

**1.1 CONSIDERATION OF PANEL REPORT - MONASH PLANNING SCHEME
AMENDMENT C125 - IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW RESIDENTIAL ZONES
(TP427:SM)**

Responsible Director: Peter Panagakos

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. *Receives and notes the Panel report on Amendment C125.*
2. *Notes that the Panel report is broadly supportive of the Monash Housing Strategy and Amendment C125.*
3. *Having considered the Panel report in accordance with Section 27(1) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987, modifies Amendment C125 in accordance with the changes set out in this report including:*
 - a. *Consolidating the proposed General Residential Zone 3 and General Residential Zone 4 into one Combined Zone which:*
 - i. *Reduces the building site coverage from 60% to 50%*
 - ii. *Increases on site permeability from 20% to 30%*
 - iii. *Increases the rear setback from 1 metre to 5 metres*
 - iv. *Requires the minimum 35m² area of private open space for multi-unit dwellings to be clear of water tanks and outdoor storage sheds*
 - b. *Applying the Neighbourhood Residential Zone – Schedule 2 to the Creek Abuttal areas which:*
 - i. *Limits development to no more than 2 dwellings*
 - ii. *Introduces a minimum lot size of 300m²*
 - iii. *Reduces the building site coverage from 60% to 40%*
 - iv. *Increases on site permeability from 20% to 40%*
 - v. *Increases the rear setback from 1 metre to 7 metres*
 - vi. *Requires the minimum 35m² area of private open space for multi-unit dwellings to be clear of water tanks and outdoor storage sheds*
 - c. *Applying the Neighbourhood Residential Zone – Schedule 3 to the Creek Environ areas which:*
 - i. *Limits development to no more than 2 dwellings*
 - ii. *Introduces a minimum lot size of 300m²*
 - iii. *Reduces the building site coverage from 60% to 50%*
 - iv. *Increases on site permeability from 20% to 30%*
 - v. *Increases the rear setback from 1 metre to 5 metres*
 - vi. *Requires the minimum 35m² area of private open space for multi-unit dwellings to be clear of water tanks and outdoor storage sheds*
 - d. *Applying the Neighbourhood Residential Zone – Schedule 4 to the area referred as the Dandenong Valley Escarpment in accordance with the original amendment exhibition zone boundaries which:*

on existing residents and the neighbourhood. These dwellings only require a building permit and have no relevant consideration of their impact on adjoining properties or neighbourhood character.

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The purpose of this report is to consider:

- the Panel report and recommendations on Amendment C125, to resolve to adopt the amendment, with modifications as set out in this report, and submit the modified amendment to the Minister for Planning for approval; and
- the commencement of an advocacy campaign calling for the review of ResCode and the residential zones to reduce the adverse impacts of large single dwellings and non-residential uses on local communities and their neighbourhoods.

The Amendment proposes changes to the Monash Planning Scheme in order to implement the first stage of the Monash Housing Strategy 2014.

BACKGROUND

Plan Melbourne

Plan Melbourne is the State Governments 40 year vision for Melbourne. Key elements of Plan Melbourne relevant to Monash include:

- Increased housing density to be delivered in close to infrastructure, Monash Employment Cluster and activity centres
- Housing strategies, zones and schedules to be used to protect neighbourhood character and determine development density
- Neighbourhood Residential Zone to be used in areas where redevelopment is not a priority due to character, environmental or accessibility issues

Monash Housing Strategy

Council adopted the new Monash Housing Strategy in October 2014.

The Housing Strategy provides a clear direction about the type and intensity of future residential development throughout Monash. The Housing Strategy has been developed in accordance with Plan Melbourne and the State Planning Policy Framework.

The Housing Strategy includes a Residential Development Framework Map that provides clear direction for where growth will occur and where the garden character of Monash will be protected and enhanced.

The Residential Development Framework Map provides for:

- a hierarchy of three areas of redevelopment type:
 - *Future Redevelopment,*
 - *Incremental Change; and*
 - *Limited Redevelopment.*

- increased residential density in the residential areas around activity centres and the Monash Employment Cluster; and
- changes to development potential in the suburban areas to lessen development pressure and better reflect the garden city character of the suburban areas of Monash.

The Housing Strategy and Amendment C125 build on the current policy and planning requirements which promote the garden city character in Monash.

Given the scale of the strategic work required to implement the Housing Strategy an indicative staged work program was set out at the time of adoption of the Monash Housing Strategy.

The first stage of implementing the adopted residential framework included developing planning provisions that support the following categories:

Category 3	Monash National Employment Cluster
Category 5:	Heritage Precincts
Category 6:	Dandenong Creek Escarpment
Category 7:	Creek Environs
Category 8:	Garden City Suburbs

The housing category areas 1, 2 and 4 of the Monash Housing Strategy will have revised planning provisions developed for them progressively upon completion of the first initial stage and as further strategic work such as Structure Plans for other Activity Centres are completed.

A copy of the Residential Development Framework Map and exhibited stage 1 zone application is provided at Attachment 1.

New Residential Zones – preparation

At the meeting of 24 February 2015 Council adopted the first stage of residential zone changes from the Housing Strategy - (Amendment C125). The first round of proposed changes (Amendments C125), flowing from the Monash Housing Strategy, aim to protect and enhance Monash's 'garden city' character.

This amendment applies to all residential land in Monash and includes:

- a new residential strategy statement,
- new residential development policies,
- revised Neighbourhood Character precincts and policies,
- increased application of the Neighbourhood Residential zone; and
- new or revised schedules to the residential zones, primarily designed to implement neighbourhood character outcomes.

Council received authorisation to prepare the amendment, Amendment C125, from the Minister for Planning on 20 March 2015. Following this, Council received a request from the then Metropolitan Planning Authority (MPA) to modify the amendment to make provision for residential growth around the Monash Employment Cluster.

Council considered this request at its meeting of 28 April, 2015 and agreed to bring forward the introduction of growth zones around the Monash Employment Cluster and Clayton Activity Centre. These changes now form part of Amendment C125.

New Residential Zones -Implementation

The implementation of the Monash Housing Strategy 2014 involves the use of:

- the new residential zones, for directing or limiting growth and setting the expected intensity of development;
- schedules to each zone that complement the zones and give effect to the housing character outcomes sought for each category. The schedules are intended to set out detailed siting and development standards reflective of the desired neighbourhood character for an area; and
- updating local policies that provide guidance for decision making, in particular through articulating the existing character and preferred future character outcomes.

