



PLANNING OUR FUTURE |

Church Street Centre | Background Report

Final Background Report

November 2006



This report was prepared by a consultant team lead by Planisphere with contributions from Bayside Council officers. The sub-consultants included Essential Economics, Maunsell and Collaborations, with additional input from Charter Keck Cramer. The contents of this report apply the directions resolved upon at a Bayside Council meeting held on 19 December 2005. A Consultant's Supplementary Report has been prepared for consideration in conjunction with this report.

The assistance provided by Council, community and agency members of the Project Reference Group is acknowledged, as are the contributions of the many Bayside community members who participated in each stage of the plan preparation.

Contents

Contents	3
1. Brief and Method.....	5
1.1 Background.....	6
1.2 About the Study.....	6
1.3 Methodology.....	8
2. Analysis	11
2.1 Policy Context	12
2.2 Bayside Activity Centre Hierarchy	27
2.3 Economic Analysis	32
2.4 Housing Analysis.....	42
2.5 Site Analysis.....	47
2.6 Neighbourhood Character Analysis.....	52
2.7 Access	55
2.8 Defining a Boundary for the Centre.....	69
3. Evolution of the Structure Plan for Church Street	71
3.1 Stage 1: Issues and Opportunities	72
3.2 Stage 2: Emerging Ideas.....	73
3.3 Stage 3: The Draft Plan.....	78
4. From Draft Plan to Final Plan.....	79
4.1 Comments on the Draft Plan.....	80
4.2 Future Capacity of the Centres	82
5. Implementation	99
5.1 Statutory Implementation	100
5.2 Implementation Table.....	104
5.3 Monitoring and Review.....	109
Appendix 1 - Essential Economics Report.....	
Appendix 2 -Background Transport, Traffic and Parking Analysis	
Appendix 3 – Parking Precinct Plan.....	
Appendix 4 – Community Bulletin 1	
Appendix 5 - Community Bulletin 2.....	
Appendix 6 - Emerging Ideas Display	
Appendix 7 - Draft Structure Plan	
Appendix 8 - Community Bulletin 3.....	
Appendix 9 - Draft Plans Community Feedback Summary Table 1: By Respondent.....	
Appendix 10 - Draft Plans Community Feedback Summary Table 1: By Issue	
Appendix 11 - Dwelling Yield Analysis for Residential Areas.....	



Report Structure

This volume of the report (Volume 2) contains the background information for the Church Street Structure Plan. The 1st volume (The Structure Plan) contains the Structure Plan itself with a vision, future role and character statement, framework plan and objectives and implementation actions for the four themes – Activities, Buildings, Spaces and Access.



1. Brief and Method

1.1 Background

In early 2005 Bayside City Council commissioned a study team led by planning consultants Planisphere to prepare structure plans for the Bay Street, Church Street, Hampton and Sandringham Shopping Centres.

Melbourne 2030 is the overarching policy of the development of current structure plans for activity centres. The Bay Street, Church Street, Hampton and Sandringham Shopping Centres were identified in *Melbourne 2030* as being Major Activity Centres, below Principal Activity Centres in the activity centre hierarchy. While previous local policies focus on the business zoned areas of these activity centres, *Melbourne 2030* requires a more holistic approach, with the inclusion of all zones, generally within 400 metres of the core business zoned area.

1.2 About the Study

Study Brief

The primary purpose of the study is to facilitate preparation of structure and parking precinct plans for Bayside's Major Activity Centres:

- Bay Street, Brighton
- Church Street, Brighton
- Hampton
- Sandringham Village

The time horizon is 20-30 years. The specific outcomes of the project were to comprise:

- A Structure Plan for each of Bayside's four Major Activity Centres, including the immediate periphery of each centre, to manage future growth and change over a thirty year period.
- Parking Precinct Plans for each of Bayside's Major Activity Centres to support the Structure Plans.
- A detailed Implementation Plan outlining key responsibilities, indicative infrastructure costs, funding options and timelines.
- Recommendations concerning an appropriate partnership model involving Council, State Government, property owners and the community, to facilitate implementation of each Structure Plan.
- Documentation for an amendment to the Bayside Planning Scheme for the purpose of implementing the Structure Plans and Parking Precinct Plans.


Status of the Project

The Structure Plan was first prepared as a Draft Summary Report which was released for community comment and received a total of 18 submissions. These submissions were considered and the draft Summary Report was updated to form the Final Structure Plan. The following stage in the project is to implement the structure plans through Council policies and a planning scheme amendment.

Study Area and Activity Centre Boundaries

A study boundary for each of the centres was not defined in the brief for the project, however it was necessary to define a boundary to identify the extent of the Activity Centre and where the Structure Plan should apply. The boundary was generally defined at a walking distance of 400 metres from the railway station but considered other criteria such as large sites, lot orientation, heritage constraints etc. The criteria used to define the boundary are explained in more detail in section 2.8.

The map below shows the boundary of each activity centre in the context of the municipality.



Map 1: Activity Centre Boundaries

1.3 Methodology

Project Stages

The project has been undertaken in the following stages:

- Stage 1: Inception and Analysis (Dec 04-Feb 05)
- Stage 2: Issues and Opportunities / *Consultation 1* (28 Feb-18 Mar 05)
- Stage 3: Emerging Ideas / *Consultation 2* (30 May-24 Jun 05)
- Stage 4: Draft Plan / *Consultation 3* (22 Aug-16 Sep 05)
- Stage 5: Final Report (current)
- Stage 6: Amendment Documentation (to come)

Consultation during the planning process has been extensive, and was managed through a Communication, Consultation & Engagement Plan that included the following:

Stage 1: Inception & Analysis

Objectives

- To analyse and synthesise existing data and policy to distil key issues and elements of change to inform the structure and focus of the consultation process.
- To scope and design an appropriate consultation and information strategy.

Key Tasks

- Client briefing
- Work with client and Council to confirm data sources
- Gather and collate information inputs
- Confirmation of the extent of parking occupancy and turnover surveys
- Preparation of draft questionnaire for interview survey on parking habits and behaviour
- Team workshop 1
- Analyse key directions and potential areas of conflict from existing policy and research
- Development of information kit, Community Bulletin 1 and consultation products
- Develop targeted consultation and communication strategies
- Draft materials to Reference Group for discussion
- Refine materials for distribution and use

Stage 2: Consultation 1: Issues & Opportunities

Objectives

- To engage identified stakeholders and the wider community in testing and confirming the key elements of the vision for Major Activity Centres
- To identify conflicting needs and aspirations and areas of broad agreement
- To provide accessible information about the process.

Key Tasks

- Distribution of Community Bulletin 1 with feedback sheet
- Media release
- Commencement of site investigations and survey program
- Development of preliminary access and parking options
- Distribution of invitation to Centre based Workshops
- Conduct four Centre based workshops (one in each Centre). The objective for these sessions is to identify points of agreement and disagreement about the future issues and opportunities in each centre
- Interviews with land owners

- Collation and analysis of consultation outcomes and any written feedback for design and planning team

Stage 3: Consultation 2: Emerging Ideas

Objective

- To provide accessible information about the future options for local Major Activity Centres in Bayside
- To provide accessible opportunities for community comment and input
- To identify the key elements of a preferred future for each Major Activity Centre

Key Tasks

- Team workshop 2
- Preparation of consultation products including illustration of key choices and summary of proposals for each Centre
- Distribution of Community Bulletin 2 & invitation to briefing
- Workshop/briefings in each activity centre
- Implementation of “on-street” information displays in each centre
- Displays to remain in local libraries for two weeks with bulletins and feedback sheets
- Collation of feedback
- Use of feedback to refine access and parking proposals
- Preparation of consultation report for planning and design team and client.

Stage 4: Consultation 3: Draft Plan

Objective

- To inform about the outcomes of the previous consultation, and the ways this has influenced further development of the plans
- To inform about progress with development of the plans
- To enable community comment on the draft plans before they are finalised for Council consideration

Key Tasks

- Preparation of consultation product: summary of draft plan proposals.
- Team workshop 3
- Distribution of Community Bulletin 3
- Displays on site

Stage 5: Final Report

Objective

- To finalise the Structure Plans for each centre

Key Tasks

- Summarising of, and response to, public comments on the Draft Plan
- Additional analysis of built form and capacity for each Centre
- Council briefing 31 January 2006 (new Councillors elected November 2005)
- Completion of the Parking Precinct Plans
- Council’s application for interim built form standards, approved by the Minister for Planning on 22 June 2006
- Council Meetings held on 19 December 2005 and 6 June 2006, which resolved on key built form policy issues, set the brief for a number of additional research and policy development tasks, and committed to urgent completion of the Structure Plans
- Preparation of the Final Structure Plan and Background Report

Reference and Technical Groups

Project Reference Group

A Project Reference Group (PRG) oversaw the project at a high level and provided advisory input. Membership included:

- Councillors
- Community / Peak Body Representatives (8-10)
- Council Senior Officers / DSE

The Group met three times, as follows:

	Date	Main Agenda Items
PRG1	17 Feb, 2005	The scope of the project; the role of the PRG Work program; consultation arrangements Preparation for Consultation 1: Issues & Opportunities
PRG2	21 Apr, 2005	Results of Consultation 1: Issues & Opportunities Preparation for Consultation 2: Emerging Directions
PRG3	21 Jul, 2005	Results of Consultation 2: Emerging Directions Preparation for Consultation 3: Draft Plans

Councillor Steering Committee (CSC)

A Councillor Steering Committee, initially comprising the Councillor members of the Project Reference Group, met at key stages to formulate recommendations to Council or to discuss contentious issues.

Technical Group (TG)

Council officers and some agency representatives met at key project stages to provide input and comment on draft material.

	Date	Main Agenda Items
TG1	15 Feb, 2005	Project brief Work program; consultation arrangements Preparation for Consultation 1: Issues & Opportunities
TG2	19 Apr, 2005	Results of Consultation 1: Issues & Opportunities Preparation for Consultation 2: Emerging Directions
TG3	19 Jul, 2005	Results of Consultation 2: Emerging Directions Preparation for Consultation 3: Draft Plans
TG4	4 Oct, 2005	Results of Consultation 3: Draft Plans Brief for Final Report & Amendment

Subsequently the study team met senior officers of the Council to discuss a number of key issues on 27 October 2005, planning and engineering officers on 7 December to resolve traffic and parking recommendations, and officers of the Department of Sustainability and Environment on 16 December to receive comments and discuss statutory implementation. There were also a number of additional meetings in 2006 aimed at resolving the detail of the final report.

Our method of working was to expose early drafts of material to Technical Group meetings, somewhat more refined versions to the Project Reference Group, then produce the 'polished' version for public release. This allowed material to evolve in responsive manner as it was detailed. It meant Technical Groups and Project Reference Groups were often helping to shape 'product' rather than reviewing polished drafts, and we therefore presented material at meetings, rather than pre-circulating it, as part of this process.



2. Analysis


2.1 Policy Context

Planning Policy from State and Municipal level forms the strategic foundation for the Urban Design Framework. Following is a summary of the relevant policies.

Influences

The future planning of the Structure Plan area will have regard to the physical surroundings, character and amenity. However, influences such as local governance, assets and infrastructure, social amenity and other urban amenity issues are important when considering the content of the Structure Plan.

The following diagram provides an outline of some of the documents that may influence the Structure Plan and how they relate.



- Bayside Council's Key Documents
- Bayside Council's Peripheral Documents
- Documents of Other Bodies

State Planning Policy Framework

Clause 12, Metropolitan Development, provides specific objectives and strategies for Metropolitan Melbourne. Clause 12 comprises a number of overall goals, objectives and strategies based on those introduced by Melbourne 2030. It is outlined that the first major goal of creating a more compact city is to be achieved through the strengthening of activity centres, where infrastructure already exists to best cope with change.

Clause 14, Settlement, encourages consolidation of residential and employment activities within existing urban areas and designated growth areas. It states that major suburban retail, commercial, administrative, health, education, entertainment and cultural developments should be concentrated in and around activity centres with good access to integrated transport nodes, and that higher land use densities and mixed use developments should be encouraged near public transport.

Clause 15, Environment, promotes consolidation of urban development, integration of land use and transport, and reduction of greenhouse emissions by reducing the long term dependency on energy from fossil fuels.

Clause 16, Housing, encourages residential development that is cost-effective in infrastructure provision and use and encourages public transport use. Section 16 encourages increased residential densities to help consolidate urban areas. It also encourages the development of well-designed medium-density housing which respects the neighbourhood character, improves housing choice, makes better use of existing infrastructure and improves energy efficiency.

Clause 17, Economic Development, encourages the concentration of major retail, commercial, administrative, entertainment and cultural developments into activity centres (including strip shopping centres) which provide a variety of land uses and are highly accessible to the community (particularly public transport).

Clause 18, Infrastructure, states higher land use densities and mixed use developments should be encouraged near public transport.

Particular Provisions

Clause 54, *One Dwelling on a Lot* and Clause 55, *Two or More Dwellings on a Lot and Residential Buildings* are both components of ResCode and are relevant to the development of dwellings located within a Residential Zone, Mixed Use Zone or Township Zone. Clause 54 is relevant to the development of a single residential dwelling on a lot, while Clause 55 is relevant to the development of two or more dwellings on a lot. Each clause comprises a number of objectives related to neighbourhood character, site layout and building massing, amenity impacts, on-site amenity and facilities and detailed design. Each objective contains standards and decision guidelines to be considered for residential development applications.

Clause 56, Residential Subdivision, also forms a component of ResCode and relates to any application to subdivide land in a Residential Zone, Mixed Use Zone or Township Zone. Clause 56 is also guided by the overarching principles of the protection of neighbourhood character and amenity and the assurance of environmentally sustainable development. The objectives within Clause 56 are focused on on-site amenity and the impact of subdivisions on the surrounding neighbourhood.

Melbourne 2030 & Metropolitan Transport Plan

Under Melbourne 2030 Bay Street, Hampton Street, Church Street and Sandringham Village are defined as Major Activity Centres. Major Activity Centres are the third highest form of Activity Centre in the hierarchy set out by Melbourne 2030, below the Central Activities District (the city) and Principal Activity Centres. They make up the majority of large activity centres in Melbourne. Metropolitan Melbourne has a network of around 100 Principal and Major Activity centres, and together they comprise around 30 per cent of total retail turnover, substantial employment, recreational and

community activities and are a focus for the surrounding community. Under Melbourne 2030 activity centres are to be further developed so as to increase access to the existing public transport network and to create vibrant urban spaces. Melbourne 2030 encourages that these centres be the location for increased future development, broadening the base of activities and increasing commercial development. Around these centres the development of a range of housing forms is also encouraged. This development is to occur with good urban design that protects and improves cultural identity, neighbourhood character, sense of place, heritage values and community safety.

The key transport-related objectives for the development of activity centres include:

- Reduce the number of private motorised vehicle trips by concentrating activities that generate high numbers of (non-freight) trips in highly accessible locations;
- Improve access by walking, cycling and public transport to services and facilities for local and regional populations; and
- Support the development of the Principal Public Transport Network.

In order to provide greater definition in relation to the transport objectives underpinning Melbourne 2030, the Government released the Linking Melbourne Metropolitan Transport Plan in December 2004. The document provides a comprehensive plan for the management and development of Melbourne's transport system. It sets out directions and initiatives to meet the challenges posed by Melbourne's growth and development over the next 10 years.

The Plan reinforces and supports the Government's strategic framework for managing land use and transport contained in Melbourne 2030. The Victorian Government has set a target that by the year 2020, 20% of motorised trips will take place on public transport. The programs contained in the Metropolitan Transport Plan will lay the foundation for future progress towards this target. The Metropolitan Transport Plan is particularly relevant to Bayside, as it outlines a number of strategies for inner and established suburbs. The Government acknowledges that increasing road capacity through road building programs alone cannot solve traffic congestion. Instead the Government is proposing a range of complementary approaches. These include:

- Promote **greater use of public transport**, particularly in established areas where the supply is relatively good
- Promote **greater use of walking and cycling**, for shorter trips
- Make the existing **public transport system more user-friendly** through improved co-ordination of services (for example bus and train timetables), real-time passenger information, better facilities at stations and stops, and an improved ticketing system
- Provide people with **better information about travel options** and the associated costs and benefits, to assist their travel decisions.

Local Planning Policy Framework

Municipal Strategic Statement

The Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS) is a statement of the key strategic planning, land use and development objectives for the municipality and the strategies and actions for achieving the objectives.

21.05 Housing

At Clause 21.05 the MSS provides an overview of the housing availability in the municipality and identifies the issues related to future housing provision, population and demographic changes, and the appearance and character of housing. There are five objectives within the clause that set future directions for housing and strategies and implementation measures are provided to achieve these objectives. They include:

- The accommodation of increases in population and changes of demographic structure;

- The provision of greater certainty to residents and developers in terms of the preferred future character of the area, as well as the identification of areas requiring special attention;
- The facilitation of quality design outcomes which make a positive contribution to the character of residential areas;
- The conservation of biodiversity through retention of native vegetation, protection of habitat and control of pest plants and animals;
- The promotion of energy efficiency in new dwellings.

21.06 Activity Centres

Clause 21.06 recognises the range of activity centres present in Bayside and identifies key issues, objectives and strategies for this range of activity centres. For each of the four activity centres of Church Street, Hampton Street, Bay Street and Sandringham Village, Clause 21.06 provides a list of strengths and issues:

- Hampton Street is categorised as a community-level centre with antiques, food and fashion as its strengths and competitiveness for weekly shopping, parking distribution, traffic circulation and urban design as the key issues confronting the centre.
- Church Street is also identified as a community-level centre with fashion and cinema as its strengths and the need to maintain competitiveness for weekly shopping, a heavy reliance on fashion and the amenity of adjoining residential areas as the key issues facing the centre.
- Bay Street is identified as a large neighbourhood centres with cafes, gourmet food, offices, specialty shops, entertainment and Victorian architecture as its strengths, with key issues including the need to develop a commercial / office component as the basis for centre sustainability and insufficient parking and traffic congestion.
- Sandringham Village is also categorised as a large neighbourhood centre with professional services, specialist food and community facilities as its strengths and key issues that include the urban design of the centre and the need to improve connectivity of precincts and parking distribution.

The overall objectives of the Activity Centres policy are to promote sustainable development of the shopping centres, to improve traffic circulation and to facilitate well-designed centres in keeping with the neighbourhood character. The strategies for implementation include changes to zoning to reflect the desired land uses in activity centres, the development of further policy to reinforce the role and function of main commercial centres and the development of design guidelines for commercial centres.

Local Policies

22.02 Church Street Activity Centre – Urban Design Policy

The Urban Design Policy for the Church Street Activity Centre applies to all land zoned Business 1 or Business 2 within the activity centre. The objectives of the policy are focused on the existing design of the Church Street Centre. The key objective of the policy is to reinforce the two distinct built form areas within the centre: the mostly single storey western end with its significant landscaped component and the predominantly two storey eastern end with narrower streets. The policy seeks to achieve well-designed development that complements the existing character of the area. Strategies to achieve these objectives include the encouragement of a modern interpretation of historic precedent in terms of building design and form, the creation of arcade links between Church Street to car parks and other policies for specific areas.

Zones and Overlays

Residential 1 Zone

The purpose of the Residential 1 Zone is:

To implement the State Planning Policy Framework and the Local Planning Policy Framework, including the Municipal Strategic Statement and local planning policies.

To provide for residential development at a range of densities with a variety of dwellings to meet the housing needs of all households.

To encourage residential development that respects the neighbourhood character.

In appropriate locations, to allow educational, recreational, religious, community and a limited range of other non-residential uses to serve local community needs.

The Residential 1 Zone requires that the objectives, standards and decision guidelines of Clause 54 are considered in any planning application.

Schedule to the Residential 1 Zone

The schedule to the Residential 1 Zone requires that a permit be sought to construct or extend one dwelling on a lot less than 500 square metres. Usually development of land for a single residential dwelling in the Residential 1 Zone does not require a permit unless the lot size is less than 300 square metres. The Schedule therefore enforces certain ResCode standards and requirements on applications for development of land falling within this lot size. The requirements are as follows:

- Front setbacks for sites not located on a corner must be consistent with those of abutting residences or 9 metres, whichever is the lesser.
- For buildings not on or within 150mm of a boundary, side setbacks should be a minimum of 2 metres and rear setbacks a minimum of 3 metres (plus 0.6 metres for every metres of height over 3.6 metres up to 6.9 metres, plus 2 metres for every metres of height over 6.9 metres).
- Fences in streets that fall within the Road Zone, Category 1 should not exceed 2 metres while fences in streets categorised as “other streets” should not exceed 1.2 metres where the fence is within 3 metres of the street.

Business 1 Zone

The purpose of the Business 1 Zone is to encourage the intensive development of business centres for retailing and other complementary commercial, entertainment and community uses.

The Business 1 Zone stipulates that land falling within the zone does not detrimentally affect the amenity of the neighbourhood in terms of the transportation of goods to and from the land, the appearance of the building and any associated works, and the emission of noise, waste product or any form of pollution.

The zone requires that a permit be sought to subdivide or construct or carry out works on any land falling within the zone. The zone also requires that a neighbourhood and site description response be submitted to the Responsible Authority, in adherence to the requirements at Clause 54.01.

Business 2 Zone

The Business 2 Zone seeks to encourage the development of offices and associated commercial uses and carries the same requirements as those of the Business 1 Zone.

Schedule 6 to the Design and Development Overlay

As part of Amendment C51, Schedule 6 to the Design and Development Overlay (DDO6) is temporarily applied to all properties within the proposed structure plan areas of Bay Street, Church Street, Hampton Street and Sandringham Village.

The overlay provides guidance for uses of the Bayside Planning Scheme on matters relating to height and setbacks for new development located within the Major Activity Centres. A maximum height limit of three (3) storeys with consideration for four (4) storey development within nominated commercial areas, and a maximum of two (2) storeys with consideration for three (3) storeys within residential areas, assists in maintaining the centres prevailing built form scale, streetscape rhythm and landscape character.

The requirements of this overlay cease to have effect after 30 June 2007.

Additional Background Documents

The following documents have been used to add depth to the broad strategic background in the development of the framework:

Association of Bayside Municipalities, *Clear Stormwater – A Planning Framework, June 2004*

With the main interest of the Association being the amenity and quality of the bay, this document looks at stormwater management as a specific component of ecologically sustainable development. The document describes the concept of water sensitive urban design as applying to developments that protect and enhance the values of the water environment, reduce potable water demand and minimise waste water generation. It looks at a performance framework with respect to stormwater quality and assesses current policies that are suited to water sensitive urban design. The document makes general recommendations for long term water sensitive urban design in terms of land use planning, performance based design, regulations and the role of councils in establishing appropriate provisions in planning schemes.

Status

This framework is an informal document of Bayside Municipalities however was a basis for Amendment C44 to the Bayside Planning Scheme. This amendment received no public objection and is currently with the Minister for Planning for approval.

Hassell and Garry Henshall and Associates for Bayside City Council, *Open Space Strategy Executive Summary, November 1996*

The Open Space Strategy has been developed to guide Bayside Council decision making in relation to management, planning, design and maintenance of their open spaces. The strategy notes the recreation needs of open spaces in Bayside and highlights the special focus of providing for recreation activities of children, teenagers and the elderly, an inventory of recreation facilities is provided in Part 2 of the strategy. The strategy advocates the foreshore as the primary open space resource in the municipality. It recommends a co-ordinated management plan (including Council, Friends of groups etc.) for the foreshore to protect conservation areas, natural areas, to enhance the landscape quality and improve the amenity and safety of the area.

Status

This strategy is included in the Bayside Planning Scheme as Schedule to Clause 81 in Incorporated Documents (Section 8). It is also cited as a reference document in Clauses 21.01 Introduction, 21.08 Tourism and 21.11 Open Space in the MSS.

Bayside City Council, *Bayside Coastal Strategy, April 1997*

This strategy outlines how the Council will manage the coast to protect and enhance its environment and public enjoyment. This document is not intended to give detail, but only broad directions to be followed later by action plans. The strategy gives a detailed background for the area in terms of the local economy, relevant planning policies, the role and responsibility of Council and local residents. The strategy is divided into three main sections, the first dealing with protection and enhancement of natural and cultural resources, the second dealing with landscape and urban design and the third looking at the use of the coast. It outlines detailed objectives and identifies the need for certain strategies under each of these topics.

Status

Included in the Bayside Planning Scheme as Schedule to Clause 81 in Incorporated Documents (Section 8). It is also cited as a reference document in Clauses 21.01 Introduction, 21.08 Tourism and 21.11 Open Space in the MSS.

Bayside City Council, *Bayside Tourism Strategy, December 2001*

Bayside seeks to promote the municipality as an attractive and desirable destination for tourists in order to boost the local economy. However, the strategy highlights the

need to protect the assets of the area including the culture, character and environment within this process. The strategy defines the character and appeal of Bayside which makes it attractive to visitors. Target markets are explored. The strategy uses strategy areas as a tool for the effective management of Bayside tourism opportunities. The recommendations of the strategy must be reconciled with other Bayside strategies and the Bayside Planning Scheme.

Status

This document was adopted by Council in 2001.

