

Attachment D

Draft 'Refresh' Frankston Housing Strategy 2017 Submission Summary and Officer Response

<u>Themes</u>	<u>Number of Submissions</u>	<u>Summary of Issues</u>	<u>Officer Response</u>
Draft Housing Strategy Issues	Submitter 1, 2, 11, 17	<p>The Council need to decide on how they control growth, not State Government.</p> <p>The Draft Strategy needs to be consistent with the current SPPF, LPPF & the MSS.</p> <p>The 'new' residential zones were a positive step but flawed. With the Reformed Zones, Council needs to discuss with DELWP on the best approach.</p> <p>The Housing Framework Plan is not considered to present an equitable distribution of the</p>	<p>The reformed zones seek to limit growth in areas where change and intensified built forms are not desirable for various reasons including impacts on neighbourhood and landscape character.</p> <p>The Draft Frankston Housing Strategy has been updated with the current SPPF, LPPF and the MSS. This is to be consistent with the approval of Planning Scheme Amendment C100.</p> <p>The adoption of the Draft Frankston Housing Strategy provides Council with strategic justification for determining the location and application of the reformed residential zones.</p> <p>Council needs to apply the reformed residential zones consistent with guidelines</p>

Attachment D

		<p>future population growth with corresponding increased new housing in the residential areas outside the two major activity centres.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that housing growth is required across Melbourne and that Council, via its Housing Strategy 2017, must meet its obligations in this regard.</p>	<p>developed by DELWP. In order to undertake this, Council has prepared and exhibited the Draft Frankston Housing Strategy as a tool to assist Council in applying the reformed residential zones.</p> <p>The intent of the Draft Frankston Housing Strategy is to ensure that appropriate housing typologies can be provided in the right locations. It has considered changes to household sizes and family composition, household incomes and different housing desires – either to be located close to services and public transport or to have a large property away from major centres.</p>
Housing in Langwarrin	Submitter 2, 5	<p>Concerns regarding Langwarrin's education facilities being at capacity due to infill and high density development around the Langwarrin area which already strains existing traffic volumes. Further consideration should be given to planning for possible</p>	<p>C5 of the Implementation Plan from the Draft Housing Strategy advocates to State Government to attract funding/grants for local housing projects and studies to identify local development constraints. This would include education facilities.</p>

Attachment D

		<p>future school sites.</p> <p>A petition signed by owners of 27 of the 45 properties within a certain area of Langwarrin requesting that Council consider this area for inclusion in the General Residential Zone and removal of the Design and Development Overlay, Schedule 4.</p>	<p>Based on current demographic information and future projections of population growth and housing demand, there will be a demand for an additional 1,406 dwellings in Langwarrin and Langwarrin South over the next 20 years. This figure is able to be accommodated within the current General Residential Zone areas of Langwarrin and Low Density Residential Zone Langwarrin South.</p> <p>Council officers do not support a rezoning of the area specified in Submission 5 due to the above reason and due to the area's close proximity to the Flora & Fauna Reserve. More justification and evidence is needed to support this rezoning proposal. Petition noted.</p> <p>It noted that Submitter 5, on behalf of the 27 landowners is</p>
--	--	---	--

Attachment D

			lodging a request to prepare a Planning Scheme Amendment to Council in the near future.
Housing in Seaford	Submitter 2, 18, 22	<p>Supports the removal of Substantial Change Area from the Seaford station area & supports Substantial Change in the Belvedere Activity Centre.</p> <p>Understands that Council needs to accommodate growth but needs to consider Seaford's neighbourhood character</p> <p>Object to more land being built upon, especially in the vicinity of the Seaford Wetlands where land is also flood prone.</p>	<p>Support is noted.</p> <p>Seaford has access to a range of services (such as the train station) and shops and therefore is considered an appropriate location for a mixture of single dwellings and medium density housing, provided they respond appropriately to the existing neighbourhood character.</p> <p>The land surrounding the wetlands is to remain General Residential Zone with the existing flood overlays in place. Council acknowledges that this area is in need of additional protection. It is therefore recommended that, Council investigates whether there is strategic justification in</p>

