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1. Introduction

The Martin Street Activity Centre is located approximately 10 kilometres south-east of Melbourne’s Central Business District in the suburb of Brighton. It is located along the Sandringham Railway Line and Nepean Highway, on the eastern boundary of Bayside City Council’s municipal area. Activity Centres are identified in current state and local planning policy as focal points for employment, infill housing and community services, and are preferred locations for higher density residential and mixed use development.

Given the identified role of the Martin Street Activity Centre in accommodating some moderate future development in Bayside and continuing to provide for convenience services for the local community, a long term strategic plan is required to ensure that this future growth and development is located and managed appropriately, as well as ensuring that public infrastructure and services will meet the needs of current and future residents. This long term strategic plan is called a ‘Structure Plan’.

The Martin Street Activity Centre is located in Brighton, to the north of the Bay Street and Church Street Activity Centres. As illustrated in Figure 1, the main focal point is Gardenvale Railway Station, with retail and services located on both sides of the Sandringham Railway Line. Some retail and services are located in surrounding streets and along the Nepean Highway.

Figure 1 – Aerial Image of Martin Street Activity Centre (source: Near Maps)
1.1 Defining the Study Area

The study area for the Martin Street Structure Plan is shown below at Figure 2.

The purpose of the study area is to form the basis for initial investigations as to the current form and function of the Martin Street Activity Centre. The extent of the study area has largely been defined by the policy direction contained in the Bayside Housing Strategy (2012), which identifies land within 400m of Gardenvale Railway Station as a focus for future medium density residential development within Bayside. This is generally consistent with the approach outlined in the State Government practice note Practice Note 58: Structure Planning for Activity Centres, as follows:

- Ease of ‘walkability’ to the core of the activities area (400m-800m), including consideration of barriers to access;
- Proximity to public transport;
- The location of existing commercial areas and land uses; and
- Location and relationship of surrounding residential areas to the commercial core.

The final Structure Plan boundary in the draft Structure Plan generally correlates to the study area as defined above and is supported by the results of the analysis undertaken through this report and other background documents.

1.2 How to read this report

The body of this document is divided into five main sections:

Locational context

This section provides a summary of current conditions and future trends within the study area, including a detailed analysis of demographics, land uses, physical infrastructure, social and community services, open space and built form.

Policy context

This section provides a summary of state and local policy and strategies which are relevant to the future planning of the study area.

Thematic discussion

The report has chapters related to traffic and transport, economic function, and urban design and built form. These sections discuss key issues identified by technical analysis contained within specialist reports on traffic and transport, urban design and economic performance within the Centre and community feedback received.

Community Engagement

This provides a summary and analysis of feedback received during the two rounds of consultation with the community about the key issues facing the study area.

Conclusions and next steps

This section provides a summary of the key issues and trends identified throughout the background analysis which required further investigation as part of the structure planning process and outlines the final steps in the process.
1.3 **Scope**

The purpose of this background report is to:

- Provide an overview of the relevant state and local policies, which apply to the Martin Street Activity Centre;
- Summarise the economic, social and environmental context of the Centre; and
- Present community views regarding key issues and aspirations for the Centre.

From this information the key issues, opportunities and constraints within the Martin Street Activity Centre were identified and have informed the development of the draft Martin Street Structure Plan. In addition to the initial two rounds of consultation, the community will have another opportunity to contribute to the content and recommendations of the draft Structure plan. Once all feedback has been considered, Council officers will make any necessary changes to the draft Structure Plan and prepare a final version to be adopted by Council, and implemented into the Bayside Planning Scheme.
2. Context

2.1 Local Context

The Martin Street Activity Centre is located at the intersection of Nepean Highway and Martin Street, on the border of the Cities of Bayside and Glen Eira. The area derives much of its heritage and early built form from its settlement in the early 1900s, with the Gardenvale Railway Station established in 1906 and a number of businesses establishing nearby.

The Martin Street Activity Centre is located approximately 10 kilometres south-east from Melbourne’s CBD. Its location at the Nepean Highway, a major arterial route, as well as the Sandringham Railway Line, means that it is highly accessible from Melbourne’s south-eastern suburbs. However, because it is smaller than nearby Activity Centres, such as Bay Street and Elsternwick (Glenhuntly Road), it serves a more local catchment. The centre has good access to a range of services and attractions, including:

- Gardenvale Railway Station;
- A wide range of convenience services;
- The Port Phillip Bay foreshore, approximately 1.5 kilometres to the west;
- The Elster Creek cycle path and recreation trail extending from the north-west of the centre to Elwood; and
- Star of the Sea College, approximately 500 metres west of the centre.

Similar to several Activity Centres on or close to the Nepean Highway, the Martin Street Activity Centre is significantly impacted by the physical fragmentation of land by Nepean Highway and the Sandringham Railway Line. These create both visual and physical barriers to vehicular and pedestrian movement.

The retail core is focussed on the eastern end of Martin Street with some frontage also to the Nepean Highway and Spink Street. The centre then traverses the highway with a secondary commercial area in Gardenvale, within the City of Glen Eira to the east. The Martin Street Structure Plan exclusively relates to the Bayside portion.

The Martin Street Activity Centre is the northern most and smallest in geographical area of Bayside’s larger Activity Centres. It has approximately 90 businesses with a focus of activities on personal services, business services and health care and social assistance businesses. It performs the role of a “neighbourhood” or local centre and is impacted by the Bay Street, Church Street and Glenhuntly Road (Elsternwick) shopping centres. The Martin Street Activity Centre is classified as a Large Neighbourhood Activity Centre in the Bayside Housing Strategy (2012).
3. Policy Context

3.1 State Planning Policy

3.1.1 Plan Melbourne 2014

*Plan Melbourne* is the Victorian Government’s metropolitan planning strategy that will guide the city’s growth to 2050, and seeks to address future housing, transport, and employment needs. *Plan Melbourne* replaces the previous metropolitan planning strategies *Melbourne 2030* and *Melbourne @5 million.*

*Plan Melbourne* contains policy direction specifically for Activity Centres. The focus of planning for smaller centres such as Martin Street is through neighbourhood activity centre planning. A key direction of this concept, as detailed in Direction 4.1 of *Plan Melbourne*, is to create a city of 20-minute neighbourhoods. These are neighbourhoods where people have safe and convenient access to the goods and services they need for daily life within 20 minutes of where they live, travelling by foot, bicycle or public transport. *Plan Melbourne* suggests these neighbourhoods therefore include a variety of housing choices, shops and commercial services, schools, parks and recreation opportunities, and good walking and bicycle infrastructure.

*Plan Melbourne* identifies the role of Activity Centres can be enhanced by:

- Organising centres to enable a mix of goods and services;
- Supporting their ‘village’ character and feel through open space and urban design improvements;
- Encouraging targeted infill development of areas to support a 20-minute neighbourhood experience;
- Improving access to cafés, dining and shopping, and by creating village shopping strips that promote small business;
- Accommodating more community-based services, and shop-top housing, and by creating more open space; and
- Enhancing the quality of public spaces by making places safer, and improving pedestrian and cycle access.

Direction 4.2 ‘Protect Melbourne and its suburbs from inappropriate development’ highlights that in order to sustain liveability in the future, housing must be supplied in the right locations while also protecting neighbourhoods that have created suburban Melbourne’s image and provided many family-friendly homes. Under this direction, Initiative 4.2.2 ‘Protect Melbourne’s neighbourhood centres, including provisions for mandatory controls’ notes
that local government should plan and manage neighbourhood centres, including assessing building height and local character to inform the application of local mandatory controls. Plan Melbourne is currently under review.

3.1.2. State Planning Policy Framework

The State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF) provides the overarching policy framework for land use and development within Victoria. Planning authorities must take into account and give effect to the general principles and specific policies contained in the SPPF when developing and implementing planning controls.

The key state planning policies relevant to the Martin Street Activity Centre are as follows:

- **Clause 11.01 Activity Centres**
  This clause provides a series of objectives and strategies which support the concentration of residential, commercial and other land uses into defined Activity Centres, to operate as key focal points for future development. Structure planning is identified as the key tool for achieving this objective.

- **Clause 12.02-5 Bays**
  This clause seeks to improve the environmental health of bays and associated catchments by managing and improving stormwater quality. This policy is relevant to the Martin Street Activity Centre given the location of the Elster Creek Canal to the centre’s north.

- **Clause 13.04-1 Noise Abatement**
  This clause seeks to control noise on sensitive land uses through using a mix of building design, urban design and land use separation techniques. This policy is relevant as the Nepean Highway carries high traffic volumes that could impact on increased residential development. There is also potential for increased conflicts between commercial and residential uses as both uses intensify.

- **Clause 15 Built Environment and Heritage**
  This clause provides a series of objectives and strategies aimed at ensuring that land use and development appropriately responds to the surrounding landscape, built form and cultural context, whilst recognising that additional development within Activity Centres will lead to a change in the scale and appearance of built form.

- **Clause 16 Housing**
  This clause states that planning should provide for housing diversity, ensure the efficient provision of infrastructure and provide housing that has good access to services, public transport, schools and open space within walkable distances. Within established urban areas, additional housing is to be concentrated in and around Activity Centres and public transport routes in order to maximise access to services and efficiencies in infrastructure provision.

- **Clause 17 Economic Development**
  This clause encourages the consolidation of commercial, retail and entertainment uses within Activity Centres to both maximise efficiencies in access and promote economic viability and sustainability.

- **Clause 18 Transport**
  This clause encourages the integration of land use and transport planning to achieve greater efficiencies in infrastructure provision and facilitate greater use of non-car based transport modes. It specifically encourages increases in density in and around public transport interchanges. Specific guidance is provided around the provision and management of public car parking, encouraging the consolidation of parking facilities within Activity Centres and minimising uncontrolled on-street parking in residential areas to reduce road congestion.

