

**03 May 2016 – Special Council Meeting: Amendment C125**

The Special Meeting of Council was held in the Council Chambers (293 Springvale Rd, Glen Waverley) on Tuesday 3 May 2016, at 6.30pm.

This meeting was for Council to hear verbal submissions from the community about proposed changes to Monash’s residential zones (Amendment C125).

The following is a summary of the verbal submissions made on the night.

**List of Speakers and Summary of Comments**

	<b>Name &amp; Comments Summary</b>
1.	<p><b>Rosemary Burke</b></p> <p>Very disappointed that C125 has been watered down, there are too many grey areas, the garden city is being lost:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be side setbacks</li> <li>• Increase rear setbacks &amp; private open space</li> <li>• Why reduce canopy trees</li> <li>• A 1 metre rear setback not enough for trees and gardens between houses</li> </ul>
2.	<p><b>Joanna Daves (Kathy &amp; Dealno Schokman)</b></p> <p>Land affected by the Neighbourhood Residential Zone (NRZ) 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose 6-7 metre setback rule, why was it abolished in other zones but not NRZ3</li> <li>• Why 6 or 7 metre rear setback but 1 metre elsewhere</li> <li>• I have a 600m<sup>2</sup> lot and want to build two 4 bedroom homes</li> <li>• Smaller properties will reduce in value</li> <li>• Recommend 3 metre rear setback</li> </ul>
3.	<p><b>Fiona Wright (Tabled a package of 192 pro-forma submissions)</b></p> <p>Support overall objective of C125 – too much garden space is being lost in new development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C125 is too complex</li> <li>• Tired of 2 storey buildings</li> <li>• Allow moderate gardens &amp; 3m setbacks</li> <li>• Keep excluding balconies and roof tops as private open space</li> <li>• There should be a minimum lot size</li> <li>• There was a very distorted view from the OurSay forum – it was just a few hundred people with self interest</li> <li>• City of Bayside has a 400m<sup>2</sup> minimum lot size – 75m<sup>2</sup> – and has clearly refined &amp; restrained development</li> <li>• Development should be made to meet new regulation ASAP</li> </ul>

4.	<p><b>Ken Crinland</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports reduction of building site coverage to 50% or less</li> <li>• There has been a rise in apartments around the Glen Waverley Activity Centre</li> <li>• Street parking is an issue on Fraser &amp; Vermont Streets caused by too many units</li> <li>• What can be done to make sure cars park on their own property</li> <li>• Parking at Glen Waverley is poor</li> <li>• Does Council have any solutions to parking areas?</li> </ul>
5.	<p><b>Renne Lu</b></p> <p>I live in Ashwood when I moved here it had quiet streets, single dwelling family homes, canopy trees - apartments were being built elsewhere</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Now it is a development zone with trucks, mud, concrete, rocks &amp; makeshift fencing</li> <li>• Semi destruction of our street</li> <li>• We thought it would only be Dual Occupancies and two storey townhouses</li> <li>• Now we get five 2 storey townhouses on a block</li> <li>• We are losing all canopy trees</li> <li>• Our neighbourhood is being destroyed</li> <li>• Developers are greedy and don't live here</li> </ul>
6.	<p><b>Bill Ramsay</b></p> <p>Generally in favour of amendment but objects to NRZ2 &amp; 3 setbacks and rear setbacks in NRZ4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about irregular lots</li> <li>• Suggested rear setbacks of 2 metres</li> <li>• In-principle changes are not the middle ground for NRZ2 &amp; 3</li> <li>• NRZ2 &amp; 3 is being treated differently to General Residential Zone (GRZ) 3&amp; 4</li> <li>• 6 metres in NRZ3 is an unreasonable imposition</li> <li>• Report and consent process to vary setbacks is an expensive and uncertain</li> <li>• My property has no direct link to the creek then why the setback in the NRZ3</li> <li>• Greening objective will be met regardless of setbacks</li> </ul>
7.	<p><b>Michael Partoglou on behalf of Sid Jager (Designer - Rokk Homes Pty Ltd)</b></p> <p>Objects to the 50m<sup>2</sup> minimum private open space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As it will result in bad design</li> <li>• Suggest rear unit with minimum 5m width and &amp; 50m<sup>2</sup> minimum parcel</li> <li>• Front unit open space should be reduced to 40m<sup>2</sup> in one parcel</li> <li>• (handed in a proposed design that shows the above)</li> </ul>
8.	<p><b>John Le Marchant</b></p> <p>Objects to C125</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We live in a democracy, let people decide what we want, there should be no planning controls</li> <li>• 'Garden City' is a ploy to restrict us &amp; twist our necks</li> <li>• Amendment should go to election in 2/3 months</li> </ul>