Bayside City Council - Council Plan 2006 – 2010

The current Council Plan for Bayside is the blueprint that guides Council's strategic direction for the four-year period from 2006 to 2010, and outlines the key goals and objectives to continue to improve the quality of life in Bayside. The Plan contains both specific short term commitments that will be implemented during the 2006/2007 financial year, and a range of longer term commitments to be tackled during future years.

The plan contains several goals relating to sustainability and the environment and commitments for achieving these goals. These include the completion and commencement of implementation of the structure plans for Major Activity Centres (Bay Street, Brighton; Church Street, Brighton; Hampton; and Sandringham).

It also commits Council to the completion of a review of parking for Major Activity Centres, including consideration of parking precinct plans.

Status

This document was adopted by Council in 2006.

Ratio Consultants Pty Ltd, Hennessy Services Pty Ltd, Bayside City Council Road Safety Strategic Plan, June 2003

This document is a strategic plan to improve safety and thereby reduce deaths and injuries on roads in Bayside. The plan has been prepared as part of the Safe Roads Initiative, and aims to assist Council co-ordinate more closely with other interest groups such as police, local schools, and the community regarding increases in safety on Bayside roads. The plan establishes a series of action plans to address the identified road safety issues in Bayside. These include road safety education and, partnerships with key agencies to provide strong leadership and to improve pedestrian safety and traffic management.

Status

This strategy is an informal document of the Bayside City Council.

Peter McNabb and Associates Pty Ltd, Bayside Melbourne 2030 Analysis, June 2003

This research report was commissioned by Bayside City Council in response to the release of State Government's Metropolitan Strategy- Melbourne 2030. It provides a broad assessment of the social, economic and environmental implications of Melbourne 2030. It included demographic, built form and economic analysis as well as a social / infrastructure capacity assessment.

This report identified a projected increase in dwellings (based on a low growth scenario) of 6100 over the period 2002-2030, and an increase in population of 7288. Average household size is projected to decline slightly slower than the DSE forecasts because the number of new medium density developments will be slower than DSE forecasts, and therefore household size will remain slightly higher.

This scenario assumes that the current level of activity will continue over the forecast period and includes other assumptions regarding land availability / constraints.

Other issues such as housing affordability and land economics and preparedness of the Bayside community to accept the evolution of planning controls that permit more intense development were raised in the report.

Status

This submission is an informal document of the Bayside City Council.

Bayside City Council, Melbourne 2030: Planning for Sustainable Growth Bayside City Council's Submission to the Minister for Planning, February 2003

Bayside's primary concerns with Melbourne 2030 are in regards Direction 1 'A More Compact City' and Draft Implementation Plans No's; 3. *Housing* and 4. *Activity Centres*. The Council states that Bayside has already absorbed a substantial amount of development pressure within existing policy frameworks. In the submission, the Council asserts that high levels of development cannot be sustained in the long term without significantly compromising the attributes that make Bayside a valued and desirable place to live including; the neighbourhood character, high residential amenity and aesthetic and environmental qualities. The Council also highlights the lack of available large size lots for development in Bayside. They claim that the nominated activity centres only have small size lots which, if developed, would have a significant impact on adjoining properties.

Status

This submission is an informal document of the Bayside City Council.

David Lock Associates and PBAI for Bayside City Council, Bicycle Strategy, 2003

The study concentrates on the need for broad strategic understanding that extends beyond improving the physical infrastructure of cycling. Recommended strategies within the report were the outcome of data analysis and community consultation. The strategy recommends improvements to cycling networks, promotion of cycling, educating the community on cycling rights and safety issues and improving cycling provisions in activity centres and other destinations with an aim to increasing the number of people who cycle between destinations in Bayside.

Status

The key recommendations of this study are included in Clause 21.12 – Infrastructure as part of Amendment C46. The study is also included as a Reference Document.

Charter Keck Cramer for Bayside City Council, Business Monitor, 2006

This document provides a general overview of the retail performance of the following centres in Bayside including; Bay Street, Hampton Street, Highett Shopping Centre, Martin Street Shopping Centre, Hampton East and Sandringham Shopping Centres. The monitor offers findings on the tenancy mixes, centre structures, competitive environment and offers recommendations for enhanced performance within these retail centres.

This 2006 Business Monitor Study is the fourth in a series; the previous studies were in 1996, 1999 and 2003. It was extended in 2006 to include industrial areas where previous reports had concentrated solely on the retail sector. The purpose of this component is to assess the strategic positions of the 9 retail centres in Bayside. The findings are based upon analysis of data relating to land use, tenancy mix, behavioural patterns of shoppers and the characteristics of businesses within the centres. Data relating to the wider retail sector is cited for its impact on retail centres. Findings include the identification of food retailing as the core unit of retailing in most centres, and the recognition of Church St and Hampton St as the regional level centres in Bayside, drawing from a wide catchment.

Status

The reports are informal documents of the Bayside City Council. The 2006 version is currently awaiting final consideration from Council therefore the 2003 version has been utilised for the majority of the analysis.

Bayside City Council, Project Brief – Quotation 030464Q Housing Strategy/Social Housing Strategy – Stage One, December 2003

This document is a project brief calling for the appointment of a suitably qualified candidate to undertake a Housing Strategy and Social Housing Strategy for the

Municipality. The preparation of this strategy is considered integral to the Council's response to Melbourne 2030. The key tasks the consultant will be required to perform are; to identify areas for population and housing change around Activity Centres, describe housing need with emphasis on the aged and social housing, to identify housing forms and address potential conflicts with existing local policies.

Status

This project Brief is an informal document of the Bayside City Council.

David Lock & Associates & SGS Economics/Planning, Bayside Housing/Social Housing Strategy, Stage 1 Final Report & Background Report June 2005

The reports provided some preliminary background material on potential methods for Bayside to meet the changing needs of the community whilst retaining the valued amenity, character and environmental qualities. It provided some potential built form implications of balancing the need to equip Bayside with the housing infrastructure required to meet the needs of the local population with consideration for the City's unique and valued sense of place.

Status

This document is a preliminary data report for Bayside City Council.

Bayside City Council, Review of Bayside Coastal Strategy 1997, August 2003

This document reviews the previous Bayside Coastal Strategy in relation to the current strategic and statutory context for the council's coastal management activities. It gives a detailed review of the Coastal Strategy in terms of its role, functionality and usefulness and looks at what action has been taken from the recommendations of the strategy. The review identifies opportunities for integration of Foreshore Master Plans into the planning system, looks at the development of a coastal framework and provides a series of key directions for management. The strategy also provides a protocol for consultation with indigenous groups in the Bayside area.

Status

Work has commenced on implementation of this study through an Amendment to the Planning Scheme expected in 2007.

Department of Sustainability and Environment, Activity Centre Design Guidelines, January 2005

This document has been developed to assist planners and designers in applying design principles to create activity centres. The design guidelines will support in the development of planning scheme policies and controls as well as, inform structure planning processes. The guidelines are structured around 8 elements of design considerations, and general design objectives are set out within these categories.

Status

These guidelines are informally produced by the Department of Sustainability and Environment for planners and designers.

Department of Sustainability and Environment, Guidelines for Higher Density Residential Development, October 2004

The guidelines set out objectives and suggestions for designing and assessing higher density residential development. They will assist designers and planners to apply design principles set out in Clause 19.03 of the SPPF and for Council when assessing applications. They comprise analysis of such issues as urban context, building envelope and layout, street pattern and street-edge quality and open space.

Status

The guidelines were released in November 2004 and comprise part of the Melbourne 2030 package. Council will need to have regard to the guidelines when assessing development applications.

Crime Prevention Victoria and Department of Sustainability and Environment, *Safer Design Guidelines for Victoria, 2005*

The purpose of these guidelines is to provide practical design suggestions for achieving development that is safer for the community using it. The Guidelines need to be considered in the preparation of planning permits, MSS, the development of Planning Scheme Policies and controls, public space planning and so on. The guidelines are set out under 10 design elements including, signage, lighting, building design, activity centres, parks, cycling paths urban structure, public facilities and car parks.

Status

It is stated in the Safer Design Guidelines, that they provide advice on how to achieve the objective for Safety in the SPPF Clause 19.03 Design and Built Form.

Department of Sustainability & Environment, *Southern Regional Housing Statement, 2006*

The Southern Regional Housing Statement (April 2006) has been prepared by DSE in partnership with local authorities in the southern region. The Statement contains an overview of the region's current demographic profile and the existing housing policy framework. It also identifies challenges and opportunities to achieve housing policy outcomes and proposes objectives, strategies and actions to ensure a regionally coordinated approach to managing housing growth and change.

Included in the vision statement is to ensure the southern region continues to be a most attractive, diverse, safe and harmonious living environment. There is a vision that new development should respect the character of suburbs valued by the community.

Status

The statement was adopted by the Southern Regional Housing Working Group in April 2006 and has been published by DSE.

Allom Lovell & Associates, *Bayside Heritage Review, 1999.*

The City of Bayside Heritage Review was commissioned by the Bayside City Council to examine heritage structures, precincts and landscapes within the former Cities of Brighton, Sandringham and those parts of the former Cities of Moorabbin and Mordialloc-Cheltenham, Highett and Beaumaris which now form the City of Bayside.

Conducted in 1999 by Allom Lovell and Associates Pty Ltd, the study included a review of Andrew Ward's two previous studies; the City of Brighton Urban Character and Conservation Study (1986) and the City of Sandringham Heritage and Conservation Study (1989). The study contained the following five volumes:

- Volume 1: Thematic History
- Volume 2: Building Citations
- Volume 3: Heritage Overlay Precincts
- Volume 4: Landscape Citations
- Volume 5: Heritage Overlay Schedule

Individual structures were given a classification (A, B or C) according to their heritage significance. Twenty-seven areas, known as heritage overlay precincts were deemed to be of heritage significance. These were also identified and contributory buildings were ranked A, B or C within the precinct boundary.

Heritage Overlays were not incorporated for the precincts that encompassed the structure plan areas of Bay Street, Hampton Street, and Sandringham. This was due to a Council resolution in 2000, which considered it more appropriate to address heritage issues in the course of preparation of Structure Plans for these centres.

Following the review, the following recommendations were made:

- All buildings graded A and B located outside precincts and which are listed within Volume 2 are recommended for Heritage Overlay Protection under the Bayside Planning Scheme.
- All precincts described in Volume 3 are recommended for Heritage Overlay Protection under the Bayside Planning Scheme.
- All landscapes which are listed in Volume 4 and which are located outside precincts are recommended for Heritage Overlay Protection under the Bayside Planning Scheme.

Status

The Review is a reference document within the Bayside Planning Scheme. The Heritage precincts located in the Major Activity Centres area being reviewed to establish their current status and may result in a separate Amendment being initiated for implementation of these precincts into the Planning Scheme.

Bayside Height Control Study (Hansen Partnership P/L and Context CMI) March 2000

This study arose from the need to review the mandatory height controls that were imposed by the State Government around the foreshore of Port Phillip Bay in the late 1980s.

The Bayside Height Control Study commenced with a review of existing height controls along the coast and examined the pressures for increased building heights in Bayside. The recommended controls proposed by the study are generally as follows:

- *A mandatory height control to be imposed over foreshore areas.*
- *A discretionary control to be imposed over inland areas.*
- *A maximum mandatory height of three storeys should be permitted in a limited number of locations, where properties fronting the Bay do not abut residential properties at the rear.*
- *Adopt a maximum two storey building height throughout all inland residential areas in Bayside. This height would be discretionary and the ability would exist to apply for a planning permit to exceed that height.*
- *A recommended height of three storeys in activity centers, with a mandatory limit of four storeys.*

Generally these recommendations were translated into Amendment C2, with the exception that the Minister did not approve height limits for activity centers.

Status

The Study is a reference document within the Bayside Planning Scheme.

Amendment C2

Amendment C2 sought to implement key strategic principles and planning controls from the following four studies:

- *The City of Bayside Residential Strategy 1999*
- *The City of Bayside Urban Character Report 1999*
- *The Bayside Vegetation Character Assessment 1999*
- *The Bayside Height Control Study 2000*

The amendment was written in the following three parts

Part I proposed to:

- **Modify the Municipal Strategic Statement** (Clause 21) to reflect the major outcomes of the Residential Strategy, Urban Character Assessment and Vegetation Character Assessment.
- **Introduce a Vegetation Protection Overlay** for the southern part of the municipality consistent with the findings from the Vegetation Character Assessment.
- **Introduce a Design and Development Overlay** across the municipality to reflect the findings of the Residential Strategy, Urban Character Assessment and Vegetation Character Assessment.
- **Introduce a Local Policy relating to Housing** (Clause 22.06) to reflect the findings of the Residential Strategy.

Part II proposed a **Local Variation to the Good Design Guide for Medium Density Housing**.

Part III proposed **Building Height Control Principles and Height Control Guidelines** to reflect the findings of the Height Control Study.

There were many submissions, which were received by the Panel to Amendment C2 concerning building height. Nearly half of the submissions supported one and two storey buildings in residential areas and three storey limits for buildings in commercial centres.

The Panel agreed that the Height Control Study is a robust analysis of the issue of height in Bayside and is based on sound strategic analysis.

Status

Part I, II & III have been incorporated within the Bayside Planning Scheme.

Amendment C46: Highett Structure Plan 2004

The Highett Structure Plan is a joint project involving Bayside and Kingston City Councils. It led to Amendment C46 which seeks to implement appropriate land use and policy framework within the *Bayside Planning Scheme* in accordance with the *Highett Structure Plan (Draft – November 2004)*. The proposed amendment will guide future development in and surrounding the Highett Neighbourhood Activity Centre.

Amendment C46 proposed to introduce two Design and Development Overlay Schedules, identifying areas that have specific requirements relating to the design and built form of new developments.

- DDO4 - Highett Activity Centre (Bayside Component) Apply a three (3) storey height limit to the commercial area west of the railway line.
- DDO5 - Preferred Medium Density Residential Areas (Highett) Encourage consolidation of lots to promote apartment-style development to a maximum height of 3 stores or 9.0 metres.

The Panel appointed by the Minister for Planning delivered their Panel report on Amendment C46: Highett Structure Plan in November 2005.

The Panel, in its report, specifically stated:

“The advantage of mandatory controls is the certainty they provide to all parties: the intending developer, the adjoining property owners, the community and Council.....Mandatory controls are therefore worth pursuing, provided planning has been undertaken in sufficient detail to take account of all the strategic objectives at both local and metropolitan levels and develop an urban form that most satisfactorily meets these objectives.”

The Panel noted that they strongly supported the use of mandatory height controls to implement activity centre structure plans. The Highett Panel supported the proposed three storey limits in the commercial areas but with provision for a further storey if “not visible from any parts of Highett Road”. Council considered this ambiguous and

difficult to translate into an appropriate legislative form, and did not adopt that part of the recommendation.

Status

Council adopted Amendment C46 on 21 February 2006 and the Amendment documentation is awaiting decision of the Minister for Planning for gazettal.

City of Bayside, Church Street Brighton, Urban Design Strategy, Background Report, June 2001

This urban design strategy looks at proposed improvements to carparking, streetscaping upgrades, the recognition of three distinct precincts within the Church Street centre and measures to improve traffic circulation and pedestrian access to the centre. The strategy examines design guidelines for certain aspects of the centre such as setbacks, facades and signage. It also provides an action plan and resource allocation for specific improvements.

Status

This strategy is an informal document of the Bayside City Council.

Planning Scheme Urban Design Principles

The State section of the planning scheme includes objectives and principles relating to Design and Built Form (Clause 19.03). These were added to the planning scheme as a result of the report of an advisory committee, established by the then Minister for Planning to review development control techniques in relation to urban design.

The objective of the Design and Built Form section of the planning scheme is (19.03-1):

To achieve high quality urban design and architecture that:

- Reflects the particular characteristics, aspirations and cultural identity of the community.
- Enhances liveability, diversity, amenity and safety of the public realm.
- Promotes attractiveness of towns and cities within broader strategic contexts.

For development proposals for non-residential development and multi-unit development not covered by ResCode, planning and responsible authorities must have regard to ten design principles contained in clause 19.03-2. These cover the following topics:

- Context
- The public realm
- Landmarks, views and vistas
- Pedestrian spaces
- Heritage
- Consolidation of sites and empty sites
- Light and shade
- Energy and resource efficiency
- Architectural quality
- Landscape architecture

These principles have informed the approach to this review, and will help to underpin the performance approach embodied in the review's findings.

Urban Design Principles for Activity Centres

Principles of urban design were developed as part of the Melbourne 2030 process in Technical Report 12: Sense of Place: Urban Design Principles for the Metropolitan Strategy. This states that we should aim to design activity centres according to the following principles:

- Safe (perceived safety, actual safety)
- Compact / walkable
- Integrate activities into a single, connected place entity
- Multi-function
- Open, accessible and welcoming to all
- Integrate with the surrounding area
- Layout centred on public transport

In addition, in upgrading an existing street based centre to embody the principles described above, the following aims should be considered:

- Maintain the continuity of built form to the street
- Retain and enhance the continuity of the shopping and other uses directly linked to the surround residential areas.
- Avoid extensive ground level car parks separating the centre from surrounding uses
- Retain and enhance the focus on public transport
- Encourage a vertical mix of uses, shop to housing or offices over shops, bearing in mind accessibility requirements of mobility impaired people
- Respect the character and heritage of the centre

Design Guidelines for Activity Centres

Melbourne 2030 Implementation Plan 4: Activity Centres includes design guidelines for activity centres that include the following advice, which is relevant to the structure planning challenge in Church Street:

Activity centres should be the focal points of the local community, and they are essential to local identity. They should be the places in which local services are concentrated, and at which public transport interchange occurs. Their design and appearance should express public and civic values. Their proper planning is the key to reducing car-dependence in Melbourne and other urban centres. The principles that should guide the design of every activity centre are contained in the Implementation Plan.

For activity centres to fulfil their role as community identity points they must be attractive and convenient for all visitors to the centre. A key to developing vibrant and attractive centres is to provide a strong identity that builds on local character. Street environments need to be welcoming and provide variety and interest.

...large stores such as supermarkets are essential to the vitality of many activity centres, but their large footprints, blank walls at the rear and sides, and sheeted roofs, can create visual and functional blight within the centre and surrounding areas. Poor integration can also adversely affect the economic and social performance of an activity centre.

For activity centres to deliver on the promise of increased sustainability, they need to attract an increasing proportion of public transport users. Public transport stops need to be come a central feature of activity centres, offering more convenient access than car parks. Different routes and modes of public transport need to be connected into well-located interchanges, integrated into the fabric of the centre.

Railway stations should function as a gateway to an activity centre, and should facilitate convenient modal interchange. There are difficult design challenges in trying to integrate railway lines and stations better into the fabric of activity centres. Railway lines can divide

activity centres and communities, and the parking areas associated with stations can blight adjacent residential and retail areas.

The boundary between activity centres and their residential hinterland often has the appearance of a collection of 'left-over' spaces, containing backs of buildings, delivery bays and car parks. The impacts of activity centre edges on adjoining residential areas are often addressed in a piecemeal fashion, yet this is one of the most important planning issues affecting local people. A positive approach is needed to the planning and development of sites along the edge, many of which have potential for better use and development. With changing demographic requirements there is an increasing desire for people to live close to or within activity centres, a trend that can reduce the necessity for car travel. There are numerous opportunities to provide higher density housing as part of mixed use developments, or by placing them above other uses such as shops or car parks. New residential developments tend to demand an increased density and height. This presents design challenges in making a transition in scale between larger new developments and existing built form.

Buildings can be designed in ways that contribute to the overall vitality of an activity centre. The mix of uses is also important. Activity centres only reach their full potential as community focal points if they accommodate a multiplicity of uses – not just retail. To fulfil the aim of reducing the need to travel, they should increasingly become concentrated centres of mixed use activity. There are also benefits in mixing compatible uses 'horizontally', within precincts, and 'vertically', within buildings, to make the public spaces in the centres safer and more attractive to pedestrians.

Best Practice for Structure Plans

The Practice Notes for Structure Plans and Urban Design Frameworks were developed as part of Melbourne 2030 and provide a guide to their preparation and use. The practice notes list the key characteristics of Structure Plans and Urban Design Frameworks, important steps in the study process and outputs and skills required to undertake the studies. These requirements have guided the process of, and been addressed in the Structure Plan.

Structure Planning for Activity Centres, DSE General Practice Note, 2003

The Practice Notes outline that Melbourne 2030 expects activity centres to be a focus of services, employment, and social interaction. They will be locations for significant change and will be served by public transport.

It outlines the process for structure planning from the review of the existing strategic work, analysis of the particular centre and its context, development of vision / objectives, preparation of a framework plan through to consultation with the local community and stakeholders.

Parking Precinct Plans, VPP Practice Note, DOI, 2002

The practice note gives guidance on the application of a Parking Precinct Plan and the information that can be included in a Plan.

An assessment of the parking demand and supply should be carried out to justify the Plan and this study should be based on an assessment of current and future conditions and existing catchment, behaviour and expectations of users should be considered.

The practice note outlines the requirements of the plan including: definition of a boundary, setting objectives, and understanding parking outcomes and implementation in the planning scheme.

2.2 Bayside Activity Centre Hierarchy

Introduction

This section examines the classification of activity centres in the City of Bayside and neighbouring areas according to the *Melbourne 2030* metropolitan strategy. On a more functional level, the hierarchy of these centres is also considered according to a traditional retail and commercial analysis.

Melbourne 2030 Activity Centre Classification

The *Melbourne 2030* metropolitan strategy classifies metropolitan Melbourne's activity centres according to the following categories:

- Central Activities District;
- Principal Activity Centres;
- Major Activity Centres;
- Specialised Activity Centres; and
- Neighbourhood Activity Centres.

The classification system takes into account the development aspirations for each centre in the context of metropolitan planning outcomes; in particular the preferred uses, scale of development and links to the public transport system.

There are no Principal or Specialised Activity Centres defined for Bayside while *Melbourne 2030* does not specifically define individual neighbourhood centres. There are four Major Activity Centres defined in *Melbourne 2030* for the City of Bayside. These four centres are Brighton – Bay Street, Brighton – Church Street, Hampton and Sandringham.

According to *Melbourne 2030*, the characteristics of Major Activity Centres include:

- a mix of activities that generate high numbers of trips, including business, retail, services and entertainment;
- being generally well served by multiple public transport routes (many being on the rail network), and on the Principal Public Transport Network or capable of being linked to that network;
- a large catchment, and attracting activities that meet metropolitan needs; and
- the potential to grow and support intensive housing developments without conflicting with surrounding land uses. (*Melbourne 2030, Policy 1.1*)

Major Activity Centres have a similar role to Principal Activity Centres but serve a smaller catchment and provide a more localised role.

Principal and Major Activity Centres located in neighbouring local government areas (LGAs) which are of relevance to the City of Bayside include:

- Port Phillip – Balaclava (Major), St Kilda (Major)
- Glen Eira – Elsternwick (Major), Bentleigh (Major)
- Kingston – Southland (Principal), Moorabbin (Major), Cheltenham (Major), Mentone (Major)

City of Bayside Retail and Commercial Hierarchy

For the purposes of preparing a retail and commercial assessment for individual activity centres, we have assessed the centres according to an Activity Centre

hierarchy normally used in retail-economic analysis. The hierarchy is based on the size of the centre, its retail elements (department stores, discount department stores, supermarkets, etc), its geographic catchment, and the role it plays in terms of meeting the convenience and comparison shopping needs of the surrounding population.

Although the presence of a range of community and non-retail commercial functions in most activity centres is inevitable and desirable, the size and nature of retail floorspace in an activity centre is a key determinant of a centre's overall role and relative importance. This is because retail is most often the key activity generator in an activity centre, and the presence of a strong and vibrant retail presence tends to attract other non-retail functions.

The following paragraphs present a description of the retail hierarchy serving Bayside residents. The Bayside retail hierarchy is shown in Map 1.

Central Business District

The Melbourne CBD contains around 500,000m² of retail floorspace and provides retail and commercial facilities of metropolitan and state importance. Around 20% employed residents of the City of Bayside work in the inner city, including the CBD.

The Melbourne CBD is located just 7.5km from the northern boundary of the City of Bayside and is readily accessible to residents due to the strong rail and road links, as well as the high share of the City of Bayside population employed in the inner city. The Melbourne CBD is a metropolitan-wide destination for higher-order retail and entertainment.

Regional Centres

Regional centres serve a large regional catchment with their higher order shopping requirements. Typically, regional centres will include one or more department stores (e.g. Myers, David Jones), discount department store(s) (e.g. Target, K-mart, etc), major full-line supermarkets and a wide range of specialty stores. Regional centres often contain a substantial range of non-retail commercial and community facilities.

There are no regional centres located in the City of Bayside. The residents of Bayside are well served by regional shopping facilities at the nearby Southland Shopping Centre which is located just to the east of the municipal boundary and is easily accessed via the Nepean Highway. The Chadstone Shopping Centre located 9 km to the north east of the Hampton Major Activity Centre, and the Prahran shopping precinct (including Chapel Street) located in Melbourne's inner -southern suburbs, are also reasonably close, and draw some patronage from across the City of Bayside.