- **Clause 19 Infrastructure**
  This clause directs that land use planning should facilitate the efficient, equitable and timely provision of social and physical infrastructure, with a key strategy being to consolidate social and cultural facilities within Activity Centres and maximise access.
3.2 Local Planning Policy Framework

3.2.1 Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS)
The MSS presents the strategic vision for land use and development within Bayside. It identifies the key policies and objectives through which this vision is to be achieved, in addition to how relevant State level policies are to be implemented within the municipality. The key policy objectives and strategies within the MSS relevant to the Martin Street Activity Centre Structure Plan are as follows:

- Clause 21.02 Bayside Key Issues and Strategic Vision;
- Clause 21.03 Settlement and Housing;
- Clause 21.05-1 Environmental Risks - Flooding and Stormwater;
- Clause 21.06 Built Form and Heritage;
- Clause 21.07-1 Economic Development – Activity Centres;
- Clause 21.09 Transport and Access; and
- Clause 21.11 Local Areas.

The MSS identifies Martin Street as one of four Large Neighbourhood Activity Centres within the municipality, which sit below Major Activity Centres such as nearby Bay Street. The MSS also identifies that Activity Centres will play an increasingly important role in providing future housing needs and that this will need to be carefully managed with respect to built form, heritage, transport and environmental risks. These clauses provide important policy direction for how the Martin Street Activity Centre should be managed into the future.

3.2.2 Local Planning Policies
Local planning policies provide specific guidance for the assessment of individual planning applications for use and development. Local policies are used to supplement the decision guidelines of planning zones, overlays and particular provisions where specific guidance is required to address local issues. Two key local policies are of particular relevance to Martin Street.

Heritage Policy at Clause 22.05: This policy sets out objectives and performance standards for all individual properties and heritage precincts. It also applies the Heritage SPPF objective in clause 15.11; and builds on the MSS objectives in clause 21.06-3 relating to Heritage. There are two heritage precincts of relevance to Martin Street, as identified in the Bayside Planning Scheme. The Martin Street Precinct (HO749) is of historical, architectural and aesthetic significance containing commercial buildings constructed in the early 1900s, following the opening of Gardenvale Railway Station in 1906. The Hamilton Street Precinct (HO657) is a very intact late nineteenth and early twentieth century residential area consisting of buildings in Hamilton, Cochrane, Cole and May Streets.

Neighbourhood Character Policy at Clause 22.06: This policy identifies the key character elements which define various residential areas within Bayside, and outlines specific design objectives and responses which further development should respond to. The Study Area is located within Neighbourhood Character Precincts A1 (small pocket of land north of Cole Street) and A2 (land north and south of Martin Street) and B5 (land north of South Road) as highlighted by Figure 3. Common key character elements within each precinct include dwellings sitting within established landscaped gardens, pitched room forms, low and open front fencing, and regular front and side setbacks. Architectural styles slightly vary between precincts, however Victorian, Federation and Inter-War styles are common.

Figure 3 - Residential Character Precinct Map: from Clause 22.06 Bayside Planning Scheme
3.3 Zones and Overlays

3.3.1 Zones

Figure 4 presents the zones within the study area. All land within the existing activity centre boundary, is zoned Commercial 1. The purpose of this zone is to create vibrant mixed use commercial centres, which consist of housing complementary to the role and scale of the commercial centre. The Commercial 1 Zone allows most commercial uses to operate as of right, with planning permission only required for new buildings and works, liquor licensing, or reduction of car parking requirements.

All residential land surrounding the retail area of the Activity Centre is zoned Neighbourhood Residential 3 as a result of the Bayside Housing Strategy 2012 as implemented through Amendment C106 to the Bayside Planning Scheme in June 2014. The purpose of the Neighbourhood Residential Zone is to recognise areas of predominantly single and double storey residential development, limit opportunities for increased residential development, and ensure that development respects the identified neighbourhood character, heritage, environmental or landscape characteristics of a given area. The zone also allows for a limited range of non-residential uses such as educational and recreational uses. In the Neighbourhood Residential Zone, the number of dwellings on a lot must not exceed two. There are also additional mandatory requirements related to setbacks, site coverage and front fence height.

Land along the railway line that dissects the centre is zoned Public Use Zone 4 (Transport) and the Nepean Highway is zoned Road Zone Category 1 (RDZ1).

3.3.2 Overlays

The study area is covered by the Heritage Overlay (HO), Design and Development Overlay (DDO) and the Special Building Overlay (SBO). The Elster Creek is encompassed within the SBO.

Heritage Overlay

The retail core of the centre, including the shops on both sides of Martin Street from Asling Street to the Nepean Highway and a small section of properties on the north side of Martin Street west of Asling Street are included within a Heritage Overlay under the Bayside Planning Scheme. Number 75 Asling Street is also included under the heritage overlay as an individually listed property. Additionally, the railway embankment and railway station are listed along with residential precincts based around Westley Avenue and to the north west of Hamilton Street. The purpose of the Heritage Overlay is to conserve and enhance heritage places of natural or cultural significance, including allowing prohibited uses where appropriate, and to ensure that development does not adversely affect the significance of heritage places.

A map of sites subject to the Heritage Overlay can be found at Figure 5.
3.4 Adjoining Council Zones, Overlays and local policies

3.4.1 Glen Eira Planning Scheme

The Activity Centre continues east across Nepean Highway into Gardenvale Road which is within the City of Glen Eira. This area is designated a Local Activity Centre with the Glen Eira Planning Scheme (Clause 21.06) with the surrounding residential area identified as minimal change (Clause 32.09). As illustrated by Figure 7, Martin Street, Brighton becomes Gardenvale Road, Gardenvale on the eastern side of the Nepean Highway within the jurisdiction of Glen Eira City Council. The land use zoning for this area continues a Commercial 1 Zone along Gardenvale Road and a Neighbourhood Residential Zone in the surrounding residential area. The highway frontage is in the Commercial 2 Zone.

The Special Building Overlay (Clause 44.05) applies to much of the Glen Eira part of the activity centre, following the line of Elster Creek along this side of the highway. A Parking Overlay (Clause 45.09) also applies to this eastern part of the centre. The Parking Overlay only impacts on the provision of parking for student housing. A small portion of the surrounding residential hinterland to the north is subject to DDO4 (Clause 43.02), which controls front fence height, and the Neighbourhood Character Overlay – Schedule 3 (Clause 43.05), which controls development in ‘Interwar Era Significant Character Areas,’ as determined by Council.
3.5  Bayside City Council – Plans and Policies

The Bayside Council Plan 2013-2017 was adopted in July 2013. The Council Plan sets out Council’s strategic objectives for its four year term in office, and identifies the key goals which it will focus on achieving in order to deliver quality community outcomes.

Of particular relevance to the preparation and content of the Martin Street Structure Plan are Goal 1: An engaged community and Council; and Goal 3: Bayside will have a well preserved neighbourhood character and will have accessible transport options. These provide the following strategic directions:

- Increase community awareness, understanding and participation in planning and decision making;
- Implement sustainable transport options;
- Develop planning strategies and policies that enhance Bayside’s liveability and its natural and built environment;
- Ensure planning takes into account current and future infrastructure needs; and
- Engage with the community when developing planning controls.

3.5.2. Bayside 2020 Community Plan
The Bayside 2020 Community Plan was adopted by Council in 2012 and expresses a vision for Bayside for the next ten years. It identifies six key priority areas to drive future policy and decision making. Of particular relevance to the preparation and content of the Martin Street Structure Plan is Priority Area 3 – Planning, infrastructure and transport, which contains the following objectives:

- Preserve residential amenity by ensuring traffic is managed appropriately and the scale and form of new buildings are sensitive to their setting, particularly on the edge of Activity Centres;
- New buildings should be environmentally sustainable;
- Improve public transport, cycling, and pedestrian facilities; and
- Improve accessibility to buildings and infrastructure for people with disabilities and the elderly.

3.5.3. Bayside Housing Strategy 2012
The Bayside Housing Strategy was adopted by Council in September 2012. The Housing Strategy provides a framework for how residential development in Bayside will be planned and managed over the next 20 years, by identifying the location and type of residential development required in order to meet the changing needs of the Bayside community.

The Strategy recommends that the main focus for new housing should be within Bayside’s Activity Centres where there is existing infrastructure and good transport connections. The Martin Street Neighbourhood Activity Centre is identified as a focus for future medium density development within Bayside. The Strategy identifies that a Structure Plan should be prepared. The Strategy also provides a broad spatial framework for future development of the area, as follows:

- Medium density residential development is to be directed to the commercial core and be located above shops and offices;
- Heritage values are protected and development must respond to and provide an appropriate transition with nearby heritage precincts;
- To encourage the consolidation of allotments within the ‘Moderate Residential Growth’ areas to create opportunities for medium density development; and
- Development is to incorporate landscaping in order to maintain the green leafy feel of Bayside’s suburbs.

The vision and objectives sought to be implemented as part of the Structure Plan are consistent with the Bayside Housing Strategy Strategic Framework.
3.5.4. Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy 2013

The Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy (ITS) was adopted by Council in April 2013. The ITS provides a policy and implementation framework for the integration of land use and transport planning within Bayside, and aims to improve community wellbeing outcomes and promote sustainable transport use. The ITS places a significant focus on improving infrastructure relating to walking and cycling as well as consolidating development in Activity Centres around transport nodes, with structure planning being a key mechanism for implementing key actions and policies within the ITS.

A number of specific projects are flagged relating to the study area, as follows:

- Increase pedestrian priority within shopping areas;
- Upgrade the Nepean Highway shared trail;
- Wayfinding signage to public transport hubs;
- Develop and implement a policy to ensure the provision of bicycle parking in shopping centres and within major and neighbourhood Activity Centres;
- Upgrade the Elster Creek Shared Trail between Gardenvale Station and Asling Street;
- Support development of a Parking Strategy to address parking issues within Bayside;
- Development of parking precinct plans for all major Activity Centres and large neighbourhood Activity Centres to be undertaken in conjunction with Strategic Structure Plans;
- Ensure Martin Street Activity Centre Structure Plan identifies opportunities to support the guiding principles and policies of the ITS.

Consistent with the intent of the ITS, the Martin Street Structure Plan has identified opportunities to support its guiding principles and policies.