Attachment D

		Land bounded by Frankston-Dandenong Rd, The Freeway and Klauer St could provide higher density.	<p>applying a Design and Development Overlay within the Wetlands environs. This would form part of the Implementation Plan.</p> <p>Council notes the suggestion regarding the land bounded by Frankston-Dandenong Road, the Freeway and Klauer Street. Construction of three storey apartment buildings is now permitted within the General Residential Zone. As such, the area in question is now able to support higher density development.</p>
Housing in Carrum Downs	Submitter 2, 3, 8	The Substantial Change Area in the north east part of Belvedere Activity Centre is not supported (Fulmar, Turnstone & Fernwren).	The suggestion that the north east part of Belvedere Activity Centre area should remain as General Residential Zone is noted. This area is part of the walkable catchment of the Belvedere Park shopping centre. The recommendation to rezone the specified area to Residential Growth Zone is therefore considered by Council officers to

Attachment D

		<p>Object to any development which leads to more traffic and Concern over parking and emergency vehicle access as Fulmar Street is the only entry point for any type of vehicle.</p>	<p>be appropriate.</p> <p>All planning proposals impacting on traffic and car parking are assessed against the car parking provisions of the planning scheme. Any concerns regarding traffic and car parking may be reasonably addressed through permit requirements.</p>
Housing in Frankston North	Submitter 2, 4, 6, 24	<p>Support Substantial Change in the south east part of Belvedere Activity Centre. In particular there are substantial opportunities for development along the Frankston-Dandenong Road interface.</p> <p>Council needs to enforce property clean up and restrict the amount of investment property in the area, in particular Frankston North.</p>	<p>Support noted. The area south east of Frankston-Dandenong Road is part of the walkable catchment of the Belvedere Park shopping centre. As such, substantial change in the south east part of Belvedere Activity Centre is considered by Council officers to be appropriate.</p> <p>Council can only enforce the clean-up of property if a complaint is lodged with Council's Local Laws department.</p>
Housing in Karingal	Submitter 2, 7, 15	<p>Substantial Change Area not supported along the Cranbourne Rodd and Peninsula Link</p>	<p>While new development may bring additional traffic, all planning proposals impacting on</p>

Attachment D

		<p>intersection due to the potential for increased traffic and parking congestion at Karingal Hub. Proposal of adding a Commercial zone opposite Karingal Hub on Cranbourne Road is not logical.</p> <p>Substantial Change area connecting the Hub to Ballam Park is supported.</p> <p>Does not support high density development within Karingal or Langwarrin. Future development should remain restricted to three storeys (no substantial change along Cranbourne Road)</p>	<p>traffic and car parking are assessed against the car parking provisions of the planning scheme. Any concerns regarding traffic and car parking may be reasonably addressed through permit requirements.</p> <p>The commercial and housing needs and future growth in the Karingal area are addressed in the Karingal Major Activity Centre Structure Plan which was adopted by Council on 4 April 2013.</p> <p>Rather than applying the Commercial 1 Zone along Cranbourne Road opposite the Karingal Shopping Centre, The Mixed Use Zone would provide modest opportunities for housing growth and diversity with a mixture of single dwellings, dual occupancies and town houses while respecting existing neighbourhood character in the areas highlighted in this</p>
--	--	--	--

Attachment D

		<p>Opposition to Substantial Change Area on Taketa Crescent, Frankston as any high density development would lead to more traffic and reduce the liveability and affect the neighbourhood character of the street. Concerned of social housing and issues relating to it.</p>	<p>submission. The same will apply to the Residential Growth Zone.</p> <p>The suggestion that the Taketa Crescent of Karingal Activity Centre area should remain as General Residential Zone is noted. This area is part of the walkable catchment of the Karingal Hub. The recommendation to rezone the specified area to Residential Growth Zone is therefore considered by Council officers to be appropriate.</p> <p>The assumption that there is a direct link between more intensive housing and social issues is not borne out by experience elsewhere in metropolitan Melbourne.</p> <p>All planning proposals impacting on traffic and car parking are assessed against the car parking provisions of the planning scheme. Any concerns regarding</p>
--	--	---	--