These three regional centres would all draw a share of their patronage from the City of Bayside, with Southland in particular exhibiting a strong trading influence across the municipality. Southland is one of the largest integrated shopping centres in Australia and has an extensive range of specialties and major retailers, including two department stores and three discount department stores. The proximity of Southland to the City of Bayside means that Southland would be the higher-order retail destination of choice for many residents, and this limits the potential growth of similar retail development in the Bayside municipality.

The fact that Southland is located just outside the boundary of the City of Bayside means that a significant share of employment at the centre would be for Bayside residents. In this respect, any "escape" spending to Southland does not necessarily represent a significant economic loss to the municipality.

Sub-Regional Centres

Sub-regional centres serve a large catchment stretching across several suburbs and typically include one or more discount department stores and major full-line supermarkets. People frequent sub-regional centres for their weekly and higher order shopping requirements. There are no sub-regional centres in the City of Bayside.

The nearest centres serving a sub-regional role include the St Kilda Major Activity Centre just to the north of the City of Bayside (4km from Bay Street) and Malvern Central/Armadale (5km from Bay Street). Another centre serving a similar sub-

regional catchment is the Direct Factory Outlets (DFO) complex at Moorabbin. St Kilda and the DFO at Moorabbin in particular are retail centres located outside the City of Bayside, which actually serve Bayside residents.

Large Neighbourhood Centres

Large neighbourhood centres serve the basic day-to-day retail and service needs of the surrounding catchment and typically include a full-line supermarket as well as a variety of specialty stores aimed towards convenience retailing (e.g. food, pharmacy, video hire, hairdressers, cafés, etc) as well as a selection of high order specialty stores (including fashion, shoes, etc). A full-line supermarket contains the full range of products expected by consumers in a large, modern store including a bakery, butcher and comprehensive fruit and vegetable section.

There are three large neighbourhood shopping centres in Bayside comprising the following centres which are the subject of this report:

- Church Street Brighton;
- Hampton; and
- Sandringham.

These large neighbourhood centres provide the surrounding catchment with easy access to a range of retail facilities to undertake their weekly and daily convenience shopping. The retail and commercial offer of these centres and the size of the catchments they serve justifies their “large” neighbourhood activity centre status. These three centres are the major retail destinations located in the City of Bayside.

Outside of the municipality, Large Neighbourhood Centres at Bentleigh, Elsternwick, Moorabbin and Mentone also serve nearby residents of the City of Bayside.

Small Neighbourhood Shopping Centres

Small neighbourhood centres tend to serve a more localised catchment with a smaller retail and commercial offer and an increased focus on convenience retail outlets. These centres may include a small independent supermarket as well as shops selling basic convenience orientated items.

There are four small neighbourhood centres located in the City of Bayside:

- Bay Street Brighton, which is a subject of this report;
- Gardenvale;
- Black Rock; and
- Beaumaris Concourse.

Of these four centres, Bay Street is the most influential in terms of the size and role of the centre. However, the Bay Street Brighton centre is defined as a small neighbourhood centre due to the lack of a major supermarket and the limited catchment the centre serves. This is not a reflection of the future development opportunities in the centre, nor its classification as Major Activity Centre under *Melbourne 2030*, but merely a reflection of the existing retail role being served by the centre in the context of the shopping centre hierarchy in the City of Bayside.

The small neighbourhood centre of Highett is also located on the eastern boundary between the municipalities of Bayside and Kingston.

Local Shopping Centres

Various local shopping centres are located in Bayside and they serve a very localised catchment. Local shopping centres consist of a small strip of specialty shops (typically from 1 shop up to about 10 shop fronts) which provide day-to-day retail requirements.



Map 1 City of Bayside Retail/Commercial Hierarchy

Source: CData with MapInfo
Produced by: Essential Economics

	Regional Centre		Small Neighbourhood Centre
	Large Neighbourhood Centre		City of Bayside



Other Centres

There needs to be consideration of other activity centres which do not fit the traditional criteria for an activity centre hierarchy. These centres tend to serve more specific roles and an appropriate example is the Direct Factory Outlets centre at Moorabbin Airport in the neighbouring City of Kingston. However, there is no such specialised activity centre located in the City of Bayside.

Summary

The City of Bayside Activity Centre Hierarchy is summarised in Table 2.21 below. The activity centre hierarchy in the municipality is fairly “flat” as there are no regional, sub-regional or other specialised activity centres located in Bayside, as a result residents are required to travel further to centres such as Southland, Chadstone and the Melbourne CBD in order to undertake their higher order shopping. However Church Street does contain a significant component higher-order retailing for a centre of its size and role.

Table 2.21: City of Bayside Activity Centre Hierarchy

Retail Hierarchy	Anchor Retail Tenants	Occupied Retail Floorspace	Other Major Tenants	M2030 Classification
Large Neighbourhood Centres				
Church Street Brighton	Safeway and Coles	19,360 m ²	Dendy Brighton Cinema	Major
Hampton	Safeway	20,590 m ²	True Value Hardware	Major
Sandringham	Coles	9,180 m ²	Sandringham Hotel	Major
Small Neighbourhood Centres				
Bay Street Brighton	2 small IGA supermarkets	11,810 m ²	Brighton Bay Cinema	Major
Gardenvale	Small Foodrite Supermarket	3,970 m ²	-	Not identified (Neighbourhood)
Black Rock	Small IGA	na	-	Not identified (Neighbourhood)
Beaumaris Concourse	Supa IGA (limited range)	na	-	Not identified (Neighbourhood)
Highbett	Aldi under development	na	-	Not identified (Neighbourhood)
Local				
Various	na	na	-	

Source: Essential Economics Pty Ltd and Melbourne 2030

Conclusion

The *Melbourne 2030* metropolitan strategy classifies Brighton – Bay Street, Brighton – Church Street, Hampton and Sandringham as Major Activity Centres. This classification system in *Melbourne 2030* reflects the development aspirations for each centre based on metropolitan wide planning policies.

A useful tool in examining the existing role and function of activity centres in a local area such as Bayside is a more traditional retail shopping centre hierarchy. Using this analysis, Church Street Brighton, Hampton and Sandringham are all defined as **large** neighbourhood centres due to the size of their retail and commercial floorspace components and the presence of major supermarkets. These centres offer the surrounding catchment with a place to undertake most of their basic weekly shopping

and also offer some higher order non-food shopping such as apparel and other specialist retailers.

Bay Street Brighton, while defined as a Major Activity Centre under *Melbourne 2030*, currently fulfils what can be defined as a **small** neighbourhood centre role in the context of the City of Bayside's activity centre hierarchy. The lack of a major supermarket and the proximity to the much larger Church Street – Brighton centre means that the Bay Street centre does not serve an extensive catchment and does not generate the patronage levels observed at the three other subject centres.

In the absence of regional or sub-regional shopping centres in the City of Bayside, residents are required to travel to other municipalities in order to visit facilities such as department or discount department stores. The absence of such centres contributes to a significant amount of available retail spending by Bayside residents escaping to other municipalities. However, the economic cost of this is reduced by the relative proximity of these centres to Bayside, particularly Southland which is located just beyond the Bayside boundary.

2.3 Economic Analysis

Introduction

The Church Street, Brighton centre is located just a kilometre to the south of the Bay Street Centre. The retail and commercial functions in the activity centre extend along Church Street from New Street in the west to just beyond Male Street in the east. Middle Brighton rail station is located towards the eastern end of the strip. [The full Essential Economics Economic Analysis appears in [Appendix 1](#).]

Centre Profile

The following analysis provides an overview of the Church Street Brighton Centre including comments on the tenancy and land use mix, its retail and community function, general centre performance, character and the competitive environment faced by the Centre.

Tenancy Mix

The Church Street Centre is anchored by a Safeway supermarket of around 2,360m² located to the west of the rail line, and a Coles supermarket of around 1,100m² located in the Dendy Plaza. The presence of both major supermarket chains in the Church Street Centre is an important generator of customer traffic and activity in the centre. The two supermarkets also help support a range of other fresh food specialties in the strip including bakeries, take-away liquor and fruit and vegetable stores.

The results of the Essential Economics floorspace survey are shown below in Table 2.31.

Table 2.31 Church Street Brighton Retail Floorspace Summary, December 2004

Category	No. of Businesses	Retail Floorspace (m ²)	% of Retail Floorspace
FLG	16	5,660	29.2%
Café and Restaurant	22	2,610	13.5%
<u>Takeaway Food</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>360</u>	<u>1.9%</u>
Total Food	42	8,630	44.6%
Apparel	54	5,450	28.2%
Homewares	21	1,900	9.8%
Bulky Goods	2	180	0.9%
<u>Leisure</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>1,350</u>	<u>7.0%</u>
Total Non-Food	89	8,880	46%
Services	22	1,850	9.6%
Occupied Retail	153	19,360	100.0%
Vacant (vacancy rate)	3	280	1.4%
Total Retail	156	19,640	

Source: Essential Economics Pty Ltd Floorspace Survey 13th December, 2004

It is important to note the strong presence of non-food retail operators in Church Street. In particular, there are an extremely high number of apparel stores, with over 50 individual traders. The quality of the apparel traders in the centre is also impressive with a selection of “name” national brand tenants including Laura Ashley, Country Road and Rivers. The presence of these traders suggests that the apparel stores in the centre are trading strongly.

Church Street is also notable for its range of homewares traders which include a number of antique stores, giftware shops as well as major chain stores House and Bed, Bath and Table.

The major non-retail tenant in the strip is the Palace cinema complex located in Dendy Plaza. The Half Moon Hotel located just to the east of the rail line is also an important local entertainment venue.

Based on the 2006 Bayside Retail Monitor, there are 30 non-retail commercial businesses located at ground level in Church Street. Despite the obvious retail focus of Church Street, there is a notable office component, particularly towards the western end of the centre near the corner of Church Street and St Andrews Street.

Table 2.32 Church Street Brighton Non-Retail Business Count, 2006

Category	No. of Businesses
Health & Community Services	6
Property & Business Services	12
Other	12
Total	30

Source: Charter Keck Cramer “2006 Bayside Retail Monitor”

Retail Function

The Church Street Centre contains a diverse and strongly performing retail sector. The Safeway supermarket appears to be a busy store which successfully anchors the

centre by attracting a high level of customer traffic. The store is the only major supermarket located in the northern part of the City of Bayside and therefore serves a relatively large catchment.

The Coles supermarket occupies space that was previously operated by the former Foodchain store by David Jones and before that a Franklins store. The Coles is of an insufficient size to be considered a full sized store but nevertheless also appears to be trading successfully and is an important tenant in the Dendy Plaza complex.

The café and restaurant offer in Church Street is also strong with a solid range of traders along the strip. However, in a relative sense the proportion of traders in this category is low compared to the other Major Activity Centres in Bayside. The Church Street share of retail floorspace as cafes and restaurants is 13.5%, compared with up to 20.3% at Bay Street as shown below in Table 2.33. This does not necessarily reflect a weakness of the Church Street Centre, and is likely to reflect the strength of the centre in apparel and homewares retail.

Table 2.33 Bayside MACs - Share of Café and Restaurant Floorspace as Proportion of Total

RETAIL SECTOR	BAY STREET	CHURCH STREET	HAMPTON	SANDRINGHAM
Café and Restaurant	20.3%	13.5%	16.1%	19.7%

Source: Essential Economics

The strength of the apparel and homewares offer in Church Street is due to both the high income profile of the area and the relatively high levels of activity which occur along the strip. Apparel and homewares traders, and in particular the name brands such as Country Road etc., require exposure to substantial numbers of potential customers. This exposure is enhanced when there is a critical mass of apparel traders that generates a sense of “destination”. Church Street has this dynamic working strongly with around 75 apparel and homewares operators combined. Most of these traders are also aimed at the high end of the market.

The strong trading position of the Church Street Centre is exemplified by the very low level of retail vacancies in the centre. As of December 2004 there were just three retail vacancies in the centre with two of these vacancies occurring on the fringe of the centre.

The overall centre presents extremely well with a high quality streetscape and a strong degree of integration along the strip, despite the presence of the rail line in the east.

Commercial and Community Function

The Church Street Centre does not have an extensive office precinct as is the case for the Bay Street Centre. However, there is a considerable range of non-retail commercial uses in the centre including real estate and travel agents, banks as well as some office space located at the western fringe of the centre. The St Andrews Hospital is located on the western side of New Street.

In contrast to the office market in Bay Street, the Church Street office market, although smaller in size, appears to be operating effectively with only a low number of vacancies.

Competition

The Church Street Centre, given the strength of its apparel and homewares offer, faces competition from Southland, located around 7km to the south east. Southland is currently trying to establish itself as the key fashion destination in the middle south eastern suburbs of Melbourne (in competition with Church Street and to a lesser extent DFO at Moorabbin) and is therefore directly competing with Church Street for a share of trade area apparel spending.

Other nearby centres includes Bay Street, Hampton, Moorabbin, Bentleigh and Ormond.



Table 2.34 Church Street – Competing Activity Centres


Competing Centre	Retail Floorspace	Distance from Church Street
Bay Street	11,800m ²	1 km
Hampton	20,900m ²	3 km
Moorabbin	12,000m ²	4 km
Bentleigh	22,300m ²	4 km
Ormond	5,000m ²	4 km
Southland	120,000m²	7 km

Source: Essential Economics

Trade Area Analysis




Definition

The trade area served by the Church Street Centre extends north of North Road to include parts of Caulfield South and Gardenvale, in the east the trade area includes Brighton East and parts of Bentleigh while in the south the trade area is bounded by South Road. The trade area is shown in Map 3.



Map 3 Church Street Trade Area

Source: CData with MapInfo
Produced by: Essential Economics

-  Regional Centre
-  Large Neighbourhood Centre
-  Small Neighbourhood Centre



Trade Area Population

The historical and forecast population of the trade area served by Church Street is shown in Table 2.35. In 2005, the trade area population was around 42,380 people. This represents growth of around 1,400 persons since 1996.

According to the latest DSE population forecasts and the Draft Southern Regional Housing Statement, the trade area population is expected to grow to around 44,860 persons by 2021. This represents growth of around 150 persons per annum or 0.4% per annum over the 2006 to 2021 period. Population growth in established suburbs such as those in the Church Street trade area is typically as a result of infill development and urban consolidation.

Table 2.35 Church Street – Historical and Forecast Trade Area Population, 1996 to 2021

Year	ERP	Average Annual Growth (pers.)	Average Annual Growth (%)
1996	40,900		
2001	41,770	174	0.4%
2005	42,380	153	0.4%
2006	42,560	180	0.4%
2011	43,430	174	0.4%
2021	44,860	143	0.3%

Source: ABS Regional Population Growth, DSE Victoria in Future 2004, Essential Economics, Southern Regional Housing Statement

Socio-Economic Characteristics

Table 2.36 shows the socio-economic characteristics of the population in the Church Street trade area according to the ABS Census of Population and Housing 2001. As can be seen the income profile of trade area residents is substantially above the Melbourne average. The proportion of employed persons earning over \$800 a week (at around 35%) is well above the metropolitan benchmark of 21%.

An important point to note is that the share of the population aged 0 to 24 years (at 30%), is well below the metropolitan Melbourne average of 34%. Meanwhile the share of the population aged 40 years and over is around 50% compared to the Melbourne average of 42%. This older population profile of residents needs to be taken into account when planning for the centre.

Table 2.36 Church Street - Socio-Economic Characteristics of Trade Area Population, 2001

Item	Church Street, Brighton	Metropolitan Melbourne
Per Capita Income (\$)	\$38,000	\$27,600
Variation from Metropolitan Melbourne average	38%	-
Individual Income - % of persons earning \$800+ a week	34.8%	20.8%
Average household size	2.55	2.71
Age Distribution		
0-14	19.0%	19.8%
15-24	11.1%	14.2%
25-39	19.9%	23.9%
40-59	29.4%	26.1%
60+	20.7%	16.1%

Place of Birth

Australia	69.7%	65.2%
MESC Born	9.8%	7.2%
Other OS Born	20.5%	27.6%

Dwelling Type

% of detached dwellings	68.2%	74.5%
% of semi detached dwellings	17.7%	10.4%
% of units/apartments	13.4%	14.4%
% of other dwellings	0.7%	0.7%

Source: ABS Census of Population and Housing 2001

Available Retail Spending

Table 2.37 shows the per capita retail spending of Church Street trade area residents is around 22% higher than the Melbourne average. The overall spending profile is similar to that of the Bay Street trade area with extremely high levels of per capita spending on Cafes and Restaurants, Apparel, Leisure and Services.

Table 2.37 Church Street - Trade Area Per Capita Retail Spending 2006 (\$2006)

Retail Category	Church Street Trade Area	Metro Melbourne Ave.	Variation from Metro Melbourne Ave.
Food, Liquor and Groceries	4,560	4,130	+10%
Café and Restaurant	980	660	+48%
<u>T'away Food</u>	<u>970</u>	<u>830</u>	<u>+17%</u>
Total Food Retail	6,510	5,620	+16%
Apparel	1,840	1,400	+31%
Homewares	1,460	1,160	+26%
Bulky Merchandise	1,480	1,260	+17%
<u>Leisure</u>	<u>1,640</u>	<u>1,240</u>	<u>+32%</u>
Total Non-Food Retail	6,420	5,060	+27%
Total Services	470	340	+38%
Total Retail	13,400	11,020	+22%

Source: MarketInfo, Essential Economics

Issues and Opportunities

This section identifies the issues and opportunities facing the Church Street Shopping Centre in terms of its retail role and performance.

Issues and Observations

- Despite the centre's large overall size, Church Street does not currently have a full-line major supermarket. A full line supermarket contains the full range of goods and services available in modern supermarkets and is an important community facility in their own right. The potential for the existing Safeway store to further expand to full line status (i.e. around 3,000m² or more) needs to be considered.
- There appears to be some traffic and parking congestion on Church Street, and it is questionable whether the public parking areas on Black Street and Well Street are being utilised effectively.
- There are very few retail vacancies in the centre. Church Street appears to be trading strongly and in an overall sense performing its neighbourhood role very well.

Opportunities and Recommendations

The following is a list of potential future opportunities for the Church Street Centre:

- Currently the centre appears to be trading successfully, however the retail and commercial sector is dynamic and measures will be required over coming years to maintain the centres competitive advantage. Southland is currently trying to establish itself as the key fashion destination in the middle south eastern suburbs of Melbourne; Church Street offers an alternative for fashion shoppers but will face competition for a share of this spending in the future. Church Street should build on its competitive position as a vibrant main street style shopping destination.
- Investigate opportunities for future office development having regard for the impact this may have on the Bay Street office precinct. In existing retail areas, ground floor office activities should be limited to avoid conflict with retail uses.
- Given the lack of existing retail and commercial vacancies and the forecast population growth in the trade area over coming years, there is likely to be strong demand for additional retail and commercial floorspace in the centre over coming years. Without additional retail floorspace, there will be less scope to refine and improve the retail offer in the centre relative to competitors such as Southland, while rents in the strip are likely to increase which may squeeze out some smaller independent traders in food and service retail categories.
- The potential for redevelopment of the Safeway store needs to be considered. The existing store could be expanded to full-line status (i.e. around 3,000m²) and serve as a stronger anchor tenant for the overall centre. This would benefit Church Street by creating a stronger food offer, in addition to the centres current strong role as a non-food and leisure destination.
- The possible development of a competing full line supermarket at the Bay Street centre needs to be considered in any strategic planning for the Church Street centre given the centre's proximity to each other.

Retail and Commercial Floorspace Growth Potential

Retail Development Opportunities

Church Street has a relatively large retail floorspace component of around 19,000m² which includes two major chain supermarkets and an extensive range of high quality specialty stores. There is an extremely low vacancy rate in the centre and it appears to be trading very strongly. There also appear to be significant physical constraints to new development in the centre.

Our comments are as follows:

- Given the role of this centre and lack of vacancies, it is appropriate to allow for an increase in retail floorspace at the centre. This will however need to be balanced with the physical constraints present in the centre. A priority is the expansion of the Safeway supermarket which should be allowed to expand to a full line store of around 3,000m² or larger.
- Other opportunities to expand the specialty retail floorspace in the centre should also be explored, although it is important to make sure that this floorspace meets the criteria of achieving accessibility and visibility. In a physically constrained centre, it is often true that new retail floorspace does not achieve these criteria given the difficulties associated with finding appropriate sites. As a result, even in highly successful centres, poorly located retail tenancies can remain vacant and form “dead spots” in an otherwise busy precinct.

An indicative guide to increased supportable retail floorspace in the centre to 2021 is around 3,000m² based on existing rates of per capita floorspace provision, although this is predicated on finding quality locations for this floorspace that achieve both accessibility and visibility. This may be made easier with expansion of the centre to the east of Male Street.

Although there may be some impact associated with the development of a full line supermarket at Bay Street in the future, these impacts will be mitigated somewhat by the present trading strength of the Church Street centre and population and spending growth in the trade area.

Commercial Development Opportunities

The commercial office market in Church Street appears much more vibrant than in the nearby Bay Street centre, with no apparent vacancies and recent examples of investor interest as shown by the proposed development of office space and serviced apartments in Male Street. Office space is not subject to the same site considerations as retail and can be easily accommodated in multi storey development without a shop front.

Growth in the Church Street commercial office sector has to be sensitive to the potential for impacts on the office precinct at Bay Street to the north. Overall, an opportunity may exist for commercial expansion in the order of 2,000m² to 3,000m² (noting that some of this is likely to be configured in multi-storey development).

Summary of Potential Retail and Commercial Floorspace Growth to 2021

	Current Retail Floorspace (m2)	Additional Retail Floorspace	Additional Commercial Floorspace
Bay Street Brighton	11,800	Consolidate Supermarkets plus around 2,000m2 of additional specialty floorspace.	Add 1,000m2 to 2,000m2 of office space
Church Street Brighton	19,400	Expand Safeway to full line store and add up to 3,000m2 of specialties	Add around 2,000m2 to 3,000m2 of office space
Hampton	20,600	Expand Safeway store to full line status and add up to 2,000m2 of specialties	Add around 1,000m2 of office space
Sandringham	9,200	Add up to 1,000m2 of specialties	Add 500m2 of office space, redevelop Sandringham Hotel site

Source: *Essential Economics*

[Note that these floorspace projections are provided only as broad indicators of potential development opportunities in the centres. A key variable which may influence future retail and office floorspace provision in these centres is the extent to which competing centres may capture development opportunities that would otherwise be directed to the nominated centres.]

2.4 Housing Analysis

This section of the background report outlines the State Government expectations set out in Melbourne 2030 / Clause 12 of the State Planning Policy Framework and the Southern Regional Housing Statement for growth of housing in Bayside until 2030 in the Bayside Activity Centres, Strategic redevelopment sites and in dispersed locations across the municipality. It also outlines the capacity of Bayside to be able to accommodate this growth in housing to meet the State Government expectations.

State Government Expectations

The State Government Housing provision expectations and capacity of Bayside to meet these expectations has been assessed through:

- Consideration of Clause 12 of the State Planning Policy Framework.
- Analysis of how the Southern Regional Housing Statement housing figures for Bayside can be implemented.
- Analysis of where Bayside is able to accommodate this expected level of growth.

Melbourne 2030/Clause 12: Metropolitan Development (State Planning Policy Framework).

There are five Major Activity Centres designated by State Government in the City of Bayside under Melbourne 2030. These include Bay Street (Brighton), Church Street (Brighton), Hampton and Sandringham Village and Moorabbin. Structure Planning for Moorabbin is not yet commenced and will be undertaken in conjunction with Kingston and Glen Eira Councils.

The Structure Plans have been developed having regard to the principles outlined in Clause 12.

One of the key initiatives of Melbourne 2030 was to protect the established character of the residential areas with increased densities being accommodated but not at the expense of existing amenity and character.

Clause 12.01- A more compact city aims “to facilitate sustainable development that takes full advantage of existing settlement patterns, and investment in transport and communication, water and sewerage and social facilities.”

Through identified strategies (Clause 12.01-2) it states: “Build up activity centres as a focus for high quality development, activity and living for the whole community by:

- Developing a network of activity centres that:
- Provide different types of housing, including forms of higher density housing.

In the Housing section of Clause 12.01 whilst it emphasises the need to locate housing in and close to the activity centres, increase the proportion of housing to be developed within the established areas, encourage higher density housing development on sites well located in relation to activity centres, it also recognises the need to ensure “that all new development appropriately responds to its landscape, valued built form and cultural context.”

Clause 12.05 – ‘A great place to be’ aims “to create urban environments that are of better quality, safer and more functional, provide more open space and an easily recognisable sense of place and cultural identity.”

Clause 12.05-2 recognises the importance of protecting cultural identity and neighbourhood character and specifically ensures that “development responds to its context and reinforces special characteristics of local environment and place by emphasising...the heritage values and built form that reflect community identity and the values, needs and aspirations of the community.”

Victoria in Future

Victoria in Future has estimated the requirement for Bayside to accommodate an additional 6074 households over the period 2001-2030.

Southern Regional Housing Statement

Bayside City Council is represented on the Southern Regional Housing Working Group, which has prepared, in partnership with DSE and other local authorities, the Southern Regional Housing Statement (Adopted in April 2005). The Statement contains an overview of the region's current demographic profile and the existing housing policy framework. It also identifies challenges and opportunities to achieve housing policy outcomes and proposes objectives, strategies and actions to ensure a regionally coordinated approach to managing housing growth and change.