9.	<p><b>Barry Esmore</b></p> <p>People who want garden character should put a perpetual caveat, a permanent restriction on their property to meet the planning controls or other garden character objectives of C125.</p>
10.	<p><b>Matt Ryan</b></p> <p>Consultant for apartment proposal at 321 &amp; 427 Huntingdale Road but submission is general</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like many Councils the Monash Housing Strategy is flawed</li> <li>• SGS capacity report is flawed</li> <li>• Need lesser not greater standards to keep housing affordable</li> <li>• Need an affordable housing option</li> <li>• Not enough growth areas proposed in Monash: growth areas are only <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Two main roads</li> <li>○ Clayton</li> <li>○ Activity Centres</li> <li>○ Accessible areas</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Apartment development elsewhere in Monash</li> <li>• Guidelines require flexibility – let the market establish the rules</li> </ul>
11.	<p><b>David Crowder – Ratio Planning Consultants</b></p> <p>Congratulation to Council for approach, the in-principle position is welcomed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is misguided to assume that density will protect garden character</li> <li>• Reducing density will result in bigger houses</li> <li>• There are other tools for garden city character – setbacks and other elements of the schedule</li> <li>• No provision in C125 for Boulevards as per the Monash Housing Strategy</li> <li>• I have prepared a draft schedule for main roads as a standard schedule</li> <li>• To achieve garden character you could have more onerous standards rather in the General Residential zone rather than simply limit development to two dwellings by using the Neighbourhood Residential Zone</li> <li>• Neighbourhood Residential zone should only be about 100m from the creek</li> </ul>
12.	<p><b>Ching Shao</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population is growing</li> <li>• We should share our resources</li> <li>• We need higher density to sustain the economy</li> <li>• There should be no setbacks</li> <li>• Open space doesn't have a place in development – it will encourage urban sprawl</li> <li>• More people want to live in Monash, there is no future for gardens</li> <li>• If we keep gardens there will be less people living in Monash</li> </ul>
13.	<p><b>Murray Nicholas</b></p> <p>Good job with what went to Council meeting March 29 but bad job with what came out</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bulldozers are destroying everything</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are seeing wall to wall development</li> <li>• I don't have a problem with high density in appropriate locations</li> <li>• 2 to 3 storeys are OK in appropriate locations</li> <li>• OurSay website had outrageous statements such as trees will poison us with carbon dioxide</li> <li>• NRZ4 protects the Dandenong Creek from overdevelopment</li> <li>• Council has heard from friends groups about the importance of the escarpment</li> <li>• Overdevelopment means that when it rains gardens and paths wash away</li> <li>• NRZ4 boundary should be defined by the escarpment not some other arbitrary thing</li> <li>• Planning schemes are also about drainage</li> <li>• Council will be sued for drainage problems created by high site coverage</li> <li>• NRZ4 is not much different from GRZ4 so why change it?</li> </ul>
14.	<p><b>Lynnette Saloumi on behalf of Monash Ratepayers</b></p> <p>Specific objection to Cr Lake's change from Neighbourhood Residential Zone 4 to General Residential Zone 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports NRZ4 as exhibited</li> <li>• Narrow streets can't cope with school traffic that feed into local facilities – there are major delays on Springvale Road</li> <li>• Springvale Rd 3<sup>rd</sup> worst for accidents</li> <li>• Glen Waverley will have unsustainable traffic levels</li> <li>• The garden character is being lost</li> <li>• The in-principle position is a sad reflection on Councillors development first attitude</li> <li>• Council needs an environmental science officer</li> <li>• Why should residents accept what Cr Lake says as he doesn't live here</li> <li>• Cr Lake declined an invite to walk through the area</li> <li>• There is a lack of acknowledgement of character of the area</li> <li>• There is too much residential development</li> <li>• The escarpment area should remain NRZ4</li> <li>• Why are Councillors making technical planning decisions about zone boundaries and standards – it's like a lawyer doing a heart operation</li> </ul>
15.	<p><b>Jo Lucas</b></p> <p>Empathise with Councillors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why limit development in the School zone</li> <li>• Council could get a class action for changing standards</li> <li>• Don't like canopy trees</li> <li>• Trend towards smaller capacity housing</li> <li>• There should be special treatment for 'Mum &amp; Dad' Developers</li> <li>• Don't take a blanket approach</li> <li>• Amendment contradicts housing strategy</li> <li>• Clay soil should not have to be planted with trees</li> <li>• I want to cut trees when I want</li> <li>• Gum trees in the street have been hacked by schmucks</li> <li>• Put trees in parks not in backyards</li> <li>• Put power underground – need a 5 year plan for underground power</li> <li>• Let people choose how they live</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possums should be culled – they are a pain</li> <li>• Stop encroaching on people’s rights</li> </ul>
