

Requests to be Heard

9 May 2023

Planning and Amenity
Delegated Committee Meeting



Bayside
CITY COUNCIL

Requests to be Heard

9 May 2023 Planning and Amenity Delegated Committee Meeting

Item 4.2		Objector (O) Supporter (S) Applicant (A)
Haileybury College Traffic and Parking Study		
Written Statements		(Page 4)
1.	Mrs Sue Forster	(O)
Requests to Speak		
1.	Mr Harry Pavlou	(O)
2.	Ms Felicity Frederico OAM	(O)
3.	Mr John Ryan	(O)
4.	Mr Paul Rubinstein	(O)
5.	Mr Rob Curtain	(O)
6.	Mr Gary Crocker	(O)

Item 4.3		Objector (O) Supporter (S) Applicant (A)
28–34 Service Street, Hampton		
Written Statements		(Page 5)
1.	Mr Tony Shepherd (on behalf of Hampton Neighbourhood Association)	(S)
Requests to Speak		
1.	Mr Adam Haines	(S)
2.	Mr James Pearce	(S)
3.	Mr Stephen Barrow-Yu	(A)

Item 4.4		Objector (O) Supporter (S) Applicant (A)
14 Bridge Street, Hampton		
Written Statements		(Page 7)
1.	Mrs Roseann Lenihan	(O)
Requests to Speak		
1.	Ms Katrina Luxton	(A)

WRITTEN STATEMENTS

Item 4.2 Haileybury College Traffic and Parking Study	Objector (O) Supporter (S) Applicant (A)
1. Mrs Sue Forster	(O)
<p>I wish to support all the recommendations outlined on page 15.</p> <p>I have been a resident of Castlefield precinct for 38 years and am affected by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the current high levels of Haileybury College traffic at morning and afternoon peak periods; 2. the potential for this to increase if Haileybury’s planned Creative Arts and Sports Centre (CASC) development is approved; 3. potential increases in evening and weekend traffic and on-street parking if the CASC is approved. <p>I only have two routes out of my street (South Road and Avelin Street, which leads into Villeroy Street). Both routes entail battling through heavy school traffic and double-parked tailbacks during drop-off and pick-up periods. There has been a big increase in traffic since Haileybury College became co-educational.</p> <p>In response to the Traffic Report, the recommendations acknowledge that there is a traffic problem in the Castlefield area and attempt to provide sensible solutions to it.</p> <p>Even if the CASC does not go ahead, the current student cap could still be lifted; this would inevitably increase the burden of traffic in the Castlefield precinct. Therefore, I also urge Councillors to consider tabling a sixth recommendation:</p> <p>That Council: endorses maintaining the current cap on Haileybury student numbers as the most effective method of managing peak-period traffic around the college.</p> <p>I also note and support initiatives undertaken by Bayside City Council officers to implement keep-clear line markings on South Road at Imbros Street and move the South Road pedestrian crossing to the east of Haileybury entrance.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Sue Forster Hampton 3188.</p>	

Item 4.3 28–34 Service Street, Hampton		Objector (O) Supporter (S) Applicant (A)
1.	Mr Tony Shepherd (on behalf of Hampton Neighbourhood Association)	(O)
<p>This submission is made by the Committee of HNA on behalf of its membership.</p> <p>Under this agenda item (4.3), councillors will consider a proposal for development at 28-34 Service Street, Hampton, 3188. The proposal contemplates construction of two, three storey residential apartment blocks comprising 32 dwellings on a consolidated lot of 3662m².</p> <p>Hampton Neighbourhood Association (HNA) urges councillors to support a grant of permit. Our reasoning follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HNA supports development which is consistent with Bayside planning guidelines and reasonable community expectations. Having reviewed the community-facing aspects of this proposal we are of the view that it demonstrates compliance with the provisions of Bayside’s planning scheme in all but the most minor of respects. Additionally, we note that the proposal demonstrates material exceedance of compliance with planning scheme requirements in the following important aspects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A sustainability performance (as measured using the BESS approach) of 65% (as against the minimum performance requirement of 51%). 2) Garden area of 40% (as against the minimum requirement of 35%). This enhanced level of green space has further enabled retention of five existing significant trees, contributing to the landscaping values of the proposal. 3) Setbacks of the uppermost level on the Service Street elevation of 6m from the front wall of the level below (in recognition of transitional height requirements at this site). - In preparing the proposal, the developer has demonstrated a high level of respect for the local community, through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Extensive ongoing consultation with neighbours and the broader community (including HNA) via numerous ‘town hall’ meetings and one-to-one negotiations; and 2) A willingness to amend its plans to address concerns arising. <p>In HNA’s view this approach has embodied the highest standard of community consultation we have seen.</p> - Should councillors be minded to grant a planning permit for the proposal, this will bring certainty and closure for local residents and the broader community many of whom have committed a great deal of time and effort over several years to securing a suitable development proposal for the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A previous, controversial application for a ‘resort style’ development of the site was vigorously and successfully opposed by both Council and neighbours (with HNA support), and was ultimately refused a permit at VCAT, albeit the conduct of the applicant in that case resulted in the pre-emptive demolition of four homes with significant heritage values at the site. 2) The current application, undertaken by a new, different developer (a Hampton resident) has been in preparation in conjunction with affected neighbours for twelve months. 		

In summary, HNA believes the proposal meets Bayside planning guidelines and community expectations and a grant of permit to be in the interest of local residents and the broader community. Accordingly, we urge councillors to support a grant of permit for it.

Item 4.4 14 Bridge Street, Hampton	Objector (O) Supporter (S) Applicant (A)
1. Mrs Roseann Lenihan	(O)
<p>PROPOSAL Buildings and Works in a Design and Development Overlay Schedule 1</p> <p>This build has been unusual in that a yellow permit notice appeared when the property is half completed. This build has taken place without any consultation with the neighbours, other than the two adjoining properties. At no stage did we get the opportunity to see the plans of what was going to be built. It is only when they broke the regulations that plans became available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does a building surveyor not familiar with Bayside specific rules be allowed to administer the permit on behalf of a client in the Bayside area. • The building height: The build appears to be much higher than the surrounding properties. Has the height of the build been measured from the ground up or from the top of the wall that is a raised foundation on which sit raised floor trusses. The overall effect is to give the owners a view. • The boundary setbacks: I would query the off-set measurement that applies to the Carew Steet side. I have been informed that the offset is 3.8 meters from the street. My measurement gives me an off set of 1.6 meters. For some reason the decking that goes around the side has been classified as a raised walkway. • Bridge street side: I have asked on several occasions about the documents that Verma had put in front of her nose to sign without any explanation to what she was signing. I would like to know if fresh paperwork has been furnished to Verna, the document explained before signing it again. If not, Council cannot rely on the initial paperwork as proper consent. • Minimum garden: I question that 25% of that plot is garden space. • The brick wall: Undue pressure was put on Ken at no. 1 Carew Street to have this wall removed. • The building backing on to no. 1 Carew Street. The height of the build together with a lot of windows at the back is overlooking the Carew Street property. Are these windows opaqued to protect Ken's privacy. <p>Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to put my concerns forward regarding this development. As I have previously said I am a bit over people building their "dream home" at everyone else's expense.</p> <p>Roseann Lenihan</p>	