Included in the vision statement is to ensure the southern region continues to be a most attractive, diverse, safe and harmonious living environment. There is a vision that new development should respect the character of suburbs valued by the community.

The Statement outlines that Bayside has indicated the opportunity to accommodate almost 6100 dwellings in the municipality to 2030. This is made up of 2600 in strategic redevelopment sites (includes activity centres) and 3500 from dispersed residential locations.

This Statement has been through a public consultation process and there were no public challenges to the dwelling prediction figures outlined for Bayside. These figures were adopted in the Statement.

Forecasts for future housing in Bayside

There has been strategic work undertaken by Bayside City Council to forecast housing growth in Bayside. This strategic work includes:

- Population and Household forecasts (forecast. id 2006)
- Bayside Melbourne 2030 Analysis (Peter McNabb and Associates, 2003)
- Unpublished housing research 2005 (David Lock and Associates & SGS Economics and Planning)
- Bayside Housing Statistics 1995-2006
- UDP 2006 updates for Strategic Redevelopment Sites
- Major Activity Centres: Housing Yield work (Planisphere 2006)

Population and Household Forecasts

Work completed recently by forecast.id for Bayside City Council has outlined that between 2001-2016 the number of households is expected to increase by 3642 (0.67%) and population expected to increase by 7182 (0.52%). (See Table below) This is greater than half of the number of additional dwellings which Council would need to meet the aspirations of 6100 new dwellings by 2030 as outlined in the Southern Regional Housing Statement. These figures produced by forecast.id have taken into consideration a number of factors including key drivers of change such as migration, age structure, household type, births, deaths and natural increase. Information has been collated on a suburb basis and shows the greatest amount of growth expected in the suburb of Brighton.

Bayside Community Profile Forecasts 2006

Year	Population (Forecast id)
2001	88,808
2006	90,896
2011	93,784
2016	95,990
2021	98,265
2030	-

Year	Households (Forecast id)
2001	34,342
2006	35,273
2011	36,727
2016	37,984
2021	39,163
2030	-

Source: forecast id Community Profile forecasts 2006

Bayside Melbourne 2030 Analysis

This research report was commissioned by Bayside City Council in response to the release of Melbourne 2030 and was finalised in 2003.

This report identified a projected increase in dwellings (based on a low growth scenario) of 6100 over the period 2002-2030, and an increase in population of 7288. Average household size is projected to decline slightly slower than the DSE forecasts because the number of new medium density developments will be slower than DSE forecasts, and therefore household size will remain slightly higher.

This scenario assumes that the current level of activity will continue over the forecast period.

Some other assumptions include:

- Land currently zoned for industrial purposes will not be available for residential development.
- Land currently zoned and used for Public Open Space purposes will remain and will not be available for residential development
- Private land used for recreational purposes may under some scenarios be available for residential development.
- Existing strategies adopted by the Council in respect to Vegetation, Height Control and Heritage are a key determinant of built form in the Municipality
- There are limited major development sites available that can accommodate significant levels of new development.
- Over the thirty year forecast period there will be boom and bust periods that will influence the level of development activity and the nature of development activity.
- Household formation rates will continue to drop, as demonstrated by both figures forecast by DSE and Ratio consultants.
- Floor areas per dwelling most likely continue to increase.

The report identifies constraints on development in Bayside including:
Existing Heritage controls

Special Building Overlays
Neighbourhood character

Data used by the Consultants in preparing this report includes:

- History of dwelling structure 1991-2001
- Home Ownership 2001
- Lot sizes located across the entire City, in 2002
- Population in 2001 and change in age structure.
- Household structure 2001
- House prices 1998-2001
- Building approvals from 1994-2001
- Projected dwelling building activity.

Other issues such as housing affordability and land economics and preparedness of the Bayside community to accept the evolution of planning controls that permit more intense development were raised in the report.

Bayside Housing/Social Housing Strategy, Stage 1 Final Report

Based on the total net dwelling yield calculated, an assessment was made of the potential for new housing development in this report. The table below provides a summary of the yield estimates as outlined in the Housing Strategy (Part 1).

Overview of Bayside's Capacity to Accommodate New Dwellings 2004-2033 (inclusive)

Location	Estimated Net No. of Additional Dwellings
Major Activity Centres (Primary Investigation Areas)	
Scenario A	1,694-1,789
Scenario B	2,467-2,654
Neighbourhood Activity Centres (Secondary Investigation Areas) <i>Gardenvale, Highett, Black Rock and Beaumaris</i>	
Scenario A	1,097-1,131
Scenario B	1,924-1,994
Dispersed Development (Tertiary Investigation Areas)	
Total Scenario A	4,383-4,512
Total Scenario B	5,983-6,240

The Major Activity centre areas identified in the table above were a wider defined area than that identified in the current work being undertaken in the Major Activity Centre Structure Plans.

Neighbourhood Activity Centres included Gardenvale, Highett, Black Rock and Beaumaris only. There are additional neighbourhood centres in Bayside.

Bayside Housing Statistics from 1995- 2005

Bayside City Council analysed (in January 2006) the housing statistics from 1995-2005 to:

1. ascertain the rate of growth per annum in dwellings which has occurred in the Bayside from 1995 – 2005, and
2. present figures for gains and net gains in dwellings per annum from 1995 – 2005


Based on previous rates, Council's Building Surveyors advise that between 95-98% of all approvals of dwellings are constructed. The Council's database for building approvals was manually searched with a base figure extracted for building approvals. The number for demolitions and works that did not constitute an extra dwelling was subtracted to give a net gain figure for dwellings.

Figure 2.41 below shows the historical trends in net gains in dwellings between 1996 and 2005. Overall, the trends reflect the housing cycle, with high interest in dwelling

construction during the boom periods of the late 1990s, relatively subdued market in early 2000s, followed by slight recovery in the 2004 – 05 period.

The data also shows that on average around 353 dwellings (net) per year was added to the City of Bayside's dwelling stock between 1996 and 2005.

Figure 2.41: Net Gains in Dwellings, City of Bayside, 1996 – 2005



If the average annual increase figure of 353 dwellings is extrapolated over next 25 years a total of 8825 new dwellings will be provided in Bayside. These figures indicate that based on the current rate of growth Bayside can meet and exceed the aspirations set out in the Southern Regional Housing Statement without the need for substantial growth in Major Activity Centres.

Indeed in order to meet the target of 6100 additional dwellings by 2030, outlined in the Southern Regional Housing Statement, a rate of growth of 218 dwellings per year from 2002 would be required. This figure is below the lowest annual figure recorded over the ten-year period 1996-2005.

Methodology for Bayside Housing Statistics work

Under the Building Act 1993 anyone intending to undertake any structural works is required to obtain the building permit from the respective Local Government / Council. Generally speaking, a building permit is required when constructing or demolishing any building or altering an existing building. Bayside City Council maintains a database which holds all the information for which a 'building permit' is granted. The data from this database was used by SGS to analyse the gains and net gains in dwellings.

Since building permits are not limited to construction of new dwellings or demolition of dwellings, not all the records in the Council's building approvals database was relevant for this project. Hence, the first step was to filter through the database and extract the data for permits that were issued for construction or demolition or removal or change of use of dwellings.

Following the filter operation:

1. Council's consultant went through each and every record in the database for 1995 – 2005 and manually extracted records that were relevant for this study. In other words, the records for change of use / construction of new dwellings and demolition / removal of dwellings were extracted.
2. Council's consultant then went through each and every record with the aim to make sure that the data entered in the fields for number of existing dwellings,

number of dwellings to be constructed and number of dwellings to be demolished were correct based on the information from rest of the fields in the database.

3. Following this Council's consultant did the analysis of the database to ascertain the figures for gains and net gains in dwellings per annum for 1995 – 2005¹. The analysis was conducted for each postal area in the municipality.
4. A validation exercise was then undertaken against ABS data to ascertain the accuracy of the information.

UDP (Urban Development Program) 2006: Strategic Redevelopment sites

The strategic redevelopment sites as identified in the Urban Development Program have recently been reviewed and submitted to the Department of Sustainability and Environment. These include major sites for development such as the CSIRO site in Highett (Neighbourhood Activity Centre). Based on the recent review it is estimated that in total there will be a yield of approximately 900 dwellings generated from these sites.

Housing Yields for the Major Activity Centres


A later chapter of this report outlines the Housing Yields work which has been undertaken by Planisphere in 2006. In summary, a number of housing yield scenarios were considered for the four Major Activity Centres (of Bay Street, Brighton, Church Street, Brighton, Sandringham Village and Hampton).

2.5 Site Analysis

A detailed survey of the study area was undertaken by members of the study team. The survey was gathered information about the centre, including land use, built form, pedestrian movement, and open space. Background material was reviewed prior to the survey and was an input into the survey process. An additional survey was undertaken to look at access issues such as traffic, parking, public transport, cycling and pedestrian access. Access analysis is summarised in Section 2.7.

A site analysis plan was prepared and included in Community Bulletin 2 at the Emerging Ideas stage of the project. A copy of this plan as contained in Community Bulletin 2 is shown on the following page. There may have been subsequent changes to various boundaries or information since the Emerging Ideas stage.

¹ Note that the database that was made available to SGS is believed to be incomplete for 1995. Hence, reference below is made from 1996 so as not to distort the figures.



Church Street Precinct Analysis

PRECINCT A - Male Street to Carpenter Street

EXISTING CHARACTERISTICS

- Includes specialty retail uses, cafes and a supermarket.
- Comprises older style, narrow shopfronts and the Safeway building with a wide frontage and blank wall to the street.
- A number of heritage buildings are included within rows of shopfronts.
- Buildings generally between one and two storeys.
- Train station is nearby with priority pedestrian access to the station and shops fronting onto the path.
- Streetscape has a cohesive appearance with recently laid paving and regular street trees.

ISSUES

- Protection of the heritage fabric and character.
- Interface with residential areas.
- Redevelopment opportunities constrained by the narrow allotments.
- Lack of a full line supermarket.

PRECINCT B - Carpenter Street to St Andrews Street

EXISTING CHARACTERISTICS

- Includes specialty retail stores, cafes, a cinema and a supermarket.
- Comprises mostly narrow shopfronts and the Dendy Cinema with an internal arcade and supermarket.
- Buildings are predominantly single storey with some two storey developments.
- Pedestrian orientated setting with consistent street furniture, recent paving, safety island and consistent street trees.
- Includes angled car parking.

ISSUES

- Allotments interface with residential areas including a number of heritage properties.
- Redevelopment opportunities constrained by the narrow allotments.

PRECINCT C - Church Street, St Andrews Street and New Street triangle

EXISTING CHARACTERISTICS

- Triangle site which includes a recent mixed use development, service station, offices and a medical practice.
- Buildings of mixed heights including a recent 3 storey development.
- Lacks a pedestrian focus with major roads and few street trees.

ISSUES

- Traffic from New Street reduces pedestrian amenity.

PRECINCT D - Well Street offices

EXISTING CHARACTERISTICS

- Small area of office development which includes the car park behind the supermarket.
- Buildings either one or two storeys. Four storey development proposal in Male Street recently approved by Council.
- Streetscape shares characteristics of residential areas with nature strips and large avenue street trees.
- Parking provided in the grounds of some offices.

ISSUES

- Allotments interface with residential areas including a number of heritage properties.
- Redevelopment opportunities constrained by the narrow allotments.

Parking Survey

- 2,579 parking spaces were surveyed within and in the vicinity of the Church Street Centre.
- Approximately 63% of car parking spaces are utilised during the peak parking period with much higher occupancy rates experienced in the commercial core of the centre.
- The turnover of 1 hour limit spaces is high, with people parking for 41 minutes on average.
- There is a high utilisation of off-street car parks close to the commercial strip, with the exception of the Dendy Centre car park (where a fee is payable) that often has about half of its capacity available.

Site Analysis

Activities

- Church Street is a linear shopping strip with Middle Brighton station located towards the eastern end and the St Andrews Church to the west. The centre is very well structured with a range of activity consolidated into a compact area.
- Church Street is a vibrant strip that has a range of functions during daytime and evening hours. This includes a retail offer of two supermarkets and an extensive range of quality specialty shops, entertainment venues such as cafes, restaurants, pubs and the cinema and residential development within the core of the centre.
- The concentration of high quality specialty shopping, which includes a number of national brand stores, creates a strong sense of destination for the centre and in this role.
- Due to the varied nature of Church Street it not only serves local needs very well but also attracts visitors from a wide regional catchment.
- There is a range of business activity in the Church Street centre in addition to retail.
- There is a significant office component located at the western end of the centre, near the corner of St Andrews Street, and a new office development is currently proposed in Male Street at the eastern end of the centre
- The attractive design of the streetscape and the pedestrian scale of development add to its ambience.
- Immediately outside of the centre, west of St Andrews Street, are the Brighton Hospital and Grammar School.
- The residential areas surrounding Church Street comprise large dwellings of a range of architectural styles, many of which have heritage significance. The streets are lined with mature trees and the leafy character of these areas is highly valued.
- Currently, residential use in Church Street comprises a limited amount of shop-top housing.
- A recent three-storey development in St Andrews Street includes apartments above ground level commercial with upper level roof terraces overlooking the street activity.

Social Infrastructure

Refer to the Social Infrastructure Map at the end of this section.

- A Residential Aged Care Facility and retirement village are located on the north eastern periphery of the Church Street Centre.
- Early childhood/child care services exist both within and just outside the Centre.
- The Brighton Town Hall and associated buildings housing several community facilities such as a library and arts centre is located on the northern periphery of the Centre, on Carpenter Street.

Buildings

- An analysis of the buildings and character of the Church Street centre has identified that there are three distinct precincts, all requiring a different approach to future development.
- The eastern end of the centre, from Male Street to Carpenter Street contains many buildings that are valued for their heritage significance, including rows of Victorian shopfronts (equivalent in height to a contemporary 3 storey building).

- The notable exception to this pattern is the Safeway store that has a wide frontage and presents a long, blank façade to the street.
- The western end of the strip comprises more contemporary buildings and the Dendy Plaza, with some 3 storey examples, however the majority of buildings in this strip are 1-2 storeys.
- West of Andrews Street is the 'gateway' to the centre, comprising St Andrews Church and surrounds and the Church Street 'triangle site' which is currently being partially redeveloped.
- Commercial buildings are largely built to the street boundary with no side setbacks.
- Commercial buildings generally provide weather protection to pedestrians with awnings over the footpath.



Half Moon Hotel in Church Street



Two storey shops in Church Street



Nearby residential street




Retail at northern end of Church Street

Spaces

- The experience of Church Street is greatly enhanced by the high quality of its design and appearance.
- Between St Andrews and Carpenter Streets the streetscape has been recently upgraded and has consistent street furniture, new paving and a central safety island for pedestrians.
- There are regular and established small to medium street trees that also create a sense of continuity along the strip.
- Importantly, the retail core is a pedestrian oriented setting. Most of the buildings have active street frontages, and outdoor dining and street displays through most of the centre add to its vibrancy.


Social Infrastructure Map



2.6 Neighbourhood Character Analysis

Additional neighbourhood character analysis was undertaken by the study team in August 2006. The additional work included a field survey of all residential areas within the Structure Plan boundary collecting information about neighbourhood character elements including building styles, heights, setbacks and street trees. The results of this work are detailed in the following pages.

Neighbourhood Character Analysis Map



- | | |
|--|--|
| Areas with consistent neighbourhood character | Building Heights |
| Existing Heritage Overlay | Predominantly single storey with less than 10% double storey |
| Large street trees important elements of streetscape | 10-40% double storey |
| Areas small front and side setbacks | Greater than 40% double storey |
| Architectural Styles | Non-Residential Zones |
| Mixed Styles (including recent development and original dwellings) | Structure Plan Boundary |
| Predominantly Victorian | Bayside Neighbourhood Character Precincts |
| Mix of Victorian and Edwardian | |
| Mix of Edwardian and Interwar (Californian Bungalows, 1930s-40s) | |
| Predominantly Californian Bungalows | |
| Interwar (1930s-40s) | |

Building Styles

Building styles are mixed within the Church Street Centre with redevelopment occurring across a number of periods. Examples of recently developed buildings are common particularly in areas close the shopping strip.

There are a small number of areas where dwelling styles are consistent including several streets with a mix of Victorian and Edwardian dwellings. The north western end of Black Street consists of a number of large Victorian Dwellings most of which are covered by a Heritage Overlay. There are also two small areas with Californian Bungalows located to the south east of the rail line.



Baker Street includes a mix of Victorian and Edwardian dwellings



Contemporary housing in Bleazby Avenue

Building Setbacks

Setbacks in the Church Street centre are generally spacious with front setbacks of between 6 and 9 metres and side setbacks of 3-4m to one boundary, and 1m to the other. Larger allotments often have bigger front and side setbacks.

Reduced front and side setbacks can be found in streets where there are a high proportion of Victorian and Edwardian dwellings on small allotments. In these areas front setbacks are between 3-5m.

Some of the recently developed areas along Well Street also have reduced front and side setbacks contributing to the urban appearance of the area.



Lawrence Street in the Church Street Centre where the Victorian and Edwardian dwellings have smaller front and side setbacks

Building Heights

The Church Street Centre has a significant amount of two storey dwellings in comparison to the other Major Activity Centres. This is typically due to the greater amount of properties that have been redeveloped in the Centre.

Two storey developments are predominant in Well Street and Black Street and at the south eastern end of Church Street. Elsewhere the streets contain either a small proportion of two storey or predominantly single storey buildings. A substantial single storey area exists to the south east of Male Street and there are also a small number of isolated single storey areas which relate to the era of dwellings.



Consistent single storey Victorian housing located in Loller Street



Two storey development in Black Street

Street trees

There are a number of streets in the Church Street Centre which contain significant avenue planting. Well Street is a good example of this with a lengthy avenue of large Plane Trees. Several streets between Male Street and the railway line also have avenues of large Plane Trees. The north western end of Black Street provides a contrast with large eucalypts lining the street.



The avenue of Plane Trees in Well Street



Large Eucalypts in Black Street

Bayside Neighbourhood Character Precincts

The Neighbourhood Character Analysis Map shows that all residential areas in the Church Street Centre are included in Precinct B2.

Precinct B2

The Precinct Brochure for B2 lists the following Valued Characteristics:

- Diverse dwelling styles with well articulated facades and rooflines including Victorian, Federation, Interwar, Post War and 1990s reproduction, some 1960s - 80s, and occasional Mansion and English attic houses
- Front setbacks vary from 5-9m, some are larger and occasionally houses on angle to street

- Side setbacks generally 1.2-1.5m on one side with garages, car ports or driveways to the boundary on the other, new development 1m each side and some houses setback 3-4m each side
- Established, mixed native and exotic gardens that enhance the separation of individual dwellings and include moderate coverings of shrubs and scattered medium to tall specimen trees
- Varied native and exotic street trees, some incorporated into strong avenues
- Bluestone kerbing and channelling
- Combination of crescent and grid subdivision pattern

2.7 Access

Overview

The analysis of transport, traffic and parking issues in the Church Street Activity Centre was undertaken in the context of a vision for the Centre that is based on the sustainability principles underlying Melbourne 2030. [The full Background Transport, Traffic and Parking Analysis appear in [Appendix 2.](#)] This is a form of urban development that clusters a greater mixture of land uses around high quality transport services. The transport node, combining train and bus services is a clear focus for the Centre and ideally becomes part of the community “heart”. The principles underpinning this vision include:

- Provide direct and inviting links to public transport nodes
- Enhance connectivity between different travel modes
- Give public transport a high public profile
- Create permeable street networks and legible built environments
- Provide pedestrian and cycling facilities
- Bring traffic in, carefully
- Encourage travel behaviour change

By 2020, the Government intends that public transport’s share of motorised trips within Melbourne will rise to 20 per cent from a level of 9 per cent in 2002. Achievement of this target will be influenced to a large degree by changes in travel modes in outer suburbs where ridership is low and service levels are poor, but gains in the inner areas will also assist. It will also depend on development of two main markets for public transport:

- trips that use high-quality public transport services for long-distance fast travel to get to and from activity centres – traditionally, this has meant rail transport and commuting to Central Melbourne, but, increasingly, it will include light rail, tram and express bus services on non-radial routes connecting Major Activity Centres
- trips that use frequent local public transport for travel to Activity Centres and to provide easy connections to Principal Public Transport Network routes – improved bus and taxi interchanges and coordination of timetables and fares will build better links with this network.

The Principal Public Transport Network must be supported by a comprehensive network of local public transport services. Typically, buses and taxis will provide these local services and other niche modes may be appropriate to specific travel needs and locations.

Areas where performance needs to be substantially improved include:

- improvements in public transport frequency, reliability and ease of use
- faster on-road travel times
- coordination between services and interchanges

- the implementation of a new ticket and fare system
- better information, including maps and timetables.

Elements of the Analysis

The analysis combined a review of past documents and studies, formal surveys (specifically parking occupancy, turnover and interview surveys) as well as on-site evaluation and assessment of vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist activity throughout the Activity Centre area. Close examination was also undertaken of public transport networks, infrastructure, services and patronage.

The aim of the analysis has been to clearly identify issues that affect accessibility and mobility and investigate the management/operational, statutory controls and physical opportunities to improve the transport environment in the Church Street Centre. Ultimately, the analysis has enabled the development of a package of measures designed to improve access and parking.

Given the critical role identified for public transport in Melbourne 2030, there was strong emphasis in the analysis on understanding the current operation of public transport.

In summary, in order to gain a comprehensive understanding of transport issues and traffic movement patterns relevant to the Activity Centre, a range of matters have been considered in some detail, including:

- capacity and patronage of all public transport services;
- travel patterns in the area, by all transport modes – this includes an examination of pedestrian and bicycle networks in addition to the vehicular network; and
- the effectiveness of existing transport modes and arrangements, and traffic management measures previously implemented in the Centre.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Overview

The Church Street Activity Centre features a network of footpaths which provides good pedestrian connectivity between the Church Street shopping strip and the surrounding streets. Additionally, Middle Brighton Station is located near the heart of the Church Street shopping strip.

Some of the pedestrian connections to the railway station from Church Street, the rail overpass near Black Street, and Male Street could benefit from improvements. The pedestrian path from Church Street on the north-west side of the rail line is narrow and unappealing. The same characteristics apply to the existing pedestrian path between the railway overpass near Black Street and the railway station. A laneway connects Male Street directly to the entrance of the southbound platform of the railway station. This access, whilst direct and convenient, may not be suitable or desirable, particularly at night, due to limited lighting and a poor surface.

There is no formal modal interchange facility at Middle Brighton Station. The station is linked to Church Street by uncovered walkways. Further uncovered walkways link the platforms to the footbridge and to Black Street, as described above. The main bus stops are provided in Male Street on each side of the Church Street intersection about 100m from the station. There is limited shelter from the elements at the bus stops, and no seating or formal waiting facilities are provided. There is no directional signage at the station indicating where connecting transport services may be accessed. No real time arrival status information is available at the bus stops.

The existing and proposed cyclist network is shown in Figure 2.74.

Figure 2.71: Pedestrian Path from Church Street to Railway Station




Figure 2.72: Pedestrian Path from Rail Overpass to Railway Station



Figure 2.73: Pedestrian Path from Male Street to Railway Station



Figure 2.74: Church Street Bicycle Network



MTN – Metropolitan Trail Network, PBN – Principle Bicycle Network, MBN – Metropolitan Bicycle Network

Key Issues and Conclusions

The key issues identified and conclusions drawn as part of the pedestrian and bicycle analysis have been summarised below:

- A good pedestrian environment exists but some improvements are possible particularly at and near public transport facilities.
- Opportunities exist to improve the following linkages:
 - Between off-street car parks and Church Street
 - Paths to the railway station
- Opportunities for new links at the following locations:
 - Between Well Street and Church Street
 - Between Lindsay Street and railway footpath
- Roundabouts pose interruptions for pedestrian movement. Give consideration to installing pedestrian priority at roundabouts.
- Weather protection should be provided, wherever possible, through continuous verandahs.
- Opportunity to provide covered walkways from the station to Church Street

- Areas where opportunities exist to improve pedestrian amenity are the various off-street carparks. Access within these areas becomes more difficult at night compared with the daytime, as lighting levels are relatively poor.
- Bayside Bicycle Strategy – The installation of On-Road & Off-Road Bike Paths needs to be completed and complemented with route signage.
- Bicycle parking facilities at Middle Brighton Station need to be expanded. There are opportunities for additional bicycle facilities throughout the centre.
- It is important that parking facilities are installed in new developments to reduce private vehicle reliance.

Public Transport

Service Frequencies and Connectivity

Trains at Middle Brighton Station link to Sandringham and the City. Service frequencies are 10 minutes during peak periods falling away to 20 minutes during other periods. A seven day per week operation is provided with service coverage being from 0500hrs to 0010hrs. Middle Brighton Station is in Metcard Zone 1.

Three bus routes directly link the activity centre to destinations such as Southland Shopping Centre, Blackburn (via Monash University Clayton Campus) and Dandenong. A further three bus routes operate in streets within easy walking distance from the Activity Centre and link to locations such as Southland Shopping Centre, St. Kilda and Sunshine. Services to Southland tend not to operate in the evenings (indicating that their prime purpose is for shopping trips). Higher service levels are provided during peak hours for the links to the City and to Blackburn indicating some commuter activity, but there is significant service frequency drop off on weekends, with all routes only running every 60 to 90 minutes.