3.5.5. Bayside Open Space Strategy 2012

The Bayside Open Space Strategy (BOSS) was adopted by Council in 2012. It is a 20 year planning document designed to provide policy and strategy to enable Council to make decisions about how open space is used, developed, managed and maintained across the City. It suggests a range of actions to improve the open space network including:

- The acceptance of land in lieu of cash in suburbs deficient in open space;
- Improving existing trails to better connect existing open spaces and railway stations;
- Improving the Nepean Highway shared trail; and
- Develop improved trail links along railway lines

The BOSS is supported by the Bayside Open Space Suburb Analysis and Action Plan, which provides a detailed analysis of current provision and future demand for open space within each of Bayside’s 9 suburbs. Whilst the is identified as being generally well serviced with respect to provision of open space, the Martin Street Neighbourhood Activity Centre and immediate is identified as being deficient, with no public recreation spaces within 400 metres.
3.5.6. Draft Bayside Bicycle Strategy 2013-2019

The Draft Bayside Bicycle Strategy was endorsed by Council in December 2013. The role of the Strategy is to guide the planning, management, and provision of bicycle facilities and services in the City of Bayside. The Strategy includes a number of recommendations relevant to the preparation of the Structure Plan, as follows:

- Council will advocate to VicRoads for increased bicycle infrastructure on the Principal Bicycle Network (PBN) and Bicycle Priority Routes (BPRs);
- Advocate to VicRoads for early starts for cyclists at traffic signals where an arterial road crosses a local road;
- Develop a Street Space Management Plan which assigns greater priority to cyclists over private vehicles on roads within the municipality;
- Trial the installation of a bank of bicycle parking in place of an on-street car parking space; and
- Investigate the use of bicycle advisory markings along existing and proposed bicycle routes and where this is not feasible, consideration will be given to them becoming signed bicycle routes.


The Bayside Economic Development Strategy (EDS) was adopted by Council in December 2013. It updates the 2010 EDS with current statistical data on Bayside's employment, business and demography as well as the findings of the 2012 Bayside Business Monitor. It also provides an action plan for the next 5 years. Of relevance to the Martin Street Neighbourhood Activity Centre Structure Plan are the following actions:

- Ensure planning policy preserves the existing Bayside activity centre network;
- Implement parking management options such as real-time availability signage, time-limits, sensors etc, with parking identified as key issue for traders and customers, potentially results in lost revenue to Southland;
- Identify next centres for streetscape improvements and develop masterplans with quality 'sense of place' treatments; and
- Planning policy to minimise ‘out of centre’ developments, i.e. commercial development occurring outside of Activity Centres.

3.5.8. Bayside Wellbeing for All Ages and Activities Strategy 2013

The Bayside Wellbeing for All Ages and Activities Strategy (WAAA) was adopted by Council in 2013, and provides the framework for Council’s community services planning for health and wellbeing. Key objectives of the WAAA of relevance to land use planning for Activity Centres such as Martin Street include:

- Support opportunities for physical activity that are inclusive;
- Increase Bayside residents utilising active transport;
- Improve Bayside infrastructure that supports physical activity; and
- Support opportunities that build social networks and community connection.
3.6 Other Relevant Documents and Guidelines

Regard has been given to the following guidelines in the preparation of the Structure Plan:

3.6.1. Activity Centre Design Guidelines 2005
This document was prepared by the Department of Sustainability and Environment (DSE) for planning professionals as a framework for the development of structure plans, design guidelines and planning controls in Activity Centres. It provides a series of general design guidelines for eight key design elements, as follows:
• Urban structure;
• Railway stations and public transport interchanges;
• Street design;
• Public spaces;
• Building design;
• Malls and large stores;
• Higher density housing; and
• Car parking

3.6.2. Guidelines for Higher Density Residential Development 2005
This document was prepared by DSE for use in the assessment of planning applications for residential development of five or more storeys in height. It provides a series of design guidelines and objectives around key issues including urban context, building envelope and layout, street-edge quality, management of environmental and amenity impacts (internal and external), and design.

3.6.3. Safer Design Guidelines for Victoria 2005
This document was prepared by DSE for planners, place managers and urban designers and provides a series of practical design strategies for improving public safety within Activity Centres by maximizing activity and passive surveillance within the area, and avoiding fragmented or ‘dead’ spaces.

3.6.4. Practice Note 58: Structure Planning for Activity Centres 2010
This Practice Note sets out the preferred process to be followed when developing structure plans for Activity Centres, with detailed guidance provided on the following:
• What a structure plan must contain, including scoping of necessary infrastructure improvements;
• Defining the boundaries of the Structure Plan; and
• Implementation mechanisms.

3.6.5. Practice Note 60: Height and Setback Controls for Activity Centres 2010
This Practice Note outlines the key principles and strategic justification required when using the Victoria Planning Provisions to control over building heights within Activity Centres. Of particular relevance are the following:
• Increases in scale and intensity of development are expected and encouraged within Activity Centres;
• The preferred tool for setting guidelines around the height and design of new buildings within Activity Centres is the Design and Development Overlay; and
• Mandatory height limits are not encouraged within Activity Centres, and should only be used where a detailed strategic analysis demonstrates that a design outcome cannot be achieved in any other way.
Policy Context - Summary and Key Points

- The current State Government metropolitan planning strategy, *Plan Melbourne* (2014) emphasises the need to enhance neighbourhood Activity Centres by improving available services and providing a wider variety of housing options to the community.

- The *Bayside Housing Strategy* (2012) directs medium change to occur within the bounds of the commercial zoning of the centre.

- New housing in and around the centre can provide a means of supporting the viability of a walkable catchment around the activity centre, but also needs to recognise the broader housing policy directions to protect character of the surrounding residential streets and the intimate scale of the commercial core.

- The planning scheme provides specific design directions for Martin Street, but these are based on an urban design framework is understood to have been developed in the early 1990s.

- Adopted Council strategies, specifically the *Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy* (2013), the *Bayside Open Space Strategy* (2012), strongly promote sustainable transport, environmentally sustainable development and enhanced liveability as key priorities within Activity Centres.
4. Background Analysis

4.1 Demographic Profile

This section reviews the key demographic statistics and trends occurring within the Martin Street Main Trade Area (MTA), identified by Essential Economics and comparative data for the broader area of Brighton, sourced from ID Consulting statistics for the City of Bayside.

The MTA is identified as extending some 1.5km from the retail core. The trade area describes the geographic area within which the Martin Street Activity Centre is an important destination for people wishing to visit the retail and other facilities on offer. Typically, around 70-90% of retail turnover at an activity centre is derived from residents of the MTA, with the balance in trade coming from people living beyond this area. The trade area for the Martin Street Activity Centre, was identified by Essential Economics having regarded to:

- the range and type of retail offer represented in the centre, noting its lack of a major supermarket anchor
- the size and composition of nearby centres, including Bay and Church Streets, Brighton and other competing centres including Glenhuntly Road, Elsternwick
- physical barriers to movement, such as main roads and Port Phillip Bay.

The trade area is generally contained within a 1.5 kilometre radius of the retail core. Boundaries of the trade area are as follows:

- To the north: Head Street and Glenhuntly Road
- To the east: Elizabeth Street, Hawthorn and Kooyong Roads
- To the south: Bay Street
- To the west: Port Phillip Bay and St Kilda Street.

The background report has adopted the MTA as a basis for examining demographic and economic information as a general guide to the area on which the Martin Street Activity Centre draws much of its custom.
4.1.1. Population and Forecasts
The resident population of the MTA in 2013 was 18,740 persons. This is estimated to have increased by 130 residents annually over the last two years at a modest annual growth rate of 0.7%. This is slightly below half the metropolitan growth rate of 1.6% per annum and reflects the relatively established settlement pattern in the MTA. Such population growth can be attributed to the redevelopment of the existing housing stock into more dense forms.
Population growth in the MTA is forecast to be below the growth rate forecast for metropolitan Melbourne over the forecast period to 2031. In total, the MTA is forecast to have an additional 980 new residents (net) over the decade to 2023 (a total increase of 5.2%) and 1,690 new residents (a total increase of 9.0%) over the eighteen years to 2031. The population of the wider Brighton suburb is projected to increase from 23,734 in 2015 to 24,966 in 2031 which is an increase of 5.19%.
4.1.2. Age Structure
As presented in Figure 8 above, the MTA has a higher proportion of people aged between 25 to 44 years than the suburb of Brighton, at 26% compared with 21.1%. The proportion of people aged 50 to 64 years is lower for the MTA and Brighton as a whole. Overall, the Martin Street Activity Centre MTA appears to have a younger profile compared with Brighton, however still appears to be a population that is ageing. This may indicate the need for more diverse housing options within the Martin Street Activity Centre MTA and Brighton.

4.1.3. Households
In 2011 there were 7,462 dwellings located within the MTA, equating to an average household size of 2.5 persons. This is slightly lower than the Bayside average of 2.55 persons and slightly lower than the metropolitan average of 2.62 persons. It is expected that household sizes will continue to decrease over the next 17 years to an average of 2.45 persons on average per household in Bayside and 2.37 in the suburb of Brighton.

As illustrated by Figure 9 the dominate household composition within the Martin Street MTA is couples with children, comprising 29.6% of its population. This is consistent with couples with children being the dominate household competition in Bayside at 36.3%. The Martin Street MTA has a lower proportion of couples with children, one parent families, and lone person households and as a higher proportion of group households. There is a significantly higher proportion of other families at 17% compared to the Bayside average of 5%.
**Figure 9**

Household composition 2011, Martin Street Activity Centre MTA compared with Brighton

Compiled and presented in profile by .id, the population experts.

**Figure 10**

Forecast change in household types in Brighton, forecast 2011 to 2031.

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Census of Population and Housing, 2011 [Parameter][StartYear]
Compiled and presented in economy.id by .id, the population experts.
There has been a significant shift in the type of households present within Brighton in the past 20 years. Between 1991 and 2011, the largest increase was in couples without children, comprising 65.4% of the increase. In contrast to other areas within Bayside and metropolitan, lone households in Brighton have decreased in the same period.

Figure 10 presents the forecast change in household types in Brighton from 2011 to 2031. Current demographic trends are projected to subside with lone person households expected to grow at a similar rate to couples without children. In contrast with past demographic trends, the growth of couples with children will slow substantially.

