

BAYSIDE CITY COUNCIL

MANAGING GROWTH IN CHELTENHAM AND PENNYDALE

Workshop Meeting Notes

**Saturday 21st October and
Wednesday 25th October**

OUR WORKSHOP PURPOSE

To update the community on the progress with the Structure Plan, share feedback from the first round of community consultation and for the community to provide input into the next steps in the development of the draft structure plan.

PLEASE NOTE: All comments have been transcribed from participants hand written notes by the session facilitators, MosaicLab. Care has been taken to capture verbatim comments, some inconsistency may exist due to illegible handwriting. For clarification on any content please refer to the facilitators directly on Keith@mosaiclab.com.au

POSSIBLE FUTURES NO. 1

Baseline / No change - the area would retain its existing zoning (General Residential Zone) which allows up to 3 storey development throughout the Study Area.

Participants offered some reflection on data provided by the Council's consultancy team.



CONCERNED BY...

Laminex site being used as a development site. Your theoretical numbers are just made up. Do not take into account Mirvac. Why is there no structure plan on this model? Why is there a Heather Grove? Why is laminex 'a green wedge' now a residential development in this plan?

Possibility of 3 storeys. Why is there a walkway to Southland station along Heather Grove? That does not exist and PTV has said there wont be a walkway there. Car parking / development along Jack Rd - we will lose even more open space. Reality is that 2 dwellings per lot is happening throughout Pennydale.

Reverse planning that is presented. No real modelling done for 1. Parking, massive cars on streets. Car traffic much heavier and can take up to 10 minutes to enter Bay Rd. Not consulting with Kingston as this concerns them and is not working in congestion. Option 2 and 3 absolutely no! Southland Station was not originally a commuter station. Bay Rd too narrow for bike and pedestrian improvements. getting out into Bay Rd and Park Rd.

Options 2 and 3 isolate the community from the green spaces both by the 3 plus storey buildings and expected increase in Park Rd to a major road. This development concentrates development in Pennydale.

Bay Rd footpath under bridge totally unsafe!

Does not allow for better open space, vegetation, residential amenities, cycling paths, pedestrian access to Cheltenham. Could make assumption that further subdivision of lots is going to occur, along all roads - this hasn't been included. No traffic at Park Rd, Jack Rd and Bay Rd. No innovation.

No open space at north end of Jack Road. The laminex strip should be retained as open space, since they are disadvantaged by open space. A structure plan can be implemented for this option.

Poor traffic modelling. Considers only increase due to Blvd. areas, makes no mention that intersections to Bay Road are dangerous now due to wait times 5 mins.

Gaps in the planning around traffic management. Basically they will only plan for traffic once the future plan is decided. But how can we decide on future plan without considering the traffic management?

The outer ring of 2 dwellings per lot seems very arbitrary and ignores things like heritage dwellings. Potential high - rise on Laminex Road land. Loss of neighbourhood character if 3 storeys happen throughout Pennydale.

Already existing high levels of parking + traffic - Vrail alternative requiring residents to apply for permits is outrageous. They should be forwarded with rate notices for residents.

The constant referral to 3 storey development and the underplaying of 2 storey preferred. Council (Bayside) imposing parking fees re visitor parking without consultation. Too much theoretical modelling re traffic flow and little seeking of input from residents.

Possible ad hoc development.

Poor clarity of content.

By people needing to apply for a parking permit very unfair - rates are high enough. New lights? Graham / Bay Rd / Jack Rd - work only when can, so yes at Jack / Graham.

Half - half bicycle paths put pedestrians out at junctions or are taken up by parked cars.

Lack of infrastructure - parking, pedestrian crossings, traffic already in Pennydale.

That Bayside council does not care about the impact of the residents lives these 3 storey structures have not only by home owners. Bay Road will never sustain the traffic going into 3 storey buildings where cars are coming out of Munro Avenue. Who will be responsible for the 'deaths' in this area it's hard enough to get out of Munro Avenue now.

Why not a structure plan for this - Why can this not contain a more stringent version of what we current situation we have. - High development before Paul St. - Less development after more than 2 storey is covering?

Why Kingston development on highway near South & near Cheltenham Station is not being factored in.

Does not address need for higher density housing.

Blanketed 3 stories - Lack of existing concerns.

Asked to provide input when existing problems have not been addressed and no baseline established for future development planning, why?

By presumptions that council is making after supposed consultations with residences.

A structure plan should cover this option 1. The other options (i.e.. 2 + 3) are unacceptable in terms of housing density & traffic & parking.

60 Tulip Grove opened - Jack Rd / Laminex buffer zone development - No traffic / parking modelling on current + future Mirvac / Cheltenham station and Southland Station. Numbers? People? Traffic? What are they?

Walkability map assumes 60 Tulip Grove is open. Sounds like option 1 has no certainty. Study does not include Mirvac traffic. Even in current state average development per site would be 2.5 (guess) (example 5 on same blocks), 1 on others.

Capacity of Bay, Jack, Park Roads if proposed two dwellings per lot occur. Will council allow two dwellings per lot in other parts of Pennydale? What affect will that have on intersections then?

Decision looks pre determined - Amateur analysis based on local Bayside data point - Information has not been properly gathered and assessed. - Gaps in analysis e.g. agreed developments (Mircvac).

I am concerned that Bayside council treats Pennydale as Cinderella, our wishes have been ignored, the council has decided which area is a residential area and which is a community zone?

Here is your local New Southland Station - now hand over to the developers.

Implementation of high rise inappropriate development in Pennydale. Overly restrictive newly implemented parking restrictions.

Bay Road footpath under bridge totally unsafe!

Does not allow for better open spaces, vegetation, residential amenities, cycling paths, pedestrians access to Cheltenham. Could make assumption that further subdivision of lots is going to occur along all roads (this hasn't been included). No traffic light at Park Road / Jack Road + Bay Road. No innovation.

No open space at North end of Jack Road The Laminex strip should be retained as open space, since they are disadvantaged by open space. A structure plan can be implemented for this option 1.

Poor traffic modelling - considers only increase due to growth Areas makes no mention that intersection to Bay Road are dangerous now due to wait times (5mins).

Gaps in the planning around traffic management. Basically they will only plan for traffic one the plan is decided. But how can we decide on future plan without considering the traffic management.

What can we expect if we have no structure plan.

4 storey buildings - Parking - Traffic.

Traffic

State government over riding and making a disaster of it as they do with most things.

Promised infrastructure not being delivered. Traffic station getting onto feeder roads inadequate.

Inappropriate development in Pennydale.

Having no structure plan in place is concerning.

3 storey are over whole area. This should be better designed to protect existing.

What is the maximum storey limit on a 2 dwellings per lot. Is it still 3? Traffic from Mirvac - Congestion at Park + Jack Roads (both ends).

A plan of do nothing when something has to be done to meet the higher plans mean that this will be ignored by the powers that be.

The possible imposition of over development by the State government in pursuit of Plan Melb. over riding structure plan develop by council.

Both options are not viable Bay Road development mult storey is not sustainable . Pushing activity centre and councils own agenda. Impact on the community with the introduction of high density housing. Crime, Traffic, Noise.

Over development - increased traffic - loss of amenity.

