



HAMPTON NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATION INC.

Reg. A0061728S

www.hna.org.au

P.O. Box 55,
Hampton, 3188
community@hna.org.au

Mr M. Kelleher,
Manager Urban Strategy,
Bayside City Council,
PO Box 27,
Sandringham, 3191

28 October 2014

Dear Mr Kelleher,

Hampton Activity Centre & VicTrack

I would like to advise that the Hampton Neighbourhood Association has now been incorporated and has met twice since the presentation from VicTrack and Bayside Council representatives.

The number of people attending has remained high, reflecting the level of interest and concern with aspects of the Activity Centre and VicTrack proposal.

The Association has now elected inaugural office bearers and at the last meeting discussed the proposal, identified an initial list of matters of community concern and made a decision to engage further with VicTrack and Council.

Matters of community concern are:

1. Apartments

The Association is aware of the current public debate concerning the size and mix of apartments within multi storey developments within the City of Melbourne and numerous local councils. A particular concern is the negative social outcome for both the inhabitants and existing residents in the developments where there are a high proportion of small (less than 50m²) one-bedroom dwellings. The negatives associated with this style of development have even greater impact when they are placed within lower density residential environments like Hampton. The Association notes that a large number of single bedroom apartments are already under construction in Hampton St. The Association notes the commentary in Council's UDF document regarding enduring community benefits and requests that Council adopt:

- a. A minimum apartment size of 50m²
- b. An apartment mix of not greater than 30-40% of 1 bedroom apartments

2. Car Parking

The Association members note the VicTrack Traffic Report prepared by Cardno and the recommended early request for car parking concessions. This is considered to be a self-serving request given the high costs of underground carparking on a difficult construction site and driven by a desire for a higher land sale price and development profit.

The Association believes the need for car parking will increase as a result of:

- a. Expanded retail and commercial activities in Hampton Street
- b. The range of residential developments within and around the Activity Centre, not limited to the current development under discussion
- c. Increased public transport use
- d. The elimination of Zone 2 rail fares meaning many commuters will park at Hampton Station rather than driving to Brighton Beach.
- e. Other future factors including increased retail traffic and requirements for visitor parking.

The Association also notes the reliance on Census data on car ownership in a statistical division with a high percentage of public housing and associated low car ownership.

The Association believes that Bayside Planning Scheme car parking requirements for residents and visitors should be provided within the development.

3. Building mass and form

The Association notes Council's preference for a 6-storey limit and VicTrack's refusal to confirm this limit in advance of a review of responses to the EOI.

The increased height of the development will obviously increase the value of the VicTrack land and the profits for the developer. Hence, a request for further height concessions is considered inevitable.

There are significant overlooking implications as a consequence for adjacent residents in Orlando, Station and Willis Streets. The Association believes:

- c. The potential overlooking will have a major impact on the amenity of current residents. This will directly and negatively affect the surrounding community, compromising residents use and enjoyment of their properties and possibly the value of their homes
- d. The design of the building should have regard to minimisation of these impacts
- e. Requests for further height concessions should be rejected

4. Traffic

The Association noted the contents of the Cardno traffic report commissioned by VicTrack and also that Bayside is completing a further traffic investigation.

Understandably concerns are expressed over the level of influence a client like VicTrack would have over the conclusions of such a report. The Association would like to know if the findings are confirmed by Council's own investigation prior to considering whether to commission its own report.

The Association notes:

- a. The evaluation of options is based only on traffic movement criteria and there is no consideration of impacts of that traffic on surrounding residential and commercial use
- b. The mix of 60% Studio and 1 bedroom apartments in the proposed development
- c. The report is based on 200 dwellings when VicTrack indicated proposals were 250+ dwellings
- d. The requested car parking concessions
- e. The fact that there is no consideration of traffic generated by other development and increased retail/commercial in the Activity Centre
- f. The work is based on options 1 & 5 contained in the Arup report that are further discussed below
- g. The absence of evidence for the assumption that the majority of traffic will exit via Willis Lane not Koolkuna Lane

5. Single interest decision-making process

The Association notes the option development process in the Arup transport report and the subsequent review of only selected Arup options in the Cardno traffic report.

The Arup report worked from options developed/dictated by a heavily transport focused working group comprising Public Transport Victoria ("PTV"), Department of Transport Planning and Local Infrastructure ("DTPLI"), VicRoads and Council.

There is little or no evidence of consideration of wider community impacts in the decision or a search for wider community benefits including those identified in the high level principles adopted by Council in their public UDF documents.

The options developed by this working group were evaluated and scored using assessment criteria (Arup Section 4.2) that were public transport focused, inward looking and attributed no value/decrement for impacts on surrounding communities and commercial/residential land use.

Options discarded by this decision-making process had significantly less impact on the surrounding community (Arup Option 3 – traffic continuing to exit the precinct via Willis Lane).

Only two options selected through this narrowly focused process were then evaluated in the Cardno traffic report.

The Association members want the Options within the Arup report to be evaluated again using assessment criteria that reflect business and community concerns and the principles identified in the UDF and for this evaluation to be the subject of community review. The Association members believe this is very important given the likelihood pressure for future development on the whole site including the Community Centre and Playhouse.

6. Consultation

The Association welcomes the recent decision by Council regarding further community consultation, as it believes that previous consultation attempts have been inadequate, poorly advertised with short notice and have not ensured an informed discussion.

Furthermore community views have not been appropriately sought on all the available options.

The Association expects a more informative and a better-advertised consultation process that allows reasonable time for community assessment of all options. The Association requests that Council ensures that future consultation is conducted with local residents rather than residents from outside the area.

Clearly some of these matters can only be considered as the VicTrack EOI process progresses and more information (building form and car parking) is available whilst others can and should be considered now, as they will inform the VicTrack process.

In these circumstances the Association members have developed shorter and longer-term actions:

Short Term

- i. Request a copy of the brief for the Council Traffic Study and a briefing on the draft report.
- ii. Request that the option assessment contained within the Arup report be amended to have regard to the objectives of the Hampton Activity Centre UDF and concerns expressed by retailers and the community.
- iii. Request that the transport decision making process be amended to incorporate all stakeholders rather than just public transport stakeholders

- iv. Request a roadmap of the Council community consultation process.
- v. Discuss these matters with the Hampton Traders Association

Longer Term

- i. Review of building mass and form and associated overlooking effects
- ii. Review of apartment size and mix
- iii. Review of proposed car parking concessions

I will be in contact to discuss a mechanism whereby Council can engage with the Association on this and other matters.

A representative of the Association who spoke at the September Council meeting was asked whether the Association supported the Option 3 traffic plan as described in the Officers Report to that meeting.

The Association believes that further information (including that identified above) is needed before members could make a decision on that issue.

Yours Sincerely,



D. Osborn
President