



Tooronga Village

**Boroondara Planning Scheme
Amendment C70**

Policy Context Submission

Presented by: **Richard Read**

Prepared by:

Tooronga Action Group Inc
A0048773B

August 2006

Planning and Environment Act 1987

Boroondara Planning Scheme Amendment C70 Submission on behalf of the Tooronga Action Group

POLICY CONTEXT

1. Melbourne 2030

1.1 Melbourne 2030 is the government's key strategic plan for managing growth and change across metropolitan Melbourne and its surrounding region.

“In the next 30 years Melbourne will grow by up to one million people and will consolidate its reputation as one of the most liveable, attractive and prosperous areas in the world for residents, business and visitors”.¹

1.2 The prime focus of Melbourne 2030 is the area covered by the 31 Melbourne metropolitan municipal councils (including the nine ‘interface councils’ which cover both urban and rural areas at the fringes of metropolitan Melbourne)

“.....Melbourne 2030 is a plan for the growth and development of the metropolitan area. An important objective is to ensure that Melbourne retains the qualities that people enjoy about it”

“The main thrust is to continue to protect the liveability of the established areas and to increasingly concentrate major change in strategic redevelopment sites such as activity centres and underdeveloped land”.²⁾

¹ Melbourne 2030 dated October 2002 page v

1.3 Furthermore, Melbourne 2030 consistently refers to the vitally important objective that Melbourne retains the qualities that people enjoy about it. This is reinforced further under the heading “Protection of existing suburbs”

“The character of established residential areas will be protected through ResCode, and increased densities will not be achieved at the expense of existing amenity.”³

2. Inner Melbourne (Relevant Experience)

2.1 The First Effects of Melbourne 2030 were experienced in Inner Melbourne

While the climate is evolving, Melbourne’s Inner ‘Ring’ Councils, which for a long time had been spared the rampant development occurring on Melbourne’s fringes, were totally unprepared for the development pressures unleashed by Melbourne 2030. The Department of Sustainability and Environment (DSE) provided some funding for these Councils, in particular to expedite their Structure Plans so that they were in a position to respond to development pressure. Poor preparedness and the climate under which approvals were given has meant that several early development proposals in the time of Melbourne 2030 have not proceeded.

² Melbourne 2030 dated October 2002 page 12

³ Melbourne 2030 dated October 2002 page 18

2.2 Inner Melbourne's Response - Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP)

2.2.1 In May of this year, the Inner Melbourne Action Plan ‘**IMAP**’ a collaborative project between the Cities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Yarra and Stonington (west of Kooyong Road) and Vic Urban (Docklands)” was developed to “respond to the challenges of Melbourne 2030”. The inner Melbourne Councils in association with Vic Urban and the State Government have worked together to strengthen the liveability attraction and prosperity of the region.

2.2.2 The Strategies of IMAP are as follows

- Celebrate the unique and concentrated 19th century heritage of Inner Melbourne Region
- Effectively link transport routes so the Inner Melbourne region is accessible throughout by walking, cycling and public transport
- Minimise the growing impact of traffic congestion
- Increase public transport use
- Plan to accommodate 90,000 more dwellings by 2030
- Support the distinct and diverse character of Activity Centres
- Promote the Inner Melbourne Region as an investment location for knowledge rich business sectors
- Facilitate the growing importance of the Inner Melbourne Region as south east Australia's freight hub

- Substantially improve the environmental performance of Inner Melbourne Region
- Complete the regional open space network
- Promote the Inner Melbourne Region as a tourism destination

2.2.3 From a comparison of the broad objectives of Melbourne 2030 with the much more specific objectives of IMAP, it is not hard to conclude that IMAP as an outcome to be led by Councils is much more purposeful, and combined with a greater understanding of local conditions, gives much greater confidence in the outcomes. Most importantly, local Council's have a far greater capacity to get buy in from their communities than higher, more removed tiers of government.