Option 1 + 2 do not show opening of Tulip Grove to Southland Station yet SJB advised they would recommend it. How will residents views be gathered on this?

Plans are not realistic and do not reflect the values of the Pennydale residents.

The future plans based on 'higher' thinking and not actualities.

Inability to address infrastructure issues - traffic . Park Road traffic worsening - Car parking

Focus is on S'land stations 'the' station to be utilised. No mention has been made of Cheltenham Station. Huge assumption that S'land station is the priority main focus . This is supposed to be a DESTINATION station only to service Southland shops. So why so much focus on t?

Lack of consideration of the potential impacts from near developments (traffic) - Mirvac - Removal of Park Road x'ing - Kingston developments on other side of rail near Southland - Increased use of Cheltenham park oval.

It is Not 'No Change' we do not have 3 storeys at present.

Last chance to obtain open green space on Jack Road. - Your graph / study shows that Jack Road residents are disadvantaged for green space - But it is still not in the 'possible futures' to allow more green space!

The fact that 'no change' actually required a lot of change. Although people around Jack Road are disadvantaged by lack of 'green space', there has been no thought into adding green space i.e.. existing green space on Laminex site.

May not be accepted by the state government as a structure plan.

Lack of open space in western area of Pennydale. Laminex strip of land has a caveat to not build on it. So why not make it or zone it open space to benefit the lack of open space available to residents. And this is set up, it will be reviewed every 4 -10 years so still not certainty.

Traffic back up in Park Road from reserve + Charman now + future when rail begun. Jack Road across to Park + Bay already Jack can't turn right into park. Jack Road into Bay when Pedestrian lights red Jack blocked by right turn vehicles. Answer traffic lights both ends will improve.

High density development (more than 3 units / dwellings per 800m2 lot or less. Developments greater than 3 storeys.

Traffic congestion on Jack Road. Existing Jack Road onto Bay Road + Park Road.

My main concern is the association by name of tying Pennydale which is a suburb (Bayside) to Southland which is a shopping centre (Kingston).

Pennydale changes of name 8 - 10 months. High density - less spots in schools - Parking / traffic. Forecast I D didn't include the golf course into vacant land so that's good. Option 1 is not really an option too conservative.

An unregulated 3 storey height limit & developers pushing for inappropriate dwellings in Pennydale.

Assessment that Jack Road / Bay Road intersection will 'operate within capacity' under this model. Increased car parking requirements throughout area to new development. Lack of consideration of impact of level crossing removal on traffic / pedestrian.

No concerns with current. Possibility to incrementally improve within a medium density framework.

Overall increase in population will triple the size of Pennydale? Storey development is too excessive.

Whole area losing it's identity. Trees will be knocked down. More traffic.

Urban design consult, traffic + parking + transport consult. SJB consultants - urban. Jack Rd not a main road. State planning? Has identified Southland - Cheltenham. GRZ up to 3 as is now! Info in this room is from the Southland side not Pennydale advisory group. Experience of consultants. When were the tenders for the consultants just called for and how many were received.

No pedestrian access from Pennydale into Southland Station via Heather Grove.

The logic behind the need for a structure plan and it's ability to protect the core of Pennydale. Why isn't there any development proposed for the south end of Jack Rd?

Lack of consultation and errors.

These plans are proposed without consulting Vic Roads, LXRA, PTV. Lack of genuine data for a structure plan based on infill and current development.

The lack of weight our concerns are given by council repeatedly. Spending money on ill advised consultants.



COMFORTED BY...

Preferred model - no change! Still allows up to 3 storeys why we purchased in this area?
Traffic is controlled. Can we have a preferred height of 2 storey now?

That this is actually an option, even though it is not "no change".

Nothing sadly!

Option 3 concentrated development immediately adjacent to Southland station makes sense.

Retaining existing residential character. Willingness to accept this model as the basis of a structure plan. Comfort with my existing way of life.

Not much. The level of activity that residents care about their community and providing feedback.

No extreme change with significantly larger dwellings.

The fact that a basically status quo option is presented is encouraging but will this be seriously considered? Pedestrian crossing at Park Rd / Railway line (Much needed!) - but LxRA are doing that anyway. - But does this count as a structure plan basis?

The cohesion of the community Pennydale + Cheltenham Parks.

The fact that this meeting occurred.

More controlled development.

2 new pedestrians crossings.

No 3 storey or higher developments in Pennydale.

Not comforted at all by the impact of our way of living and our children + friends can't even visit us unless we pay \$70+ this is truly about greed we should have at least 4 per home.

If done properly max 2 storey over the area. This is preferable.

Two dwellings per lot but even better multi unit development on every 3rd lot as per some Sydney councils impose on development.

Nothing. I have no trust in council looking after the interests of Pennydale. Trucks should be barred along Park Road. Safety issues to pedestrians.

Focus on improving accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists.

There is an option to keep Pennydale on 2 and 3 storey.

With the new parking restriction I would be unable to have a family gathering due to 2 hours parking restrictions for 365 days a year! At least the weekends or public holidays these should be no parking restrictions e.g. 'Christmas' etc.

Continue what we know.

Lack of council accepting ratepayers requests to implement reasonable parking restrictions, now it is 2 homes and we have to pay for permits. Where else does this happen in Bayside?

Maintaining neighbourhood characters. Minimizing future uncertainties.

Yes - preferred model no change! Still allows up to 3 storey why we purchased in this area. Traffic is controlled. Can we have a prefer height of 2 storey now?

That this is actually an option, even though it is not 'no change'.

Nothing sadly!

Option 3 : Concentrated development immediately adjacent to Southland Station makes sense.

Retaining existing residential character - willingness to accept this models the basis of a structure plan- comfort with my existing way of life.

Not much. The level of activity that residents care about their community and providing feedback.

No extreme change with significantly larger dwellings.

Council organising meetings - Please keep us informed.

Redevelopment of the Laminex site would relieve the pressure on Pennydale.

This does not provide a 'walled city' which is in option 2. I believe more developments close to train stations make sense. Further along Park Road does not make sense.

The opportunity to come + listen + be informed moving forward .

The professionalism of the facilitation team + the preparation that has occurred.

Community participation in the process.

Park Road - Bay road.

Community passion - lots if people care about this!

People who live in Pennydale. Ability to protest, ability to lobby politicians , ability to investigate link between Bayside CEO and developers - keep you posted!

Community - Polite - Cohesive - Inclusive - Generous - Everything BCC isn't.

Structure for 2 storey is possible.

Can we also consider Water sensitive urban design sustainability considered in the design guidelines please?

Degree of community interest.

Nothing.

We need a traffic lane management plan showing where reductions in lanes i.e.. 2 to1 in each direction implications of cycle track between rail bridge + reserve road. B doubled can take a whole change of lights to turn from reserve road into Park Road.

Maintains the existing neighbourhood character being mainly one and two storey development. 4 storey apartments not possible.

Inside areas of Pennydale appear to maintain their existing built form - Outcome and neighbourhood.

Alcohol.

Future developments would need to cater for parking to remove / limit the number of cars parked on the street. This option looks like the most acceptable of all options presented.