It is important to note that the changes to the zones and schedules whilst adjusting the standard ResCode siting provisions do not become and are not intended to become mandatory requirements. As is the case now, these requirements can be varied by Council (Planning permit process for multi dwelling development or siting dispensations for single dwellings), or at appeal by VCAT on planning matters or the Building Appeals Board for Building dispensation matters.

A summary of the exhibited zones and schedule changes, including the in-principle changes to the exhibited amendment are provided at Attachment 2.

The formal notification of the amendment was conducted in July and August 2015 and is discussed later in this report.

Notice of Motion: 27 October, 2015

At the Council meeting of 27 October, 2015 Council deferred consideration of Amendment C125 and passed a Notice of Motion (the Motion) to “allow further consideration of the various and important issues which have been raised by many members of the community.”

The Motion required further community consultation and several strategic research projects to undertaken.

The additional research projects can be summarised as:

- Preparation of “before and after” examples of dual occupancy development, by average size development lot, by proposed zone;
- A review of Monash Housing Strategy and Neighbourhood Character Study and the application of the proposed zones and schedules; and
- An analysis of potential impact on housing supply across Monash arising from the proposed changes

The research projects concluded that the exhibited amendment was consistent with the Monash Housing Strategy and State policy and would not reduce housing capacity in Monash.

A summary of the outcomes of the further strategic research is provided at Attachment 3.

Council meeting of 29 March 2016 – In principle position

Council considered the results of the second round of community consultation and the research projects at its meeting of 29 March 2016.

At this meeting Council resolved on an ‘in-principle’ position on the Amendment and sought further submissions from the community on this ‘in-principle’ position.

The ‘in-principle’ position includes changes recommended by officers and additional changes adopted by Councillors at the meeting of 29 March, 2016.

In addition to the adopting the ‘in-principle’ position Council resolved to hold a Special Meeting of Council on 3 May, 2016 to allow for verbal presentations from the community on the in-principle position

This special meeting has been held and 30 verbal submissions were made.

Council meeting 31 May 2016 – Adoption of an in-principle position and changes

In response to feedback that the exhibited measures would place too much restriction on people's abilities to redevelop their properties several elements of the amendment were deleted or revised.

The main changes proposed by the in-principle position on the amendment are summarised below:

- Reducing the maximum amount of coverage that buildings have across a property block (the site coverage) from 60% to 50%. In environmentally sensitive areas near the Damper, Gardiners and Scotchman's Creeks, the maximum site coverage is proposed to be 40% - 45%.
- Amending the exhibited proposal for a 60m² parcel of private open space in new developments. This is now proposed to be a 50m² minimum parcel of private open space, except in areas near the Damper, Gardiners and Scotchman's Creeks where the proposal is still for a 60m² parcel.
- Deleting the proposal for a five metre rear setback in the General Residential Zone 3 & 4 and the Neighbourhood Residential Zone 1 & 4.
- Retaining the proposed a rear setback of six or seven metres in areas proposed to be in the Neighbourhood Residential Zones 2 & 3, near the Damper, Gardiners and Scotchman's Creeks.
- Requiring a minimum of two canopy trees (not three canopy trees as initially proposed in some areas) in new multi-unit developments. In addition, it is proposed that there be no specific height set for these trees: it is proposed that the height of the trees be linked to the height of the new units (so if a site has a single storey building, the canopy trees only need to be as high as that building but if it has a double storey building, the canopy trees need to meet the height of that building)

Removing the area of Glen Waverley (generally bounded by Highbury, Springvale, Waverley, Gallaghers and Westlands Rds and Camelot Dr) from the Neighbourhood Residential Zone, which limits development height to 9 metres and to no more than 2 dwellings per lot and including the area in the General Residential Zone, which has no height or limit on the number of dwellings.

Council meeting 26 July 2016 – Reinstatement NRZ4 to area south of High Street Road.

In response to these concerns from residents in the area of High Street, Springvale, Waverley and Gallaghers Road Council resolved to include that in the proposed Neighbourhood Residential Zone – Schedule 4.

Community Consultation Program

There has been an extensive program of community consultation on the amendment that commenced in April 2015.

Three rounds of community consultation have been undertaken to engage with the community on the proposed changes. A summary of the community consultation is provided at Attachment 4.

Key milestones in the amendment are shown in the table below:

24 February 2015	Council resolves to proceed with Amendment C125
20 March 2015	Minister grants authorisation to prepare the amendment
28 April 2015	Council agrees to MPA request to include residential rezoning in the Monash Employment Cluster area
22 June 2015 to 31 August 2015	Round 1 Community Consultation <i>(Formal exhibition of the amendment)</i>
27 October 2015	Amendment deferred to allow further consideration of issues raised by submitters, additional consultation and strategic research
Feb-March 2016	Round 2 Community Consultation
29 March 2016	Council considered Round 2 Community Consultation, strategic research undertaken and resolved an 'in-principle' position.
April to 3 May 2016	Round 3 Community Consultation Special Council meeting to allow for verbal presentation on the 'in-principle' position – consultation
31 May 2016	Council confirms its 'in-principle' position and requests a Panel be appointed to hear submissions.
26 July 2016	Council resolves to reinstate land bounded by Springvale, Waverley and High Street Road, south side, back into the Neighbourhood Residential Zone – Schedule 4
5 September – 10 October 2016	Panel hearing – held over 13 days during this period
3 January 2017	Panel report released to the public

PURPOSE/DISCUSSION

Council referred the amendment to an independent Panel for consideration of the amendment and all submissions made to the amendment.

The main issues raised through the submissions at the various stages of consultation can be summarised as follows:

- Objection to the 2 dwelling limit of the Neighbourhood Residential Zone
- Concern over the reduction in building site coverage from the ResCode standard of a maximum of 60% to 50% or 40% of the site.
- Rear Setback - 5 metre rear setback in the General Residential zones 3 & 4 and Neighbourhood Residential zones 1 & 4.
- Rear setback – 6 or 7 metre rear setback in the Neighbourhood Residential zone Schedule 2 & 3.
- Side Setbacks – particularly in the General Residential Zone Schedule 3.
- Change to the minimum parcel dimension of Private Open space – one parcel of 60m².
- Landscaping and canopy tree requirements.
- Objection to proposed zone or zone boundary application.
- Objections to proposed growth areas around the Clayton Activity Centre, Monash Medical Centre and Monash University environs.

Some of these issues were addressed in revisions to the proposed Amendment prior to the Panel hearing.

Although Council adopted revisions to the amendment the Panel is required to consider the revised amendment, all submissions and the original exhibition version of the amendment.