3. Boroondara's Response to Melbourne 2030

3.1 The Draft Eastern Region Housing Statement Addresses Melbourne 2030 Planning for Growth Objective⁴

3.1.1 Boroondara's participation in the Draft Eastern Region Housing Statement and in the absence of a Structure or specific plans for Tooronga, should be seen as a better response to Melbourne 2030 and the anticipated growth expected therein than the present weight being placed on Tooronga to accommodate extreme population and housing densities.

3.1.2 *"Victoria in Future 2004, the State Government's population projections, anticipate that from 2001 to 2031, the population of*

⁴ Draft Eastern Regional Housing Statement dated August 2005 pages iv and vi

metropolitan Melbourne is expected to increase by over 1 million people and will result in demand for approximately 627,000 additional households. The population of the Eastern Region is expected to increase by about 111,000 to reach nearly 1.1 million and over 91,000 additional households by 2031 (Victoria in Future 2004)”

3.1.3 *“Councils within the Eastern Region have commenced identifying opportunities to accommodate the 91,000 additional households the State Government projects will be needed between 2001-2031 to accommodate anticipated population growth within the region, Councils are working towards achieving gradual shift in the location of additional housing within the Eastern Region over time which is generally consistent with the strategic direction of Melbourne 2030.”*

3.1.4 *“Based on preliminary work undertaken to date, Councils have identified opportunities for 90,100 households between 2001 & 2031. This indicates that a reduction in the proportion of dwellings in greenfield locations from (15% to 10%), an increase in the proportion of dwellings in strategic redevelopment sites (from 20% to 56%) and a marginal decrease in the proportion of dwellings in dispersed residential locations from (65% to 34%) can be achieved, This represents a gradual shift in new housing within the Eastern Region over time which is consistent with the strategic direction of Melbourne 2030.”⁵*

⁵ Draft Eastern Regional Housing Statement dated August 2005 page vi

<i>Population Growth 2001-2031</i>		<i>Household Growth 2001-2031</i>
<i>Boroondara</i>	<i>8,500</i>	<i>7,700</i>
<i>Knox</i>	<i>14,800</i>	<i>15,000</i>
<i>Manningham</i>	<i>18,000</i>	<i>13,800</i>
<i>Maroondah</i>	<i>27,700</i>	<i>17,000</i>
<i>Monash</i>	<i>19,400</i>	<i>13,50</i>
<i>Stonnington (East of Kooyong Rd)</i>	<i>3,800</i>	<i>2,600</i>
<i>Whitehorse</i>	<i>14,100</i>	<i>10,400</i>
<i>Yarra Ranges</i>	<i>5,300</i>	<i>11,200</i>
<i>Eastern Region</i>	<i>111,600</i>	<i>91,200</i>

(Source: Victoria in the Future, 2004)

3.1.5 “ *The City of Boroondara has identified the capacity to accommodate between 7,000 and 8,000 additional households within the municipality between 2005 and 2031. It is anticipated that the majority of residential developments will be accommodated around activity centres, mixed use corridors and through major redevelopment sites identified in the Council’s local housing strategy, the My Neighbourhood Strategy. The exact capacity of the Principal and Major Activity Centres will be defined through the structure planning processes. These processes have commenced in relation to Camberwell Junction and Kew Junction.*”⁶

3.1.6 “*Boroondara lists its Principal Activity Centres as Camberwell Junction and its Major Activity Centres as Glenferrie Road Hawthorn and Kew Junction.*”⁷

⁶ Draft Eastern Regional Housing Statement dated August 2005 page 36

⁷ Draft Eastern Regional Housing Statement dated August 2005 Appendix 1 List of Activity Centres Eastern Region

3.2 Boroondara's Planning Scheme - Tooronga Under Melbourne 2030

3.2.1 In City of Boroondara's submission to Melbourne 2030, "*Planning for Sustainable Growth*" dated 24/2/2003. it supports the strategic concept of concentrating certain forms of new housing around activity centres, but with the important proviso that

*"the key determinant of the location and quantity of such new development must be a function of the capacity of that area measured in terms of liveability, urban character, and infrastructure availability"*⁸

3.2.2 Most importantly in Boroondara's submission, having referred to certain contradictions in Melbourne 2030 that should be removed, that the correct emphasis must be on the

*"protection of valued suburbs and their character established before predicting what levels of development may or may not be appropriate in them"*⁹

3.2.3 The Boroondara Planning Scheme identifies Tooronga as a "**medium convenience retail centre**" (Planning Scheme C1 22:10).