These plans are not sanctioned by the Southland / Pennydale Cheltenham advisory group. But why? Weren't they part of this presentation.

The ability of the community of Pennydale to come together.



FRUSTRATED BY...

Let's build future 1 into a structure plan. Only double storeys, no more than 2 on a block.

Why isn't government planning to build over train line but this is not on plan? Traffic assessment not complete! Everything in the process. Process is not asking for feedback but dictating changes not yet properly investigated. "Proposed" changes are gross overdevelopment that is Bayside selling Cheltenham to developers so the richer suburbs don't have it! Why is Mirvac / Jack Rd not considered in these plans and traffic management?

This is not no change.

Maps out of date and not current. Traffic. Too high density. Narrow streets.

Walkability analysis not correct in regard to 60 Tulip Grove. It is not open to new station.

Doesn't include open space along Jack Rd. Walkability to Southland isn't accurate (should only reflect long term view of station closure to Pennydale). Traffic predictions do not assume dual OCC development across Pennydale. Please remove pedestrian access from Heather Grove to Southland. LXRA implications of residential developments not included. No vegetation analysis or built form analysis presented.

Council not taking this option seriously, when residents love the low density character of the area.

If future 1 is not sanctioned by state government, why put it in as a possible scenario?

The way Southland Station is being used as an excuse to as an excuse to destroy our neighbourhood. The actual criteria for an activity centre seem to be absent from Pennydale - Yet they exist at Southland but the railway line is a major barrier to Pennydale.

1. The failure of the CEO to be at the meeting. 2. I have no faith in the consultation process - the high handed return of council re parking permits + charges in symptomatic of the lack of professional consultation.

An over emphasis on the needs of potential future residents at the expense of existing residents. The consultative process is all about how to develop our residential area - need a structure plan for 'No change' with regulations.

Paths under Bay bridge disgraceful + dangerous.

Not enough pedestrian crossing on Park Road and Bay Road.

2 hour parking restrictions - paid visitor parking for rate paying residents - traffic issues , particularly turning out of Pennydale onto Bay Road.

I feel like we are victims of tourism in our own homes. People will be looking over our backyards in these 3 storey monstrosities on Bay Road. Over Munro Avenue there are apartments all over Melbourne that are empty why more? There is an over supply of these dog boxes, 30 apartments on corner of Bay Road and Munro Avenue is totally crazy most apartments will have more than 2 people living in them so many more cars.

Why the possibility is not discussed properly. There should be greater development along Jack Rd & near Southland Station & Cheltenham Station.

The current difficulties with traffic is Park Road not being appreciated. The study area needs to include access to Cheltenham Station & Cheltenham Park.

Walkability analysis filmed 60 Tulip Grove Closed.

Why ask for consultation when future assessments modelling are still required? Poor research methodology + research around planning assumptions - e.g. Walkability of 5 minute to Southland Station. 60 Tulip Grove does not provide access to the station so the walkability shading is just plain wrong. Bay Road is a Vic Road responsibility nothing to do with council , therefore not part of the structure plan - relevance again! What does Vic Roads say?

Consultants presentations were lacking. Many inaccuracies. Traffic prevention seems to ignore Mirvac development that will impact the study area. Also ignores level crossing removal at Cheltenham station.

Modelling predicted on 60 Tulip Grove - Conflicting info about Jack / Laminex buffer - Plans presented info do not factor any traffic or parking modelling from current + future Mirvac, Cheltenham and Southland train stations. 2hr parking 365 days = Stupid. No numbers?

Apparent lack of desire to keep zoning as is. The intersection increased numbers are incorrect - they only count increase from blue boxes (2 dwellings) but in reality all properties in Pennydale could have 2+ dwellings, therefore intersection numbers would balloon and certainly fall into a red circle category - Mirvac development traffic has not been included in these assessments.

Assumptions made by consultants regarding impact on intersections and ignoring impact on Bay, Park + Jack. Consultants ignoring impact of Mirvac development and train stations on the area and possible futures. Council not operating on factual data / info e.g. buffer zone.

Inaccurate drawings - is this based on lies to us or incompetence? - Not enough time to discuss. - Are we being snowballed by information? - So many errors in drawings / plans + observations. This is our lives.

Green wedge on Jack Road showing development.

No plans has been presented to improve amenities although no change is going to make in terms of dwelling perspective, the traffic around Pennydale will increase nevertheless. Particularly after new Charmin Road intersection and Mirvac site is finished.

Let's build future 01 into a structure plan. Only double storey no more than 2 on a block

Why isn't government plan to build over Cheltenham train line but this is not on plan Traffic assessment not complete!!! Everything in the process. Process is not asking for feedback but dictating changes not yet properly investigated. 'Proposed' changes are gross over development that is Bayside selling Chelt & Highett to developers so the richer suburbs don't have it! Why is Mirvac / Jack Road not considered on these plans and traffic management? When was parking & traffic survey done - before 2hour parking or after? They have not included the Mirvac exit onto Jack Road soon or those cars - Build certainty into this plan. Need to move Bay Road lights to Jack Road. Why is Heather Grove walk way to Southland Station?

This is NOT 'No change'.

Maps out of date and not current. Traffic , Traffic, Traffic. Too high density. Narrow streets.

Lack of detail still.

Over shadowing.

Traffic.

Why this plan could not be viewed as a base with stricter control - Lack of analysis of 'now' in this option. This 'as is' option does not reflect what is there now.

It may not be in a structure plan.

Traffic already not well managed around Mirvac development on Jack Road + either end on Jack Road. Current traffic data represented is grossly underestimated.

The illusion of choice that has been presented. Here 3 options: 1 Do nothing, 2. Higher level than the CR2, 3. Stupid idea which no one will support.

Council not listening - continuing to push their agenda regardless of community concerns. Not providing options that are fair on the whole community. Putting people under enormous stress releasing options that show our houses being engulfed.

Is anyone listening? Does council / state government really care? Flawed traffic options including rail crossing removals.

Council officer assumptions. Develop Laminex, who want to sell the site?

Feeling rushed through not taken seriously by council officers. Disagree with council officer assumptions. Julianna + Katanya are rude + selective in responses . I am concerned that these are the officers who are selectively briefing the elected councillors. They already have an appalling track record. C125, C140, C150 , C151, c126...as well as the repeatedly criticised Bayside Housing Strategy 2012.

Please provide guidance on what should happen with the properties acquired by LxRA.

Lack of any control over the whole process.

Proposal does not include increased density that is already happening throughout Pennydale - i.e.. single houses are being replaced by 2 or 3 townhouses - why can't that be taken as option for interested density not 3 storeys?

Use of flawed data. Use at external agencies to come up with plan on an area they don't know! Not taking into account future traffic from Mirvac + Park Road crossing.

As above! Lack of understanding / knowledge of 'planning' teams involved. Given incorrect / misleading information. i.e. No access to station from Tulip Grove.

Why can't we talk about only 2 storey high and no more than 2 on a block and look at how this meets with what the state government require.

What we can't influence' - why? State government policy determines activity centres so it is up to local councils to determine the boundaries so local councils can influence and change activity centre boundaries. Residents 'desire' has been misconstrued from suggestive questioning in the survey. Jack Road is not a 'main' road.