It can be concluded that, compared to many other parts of Melbourne, the Church Street Activity Centre receives a reasonable level of public transport service, particularly during normal business hours on weekdays.

Modal Interchange

There is no formal modal interchange facility at Middle Brighton Station. The station is linked to Church Street by uncovered walkways. Further uncovered walkways link the platforms to the footbridge and to Black Street. Bus stops are provided in Male Street on each side of the Church Street intersection about 100 metres from the station.

There is limited shelter at the bus stops, and no seating or formal waiting facilities are provided. There is no directional signage at the station indicating where connecting transport services may be accessed. No real time arrival status information is available at the bus stops.

The station car park is to the north of the platforms and accommodates around 107 vehicles.

A survey conducted in December 2003 for the Department of Infrastructure revealed a strong role for walking at North Brighton and Middle Brighton Stations. This survey examined how people catching city bound trains arrived at the station and provides the following insight:

Figure 2.75: Method of arriving at stations for city bound rail passengers

<i>Mode used to arrive at the station</i>	<i>North Brighton</i>	<i>Middle Brighton</i>
Walk	53%	50%
Drove	30%	29%
Dropped off	13%	19%
Bus	3%	1%
Bike	1%	1%

These results show a strong reliance on walking, and an almost negligible use of buses and bicycles.

Key Issues and Conclusions

The key issues identified and conclusions drawn as part of the public transport analysis have been summarised below:

- The bus interchange at the train station is generally well located but could benefit from an upgrade of facilities such as shelter and seating.
- Train and bus services offer good weekday frequencies but there is some reduction in the level of service on weekends when the frequency of some buses increases to between 60 and 90 minutes.
- A recent survey has revealed that around 50% of city bound train passengers at Middle Brighton Station walked to the station and 48% either drove or got dropped off. Only 1% arrived by bus and 1% by bicycle.
- 81% of city bound train passengers originated from Brighton and Brighton East.

Car Parking

Parking Surveys – Summary of Process

Extensive parking surveys have been undertaken in order to obtain a clear understanding of parking patterns and behaviour and thus provide an objective basis for deciding on a parking strategy and, in turn, providing the basis for the preparation of a parking precinct plan for the Church Street Centre. [The full Maunsell Parking Precinct Plan appears in [Appendix 3](#).]

A starting point for the survey program was to quantify, record and map:

- The number of parking spaces
- The location of parking spaces
- Ownership or management
- Restrictions on use (access, time or cost)

Having established “base” conditions in Church Street, new data was collected, in order to establish the demand for parking both on and off street. The aim of the data collection / survey program was to build a picture of how existing car parking is used in the Activity Centre. Surveys were therefore designed to capture the following data:

- Parking **occupancy** during both daytime hours and at night-time (for both a typical weekday – Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday – and a Saturday or Sunday). Occupancy was measured in on-street areas and off-street carparks at five different times – namely 7.00am, 11.00am, 2.00pm, 5.00pm and 8.00pm. Surveys covered an area at least up to a distance of 400 metres around the core of the business zoned area in the Activity Centre.

- **Parking turnover** – representative samples of all main parking time limits that exist in the Activity Centre were surveyed in order to determine compliance with sign-posted time limits and average duration of stay. Turnover was measured for four time limit restrictions in the Centre using a minimum sample of 40 parking spaces for each time limit and half hour parking sweeps over a six hour period on a weekday.
- **Parking purpose & behaviour** surveys were also conducted. These were in the form of simple interviews and were targeted at both motorists parking in the Activity Centre as well as other users. The surveys will be designed to establish a link between the parking requirement and a land use/s in the centre. The survey sheet consisted of 21 questions. Approximately 500 interview surveys were conducted throughout the Centre. The *parking purpose & behaviour surveys* were conducted over a range of times to cover peak activity periods on both weekdays and Saturday. Typical questions included:
 - Trip origin & destination(s)
 - Travel and parking preferences
 - Mode(s) of travel

The findings from the parking surveys have been utilised to prepare a parking strategy for the Church Street Activity Centre – this sets out what Bayside aims to achieve in the Centre. The parking surveys and resultant strategy provide a diagnosis of the parking conditions and needs in the Church Street Activity Centre – as a step toward preparing a Parking Precinct Plan.

Parking Interview Surveys – Key Findings

The majority of respondents were interviewed in the afternoon period, 12noon to 5pm, accounting for 79% of responses. 19% were surveyed in the morning period (9am to 12noon) and 1% in the evening (after 5pm).

93% of respondents stated that they only had one trip purpose. The dominant trip purpose was for Retail / Other Shopping 42%, followed by Supermarket / Convenience Store shopping 20% and Work / Business 17%. 85% of all trips originated from home, and 8% from work which may include trips external to the Activity Centre. The dominant mode of respondents is car, with 65% of all responses “car as driver” and 5% “car as passenger”. A reasonable proportion of trips (9%) were made by public transport. 28% of respondents expressed the next most preferred alternative travel mode choice as walking. Overall **mode split** during the survey period was:

Car (as driver)	65%
Car (as passenger)	5%
Bus	2%
Train	7%
Bike	1%
Motorbike	0%
Walk	19%
Other	1%

It is interesting to note that a significant 19% of trips were made on foot. In addition, 28% of respondents indicated that the next most preferred mode choice was walking thus indicating good potential to reduce the use of private motor cars.

Another key finding was the “Car driver trip purpose” when driving to the Centre. The land-uses being visited by car drivers were found to be as follows:

Land-Use	Proportion of Car Drivers Interviewed		
	Average	11am	2pm
Supermarket	16%	15%	16%
Convenience Store	0%	0%	0%
Other Retail	47%	48%	47%
Restaurant	6%	3%	7%
Work/Business	14%	15%	14%
Tavern/Leisure/Social/Pleasure	8%	14%	7%
Medical	2%	0%	4%
Cinema	0%	0%	0%
Community Facility	0%	0%	0%
Other	5%	4%	5%

Parking Supply

On-Street Parking Supply

The inventory of parking spaces identifies there are in the order of 1404 public on-street car parking spaces within the catchment. The location and restrictions are summarised in Table 2.71.

Table 2.71 – On-Street Parking Supply

Street	Capacity	Parking Restriction					Unrestricted
		1/4P	1P	2P	4P	Other	
Total On-street	1404	11	175	331	36	70	781

Off-Street Parking Supply

There are four publicly available off-street car parks, providing 318 off-street parking spaces within the catchment. The location and restrictions are summarised in Table 2.72.

Table 2.72 – Off-Street Parking Supply

Streets	Capacity	2P	4P
Carpenter Street carpark	94	94	
railway carpark	40		40
Safeway/Well Street carpark	156	156	
Well Street carpark	28	28	
Total Off-Street	318	278	40

Note: The unrestricted spaces in the railway carpark are excluded, as these are primarily used by commuters.

On-Street Parking Utilisation

The results of the weekday on-street parking utilisation surveys show that parking in Church Street catchment is well utilised, and that parking spaces in prime locations have reached capacity.

Table 2.73 – Weekday On-Street Parking Utilisation

Streets	Capacity	% Occupancy				
		7am	11am	2pm	5pm	8pm
Total On-Street	1404	28%	65%	66%	45%	44%

The results indicate that there is high utilisation of car parking within the core area of the catchment. The peak occupancy occurs throughout the day, with 65% of spaces occupied at 11am and 66% at 2pm. While this indicates there is spare capacity, the spare capacity is generally available in streets located at some distance from the centre, or where parking restrictions discourage use by shoppers.

The utilisation of spaces by restriction has also been reviewed, and is provided in Table 2.74.

Table 2.74 – On-Street Utilisation by Restriction

Restriction	Capacity	% Occupancy				
		7am	11am	2pm	5pm	8pm
¼P	11	9%	73%	73%	55%	64%
1P	175	31%	84%	81%	71%	83%
2P	331	31%	66%	73%	48%	53%
4P	36	11%	50%	75%	28%	33%
Unrestricted	781	29%	63%	63%	41%	35%
Other	70	11%	36%	23%	19%	20%
Total	1404	28%	65%	66%	45%	44%

There are very few spaces designated ¼ hour parking, and none designated ½ hour parking. Therefore, the use of 1P spaces is extremely high (84%), and suggests it is very difficult to locate a short-term parking space in the heart of the centre. This high utilisation of 1 hour limit spaces continues well into the evening, reflecting the high use of spaces on Church Street, both during the day and the evening due to cinema and restaurant activity.

The two hour limit spaces that are located close to the heart of the centre are generally well utilised, whilst still providing opportunities for most people to find a parking space. There is relatively high utilisation of unrestricted spaces within immediate proximity to the centre.

Parking turnover surveys were also conducted to determine compliance to time limit restrictions and the suitability of the existing time limits. The key findings were:

- The ¼ hour spaces along Church Street have high occupancies for most of the day with the average duration of stay of approximately 35 minutes, well over the 15 minute limit. Better enforcement may be necessary to ensure these spaces are available for short-stay visitors, or consideration should be given to the provision of some ½ hour limit spaces to cater for this demand.
- The 1 hour limit spaces on Church Street have very high occupancies, and an average duration of stay of 41 minutes, suggesting that there is good compliance to the restrictions and high levels of turnover – reflecting the very high demand. More spaces would be of benefit to cope with the high demand, and shoppers

should also be encouraged to make better use of the off street carparks, to reduce the on-street demand.

Off-Street Parking Utilisation

The utilisation of the 318 off-street spaces in the precinct is shown in Table 2.75 below.

Table 2.75 – Off-Street Parking Utilisation

Car Park	Capacity	Restriction	% Occupancy				
			7am	11am	2pm	5pm	8pm
Carpenter Street	94	2P	9%	62%	68%	22%	35%
Railway	40	4P	33%	90%	90%	93%	48%
Safeway/Well St	156	2P	5%	37%	41%	13%	21%
Well Street	28	2P	25%	93%	86%	100%	86%
Total Off-Street	318		11%	56%	59%	34%	34%

The utilisation of the railway carpark and the small Well Street carpark is very high. However, there is only modest use of the main shopping carparks on Carpenter Street, and the Safeway carpark (corner Well Street and Carpenter Street).

The turnover surveys revealed the average duration of stay of cars within the 2 hour carpark spaces in the centre is 59 minutes, suggesting that the restrictions are adequate. The demand for short-stay parking, in the order of 1 hour limit, tends to place pressure on the parking spaces in Church Street (as they are predominantly 1 hour limit spaces). This accounts for the higher utilisation of on-street spaces, and lower utilisation of off-street spaces.

To improve usage of the carparks, better signage may be appropriate to promote their use as well as improved lighting at night.

Peak Utilisation

The peak for on and off-street parking for the area occurs at 2pm.

Updated Parking Survey

Parking inventories were assembled and parking surveys were originally undertaken by Maunsell in November 2004. This represented the initial data collection phase in the preparation of the Structure Plans and Parking Precinct Plans for the four Activity Centres. A smaller more compact area has subsequently been defined which covers the public parking spaces that are in convenient proximity to the retail and commercial land uses in each Centre and can realistically be used by local workers, shoppers and visitors. This supply of spaces is referred to as the parking "catchment".

Additional parking surveys have now been undertaken, in August 2006, to assess whether parking conditions have changed by any significant amount since the original parking surveys were undertaken. The additional weekday parking occupancy surveys were conducted on Tuesday 22nd August 2006 and Thursday 17th August 2006 at both 11.00am and 2.00pm in each of the four Activity Centres. The initial aim was to cover at least 35 to 40% of parking spaces in each catchment in order to provide a sample of sufficient size to confidently assess the currency of the original findings. In fact at least 50% of the spaces that were surveyed in 2004 were resurveyed in 2006 for each activity centre, thus providing an extremely reliable sample size. The areas that were resurveyed include the "main street" in each centre, together with off-street parking areas and a range of selected "side streets". Surveys were not undertaken in streets and carparks located in the vicinity of areas where circumstances have significantly altered since the time of the original surveys (i.e., the renovation works at the Safeway supermarket in Hampton) or where parking restrictions have changed.

Table 2.76: Comparison of Parking Survey Results – November 2004 versus August 2006

		Church Street		
		On Street	Off Street	Total
11.00am Survey	Nov 2004	76%	72%	74%
	Aug 2006	83%	73%	79%
2.00pm Survey	Nov 2004	81%	69%	76%
	Aug 2006	82%	78%	81%

Table 2.76 indicates that in most circumstances the total parking occupancies of the on-street and off-street parking spaces which were surveyed in August 2006 are very similar to the surveyed occupancies in November 2004.

Generally, in each of the four Activity Centres, the total occupancies recorded in 2006 are only a few percentage points different from the occupancies recorded in 2004 – for both the 11.00am and 2.00pm survey periods. This would suggest that parking conditions have not changed significantly since the original parking surveys were conducted in November 2004. The 2004 survey results can therefore be confidently used for the purposes of the Parking Precinct Plans.

Future Parking Demands

The ability of the transport system to accommodate increased demands for movement and parking of traffic was assessed by taking into consideration the increased demands derived from likely future changes in land use in the Church Street Activity Centre. In forecasting future transport demands, account has been taken of the provision of public transport and the ability to walk and cycle.

The following process was used to determine potential future parking demand:

- All future residential development would fully satisfy current planning scheme parking requirements for both residents and visitors. Thus it is assumed that new dwellings would entirely provide for their own parking needs off-street and generate no impact in terms of increased demand for on-street parking.
- Using the forecast floorspace areas for future retail and commercial development, parking demand was calculated using the planning scheme rates as a starting point.
- Some allowance has been made for achieving the Victorian Government's modal shift target that by the year 2020, 20% of motorised trips will take place on public transport, as well as recognising that some parking provision can and will still occur as part of new development. For the purposes of establishing a possible on-street parking demand target, it has been assumed that in most cases (two thirds of new development) it is impossible or impractical to provide off-street parking; accordingly it is assumed that about one third, (30%) of new development will provide parking to satisfy its needs.

Parking Analysis and Forecast of Future Needs

The maximum parking occupancy over the entire catchment peaks at around 66% at 2.00pm – this represents 1137 of the 1722 spaces being utilised. At the same time the parking occupancy in the heart of the Activity Centre – Church Street – peaks at 82%. This finding suggests that peak period parking conditions in the heart of the Activity Centre are already at a critical level where some sort of intervention is necessary to better satisfy parking needs. As previously indicated, parking occupancies of 80% or above indicate difficulty in finding parking and reflect reduced accessibility in a precinct. Furthermore, the occupancy in other streets close to Church Street, such as Male, St Andrews and Carpenter Streets averages around

85% – an occupancy that reflects exceptionally busy conditions and is even higher than Church Street.

The spare parking capacity in the entire catchment at peak time (2.00pm) is 585 spaces.

The application of the Planning Scheme rates to the forecast retail and commercial development generates a total parking demand of 345 spaces. In order to determine the on-street share of forecast demand the total is first reduced by one-third (to account for on-site parking) – this leaves a demand for 230 spaces. In turn this total is reduced by 20% (to reflect the Victorian Government's modal shift target). The final estimated on-street parking demand is therefore 184 spaces.

As with Bay Street, it would appear that the identified spare capacity (585 spaces) could contribute to addressing the new parking demand (184 spaces) although most of the spare parking spaces are located at the extremities of the catchment. Nonetheless, Church Street could also have a small number of motorists that may be prepared to walk longer distances and new development will also be dispersed throughout the Activity Centre thereby offering a range of parking opportunities in areas where the spare capacity may be more concentrated and easier to access.

It is therefore considered reasonable to develop new car parking facilities to accommodate between 120 to 160 cars over the existing parking lots located on the corner of Carpenter and Black Streets and off Well Street between Carpenter Street and the railway line. Such facilities would be able to accommodate the majority of the forecast demand of 184 spaces. Council is also committed to the construction of 29 additional off-street carparking spaces on a site at number 7 Well Street, near the Dendy Plaza, and just to the east of an existing off-street carpark. The establishment of this new parking area is likely to keep the requirement for new car parking facilities closer to 120 spaces rather than 160 spaces.

Key Issues and Conclusions

The key issues identified and conclusions drawn as part of the car parking analysis have been summarised below:

- Approximately 2579 parking spaces were surveyed within a large area surrounding the Church Street Activity Centre. This included 548 spaces located in public off-street car parks, of which nearly 300 are restricted to a maximum 2-hour limit – the remaining being a mixture of fee parking, 4-hour limit and unrestricted.
- In total, over 1412 of the parking spaces have no time limit restriction and motorists can therefore park for as long as they wish.
- There is high utilisation of all parking spaces, including on-street parking in residential streets, within approximately 350m of Church Street. Overall, the peak period for parking in the Church Street Activity Centre occurs at 11am and 2pm, with occupancy rates reaching 63%. Much higher occupancy rates are experienced in the heart of the Centre.
- The results of the parking surveys indicate that there is high utilisation of car parking within the core area of the catchment. The peak occupancy occurs throughout the day, with 65% of spaces occupied at 11am and 66% at 2pm.
- Although the survey indicates there is some spare capacity, the majority of this spare capacity is generally available in streets located at some distance from the heart of the Centre, or where parking restrictions discourage use by shoppers. The spare capacity in these streets represents capacity at the extremities of the Activity Centre, in many cases adjacent to residential properties. Therefore, increased use of this spare capacity may lead to a reduction in residential amenity and is considered inappropriate.
- The parking occupancy in the heart of the Activity Centre – Church Street – peaks at 82%. This finding suggests that peak period parking conditions in the core of the Activity Centre are already at a critical level where some sort of intervention is necessary to better satisfy parking needs.

- The turnover of *15 minute* limit parking spaces in Church Street is relatively low as the average duration of stay is approximately 35 minutes, and 6 of the 14 spaces exhibit 100% daily occupancy rates. In contrast, the turnover of *1-hour* limit parking spaces in Church Street is relatively high as the average duration of stay is 41 minutes, with daily occupancy rates of 75%. These findings highlight that there is a strong demand for parking of around 30 to 40 minutes duration in the heart of the Activity Centre.
- There is very high utilisation of carparks close to the main shopping strip. The average duration of stay in the carparks located off Church Street is 59 minutes, well below the *2-hour* permitted parking restriction currently in place. The surveys have also revealed a high level of demand in the off-street carparks with a maximum occupancy rate of 93%.
- A fee is payable at Dendy off-street carpark. This carpark experiences lower levels of utilisation reaching a maximum occupancy of 64% on a typical weekday. It often has about half of its capacity available.
- Commuter car parking servicing the station is heavily occupied.
- The estimated parking demand associated with future development is 184 spaces. While some spare capacity exists (585 spaces) most of these spare parking spaces are located at the extremities of the Activity Centre catchment, as the surveys have revealed that occupancies are very high (84%) in the sections of streets nearest Church Street. It is therefore considered appropriate to develop new car parking facilities to accommodate between 120 to 160 cars over the existing parking lots located on the corner of Carpenter and Black Streets and off Well Street between Carpenter Street and the railway line.
- A contribution to this future parking supply will also be made by the already committed Council proposal to provide 29 new parking spaces on a site at 7 Wells Street. Such facilities would be able to accommodate the majority of the forecast demand of 184 spaces (at least around two thirds if 120 spaces were provided). The remainder would be accommodated in a more dispersed manner through the spare capacity that exists across the Activity Centre – consistent with the likely dispersal of new development.

Traffic

Future Traffic Demands

In metropolitan Melbourne, the peak activity time of the road network is generally found to be the evening peak period. This is also likely to be the period that coincides with the peak activity time of developments in the Church Street Activity Centre. Therefore, the evening peak traffic period has been examined, for the purposes of evaluating the traffic impacts associated with increased land use in the Centre.

Traffic Rates

The following weekday evening peak hour traffic generation rates have been adopted as a suitable standard for Activity Centres in Bayside. They are based on the *Guide to Traffic Generating Developments* with appropriate adjustments for metropolitan Melbourne.

Office & Commercial:

2 vehicle trips per 100 square metres of gross floor area

Retail:

7.6 vehicle trips per 100 square metres of gross floor area (where the total retail floor area in the Activity Centre is between 10,000 to 20,000 square metres)

5.9 vehicle trips per 100 square metres of gross floor area (where the total retail floor area in the Activity Centre is between 20,000 to 30,000 square metres)

Residential:

0.4 vehicle trips per dwelling per hour

The residential peak hour rate of 0.4 vehicle trips per hour is 10% of the daily rate of 4 vehicle trips per dwelling – which represents about half of the rate typically found in outer suburban areas in Melbourne. The reason for selecting a lower rate is based on the expectation that the new residential development will be of medium density and be able to capitalise on public transport, walking and cycling opportunities through being located in the heart of the Activity Centre. Evidence around Melbourne indicates that a rate of 4 vehicle trips per dwelling per day is realistic in a medium density context, close to public transport and where reasonable walking and cycling options exist.

Analysis undertaken for Church Street has revealed the following:

- The economic analysis has indicated that the anticipated growth in commercial floorspace is in the order of 3,000 square metres.
- The economic analysis has indicated that there are 19,400 square metres of existing occupied retail floorspace and a forecast increase of 3,500 square metres. Thus the adopted evening peak hour traffic generation rate will be 5.9 vehicle trips per 100 square metres.
- Various development scenarios have been considered in the structure planning process. New dwellings in the Church Street Activity Centre could range between 160 and 220. The upper limit of 220 has been adopted in the interests of a conservative analysis.

The application of the relevant traffic rates generates the following traffic volumes in the evening peak period:

Office & Commercial:	60
Retail:	177
Residential:	88
Total:	325 vehicle trips per hour

Traffic Distribution

In order to establish whether an additional 325 vehicle trips per hour can be managed, it is necessary to understand the distribution of trips onto the road network. However given that the exact location and extent of future development is unknown, it will be necessary to make certain conservative assumptions on how traffic will be distributed onto the road network around Church Street. Given the orientation of the Activity Centre there are likely to be a number of roads that will be used by motorists. These include Church Street, Well Street, New Street, Black Street, Carpenter Street, St Andrews Street, Durrant Street and Halifax Street.

Many trips will only utilise one of these roads and it is also possible that some trips would occur entirely off these routes. It is also worth noting that the major off-street parking areas are accessed off Well Street, Black Street and Carpenter Street – thus reducing reliance on actually having to use Church Street when visiting the Activity Centre. In this context it will be conservatively assumed that around 30% of the forecast traffic ends up on some section of Church Street, namely an increase of 98 vehicles per hour. It will also be assumed that this traffic volume increase is split equally in each direction, say 49 vehicle trips per hour each way (less than one trip per minute).

It will also be assumed that each of the seven nominated side streets takes 20% of the forecast traffic increase (this assumes some vehicles using more than one of these streets – naturally the exact amount on each street will be highly dependent on the location and intensity of new development). This is equivalent to around 65 vehicles per hour (total flow) or 33 vehicles per hour in each direction (approximately one vehicle every two minutes).

Capacity of Road Network

The maximum forecast traffic volume in the Activity centre is expected to occur on sections of Church Street with 49 vehicles per hour in one direction. This traffic volume increase is equivalent to less than one vehicle per minute and represents less than 6% of the traffic lane capacity on Church Street.

In summary the forecast traffic volume increase associated with new development in Church Street is expected to be modest. The traffic increases combined with the existing traffic levels on all the key routes within the Centre, are expected to generate peak hour traffic volumes that are well within the traffic carrying capacity of the roads. Therefore there are not expected to be any significant congestion issues arising from the land development scenarios envisaged in Church Street.

Key Issues and Conclusions

The key issues identified and conclusions drawn as part of the traffic analysis have been summarised below:

- The forecast traffic volume increase associated with new development in Church Street is expected to be modest. There are not expected to be any significant congestion issues arising from the land development scenarios envisaged in Church Street.

2.8 Defining a Boundary for the Centre

It was necessary to define a boundary for the Church Street Centre to identify the extent of the Major Activity Centre, where the Structure Plan will apply, and where the focus should be for future development, including additional housing. The boundary was defined to include areas in close proximity to public transport, shops, and services, and it included sites that have development potential because of their size, orientation and accessibility. The boundary was carefully defined to minimise impacts on heritage buildings and areas.

The map on the following page shows a number of characteristics that informed the location of the Church Street Centre Boundary. This map appears exactly as it did in the Emerging Ideas stage of the project. There may have been subsequent changes to various boundaries since the Emerging Ideas stage.

The characteristics that were used to help define the boundary for the Church Street Centre are explained below:

- *Walking Distance to the Railway Station* - To create a sustainable centre, additional housing opportunities should be provided within walking distance of the railway station. 400 metres is commonly used as a measure for a convenient walking distance.
- *Large Sites* - Higher densities of housing can be accommodated on larger sites with less impact on the amenity of adjoining areas. This can be achieved by providing height transitions and setbacks to adjoining housing.
- *North south orientated allotments* – The orientation of these allotments provides opportunities for new development to make best use of energy efficient design.
- *Existing medium density development* – In areas where medium density development is a strong characteristic of the area, the introduction of additional medium density housing would be less likely to impact on the character of the area.
- *Allotments with two street frontages* – These allotments can provide vehicle access from each street frontage and when designed well, new dwellings can contribute positively to both street frontages.
- *Heritage Overlay areas and properties* – Heritage areas and places limit opportunities for additional housing because of the contribution they make to the heritage fabric of Bayside.