The scale of the development proposed for this site is such that it does not fit into the scheme of Melbourne 2030.

⁸ City of Boroondara's Submission to Melbourne 2030 dated February 2003 page 6

⁹ City of Boroondara's Submission to Melbourne 2030 dated February 2003 page 6

3.2.4 Tooronga Action Group argues that, Tooronga should more properly be viewed as a Neighbourhood Centre. Its features (i.e features of a Neighbourhood Centre according to Melbourne 2030) include:

1. *Limited mix of small business, shops, local convenience services*
2. *< 10,000 sq m of retail space*
3. *good level of accessibility for walking & cycling*
4. *Accessible to local bus service, tram and train which connect to principal and major activity centres*
5. *Accessible to schools, libraries, child care, health services, police stations etc*

4. Melbourne 2030 and Tooronga

4.1 Stockland argues conformity with the relevant planning provisions and in particular Melbourne 2030. Such an argument is meaningless as the proposal could be amended in many different ways and it could be argued that each variation would equally conform.

4.2 Tooronga Action Group reminds Panel Members of the key concerns of neighbours:

- Increased traffic which will have a significant impact on surrounding roads, particularly Toorak, Tooronga and Burke Roads, and the Monash Freeway;
- Car parking provision for the retail, office and residential components as well as the 900 overspill car parking spaces required for the building occupied and tenanted by Coles Myer;

- The excessive scale of the proposed development, particularly with reference to the number of dwellings (600), the heights and setbacks of the buildings, and the provision for open space;
- Treatment of the Gardiner’s Creek corridor and set back from the pedestrian/ bike path;
- Adverse impact on the amenity of the surrounding neighbourhood.
- Paucity of analysis of the effect on community facilities

4.3 Add to this the environmental concerns caused by proximity to high voltage powerlines and the regions propensity to flooding.

4.4 It is unsurprising then that, Tooronga Action Group takes the view that the scale of Stockland’s proposed development and in particular the heights and set backs are such that this would adversely impact on residents and neighbours. In addition the increase in traffic and the parking difficulties compound the problems which are sought to be avoided by

Policy 5.1 of Melbourne 2030 under “Direction 5 – A Great Place to be” says

“Promote good urban design to make the environment more liveable and attractive”

“The physical environment affects people’s ability to participate in community activities, access services and facilities, and undertake their daily lives. It also affects their sense of community and security. Urban design, including the design of buildings, streets, and neighbourhoods, can foster or discourage interaction and participation in civic life”¹⁰

¹⁰ Melbourne 2030 dated October 2002 page 85

It then says:

“Urban design is also important in creating safe, walkable and attractive environments, which will make using public transport more attractive”¹¹

4.5 Tooronga Action group submits that, Tooronga is neither an Activity Centre nor a Greenfield site and more fittingly falls in the category of ‘Infill’ Development. TAG provides another independent and reasoned opinion on the application of Melbourne 2030 to ‘Infill’ Development.

4.6 In its May 2005 Research Note Charter Keck Cramer provides another reasoned and independent opinion on the application of Melbourne 2030 to infill development:

“.....Melbourne 2030 aspires to alter the distribution of new dwellings across the metropolitan area. This is proposed via two key actions; firstly through the introduction of the Urban Growth Boundary which aims to reduce the number of Greenfield dwellings to 31% (194,000) of all new dwellings and in doing so limiting urban sprawl, and secondly through locating some 255,000 new dwellings (41%) in Activity Centres and Strategic Redevelopment Sites, where it is intended that they will take advantage of good access to services and transport, whilst limiting the need for car travel. As would be expected both of these objectives are explicitly supported by Key Directions and Policies in Melbourne 2030.”