4.1.4. Employment and Income

In 2011, 8573 (90.6%) of the labour force in the Marin Street MTA were employed, of which 58.9% are working full time and 31.8% are working part time. This is lower than the Bayside average of 96.2% and Brighton average of 97.3%. Brighton has a larger proportion of its workforce employed as managers and professionals compared with metropolitan Melbourne, at 58.3% compared to 37.4%, and a high proportion of clerical and sales workers at 30.7% which is lower than the metropolitan average of 34.4%.

Consistent with the proportion of managers and professionals living in the Martin Street MTA, households generally earn more per week compared to Brighton, demonstrated by Figure 11. The greatest difference is the proportion of households earning between $1500 and $1999 per week. While the proportion of households in the highest income quartile substantially increased in the period 1991-2011, this proportion did not significantly increase in the period 2006-2011.
Although Brighton is characterised by a highly skilled and well paid labour force, a larger proportion of its population is not in the labour force compared to metropolitan Melbourne and Bayside as a whole. This may be due to the higher proportion of elderly people in the suburb, which highlights the need to plan for smaller Activity Centres such as Martin Street.

Whilst the characteristics of Martin Street’s catchment population indicate a good economic potential for the centre, there is also a long term need to ensure that the proportion of Brighton’s population not in the labour force stabilises when compared to Metropolitan and Bayside as a whole. Medium density housing for the elderly and for couples without children is required to service current population trends in Brighton. However, if Brighton’s economic strength is to be retained in the long term there needs to be sufficient housing to continue to attract families with adults in the labour force to maintain high levels of disposable income amongst Brighton’s population.

Gardenvale

Gardenvale has a high proportion of its labour force employed, at 91% with the proportion of people earning $2000 or more being 30%. This is a higher proportion than both Brighton and metropolitan. Similar to Brighton, Gardenvale has higher proportion of managers and professionals in its workforce than in metropolitan with a similar proportion of workers in sales compared with metropolitan.

In view of the above, Gardenvale’s residents are likely to have an even higher level or disposable income than Brighton’s residents. Given the right conditions there may be potential for Martin Street to increase patronage from Gardenvale residents and commuters. Furthermore, Gardenvale has a significantly higher population density (i.e. 37.45 persons per hectare) than Brighton (i.e. 25.54 persons hectare) from which to attract patrons.

4.1.5. Car ownership

The resident population is generally mobile, with 55.3% of households possessing two or more vehicles. This is similar to the metropolitan average of 54.5%. Therefore, this could indicate that residents in the MTA have less reliance on public transport than indicated by the metropolitan average. Just 7.9% of MTA households did not possess a car, compared with 9.4% of the metropolitan area. Section 6 contains more detail about mode share of trips.

4.1.6. Comparison with Bayside

Akin to the Martin Street MTA, Bayside has a more mature age profile. This is illustrated by the proportion of people aged between 22 and 44 decreasing and the proportion of people aged 60 years or over is increasing. Population growth to 2031 is expected to be 10.19% which is greater than the Martin Street MTA average of 9%, and is reflective of Martin Street’s ability to accommodate growth compared to other parts of the municipality. There is a higher proportion of couples with children, couples without children, one parent and lone person households in Bayside compared to the Martin Street MTA.

Demographic Summary and Key Points

- The resident population of the immediate Martin Street area is not expected to grow significantly in the foreseeable future.
- The population is generally wealthier and older than metropolitan Melbourne. The broader areas of Brighton and Gardenvale reinforce the socio economic profile of the area as more affluent than metropolitan Melbourne and an area that is aging.
- Medium density housing for the elderly and for couples without children can support the viability of centre and accommodate current population trends in Brighton toward an older population. There also needs to be sufficient housing for families as a dominant demographic in the area.
- A lower proportion of the Martin Street area is employed compared to Brighton and Bayside, which may be reflective of a more mature age profile.
4.2 Household and Dwelling Types

In 2011 58.1% of housing within the Martin Street MTA comprised traditional comprised traditional detached single dwellings, which is similar to 60.2% in Brighton. There is double the proportion of semi-detached houses and townhouses in Brighton compared to the Martin Street MTA (34.2% compared to 17.2%). Conversely, the proportion of apartments in the Martin Street MTA is greater than in Brighton (24.2% compared to 5%). This may be because the Martin Street MTA includes areas that have attracted increased apartment development, for example Bay Street, Brighton and Elsternwick Railway Station.

In Brighton, there were a similar number of separate houses and higher density dwellings built and a decline in the number of medium density buildings built in the period 2006 to 2011. Conversely, in the period 2001 to 2011, the proportion of higher density dwellings constructed was higher than the proportion of medium density dwellings constructed. Similarly, the proportion of medium density dwellings constructed was higher than the proportion of separate houses constructed in this period. However, this shift away from separate houses is not reflected in the change in the number of bedrooms. This is demonstrated by the increased number of dwellings constructed in Brighton between 2006 and 2011 which are four or more bedrooms.

4.2.1. Home ownership

In 2011, 74% of residents in the Martin Street MTA owned their homes, with 39.5% of residents owning it outright. This is slightly above the Bayside owner-occupier average of 72.6%, and the metropolitan Melbourne average of 66.8%. The cost of housing in the Martin Street MTA is significantly higher compared with the metropolitan average where the median monthly mortgage payment in 2011 was $2,530 compared to $1,840 in metropolitan Melbourne. The proportion of rented properties is the same as for metropolitan Melbourne (at 28%).

Current projections based on 2011 Census results, land availability, and current and proposed planning policy estimate that the number of dwellings within Brighton as a whole will increase from around 9,453 in 2011 to 10,937 in 2031. This represents an overall increase of approximately 15% (see Table 1). This is similar to the overall number of dwellings projected to be constructed within Bayside over the same time period, which is to increase by approximately 19% (38,329 in 2011, to increase to 45,658 in 2031). It is expected that household sizes in Brighton will continue to decrease from 2.49 people in 2011 to 2.37 people in 2031. The average household size of 2.55 in the MTA is expected to decrease by a similar rate. Similarly, the average household size in Bayside is expected to decrease from 2.56 in 2011 to 2.45 in 2031. Given the projected decrease in household size, increases in lone person households and couples without children, and the substantial proportion of families with children in Brighton, it is important that a diversity of housing be provided to accommodate for this broad range of households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brighton</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>9,453</td>
<td>10,068</td>
<td>10,367</td>
<td>10,652</td>
<td>10,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household size</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 - Forecast increase in dwelling numbers, Brighton 2011-2031
Housing - Summary and Key Points

- Significant redevelopment and renewal of the existing housing stock is occurring, dominated by the replacement and/or renovation of existing single dwellings with larger buildings or medium density infill development.

- There is a relative lack of diversity in housing sizes, with an increasing proportion of new housing being 4 or more bedrooms. This is in contrast with projected future population housing needs.

- The home ownership rate is higher in the Martin Street MTA compared with Bayside as a whole.

- More choice of small and medium housing types will be increasingly important to meet the needs of Bayside’s aging population and increasing number of lone person households.

- Medium density housing for the elderly and for couples without children is required to service current population trends in Brighton. However, if Brighton’s economic strength is to be retained in the long term there needs to be sufficient housing to continue to attract families with adults in the labour force to maintain high levels of disposable income amongst Brighton’s population.
An assessment of the economic function and performance of the Martin Street Activity Centre has been undertaken by Essential Economics to understand:

- The appropriate level of development that can be supported by the activity centre in the future; and
- The policy directions or structural changes to the Centre which might improve its overall performance and secure its longevity.

5.1 Performance and Function of the Neighbourhood Activity Centre

The Martin Street Activity Centre is approximately 3.87 ha in area excluding the train station and railway line. This is consistent with the size of other large Neighbourhood Activity Centres in Bayside. (Black Rock is 4.15ha, Beaumaris 3.96 ha, Highett 2.5 ha and Hampton East 3ha in area). However, as a commercial ‘strip’ Martin Street is one of the smallest centres covered by the Bayside Business Monitor and the most compact in geographic terms at approximately 300m in length.

Floor space surveys undertaken in July 2013 indicate that the Martin Street Activity Centre has 92 commercial premises and an estimated ground floor retail floor space of 6,200sqm (44%). The centre supports a further 7,590sqm (45%) of non-retail commercial space and has 220sqm (2%) of vacant commercial space. The combined commercial floor space is 14,010sqm. The share of retail floor space at 44% of the total floor space is relatively low for a centre of this type, and reflects the strong provision of both dedicated office space and a wide range of medical and professional services occupying shop front tenancies. These non-retail uses account for 54% of floor space in the Centre. The vacant floor space estimated at 2% of total floor space is well below the typical vacancy rate. This suggests the activity centre can be described as virtually ‘fully-tenanted’ and strongly performing.

The Martin Street Activity Centre serves a number of important functions for the community. These can generally be described as follows:

- Convenience and ‘top-up’ shopping: Martin Street contains a number of traders, most notably the small Foodworks supermarket, that provide convenience and top-up shopping facilities to residents of the surrounding area and other visitors, including commuters using the adjacent Gardenvale station.
- Passing trade: Due to the exposure to the busy Nepean Highway at the eastern end of the centre, the centre has a role in providing convenience goods and services to passing trade. Accessibility to Martin Street for this passing trade is assisted
through the provision of traffic lights. Furthermore, at-grade car parking is provided directly outside the strip of shops fronting the Nepean Highway and this provision allows for safe, quick-stop shopping trips to be made by passing traffic.

- Café and specialised retail: Martin Street provides a small number of high quality cafes and specialist retailers. These traders give the Martin Street centre a greater sense of ‘destination’ for people living beyond the immediate surrounds of the centre but who visit the centre for these particular features.
- Non-retail and professional services: The centre includes a small dedicated office building in Spink Street and various professional services located in shopfront tenancies. The western end of the centre has a particularly strong provision of non-retail uses.