Park Road. Failure of removal of car park along kerb west of rail xing when cars turning into car park (to drop off + pick up kids primary school) holds up traffic for several minutes. A car parks on kerb over Charman opposite commonwealth Bank hold up traffic to Nepean Highway. Tail backs to rail xing + beyond . Remove parking change lights to stop all traffic + allow diagonal Pedestrian crossing intersection.

Why can't they rezone Laminex site to residential?

It is unclear to me possible whether possible future1 includes a structure plan - if this option is successful - who determines this structure?

The 'overreach' of Southland activity centre (which in plan Melbourne is in Kingston) into Pennydale.

Others options not considered.

Lack of transparency - lack of parking - lack of taking any notice of local residents.

What % of social housing do the developers have to commit to , to get their planning permits?

Lack of community input into finer details. Why was plan / option 3 removed? What is the process behind this?

Lack off consultation and errors. Why did you not include the advisory group.

The number of basic errors in the proposals, incorrect railway crossing , no inclusion of Mirvac cons, buildings on the Jack Road green wedge.

The council continuing to push their own zealous approach to development at all cost, despite lack of evidence , need or thorough research.



ANYTHING ELSE...

Keep as is. No more than 2 dwellings on a block. No more than 2 storeys high. I want this to be the model for the Southland / Pennydale structure plan.

When was parking and traffic survey done - before 2 hour parking or after? The have not included the Mirvac exit onto Jack Road soon or those cars. Build certainty into this plan. Need to move Bay Road lights to Jack Rd. Why is Heather Grove walkway to Southland station?

Why can't this be the structure plan? Why does map only show 2 dwellings per lot along Bay, Jack and Park Rd? Re pedestrian connection to Southland station - map should show pedestrian crossing across railway at bottom of Heather Grove and walkway along Kingston.

Need much more community consulting. Many questions still to be answered with more detail given. Need much more community consultation. How were the consultants chosen? Why were consultants not also working with Kingston too?

Why does no structure plan fit this model? Would be great to consider structure plan for this model with some amendments. Where's the evidence of more pressure will necessitate development in the absence of a structure plan (e.g. 6 storey development close to station). Can we optimise incremental change on this model based on retaining 2 storey preferred?

Should be a maximum of 2 storeys. Council decides what happens not Plan Melbourne, so it can be altered. Rezone to NRZ.

Need to have more measurements made of existing Bay Rd intersections. Put traffic lights at corner or Park and Bay Rd instead of away from the Centre.

While frustrated by 2 and 3, future 1 is not ideal either as all proposals take away from the character and peacefulness we have had in the area.

Worried that this work is based on flawed fundamentals e.g.. 2012 housing strategy (panel C140 described this as 'fundamentally' flawed.). Walkability analysis assumes 60 Tulip Grove is open. Pedestrian line from Heather Grove to Southland Station is not feasible.

I received an email from council traffic dept. informing me that it had no statistics in business hours traffic flows along Bay Road., I was to consult Vic Roads! Surely a council contemplating structure plans in Pennydale would have these statistics at hand. Preferred 2 storey in dwellings should be a mandatory limit.

What is the timeline? Consultants referred to 'big picture' thinking'. When are specific recommendations to be made and implemented? Can a timeline be published for residents?

Parking: 2 hour limit for over 365 days is antisocial and anti family gatherings. 2 hour is not enough time for a family get together for Christmas lunch, cup day, foody friends etc. Southland was 3 hours - 4 hours is good for a family gathering. would relieve all day commuter problem - for Mon - Fri with weekends unrestricted.

Pennydale residents should not be impacted by the Southland Station and councils vision for this part of Bayside.

What's wrong with our government they are not thinking about their people, it's all about greed not need! God help us all.

Max 2 Sbray. Need greater development past Jack Rd. (West of Jack Rd) and leave neighbourhood as is. Why no development closer to train? Isn't all of area 2 per block anyway?

When is another community consultation session being held to discuss possible future options 2 +3 ? Obviously not enough time allocated to the Saturday afternoon session considering the level of concerns by the local residents and the number of issues raised. Please all day sessions.

Traffic and parking report does not take into account existing conditions. Traffic, congestion of parking already at capacity. Let alone contemplating option 2 and 3.

Buffer zone - in what situation could this be developed?

Who has decided that Pennydale needs to change? What elected government official made this decision?

Allows for controlled development within current zone.

Leave Pennydale alone!

I want railway connection via Heather Grove and Tulip Grove. Don't want bridge too hard to get over if you have a disability.

What are the chances of state government over riding the whole plan?

I would like to see a mix of option 1 + 2 with development closer to the stations. Stay with 400m walkability to stations.

What population growth would this accommodate compared to now which is mainly single storey dwellings / some dual 2 storey - 3 storey of this option? Does this meet future needs? What is future needs you are trying to accommodate? Would this be accepted by state government.

Interested to see the transparency that has been applied and the hidden agenda / misdirection that has already occurred.

Possible future 01 is not a viable option. Possible future 02 would be preferred at this stage

Mirvac Jack Road needs another exit

Our house has been blocked out. by both plans on Bay Road development. This feels like Big Brother Bullying. Development should be similar to existing premises. House for house No multi storey units.

Car parking with surrounding developments not in Pennydale - Mirvac / Southland station - Charman Road unit development.

No change preferred.

The concept of variable height for buildings stepping down to 2 stories adjacent to other properties is really important to me as a resident on Churchill Avenue with option 2 having development on both sides of my property (assuming LXRA acquired sites will also be developed).

Possible plans (parking - traffic should record) Do not include nearby developments.

01 +2 - Why does our area which has had a station added to our area for destination of a shopping centre, why so we need to be reactive to accommodate those needs?

We need to fix this 'possible future' before even considering adding any more dwellings to the area.

Questions were not answered to put people at ease.

Traffic Jack Road. Bay + Park traffic light (not pedestrians in Bay Road). Agreed cycle tracks feed into Heather over rail xing, dense existing lane to Jean St. + North to Southland shops + railway, no need for rail access from Tulip Grove.

If this option is maintained what will be done to improve infrastructure? Highett's structure plan is being reviewed now because 'the last one was in 2006' - will this one be reviewed in 11 years despite telling us it is to shape the area the next 20 years?

Cycling and pedestrian access need improvement. Potential walking / cycling shared path along Park Road from Cheltenham Station to Reserve Road intersection. Need for garden space requirements to maintain Pennydale garden aspect.

Should consider options for incremental growth within a medium density framework. Medium density = 1 or 2 storey as per definition in p18 of background report. Can we have a structure based around the 'as is' built form.

Should not be planned on what non local people require.

Community housing supply info near Station proximately plus remainder do S/H . Once majority sold at high prices i.e.. Sandy Hill - Bay Rd. State planning policy - State planning controls -can maybe influence - Wouldn't they go together ?! Partnerships - Government + private.

Listen to your rate payers + constituents.

Frustrated that these proposals are based on 165 exchanges 'higher thinking' and not genuine community consultation.

I would like to see a proper researched thoroughly community consulted structure plan based on this promise led by the community advisory group.