Panel hearing

A three person independent Panel was appointed by the Minister for Planning to consider the submissions to Amendment C125, and to provide a report and recommendations for Council's further consideration. The Panel hearing was held over 13 days at the Monash Civic Centre, commencing 5 September and concluding 10 October 2016.

All submissions made about Amendment C125 were referred to the Panel and submitters were invited to attend and present their views at the Panel hearing.

A total of 77 parties presented to the Panel over the 13 days, including the Metropolitan Planning Authority (now the Victorian Planning Authority - VPA), Monash University, Housing Industry Association, Metricon Homes, Monash Ratepayers Association, and the Friends of Damper Creek.

The Panel also undertook unaccompanied site inspections on 5 occasions and during the hearing were provided with aerial photography, maps and plans as requested to assist in their consideration of the submissions made to them during the hearing. The Panel's recommendations are included as Attachment 5.

Panel report

Overall, the Panel is supportive of directions of Amendment C125 and particularly its objectives of:

- Directing growth to activity centres;
- Limiting growth in suburban and sensitive areas;
- Recognising garden character, and
- Modifying siting standards to maintain garden character in new development.

The Panel stated: *"The Housing Strategy and the Amendment acknowledge key planning policy themes. The broad strategy to direct more intensive forms of housing to locations that are well served by infrastructure, and to manage change in more sensitive locations, is sound. However, it should be articulated much more effectively in the LPPF to inform decision making while the Housing Strategy is progressively implemented."* Amendment C125 Panel Report - Page 7

The Panel has recommended that the amendment be adopted as originally exhibited but with a series of changes to siting requirement or zone boundaries of the amendment. The Panel also noted the significant adverse impacts of large dwellings, large multi-unit development and the loss of tree canopy was having on the garden character of Monash.

The Panel stating: *"The Panel considers large trees with spreading canopies can transform the character, amenity and resilience of areas and broadly endorses strategies to ensure there is space to plant trees. In balancing resident preferences, the competing objectives relating to neighbourhood character, ecological sustainability, accommodating projected growth, housing diversity and housing affordability, the most efficient means of achieving green space should be adopted. The Panel considers that consolidated spaces at the front and rear of lots and along park interfaces optimise the outcomes."* Amendment C125 Panel Report - Pages 7 & 8

Broadly, the key recommendations of the Panel are:

Zone changes

- Combine General Residential Zone 3 (GRZ3) and General Residential Zone 4 (GRZ4) into one combined zone/schedule
- Replace the Neighbourhood Residential zone around the Creek areas with a combination of a General Residential Zone, a new Design and Development Overlay and a new Significant Landscape Overlay
- Retain future development areas of the Housing Strategy in the existing General Residential Zone - Schedule 2.

- Delete the proposed Victorian Planning Authority growth zones around Clayton and the Monash Employment Cluster.

Schedule changes

- Reinstate the 5 metre setback for the combined GRZ3&4 and the NRZ4 from the first exhibited amendment
- Reduce site coverage 50% in most zones
- Increase on site permeability to 30% in most zones
- Set a formula for requiring canopy tree planting in new development

The major issues relating to the application of zones and schedules dealt with by the Panel are set out in the balance of this report.

A full list of the Panel's recommendations, officer comment and recommendation is included as Attachment 6.

Planning Policy Changes

Amendment C125 introduces the *Monash Housing Strategy 2014* into the Monash Planning Scheme as a reference document and updates the local planning policy framework to reflect the housing and development outcomes of the Residential Framework Plan contained in the Strategy.

The amendment proposes changes to the Municipal Strategic Statement (Clause 21.04) and the Residential Development and Character Policy (Clause 22.01) and minor changes to other sections of the MSS.

The Panel is supportive of the amendment, particularly:

- Directing growth to activity centres – developing a polycentric approach to development density and location in Monash
- Recognising and strengthening garden city character
- Taking a staged approach to the implementation of the Monash Housing Strategy.

The Panel made recommendations about how these issues can be further strengthened and incorporated into the Monash Planning Scheme.

These include:

- updating the Strategic Framework Plan (March 2009) in Clause 21.03 Vision
- incorporating the Housing Strategy Residential Development Framework Plan in Clause 21.04 Residential Development
- articulating the policy intent regarding locations identified for more intensive housing development

- ensuring that neighbourhood character provisions recognise that change will occur in these areas
- identifying the further strategic work to be undertaken to inform the staged implementation of the Housing Strategy.

The Panel also noted the significant adverse impacts that large dwellings, large multi-unit development and the loss of tree canopy is having on the garden character of Monash.

Officer Comment

The Panel majority of the recommendations made by the Panel relating to the strengthening policy sections of the Monash planning Scheme to give effect to the Housing Strategy and Amendment C125 are supported.

There are some recommendations, such as seeking to address housing affordability and aging population issues, which require separate investigations and are beyond the scope of the current amendment and therefore cannot be considered at this time.

In addition some of the recommendations will be addressed in subsequent strategic work, including the review of the Municipal Strategic Statement of the Monash Planning Scheme which is required to be commenced in 2017.

A full response to each Panel recommendation is included in Attachment 6.

Officer Recommendation

It is recommended that the local policy section of the Amendment be modified to:

- update the Strategic Framework Plan (March 2009) in Clause 21.03 Vision
- incorporate the Housing Strategy Residential Development Framework Plan in Clause 21.04 Residential Development
- more clearly articulate the policy intent regarding locations identified for more intensive housing development
- ensure that neighbourhood character provisions recognise that change will occur in these areas implementation of the Housing Strategy.
- identify the further strategic work to be undertaken to inform the staged

Zone application

The application of the new residential zones gives effect on the ground to the directions of the Housing Strategy.

As noted earlier in this report the three new zones:

- Give direction about what type and intensity of development will occur where
- How many dwellings can be expected in an area
- How many people can be expected in an area

General Residential zone

The General Residential Zone is designed to respect and preserve neighbourhood character while allowing modest housing growth and diversity. This zone currently applies across the majority of residential areas in Monash and metropolitan Melbourne.

General Residential Zone - Schedules 3 & 4 (GRZ3, GRZ4)

This zone is proposed to apply to the broader suburban garden suburban areas of Monash. The purpose in applying this zone is to allow for some increase in development in a way that respects and contributes to garden character.

As originally exhibited, the two zones had minor siting differences that reflected the historical pattern of subdivision and development of Monash. The schedules to the zones built on the existing variations to ResCode standards and included proposals to:

- Decrease the maximum building site coverage from 60% to 50%
- Increase onsite permeability from 20% to 30%
- Require the planting of a minimum of 2 canopy trees in new multi-unit development
- Require that the private open space for a new multi-unit dwelling includes one parcel of 50m² (exhibited version proposed 60m²) rather than the current 35m².