“Almost 30% of new dwellings envisaged to be required by the year 2030 are defined in Melbourne 2030 as residential infill. Yet despite representing some 170,000 new dwellings and being recognised as a way of providing a range of

¹¹ Melbourne 2030 dated October 2002 page 85

options to meet the changing needs of residents Melbourne 2030 fails to explicitly support residential infill development by any Key Directions and related policies “

“In fact, Melbourne 2030’s emphasis upon protection and maintenance of existing residential character together with claims that increased densities will not be achieved at the expense of existing amenity are an implicit denial of the legitimacy of infill development as an increasingly desired form of housing.”¹²

4.7 Mr Rob Burgess, Senior Property Analyst and the author of this article, concludes with the following observation:

“Although perceived by some to be contrary to the ideals of Melbourne 2030, residential infill provides a diverse, desired, feasible and sustainable form of housing. However, by failing to recognise its significance with any sound policy direction, the perceived impacts of residential infill upon the preferred ‘compact city’ model expressed in Melbourne 2030 will not be lessened. Therefore the uncertainty and inaction resulting from Melbourne 2030’s policy void on infill will not only put at risk the ability to deliver higher density housing choice to a changing population, but also limit the ability to effectively plan and provide the required level of infrastructure and services for local communities—exactly the issues that Melbourne 2030 is aiming to address”¹³

4.8 In substance, Melbourne 2030 provides little specific guidance, or for that matter specific instruction, to balance the absence of proper structural planning.

¹² Charter Keck Cramer :Research Insight May 2005

¹³ Charter Keck Cramer :Research Insight May 2005

5. TAG Assessment of Evidence

5.1 Mr David Barnes, a Director of Hansen Partnership Pty Ltd, Urban Planning, Design, and Landscape Architecture.

5.1.1 Mr Barnes provided an expert witness statement to the Panel. It is his opinion that Melbourne 2030 provides strategic justification for a development of the general type and form that would be accommodated by the proposed amendment. However he does not believe that the detail contained in the amendment documentation is sufficient to warrant approval in its exhibited form, in particular in relation to the incorporated plan. (Para 8) He says that the amendment does not provide sufficient guidance to avoid an inappropriate development outcome on the site. He is particularly concerned about the potential for inappropriate development along the Toorak Road and Tooronga Road frontages, along Gardiner's Creek, and abutting existing residential areas to the east.

5.1.2 However, Mr Barnes is of the opinion that within the context of Melbourne 2030 and Clause 12 of the Planning Scheme, the site is a strategic development site and strong policy exists for the site to be developed for a mix of higher intensity uses. He says that:

“ I believe the rezoning of the land to a Priority Development Zone (PDZ) in association with a schedule to the zone, an incorporated plan and a reference document, is an appropriate package of controls to

facilitate development of what is a large strategic development site that has a long planning history.”¹⁴(Para 17)

5.1.3 He says that the PDZ was introduced by the State Government for the purpose of assisting in the implementation of Melbourne 2030.

5.1.4 Mr Barnes observes that the difference between the PDZ and the existing Comprehensive Development Zone (CDZ) that applies to the Tooronga site, is that the schedule to the CDZ makes it primarily an office zone, in which residential and retail uses are discretionary rather than as of right. The proposed schedule to the PDZ will make that zone more of a mixed use zone in which residential, office and retail uses are as of right. (Para 21)

5.1.5 In this context Mr Barnes points to the real difficulty which the proponent cannot rectify, namely that the incorporated plan, which comprises text setting out general development principles and an urban framework plan and height plan, expresses an intent which is very general and

“in most cases does not provide any real indication of future development outcomes”.¹⁵ (para 32)

5.1.6 This situation is unacceptable and demonstrates that the proponent has failed to comply with the principles of 2030.