POSSIBLE FUTURES NO. 2

Limited Change - the lots fronting Bay Road would be rezoned to Mixed Use Zone to encourage shops, cafes and offices along Bay Road with residential above. Development of up to 4 storeys would be allowed along Bay and Park Road and along some of the west side of Jack Road. The remaining area retains its existing zoning (General Residential Zone) which allows up to 3 storey development.

Participants offered some reflection on data provided by the Council's consultancy team



CONCERNED BY...

Urban design walkability map is not valid as 60 Tulip grove is not accessible to the station. 3 storey dwellings / buildings does not fit in the area. 4 storeys.

Possible laneway off Bay Rd? No! Bay Rd mixed use - why? We are near shops etc. already. No! we do not want mixed development. Tulip Grove as a through road to Bay Rd. Too much traffic. Existing information and data is not included or known by staff.

4 storeys - not acceptable at all. This is not limited change.

Not wanted! No.

The proposed setbacks will likely be used as decks - effectively overlooking all neighbours.

Assumption that 60 Tulip Grove is open - all indications state long term review only. Pennydale becoming an area surrounded by high rise. Too much development. No guarantee that state government will keep to height limit - out of our control. No innovation. Mixed use on Bay Rd simply not required. No mention of open space requirements for large scale development. Analyses do not include safety, crime and other social issues arising.

Is there any transition requirement in heights of buildings back from Bay Rd?

4 storeys on Park Rd.

This is not limited change! Developers on Jack Road open space / buffer zone (Laminex). Excessive increase in population.

The language being used is misleading 'limited change' this is in fact 'extreme change'!

3 + 4 storey developments in Pennydale - inappropriate development + not keeping with the character of the area. Infrastructure issues - parking, traffic, safety.

This is significant change and is greater density not coincide near the train station which is obviously the natural extension place.

Needs more traffic lights in Park Road - Should include Mirvac development.

Continuing Luxmoore St over Jack Road. - Traffic - Safety - Surrounded by high rise 'Ghetto!!' Children's interaction on current street scape.

The proposed changes - in particular density numbers.

4 storey developments - the traffic analysis doesn't take into consideration known changes in surrounding areas, Mirvac level crossing removal.

That the transition from 2 - 4 could involve overlooking outdoor areas. Amenity of neighbouring properties compromised due to the noise.

Limited' no it's not change. No inclusion of Jack Road , Mirvac development traffic figures. Bicycle lane proposal without consultation with Vic Roads.

The development on Park road, particularly that , that encroaches into the neighbourhood beyond a plot deep. The loss of privacy and loss of value to my house (Tulip Grove) - The loss of character for the area - the increased traffic . I purchased in residential area for comfort + safety, this looks to be destroyed.

The locality of proposed high density to my house. Over shadowing my property.

Unable to turn right into Park, Bay Roads. Park Road traffic and tracks. Car parking.

Use of heritage overlay land - loss of street scape / poor design - Use of a Laminex land that a caveat on it prevents - No consideration to the specific change in type of number of dwellings - No consideration of population change - Absurd assumption in the change of traffic.

Continued push towards further subdivision and 3 and 4 storey buildings - There was no design brief given to the urban designers - There appears to be a set agenda to greatly increase the population of Pennydale against the wishes of the residents.

What will happen if people still drive everywhere? Has this been considered. Not enough parking will be provided for 4 storey development - 1 car space for a 2 bedroom unit is unacceptable as potential w people will sleep in that 1 bed so 2 cars. A 3brm appt. could have 4 people (family) + 4 cars, where do the others park? - days of 1 car family are non existent. Are parking permits going to be issued to all?

Same as for future!

3 + 4 storeys is not appropriate at all - This is not 'limited change'

Pennydale already has 39.97 density - this is high - heritage - Increase traffic flow within 400m of a primary school and kinder.

Everything!

Set back planning control for Bay Road and Park Road from 4 storey development.

Over shadowing - transient renters who offer no value to community.

Whether all Bayside structure plans have been developed / preferred holistically. Are population targets even across plans? Is Pennydale planned to have more growth or density than Brighton / Sandy/ Hampton?

Traffic congestion on Jack Road - Exiting Jack Road onto Bay + Park Road.

Over development of our suburb.

Is the proposed number of carparks required for developments only being seen as imparting the Jack Road / Bay Road intersect & one part of Park Road. Not addressing the increased traffic on Park Road once level crossing removed. No consideration to increased services that this will require in particular for Kindergarten & schools. That the family home I and my husband have worked so hard for (with 2 young children) is going to be engulfed by a concrete jungle.

Cycling Bay Road - Bay / Jack intersection - Park Road crossing - garden limits - trucks Park Road - Kinder pedestrian crossing ? - Footpath / Bike / Walk path along Park Road to Tulip-Tulip Grove playground - Bay Road shopping strip - Parking. 4 storey development on Jack Road - this is not a major arterial and very narrow - different to Bay Road + Park Road . Pressure on infrastructure (kinders, schools) with population not addressed. Existing difficulty for pedestrian access to open space at Cheltenham Park - Tulip Grove is not enough and impossible to safely cross with pram / young children. Increase noise, pollution due to increase in people + cars

That we be hamstrung to accept 4 storey or suffer the consequences of state government. 3 storeys along all Park, Bay + Jack Roads. How on earth can we accommodate more people + cars ? Sandy hospital is at capacity - schools are bursting at the seams.

4 storeys along Jack , Park + Bay Roads. How on earth can we accommodate all the extra people + cars? Where is the investment for essential services such as hospitals, schools ? They are already stretched to limits.

If my property adjoins a high density site coverage site and I can not develop to this density i.e.. 50% site coverage etc. will I be compensated for the loss of my property or given the same development opportunity of my property

Rear tearing being looked at, what about tearing on side boundaries of existing town houses developments / homes?

Possible change to turning options at Jack / Bay for traffic. Greatly concerned by proposed 4 storey developments along Park / Jack + Bay Roads.

Why isn't the west side of Jack Road included in the development plan?

Up to 4 storey buildings along Park Road , which is already stretched to capacity. It can take up to 10 minutes to move from Jack Road to Reserve Road at 8.30am weekday mornings. Squashing more development in this area will put a a train on this system, pushing it to capacity.

Lack of consultation + errors + repeated mistakes like C125.

compulsorily acquire these properties - proposed new Bus stops but without consultation with relevant authorities and without costings.

Proposal to build along Bay Road. Proposal laneway behind Bay Road. Proposed heights of said buildings.



COMFORTED BY...

Retaining the trees and streetscapes. 4 storeys have set back consideration.

Nothing! Look at the C125 data as we still agree we do not want this!

Retaining 2 storey for majority of Pennydale. Setbacks considered for built form.

The consensus in the Pennydale community that this is a plan that would result in more dangerous roads and an environment where many unwanted buildings are allowed to be built.

Retaining greenery / landscape.

There is nothing here of comfort. I can see no benefits, only costs in loss of amenity in future.

Nothing - there is no benefit to residents of Pennydale increased traffic, too many residents, less safety for children + elderly, insufficient parking.

Good idea to have laneway at back of Bay Road development.

First indication of better use of residential zoned land on the Laminex site.

Potential bike paths should be option1 - Nothing.