Panel recommendations

The Panel supported the application of the General Residential zone to garden suburban areas of Monash stating: *“The application of the GRZ is consistent with the PPN78 principle that it will be applied in residential areas where moderate growth and diversity of housing is to be provided, and with the RZSAC principle 96 that the GRZ will typically be the ‘default’ zone.”* Amendment C125 Panel report Page 85

Given the modifications to the siting provisions that were made to the zones over the course of the consultation period in response to community submissions, that resulted in reduced differences between the GRZ3 and GRZ4, the Panel recommended combining these two zones into one combined zone.

Although the Panel acknowledged and supported the staged approach to the implementation of the Housing Strategy, for areas within future stages such as Activity Centres or Accessible areas, the Panel recommended deleting the proposed GRZ3 or GRZ4 and retaining these areas in the current planning provisions, GRZ2, until future strategic work has been completed.

On the proposed changes to the Schedule that accompany the proposed zones, the Panel recommended:

- Reducing site coverage to 50%

- Increasing on site permeability to 30%
- Canopy tree planting based on width of block
- Reinstating the 5 metre rear setback
- Retaining the private open space provisions as they currently applying, by keeping the minimum parcel size of secluded private open space at 35m², with an overall total of 75m² per dwelling

Officer Comments

Combined zones

As modifications to the Schedules based on the 'in principle' position of Council have reduced the differences between the GRZ3 and GRZ4 the recommendation to consolidate the two General Residential Zones 3 & 4 is appropriate.

Retaining the General Residential zone - Schedule 2

The recommendation to retain the existing zoning of the GRZ2 for the Activity Centres, Accessible Areas and Boulevards until future work is completed is very problematic. To do this would require significant strategic work in the short term to determine the appropriate boundaries for the exclusions, as the areas shown in the Housing Strategy are strategic concepts rather than defined and delineated boundaries. It is more appropriate for this work to be undertaken in future stages of strategic work where detailed analysis and further community consultation can be undertaken.

Changes to ResCode Schedules

The proposed changes to the schedule provisions in the two General Residential Zones 3 & 4 are supported, particularly the reduction in site coverage to 50%, tree planting based on the width of the block and the reinstatement of the 5 metre rear setback from the original exhibition version of the amendment

The Panel has recommended the reinstatement of the proposed 5 metre rear setback provision as it will assist in achieving the garden city character objectives expressed in the Monash Planning Scheme.

The Panel did not support the proposed increase to the minimum parcel size for secluded private open space as it considered this may limit design flexibility and that no adequate case had been made to show that a 35m² parcel was not meeting the recreation needs of the residents of the new dwellings. The Panel did not link the increase in the private open space dimension to landscaping and neighbourhood character objectives, rather viewing the private open space provisions separately and as relating only to the suitability of the space for the occupants of the dwelling. The ResCode objective for Private Open Space states: *"To provide adequate private open space for the reasonable recreation and service needs of residents."*

The current requirement for private open space in the Monash Planning Scheme is 75m², with one parcel of 35m². *(This amount is about the size of a double garage).*

The amendment does not propose to increase the overall amount of private open space provided in a development but change how that private open space is provided. In the revised position of the Amendment, it was proposed to increase the parcel of private open space from 35m² to 50m². Noting that the overall amount of 75m² would not change. This meets the dual objective of providing more usable private open space and providing the opportunity to better meet garden character objectives.

It is over 15 years since ResCode was introduced and given that ResCode was derived from the Good Design Guide of 1995 it could be argued that the ResCode is in fact much older. Never the less, since the introduction of ResCode significant changes have occurred in the size and type of dwellings constructed as medium density developments.

Developments now mainly comprise two storey, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings. In addition to the increase in dwelling size, other design requirement have changed resulting in, rain water tanks for toilet flushing, large split system air conditioning units and outdoor storage sheds all being located in the private open space. Despite all these changes the minimum parcel dimension for private open space has not increased.

The Panel also noted that private open space standard vary across Councils and that some Councils have a sliding scale that requires more private open space for 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings than for a 2 bedroom dwelling. The Panel noting that: *“Variations to the Private Open Space standard apply in many suburban areas, suggesting that the current ResCode standard is seen as inadequate. The differing requirements add to complexity; a State led review of this standard could restore greater consistency.”* Amendment C125 Panel Report. Page 123.

Whilst the Panel identifies private open space as an issue, its position on the proposed change to the parcel dimension is not fully supported. Given the substantial increase in 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings, the increased demand for a usable area of private open space that larger dwellings create and the increased requirements for external utility infrastructure such as water tanks and storage sheds 35m² is considered inadequate in most circumstances. Rather than increase the size of the parcel of open space it is considered appropriate to revise the way the 35m² minimum parcel is calculated and provided to ensure that it remains usable for the outdoor recreations needs of the occupants by requiring that the storage sheds and water tanks are not included in the 35m² parcel.

This minor change means that the 35m² parcel is available as fully usable outdoor space for the dwelling occupants.

Officer Recommendation

It is recommended that:

- the General Residential Zone 3 and 4 be combined into one zone and schedule combination
- The combined General Residential zone will continue to apply to all the garden suburban areas and the areas identified for future strategic work in the Housing Strategy
- The Schedule to the combined zone include:
 - Reducing site coverage to 50%
 - Increasing on site permeability to 30%
 - Canopy tree planting based on width of block
 - A 5 metre rear setback
 - Private open space minimum parcel dimensions of 35m² be kept clear of water tanks and storage sheds.

Neighbourhood Residential Zone (NRZ)

The Neighbourhood Residential Zone restricts housing growth and protects an identified neighbourhood character. This zone represents the lowest scale of intended growth of the three new residential zones.

As the zone that provides for the lowest level of redevelopment the zone includes the ability to limit dwellings to 2 per lot and specify a minimum subdivision size.

This zone currently applies in the Heritage areas of Oakleigh. Amendment C125 proposes to apply the NRZ to the Creek areas and Dandenong Valley Escarpment.

Oakleigh Heritage Precincts – Neighbourhood Residential Zone Schedule 1 (NRZ1)

This zone currently applies to heritage precincts surrounding the Oakleigh Activity Centre. The changes proposed by the Amendment relate to siting and design issues to ensure that development is more sympathetic to the heritage of the area.