¹⁴ Amendment C70 to Boroondara Planning Scheme Statement by David Barnes Town Planner Hanson Partnership

¹⁵ Amendment C70 to Boroondara Planning Scheme Statement by David Barnes Town Planner Hanson Partnership

5.2 Mr Craig Czarny of Hansen Partnership Pty Ltd ¹⁶

Mr Czarny provided an expert witness statement and gave evidence before the Panel. He discussed aspects of 2030 and also referred to the Tooronga Village Urban Design Framework (November 2001)(UDF) adopted by the Boroondara Council, as a relevant document. It adopts the necessary mechanisms to realise “mixed use” on the site.

5.2.1 Mr Czarny expresses the opinion that the UDF represents the most recent expression of suitable design form and massing across the site. He says that the notions expressed in the UDF are strong and have been significantly compromised in the proposed Amendment. This is particularly so with reference to retaining the Coles Myer building as the highest built form on the site. He concludes by making a series of recommendations, including a recommendation that no individual form is higher than the Coles Myer building, that the street scale to Toorak and Tooronga Roads is no greater than 3 storeys, with active and attractive frontages, with generous setbacks. He makes other important recommendations at page 13 of his report, which is before the Panel.

5.2.2 Mr Czarny fully supports the intent of the proposed Amendment but he states that he does not believe that the content or structure of the Amendment documentation (in current form) is satisfactory. He says that in his opinion Amendment C 70 fails to provide adequate detail to ensure a site responsive urban design outcome on the land and demonstrate a

¹⁶ Boroondara Planning Scheme Amendment C70 Statement of Urban Design Evidence by Craig Czarny June 2006

form and mass sensitive to the broader urban, environmental and visual context (para 49)

5.2.3 Reference is made to Appendix C in Mr. Czarny's Witness Statement. The 8 Photomontages prepared by Mr Czarny show the projected mass of the built forms. This demonstrates the excessive scale of the proposed Amendment and the negative impact on the amenity of the site and surrounding neighbourhood.

5.3 Mr Andrew Biacsi of Contour Consultants Australia¹⁷

The inappropriate size of the proposed development discussed above with particular reference to the issues concerning the greatly increased population from the occupants of the proposed 600 dwellings, the Coles Myer overspill of 900 cars and other vehicles using the site, is directly related to the insurmountable problems that will arise because of the greatly increased traffic volume. This critical issue is referred to by Mr Andrew Biacsi of Contour Consultants Australia in his witness statement prepared for Stockland and outlining his evidence before the Panel.

At 4.2, (para 25}, Local Planning Policy Framework he discusses the Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS)

Mr Biacsi acknowledges that Clause 21.12 identifies movement issues in the areas surrounding the site. He says:

“in spite of a well developed public transport network, Boroondara suffers from heavily trafficked main roads, particularly during peak periods”¹⁸

¹⁷ Statement of Evidence prepared by Andrew Biacsi of Contour Consultants June 2006

He then states

“The limited availability of parking for major activity centres affects the amenity of surrounding areas and the viability of some commercial centres”¹⁹

5.3.1 Mr. Biacsi then refers to the objectives and strategies relevant to promoting public transport use and optimizing the provision for car parking. Reference is then made to the local planning policies for Boroondara by clause 22 of the Planning Scheme, which deals with car parking.

However, at paragraphs 74 and 75 of his report Mr Biacsi expresses his opinion that he is satisfied that the:

*“key traffic and car parking parameters...
have been identified and are generally consistent with those that have generally applied to other major development projects”*

5.3.2 It is submitted that this opinion is not supported by the evidence of the other expert witnesses, and is rejected in Tooronga Action Group’s Traffic Submission.

5.3.3 We note that Mr. Biacsi goes on to review Boroondara’s submission and is critical of the Council’s recommendations relating to the suggested height reductions and set backs of 30 metres. He says this is:

¹⁸ Statement of Evidence prepared by Andrew Biacsi of Contour Consultants June 2006 para 29

¹⁹ Statement of Evidence prepared by Andrew Biacsi of Contour Consultants June 2006 para 29

*“unnecessary and inconsequential and bordering on meddling without producing any meaningful or tangible improvement to the outcomes sought under the Amendment.”*²⁰

5.3.4 This type of observation expressed by an expert witness appears to be a subjective attack on Boroondara Council officers rather than an objective opinion. The Tooronga Action Group takes exception to this approach, and maintains in the strongest terms that height and set back issues are of considerable importance.