5.1.1 Implications

The Essential Economics report indicates that the Martin Street Activity Centre contains a relatively wide range of traders and land uses (including office and non-retail uses) and has other non-retail functions that support the centre, notably the location of the centre at a train station. In comparison to the other large neighbourhood Activity Centres (Black Rock, Highett and Beaumaris), Martin Street is relatively small in its provision of core retailing but has different strengths and weaknesses to these centres. This means that their designations as large neighbourhood centres have been derived from varying factors, not simply their retail floor area.

The Centre has several potential weaknesses including the lack of a major anchor tenant (which limits the centre’s drawing power), physical constraints that limit re-development opportunities, the lack of a consistent ‘sense of place’ throughout the centre due to variability in the quality of shopfronts, and the ‘barrier to movement’ created by the 8-lane Nepean Highway at the eastern end of the centre. However the centre also has a number of positive attributes which include its particular retail niches (such as al fresco cafes and the specialist food offer), good accessibility within the centre, including railway station access, and the diverse business mix which extends beyond the essentials of day-to-day convenience retailing.

The Essential Economics report suggests in functional terms, the centre has a primary focus on destination and top up convenience retailing for both local residents and visitors. The report indicates the Martin Street Village is unlikely to ever have a full line supermarket which could provide leverage to lift the centre above its current local neighbourhood role. This is due to the physical limitations of the centre and the competing facilities at nearby centres, notably Bay Street, Brighton.

5.2 Turnover and Market Share

The Essential Economics report indicates that the Centre is presently turning over annual retail trade worth approximately $32.4 million (or $5,230 per square metre of occupied retail floor space), which is consistent with its current function as a neighbourhood centre. This estimate is based on an assessment of the centre’s composition, retail mix and apparent trading performance.

On the basis of this retail performance, the centre is achieving a market share of approximately 9.6% of the total available retail expenditure from the MTA. A market share of 9.6% is relatively low for a Neighbourhood Activity Centre. The report suggests this reflects the lack of a major supermarket anchor in centre. A substantial share of the trade area’s available food and grocery expenditure is presently directed to Bay Street, Brighton, Glenhuntly Road, Elsternwick and other surrounding centres containing major supermarket operators.
5.3 Retail Floor Space Forecast and development opportunities

A forecast of retail floor space for the centre, undertaken by Essential Economics estimates that the centre will maintain its current market share of MTA spending (9.6%) and sales sourced from residents living outside the MTA (10% of total sales). Allowing for an increase in sales at existing retailers of 1% per annum, the analysis shows that by 2031 the centre could potentially support an additional 1,100sqm of retail floor space (from 6,200sqm to 7,200sqm).

The Essential Economics Report correlates with the Urban Design Report which outlines that there are limited areas for new development in the centre. The Essential Economic report also notes that there are easier, more available sites to establish larger footprint retail uses in other centres, where access and amenity impacts provide better opportunities (such as larger Activity Centres). Opportunities for new commercial floor area are therefore focussed on the incremental intensification of existing land uses, rather than any expansion in the “footprint” of the centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Summary and Key Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➔ Relatively small amount of ground floor retail compared to other large neighbourhood centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➔ Appears to be performing very well given the very low vacancy rate and the level of niche retailing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➔ Share of retail space is comparatively low, with personal services and offices providing more than half of the centre commercial floor space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➔ The centre performs a number of functions; including provision of ‘top up’ trading for convenience retailing, café trading, highway trading to Nepean Highway and a range of personal and health services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➔ Lack of physical room for significant expansion and has other larger centres nearby that provide competition thereby leading to a limited forecast for future ground floor retail space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➔ The Centre’s strength lies in niche retailing and drawing on an affluent trade catchment area. Establishing a physical environment that can better capitalise on drawing this local catchment into the centre would benefit the long term sustainability of the centre in competing against nearby larger centres.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As part of the research and analysis undertaken for this report, Council commissioned preparation of a detailed assessment of existing traffic, parking and transport within the study area. The key findings of this study are summarised below.

6.1 Traffic Conditions

The Traffic Assessment Report examined the capacity and functionality of each intersection and intersection analysis used modelling based on AM and PM peak hours turning movement counts. The assessment found that the existing midblock traffic volumes for all streets and laneways in the Activity Centre operate below the capacity of their road designations, as defined within the Bayside Planning Scheme.

Martin Street, as the critical street located within the Activity Centre is operating at closest to its recommended capacity with an existing traffic volume of 6,569 vehicles per day, compared to a recommended capacity of 7,000 vehicles per day. The existing cross section of Martin Street is narrower than the cross section for connector streets as recommended in the Bayside Planning Scheme, with narrow 0.7 metre bicycle lanes and 2.9 metre traffic lanes compared to a recommended combined width of 4.2 metres for a shared traffic and bicycle lane.

Each of the key intersections within the Activity Centre are found to be operating within acceptable limits, with the most critical intersection determined to be the traffic signals at Nepean Highway/Martin Street/Gardenvale Road. The only locations within the activity centre where there has been a history of multiple road crashes involving injuries, is at the Martin Street/Asling Street roundabout. This roundabout was improved with a raised roundabout and additional raised pedestrian crossing as part of Council’s streetscape works carried out between March and May 2015.

6.1.1 Laneways

The Centre is serviced by a number of rear laneways. These provide an important service function to the rear of commercial and residential sites as well as providing pedestrian and cycle links to surrounding areas. All the laneways within the activity centre are currently approximately 3.0 - 3.7 metres wide which is less than the desirable width of 5.5 metres described in the Bayside Planning Scheme to enable two vehicles to pass. However, due to the low existing traffic volumes estimated to use the laneways, the existing laneway width is considered sufficient to meet current demand. As the laneways are primarily for access to the rear of businesses or dwellings it can be assumed that most of the traffic will be generated by staff of the
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane</th>
<th>Estimated Private Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Estimated Peak Hour Traffic Volume</th>
<th>Estimated Daily Traffic Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laneway 1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laneway 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laneway 3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laneway 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laneway 5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laneway 6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laneway 7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laneway 8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laneway 9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12 - Laneway Traffic Volume Estimates: Source Traffix Group

businesses or by residents of the adjoining dwellings. From this it can be conservatively assumed that traffic generated during the peak hour would be 80% of adjoining parking spaces. The ratio of daily trip generation to peak hour generation could range from 10:1 for predominantly residential uses to 5:1 for predominantly office and commercial uses.

The potential laneway volume estimates were prepared and traffic counts undertaken for Laneway 1 as a comparator (see Figure 12). The estimates correlated with the traffic counts suggest the estimates over-estimate the current volumes. The volumes estimated for Laneway 1 were significantly higher than those recorded during the surveys. The estimated peak hour traffic volume of 21 vehicles is much higher than the peak volume of 11 vehicles recorded from the tube counts, and the 208 vehicles per day is significantly higher than the average weekday volume of 31 vehicles. Part of the difference in volumes could be attributed to Laneway 1 having 3 exit points, as not all vehicles would need to cross over the tube counters if they entered from another entrance to the laneway.

Australian Standard AS2890.1 states in clause 3.2.2 that “As a guide, 30 or more movements in a peak hour (in and out combined) would usually require provision for two vehicles to pass on the driveway, i.e. a minimum width of 5.5 m”. This would imply that for up to 30 vehicle movements in a peak hour, a single lane is sufficient. From the estimates it can be seen that none of the laneways would generate a peak hour traffic volume of 30 vehicles or higher and as such could all be deemed to be below capacity.

6.2 Existing Travel Patterns

An initial consultation exercise undertaken by Council as part of Stage 1 of the preparation of the Martin Street Structure Plan was to undertake a survey of customers and traders of the centre. A summary of results from this survey is contained in Chapter 8 - Community Engagement. The main issues identified for people appear to relate to car parking, especially that it is inadequate or unsuitable.

Community feedback also indicated that:

- Traffic enters from the Nepean Highway into Martin Street too quickly;
- Traffic congestion, mostly relating to school pick up and drop off times; and
- Pedestrians crossing should be given greater priority

Of note, 33% of the people who responded to the survey stated they visit the centre daily, with a further 39% visiting a few times a week. Of the people surveyed, 59% stated the purpose of their visit was to shop or for recreation purposes whilst also catching public transport or walking through the centre. Only 11% of respondents went to the centre specifically to shop.
The main modes of travel to the centre were through walking or by car. People surveyed by Council as part of the background report preparation nominated that they sometimes travelled by different modes to the centre. Hence, 74% of respondents said they walked to the centre and 55% of respondents stated they drove to the centre.

The transport assessment undertaken by Traffix Group confirms that use of the station is important and that access to the station is generally through walking (see Figure 13).

The assessment of journey to work data and other relevant census information undertaken by Traffix indicates that:

- For both Brighton and Gardenvale-Elsternwick car use is the primary mode of transport, however it is lower than that of metropolitan Melbourne. The percentage of people who travel to work by car, either as driver or passenger, in Brighton was 58.6%. Across metropolitan Melbourne the proportion is 64.9%.
- The use of the train in both Brighton and Gardenvale-Elsternwick is the second most common mode of travel to work with 14.9% of Brighton residents and 21% of Gardenvale-Elsternwick residents using the train to get to work. These figures are significantly higher than the metropolitan Melbourne average of 10% of people.
- The trend in commuting patterns within the Brighton area has seen an increase in commuters using sustainable modes including walking, cycling and train, with a corresponding reduction in commuters travelling by car.
- The majority of rail commuters arrive at Gardenvale Station by walking (approximately 70%) with relatively low proportions arriving by bus or car, noting that there is no dedicated commuter car park provided at Gardenvale Station.
The suburb of Brighton has a significantly higher proportion of dwellings which contain two motor vehicles compared to the average across metropolitan Melbourne, with a corresponding reduction in the proportion of dwellings with no vehicles.

Direction of travel to work for Brighton residents is predominantly to the north (47%) with lesser proportions of 12% to the east and 10% to the south, with the remainder (21%) working within the local area.

Most employees who work in Brighton also live in the suburb (35%), with 25% coming from locations further to the south, 22% from the east and only 18% from the north.

Brighton also has a high percentage of people who work from home with 8.7% of people working from home compared to only 3.7% for metropolitan Melbourne.