16.	<p><b>Gayle Nicholas</b></p> <p>Creek Escarpment is defined by topography and the Melbourne Water (MW) escarpment definition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cr Lake proposed to reduce the NRZ4</li> <li>• Water is flooding through quickly as the area is steep and increasing in development density</li> <li>• Extra storm water pits installed – Campbell Street floods – backwash runs through houses</li> <li>• MW escarpment includes The Glen Shopping Centre &amp; Mountain View Hotel</li> <li>• Trees are needed to soak water</li> <li>• There has been a loss &amp; destruction of trees over the years</li> <li>• Don’t agree with the removal of 5m rear setback</li> <li>• Need to deal with the greater good not just what an individual wants to do with a property</li> <li>• Use permeable ground treatment not concrete even on driveway</li> <li>• Urge you not to reduce the NRZ4</li> <li>• Perhaps some more planting in parks would also help</li> </ul>
17.	<p><b>Anna Earl</b></p> <p>I agree with Gayle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owners have knocked down trees in Campbell Street</li> <li>• There are a few islands of green left</li> <li>• Appalled by Council’s conduct watering down the amendment from the exhibited version</li> <li>• We received the elaborate NRZ brochure last year, which we were happy with, now, because of the changes we have been deceived by the process</li> <li>• Council support developers not residents</li> <li>• OurSay was biased by early comments, needed to be able to vote against a topic</li> <li>• No scope to look at family friendly properties – everything is for development</li> <li>• Need to protect environment</li> <li>• Everything is being cleared and Yuccas are planted in the garden (No attention is being paid to Climate Change and Urban Heat Islands)</li> <li>• Like to see low rise apartments with shared gardens</li> <li>• Campbell Street needs protection</li> <li>• No consideration of drainage</li> <li>• Reconsider the in-principle position and reinstate the original proposed protections</li> </ul>
18.	<p><b>Ann Earl</b></p> <p>Not against development but against bad development due to the removal of NRZ4 to GRZ4 change made by Cr Lake and Cr Klisaris</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much concrete and loss of vegetation</li> <li>• Flood overlay</li> <li>• Loss of large blocks, how does knocking down a house and building one large house increase dwellings in the area</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wild life in Australia is unique and provides jobs</li> <li>• If we destroy the wildlife we'll kill jobs</li> </ul>
19.	<p><b>Christina Drummond</b></p> <p>Opposes changes to the NRZ4 – loss of trees, 50% has gone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monash Garden City is a now joke</li> <li>• Inappropriate development is appalling</li> <li>• 80 square houses removing trees, concrete everywhere, people park in the streets, trucks everywhere destroying roads &amp; traffic islands, losing trees and gardens</li> <li>• Plastic grass in front yards with no trees</li> <li>• We want the original C125 Amendment provisions</li> <li>• Council should expand NRZ4 area &amp; reinstate the area removed by Cr Lake</li> <li>• On Melbourne Water definitions the escarpment should be extended</li> <li>• Heavy rains in front yard, house flooded (Photographs were shown &amp; Cr Paterson undertook to respond to the drainage issue)</li> </ul>
20.	<p><b>John Clements (Friends of Damper Creek Reserve Inc.)</b></p> <p>Amendment C125 is vital to protect the Creek Environs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Happy with changes to NRZ3 &amp; 2 as they largely retain objectives but concerned about definition of canopy trees</li> <li>• Canopy trees should be bigger than a house &amp; use appropriate species</li> <li>• Council undertaking landscaping strategy which will help with species selection</li> <li>• Reinstate requirement for 3 canopy trees in Amendment</li> <li>• Change to 45% site coverage in NRZ3 is disappointing</li> <li>• Reduction in side setback is a concern as it changes the character of the area</li> <li>• Need space between dwellings</li> <li>• Regret the removal/reduction of the NRZ4 in Glen Waverley</li> <li>• Oppose the removal of the 10% Public Open Space contribution from Clayton – need POS in density areas for health and well-being</li> <li>• Monash does not compare well with other councils for green space/public open space</li> <li>• Housing policy is important, Council should give primacy to the long term vision to maintain garden city character not short term individual gain</li> </ul>
21.	<p><b>Caroline Bayliss</b></p> <p>C125 has been weakened</p> <p>In my opinion, any further compromise on Amendment C125 beyond the long list of compromises outlined above would undermine the purpose and spirit of the proposed Amendment. It would also constitute a massive capitulation by Councillors in implementing its own Housing Strategy.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of removing the rear setbacks originally proposed, taken together with increasing maximum site coverage and reducing the minimum parcel of private open space, greatly dilutes and diminishes the potential of C125 in preserving the “garden city” character of the municipality.</p> <p>Large-scale single occupancy dwellings that denude all existing tree canopy and other</p>

