</td>
<td>Recognising the role of the entire centre of Moorabbin Junction which is shared with Glen Eira, Kingston and Bayside. Due to its proximity to Nepean Highway and South Road, there are greater opportunities for housing and job growth through urban renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed activity centre type — major activity centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentleigh</td>
<td>Urban village</td>
<td>Due to its suburban residential context, there is less opportunity for housing and job growth through urban renewal than other major activity centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed activity centre type — emerging major activity centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Huntly</td>
<td>Neighbourhood centre</td>
<td>A large centre with an existing supermarket, on a train and tram link. The centre has an existing dense population catchment, and opportunity for further growth through exploration of underutilised land and a potential future grade separation project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed activity centre type — neighbourhood centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma Village</td>
<td>Neighbourhood centre</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentleigh East</td>
<td>Neighbourhood centre</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caulfield Park</td>
<td>Neighbourhood centre</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caulfield South</td>
<td>Neighbourhood centre</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardenvale</td>
<td>Local centre</td>
<td>Recognising the role of the entire centre of Gardenvale, which is located in both Glen Eira and Bayside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murrumbeena</td>
<td>Neighbourhood centre</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montefiore</td>
<td>Neighbourhood centre</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash</td>
<td>Neighbourhood centre</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormond</td>
<td>Neighbourhood centre</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td>Local centre</td>
<td>Recognising that Patterson has a community supermarket, and train station, serving the needs of its local neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupertsdale</td>
<td>Local centre</td>
<td>Recognising the role of the entire centre of Rupertsdale, which is located in both Glen Eira and Port Philip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed activity centre type — commercially zoned land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakleigh South</td>
<td>Emerging neighbourhood centre</td>
<td>Needs further exploration to better understand the potential of the centre to work with the Monash side to become a neighbourhood centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submission to the Glen Eira Community Plan and Activity Centre, Housing and Local Economy Strategic Review, made on behalf of the Caulfield Community by [Name].

Glen Eira Council has emphasized, correctly in our opinion, that Community Consultation is the successful path to good governance, and it is currently preparing a 2017-2023 Community Plan. The Caulfield Community, by organizing a forum to discuss the future of its area, supported this premise and on 24 April some 50 concerned residents, tenants and property owners were introduced to Council’s CEO, Ms. Rebecca McKenzie. She discussed the Community Plan, and the introduction of a City Futures Department whose officers are undertaking, for the first time in Glen Eira, a comprehensive Structure Plan. Following expressions of concern she offered to “look beyond the city’s five major activity centres” to other areas, and to Caulfield in particular as being particularly suitable for higher density commercial development.

This concern is the focus of our submission.

At the forum participants expressed anxiety that Caulfield was treated as ‘second rate’. It is rated in “Vision – 2031” as “no change”, while Glen Huntly, Caulfield Station, East Village and Moorabbin are quietly elevated in status. We draw your attention to Caulfield’s ranking as having the fifth greatest area of floor space dedicated to retail – refer to Council’s “Activity Centres Snapshot” page 6.

We believe we deserve Activity Centre status.

Over the past thirty years we have watched as Council invested time and money in Elsternwick, and ignored Caulfield. Last month Council debated support for Elsternwick’s traders during redevelopment of their supermarket, including parking and a rate levy to help promote the centre. Caulfield’s request for a special rate scheme was rejected thirty years ago. Since then all four banks have closed, along with two newsagents and two greengrocers - only to be replaced by a plethora of cafes and restaurants – and empty spaces.

Caulfield recently lost an opportunity for a supermarket whereas two are presently on the drawing board for Elsternwick. We are fortunate to have retained ‘anchors’ such as the primary Post Office, the Caulfield Primary School, Penhalluriack’s and quality pharmacies, but Caulfield also has many large sites just waiting to be developed. We don’t want to see our ‘anchors’ close just to be replaced with three-level apartments – those “little boxes made of ticky-tacky” https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n-sQSp5jbbSQ that Pete Seegers’ warned us about back in 1963.

We would like to see new buildings that accommodate people at work. This would encourage “shop local” and eliminate the need for our dormitory community to travel to Elsternwick or Glen Huntly.

Over many years locals have invested emotionally and financially in this area. They have made long-term investments in homes for their families, and created life-styles and employment in shops and offices. Many feel bitterly disappointed.

Caulfield has many significant consolidated land-holdings in excess of 2,000m2. We would like to see a planning scheme that rewards larger sites, and encourages discretionary (not mandatory)
development. This will return real benefit to the community – and that is also what our community wants.

We do not like playing second fiddle to Elsternwick and Glen Huntly, and we strongly recommend that council’s planners takes a holistic view, and zone our two tram-lines as longitudinal business zones, with emphasis placed not just on housing but on facilities that ‘both serve and service the local community”.

Caulfield has an important tram-junction that provides north-south access along Hawthorn Road and which has exciting potential to develop commercially, providing employment opportunities and encouraging local businesses to provide for the needs of residents living in the many new apartments in our area.

We also have excellent public transport and infrastructure, but have somehow been left adrift in the middle section of Glen Huntly Road, between the two railways.

We would like to nominate a member of the [REDACTED] to represent our community on any Committee, and to be actively involved in the strategic planning and future development of this as a commercial area.

Finally, you will notice we have used the name Caulfield throughout this submission. We feel this better reflects the community that we represent and for whom we speak. Melway indicates that Caulfield covers both the north and south sides of Glen Huntly Road, from Kooyong Road in the west to Grange and Booran Roads in the east, and as far north as the Town Hall on Glen Eira Road.

For your kind consideration please,

12th June 2017
Dear Aidan,

Please see attached submission to the Activity Centre Strategy.

Kind regards,

SUBMISSION 26

From: [Redacted]
Date: 7 July 2017 at 10:50:39 am AEST
To: "Aidan Mullen (AMullen@gleneira.vic.gov.au)" <AMullen@gleneira.vic.gov.au>,
"mail@gleneira.vic.gov.au" <mail@gleneira.vic.gov.au>
Cc: 
Subject: Glen Eira Activity Centre, Housing and Local Economy Strategy Review

Dear Aidan,

Please see attached submission to the Activity Centre Strategy.

Kind regards,
7 July 2017

Aidan Mullen
Manager City Futures
City of Glen Eira
PO Box 42
Caulfield South VIC 3162

via: AMullen@glen.eira.vic.gov.au

Dear Aidan,

Glen Eira - Planning for the Future
Activity Centre, Housing and Local Economy Strategy

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this submission, which has been prepared:

As Council is aware, our client has acquired a number of adjoining lots, and has assembled a site of over 6,500sqm that represents the largest development opportunity site within the centre.

Council has prepared a draft Activity Centre, Housing and Local Economy Strategy. Our client shares a number of concerns with the Strategy in its current form.

In particular:

- The Strategy lacks vision for the economic growth of smaller order activity centres within the municipality. The “no-change” designation for “South Caulfield” is opposed because it does not allow the centre to grow and unreasonably prejudices the commercial viability of the centre in favour of the nominated larger centres.
- The Strategy proposes limitations on the type and quantum of retail development within the centre. We do not believe these limitations are soundly based, and their introduction will be detrimental to the commercial viability of this centre.

We request the opportunity to elaborate on this submission through any further public consultation or process.

Yours sincerely,