6.3 Public Transport Access

6.3.1. Gardenvale Station
The Gardenvale Railway Station is located to the north of Martin Street and to the west of Spink Street and forms part of the Sandringham Railway Line providing services between Sandringham and the city. Data obtained from Public Transport Victoria states that Gardenvale Railway Station had around 1,624 entries on a weekday in 2011/2012, with 762 and 498 entries on a Saturday and a Sunday respectively. Of the weekday entries 60.5% of trips were for work/business, 16.4% for education, 11.1% for social and leisure activities, 7.6% for personal business appointments with the remaining 4.3% consisting of tourism and visiting friends and family.

The mode of access to Gardenvale Railway Station is heavily influenced by a lack of commuter parking for either cars or bicycles and by bus route 630 being the only bus operating in the locality which stops outside the station. These factors reveal that 70% of commuters using Gardenvale Railway Station walk the entire way to the station before boarding a train while a further 13% take the bus to the station.

To meet increased commuter demand the Sandringham Railway Line is expected to undergo several upgrades in the coming years. These upgrades include trailing high capacity signalling by 2016 in Stage 1 of the Metropolitan Rail - Network Development Plan and supporting works and operational changes for the Brighton Beach turn back by 2022 in Stage 2. These upgrades are expected to increase the number of train services on the Sandringham Railway Line by 50% from a current 8 services per hour in peak to 12 services per hour in peak. A typical Melbourne train has a capacity of approximately 800 passengers, so the provision of 4 extra services would result in capacity for an additional 3,200 on the Sandringham railway line during the AM Peak hour and a total capacity of 9,600 during peak hour following the upgrade.

6.3.2. Bus Routes
The key bus route through the Centre is Route 630. This operates along Martin Street to Gardenvale Station and provides a service between Monash University and Elwood.

Other nearby bus routes which operate to the east of the Nepean Highway include:

- Bus Route 219 provides a service between Gardenvale and Sunshine and operates along Gardenvale Road, just to the east of the Centre.
- Route 220 provides a service between Gardenvale and Sunshine Station via the City and operates along Gardenvale Road, just to the east of the Centre.
- Route 626 provides a service between Middle Brighton Station and Chadstone Shopping Centre and operates along Gardenvale Road, just to the east of the Centre.
- Route 605 provides a service between Gardenvale and the City and operates along Gardenvale Road, just to the east of the Centre.
- Route 970 (NightRider Service) provides a service between the City and Frankston/Rosebud and operates along the Nepean Highway, just to the east of the Centre.
Effective August 2015

City of Bayside

• Martin Street has narrow on-street bicycle lanes outside the station. Better public transport connections within the activity centre could reduce congestion by providing an attractive alternative to the private car.

6.4 Bicycle Routes and Facilities

6.4.1 Bicycle Routes

There are multiple bicycle routes traveling through or around the Martin Street activity centre. The bicycle routes which operate around and through the study area are summarised below.

On Road:

- Martin Street has narrow on-street bicycle lanes (approximately 0.7m in width) on each side of the road, providing an east-west route through the Activity Centre.
- Asling Street has on-street bicycle lanes on both sides of the road, providing a north south route through the Activity Centre.

Off Road:

- The Elster Creek Shared Trail starts at the north end of Spink Street and connects to New Street, Elwood.
- The Nepean Highway Shared Path begins at the end of Rose Street and follows the Nepean Highway south to South Road, Hampton East.

At present there is no connection between these two off-road shared paths however there is a proposed connection being considered in the outer separator between the Nepean Highway and the Service Road by converting 27 angle parking spaces into 18 parallel parking spaces, connecting the two off road bicycle routes. As a part of the Martin Street Streetscape Upgrade completed by Council earlier this year, bicycle parking facilities were installed. However, there are no designated cycle facilities at Gardenvale Railway Station.

6.5 Car parking

6.5.1 Public Car parking within the Activity Centre

Parking survey data was collected as part of the traffic assessment. There are a total of approximately 195 public car parking spaces within the Martin Street Activity Centre (177 on-street parking spaces and 18 off-street parking spaces). For this study the private parking at the front of 170 Martin Street (the west side of service road south of Martin Street) was included as public parking as it is available for customers and would generally be assumed to be public parking by road users. The study area also has approximately 12 loading zone spaces which are not available for customer parking. A parking occupancy survey was conducted in the study area on Thursday, 18 July 2013 from 11am to 3pm to establish existing parking conditions.

The survey found that the majority of public parking spaces within the activity centre are restricted to 2 hour or 1 hour duration, with very few spaces without any time restriction. The occupancy of public parking spaces peaked at 83% at 12:00 noon on the day of the parking survey (Thursday 18 July 2013). The small number of unrestricted spaces had the highest level of parking occupancy, at 100%, followed by the 4 hour spaces. Spaces with shorter term restrictions had lower levels of occupancy.

Parking in the surrounding residential streets as far as Cole Street to the north, Cochrane Street to the west and North Road to the south peaked at 58% at 11:00am on the day of the survey out of a total of 426 public spaces that were identified. A large proportion of these spaces are unrestricted. The occupancy of these spaces is a result of there being very little parking for railway commuters, which forces rail commuters who drive to Gardenvale Railway Station to park in the surrounding residential streets or on the Glen Eira side of the Nepean Highway.

It is estimated that there are a further 205 private parking spaces located with the activity centre, which are generally accessed from rear laneways.
The number of private parking spaces surveyed was 156, with a further 49 estimated to be obscured by roller doors or high gates. The number of obscured parking spaces is based on the number of roller doors, high gates and spaces visible from aerial photographs. The occupancy of public parking spaces peaked at 71% at 11:00am of the day of the survey, although it is acknowledged that the survey did not include the evening period when a higher occupancy of private residential parking could be expected.

An assessment of the current parking provision compared to the rates specified in Clause 56.06 of the Bayside Planning Scheme suggests that the existing parking supply of 400 spaces within the Activity Centre is less than the statutory provision of 593 spaces. The study suggests that this may be because the centre is underperforming, which contrasts with the Essential Economics report that the Centre is trading well. However, it may be reflective of the reality that not all uses peak at the same time and that the surveys did not evaluate demand in the evenings associated with residential uses combined with commercial uses.

Additionally, the report finds that much of the parking that is available is in separate pockets. Examples include the Council owned car park south of the Nepean Highway and the parking clustered along the western side of Spink Street. This may add to traffic congestion as visitors to the activity centre search for spaces. Improved signage and physical connections could improve circulation and utilisation, ultimately reducing the demand on Martin Street.

Overall, the peak parking demand occurring within the activity centre is estimated to be 291 vehicles which represents 72.8% of the overall parking supply. It is noted that the overall peak parking demand is based on the daytime period that was surveyed between 11am and 3pm. It is possible that a different peak occurs later in the day due to parking associated with residential uses within the centre. Importantly, although the surveys estimated 109 unoccupied spaces during the peak period, only 34 of these spaces are available to the public.

**Traffic and Transport Summary and Key Points**

- Traffic volumes for all streets and laneways within the Activity Centre are operating below their capacity as defined within the Bayside Planning Scheme.
- Laneways serve an important service function at the rear of commercial and residential sites and are wide enough to meet current demand.
- Community feedback has identified the main issues within the centre relate to inadequate parking, entering speeds from the Nepean Hwy, traffic congestion and a lack of pedestrian priority.
- Predominant modes of transport to the centre are on foot or by car.
- The railway station is an important feature of the Centre and the train is the second most common mode of transport taken to work.
- There is one main bus route through the centre and 5 other nearby bus routes operating to the east of Nepean Hwy.
- Multiple bicycle routes provide access to the Martin Street Activity Centre.
- 195 parking spaces were identified within the martin Street Activity Centre most of these were restricted to 1, 2 or 4 hours though a small number were unrestricted.
- Unrestricted car parking is generally remains occupied throughout the day, while restricted car parking occupancy fluctuates.
A detailed analysis of development patterns, built form and urban design features within the study area was commissioned by Council as part of the background analysis for this report. The key findings of this analysis are summarised below.

7.1 Martin Street ‘High Street’
Martin Street itself provides the main shopper experience and is defined by the generally consistent strip of Edwardian scaled shopfronts. Buildings along Martin Street are generally without a street frontage setback and have active ground level street edges and overhead canopies to provide a safe and comfortable retail environment in the street. Not all buildings have over street awnings or verandahs to provide protection from rain and there is no evidence of wind barriers in outdoor dining areas.

East of the rail line these shopfronts are predominately two storeys, have an 11 to 12 metre street walls and have parapet roofs. Verandahs and awnings are dominant, as illustrated in Figure 15.

The street is somewhat split by the elevated railway bridge that bisects the strip east and west. West of Asling Street lots become larger and less traditional in form. North-west and north-east of Asling Street buildings have heritage significance, however south-east of Asling Street, buildings are considered to be non-contributory to the Martin Street precinct according to Clause 22.05-1 of the Bayside Planning Scheme. South-west of Asling Street, the lots are larger and not identified as having heritage significance. A VCAT approved five storey mixed use development is currently being constructed on the corner of Asling and Martin Streets.
Martin Street provides the core of convenience retailing. The ‘High Street’ also includes some speciality retailing, personal services along with a range of cafes and restaurants that add to the night time use of the centre.

Council have recently completed a $1.5 million streetscape upgrade of Martin Street to make the shopping village a more attractive place for shoppers and commuters and safer for pedestrians and cyclists. Improvements were guided by the Martin Street Masterplan. Key improvements include:

- New footpaths using bluestone, concrete and asphalt;
- Raised pedestrian crossings at the Asling Street roundabout to improve safety;
- Bicycle lanes widened and more bike parking installed;
- New street furniture;
- New street trees planted;
- ‘Rain gardens’ created to clean stormwater; and
- Reconstructing parts of the road and installing new drainage infrastructure.

### 7.2 Nepean Highway Service Road

Upon turning the corner from Martin Street to the Nepean Highway, the built form and public realm change significantly. This is relative to the significant change in road interface, being an eight lane highway and service lane, rather than the intimate scale of Martin Street. The highway provides a somewhat hostile and noisy environment that is not conducive to pedestrian movement.