The Amendment proposes:

- Reducing site coverage from 60% to 50%
- Increasing onsite permeability from 20% to 30%
- Requiring the planning of a minimum of 2 canopy trees
- Garages/carports setback 1m behind front facade

Panel recommendations

The Panel has supported the proposed Schedule changes.

- Tree planting based on width of block
- No requirement for boundary walls to be set back 2m from front facade
- 1 m additional setback for garages
- Site coverage reduced from 60% to 50%

- Onsite permeability reduced from 20% to 30%

Officer Comment/Recommendations

Officers support the Panel's recommended changes to the schedule requirements for this zone.

Creek areas – Neighbourhood Residential Zone Schedules 2 & 3 (NRZ2, NRZ3)

The Neighbourhood Residential Zone is proposed to apply to the Creek Abuttal (NRZ2) and Creek Environs (NRZ3) areas shown in the Monash Housing Strategy. These areas either have a direct abuttal to the creek or fall within the immediate creek catchment based on topography, neighbourhood character and vegetation cover. They are intended to provide for limited redevelopment in a way that improves the environment, tree cover and neighbourhood character around the creek areas. The revised zones propose:

- no more than 2 dwellings per lot
- minimum lot size of 300m² for subdivisions
- A reduction in site coverage from 60% to 40% NRZ2 or 45% NRZ3
- An increase in onsite permeability from 20% to 40% NRZ2 or 35% NRZ3
- The planting of a minimum of 2 canopy trees
- Increasing the rear setback from 1 metre to 6 metres NRZ3
- Increasing the rear setback from 1 metre to 7 metres NRZ2

Panel recommendation

As noted earlier in this report the Panel is supportive of the Monash Housing Strategy policy of limiting residential growth in some sensitive areas and directing it to areas that are less sensitive and have better access to facilities and services.

On the application of the NRZ to the creek areas the Panel appears supportive of the objective but questions the approach or the planning tools proposed by the amendment.

The Panel noted that: *The objective to protect and enhance the Gardiners Creek, Scotchmans Creek and Damper Creek open space corridors by managing the interface of abutting residential areas is justified. However, overlays in combination with the GRZ are more effective tools to manage these interfaces than the NRZ. The interface with the Dandenong Creek open space network warrants similar protection. In contrast, the strategic basis for the application of the NRZ3 'Creek Environs Areas' is very weak and these areas should be included in a GRZ.*" Panel report Pages 8 & 9

Specifically the Panel recommends the following:

Zone changes

- Replacing the NRZ2 with the combined General Residential Zone, a new Significant Landscape Overlay and a new Design and Development Overlay to address landscape and built form issues.
- Replacing the NRZ3 with the combined General Residential zone.

Schedule changes – NRZ2 areas

- Reducing site coverage from 60% to 40%
- Increasing on site permeability from 20% to 40%
- Tree planting based on width of block
- Rear setback of 7 metres
- Keep secluded open space at 35m²

Schedule changes – NRZ3 areas (apply the combined GRZ revisions)

- Reducing site coverage from 60% to 50%
- Increasing on site permeability from 20% to 30%
- Tree planting based on width of block
- Increase rear setback from 1 metre to 5 metres
- Keep secluded open space at 35m²

Officer Comments

Whilst the Panel has acknowledged the overall directions of the Housing Strategy, particularly directions for growth or limiting growth, and garden character, including the sensitivity of the creek areas. It is somewhat surprising that it does not support the application of the NRZ to the creek areas as simple mechanism for addressing these objectives. Particularly when the Panel supports the changes to the siting standards proposed by the amendment.

The proposal to apply the combined General Residential and a suite of overlays is an alternative approach but one that is more complicated and does not address the objective of the Housing Strategy of limiting dwelling numbers in the creek areas.

Not applying the NRZ zone to the creek areas also conflicts with other recommendations of the Panel report which support the specific site variations proposed by the amendment. It is also at odds with its support for the application of the NRZ to the Dandenong Valley Escarpment area.

A key element of the Monash Housing Strategy is the direction of growth away from sensitive or heritage areas and to Activity Centres or the Boulevards. The NRZ2 & 3 contain a 2 dwelling limit and modifications to the ResCode development standards. The Panel's recommendations would result in a more complex and confusing array of controls that is inconsistent with directing growth away from sensitive areas identified in the Monash Housing Strategy.

The issue about retaining the secluded private open space at 35m² is the same as discussed in the General Residential zone section earlier in this report. The same concerns apply in the NRZ zone areas.

Officer Recommendations

It is recommended that:

- The Neighbourhood Residential Zone 2 and 3 be retained generally in accordance with the boundaries adopted by Council at its meeting of 31 May 2016 as its position to the Panel.
- The Schedule to the NRZ2 zone include:
 - Reducing site coverage to 40%
 - Increasing on site permeability to 40%
 - Canopy tree planting based on width of block
 - A 7 metre rear setback
 - Private open space minimum parcel dimensions of 35m² be kept clear of water tanks, storage sheds and other ancillary items.
- The Schedule to the NRZ3 zone include:
 - Reducing site coverage to 50%
 - Increasing on site permeability to 30%
 - Canopy tree planting based on width of block
 - A 5 metre rear setback
 - Private open space minimum parcel dimensions of 35m² be kept clear of water tanks and storage sheds.

Dandenong Valley Escarpment – Neighbourhood Residential Zone Schedule 4 (NRZ4)

The Neighbourhood Residential Zone is proposed to apply to the Dandenong Valley Escarpment area shown in the Monash Housing Strategy. This area is broadly east of Springvale Road and falls towards to the Dandenong Valley. The zone is intended to provide for limited redevelopment in a way that improves the environment, tree cover and neighbourhood character along the escarpment and creek valley.

The NRZ4 has been applied to the Dandenong Valley Escarpment is generally consistent with the extent of the topography to the eastern face of the Dandenong Valley escarpment and the extent of the neighbourhood residential zone in the City of Whitehorse and the City of Greater Dandenong.

The application of the zone took into account the ridgeline and topography that slopes towards the Dandenong Creek valley which affords long range views across the Dandenong Valley and to the Dandenong Ranges.