	<p>shrubbery in favour of concrete ground cover and building to the closest distance permitted from the edge of the property boundary (often disparagingly referred to as “McMansions”).</p> <p>Dual occupancy or multi-unit residential dwellings that similarly denude all tree canopy and green spaces in order to provide for maximum residences with driveways, garages and off street parking to each.</p> <p>Whilst I believe that the in-principle position is greatly diminished from the original proposal, I nonetheless believe that it represents a step in the right direction and a chance for Council to leave a lasting planning legacy.</p> <p>Council has a once-in-a-decade opportunity to put in place safeguards that preserve what is left of the well-known and much-valued “garden city” character of our municipality, whilst ensuring planning certainty into the future.</p> <p>Please don’t squander that opportunity.</p>
22.	<p><b>Alan Meagher</b></p> <p>Lived 45 years in Mt Waverley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minister for Planning asked for a report on residential zones – including infrastructure</li> <li>• Major concern is lack of car parking in community hubs – should have user pay for car parking</li> <li>• Each unit should pay for community hubs needs 1000’s of extra car spaces</li> <li>• \$25K for each bedroom to find car parks – development industry can afford it</li> <li>• Foreign investment is squeezing out local investment</li> <li>• Planning applications do not have enough detail on density</li> <li>• Can’t get enough car parking at The Glen</li> <li>• Developers build at less than 50% of selling price, Agents get 2% for nothing</li> <li>• Need to rethink on property development</li> <li>• 213 Billionaires in China, too much foreign investment here</li> </ul>
23.	<p><b>Brenda Mason</b></p> <p>What is it like to live in a fishbowl?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 double storeys units being built – now surrounded by 2 storey development</li> <li>• Council proposals back 50% site coverage</li> <li>• New development 2 dwellings but with higher site coverage</li> <li>• Parking – no enough parking – kids can’t play on roads</li> <li>• Canopy trees are needed in new development</li> <li>• My pool area has been ruined by overlooking from new development</li> <li>• Wants trees to grow to screen POS at 60m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Process of development approval needs change</li> <li>• Monash Council silent on asbestos &amp; 7 day a seek development – working on Saturday and Sunday</li> <li>• Needs accountability in the process</li> <li>• Trees often taken out in contravention of planning permit</li> </ul>