Attachment D

			traffic and car parking may be reasonably addressed through permit requirements.
Housing Density around Kananook Station	Submitter 2	Proposed development within substantial change area around Kananook Train Station requires very detailed documents to adequately address traffic management and waste management objectives.	Advice noted. Within the proposed Amendment to implement the recommendations of the Housing Strategy, a Development Plan Overlay will be proposed for the site. This would require any Town Planning applications for any development proposed to meet requirements, in particular, traffic management and waste management. This proposed overlay can be tested at Panel.
Seaford Wetlands	Submitter 1, 10, 11, 18	Does not support the removal of the Minimal Change area surrounding the Seaford Wetlands. Intensified development of residential land immediately abutting the wetlands needs to be sensitively managed and, ideally, should be disallowed. Submitters recommended the provision of a 100 metre Neighbourhood Residential Zone buffer to	The Seaford Wetland is considered to be sacred in Frankston. However, the existing overlays are limited to the Land Subject to Inundation Overlay and Environmental Significance Overlay and are mostly found within the wetlands property and not the abutting residential land. The Minimal Change area surrounding the Wetlands was removed due to the lack of justification that the Panel assessed in C95. The Panel did comment that more research could be done.

Attachment D

		<p>address this issue.</p> <p>Submitters strongly urged that Minimal or Limited Incremental Change Areas should be reinstated around waterways, wetlands and sensitive areas with a future application of NRZ allowing maximum two storeys and a mandatory garden area.</p>	<p>Council acknowledges that this area is need of additional protection. To address this issue, further investigation is recommended as part of the Strategy's Implementation Plan. This will explore the strategic justification in applying a Design and Development Overlay within the Wetlands environs.</p>
Higher Density Housing in Frankston	Submitter 2, 17, 18, 20	<p>Higher density areas will bring about a lot of problems such as lack of parking, noise and crime.</p>	<p>The assumption that there is a direct link between more intensive housing and social issues is not borne out by experience elsewhere in metropolitan Melbourne</p> <p>All planning proposals impacting on traffic and car parking are assessed against the car parking provisions of the planning scheme. Any concerns regarding traffic and car parking may be reasonably addressed through permit requirements.</p>

Attachment D

		<p>The apartment market is coming to a halt and the impact of not providing residential targets within the FMAC should be considered.</p> <p>Figures 37 and 41 largely ignore the key employment and density opportunities for Frankston. Higher density should be provided for areas surrounding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Hospital and Monash University • Along Beach St, out to Cranbourne Rd. • Further East along the train line route past Monash University. 	<p>The population within the FMAC is forecasted to increase from 3,597 to 4,209 in 2021. The Council Plan 2017 to 2021 aims to provide 1000 dwellings within the Frankston Metropolitan Activity Centre (FMAC).</p> <p>The recommendations in Planning Scheme Amendments C123 and C124 propose to implement zones which facilitate higher density. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed Use Zone near Monash University & the Hospital precinct. • Residential Growth Zone along Beach Street within the FMAC. This will cater enough high-density that is in walkable distance to the Frankston Station. • Commercial 1 Zone along Cranbourne Road between the central part of the FMAC and the Power Centre site.
--	--	---	---