This zone is proposed to apply to the Dandenong Creek escarpment along the eastern parts of Glen Waverley, Wheelers Hill and Mulgrave. The zone proposes:

- No more than 2 dwelling per site
- Minimum lot size of 300m² for subdivisions
- Site coverage from 60% to 50%
- Onsite permeability from 20% to 30%
- Requiring the planting of min 2 canopy trees
- Increasing the rear setback to 5 metres
- Height limit of 9m (or 10m for sloping sites)

Panel Recommendation

Although acknowledging some diversity in the housing styles, the Panel is supportive of the policy objectives and zone application for the Dandenong Valley Escarpment noting:

“The Panel observed that the character in this area is quite diverse, with some pockets of densely planted native trees, other areas with a general treed environment and significant areas with very few trees other than street trees and trees in public reserves. There is also a diversity of built form ranging from modest, single-storey dwellings, large double storey townhouses, and very large double-storey single dwellings. While larger single dwellings are an emerging built form in the northern part of the precinct, they are the dominant built form in Wheelers Hill. The Panel finds that the area’s character is not derived from a cohesive built form or treed character, rather the key characteristic is the slope of the land down to the Dandenong Creek valley and the view lines across the valley.” Panel report page 80

The Panel noted that the NRZ limit of no more than 2 dwellings per lot was appropriate; stating:

“The application of the NRZ to this area is consistent with the PPN78 principles that support the NRZ in areas with a neighbourhood character that is sought to be retained and in areas of identified environmental or landscape significance. Having regard to the broader Dandenong Creek valley, the Panel notes that the adjoining municipalities (Whitehorse City Council to the north and City of Greater Dandenong to the south) have applied the NRZ to the Dandenong Creek valley escarpment areas.

The limitation of development in the NRZ to a maximum of two dwellings per lot is acceptable in the context. Compared to the remainder of the municipality, which has an extensive network of activity and neighbourhood centres and public transport, much of the escarpment area is somewhat remote from the Glen Waverley and Wheelers Hill Activity Centres and from the fixed principle public transport network (PPTN).” Panel report page 81

Specifically the Panel recommends the following:

Zone changes

- Retaining the NRZ4 as exhibited in the original Amendment and generally in accordance with the Dandenong Valley Escarpment shown in the Monash Housing Strategy

Schedule changes –

- Limiting development to no more than 2 dwellings
- Limiting subdivision to a minimum of 300m²
- Reduce site coverage from 60% to 50%
- Increasing on site permeability from 20% to 30%
- Tree planting based on width of block
- Reinstating the rear setback of 5 metres
- Retaining secluded open space at 35m²
- Deleting the 3 metre setback to side streets

Officer Comment

The Panel has recognised the significant landscape feature that the Dandenong Valley Escarpment is in the regional context. The recognition of this area will ensure that the landscape and neighbourhood character are provided with increased protection and in turn ensure that Monash maintains a diversity of housing types, in this case traditional garden suburban development.

Given that the majority of the area is developed as single dwellings with substantial street setbacks, the Panels proposal to delete the proposed 3 metre side street setback is not considered appropriate. Particularly with the increased prevalence of 2 storey development, the 2 metre ResCode standard is considered inadequate.

The issue about retaining the secluded private open space at 35m² is the same as discussed in the General Residential zone section earlier in this report. The same concerns apply in the NRZ4 zone area.

The balance of the recommendations relating to the schedule siting provisions are supported.

Officer Recommendations

It is recommended that:

- The Neighbourhood Residential Zone 4 be retained in accordance with the boundaries of the exhibited amendment and the Monash Housing Strategy.
- The Schedule to the NRZ4 zone include:
 - No more than 2 dwellings per lot
 - A minimum lot size of 300m²
 - Reducing site coverage from 60% to 50%
 - Increasing on site permeability from 20% to 30%
 - Canopy tree planting based on width of block
 - A 5 metre rear setback

- Private open space minimum parcel dimensions of 35m² be kept clear of water tanks and storage sheds.

Monash Employment Cluster & Clayton Zones

The areas around the Monash Employment Cluster, Clayton Activity Centre and the Monash University propose a range of new planning provisions. These zones and overlays are proposed for the residential areas in the Clayton activity centre and the housing diversity area within the Monash National Employment Cluster and were developed in conjunction with the Victorian Planning Authority (VPA).

Residential Growth Zone (RGZ3)

The Residential Growth Zone enables new housing growth and allows greater diversity in appropriate locations while providing certainty about the expected built form outcomes. The zone sits within the suite of residential zones as the zone which encourages the greatest residential density and scale of development amongst the three new residential zones.

This is the highest change zone and is proposed to apply in the areas close to the Clayton Activity Centre, Monash Medical Centre and Monash University.

General Residential Zone Schedule 6 (GRZ6)

This zone is proposed as the transition between the high change areas of RGZ3 and the lower intensity suburban areas of the new combined General Residential Zone.

Design and Development Overlay (DDO13)

This overlay sets out the height, setback and built form requirements to encourage consolidation of lots and the construction of apartment style development, linking maximum building height to lot size. The overlay creates variations to ResCode base standards.

Development Contributions Plan Overlay (DCPO)

This overlay requires that new development make a financial or in kind contribution to community infrastructure required as a result of increased development or population density.

Panel recommendation

The Panel made the following conclusions about the Monash Employment Cluster:

There is clear policy support for the transformation of the Monash NEC as a centre for knowledge-based employment and innovation of national significance.

Prof McGauran provided compelling evidence of the very substantial initiatives being implemented by the University in support of the policy ambitious for this cluster. The Panel inspections of the NEC confirmed the strong basis provided by established

institutions, the quality of recent University progress towards its master plan, the attraction of these high quality anchor uses to a range of uses with synergies and the extensive potential development opportunities.

The Panel agrees that ad hoc development could mean sites for apartment developments may be locked away by lower density housing developments and that the planning framework should signal support for more intensive forms of housing. However, the Panel does not agree with the argument put on behalf of a submitter with immediate development intentions supporting advancing the Amendment provisions as a stepping-stone to a more ambitious framework, rather than waiting for a future amendment that is dependent on the completion of strategic planning work that is in its infancy.

Prof McGauran's evidence demonstrated that there are significant strategic issues to be resolved through planning initiatives that are underway. This includes fundamental issues such as:

- establishing important linkages between the university, the Monash Medical Centre, public transport, and then ensuring the planning framework delivers those links or at least facilitates and preserves opportunities*
- the right land use priorities and mix in the 'core' of the NEC*
- defining built form ambitions and how the area transitions to more intensive urban forms*
- how interfaces with more suburban housing areas should be managed.*

It is recognised that the strategic planning work necessary to capitalise on the opportunities presented by this area requires the investment of planning resources. Further, it is rarely possible to have 'all the ducks in a row' with the ideal, complete analysis underpinning amendments; a pragmatic approach is often required with progressive development of the planning framework to avoid protracted delays and paralysis of the planning system. However, the strategic planning work for the NEC and Clayton Activity Centre is underway, with timeframes indicating a stronger strategic basis will be established in the not too distant future." Panel report pages 133-134

Having considered the submissions to the Amendment, in particular the submission from Monash University, the Panel concluded that the proposed rezoning's are premature and they should be deferred pending the completion of further detailed strategic work.