5.3.5 Mr Biacsi concludes as follows at paragraph 102:

“The potential effects of development facilitated by the Amendment are likely to be regarded by some individuals as dis-benefits. For example, more intensive development of the land inevitably presumes changes to the physical environment, increased activity levels, more people, more traffic, more cars, and more noise and so on. In my opinion these factors are not necessarily dis-benefits in themselves or issues that would form the basis of a net community benefit assessment.”

5.3.6 He is of the opinion that such factors are relevant at the time of the planning permit application, and can be dealt with then.. In other words he acknowledges that more intensive development on this site is more than likely to cause the problems associated with extra traffic, more people, and more noise. Although it is his opinion that the changes will be for the better, he cautions by saying:

²⁰ Statement of Evidence prepared by Andrew Biacsi of Contour Consultants June 2006 para 85

“I accept that the Amendment will facilitate outcomes that have the potential to change the environment, character and amenity of the area, however in substance I believe that these changes will be to the betterment rather than the detriment of the area”²¹

This is a critical concession made by this witness. In Tooronga Action Group’s Submission the balance of the evidence before the Panel supports the view that the environment character and amenity of the area will undoubtedly be changed, but to the detriment of the amenity of the entire surrounding area

5.3.7 When cross-examined before the Panel he agreed that a subjective rather than objective judgment would determine whether the changes were for the better or worse. He went on to say that there were no heritage or character issues and this is as close as you get to a greenfield site, and the “ingredients” encapsulated Melbourne 2030. However he conceded that the links to the east were an issue.

5.3.8 In giving his evidence Mr. Biacsi supported almost every aspect of Stockland’s proposal, and was not prepared to concede that the different opinions of other expert witnesses had any merit. When giving evidence he repeated his personal attack on the officers of the Boroondara Council. It is submitted that the Panel should carefully examine Mr. Biacsi’s evidence when assessing the weight to be attached to his opinions.

²¹ Statement of Evidence prepared by Andrew Biacsi of Contour Consultants June 2006 para 102

5.4 Mr Phillip Storer, Director of City Planning at the City of Boroondara,

In his submission to the Panel on behalf of Boroondara Phillip Storer said

“I have no doubt about Council’s capacity or willingness to perform the role of responsible authority for this site. The site and amendment give rise to issues which are encountered by Council’s resources on a regular basis given that Boroondara is an established area in which all projects are in the form of infill developments. The finer grain planning required beyond this amendment for successful change is very much the focus of our daily activities”

6. Conclusions

6.1 Boroondara’s participation in the Draft Eastern Region Housing Statement and in the absence of a Structure or specific plans for Tooronga, should be seen as a better response to Melbourne 2030 and the anticipated growth expected therein than the present weight being placed on Tooronga to accommodate extreme population and housing densities. If housing numbers were reduced to 400 on site (i.e. 4 times ambient housing density - refer Tooronga Action Group Submission on Built Form and Open Space) the development would not only conform to the prime thrust of Melbourne 2030, it would better accord with the thrust of the directions in 2030.

6.2 The deficiencies of directly applying Melbourne 2030 are well recognised by the Inner Melbourne Councils in the development of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan. This process provides a greater understanding of local conditions and it gives much greater confidence in the outcomes. Most importantly, local Council’s have a far greater capacity to get “buy in” from their communities than higher, more removed tiers of government. By calling in Amendment C70 the Minister is interfering with the momentum of Eastern Region

Councils, and in this case Boroondara to achieve similar results. With Kew Residential Services, this is the second such action within Boroondara in quick succession. Contrary, to assertions by Counsel for the proponent this action is not warranted.