Attachment D

		Frankston needs a bold plan to make itself the standout destination in Melbourne.	Submission about a grand plan for Frankston Central is noted.
Incremental Change Areas	Submitter 1	Incremental Change Areas need to respect neighbourhood character. The Frankston Planning Scheme currently lacks at achieving this.	Noted. Council is conducting a review of the Neighbourhood Character Policy. Once this has been undertaken, it will go out for Community Consultation.
Limited Incremental Change Areas – Frankston South	Submitter 9, 11, 12, 27	<p>The proposed elimination of the Limited Incremental Change Area (LICA), for which the Neighbourhood Residential Zone (NRZ) was intended, is not strategically justified and not aligned with current State and Local Planning Policy.</p> <p>Retention of the identified LICA (LICA) is urged with a recommended extension to align it with the northern boundary of Frankston South to encompass the coastal Character Precinct FS12. A corresponding application of the NRZ is advocated.</p> <p>The findings of the capacity</p>	<p>Under the lapsed Planning Scheme Amendment C95, the Limited Incremental Change Area to be rezone as Neighbourhood Residential Zone (NRZ) was not supported by Panel for various reasons. A key concern was that the NRZ was applied with Schedules to restrict building height and which, in many instances, conflicted with the existing Design and Development Overlay (DDO), Schedule 8 (DDO8) and Schedule 9 (DDO9).</p> <p>The Panel for C95 felt that the</p>

Attachment D

		<p>analysis indicate that there is “adequate land supply within the Frankston Activity Centre, Karingal Activity Centre, Substantial Change Areas and Incremental Change Area to accommodate the City’s forecast population growth.” Added housing for population growth in LIC Areas is not needed.</p> <p>Proposals in the Update 2017 for increased residential development in Frankston South north of Sweetwater Creek, by the proposed inclusion in the Incremental Change Area and retention of the current default General Residential Zone is not supported.</p>	<p>multitude of existing schedules to the DDO and Significant Landscape Overlay (SLO) already restricted and protected these residential areas in site specific ways. Additionally, the Panel felt that introducing the NRZ with different boundaries would only confuse and work against the site responsive provisions of the existing DDO and SLO that apply to this area. In this location the Panel found that while the policy may be to direct minimal change, the statutory mechanism to achieve this is to retain the more detailed and site response overlays that apply to this area.</p>
Substantial Change Area along Nepean Hwy Seaford	Submitter 2, 10, 18	<p>Concerns regarding the proposed Substantial Change areas along Nepean Hwy. This is due to the infrastructure and environmental constraints.</p> <p>MSS policy statements confirm that there is no imperative for</p>	<p>Concerns noted.</p> <p>During the informal exhibition period of the draft ‘Refresh’</p>

Attachment D

		<p>new housing at the highest density level along Nepean Highway because of environmental significance. The Residential Growth Zone for the Seaford coastal strip is not supported.</p>	<p>Housing Strategy, the State Government introduced General Residential Zone, Schedule 3 (Frankston-Seaford Coastal Strip) which transitioned the previous 11m height limit to the present height limit on the lots facing Nepean Highway. Therefore no rezoning is required.</p> <p>The updated Housing Framework Map will be amended to show the area between Nepean Highway to Kananook Creek to Incremental Change.</p>
Affordable Housing	Submitter 16, 17, 23, 25, 26, 28	<p>The Council needs to realise that more housing doesn't necessarily equate with affordable housing</p> <p>The proposed Inclusionary Zoning threshold for public, social and community housing should be significantly increased: to at least 15%, as in South Australia.</p>	<p>Council notes that more housing does not equate with affordable housing.</p> <p>Within the draft Strategy, Council is proposing an Inclusionary Zoning model; where 5% or 1 out of 20 of dwellings constructed requires being social housing. These dwellings would be proposed within mixed-use/residential developments that are expected to occur in the</p>