Specifically the Panel recommended the following:

- Deleting the proposed RGZ3 and GRZ6
- Retain the land in the existing planning provisions contained in the GRZ2.
- Delete the Development Contributions Plan
- Delete the Design and Development Overlay No. 13.

Officer Comments

Application of zones and design and development overlay

The boundaries of the proposed growth areas and the proposed planning controls were developed in conjunction with the MPA and reflect both the Monash Employment Cluster and the Monash Housing Strategy.

One of the two main tenets underlying of the submission from Monash University is that of the University as land owner in the immediate environs of the University Campus. In this instance their submission by Professor McGauran, of MSG Architects, suggested the extension and application of a Public Use zone to their land holdings in Beddoe Avenue and east of Blackburn Road. The submission also raised the potential for Public Acquisition Overlay for the *“properties south of the current University landholdings to either side of Beddoe Avenue to enable improved future access to and from the campus and the expanding public transport and health and education functions in this quadrant of the core campus.”* Page 13-14 Prof. R McGauran Independent Expert Witness Statement -C125 Amendment

This would allow the University to develop these land holdings in a manner consistent with the University Master plan and their long term plans.

The second thrust of the University’s submission was that the proposed rezonings do not go far enough in promoting large scale redevelopment for either complementary high density residential development, similar to that which occurs in Parkville or do not encourage complementary commercial Health and Education uses in the residential areas around and between the Monash Medical Centre and the Monash University.

Whilst there may be a great deal of merit in progressing all or some of the changes flagged by Prof McGauran, they are changes that go far beyond the scope of Amendment C125 and would require significant strategic work by Council, the State Government Monash Medical Centre and Monash University and extensive community consultation before they were implemented.

The essence of the University submission and the position recommended by the Panel is that the changes proposed by Amendment C125 are an under development of the potential that exists in the Cluster.

The assessment of the proposed development changes undertaken by MGS Architects, (but not by Prof McGauran), on behalf of the VPA found that the built form controls provide an increased incentive for apartment style construction above the standard ResCode provisions.

The changes proposed by the Amendment may not give effect to the vision as set out by Prof McGauran but they have been prepared in conjunction with the VPA, are considered consistent with Plan Melbourne and the current strategic framework for the area.

Leaving the land in the current General Residential Zone Schedule 2 would send the wrong signal to the industry and continue the existing risk that development sites are

underdeveloped for low intensity uses such as dual occupancy whilst further more complex strategic planning work is prepared.

Application of Development Contributions Overlay

The changes to the residential zones proposed in provide for significant increases in residential capacity over a 10 year period, potentially doubling the population. (Based on the 2006 Census there are approximately 5,257 dwellings in Clayton.)

Ideally, issues such as the provision of public open space, drainage infrastructure, community infrastructure and developer contributions towards community infrastructure would be resolved prior to rezoning land to facilitate substantially increased densities. The development of the Clayton Activity Centre Structure Plan and the Monash Employment Cluster Strategic Framework Plan are the appropriate mechanisms to address these issues and are currently being prepared.

However, unless early provision is made now to address public open space and infrastructure contributions, rezoning the land ahead of the finalisation of the detailed strategic planning work presents a significant risk to Council and the community that infrastructure demands generated by the increased growth will not be contributed to by new development.

There is a critical need to address infrastructure contributions through this rezoning process. Although detailed infrastructure planning has not yet been completed the application of a Development Contribution Overlay across the growth areas is consistent with the planning provisions applied in the rezoning of the Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area. It allows the rezoning process to commence; flagging to the community and the development industry the areas that are proposed to have increased residential density will be required to make a contribution to infrastructure and allows the completion of further detailed planning.

Residential growth in these areas is consistent with Plan Melbourne. It is considered that sufficient strategic work has progressed to justify the application of the proposed zones and overlays.

Officer Recommendations

It is recommended that:

- The Residential Growth Zone – Schedule 3 (RGZ3) and the General Residential Zone – Schedule 6 (GRZ6) be retained in accordance with the boundaries of the exhibited amendment.
- The Design and Development Overlay Number 13 (DDO13) be retained; and
- The Development Contribution Overlay Number 1 (DCPO1) be retained as exhibited.
- Any changes that address the provision of public open space to serve the increased population are pursued through the Monash Open Space Strategy to be considered later in 2017.

Zone Changes – Boundary Corrections

Following the receipt of submissions and in preparing the 'in principle' position to present to the Panel, Council agreed to make a number of minor corrections to the application of the zones. These were the result of mapping errors and inconsistencies that were raised through the consultation process, and were agreed to by Council.

The Panel commented in the Panel report that:

"It is not the Panel's role to redefine the zone boundaries in detail, and, as noted previously, the Panel has dealt with the issues raised in the submissions rather than providing assessments of each individual submission."

The Panel did not support the majority of the proposed minor zoning changes that Council presented to the Panel hearing, and as outlined in Recommendation 9, as they involved rezoning to the NRZ2 or NRZ3, which the Panel have recommended be replaced by the a new combined GRZ.

Officer Comments/Recommendations

It is recommended that the minor zoning corrections as outlined in Attachment 6, which are consistent with Council's 'in principle' position, be made to Amendment C125.

Other zoning & Amendment issues

In reviewing the amendment and all submissions the Panel made a number of recommendations about zones around existing activity centres, consideration of alternative zones, such as the Mixed Use Zone for future strategic work and reviewing existing planning provisions such as the Vegetation Protection Overlay.

These recommendations are set out and responded to in Attachment 6.

The proposed revised application of zones is shown at Attachment 7.

Other Residential Development Issues

The planning changes proposed by Amendment C125 will go some way to addressing the community concerns about loss of garden character, site coverage and the number of dwellings in sensitive areas.

There remains however a number of significant residential development issues that the Amendment will not address. In many instances issues around single dwellings that do not require a planning permit cause significant concern in the community and are often subject to less stringent planning provisions than a multi-unit development.

The end result of which is that a large single dwelling may have a more negative impact on a neighbourhood than two well-designed units.

ResCode – Single dwellings

A single dwelling does not require planning approval and generally does not require Council approval if deemed compliant with the ResCode standards. Consequently the majority of new single dwellings permits are approved by private building surveyors.