3. Evolution of the Structure Plan for Church Street

3.1 Stage 1: Issues and Opportunities

Issues and Opportunities Process

The issues and opportunities was the first public consultation stage of the Structure Plan. A community bulletin was distributed which posed a series of questions about the following issues: the qualities of the Church Street Centre, people, activities and services, moving around the area, and the local economy. The bulletin also included general information about the project and the Centre.

Members of the community were able to fill in a questionnaire that was attached to the bulletin. A workshop was also conducted which invited key stakeholders in the community to discuss issues and opportunities facing the future planning of the Church Street Centre.

A copy of the community bulletin appears in [Appendix 4](#).

Comments on Issues and Opportunities

A summary of the comments from the Issues and Opportunities questionnaire and workshop is included below. The comments were considered developing the Emerging Ideas for the Church Street Centre.

What you like about the Church Street Centre

- Low scale character and the village ambience of the centre, along with the quality and variety of the shops and businesses.
- Convenience of the centre as a local facility, its friendliness and the easy access to restaurants and cafes.
- Shopping and restaurants and the cinema were identified as the key attractors for this centre.
- The cinema as a key attractor and asset.
- Quality of the streetscapes and gardens.

Concerns about the Church Street Centre and issues that the Structure Plan needs to address

- Ensuring that Church Street and Bay Street centres have complementary not competing roles.
- Height and scale of new and proposed developments.
- Future development of the 'croquet site'.
- Retaining and enhancing the low scale character.
- Protecting residential amenity.
- Planning responsibly for population growth, including the need of particular groups in the community such as families and older adults.
- Providing more parks and public spaces in the centre.
- Providing more community facilities in the centre.
- Better pedestrian access, such as improved pedestrian crossings and improved footpaths.
- Quality and frequency of bus and rail services and amenities (eg lighting at the station).
- Better control of traffic speed, congestion and the loss of pedestrian amenity in the centre.
- Better access to car parking.
-

Future opportunities for the Church Street Centre

- Create a destination that people want to visit with a mix of community services and retail.
- Improve fresh food shops and supermarket.

- Improve retail and service mix.
- Make more efficient use of existing building stock.
- Improve the 'residential mix'.
- Provide more parks and open space in the area and improve open space and recreational opportunities.
- Provide more space for community activities (eg: meeting space, community hall).
- Improve the streetscape including uniform street trees, an upgrade of paving, widening of footpaths and more public art.
- Provide access for all – high pedestrian amenity and higher priority for pedestrian access (eg: more pedestrian crossings, clear footpaths).
- Improve lighting and public safety.
- Provide better facilities for cyclists.
- Encourage better interconnectivity of different transport modes.
- Promote and encourage improvements to public transport.
- Implement traffic calming initiatives.
- Increase access to parking

3.2 Stage 2: Emerging Ideas

Emerging Ideas Process

The Emerging Ideas stage of the project was used to test some of the initial ideas that the study team had developed through the Issues and Opportunities stage.

A community bulletin (refer to [Appendix 5](#)) was released which provided details of how members of the community could find out more about the Emerging Ideas Display and how they could comment on the content of the display. The bulletin also included a summary on the community feedback from the Issues and Opportunities stage.

The Emerging Ideas were communicated through an exhibition at the Brighton Library with maps and ideas for the entire centre and identified precincts. A summary of the community feedback from the Issues and Opportunities stage was also displayed as well as a site analysis plan and a set of criteria with a map that would be used to define the boundary of the centre. A printed copy of the display (refer to [Appendix 6](#)) was available for collection along with a feedback form which posed a series of questions about the contents of the Emerging Ideas.

Comments on Emerging Ideas

A summary of community comments on the Emerging Ideas was included in the Draft Structure Plan summary report. The comments were arranged into four themes - Activities, Buildings, Spaces and Access. These themes formed the basis of the objectives and Strategies / Actions in the Draft Plan and the Final Plan. A summary of comments and a response to the comments for each theme is included below:

Activities

Comments about Activities made in response to Emerging Ideas included:

- Church and Bay Streets are a considerable distance apart - they should remain locally oriented neighbourhood shopping strips.
- The character of Church Street is excellent as it is with a variety and mix in all parts.
- Church Street works and is perfect without precincts.
- There are already two supermarkets in the street - the expansion of Safeway will impact on the individual traders and is unnecessary.
- Church Street should focus on its existing reputation for upmarket clothing and homewares.

- Not happy with the creep into residential areas.
- Residential apartments above shops are not what potential Bayside residents would be attracted to.

Response to the Comments (reproduced from the Draft Plan)

Some of the comments appear to support many of the Emerging Ideas that have been developed into the Draft Structure Plan.

Some comments related to the creation of precincts of activity within the Centre. The intention of designating precincts is to assist in applying planning controls, and to further strengthen the mix of uses that exists in Church Street. It is not intended to erect signs or market the Centre as a collection of separate precincts.

Concerns about the impacts of an expanded supermarket on individual traders were also highlighted. It is believed that the expansion of the supermarket would draw more customers to the Centre, resulting in additional trade for other retailers.

Concerns have been expressed in relation to the 'creep' of commercial activity into residential areas and providing additional housing within the Centre. It is not proposed to rezone any land in residential areas for commercial purposes. An 'Activity Centre' comprises not just the commercially zoned main street, but also the surrounding residential areas. Planning for more people to live in the Activity Centre makes better use of existing infrastructure, including public transport, improves safety, and boosts the economic performance of the Centre. We have judged that increased residential densities can be accommodated in the Centre without significantly detracting from existing residential amenity. Additional housing can also be proactively directed to areas where it will have least impact.

Buildings

Comments about Buildings made in response to Emerging Ideas included:

- There should be no building higher than two storeys in the commercial or residential areas - this could destroy the village aspect of the Centre.
- Disagree with encouraging building on top of heritage buildings.
- Proposed housing will bear no resemblance to the scale and character of existing housing.
- There should be no additional housing or multi-unit development - the character of the area will be destroyed by units, short setbacks, and over-height buildings.
- Very unhappy with high density creep into residential areas and the creating of three to four storey buildings.

Response to the Comments (reproduced from the Draft Plan)

Some community comments have highlighted the need to protect heritage buildings in the commercial areas particularly with upward extensions. This is reflected in the draft plan with a policy inserted into the strategies and actions that recommends the conservation of heritage buildings and ensures that extensions are undertaken to respect the heritage significance of the building.

Many of the public comments on Emerging Ideas sought height limits on new development. The aim of these comments, judging from explanations where given, is that people want new development to match the scale and character of valued existing buildings in and around each centre. Some respondents were explicit in suggesting actual height limits for new buildings, but opinions varied on an acceptable height, generally ranging from three storeys down to only one storey.

The Victorian planning system requires that height limits are arrived at on the basis of 'performance' – meaning there must be demonstrable reasons for arriving at a chosen height limit. These reasons will be subject to intensive scrutiny, probably including the quasi-legal forum of a planning Panel. The reasons must be logical and defensible, and must take account of government planning policy.

The recommended built form controls have been arrived at by examining the concerns that people have expressed about building height and bulk, and exploring the performance of different building envelopes.



Building Envelope within the Commercial Centre ('A' and 'B' Areas on the Buildings Plan)

Within the commercial heart of each centre, most older buildings are either one or two storeys in height, set hard against the footpath. Most predominantly single storey shopping centres are in country towns or post 1950s outer suburbs of Melbourne. The heart of a classic Victorian-era shopping centre usually consists of two storey shops reaching a height of 9-10 metres. This height, which includes a substantial parapet, is equivalent today to three storeys. A modern two storey commercial building would be only about seven metres in height, and would look too small to match the character of the Centre. Therefore a three storey (10.5 metres) frontage height for buildings within the commercial core of a centre will maintain and add to the existing character. Additional policy guidance will be added to require façade designs to express the vertical rhythms and horizontal divisions of existing buildings. Areas we have judged to be suitable for a maximum building height of 10.5 metres are denoted as 'B' on the Buildings Plan.

In areas denoted as 'A' on the Buildings Plan, we have judged that a recessed additional storey could be added without harming the character of the Centre or creating additional overshadowing or affecting the amenity of residential properties through overlooking. With a minimum setback of 5 metres, a recessed additional storey up to a maximum of 13.5 metres would be hidden from view from most perspectives.

Building Envelope in Residential Areas ('C' and 'D' Areas on the Buildings Plan)

In the residential areas adjoining the Centre, protection of neighbourhood character and residential amenity remain as priorities in future development control. In areas denoted 'D' on the Buildings Plan, a new neighbourhood character precinct will be formed, a revised preferred character statement will be prepared, and normal Rescode standards will apply. The outer boundary of the 'D' area has been arrived at using the criteria published in Emerging Ideas display (walking distance to the railway station, presence of large sites or north south orientated allotments or existing medium density development or allotments with two street frontages; and heritage overlay areas and properties).

Residentially zoned areas located on the main shopping street itself or immediately adjoining the rear or side of commercially zoned properties already have the special attribute of being right next to the heart of the Centre. Where local conditions appear to offer redevelopment potential now or in the future, the area has been denoted as 'C'. In 'C' areas, the aim would be to allow redevelopable sites to take advantage of their proximity to the higher buildings within the commercial core, while limiting their frontage to a height that matches the overall height of existing residential buildings in the area.

While many if not most existing dwellings are single storey, most have pitched roofs or parapets that give them an overall height of at least 6-7 metres, often more. Many Bayside residents have added a second storey to their properties, and probably most would expect to be allowed to do so if the need arose. A two storey house will be at least 6 metres in height, more commonly 7-8 metres with a pitched roof. Therefore we are proposing a maximum frontage height for new development in 'C' areas of between 6.0 and 7.5 metres.

A recessed additional storey would have only a limited impact on the character and scale of an established residential street, as Diagram 1 illustrates. An envelope of 9 metres would provide for this opportunity (residential storeys are usually less in height than commercial storeys). Appropriate design controls will be needed to ensure consistency with existing character. This envelope would apply in the 'C' areas to provide a worthwhile potential to provide residential opportunities for people who like to live 'close to the action', and in turn to contribute to the long term vitality of the Centre. It is also likely that a similar envelope could apply to large sites in area 'D'.




Diagram 1

Spaces

Comments about Spaces made in response to Emerging Ideas included:

Very few comments were received in relation to public spaces in Church Street. However, verbal comments from residents and traders involved in the project indicate that the community is very happy with the pedestrian environment in Church Street. The streetscape treatments also contribute to a reduction in traffic speed.

Response to the Comments (reproduced from the Draft Plan)

The Spaces Plan reflects public sentiment, with the proposal to extend the highly valued streetscape treatments to the north western end of the Centre, and improve the public environment of the train station.

Access

Comments about Access made in response to Emerging Ideas included:

- All public transport services are good and handy.
- Church Street is more congested than Bay Street - this prevents driving but makes walking a good alternative.
- Further development will cause more congestion - Church Street is at its limit.
- Currently live within 100 metres of an activity centre but no visitors can park within 100 metres of it during the week.

Response to the Comments (reproduced from the Draft Plan)

The potential increase in traffic congestion on Church Street associated with increased development has been highlighted by the community. A number of actions and strategies in the Draft Plan relate to moving traffic away from Church Street including the connection and widening of laneways behind shops. The areas for increased housing have been deliberately located within walking distance of the Centre and public transport to encourage residents to walk to the Centre rather than drive. There are also strategies and actions to improve access to public transport and improve pedestrian and cycle access.

Car parking has been highlighted as an issue in the Church Street Centre with concerns relating to the difficulty in finding parks close to the Centre. It is possible to increase the turnover of parking within the heart of the Centre by altering time restrictions and reducing the amount of unrestricted parking close to the Centre. The need for additional parking has also been identified to service existing and future needs. It is proposed that redevelopment of two off-street car parks is considered. The car parks are on the corner of Carpenter and Black Street and off the north side of Well Street, between Carpenter Street and the railway line. The redevelopment of these car parks could progressively provide up to an additional 400 to 500 spaces. These strategies have been reflected in the Draft Plan.

The research for the Parking Precinct Plan has revealed that:

- The peak parking utilisation period within the Church Street Activity Centre occurs between 11am and 2pm, with occupancy rates reaching 66%. However,

much higher occupancy rates are experienced in the heart of the Centre with parking occupancies in sections of Church Street and nearby intersecting streets approaching 100%.

- The turnover of *1-hour* limit parking spaces in Church Street is relatively high as the average duration of stay is 41 minutes. These findings highlight that there is a strong demand for short-term parking in the heart of the Activity Centre.
- There is very high utilisation of free off-street car parks close to the main shopping strip with occupancies often near 100%. The average duration of stay in the car parks located off Church Street is 59 minutes, well below the *2-hour* permitted parking restriction currently in place. A fee is payable at the Dendy off-street car park. This car park experiences lower levels of utilisation reaching a maximum occupancy of 64% on a typical weekday. It often has about half of its capacity available.

Through one-on-one interviews it has been determined what percentage of people drive to the Church Street Centre and the purpose of their trips. These interview surveys have highlighted that car travel is essential to the viability of the Centre, in particular the essential needs of business and in supporting retail, leisure and other activities. At the same time future parking and traffic demands can also be mitigated by managing the intensification of land uses in a way that encourages an appropriate shift in travel behaviour. For instance, traffic generation rates can be as low as 3 trips per day per household for medium density development near public transport, compared with up to 10 trips per day per household for single dwellings that are further removed from public transport. Clearly the provision of new housing should be targeted at achieving optimum public transport accessibility and thereby achieve minimal traffic growth.

Data from the interview surveys and the car park occupancy statistics has also been utilised to calculate actual (or empirical) parking rates that could be applied to new development (as opposed to the parking rates required under the Bayside Planning Scheme).

The empirical car parking rates have been combined with the 'building envelopes' (capacity floor space figures for the Centre) to determine the total number of car parking spaces required as a result of this work, and if / how these car parking spaces can be accommodated. Recommendations cover a variety of solutions:

- In some cases, such as in residential parts of the Centre, car parking spaces will continue to be accommodated on site.
- On-street car parking spaces will continue to be utilised, but more effectively – through alterations to time limits to support short-stay parking closer to the heart of the Centre.
- Consideration of the development of a new purpose built car parking facility.

3.3 Stage 3: The Draft Plan

The Draft Plan Process

A Draft Plan (copy included in [Appendix 7](#)) was prepared for the Church Street centre which built on the 'emerging ideas' but include a greater level of detail.

A community bulletin (copy included in [Appendix 8](#)) was distributed prior to the release of the Draft Plan, which provided details of how members of the community could find out more about the Draft Plan, and how they could comment on the plans. The Draft Plan was communicated through an exhibition at the Brighton Library with display boards and a Summary Document which was able to be collected at the library, from the Council offices or downloaded from Council's website.

The summary documents and display boards included a vision for the Centre along with an artist's impression of how the centre looks now and how it could look in the future. Objectives and Strategies / Actions were also developed (see below) which covered the following topics:

Activities – the location and intensity of land use activities.

Buildings – the '3D' form of the Centre's buildings into the future.

Spaces – plans for improving the main public spaces in the Centre.

Access – transport, traffic and parking; pedestrian and cyclist access.

The summary document also included a summary of comments on the Emerging Ideas with detailed responses to the comments and justification for the recommendations in the Draft Plan.

A feedback form with a series of questions was attached to the summary document which provided members of the community with an opportunity to comment on the Draft Plan. The questions asked people whether they agreed or disagreed with the plan, whether anything was missing, and asked for any other comments they had.

Comments on the Draft Plan are included in the next chapter.

4. From Draft Plan to Final Plan

4.1 Comments on the Draft Plan

A total of 18 responses were received for comments on the Church Street Draft Structure Plan. Below is a summary of comments received which are arranged by the four themes – Activities, Buildings, Spaces and Access.

Two tables summarising all the comments received are appended:

DRAFT PLANS COMMUNITY FEEDBACK SUMMARY TABLE 1: BY RESPONDENT ([Appendix 9](#))

DRAFT PLANS COMMUNITY FEEDBACK SUMMARY TABLE 2: BY ISSUE ([Appendix 10](#))

Activities

What Comments did People Make?

- Activities Plan satisfactory

Housing

- Support infill development...agree with infill of apartments forming a second storey over existing single storey.
- Support restriction of high density development to areas described.
- Disagree with higher density...disagree with above shop residential development in Church St.

Role of the Centre

- Should treat Church and Bay Street separately.
- Brighton should not be a destination point.
- Church/Bay should not be alternative shopping district to Chadstone

Commercial Area

- There should not be any extension of the commercial area
- There should be no mixed use.
- Support for expansion of supermarkets to full line status.
- Do not support expansion of supermarket
- Suggestions for Safeway car park are terrific.

Response to comments

There was mixed support for higher density housing in the submissions to the Draft Plan. A major goal of the Structure Plan and a key direction of Melbourne 2030 is to provide additional housing opportunities close to public transport, shops and services. This will result in a more vibrant centre with increased trade and services and also minimise the dependency on trips by motor vehicles. Additional shop top dwellings will contribute to regional housing targets outlined in the Southern Regional Housing Statement.

The Draft Plan was prepared to accommodate the higher housing densities in the commercial core where building site coverage is already high. The final structure plan will continue to encourage higher densities and mixed use in the commercial core however the overall building height will be capped to ensure the character is not adversely affected.

A number of submissions related to maintaining the separate character/ function of Church and Bay Street commercial areas. This will remain an objective within the final plan.

The extension of the commercial area was also raised as a concern. There is no proposal to extend the commercial area in the Church Street Centre. However it is considered appropriate in planning terms to support any expansion of the Safeway supermarket to full line status to serve as a stronger anchor for the Centre.

Buildings

Building Height

- Support height limit to that of Victorian Buildings
- Disagree with building heights...disagree with three and four storey apartments...happy with the current height of buildings in the street.

Setbacks

- Support the built form areas described in 'C' in Well Street
- Support the 3m setbacks and proposed height limits as described for 'C'. 3m setback for Well St parking area.
- Support the setbacks proposed for the Church St strip

Built form character

- Proposal not in keeping with existing Victorian facades
- Will new buildings be in character with heritage?
- Do the existing buildings stay? Will it be a strip shop atmosphere? Will the 'village' be kept intact?
- Patchy development destroys character.

Residential Character and Amenity

- Residential character must be protected.
- Buildings along north side will be allowed a height of 13.5m recessed, which could result in loss of privacy and overshadow neighbouring residential.
- No consideration given to existing residents who will face the rear of these developments.

Response to comments

A number of submissions related to the proposed three and four storey buildings in the commercial area. There is a large number of existing two-storey Victorian shopfronts in the Church Street commercial area and these buildings are the equivalent of a modern three storey building. The proposed mandatory three storey height limit at the street frontage would match the existing heights of these buildings maintaining the heritage character of the commercial areas was an issue raised in a number of submissions. The proposed building heights in the Draft Plan will match the existing heights of two storey Victorian shopfronts. There are also guidelines to maintain the vertical and horizontal design rhythm of buildings and reflect the pattern of narrow shopfronts in new buildings. Another strategy encourages the retention of existing Victorian two-storey buildings.

There were a number of concerns about the absence of setback controls for residential and commercial interfaces. The final plan proposes setback controls that ensure commercial buildings are stepped down at the residential interface with additional setbacks afforded to adjacent heritage buildings. There are also mandatory height controls of three and two storeys. These measures will ensure that the residential character and amenity is protected.

Spaces

What Comments did People Make?

- Support the Spaces Strategies in Precinct 3.
- Carpenter Street between Church and Wilson is very poorly landscaped.
- Please more trees, beautification of Carpenter St.

Response to comments

There is a strategy to maintain existing street trees and undertake infill planting where appropriate to create a tree lined streetscape within the structure plan area, which includes a section of Carpenter Street.

There is also an action point to complete a streetscape plan at the corner of Church Street and Carpenter Street, which will improve the appearance of Carpenter Street around Church Street.

Access

What Comments did People Make?

- Suggest lanes near railway station could also be pedestrian links.
- Church St bike path is hazardous.
- Better public transport links and facilities.

Parking

- Where is additional parking provided?...need more off street parking...need more car parking spaces...parking is a problem.
- Where is the car parking for new residences above shops?
- Support the strategy to maintain (if not increasing) existing public car parking spaces.
- Public car parking must be provided to service entire retail precinct.
- Limited car parking for train travellers...need for expanded car park/ all day parking for train users.
- Do not support new multi level carpark ...underground car parking is unpleasant
- 'At grade' car parking should be maintained however Redevelopment of 'air space' above is supported.

Response to comments

The package of access and parking initiatives envisaged in the Draft Structure Plan has been reviewed in the context of the community comments received. No significant change is proposed for the recommendations contained in the Church Street Draft Structure Plan other than a reduction recommended in the quantity of new parking. It is now recommended to establish an additional 120 to 160 car parking spaces, which represents a reduction from the car parking facility of between 400 and 500 spaces originally identified in the Draft Structure Plan.

While no significant changes are proposed, there are a number of community suggestions about specific detailed matters which will be incorporated in the updated Structure Plan. Such suggestions relate to a range of improvements for pedestrians cyclists and public transport users and support the existing strong emphasis that has been built into the Structure Plan, on pursuing improvements to pedestrian and cyclist amenity as well as enhancing public transport facilities and performance. Council has also considered the working with VicRoads to consider the introduction of a reduced speed limit in Church Street between St Andrews Street and Male Street and this initiative is incorporated in the updated Structure Plan.

Some community suggestions had also promoted the provision of additional long-term parking at the railway station. However it is considered that responsibility for commuter parking rests with the train operators and the State Government and it is not an issue that should be addressed in this structure planning process.

There have also been comments on car parking structures such as the benefits or otherwise of above ground and underground structures, overshadowing issues, etc. Rigorous design criteria will need to be developed in order to ensure satisfactory design outcomes and integration into the surrounding streetscapes. It is worth noting that the recommended reduced number of parking spaces (compared with the Draft Structure Plan) provides the opportunity to supply the requisite quantity of parking in unobtrusive single storey structures with low visual impact.

4.2 Future Capacity of the Centres

This section of the report sets out to bring together information that helps to answer the following two questions:

How much change in land use activity should be accommodated?

What scale and form of development is appropriate?

The questions need to be asked in relation to all four Major Activity Centres, as they must all contribute to the intensification of land use required under Melbourne 2030.

These questions are clearly related: the scale and form of development needs to accommodate the activity (shops, offices, parking, dwellings etc) anticipated to be needed over coming decades. At the same time, the amount of activity that *should* be accommodated may be limited by values held about the character of the existing built form. Therefore the answer to each question involves making judgements about competing and sometimes conflicting issues, rather than simply adding up numbers.

Some respondents to the Draft Plans expressed the view that change to each centre should be severely limited or even curtailed. This is not a realistic response – pressures for change will occur. Without effective planning scheme policies to accommodate change, the Council will continue to have VCAT act as the effective ‘responsible authority’ for these centres. Furthermore, there are sound reasons for directing certain types of development to Major Activity Centres. Local people need local shops and services, and the best location for these is in activity centres. They also need more diversity in housing opportunities. As we strive to make Melbourne a more environmentally sustainable city, it is important to concentrate activity close to where people live, and close to public transport. Major Activity Centres also have the capacity to accommodate (eg above shops) numbers and types of dwelling that are less appropriate in traditional residential streets.

Summary of Future Land Use Activity in the Centres

Previous sections of this report have provided information about the anticipated demand for retail and office floorspace, and the anticipated need for additional dwellings. The conclusions from this analysis were assessed at a workshop held on 19 July 2006, attended by all sub-consultants plus Charter Keck Cramer and Council officers, are summarised here.

Accommodating Additional Retail Floorspace

The great majority of retail floorspace can be expected to be accommodated at ground level. Therefore a key consideration for the structure plans is to provide sufficient Business zoned land to accommodate any projected increase.

	Current Retail Floorspace (m2)	Additional Retail Floorspace	Conclusions on Capacity
Bay Street Brighton	11,800	Consolidate Supermarkets plus around 2,000m2 of additional specialty floorspace.	Can be accommodated within existing Business zoned land
Church Street Brighton	19,400	Expand Safeway to full line store and add up to 3,000m2 of specialties	Can be accommodated within existing Business zoned land
Hampton	20,600	Expand Safeway store to full line status and add up to 2,000m2 of specialties	Can be accommodated within existing Business zoned land
Sandringham	9,200	Add up to 1,000m2 of specialties	Can be accommodated within existing Business zoned land

Accommodating Additional Office Floorspace

Additional office / commercial floorspace is likely to be created either above retail premises, or in buildings devoted to commercial floorspace alone. The four Structure Plans share the aim of encouraging floorspace above shops to be used for residential or commercial purposes, and the proposed built form controls would allow a substantial increase in upper level floorspace. Preferred locations for specialised

commercial floorspace are provided for through use of the Business 2 zone and specific references in the Strategies, which are proposed for inclusion in Local Policy.