Attachment D

		<p>Rooming house beds and numbers are not to be limited</p> <p>This Strategy is used as an opportunity for making policy changes to improve the situation with regard to emergency housing and that more discussion, detailed practical responses and better provision of emergency accommodation should be incorporated into the Strategy, particularly for single people.</p> <p>Council should investigate the Mobile Home Tiny Houses project.</p>	<p>Mixed Use Area near Kananook Station and Road Transport (VicRoad) land near Skye-Overton Road intersection.</p> <p>Registration of rooming houses should be encouraged in the interests of compliance and safety</p> <p>However Council aim is to have less reliance on rooming houses as providers of emergency housing. Rooming houses are not considered to be an appropriate option for many people seeking emergency accommodation. More suitable alternatives must be explored.</p> <p>Council will be part of a State Government initiative to conduct Social Housing on a State Government site where Council is proposing a Mixed Use Zone. VicRoads have undertaken a similar initiative in the suburb of Maidstone where Tiny Homes</p>
--	--	--	---

Attachment D

		SalvoCare Eastern Homelessness & Support Services Frankston welcomes the Draft Frankston Housing Strategy and looks forward to working more collaboratively with Frankston Council to reach the most marginalised members of the Frankston community.	were set up in road reserves. Collaboration is noted and supported.
Schedules to Zones	Submitter 18	Schedules attached to zones need to define maximum building heights etc. Minimum garden requirements need to be at least 35% when a building is proposed to be more than 8 metres.	While Council can propose Schedules to the Zone to facilitate more prominent requirements than standard ResCode. Council does not have the ability to amend or provide an alternative Minimum Garden Area Requirement.
Minimal Change Areas	Submitter 17, 18	Areas marked for minimal change in Frankston South do not go far enough. Submitters would like to see it extended from Baden Powell Drive down towards the Nepean Highway.	The Minimal Change areas that are proposed to be rezoned Neighbourhood Residential Zone are within the areas of Design and Development Overlay, Schedule 1, 2, 3 and 7, which already have mandatory requirements that can be easily transitioned to the NRZ.

Attachment D

		<p>The retention of the Design and Development Overlays currently afford little protection, but they do give some protection and recognise that neighbourhood character needs preserving.</p>	<p>The DDO8 and 9 are to remain as they are discretionary controls that still require development within the General Residential Zone to respect the neighbourhood character.</p>
Sweetwater Creek Valley	Submitter 13, 14	<p>Disappointed that Sweetwater creek environs may be affected by all of the back garden 2 storey developments that are popping up. The DD09 in the area was set for a reason to protect nature, wildlife and keep the character in line with the green belt.</p> <p>Concerned that the Housing Strategy Update 2017 changes the designation of a large area of the Sweetwater catchment from “limited incremental change area” to “incremental change area”.</p> <p>Don’t believe the Design and</p>	<p>There are existing controls in place to protect the environment of the Sweetwater Creek valley (The Design and Development Overlay Schedule 8). There is an also current control that seeks to further protect the environs of the Sweetwater Creek Valley by strengthening existing control (Design and Development Overlay Schedule 9).</p> <p>Under the lapsed Planning Scheme Amendment C95, the Limited Incremental Change Area to be rezone as Neighbourhood Residential Zone (NRZ) was not supported by Panel for various reasons. A key concern was that the NRZ was applied with Schedules to restrict building</p>

Attachment D

		Development Overlays will protect the area, as shown by some VCAT decisions, where the DDO's are seen only as aspirational.	height and which, in many instances, conflicted with the existing Design and Development Overlay (DDO), Schedule 8 (DDO8) and Schedule 9 (DDO9).
Long Island	Submitter 21	Support Council's recommendation that Gould Street – Long Island be designated as a Neighbourhood Residential Zone	Support for Council's recommendation noted.
Building Heights	Submitter 19	Allowing high rise development along the beach side of Nepean Highway would be ugly and not allow for further development and views of the CBD side of Nepean Hwy. Height restrictions need to be put in place ASAP for the beach side of Nepean Highway.	Concern noted. Amendment C123 to the Frankston Planning Scheme proposes preferred height limits within the central part of Frankston Metropolitan Activity Centre. This has been adopted by Council in April 2018 and will be approved by the Minister for Planning late 2018.