The average size of single dwellings has increased substantially since the introduction of ResCode and two storey dwellings are now the norm in most areas of Monash, particularly as “knock down, rebuilds” promoted by the large volume builders.

However, ResCode and in particular the amenity provisions have not kept pace with the changes in housing styles, construction techniques and sizes. This is now at a point where a multi-unit development often has less impact on the neighbours than a single dwelling. Yet the multi-unit development undergoes a far greater level of scrutiny and community participation in its assessment.

For example, on an average block, ResCode would only allow 17 metres of single storey wall along a side boundary and in most instances a multi-unit development would require some separation between dwellings. However, a two storey single dwelling development could present a continuous two storey form, 30 metre wall length to neighbours provided it is setback 1 metre from the boundary and not be open to any public process or ability for input from neighbours.

A multi-unit development would be required to reduce the wall length and provide separation between the upper storey areas.

The effect is that the single dwelling forms are more like a block of flats or an apartment style building rather than a single dwelling.

We are hearing and seeing that this is having an impact on residents and their amenity, as well as their streetscape, neighbourhoods and sense of community and place.

The ResCode provisions for single dwellings require a significant review in light of the size and overall bulk of large proportion of single dwellings.

There are also several structural issues with the three residential zones and the way the residential zones and planning policy such as ResCode function together.

Residential zones – As of right or permissible uses

Although the three residential zones have different purposes and promote different levels of residential development and density, particularly the Neighbourhood Residential zone. There is little, if any significant difference between the as of right or discretionary uses between the zones.

As an example, a Residential Aged Care Facility does not require a use permit in the any of the residential zones, despite the purpose of the zones promoting residential development and limited local activities meeting local needs. Whilst part of the use could be argued to residential in nature, in a practical sense the use is not dissimilar to an office, hospital or other more intensive forms of accommodation that are either subject to a use permit or, in the case of office development, prohibited in the Neighbourhood Residential or General Residential Zone.

As a Residential Aged Care Facility does not require a use permit, the assessment is limited to the potential impact of the building itself and not whether the use is appropriate for any given location based on its hours of operation, staffing levels or size.

Councils are not able to vary the State standard zones, so any changes to the table of uses would need to be made by the Minister for Planning.

Residential zones and ResCode

In addition to the issues with the table of uses in Residential zones there is also a disconnect between the three residential zones promoting different levels of residential development intensity and the assessment of residential development in any zones against a single default set of residential development standards that are ResCode. This assessment is undertaken by either a building surveyor (or the Building Appeal Board) in the case of a single dwelling or by Council (or VCAT) in the case of multi-unit development.

Councils are able to vary some of the siting requirements of ResCode through an amendment to the planning scheme, such as Amendment C125. However, they are required to go a complex and lengthy process to make even a minor change to standards that may give better effect to the objectives of one of the three residential zones.

If Councils do not seek variations to ResCode, they will have situations where the development outcome in a Neighbourhood Residential Zone is likely to be the same as that which occurs in General Residential Zone, despite the zones promoting different levels of change.

As noted earlier in this, ResCode is over 15 years old. (It is even older given it is based substantially on the Good Design Guide of 1995.)

Since the inclusion ResCode in the planning scheme in 2001:

- There are now three standard zones promoting different residential densities
- Two storey development is the norm in the majority of urban infill development
- A significant shift from fringe suburb development has occurred
- It is now common place for knock down rebuilds to occur in established neighbourhoods

- The size of dwellings, either single dwellings or as multi units, has increased substantially where the majority are 3 bedroom or more

It is considered that ResCode requires a significant review to ensure that it:

- reflects community expectations,
- reflects the reality of the housing market,
- better aligns with the three new residential zones;
- improves consistency between single dwellings and multi-unit development by aligning elements such as landscaping and private open space

Officer recommendation

It is recommended that Council commence investigation into undertaking an advocacy campaign and canvas support from other Council to promote a significant review of ResCode and the three residential zones.

Status of the amendment and changes

At present the proposed changes are not being used to guide or assess development applications. Although since authorisation and exhibition the amendment has been a “seriously entertained” planning proposal, it has been afforded limited weight in the decision making process as it had not progressed far through the amendment process.

However, as the amendment has now completed the Panel hearing process and been considered by Council, it will now has more bearing on planning decisions, both for Council and at VCAT.

Should Council determine to proceed with the amendment, in any form, it is appropriate for Council to formally acknowledge that the amendment will be used to assist in the assessment of applications and to establish a date from which applications will be measured against the proposed amendment. This will assist in meeting the significant community expectation around the implementation of the proposed changes and provide some direction to the industry.

Officer recommendation

If Council resolves to proceed with the amendment and submit the amendment to the Minister for Planning it is appropriate to set out a “transition date” from when applications will be assessed against the proposed controls contained in the Amendment.

Given the extended development of the housing strategy, extensive community consultation period and the non-mandatory nature of the majority of the changes, a two stage transition process is proposed.

The transition elements proposed are:

- New pre-applications to be advised to design to the requirements of C125.
- Existing applications to be co-assessed against the requirements of C125 from 1 April 2017.

Officers will write to all submitters and regular designers/applicant to advise them of the proposed transition framework. An information session for developers and designers will also be provided in early March 2017.

Note: The proposed changes will not have any effect on the development of single dwellings until such time as the Minister for Planning approves the Amendment and modifies the Building Regulations for Monash. This will occur shortly after approval of the Amendment.

CONCLUSION

The Monash Housing Strategy October 2014 sets out a clear overall direction for the location and character of housing development in Monash. Amendment C125 is the first stage in the implementation of the Monash Housing Strategy and proposes a range of planning provisions which enhance and protect the garden character of the suburban areas of Monash whilst modifying current Monash development standards to encourage housing growth in appropriate locations.

The Amendment will limit dwellings to 2 in some sensitive areas of the municipality, and provide greater space for gardens in suburban areas in multi-unit development by reducing site coverage and requiring landscaping. It will also reduce the footprint of large single dwellings as setbacks and site coverage will apply.

Although there are some elements of the community who object to the proposed Amendment C125, and also object to some of the existing provisions of the planning scheme, there is also support from other sectors of the community.

The exhibited amendment proposed a strategically sound and balanced approach to the provision of housing that balances growth with garden city character.

It is recommended that:

- having regard to the report and recommendations of the independent Panel, Council adopt Amendment C125 as exhibited with the modifications set out earlier in this report; and
- given the age of ResCode and the significant amenity issues now being experienced by the community from large single dwellings that Council commence an advocacy campaign calling for a review of ResCode and the new residential zones.