	Additional Commercial Floorspace	Conclusions on Capacity
Bay Street Brighton	Add 1,000m ² to 2,000m ² of office space	Can be accommodated within existing Business zoned land combined with the Residential 1 zoned properties recommended for rezoning to Mixed Use
Church Street Brighton	Add around 2,000m ² to 3,000m ² of office space	Can be accommodated within existing Business zoned land
Hampton	Add around 1,000m ² of office space	Can be accommodated within existing Business zoned land
Sandringham	Add 500m ² of office space, redevelop Sandringham Hotel site	Can be accommodated within existing Business zoned land

Accommodating Additional Dwellings

The Southern Regional Housing Statement identifies opportunities for 2600 additional dwellings on Strategic Redevelopment sites and in Activity Centres. It is anticipated this is able to be met as outlined.

Preliminary work undertaken by Council indicates that the housing need arrived at in the Housing Analysis (above) will be met as follows, in activity centres and specific redevelopment sites in Bayside:

Location Category	Anticipated Dwelling Yield	Comment
Major Activity Centres (x4)	661-1053	Dependant on development rate
Major Activity Centres (Moorabbin)	-	Work yet to be completed in conjunction with Kingston and Glen Eira Councils
Strategic Redevelopment sites	900	Identified as part of the DSE Urban Development Program 2006
Other Neighbourhood activity centres	1000-2000	See Housing Strategy work however detailed work is yet to be completed on these centres
Total	2561	Based on the lowest projection for the MACs and NACs
	3953	Based on the highest projection for the MACs and the NACs

Given the importance attached to dwelling provision in Melbourne 2030 and the Regional Housing Statement process, and the neighbourhood character sensitivity of the existing residential areas around each of the Major Activity Centres covered by this study, a detailed exercise was undertaken to assess dwelling yield potential.

Assessment of Dwelling Yield Potential

The assessment of dwelling yield potential was undertaken in two parts:

- Dwelling Yields Analysis for Business Zoned Areas
- Dwelling Yield Analysis for Residential Areas

The result of the two analyses is summarised in the following table, which outlines the likely yields expected for new housing on each centre based on development rates of 20% and 40%.

Housing Yield Forecast Summary Table

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 5
20% devt rate	661	841	905	914	983
40% devt rate	1053	1298	1424	1387	1532

The figures from Scenario 1 of 661 additional dwellings (20% development rate) and 1053 additional dwellings (40% development rate) were used as the Anticipated Dwelling Yield in the Council's table in the preceding section. Scenario 1 adopts the building heights resolved upon by the Council on 19 December 2005, i.e.:

- 'A' areas = 3 storeys
- 'B' areas = 3 storeys
- 'C' areas = 2 storeys
- 'D' areas = 2 storeys

In other words, the Council's preliminary conclusion is that sufficient contribution of additional dwellings can be made by the four Major Activity Centres (MACs) within the building envelopes resolved upon by the Council.

Analysis of these figures

Over the next 20 years, the proposed rates of development for the MAC Study Area's need to achieve 1% to 2% per annum (based on the 20% / 40% rate). In terms of the extent of redevelopment required by these rates, the 20% rate requires 1 in every 5 lots within the Study Area to be redeveloped during this time, while the 40% rate requires 1 in every 2.5. The current Bayside rate is between 0.77 and 1.2% therefore a 20% development rate is considered feasible.

Due to growing demand for housing in Bayside and the increase market prices this development rate is likely to rise.

Based on the 20% development rate there is a difference of a maximum 322 dwellings, which over 28 years (from 2002) to 2030 equates to 11.5 dwellings per year. Based on the 40% development rate there is a difference of a maximum 479 dwellings, which over 28 years to 2030 equates to 17 dwellings per year.

The difference between the dwelling yields generated between each of the scenarios above is minimal. Therefore Scenario 1 with the lowest housing yield is likely to have minimal impact on the delivery of sufficient housing to meet the expectations of Clause 12 and the Southern Regional Housing Statement.

Built Form Options Assessed for Yield Potential

The following built form options informed the Yield Potential assessments:

- *Planisphere Jan 06 Revisions:* A preliminary set of modifications was made to the built form controls exhibited in the Draft Structure Plans. The changes included minor modifications that were made in response to Council and community feedback on the Draft Plans where concerns were raised about the amenity impacts of 3 and 4 storey development and the absence of side setbacks in 'C' areas.



- Interim Controls:** Interim Controls have been implemented into the Planning Scheme as a result of a Council request, with Schedule 6 to the Design and Development Overlay (DDO6) applying to each of the MACs. DDO6 allows for buildings of 2 storeys in the majority of residential areas, and up to 3 storeys in residential areas close to the Business Zoned areas. Building heights of 3 and 4 storeys are permitted in Business Zoned areas. These controls are set to expire on June 30, 2007.
- Council Resolution:** The Council has resolved to propose mandatory heights of 2 storeys in all residential areas within the MAC boundaries in the final version of the Structure Plans. A mandatory height limit of 3 storeys in Business Zoned areas is proposed as part of the resolution.

Five Scenarios were developed to explore the relationship between height and dwelling yield. The building heights (number of storeys) used in each Scenario were:

Building Heights (Number of Storeys) used in each Scenario

	'A' areas	'B' areas	'C' areas	'D' areas
<i>Scenario 1</i>	3	3	2	2
<i>Scenario 2</i>	4	3	3	2
<i>Scenario 3</i>	4	3	3	3
<i>Scenario 4</i>	4	3	3 & 4	2
<i>Scenario 5</i>	4	3	3 & 4	3

Scenario 1 incorporates the height limits of the December 2005 Council Resolution. The other Scenarios use different combinations of height to explore the relationship between height and dwelling yield. The complete results of this analysis appear in the following tables.



Dwelling yields for Business and Residential Areas

Scenario 1

Building heights: 'A' areas = 3 storeys, 'B' areas = 3 storeys, 'C' areas = 2 storeys, 'D' areas = 2 storeys (This scenario represents the Council Resolution)

Centre	Bay St		Church St		Hampton St		Sandringham		TOTAL
Built form area	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	
20% devt. rate	90	76	100	54	137	67	84	53	661
40% devt. rate	120	134	150	108	218	131	113	79	1053

Scenario 2

Building heights: 'A' areas = 4 storeys, 'B' areas = 3 storeys, 'C' areas = 3 storeys, 'D' areas = 2 storeys

Centre	Bay St		Church St		Hampton St		Sandringham		TOTAL
Built form area	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	
20% devt. rate	113	86	131	66	185	70	124	66	841
40% devt. rate	144	150	193	132	285	136	163	95	1298

Scenario 3

Building heights: 'A' areas = 4 storeys, 'B' areas = 3 storeys, 'C' areas = 3 storeys, 'D' areas = 3 storeys

Centre	Bay St		Church St		Hampton St		Sandringham		TOTAL
Built form area	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	
20% devt. rate	113	106	131	77	185	95	124	74	905
40% devt. rate	144	150	193	154	285	186	163	110	1385

Scenario 4

Building heights: 'A' areas = 4 storeys, 'B' areas = 3 storeys, 'C' areas = 3 & 4 storeys, 'D' areas = 2 storeys

Centre	Bay St		Church St		Hampton St		Sandringham		TOTAL
Built form area	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	
20% devt. rate	113	120	131	72	185	71	124	98	914
40% devt. rate	144	192	193	144	285	139	163	127	1387



Church Street Centre | Background Report

Scenario 5

Building heights: 'A' areas = 4 storeys, 'B' areas = 3 storeys, 'C' areas = 3 & 4 storeys, 'D' areas = 3 storeys

Centre	Bay St		Church St		Hampton St		Sandringham		TOTAL
	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	'A' and 'B'	'C' and 'D'	
Built form area									
20% devt. rate	113	140	131	86	185	97	124	107	983
40% devt. rate	144	234	193	177	285	191	163	145	1532

Potential Dwelling Yields in Business Zoned Areas

The analysis of Potential Dwelling Yields in Business Zoned Areas was prepared for a Council briefing held at the end of January 2006. These figures apply to the Business zoned land around within centre – i.e. the A and B areas on the Buildings map in the Draft Structure Plans.

Draft Structure Plan means that the building heights, setbacks etc from the exhibited Draft Structure Plans have been used in the calculations. These include an allowable fourth storey in A areas (plus an allowable additional storey for the Sandringham Hotel and Hampton railway station sites).

Planisphere Jan 06 Revisions means that the building heights, setbacks etc modified somewhat from the exhibited Draft Plan have been used in the calculations. The modifications referred to are described in the following section of this attachment. These modifications to the proposed A and B area building controls were in part agreed in discussions with Council officers after exhibition of the Draft Plans, and in part arise from further investigations carried out by the study team since then. These modifications do not include eliminating the possibility of a fourth storey.

3 storey throughout means that the building heights, setbacks etc from the exhibited Draft Structure Plans have been changed to exclude any development above three storeys in height. [This also includes the modifications referred to above, where they remain relevant after elimination of development above three storeys.]

Business Zoned Areas: 20% development rate

	Draft Structure Plans	Planisphere Jan 06 Revisions	3 storey throughout
Bay Street	114	113	90
Church Street	132	131	100
Hampton Street	190	185	137
Sandringham	125	124	84
TOTAL	561	553	411

Business Zoned Areas: 40% development rate

	Draft Plan as exhibited	Draft Plan as exhibited with recommended changes	3 storey throughout
Bay Street	147	144	120
Church Street	195	193	150
Hampton Street	293	285	218
Sandringham	164	163	113
TOTAL	799	785	601

Analysis of Potential Dwelling Yields in Residential 1 Zones

The analysis of Potential Dwelling Yields in Residential 1 Zones was prepared at the request of the Council following the June 2006 resolution. [The full Dwelling Yield Analysis for Residential Areas appears in [Appendix 11](#).] It is more detailed than the yield analysis undertaken prior to the January 2006 Council briefing, and includes a number of case studies designed to explore yield potential in different situations. The following is a summary of the results of that analysis, which form the subject of a separate report to Council.


The table on the following page details the main differences between the proposed built form controls for residential areas.




Comparison of proposed built form controls for residential areas

Document	Maximum Height	Setbacks	Site Coverage
Draft Structure Plans	<p>'C' areas – height of 7.5m at street frontage with an increase to 9m provided it is recessed 3m from the street frontage. Up to 12m on larger sites provided amenity impacts will be minimised.</p> <p>'D' areas – preferred height of 7.5m with increase to 9m if amenity impacts can be minimised.</p>	<p>Front</p> <p>'C' areas - 3 metres</p> <p>'D' areas – revert to ResCode.</p> <p>Side and rear</p> <p>'C' areas – 0m</p> <p>'D' areas – revert to ResCode</p>	<p>'C' and 'D' areas - ResCode (60% maximum building site coverage).</p>
Planisphere Jan 06 Revisions	<p>'C' areas – height of 7.5m at street frontage with an increase to 9m provided it is recessed 3m from the street frontage. Up to 12m on larger sites provided setback diagrams could be achieved.</p> <p>'D' areas – maintain current controls (Schedule to the R1Z)</p>	<p>Front</p> <p>'C' areas – 3m</p> <p>'D' areas – maintain current controls (Schedule to the R1Z)</p> <p>Side and rear</p> <p>'C' areas – in accordance with the setback diagram illustrated on the following page.</p> <p>'D' areas – maintain current controls (Schedule to the R1Z)</p>	<p>'C' areas - ResCode (60% maximum building site coverage).</p> <p>'D' areas – maintain current controls (Schedule to the R1Z – 50% maximum)</p>
Interim Controls	<p>'C1' areas - Discretionary 3 storeys (9m wall, 12m overall).</p> <p>'C' and 'D' areas - Discretionary 2 storeys (7.5m wall, 9m overall)</p>	<p>Front</p> <p>'C' and 'C1' areas – 3m.</p> <p>'D' areas – ResCode except where abutting a Heritage Overlay property, in which case Schedule to R1Z applies.</p> <p>Side and rear</p> <p>'C1' areas – Rear: 3m for third storey.</p> <p>'C' and 'D' areas – ResCode except where abutting Heritage Overlay in which case Schedule to the R1Z applies.</p>	<p>'C1,' 'C' and 'D' areas - Schedule to the R1Z (50% maximum building site coverage).</p>
Council Resolution	<p>'C' and 'D' areas - mandatory 2 storeys (7.5m)</p>	<p>Front</p> <p>'C' and 'D' areas - Schedule to the R1Z</p> <p>Side and Rear</p> <p>'C' and 'D' areas – Schedule to the R1Z</p>	<p>'C' and 'D' areas - Schedule to the R1Z (50% maximum building site coverage).</p>

Side and Rear Setback comparison


The table on the previous page highlights a number of differences between the side and rear setbacks provisions that have been proposed. The diagram below provides a comparison of the proposed side and rear setbacks:




-  ResCode
-  Schedule to Residential 1 Zone (existing Bayside Planning Scheme controls)
-  Side and Rear setback diagram contained in the Planisphere Jan 06 Revisions

Front Setback diagram contained in the Planisphere Jan 06 Revisions

This front setback diagram applies to 'C' built form areas in the Planisphere Jan 06 Revisions



-  Front setback for 'C' sites

Method

Two methods were used to provide estimates for dwelling capacities in each of the MACs. The first provided an estimate based on previous planning and building permits for medium density housing in the municipality (Step 1), to establish the dwelling yields for a range of lot sizes. The second estimate was based on a number of case studies undertaken by an architectural firm (Step 2), to test the yield differences between 2, 3, and 4 storey developments.

The method involved the following steps:

Step 1 – Determining historical development yields

Building and planning permit approvals were collected to establish the potential dwelling yield for each of the centres based on previous development densities. Approvals for medium density housing were analysed across the entire municipality to establish the average dwelling yields for various allotment sizes

Permit approvals were arranged into lot size ranges and the average dwelling yield for those lot sizes was calculated e.g. Lots between 500 & 700sqm yielded on average 2.1 dwellings, lots between 700 & 900sqm yielded on average 2.2 dwellings.

The historical development yields were also intended to be used to update a similar exercise which was undertaken by Ratio Consultants for the Bayside City Council in 2001. The Ratio yield figures were calculated on dwelling approvals prior to 2001 and were updated to reflect more recent development trends and planning policies.

Step 2 – Architect’s Case Study yields

The main purpose of the Case Studies was to determine the differences in terms of dwelling yields between the various built form proposals outlined in the *Comparison of proposed built form controls for residential areas* section of this report. This could not be achieved with an analysis of previous building and permit approvals because no information on building height and setbacks was provided.

David Moore Architects were engaged to test the potential yield of the lot size ranges determined in Step 1, by designing buildings for these lot sizes. For each of the lot sizes two and three storey buildings were designed. Four storey buildings were designed for the two largest allotment sizes.

In order to be able to provide a comparison between the Case Studies, a number of assumptions had to be made about the characteristics of the development and also the Case Study sites.

Step 3 – Development scenarios

The dwelling yields that were established from the Historical Development Analysis and the Case Studies were applied to each of the MACs. Properties that were constrained for development due to small lot size, heritage value etc. were excluded from the calculations.

Once every property within the MACs was assigned with potential dwelling yields, a number of development scenarios were applied to the centres to test the development yield of various built form options. Assumptions were also made about the rate at which development occurred.

Step 4 – Comparison of the built form controls

The potential yields from the development scenarios were compared to determine the dwelling yield benefits of the proposed built form controls.

Building and planning permit information for multi-unit, dual occupancy and apartment development across the municipality was collected. The permit data was used to establish average dwelling yields for a number of lot size ranges. The lot size ranges were selected by analysing the pattern of existing of existing allotment sizes in the municipality.

Indexing dwelling yields

Dwelling size has been factored into the calculation of the potential dwelling yield for each case study.

The reason for factoring in dwelling size is that it has to be considered to arrive at realistic yield figures. Simply demonstrating that three dwellings can be crammed onto a former single dwelling allotment does not necessarily translate to a realistic potential for that type of development to occur in the particular circumstances of the Bayside housing market. Dwelling sizes in Bayside are larger than the metropolitan average.

Furthermore, for most smaller multi-unit developments the height makes little or no difference to the number of dwellings able to be accommodated. This is because the separate dwellings are all located at ground level, rather than being stacked on top of each other. A third storey would usually add another floor to the same dwelling (i.e. make it larger in floor area) rather than adding an additional dwelling unit.

The development potential of any given site is therefore represented by a combination of dwelling numbers and dwelling floor area. Using historic yields to assess past development potentials, we can determine how likely it is for a site of a given size to be redeveloped into 2, 3 or more dwellings. A Case Study might show, for example, that 3 new dwellings can be accommodated on a site previously occupied by one dwelling, but with floor area less than the Bayside average. The lesson from this Case Study is not that 3 dwellings will always be built in the future; nor is it that 3 dwellings will *never* be built in the future. The realistic *average* development potential lies somewhere between these two possibilities. This has been calculated in the following way:

The total floor area for each Case Study (i.e. if there were three dwellings, the floor areas of all three would be totalled), was divided by the average historical floor area of medium density housing in Bayside. The historical floor area was determined by analysing previous floor area estimates for medium density housing, which were provided by Council's Valuation Department.

The result was a potential dwelling yield for each case study that could be indexed to historical dwelling sizes in Bayside.

Case Study requirements

The Case Study requirements have been selected to represent the built form controls proposed in the *Council Resolution* and those contained in the *Planisphere Jan 06 Revisions*. The controls contained in the *Draft Structure Plan* were not selected because of the concerns raised by the community about the amenity impacts of 3 and 4 storey development and the absence of side setbacks in 'C' areas. These concerns were addressed in the *Planisphere Jan 06 Revisions*.

It was also considered unnecessary to provide case studies that specifically modelled the provisions of the *Interim Controls*. The proposed heights were already covered in the Case Studies and it was unlikely that the subtle variations in setback would have a significant impact on dwelling yields.

Four storey developments were only modelled on sites larger than 2,000sqm. This was due to the proposed setback diagrams, which would require the fourth storey to be setback a substantial distance from front, side and rear boundaries, making the fourth level unfeasible on smaller sites.

Conclusions

Impact of 3 storeys

Applying 3 storey building heights to residential areas within each of the activity centres, produces varied results. Scenario 2 demonstrates that when a 3 storey height is applied only to the 'C' built form areas, the increase in the potential numbers of dwellings compared to 2 storey development (Scenario 1) is minimal – an increase of 38 dwellings (15%). This is mainly due to the relatively small number of 'C' sites in each of the Activity Centres.

Scenario 3 shows that when a 3 storey height is applied to both 'C' and 'D' built form areas, there is an increase of 102 dwellings (41%), which is considerable given the overall low numbers of potential dwellings. This Scenario was devised to illustrate the application of normal ResCode standards, which allow in theory for development of up to three storeys throughout residential zones. However, the reality is that only a certain proportion of development proposals for two or more dwellings on an average-sized single allotment will actually be approvable – let alone applied for – with a height exceeding two storeys. Indeed the Case Studies show that three storey developments were not achievable on the 500sqm and 700sqm allotments because of the site constraints. This would have impacted on the yield in Scenario 3, as a large proportion of allotments within the activity centres fall within this lot size range.

Impact of 4 storeys

Applying a four storey building height to large sites (i.e. 2000sqm or greater: see next paragraph) in the 'C' built form areas, has provided a modest increase in the total dwelling yield across the four centres. Scenario 4 shows the increase in the potential number of dwellings compared to a 3 storey height in 'C' areas (Scenario 2), is around 70 dwellings (25%). While the yield gain for each individual allotment can be as high as 100% when 4 storeys is allowed instead of three, the number of allotments of sufficient size to accommodate 4 storeys is so small that only a modest overall increase in yield would occur across a centre.

The Planisphere Jan 06 Revisions contained strict setback provisions for four storey height in 'C' areas. It was considered that sites with an area of less than 2,000sqm were not large enough to satisfy the proposed front, side and rear setback requirements and provide a useable fourth storey. Therefore a fourth storey was only applied to sites greater than 2,000sqm, of which there were only a small number in each centre.

The case studies for the 2,000sqm and 2,500sqm allotments demonstrated that the dwelling yield from a four storey development was substantially larger (100% increase) than the dwelling yield of a three storey development. This was primarily due of the apartment style developments that were modelled for the four storey case studies as opposed to the townhouse developments that were modelled for the 3 storey case studies. The apartment case studies provided higher dwelling densities and also basement car parking.

Development Feasibility

Council sought advice from Charter Keck Cramer, Strategic Property Consulting in 2006 which indicates the following:

As is the case throughout the metropolitan area, an ageing population, housing (un)affordability, and changing lifestyle preferences are creating significant levels of demand for smaller dwelling types. In recent years, this demand has been strongly expressed by the purchaser market for a range of 'alternative' dwelling types, such as townhouses and apartments, including numerous examples within the City of Bayside.

In any case, the context of the Bayside residential property market, including medium density housing products, is one that is expected to continue to be highly sought-after by a range of potential purchaser groups with demand for such housing remaining strong into the foreseeable future.

In understanding Melbourne's residential market it is pertinent to understand that apartments are still a relatively recent typology and represent a niche component of the residential housing market. While apartment formats have proven to be popular in the CBD, Docklands and inner suburban contexts such as Richmond, Fitzroy and Collingwood, the characteristics that define these examples, including the various lifestyle and locational opportunities on offer, do not typically exist in the Bayside MACs. The Bayside medium to high density residential market is generally characterised by affluent purchasers seeking particular housing typologies, in particular three bedroom townhouses in established residential areas. In terms of residential apartments, Bayside's comparative advantage is its waterside location,

hence this is where most pressure for apartment development has, and will continue to occur.

Clearly, purchaser preference is strongest for those properties located in close vicinity of the Bay. Conversely, there has been little demand expressed for apartment living within the MACs located 'inland'.

The application of the Heritage Overlay also undoubtedly poses as an additional constraint upon the ability to deliver multi-level apartment development in the MACs from both a development feasibility perspective and in terms of the planning application process. However, as evidenced by the sympathetic redevelopment of various heritage classified buildings in Melbourne, this is not to say that redevelopment may not be feasible in some instances.

Relative to the average Victorian dwelling size of 140.1 sq.m. (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2005), medium density dwellings currently being developed in Bayside are significantly larger areas such as Built Form Areas C and D, the predominant medium density housing form two-storey townhouse comprising two to three bedrooms with en-suite, (often including typically range from 150 sq.m. to 250 sq.m., with the average dwelling type being townhouse ranging from 200sq.m. to 225 sq.m.. (excluding garage and open space information is based upon the internal floor area of a number of recent townhouse developments by Charter Keck Cramer's Prestige Residential Valuation Group, as well as various databases. In summary, it is clear that the average dwelling size in Bayside represents a significantly larger dwelling type than the 140.1 sq.m. dwelling which represents the Victorian average.

In terms of the development feasibility within Residential Areas, a minimum development outcome consisting of two, two storey townhouses has been considered. This is based on the preferred maximum two storey height limit together with the minimum number of townhouses defined as 'medium density'.

In general, and based on recent evidence of numerous, completed townhouse projects within Bayside, the construction of two townhouses on a residential lot within the MAC Study Area has proven to be feasible. This is particularly so in Brighton and Sandringham, where there has, and continues to be strong demand for high quality townhouses. This is reflected in the current selling price which in recent years has risen considerably for this type of product and now ranges between \$750,000 and \$1.5 million for a townhouse dwelling. In light of the ongoing strong level of demand and based on existing townhouse projects throughout Bayside, it is evident that a project containing more than two townhouses would also generally represent a feasible development outcome.

Conclusion

There is further strategic work to be undertaken which will identify opportunities for housing growth in the Moorabbin Major Activity Centre, the Neighbourhood Activity Centres and dispersed locations across the municipality which will supplement that expected from the four Major Activity Centres. This would enable the neighbourhood character and low rise nature of Bayside to be protected whilst still allowing growth to satisfy the objectives of Clause 12 of the Bayside Planning Scheme.

The introduction of built form controls as outlined in the Structure Plans for the four Major Activity Centres will not have a substantial impact on the provision of housing in the City to meet the housing aspirations as set out in the draft Southern Regional Housing Statement.

Overall Conclusion

In summary:

- Based on the dwelling aspirations outlined in the Southern Regional Housing Statement, a rate of 218 dwellings per year from 2002-2030 would be required.
- On average 353 dwellings per year (net) have been added to the City of Bayside's dwelling stock since 1995.

- Household forecasts completed by forecast.id indicate that 3642 additional households are expected in Bayside between 2001- 2016.
- A research report, in response to the release of Melbourne 2030, prepared by Peter McNabb and Associates predicted a low growth scenario for Bayside of 6100 new dwellings between 2002 and 2030. This report identified constraints on development in Bayside.
- A 2006 update of sites as part of the Urban Development Program indicates a yield of approximately 900 dwellings on strategic redevelopment sites
- The Bayside Housing/Social Housing Strategy, Stage 1, Final Report identifies the estimated capacity figures for major activity centres (1694-2654 new dwellings) and neighbourhood activity centres (1097- 1994 dwellings) in Bayside.
- Major Activity Centre Structure Plan work completed to date indicates development rates of 661 new households (based on 3 & 2 storey height limits) for the four centres by 2030.
- It is expected that the figure of 2600 dwellings as outlined in the Southern Regional Housing Statement for Activity Centres and strategic redevelopment sites will be met through the introduction of built form controls as outlined in the Structure Plans.