Transition to normal neighbourhood could be 4 storey to 2 storey. I believe this is the only acceptable option.

Very concerned by huge impact on local residents / community that traffic + density will have. People will feel pushed out of their community. Really concerned about a 4 storey being built backing on to my home. Effect on property prices for future change (i.e.) safety on roads for pedestrian traffic.

The future plans not taking into account the natural growth internal to the area. Each street in the last 5 years has increased by 30% so only future plan should indicate this natural growth.

Extremely concerned with removal of Park road level crossing and associated works. What will council do to install a signalised pedestrian crossing immediately?

Does not include Mirvac site traffic figures. Lack of consultation with Vic Roads.

I would be comforted by seeing development for family homes / town houses. A maximum of 2 storey, when this impacts a neighbouring property. Apartments within this residential area (outside the immediate trackline) is not good and I object strongly.

The rest of Pennydale community has the same opinion.

None of the proposal.

Nothing!

Bicycle path for parked good. Bay Road bicycle path needs to be cleverly designed and clearly marked from Railway bridge to reserve road.

HaHa!

How does surrounding Pennydale high density work / supported by fact of figures? Where is the centre of the activity centre?

Nothing is comforting - how can this be 'limited' change?

The number of errors noted by the participants.. Hopefully these were all corrected and will be forwarded to relevant people.



FRUSTRATED BY...

60 Tulip St is currently not open for access to the train station, so the walkability map done by the urban design consultants is misleading.

4 storey limit is too much. Over development includes too much traffic and parking issues. Ghetto! Parking and traffic are not taking into account existing or the proposed for Bay Rd development.

All of the suggested high rise development.

Bay Rd not suitable for bike and pedestrians. Options 2 and 3 are not viable.

No increase in open space - consider retaining Jack Road open space. No vegetation and open space analysis included as promised by council. No VicRoads consultation on options. Doesn't include consideration of innovative solutions. Doesn't consider meeting targets through LXRA, extended Mirvac and possibility of mixed (business and residential developments) in BBD. This is significant not small change.

Possible future 1 is ideal but needs work, but possible future 2 is worse.

4 storey development right next to my single storey house reducing natural light, especially during the winter.

Do not want this.

No 'quid pro quo' protections / improvements in the Pennydale hinderland - just more maximum density development on edges? We need more protection against over development.

Lack of consultation with residents.

Not considering development around the station.

Needs to include Cheltenham Park & Cheltenham Station to get proper idea of traffic. This is fine for all the 'possible futures'.

Everything!

Lots of talk of process and procedure by Bayside council, lots of talk but where is the action and protection of residents property + assets.

That greater concentration not considered around Southland - that is an obvious choice!
The lack of consideration of areas outside 'Pennydale'.

That there is at least a medium plan put forward.

Nothing for this future.

The number of errors including but not immediate - lack of understanding of the area.
Proposals to build on buffer zone in Jack Road - Trying to make Southland Station appear more accessible - despite it being underfunded + deemed impossible by the relevant authorities, the actual experts.

Lack of appreciation + consideration of people's lives + homes & loss of privacy irrespective of the options. There are no options beyond no change 1 and Kemble change which effectively walls off the suburb 2 and ruins many residents standard of living.

Lack of openness and transparency from council - council not wanting to accept residents wishes.

Assumption that everyone will walk / cycle everywhere.

Whole process

Southland Station is in Kingston - why Bayside bearing the brunt of charges. Destination station for Southland but they charge for parking now forcing neighbouring streets to suffer increased parking.

You are not listening to us! This is not the place for high density developments.

Councils audacity to think we would go for this option.

The perception that this is the preferred option despite the general consensus that this development is not what the residents want. Why is Bayside council not looking at other areas of Bayside that could better cope with such increased population demands?

Lack of clarity around Southland station access - makes it very difficult to accurately device a future plan . Lack of discussion / detailed planning for improved cycling routes. Current access is dangerous.

Show us where the investment in essential services is going to be. How can we even consider a substantial population growth without more schools, hospitals, better roads etc.

The fact that it feels like you are forcing us to accept 4 storey apartments for fear of what the state government might do if we don't.

Additional traffic volumes of traffic on Park Rd with x'ing removal. Traffic in Jack Rd. does not identify increased car numbers from Mirvac. Traffic volumes for new development based on 1 car for 1 -2 bedroom units as being standard. No audit of actual car ownership in proposed areas, e.g. Mirvac.

Lack of consultation and errors. Rude council officers.

Lack of costings - lack of consultation with community and relevant authorities - Council pushing their agenda - Bike lane on Bay Rd.?

Continued lack of consultation by the council officers. The lack of elected representatives at the presentation. Dismissive council officers that we pay the wages of!



ANYTHING ELSE...

There is going to be huge congestion if this option is adopted into a structure plan.

I cannot see option 2 or 3 as correct as the blue boxes and numbers are not consistent.

See also option 1 comments - growth is happening throughout Pennydale with 2/3 dwellings replacing existing single dwellings. That is acceptable development. Anything else will destroy our community.

Need better consideration of pedestrian connections e.g. Bay Rd disability access crossing to Cheltenham Park. No suggestions of community facilities needed for this model. We would move and it wouldn't be a family friendly neighbourhood any longer.

Why have existing impacts (Mirvac, station) not been considered in traffic studies? Where is the vegetation impacts analysis?

Totally unacceptable + out of character with the area. The option should not even be raised.

What set backs of new building from ????????? of existing residences?

Do not understand about LXRA commitments.

Why is the acquired properties near Cheltenham station not shown on higher density?

The community does want this option.

Interested to know if there was any other innovative ideas that looked at corridors + enforcing pedestrian access as a way of slowing traffic. 'Walkability based'.

No understanding of area, site layout. With rail crossing development , B double trucks will have to use Jack roads as a thoroughfare.

Over consult with PTV, Vic Roads ,LxRA, or DWELP. They shouldn't be paid for such poorly researched 'higher thinking' when it is impossible to implement.

If mandated by state government - why are you not engaging / collaborating with Kingston council - why is all req'd state - led activity for Southland just the problem of Bayside. Please don't just centre all development in one family area because of minor constraints. No 3/4/plot deep development on Park Road that are 2 storeys - This impacts on so many properties.

Feels like C125 revisited!

This option will destroy the Pennydale community.

Why does it feel like we as residents are being forced to choose a non desirable option?
Why does this process not feel transparent?

Railway crossing removed will have a huge impact on traffic on Park Road making this an even more dangerous road to enter or cross.

Pennydale might be a desirable area now, but over development will ruin it for everyone. The focus needs to be on making industrial area mixed use.

What kind of apartments can they even build on Park Road, the blocks aren't big - how can they meet apartment design guidelines on such small blocks, especially if they aren't 'supposed' to be built up to the fenceline.

Tearing levels to the rest. set backs of 4 storey apartment building, what about overlooking into our spos?

If the proposal is to provide more housing for families in this area, surely more family friendly housing is called for i.e. NOT 4 -6 storey developments. Also council needs to consider an upgrade of amenities to cope with the increasing population.

Lack of consultation and errors and not including the advisory group.

The push to create 'precincts' within Pennydale. Is this a strategy to divide and conquer?