6.3 The proponent argues conformity with the Directions contained within Melbourne 2030.

In fact there are many aspects of the proponent's plan which should be viewed with caution in the absence of real detail, and several that are argued by Tooronga Action Group to be contrary to the Directions contained within Melbourne 2030 and in particular Policy 5.

6.4 The Panel should not recommend the Amendment in its present form. The Amendment can be interpreted very widely and is couched in words which indicate general principles rather than specific details. The design detail provided by the proponent is inadequate to make an assessment of the urban design implications of the proposed development.

6.5 The Panel is invited to accept Mr Czarny and Mr Barnes evidence as compelling. The Panel will recall Mr Biacsi's evidence that the "consequences of two levels are imperceptible". Therefore a development exceeding the height plan envelopes by one or two levels may be considered to be generally in accordance with the incorporated plan. It is submitted that the Panel should disregard Mr Biacsi's opinions where they conflict with Mr Czarny or Mr Barnes' opinion.

6.6 The development and use of the site for which a future applicant may apply may depart significantly from the indicative concept plan. It cannot be assumed that Stockland will exercise its option to purchase.

6.7 The Tooronga Village site has character not separable from the rest of the neighbourhood and that character should be preserved

6.8 If the Panel approves the Amendment in whole or part, Boroondara is the appropriate authority to administer this Amendment. The site is a challenging one that requires the Council's resources to best manage the issues that will arise. It is submitted that there are insufficient people with the appropriate expertise and local understanding in the Department of Sustainability and Environment to deal with the many complex issues that will arise.

Description of Boroondara and of the Tooronga Neighbourhood

A significant neighbourhood characteristic of Boroondara is its tree lined streets and residential open space.

“Boroondara was given its name by Robert Hoddle who took the word from the Woiwurrang language, which translated means ‘where the ground is thickly shaded,’ as the area was densely wooded.

Tree lined streets are to be found adjacent to the subject site, and the area to the North of Toorak Road and to the East of the site is comprised of well established and quality housing. (For a discussion of the surrounding neighbourhood see (*Appendix 2*)

Neighbourhood character and sense of place is a very important consideration, particularly in this area of Boroondara. In many cases families have lived in the one home for decades.

An understanding of the liveability, character and amenity of the Tooronga neighbourhood is necessary before a proper planning assessment can be made of the Amendment

Discussion of Surrounding Neighbourhood

1. Properties North of Toorak Road

- The area around the site is comprised of a mixture of residential, commercial and recreational land use.
- The north side of Toorak Road opposite the site is primarily well established high quality residential, and continues to be residential as you proceed further north. There is some light commercial development to the north west. As you proceed north in Tooronga Road from Toorak Road, “Cato Park” is between Bluff Street and Bluey Street approximately 100 metres north of Toorak Road on the Eastern side of Tooronga Road.
- Anderson Park is located a short distance further to the north, approximately 600 metres from Toorak Road, on the Eastern side of Tooronga Road. This is a very attractive and well established park, which includes Hawthorn South Bowling Club, Tennis Club, Community Centre and children’s play ground. The surrounding streets contain substantial brick dwellings of a high quality many valued at well over \$1million.
- Private and government schools are located in this area. Bialik College is approximately 300metres north of Toorak Road in Tooronga Road; Hawthorn Secondary College is a short distance to the north adjoining Burgess Street. Auburn South Primary School is also in Tooronga Road on the west side adjoining Burgess Street.

2. North side of Toorak Road up to Burke Road

- There is a Mediscreen medical clinic opposite the site on the North side of Toorak Road. Substantial brick dwellings are located along Toorak Road extending to the east to Burke Road.

3. East of the site

- Well established high quality residences abut the East side of the site, being Precinct 3. Many of these houses were built in the early part of the twentieth century of solid brick and the area was further developed in the 1930s maintaining its high standard of mainly brick dwellings. Development continued between World War I and 2 maintaining the high standard of single and double storey brick dwellings... These dwellings immediately to the east of the site are in Parkin Street, Faircroft Avenue, Rix Street, Hadley Court, Grosvenor Street, and Bristol Court.
- Parkin Street adjoins the Burke Road South Reserve, immediately adjacent to the Coles site.