24.	<p><b>Heyshan Mendes</b></p> <p>Capacity numbers are wrong. Officers must be dreaming. Many of the developers I spoke to do not want to buy any properties for dual occupancy development due to C125 uncertainty and they indicated that it is not worth developing to have very small houses where there is less demand and less living space. I am not sure how many stakeholders (residents, developers, HIA etc) being consulted in this report. C125 also failed to address the needs of activity areas such as around railway stations, medium to large shopping/town centres. These areas need to be identified and apply more relaxed residential codes.</p> <p>Canopy tree requirement of C125 is extremely poor public policy that failed to provide clear direction for where the garden character of Monash will be protected and enhanced. It only apply to the dual/multi occupancy development to preserve the garden city character. What about single house development?</p> <p>I also recommend that Council allocate more resources to beautifying and improving the several parks and reserves we have in the Monash city and plant more trees on our nature strips</p> <p>Private open space one parcel requirement increase from 35m2 to 50m2 will have huge negative impact on various developments and restrict or eliminate development potentials. As overall requirement of 75m2 is still same, I will urge council to leave POS requirement as it is with 35m2 of one parcel with total of 75m2.</p> <p>Site coverage limitation of 50% will have huge impact on dual occupancy development and hence cannot meet the projected housing capacity increase. I will propose to leave 60% site coverage for dual/multi house development and limit 55% for single house development.</p>
25.	<p><b>Catherine Mardel</b></p> <p>Thought the original C125 did not go far enough – very disappointed about in-principle changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area is being destroyed, gardens are gone, no frost in Winters, too much concrete</li> <li>• Rarity adds value to property</li> <li>• Rebuilding/redevelopment adds value to builders not residents</li> <li>• Houses are too close and almost touch, neighbouring houses all overlook my yard</li> <li>• Urge Councillors to protect Monash and revert to original Amendment</li> </ul>
26.	<p><b>Gerald Burke (Kirk)</b></p> <p>Very concerned with the changes of the in-principle position</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 5m setback</li> <li>• House at 60% site coverage, 1m off the back fence is not garden character</li> <li>• Houses are not providing diversity – 6 bedrooms, 6 bathrooms, 2 kitchens</li> <li>• Overlooking is constantly happening</li> <li>• Tree canopy lost, blocks are cleared completely</li> <li>• Trees used to be kept now they go before the application is lodged</li> <li>• What is happening with the planning controls?</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All our trees will go when we go from our land</li> <li>• Birds are gone</li> <li>• Garden suburb is going</li> </ul>
27.	<p><b>Norbert Toserus</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I have redeveloped in Blackburn Road, Syndal</li> <li>• Revisiting Amendment C119 undertaking an orderly transition</li> <li>• C125 is contrary to C119 undertaking no strategic planning framework for the balance of Monash</li> <li>• Good examples of development need good landscaping</li> <li>• Would prefer C125 to be adjourned to allow Council to prepare strategic framework for other 11 activity centres before C125 proceeds</li> <li>• C125 is almost unconstitutional – no right to interfere with value of their home</li> <li>• Council has no right to interfere in property rights</li> </ul>
28.	<p><b>Maria</b></p> <p>Disappointed no flexible for small land owners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NR22 &amp; 3 hardest hit</li> <li>• NR23 45% [site coverage] – less rights than other houses in Monash</li> <li>• We are being disadvantaged compared to others in the ward</li> <li>• Changes impact our future</li> <li>• There should be no changes to the zones</li> <li>• Delete the Creek Environs from the proposed changes</li> </ul>
29.	<p><b>Melissa</b></p> <p>The changes are too restrictive in NR22 given all the other properties are multiple dwellings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants to stay in Monash in multi-generational accommodation</li> <li>• Council in 2007/2008 sold Crown land in Monash this land was developed and now is not there</li> <li>• Development boundaries will be restricted in the proposed NR22</li> </ul>
30.	<p><b>Michael Creswick</b></p> <p>I love Glen Waverley and I own my own property</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Look at Australian Standards they are important, Australian way of life</li> <li>• Don't want concrete everywhere</li> <li>• Didn't buy into area to live in Docklands</li> <li>• Side setbacks are needed – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2 storey should be 2.5 metres from the side,</li> <li>○ 1 storey should be 1 metre from the side</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Increased dual occupancy and re-subdivision of lots reduces mobility and increases traffic congestion in street affecting all residents</li> </ul>