The scale of this highway forms a barrier to any sense of it being a dual frontage street. The shops and buildings on the Bayside side that face the Nepean Highway have no relationship to those opposite within Glen Eira municipality.

The scale and form of the buildings in the Nepean Highway service road, south of Martin Street are a utilitarian 1970s form of strip centre, but appear to be well used as convenience retailing, as illustrated by Figure 16. They are visually disconnected and appear to function somewhat separately to the rest of the centre, potentially relating to road widening in the 1970s.

### 7.3 Spink Street Mixed Use and Employment area

South of Martin Street, between the Highway and the railway is a former service industrial area that has re-invented itself into a series of small offices, design studios and residences.

There are also newer mixed use developments, such the three storey development on the corner of Spink and Rose Streets. The parking along the railway reserve is generally for short to medium term use and utilitarian in design. The buildings north of Martin Street, along Spink Street have seen a variety of mixed use forms emerge.
7.4 Station environs, Elster Creek and laneways

A key physical and land use feature of the centre is the Gardenvale Station. This physically divides the centre and provides a visual focal point due to its elevation above the street.

It is a key reason why people visit the centre and it is used by over 1700 people a day. The station is accessed via ramps to Spink Street and Martin Street. Laneways to the west of the rail line and along Elster Creek provide alternative pedestrian access to the northern hinterland around the centre from Martin Street and the station. These laneways provide an important function but generally have a low visual amenity.

The consultation undertaken to date indicates that:

- The heritage features of the station and its surrounds are valued
- The station underpass is considered unsafe.
- There is a generally poor appearance of much of the station surrounds, with graffiti, poor disabled access and general lack of good urban design.
- Elster Creek provides a pedestrian cycle path to access the northern part of the centre. The creek itself has been re-directed and appears a somewhat unsightly concrete drain, rather than a natural environs.

7.5 Residential Hinterland

The immediate and broader surrounds of the study area is characterised by detached houses on single lots. Residential development generally comprises single and some double storey dwellings. The subdivisional pattern is regular and arranged in a modified grid form, however lot sizes vary from approximately 250m² to 1000m², streetscapes are dominated by pre-WW2 era dwellings, including California Bungalow, Arts and Crafts, Victorian, and Federation architectural styles. There are some isolated developments between the 1960s and 2000s.

Front and side setbacks are generally consistent, as is the scale of the buildings. Parking structures are generally recessive, being set to the side or the rear of dwellings, and there is separation between dwellings allowing views between buildings to rear yards and vegetation. Open front fencing is common. Other areas, such as Rose Street and Montclair Avenue comprise a mix of single dwellings and townhouses and are therefore not as “dominated” by inter war homes as suggested by the character guidelines.

Many dwellings are located within heritage overlays or identified in Council’s neighbourhood character policy as areas of low key, garden settings to be protected. This policy has been discussed in Section 3 of this report. Some sites immediately around the activity centre have seen more intensive forms, taking advantage of the laneway interfaces to the commercial components of the centre. These include the some three storey developments in Asling Street, a four storey mixed use development at 116 Martin Street and a 5 storeys VCAT approved development on the south-west corner of Martin and Asling Streets.

7.6 Vegetation and landscaping

The majority of vegetation cover within the study area is located within private property, as opposed to the public realm. As is typical in an established suburban area, dwellings are set within established gardens, with many including mature canopy trees. Vegetation is primarily exotic.

Public realm vegetation quality and coverage is generally consistent. Taller trees can be found in Asling Street and the residential precinct west of the commercial area along Martin Street. Significant levels of planting occur throughout the study area, particularly within the residential hinterland west of the railway line.
Figure 19 - Urban Design Analysis (Source: Aecom)
However, there is relatively less coverage in the precinct south east of the railway line, due to the narrower width of nature strips within this area. Council has undertaken new plantings as part of the Martin Street Streetscape Upgrade. Plantings include Jacaranda trees along Martin Street, a Wine Palm tree at the Asling Street roundabout and low strappy planting suitable for use in the newly constructed rain gardens. Once matured, these plantings will add to the colour of the street and provide some shading in the summer.

As shown in Figure 19 the key issues identified from the Urban Design review were:

- The small scale village, community atmosphere of the street are considered to be key attributes.
- The centre is seen as a more quaint intimate setting than other larger, more homogenous centres.
- The moderate form and heritage attributes of buildings adds to the valued character of the centre.
- Issues raised by shoppers indicates a perception that the centre is visually unappealing and a lack of variety of shops.
- The poor public amenities of the street are seen as weaknesses of the centre. This includes poor footpath surface and some poor building appearance. In particular public seating, better footpaths and public artwork were suggested improvements. The community also noted that such improvements would reduce graffiti which is prevalent in the area.
- Use of wind breaks / outdoor café screens was suggested as an improvement.
- Martin Street’s street frontages are typically of very high quality with a great deal of transparency, frequent doorways, multiple shop fronts and a high level of visual animation. This has not typically been extended to intersecting streets and laneways.

**Urban Design summary and key points**

- Martin Street offers a relatively intact ‘high street’ environment created by the predominantly two-storey Edwardian shop fronts. This identifiable village centre environment is a core ‘point-of-difference’ for the centre.
- The station buildings, although modest, are visible from surrounding residential areas and provide a useful orientation device which provides a useful height ‘character’ which should remain prominent.
- The centre is surrounded by residential streets with predominantly separate dwellings on individual lots of a range of sizes. Laneways generally ameliorate the immediate interface between buildings in the centre and those in residential areas.
- The western end of Martin Street is undergoing change with some larger scale development under construction.
8. Community Engagement

There were two rounds of community engagement carried out as part of the background research for the Martin Street Structure Plan. The details of each round are summarised below.

8.1 Round 1 Community Engagement

The first round of community engagement was undertaken between November 2013 and January 2014. The objective of this consultation was to both generate community awareness of the project, and gain an understanding of how the centre currently operates, identify key issues of community concern, and an understanding of desired improvements and aspirations for the future development of the centre. The first round of community engagement involved the following activities:

- Brochure drop off to properties within the local area (approximately 2,500 properties) which included a brief survey;
- Advertisements in Let's Talk Bayside and in local primary school newsletters;
- Letters to MPs, community groups, service authorities, non-resident landowners, and Glen Eira City Council;
- Establishment of an online discussion forum; and
- Informal discussions with Martin Street traders and with commuters at Gardenvale Station.

The following sections provide a summary of the findings that emerged during the engagement based on the specific questions asked in the survey.

8.2 How people use the centre

182 responses were received from the brochure and surveys. The majority of respondents identified themselves as residents of Brighton (67%), with a smaller proportion identifying themselves as residents of Gardenvale (18%) or Brighton East (4%). The vast majority of respondents stated that they regularly walk to the Centre (80%), with 34% stating that they only ever walk to the centre. Residents from Brighton or Gardenvale tended to regularly walk to the Centre, with a smaller proportion of residents from other suburbs accessing the centre by foot. Accessing the Centre by car accounted for 55% of responses. It is noted that many residents used more than one mode of travel to access the centre.

A high proportion of respondents regularly use the centre for different purposes, with 59% of respondents stating that they visit the centre to shop, for leisure/entertainment purposes or when catching public transport. Visiting to shop or for leisure purposes accounted for 12% of responses and visiting the centre only to shop or to work accounted for 11% of responses. These results
suggest the convenience that Martin Street offers is highly valued and that the centre is well utilised by the local population. They also confirm the findings of the economic assessment that the Martin Street Activity Centre serves several functions, including convenience and top-up shopping, passing trade, café and specialised retail, and non-retail and professional services. Therefore, there may be scope to capitalise on Martin Street’s status as a centre of local significance.

8.3 How people view the centre

As part of the questionnaire, residents were asked to provide specific comments in response to a series of questions to identify how they viewed the centre. The top three issues raised in response to these questions are summarised below.

8.3.1. What do you like most about Martin Street?

Of the responses received:

• 28% like Martin Street’s village atmosphere and character as it provides a warm and intimate setting and enables a sense of community
• 14% of responses identified the shops and services as a positive attribute
• 12% of responses identified convenience as a positive attribute of the centre.

8.3.2. What don’t you like or you think isn’t working in Martin Street?

Parking issues were nominated by 18% of responses as something that is not working well in Martin Street. Reasons why the community believe that parking is not working well include access, supply and not enough long term parking. Neglected roads, footpaths and facilities, and graffiti was nominated by 17% of respondents. Specific responses referred to issues such as cracked footpaths and the condition of the public toilets. Traffic and safety issues were identified by 13% of responses as a key issue, with particular issues relating to the pedestrian crossings, the Martin/Asling Street roundabout and vehicles travelling too fast when entering from the Nepean Highway.

8.3.3. What should be kept into the future?

When asked about the future, 31% of responses nominated retaining the small scale shops, cafes and business that characterise Martin Street. Martin Street’s village atmosphere consisted of 24% of responses and 19% identified Martin Street’s low scale buildings as something to be retained in the future. These results are generally consistent with the findings presented in section 9.3.1, indicating that the community wish for Martin Street to remain as a convenient and smaller scale shopping precinct.

8.3.4. How would you improve the Martin Street Centre?

When asked about how they would improve Martin Street, 51% of responses made reference to public realm improvements such as repaving footpaths, increasing greenery in the centre and improving the presentation of the area surrounding Gardenvale Railway Station. Many of these suggestions have been addressed by the Martin Street Streetscape Upgrade which was completed by Council in May 2015. Improving the variety of shops available was nominated by 31% of responses, while 36% identified the need to improve and provide more parking as suggestion to improve the centre.

8.4 Second round of community engagement

The second round of community engagement was undertaken between November 2014 and January 2015. The Second round sought to build on the insights provided by the Martin Street community in the first round and identify specific ideas and opportunities for the future of the Centre.