Why were these erroneous proposals even presented? Why weren't the advisory group part of this process? Perplexed.

POSSIBLE FUTURES NO. 3

Moderate Change - the lots fronting Bay Road and immediately adjoining the Southland train station would be rezoned to Mixed Use Zone to encourage shops, cafes and offices with residential above. Development of up to 6 storeys would be allowed around the Southland train station and parts of Park Road.

Development of up to 5 storeys would be allowed along Bay Road and Park Road, Development of up to 4 storeys would allowed along the west side of Jack Road. The remaining area retains its existing zoning (General Residential Zone) which allows up to 3 storey development.

As a result of community feedback, this option was removed from the discussions by Council post the first workshop and not presented as information in the second workshop.

Residents provided some comments against this future possibility.



CONCERNED BY...

High rise developments, people may not want to set up their families in the area as access to schools will be low due to the higher population.

We do not want mixed development ever. These plans do not take into account other development that will naturally occur within this area or take into account current. No extra park land or any facilities - community centre, library, schools etc.? Number of people movement and cars with no upgrades of roads, pedestrian crossings etc.

Completely unacceptable option. This is not moderate - 3-6 storeys. Appears to be an opening from Siede Court to Bay Rd - no acceptable connector street. Tulip Grove - not acceptable, opening to Bay Rd at Railway bridge is utterly stupid, very dangerous.

No! Totally inappropriate!

The proposed change is extreme. The heights proposed are totally out of proportion for the area.

Assumption that 60 Tulip Grove is open - all indicators state long term review only. Pennydale becoming an area surrounded by high rise. Too much development. No guarantee that state government will keep to height limits - out of our control. No innovation. Opening from Siede Court to Bay road (no thank you), doesn't meet VicRoads criteria. Analyses do not include safety, crime and other social issues arising.

You are kidding yourself! Bayside council should rezone NRZ to Pennydale.

The massive difference made by 5 and 6 storey dwellings to the neighbourhood character especially the effect on houses near the main roads.

4-6 storey on Park Rd.

This is not moderate change! Over massive development of apartments - Shops on Bay Rd (not viable) - Existing shops at Jack Rd / Bay Rd have high turn over and several are not commercially viable. Tulip as a 'connector street' to Bay rd.! Massive traffic issues at Southland station.

Too much multi storey development - 5 + 6 storey buildings! - would 4 storey the other -Ghetto!

The label 'moderate change' this is in fact 'severe change'!

Significant overdevelopment of the Pennydale area. Incorrect data used to formulate councils plan - fundamentally flawed + based on population #'s development has occurred.

This is very significant change Park Road is very high density. This will inevitable bleed into the rest of Pennydale.

Re: 3 storey, 38 apartment development, 378 -382 Bay Road no consideration given to high daily traffic out of development , into Munro Avenue, to and from Bay road, 15 metres away. Ditto overflow of developments residents cars parked there. Has council considered this in their projections?

Lack of safe pedestrian access to Cheltenham Park.

Laminex site should have better and thorough site planning. Doubtful that new road connection to Bay Road would work close to the overpass.

This whole thing is a concern like option, 2 on steroids, the fact that any human being would see the later options in particular viable is mind boggling. Planners are shaping our future living... Do the right thing!

See possible 01.

The number of deeply disturbing mistakes in the proposal. How can council present these? Who is in charge of oversight? Where is their expertise?

The fact you call this moderate!?

Potentially 6 storey buildings along Park Road and along the Pennydale perimeter. How can this proposed development be justified by council?

How can this be called moderate?

This is rubbish! Dangerous.



COMFORTED BY...

Your wording is disgraceful, these are our homes and our lives. We find this language and data misleading. We find these changes extreme. This process has been flawed. No one has comfort in this process.

Nothing at all.

There is nothing here of comfort. This is scary!

Nothing - Do not believe council has looked at how they will improve the infrastructure before this option could go ahead.

Development around Southland looks realistically what commuters want. More development near Cheltenham Station would also be appropriate.

Initiative given for integration of higher density housing.

This plan being stopped.

Nothing in this proposal is comforting.

The sense of community + the courtesy of the participants despite the disgusting proposals.

This is rubbish! Ill considered.



FRUSTRATED BY...

Parking issues and traffic.

These streets are too narrow for more cars and people accessing now so how will this be after? All traffic a disaster in Tulip Grove and surroundings, these are small streets with limited place to park now. Shared zone around station will increase illegal activity into our streets with crime increased in station areas. Too many issues with residents accessing their properties, parking and traffic movements.

That this has even been put up as an option.

Planners should get their facts right before presenting their plans. Open into Bay Rd from Tulip Grove - not viable.

No increase in open space - consider retaining Jack Rd open space. No vegetation and open space analysis included as promised by council. No Vic Roads consultation as options. Doesn't include meeting targets through LXRA, extended Mirvac and possibility of mixed in BBD. Please do not focus development around Siede / Tulip Grove. We don't want this level of density in our neighbourhood. Needs significant consultation with Kington, Vic Roads before continuing to investigate these options. This is significant not small change.

Should definitely not be considered.

Lack of understanding reflected in planning about what an enormous change going up to 5 or 5 storey developments. Dangerous levels of traffic along Park Rd, even under existing conditions.

Do not want this type of building on Park Rd.

The assumption that (a) 60 Tulip Grove. will open and (b) a pedestrian line from Southland Station to Heather Grove will be constructed. (a) PTV will review the decision in the long term. (b) PTV have said this is not feasible due to safety & signaling in construction.

Lack of thought of existing residents + how we want our suburb to look.

Park Road further from train being developed. Why is Jack Road so low when it has less effect on neighbourhood?

Assumption re total 5-6 storey development all along Park way difficult with existing unit developments from 1960's & 1970's.

Jack Road development should utilise a connection through Chaudos Street rather than Jack Road.

Totally inappropriate considering the neighbourhood character.

That this even proposed , W.T Hell? No liaison with Vic Roads but propose a whole new road, in the most dangerous location at Bay Road.

Same as possible future # 02.

Has council put any thought into the strain on services this population increase will have on this area? Have they considered increased schools, hospitals, green areas, better traffic systems?

The BCC gets to present 'blue sky' , ' higher thinking' proposals, without costings, spending our money on ludicrous proposals. But we don't have to choose between imperfect + horrific.

This is rubbish.



ANYTHING ELSE...

No extra green wedge. This will reduce our quality of life.

Completely unacceptable to suggest high density development around Southland station when there is no opening via Tulip Grove and no intention to open by PTV.

If this situation arises, our neighbourhood would be fundamentally changed forever. We would move and it wouldn't be a family friendly neighbourhood any longer.

Safer pedestrian access around Park Rd would potentially reduce school start / finish time traffic as more people might allow their kids to walk or ride to school.

I have lived in the area for 32 years. The change is extreme not moderate. If I do not want to have my house, a family home, overshadowed by 4-6 storey buildings, we will have to sell up which is very frustrating.

Totally unacceptable - even more out of step with the traditional residential ambience of the area. This option should not be even put up for my discussion.

Why is Jack Road not being developed more as it has less effect on neighbourhood. 6 storey - near train 3 within 400m leave rest as is!