Lower height limits and increased setback requirements of the kind envisaged for the four Bayside MACs can have a substantial effect on the dwelling yield of a particular individual site. Development feasibility of different built form options also needs to be carefully weighed.

However the net effect of the 'tighter' control regime resolved upon by the Council is of little or no significance when the overall picture is considered. This is mainly because the Draft Structure Plans focused locations for higher buildings in only limited areas, so the overall gain of dwelling numbers arising from more relaxed controls is not large. The few hundred dwellings that would be gained as a result of the relaxed controls, when spread across 25 years and four centres, has a negligible effect on the delivery of sufficient housing to meet the expectations of Clause 12 and the Southern Regional Housing Statement.

The implications of this conclusion for access and parking are now summarised.

Implications for Access

The traffic generation analysis, based on the likely development scenarios demonstrates that in the Church Street Centre, the traffic volume increases on all of the key roads (at full development) are fairly modest and only equate to an extra vehicle in each direction typically every minute or two (and even longer). These traffic volumes can be easily absorbed within the existing road network.

The actions recommended in the Structure Plan are designed to support the reduced reliance on private motorised trips envisaged under Melbourne 2030 and encourage modal shift through:

- Improvements to public transport services / infrastructure
- Improvements to pedestrian safety / access / environment (to support the existing 19% of walkers to the Centre and capitalise on the significant proportion of visitors – 28% – who expressed their next most preferred travel mode choice was walking)
- Improvements to bike safety / access through completion of the Bayside bicycle network and provision of improved "end-of-trip" and parking facilities
- Traffic calming, through introduction of a 30 kilometre per hour speed zone in Church Street

Implications for Parking

The maximum parking occupancy over the entire Activity Centre catchment reaches around 67% at 2.00pm – this represents 1233 of the 1843 spaces being utilised. At the same time the parking occupancy in the heart of the Activity Centre, Church Street, peaks at 82%. The occupancy in other streets close to Church Street, such as Male, St Andrews and Carpenter Streets averages around 85%. This indicates a strong parking demand “away from the main street” – even an increase compared with Church Street.

The spare parking capacity in the entire catchment at peak time (2.00pm) is 610 spaces.

The application of the Planning Scheme rates to the forecast retail and commercial development generates a total parking demand of 385 spaces. The final estimated on-street parking demand is 206 spaces after allowance for provision of some on-site parking and to reflect the Victorian Government’s modal shift target.

The development of a new car parking facility to accommodate between 140 to 180 cars (over the existing parking lots located on the corner of Carpenter and Black Streets and off Well Street between Carpenter Street and the railway line) would accommodate the majority of the forecast demand of 206 spaces. The remainder would be accommodated on-street in a more dispersed manner by using a small part the spare capacity that exists across the Activity Centre – this is consistent with the likely dispersal of new development.

The recommendation to establish an additional 120 to 160 car parking spaces represents a reduction from the car parking facility of between 400 and 500 spaces identified in the Draft Structure Plan. This will be reviewed in 5 years to consider improvements to public transport etc, which may influence a shift in transport use.

A Summary Table showing parking information related to the projected increase in development intensity in all four Bayside Major Activity Centres follows.

Summary table of parking information related to projected development intensity

	Bay Street Centre	Church Street Centre	Hampton Street Centre	Sandringham Village Centre
Parking catchment	903	1843	1903	804
Peak Parking occupancy over entire catchment	67% at 11.00am (602 spaces utilised)	67% at 2.00pm (1233 spaces utilised)	62% at 11.00am (1178 spaces utilised)	65% at 2.00pm (533 spaces utilised)
Peak Parking occupancy "main street"	74% Bay Street, St Andrews to Halifax	82% Church Street, St Andrews to Halifax	76% Hampton Street, South Road to Linacre Road	77% Station Street, Abbott to Bay
Peak Parking occupancy near "main street"	84% Asling Street, Allard to Bay Cochane, Rooding to Outer Crescent Williansby carpark Carpenter, Bay to Durrant	85% Male Street, Black to Well St Andrews, Black to Well Carpenter, Black to Well	53% Willis, Wave to railway Littlewood, Hampton to Hood Wills Carpark, east of Hampton	49% Bay Road, Beach Road to Fernhill Road Waltham, Station to Abbott Trentham, Bay to Abbott Abbott carpark on Beach Road
Spare parking capacity in the entire catchment at peak time	301	610	725	281
Existing Retail Floorspace (Occupied)	11,800 m ²	19,400 m ²	9,200 m ²	20,600 m ²
Forecast additional retail floorspace	2000m ² (17% increase)	3000m ² (15% increase)	2000m ² (22% increase)	1000m ² (5% increase)
Existing No. Commercial Businesses	55	32	38	65
Forecast additional commercial floorspace	2000m ²	3000m ²	1000m ²	500m ²
Forecast maximum additional dwellings	254	258	349	192
Forecast <i>Planning Scheme</i> parking demand	230	385	195	98
Car parking diagnosis	Main street is close to practical capacity. Surrounding streets are at similar levels. Limited ability to cater for increased parking demand. Explore off-street carpark options 80 to 120 spaces	Main street is close to practical capacity. Surrounding streets are at similar levels. Limited ability to cater for increased parking demand. Explore off-street carpark options 120 to 160 spaces	Main street is close to practical capacity. However, surrounding streets and carparks exhibit significant spare capacity. Forecast parking demand should be able to be accommodated with existing parking resources.	Main street is close to practical capacity. However, surrounding streets and carparks exhibit significant spare capacity. Forecast parking demand should be able to be accommodated with existing parking resources.



5 Implementation

5.1 Statutory Implementation

There are a number of recommendations for the statutory implementation of the Structure Plan. Most of the key objectives and actions from the Structure Plan will be included in the Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF), either as a Local Planning Policy (LPP) or in the Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS). Other recommendations include the introduction of a Design and Development Overlay (DDO), for the Activity Centre, and the rezoning of land at the corner of Carpenter Street and Well Street from Residential to Mixed Use.

Local Policy Planning Framework

There are two options for implementing the Structure Plan into the LPPF. The first option is to include components of the plan in a Local Planning Policy and replace the existing policy for the Church Street Centre (Clause 22.02 Church Street Activity Centre – Urban Design Policy). This option is consistent with other Major Activity Centres in Bayside except Hampton Street, each of which has an LPP, and it is also consistent with the approach in recently exhibited Amendment C46, which proposed a LPP for the Highbury Structure Plan.


The other option is to include components of the Structure Plan in the MSS. This option has recently been favoured by DSE as a way to reduce the amount of LPP in Planning Schemes.

It is considered that the first option of preparing an LPP is most appropriate because it would provide consistency with the other Major Activity Centres in the Planning Scheme and accord with the directions of recently approved amendments.

There may be scope to include some high level policy from the structure plan in the MSS. This method was used for the Highbury Structure Plan where policy was included in some sections of the MSS like the Housing section.

Local Planning Policy

The LPP would be the major Planning Scheme product for the implementation of the Structure Plan. The diagram below demonstrates how the Structure Plan could translate in the LPP. The structure used for the LPP is based on the other Structure Plans that are currently included in the Planning Scheme.



Policy Basis

The Policy Basis in the LPP would include components of the Future Role and Character Statement. It will set the scene for future planning in the centre and the objectives and policies that follow in the LPP.

Objectives

The Objectives section of the LPP would include the key objectives from each theme in the Structure Plan. The selected objectives will need to relate to the Policies that are chosen. The objectives will be combined under one heading to be consistent with the LPPs for other Major Activity Centres in Bayside.

Policies

The Policies will be taken from the Strategies contained in the Structure Plan, and will be arranged under the four themes – Activities, Buildings, Spaces, and Access. Only the key strategies from the plan will be included in this section. It will be necessary to filter out the strategies that will be contained in the other statutory implementation measures, such as the DDO and the proposed rezoning. Many of the non-statutory Strategies such as proposed works may also need to be edited out or summarised. The Strategies should not include any prescriptive controls.

The Strategies for the Activities section will also include sub headings and policies for each of the Activity Precincts in the Centre. The locations for these precincts will be included on the Framework Plan.

The Buildings section will not include the height and setback requirements as these will be located in the DDO or other appropriate statutory control tool.

Framework Plan

It is recommended that a Framework Plan be included to demonstrate location for the policy recommendations. The plan would show the key Strategies from each theme map.

The framework map would not show the building height controls as these would be included in the DDO or other appropriate statutory control tool.

Design and Development Overlay

Built Form Controls: 'A' and 'B' Areas

The built form controls for the areas designated 'A' and 'B' on the Buildings Maps should maintain the provisions contained in DDO6, but with the 'B' building heights (10.5m / 3 storeys) extended to cover the 'A' areas also. The height limits should be made mandatory. The rear setback provisions in DDO6 should be retained.

Objectives and Strategies relating to *Buildings* in the Structure Plan should probably be added to the DDO schedule, rather than included in Local Policy.

Built Form Controls: Residential 1 Zone

The built form controls for the Residential 1 zoned areas within the activity centre boundary should have the following characteristics:

- *Height limit:* 2 storeys and not more than 7.5m wall height / 9m overall height (as in DDO6, but mandatory)
- *Slope Provision:* 8.5m wall height / 10m overall height on sloping sites (as in DDO6, but mandatory)
- *Setbacks:* retain the existing Bayside Residential 1 zone schedule setbacks

Other requirements in DDO6, such as site description / response and roof deck provisions, can also be included in the new amendment.

Therefore the Bayside Planning Scheme would need to be amended to make the provisions of DDO6 permanent and mandatory. There appears to be no need to amend the Residential 1 zone schedule.

Re-Zonings

A small number of re-zonings are proposed (for details see [Activities Plan](#) In the Structure Plan Report). The proposed re-zonings are:

Proposed Re-Zoning	Explanation
R1Z to MUZ (Properties at the corner of Carpenter Street and Well Street)	Re-zone from Residential 1 to Mixed Use Zone. This will make the zoning of these properties consistent with abutting land uses.

It is proposed that the re-zonings should form part of the Planning Scheme Amendment to implement the Structure Plan.

Parking Precinct Plans

The Church Street Parking Precinct Plan is to be implemented by replacing the Schedule to Clause 52.06-6 of the Bayside Planning Scheme and applying the car parking ratios outlined in the Parking Precinct Plan which are attached as [Appendix 3](#).

The changes to the Schedule in Clause 52.06-6 will be used in assessing applications for retail, commercial and restaurant uses.

This Parking Precinct Plan will become an Incorporated Document under Clause 81 of the Bayside Planning Scheme and shall be taken into account when retail, commercial and restaurant developments are proposed in the Church Street Activity Centre.

In summary, the Parking Precinct Plan proposes changes to the car parking rates in the Bayside Planning Scheme for retail and commercial land-uses in the Church Street Precinct as follows:

Land Use	Planning Scheme Rate	Recommended Rate
Supermarket	8 / 100m ²	no change
Retail/Other Shopping	8 / 100m ²	5 / 100m ²
Restaurant/Café	0.6 spaces/seat	0.3 spaces/seat
Commercial	3.5 / 100m ²	1 per premises + 3.5 / 100 m ²
Tavern/Leisure/Social/Pleasure/Cinema	30 / 100m ²	no change

There are no changes proposed to the Planning Scheme rates for other land uses not specified in the above table, including residential developments.

Land has been identified for the provision of additional car parking spaces within the precinct. This land is Council owned and currently used for public parking, and is located on the corner of Carpenter and Black Streets and off Well Street between Carpenter Street and the railway line. Bayside City Council will construct car parking on the land with funds generated from the payment in lieu parking scheme, and will supply the necessary short-fall in parking spaces as determined by the new parking rates. The parking site will be owned, operated and restrictions enforced by Bayside City Council.

It is therefore considered reasonable to develop new car parking facilities to accommodate between 120 to 160 cars over the existing parking lots located on the corner of Carpenter and Black Streets and off Well Street between Carpenter Street and the railway line. Such facilities would be able to accommodate the majority of the forecast demand of between 144 and 184 spaces. The car parking facility would provide at least one additional level of carparking over the above carpark, however the ultimate solution may entail different parking arrangements (including for example, underground or multilevel carpark shielded by a residential/commercial shell). Council is also committed to the construction of 29 additional off-street carparking spaces on a site in Well Street, near the Dendy Plaza, and just to the east of the existing Well Street off-street carpark. The establishment of this new parking area is likely to keep the requirement for new car parking facilities closer to 120 spaces rather than 160 spaces.

Cost recovery for the construction of the new carpark on the existing parking lot located on the corner of Carpenter and Black Streets and off Well Street between Carpenter Street and the railway line will occur via a combination of cash-in-lieu and special rate schemes. Where it is impractical to provide parking spaces on the development land in accordance with the rates specified, (or on another suitable site within the Activity Centre), developers will be required to make a payment in-lieu of the parking. The parking spaces will be charged at a rate of \$76,000 per space. This cash-in-lieu levy will be reviewed annually. The levy reflects the construction costs of a multi-storey parking facility in the precinct.

In addition to the payment in-lieu, a special rate will be levied over a number of years. This will apply to all properties in the Parking Precinct Plan Area. The special rate will be determined following the preparation of a detailed cost estimate for the new carparking structure and will be variable depending upon the amount of cash-in-lieu funds collected.

Improved management of the current on and off-street parking supply is recommended, in order to better cater for the short-term parking in the Activity Centre. The following alterations to current parking restrictions are recommended:

- Provide shorter term parking in the heart of the centre
- Consider the introduction of short-term parking restrictions in unrestricted areas immediately adjacent to Church Street (within 200 to 300 metres).

Planning Scheme Amendment

A Planning Scheme Amendment is required to implement the statutory recommendations above. This could proceed immediately and the main resource implications are officer time.

5.2 Implementation Table

The table on the following page lists each of the Actions from the Structure Plan with the relevant department at Council and other agencies that would be responsible for the implementation and a desired timeframe. These table headings are explained below:

Actions

Includes the Actions contained under each theme in the Structure Plan.

Council Primary Implementation Responsibility

Lists the department at Council which will be primarily responsible for the implementation of the proposed Action.

Other Responsibilities and Stakeholders

Includes any other agencies that may be involved in the implementation or have a key interest in the implementation.

Priority

High

Recommends a short timeframe for the implementation of the action of 1 to 3 years.

Medium

Recommends a medium timeframe for the implementation of the action of 3 to 5 years.

Low

Recommends a long timeframe for the implementation of the action of 5 to 10 years.

Cost

Low

Estimates a cost for the implementation of the action of under \$50,000.

Medium

Estimates a cost for the implementation of the action of between \$50,000 and \$250,000.

High

Estimates a cost for the implementation of the action of over \$250,000.

Funding Program

As a further action Council should develop a plan for funding over ten years for each action contained in all of the Structure Plans. This will enable the 'High', 'Medium' and 'Low' priorities in each Centre to be further prioritised so that proper budgeting can occur.

Strategies/ Actions	Council Primary Implementation Responsibility	Other Responsible Agencies and Stakeholders	Priority	Cost
Activities				
Prepare and implement an amendment to the Bayside Planning Scheme to introduce the Objectives and the applicable Strategies into the Local Planning Policy Framework.	Urban Strategy	DSE; Planisphere	High	Low
Prepare and implement an amendment to the Bayside Planning Scheme to rezone current Residential 1 zoned properties on the eastern corner of Carpenter Street and Well Street (in precinct 1) to Mixed Use.	Urban Strategy	DSE; Planisphere	High	Low
Buildings				
Prepare and implement an amendment to the Bayside Planning Scheme to introduce the Objectives and the applicable Strategies into a new schedule to the Design and Development Overlay and, where applicable, into the Local Planning Policy Framework.	Urban Strategy	DSE	High	Low
Spaces				
Undertake a streetscape upgrade of Church Street, north west of St Andrews Street following a detailed plan or masterplan of the area. Any plans should ensure that the streetscape on the south west side of Church Street relates to the retail area of Church Street and that future streetscaping in front of the St Andrews Church relates to the church and school.	Technical Services Department	Urban Strategy	High	High
Include the following proposed works in the Council's works program, prioritised to concentrate benefits and positive impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve the public spaces and visual amenity of walkways around the railway station to provide an attractive pedestrian link and open up viewlines. - Review the quantity, type, quality and placement of landscape elements including street furniture, pavements and street trees to ensure that the Centre has adequate, attractive, comfortable and safe places to sit and interact. - Review and upgrade street lighting. 	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy	High	Medium
Develop a signage guideline to manage existing signage in the Centre and promote special features of the Centre.	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy	Medium	Low

Strategies/ Actions	Council Primary Implementation Responsibility	Other Responsible Agencies and Stakeholders	Priority	Cost
Require provision of weather protection and active frontages for properties facing the Church Street footpaths between the extent of the Business zoning south-east of Male Street and New Street.	Planning and Building Department	Urban Strategy	Medium	Low
Encourage landowners of the St Andrew's Church grounds to continue to allow pedestrians to use the open space as a place to sit and meet.	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy	Medium	Low
Negotiate with property owners located opposite the Church grounds to provide for buildings with activity windows overlooking the grounds when relevant development applications are submitted.	Planning and Building Department	Urban Strategy	Medium	Low
Review opportunities for acquiring additional public open space.	Properties; Urban Strategy		Medium	Low
Access				
Prepare an amendment to the Bayside Planning Scheme to introduce the Objectives and the applicable Strategies into the Local Planning Policy Framework.	Urban Strategy	DSE	High	Low
Prepare an amendment to the Bayside Planning Scheme to introduce the Church Street Parking Precinct Plan into the Particular Provisions section of the Planning Scheme.	Urban Strategy	DSE	High	Low
Work with VicRoads to introduce of a reduced speed limit within the Church Street commercial area between St Andrews Street and Male Street.	Infrastructure Services	VicRoads	Medium	Low
Investigate the options for implementing the proposed laneway widening and laneway connections as shown on the Access Plan.	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy	Medium	Low
Develop a laneway maintenance strategy for safety, sanitation etc. The strategy should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Repaving to ensure even surfaces (asphalt typical). - Lighting. 	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy	Medium	Low
Improve view lines to, and lighting in off-street car parks and on pedestrian linkages between the car parks and Church Street.	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy	Low	Medium
Review and implement the on-street car parking recommendations contained in	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy	High	Low

Strategies/ Actions	Council Primary Implementation Responsibility	Other Responsible Agencies and Stakeholders	Priority	Cost
the Parking Precinct Plan, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultation with traders and other relevant groups. - Provide shorter term parking in the heart of the Centre. - The introduction of short-term time-restricted parking in selected unrestricted streets within 200-300 metres of Church Street to discourage long-term and all-day parking in favour of shopper and visitor parking. - Providing disabled parking for the Church Street retail strip in the intersecting side streets, which provide a safer environment. Where possible, the first parking space, after turning off Church Street, should be reserved for disabled parking, in accordance with Australian Standards. 				
Work with public transport operators to encourage the provision of signage within the train station, to identify the location of interchange facilities outside the station, including bus stops, taxi ranks, cycle parking, pedestrian links, and key features and facilities within the Centre.	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy; Public Transport Operators	Medium	Low
Work with bus operators to provide improved facilities at the transport interchange stops including improved shelter and seating.	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy; Public Transport Operators	Medium	Low
Investigate the provision of suitable passenger set-down / pick-up facilities for private vehicles in Church Street near the station.	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy; Public Transport Operators	Medium	Low
Advocate for improvements to transport services for the public, connections and amenity of stations and surrounds.	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy; Public Transport Operators; VicTrack	Medium	Low
Negotiate with public transport operators to achieve improvements to pedestrian and bicycle access and safety within and around the Middle Brighton Station, in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved lighting at the station and along pathways to the station - Opening up view lines to the station through the siting / removal of vegetation and structures - Providing covered walkways from the station to Church Street - Additional bicycle parking and storage 	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy; Public Transport Operators; VicTrack	Medium	Low

Strategies/ Actions	Council Primary Implementation Responsibility	Other Responsible Agencies and Stakeholders	Priority	Cost
facilities at the station				
Encourage landowners adjacent to the railway station pedestrian access paths to maintain rear fences and vegetation to improve pedestrian amenity.	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy; Public Transport Operators; VicTrack	Medium	Low
Develop a clear strategy for the placement of permanent and temporary street furniture on footpaths (including signage, seating, shop displays, outdoor cafes) designed to maintain unobstructed travel paths for pedestrians. Initiatives could include attaching signs and traffic signals to light poles in order to minimise the number of poles in the street and providing shelter at bus stops with cantilever canopies attached to buildings rather than with free-standing shelters.	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy	Medium	Medium
Develop a formal footpath maintenance strategy	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy	Low	Low
Investigate the installation of pedestrian priority crossings at the roundabouts.	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy	Low	Low
Complete the installation of the on-road cycle lanes and off-road cycle paths in the Church Street Centre in accordance with the Bayside Bicycle Strategy.	Infrastructure Services	Bicycle Victoria	Low	Low
Develop implementation options for the installation of bicycle facilities in all new developments and in Council buildings, community facilities and Council-controlled car parks.	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy; Bicycle Victoria	Low	Low
Prepare a mobility strategy for the area that considers the above strategies.	Infrastructure Services	Urban Strategy; Community Services	Low	Low
Review the Parking Precinct Plan in 5 years to ensure its continued relevance.	Urban Strategy	Traffic consultant	Low	Low/medium

5.3 Monitoring and Review

It is important that the Council establishes and maintains a monitoring and review program for the Structure Plan. One obvious starting point is to monitor implementation of the actions shown in the Implementation Table on the previous pages. We suggest that this be undertaken annually, as a preparatory input to the Council's budget preparation cycle. A formal review of the status and content of each action could be undertaken every three years. This review should also consider performance of the planning scheme policies (once they are in place), and any recommendations for change would best be considered at the same time as the Council is undertaking its three-yearly MSS review. Public consultation may be needed if the changes being considered have significant community or property impacts.

Monitoring and review also needs to consider the effectiveness of the Structure Plan in achieving Melbourne 2030 goals. Implementation Plan 4 Activity Centres includes an action by the State government to 'develop program for ongoing monitoring and review of activity centres'. It further states that this program may include:

- Regular assessment of the performance of each centre in the network against the integrated performance criteria
- Regular assessment of the performance of the whole network, including the PPTN
- Successful control of out-of-centre development
- The performance of the Transit Cities

Council should keep a watching brief on the emergence of this program, and any implications it may have for its own monitoring program.

The 'future strategic development objectives' for Major Activity Centres provide a more specific framework, of which the following are relevant:

- Encourage more mixed-use development in appropriately located sites
- Continue broadening the range of uses
- Encourage a wider range of arts, cultural and entertainment facilities
- Location for higher density housing
- Upgrade public transport services
- Reinforce the network of centres by connection into the PPTN

We suggest that there are three simple performance criteria that Council could adopt as a monitoring framework for assessing the effectiveness of the Structure Plan:

- Number and variety of additional residential units (or bedrooms) developed in accordance with Structure Plan policies
- Quantity and variety of non-residential uses (by use category and floorspace) added to the centre's use mix in locations that accord with Structure Plan policies
- Quantity and variety of uses in locations that do not accord with Structure Plan policies

A process should be established for collecting information on development approvals on an ongoing basis, with annual reporting (perhaps feeding into the Council's Annual Report), and a formal review of the effectiveness of the Structure Plan's policies and their implementation every three years. This could occur as part of the three year MSS-linked review referred to above.

Monitoring and Review of the Parking Precinct Plan

The Church Street Parking Precinct Plan responds to the current and future anticipated car parking demand associated with the various land-uses in the Church Street Activity Centre. The amount of new parking to be provided is based on gradual development up to 2030. Accordingly, the full amount of parking may not be required until then. It is anticipated that as a result of changes in land uses, such as increased



residential development within the Activity Centre, that car parking characteristics and travel patterns may also alter in the future. In view of these circumstances, it is recommended that the Church Street Parking Precinct Plan be reviewed in 5 years to ensure its continued relevance.



Appendix 1 - Essential Economics Report



PLANNING OUR FUTURE |

Church Street Centre | Background Report



Appendix 2 -Background Transport, Traffic and Parking Analysis



PLANNING OUR FUTURE |

Church Street Centre | Background Report



Appendix 3 – Parking Precinct Plan



PLANNING OUR FUTURE |

Church Street Centre | Background Report



Appendix 4 – Community Bulletin 1



PLANNING OUR FUTURE |

Church Street Centre | Background Report



Appendix 5 - Community Bulletin 2



PLANNING OUR FUTURE |

Church Street Centre | Background Report



Appendix 6 - Emerging Ideas Display



PLANNING OUR FUTURE |

Church Street Centre | Background Report



Appendix 7 - Draft Structure Plan



PLANNING OUR FUTURE |

Church Street Centre | Background Report



Appendix 8 - Community Bulletin 3



PLANNING OUR FUTURE |

Church Street Centre | Background Report



Appendix 9 - Draft Plans Community Feedback Summary Table 1: By Respondent



PLANNING OUR FUTURE |

Church Street Centre | Background Report



Appendix 10 - Draft Plans Community Feedback Summary Table 1: By Issue



PLANNING OUR FUTURE |

Church Street Centre | Background Report



Appendix 11 - Dwelling Yield Analysis for Residential Areas



PLANNING OUR FUTURE |

Church Street Centre | Background Report