The second round engagement involved the following activities:

• Brochure drop off of Key Directions brochure to properties within a one kilometre radius of the Gardenvale Railway Station (approximately 2,500 properties);
• Notification to public authorities, community groups and State and Federal Members of Parliament;
• Establishment of an online discussion forum through Have Your Say;
• A community workshop, to be held between 6pm-8.00pm at Bensons on Martin Café, 146 – 148 Martin St, on Tuesday 2 December; and
• Informal ‘drop in’ sessions for interested parties, under the rail bridge on Martin Street, Brighton. Dates: Friday 21 November 1 – 4pm & Monday 8 December 9am – 12pm.

8.4.1. Drop In Sessions, Ideas and Opportunities Brochure and Notification
Drop in sessions were held on Friday 21 November 2014, 1-4 pm and Monday 8 December 2014, 9am-12pm on Martin Street, under the rail bridge. Strategic Planners were available for questions and informal discussion about the Ideas and Opportunities Plan which will form the Structure Plan’s foundation. Council distributed brochures, which included the Ideas and Opportunities Plan, an invitation to the community workshop that was held on Tuesday 2 December 2014 and an invitation to lodge feedback to Council. Brochures were also mailed to properties within a one kilometre radius of Gardenvale Railway Station (approximately 2,500 properties).

Findings from the first round of community engagement and key questions for consideration were included in the brochure. These were organised into four themes including Land Use and Function, Buildings and Built Form, Traffic and Transport, and Public Spaces and Landscapes. Information about Council’s major streetscape improvements for Martin Street, managed by Infrastructure Assets, was referred to in Public Spaces and Landscapes.

Comments provided to Council generally related to increasing the amount of greenery, setting mandatory height controls and setback requirements, and increasing connectivity in the broader region. Some comments also related to the streetscape works and how these could emphasise Martin Street’s identity. Informal discussions noted the commercial strip’s distinct character, friendly nature and concerns relating to traffic management. Concern was expressed about higher density development in the precinct, especially the five storey development on the corner of Martin and Asling Streets.

During the drop in sessions, there were several instances where Martin Street patrons believed that they could comment on the ideas for Martin Street. This was because they do not live in the immediate area, despite Council officers inviting their participation as feedback from users of the space is highly valued.

8.4.2. ‘Have Your Say’ Online Forum

The community were invited to lodge their comments via Council’s Have Your Say page (http://yoursaybayside.com.au/martinstreet) from Friday 14 November 2014 to Thursday 15 January 2015. This page included information about the project and access to key documents, such as the Martin Street Neighbourhood Activity Centre Structure Plan – Background Report (September 2014). Findings from the community workshop held on Tuesday 2 December 2014 were also uploaded.

In summary, key forum findings include:

- Respondents enjoy the convenience and speciality shops (e.g. fishmonger, op shop, butcher) that Martin Street offers, and would like this small business focus to be retained.
- The ability to walk to the commercial strip is valued.
- The village feel and character of the commercial strip is valued.
- Car parking arrangements are insufficient, especially for commuters.
- Concerns regarding traffic management, particularly congestion and speed limits.
- Laneways could be better utilised, however require careful management.
- Lack of bicycle infrastructure and the desire for improved infrastructure.
- Some sections of the commercial strip are unattractive, especially the railway bridge.
- The commercial strip should be a pedestrian priority zone, with reduced speed limits.
- The Elster Creek Canal is unsightly, unsafe and could be better utilised.

One participant strongly supported 6 storey development within 500m of the commercial strip as this would allow “more people to live (and at a much lower house price) in this area which has great facilities, rather than being forced to the outer suburbs.” While the extent of such density was not popular, this comment does highlight positive sentiments towards the area’s facilities, convenient location and desire to maintain the commercial precinct’s viability. It also highlights the requirement to produce a plan that can appropriately guide long-term change in the precinct and maintain the features that the community value.

8.4.3. Community Workshop

The Community Workshop was held on Tuesday 2 December 2014 between 6 and 8pm at Bensons on Martin Café (146-148 Martin Street, Brighton). Approximately 20 people attended. It was the method of engagement that received the most detailed feedback. The following are the key directions that emerged in relation to the four topics,
Land Use and Function, Buildings and Built Form, Traffic and Transport, and Public Spaces and Landscapes.

**Land Use – Priorities**
The priorities identified in relation to Land Use and Function were:

- Mixed use is ideal in the commercial strip, with an emphasis on ground floor retail. More specifically it is important to have a mix of retail and office spaces;
- Canal needs to be covered and converted to a park; and
- It is positive to have a fine grain retail/commercial area

**Built Form – Priorities**
The priorities identified in relation to Buildings and Built Form were:

- The area which could support up to five storeys is the north-eastern corner near the commercial/retail core on Martin Street;
- Minimise visual bulk of 3+ storey buildings with first floor setbacks at all boundaries, particularly the street front;
- Maintain human scale; and
- Parking arrangements.

**Access and Movement – Priorities**
The priorities identified in relation to Traffic and Transport were:

- Laneways could support access to housing although loading and unloading of goods would need to be considered in traffic flow analysis;
- The interface to Nepean Highway needs to be improved. This would help with safety (people turning fast), character (landmark buildings to signify entry to precinct) and possibly wayfinding;
- Car parking arrangements; and
- Rat running through side streets.

**Landscape and Environment – Priorities**
The priorities identified in relation to Public Spaces and Landscapes were:

- The current streetscape upgrades are appropriate;
- Renewing the canal;
- Creating more pocket parks, public squares and public plazas; and
- Maintaining a sense of community.

The priorities identified in each category generally reflect the key issues identified by Council, with the exception of converting the canal to a park. An initiative of this nature may be outside the current scope of this project as the land is owned by Melbourne Water.

**8.5 Analysis**
The feedback received suggests that the main concerns identified by the community relate to parking and traffic, closely followed by the centre’s visual appearance. Parking supply was considered to be limited, including parking for traders. Positive feedback was also received for the better utilisation of laneways, however careful management would be required in order to maximise their efficiency. The Martin Street Streetscape Upgrade was considered to be very timely. It is envisaged that some concerns identified by the community, for example cracked footpaths and the Martin/Asling Street roundabout, have been rectified by the upgrade.

A consistent theme in the responses is that Martin Street is valued by the community for its distinct village atmosphere. Such components include the scale of the buildings, small businesses and heritage buildings. This is also reflected by comments that if shop-top development is to occur, upper level storeys must be set back from the street to reduce visual bulk and maintain the heritage value of the shopping precinct.

Community comments also suggest that if development is to occur, that this should be in appropriate locations within the centre. Suggested locations included north east of the railway line and south east of the railway line. The new developments on the corner of Martin and Asling Streets were generally considered inappropriate due to traffic and amenity considerations.

Another common theme included enhancing Martin Street’s identity through public art installations, creating more public spaces and converting the Elster Creek Drain into a linear park. In particular, the latter suggestion was viewed as a way in which the area’s open space deficiency and maintaining a sense of community.
9. Conclusions

9.1 Issues and Opportunities

Drawing on the background analysis as well as feedback received from the first and second rounds of community engagement, a series of directions were identified which required further investigation and refinement, through the structure planning process. These directions have formed the basis of the Draft Structure Plan and are summarised as follows:

1. Land Use
   • Consider the potential to increase the trade and viability of the Centre whilst protecting its heritage value;
   • Resolve how to protect the retail viability of ground floor units within the Centre;
   • Explore the opportunities to provide for additional housing opportunities whilst protecting the heritage and character values of the Centre;
   • Consider the potential of residential land within walking distance (400m) of the Centre for moderate housing development; and
   • Consider the potential of commercially zoned land with the Centre to accommodate moderate housing development.

2. Built Form
   • Explore how development within the heritage area of the Centre is to be managed in terms of building scale and density;
   • Explore and identify what levels of development will occur within the Centre and how the interface between the heritage and non-heritage precincts is to be managed; and
   • Consider the potential to enable the Centre to expand economically within the context of limited lot availability.

3. Access and Movement
   • Examine how to improve management and provision of public parking in and around the Centre;
   • Assess how to better utilise laneways and improve their safety for pedestrian access and new development;
   • Investigate how to better link the Centre’s residential areas and adjoining open space assets and nearby community facilities; and
   • Consider opportunities to improve the pedestrian and cycling environment within the Centre whilst facilitating access to public transport and managing the needs of the private motor car.
4. Landscape and Environment

- Consider opportunities for public realm improvements within the Centre through improving the aesthetics of the area, improving street seating/furniture, increasing the greenery of the area and improving the train station area (i.e. public lighting, lift/escalator the station platform, security cameras, drainage, improvements).

9.2 Structure Plan Boundary

One of the key outputs of the background analysis of most structure plans is to define the boundary for the centre, which clearly identifies the extent of the activity centre and the specific properties to which the Structure Plan would apply. Planning Practice Note 58 – Structure Planning for Activity Centres outlines a number of considerations which need to be taken into account when determining a structure plan boundary.

The strategic context of the Martin Street Activity Centre highlights broader physical constraints that should be considered when identifying a boundary for the centre. The movement network and the urban form and heritage of the area highlight that there are limited options available for housing opportunities beyond the centre. The proximity of North Road and Nepean Highway, which are obvious barriers to appropriate locations for additional housing opportunities, along with the nearby residential heritage areas create the opportunity of three key areas of housing opportunity over time.

This includes:

- The Asling Street Precinct – to the north of the centre and defined by the rail corridor, the Elster Creek/Nepean Highway and the heritage precinct to the west,
- The Martin Street West Precinct – to the west of the centre and defined by the heritage precincts to the north and south and the rear of Cochrane Street properties (limiting any change to the character of Cochrane Street), and
- The Rose Street Precinct – to the south-east of the centre and defined by the rail corridor, North Road and Nepean Highway.

However height must be guided by the context and be sensitive to its surrounds.

9.3 Next Steps

The ideas and comments received up until this stage have informed the basis for the development of the draft Martin Street Structure Plan. Following endorsement from Council the draft Structure Plan will be placed on public consultation providing additional opportunity for the community to have an input into the content and recommendations of this plan.

Once all feedback and submissions have been considered, Council officers will make any necessary changes to the draft report and prepare a final version to be adopted by Council. Implementation into the Bayside Planning Scheme will follow. An outline of the key steps in the structure planning process, and approximate timeframes for their delivery, is shown in the diagram below.