4. East of Burke Road

- The area to the East of Burke Road and south of Toorak Road is primarily quality residential, with Cedar Court Rehabilitation Hospital on the south east corner of Burke and Toorak Roads, joining Turner Street to the south. There are also some offices, one or two shops, a 2 storey apartment block containing 10 apartments and a Jehovah's Witness church on the western side of Burke Road south of Toorak Road.
- Substantial brick dwellings are located on the western side of Burke Road extending south to the Monash Freeway overpass.

- The railway line crosses Burke Road at the southern end of the overpass. Trains cross very slowly over the tram lines, and traffic jams occur as a result.
- A small shopping strip is located on the east and west side of Burke Road immediately north of Toorak Road, extending up to Clifton Road.. This area carries a considerable amount of vehicular traffic, resulting in acute traffic jams in Burke Road and Toorak Road., in both north and south directions.
- As you proceed further south from Turner Street the Monash Freeway is approximately 600 metres to the south. Howitt and Nepean Streets run off Burke Road to the east, and run through to Park Road. Bickleigh Street and Bickleigh Court are immediately south of Nepean Street.
- This is a well established area having been developed from a subdivision in the early 1930s. Many of the dwellings are of art deco style, solid brick, usually double brick, of a high standard. In Turner, Howitt and Nepean Streets there are also well restored Edwardian and Victorian houses.
- The dwellings are usually solid brick. A house in Bickleigh Court recently sold at auction for \$1,000,076. The streets are tree lined, mainly with old oak trees set in wide nature strips creating a most attractive area.
- Bickleigh Street and Bickleigh Court are attractive tree lined streets with wide nature strips. Bickleigh Street abuts the northern end of the Howard Dawson Reserve which is on the east side of Burke Road.
- Council have recently located a “No right turn” sign on the corner of Park Road and Toorak Road in an attempt to stop the heavy flow of traffic doing the “rat run” from Burke Road via Nepean Street to Toorak Road. Previously these rat

runners would turn right at Toorak Road from Park Street and travel East in Toorak Road, having avoided the intersection of Toorak and Burke Roads, which is grid locked in peak hours. Furthermore there is a “No right turn” sign facing traffic in Burke Road at Toorak Road.

5. Burke Road South Reserve

- Situated at the south end of Parkin Street it is edged with housing from Faircroft Ave and trees along its southern boundary. It is used by residents and employees of Coles Myer. It has playground equipment and BBQs. Cricket and Rugby are played on the oval part of the Reserve.

6. Howard Dawson Reserve

- The Howard Dawson Reserve, surrounded by trees, has a sporting pavilion oval, open space, a modern children’s playground, new basket ball court and BBQ area.
- South Camberwell Tennis Club is located at the northern end of the reserve and has 4 courts and a club house; all located a few metres north of the Monash Freeway entrance/exit and overpass
- The playground is very modern and regularly visited by many children and their parents. Likewise, resident cricket clubs, both senior and junior teams play each season, as do soccer clubs. Traffic is very heavy in Burke Road now, and presents a danger for the safety of children in this area.

7. Gardiners Creek

- Gardiners Creek forms the southern boundary of the site, together with the Open space and reserve which abuts onto the bike and pedestrian path.

8. West side of Toorong Road

- With the exception of a two story office building on the south west corner of Toorak and Toorong Road, the western side of Toorong Road is primarily residential, as is the southern side of Toorak Road immediately to the west of Toorong Road where there are a number of apartments.

9. Monash Freeway

- The Monash Freeway adjacent to the creek is now a major East west road carrying tens of thousands of cars each day. The traffic is so dense on the Monash Freeway that the Government has announced that it will construct another lane to improve the traffic flow. Serious concerns regarding the impact of traffic congestion in relation to the C70 proposal are discussed elsewhere in this submission.