Very valid point about Victoria Golf Club needing to be engaged in process. Agree with speaker this is extreme change.

6 storey is not moderate change for option 2.

The money, taxpayer rate payer money spent on these plans.. Money wasted. These are flawed, dangerous, ill conceived expensive white elephants.

Rubbish.

ALTERNATIVE POSSIBLE FUTURE

Participants provided some reflections around what they would like to see for planning in the area.

Consideration of B double trucks down Park Rd and Bay Rd.

Parking issues including how this was imposed, cost of visitor fees, 2hour limit, weekend restrictions. Feedback analysis says you can walk to Southland within 10 mins from Tulip Grove when there is no walk through. No residents want a walk through in this area to station and Southland.

Acknowledgement in planning process that there is no access to Southland via 60 Tulip Grove. Walkability access map needs to be revised, there is no access and we have been told there will be no access in the future (Public Transport Victoria correspondence and feedback from Bayside Council that they will not support opening 60 Tulip Grove).

I am feeling quite powerless in all of this. you are putting up options that are just not reflecting what our community has already indicated are not acceptable. Community consultation seems to mean not taking notice of anything we say. This process is causing extreme levels of anxiety and distress. people feel that their homes and lives are being destroyed and that providing input via consultations is having no impact on council decisions i.e. we feel council wants to maximise development in our area at any cost.

What number of people gave feedback saying they felt development should be on Bay Rd, Jack Rd, Frankston line? Station destination only? Expectation that residents do not have cars.

More consultation with our community BEFORE anything is done!

I would like to see a clear business case for this proposal. What requirements drive it? Why is Pennydale - an established community - the focus? Why not improve vacant industrial sites?

Report is not accurate. Much better consideration of people who live in the area!

Any option retaining closure of 60 Tulip Grove to Southland station. Vegetation analyses being conducted as committed by council. Consideration to LXRA, Mirvac development and potential residential and business joint ventures within BBD all contributing to residential development for the area, including also development in other areas of Bayside Cheltenham - all of which balance our requirements for growth.

Need to consider a structure plan which is closest to option 1 with some adjustments. Better links for cycling and pedestrians into Cheltenham and Beaumaris. Cycling path through from Pennydale Through Cheltenham golf course (shared roadway) and Weatherall Road. No mixed use for Bay Rd, it is not required. consideration of what residents need really needs to be considered.

Pennydale - not in the activity centre of Southland! Keep high development in Kingston side. Urban planner consultant incorrectly centres activity centre at Southland destination station. Background report "Key Directions" also flawed! A structure plan for option 1 and make it 2 storey max. Listen and take on board what your residents are telling you, they have been telling you since the "non-consultation" of C125 objections.

Would love to see usable bike lane along Bay Rd. Why not consider having a single wider bike lane on one side separated from the road? Have some points where people heading in opposite direction can cross to the bike lane.

The whole impact on amenity is great in either 2 or 3. There would not be enough green space for young families. How could option 2 or 3 address the traffic congestion - it could only add to it. What are the plans for the rent of Bayside? Do they have high density plans i.e. 3-6 storeys as proposed for Pennydale? The point being that it should be even across the board not just put into one small area. The proposal of future 2 and 3 would make Pennydale ghetto-like.

The council actually listen and incorporate the feedback from residents collected through the consultation process. Residents love their family friendly area with it's low density housing. Keep Pennydale as the residents love it. As is but with better infrastructure. Residents have given feedback that they are concerned about medium to high density housing so why have council proposed possible future 02 + 03? Calling possible future 02 : 'limited' change is misleading so too is calling possible future 03 'moderate' change more like 'extreme' . 60 Tulip is not open and is not planned to be open to gain access to Southland Station. Why have the consultants assumed that it open in their walkability analysis?

Clarification and confirmation that 60 Tulip Grove will not be opened. Parking + Traffic + modelling. Numbers? - Population projections - Increase - net,% - related to land area - related to rest of Bayside - Traffic -Parking.

1 -2 level housing development with retention of the green , community feel of the neighbourhood. Ensure streets do not become clogged with traffic + busy. Keep them safe for families and safe to pull out onto Park + Bay Road. Current futures that truly reflect the current situation, including 2+ dwellings on each lot and the subsequent traffic volume. Mirvac estate traffic volume. A reflection of how long it would take to turn our from a side street or driveway on Park, Jack or Bay Road. I do not want these visions to be used moving forward without the flaws in the data being corrected and the 3 futures being represented?

Clarification on accessibility to Southland Station from Pennydale via 60 Tulip Grove - Walkability analysis presented by consultants is flawed. Why are we only addressing parking and traffic why wasn't it planned for when station was planned or approved? How Park, Jack + Bay Road can cope with any increase in traffic, regardless of which possible future is considered? How the Pennydale area is meant to cope with parking pressures overflowing from lack of planning for sufficient parking at Mirvac development and the two train stations. Proposed population growth for Bayside and what preparation of this council is trying to fit into Pennydale.

Meaningful consultation - this feel like a sham- Southland train station should not open even on 60A Tulip - Why are we wasting our time? - Where are Kingston council? - How can you place a structure plan in Bayside and not in Kingston surely they are connected. - Poor local government co ordination - Traffic analysis is poor and inadequate - they have not taken new Jack Road development into account - Why is Bayside council so keen to destroy Pennydale - Everything we have all worked for - Keep Pennydale as it is, fix roads and infrastructure - you don't need to develop the area. - Why is there not a structure plan for future possible 1? - Future 1 is the answer - Information is fundamentally flawed.

Maintaining existing zone.

A detailed timeline to completion. Draft is due early 2018 but what about 'ECO'?

Evidence of more justification for an 'activity centre' in this residential area / i.e.. recognition that Pennydale is not suitable for medium / high density as far as I can see there is little or no real conformity with the criteria for an activity centre. This level of development is insane in this area! Pennydale is ?????? from the Southland - Cheltenham area by the barrier of the railway line. That barrier will only become more significant with the ??? of the rail.

Based on councils ' what people have said' slide why aren't YOU LISTENING? Options future 2 and 3 are completely contradictive to the feedback you have received. Completely disagree that council have no influence over whether growth will occur. You influence the height of fences, whether we can build a pergola or veranda + most definitely whether sub - division of land is allowed. You absolutely can influence growth. Urban design plan showing walking access to Southland Station from 60 Tulip Grove . This has not been communicated to the residents of Tulip Grove in fact the opposite has been communicated. Pedestrian crossing are needed now (actually 2 years ago) - before any discussion on further development of Pennydale. Cannot possibly consider any future option without a proper assessment of the pedestrian safety + traffic light management in Pennydale.

The representations of the populations of Pennydale are inaccurate and based on council's projections not actual data. Don't use projections based on high density development as fact - It is not accurate. The only way Pennydale will grow to the sizes proposed in future possibilities is if the high density development is approved - against the wishes of the residents. The future possibilities are putting the lives of residents in danger as our already lacking infrastructure doesn't cope now - let alone if high density or even 3 storey development is implemented. Please act on this feedback!

Discussions with Kingston council so a coherent plan developed I think hold off is best. Impact of add development at Cheltenham Station has not been out lined. How does that affect activity zone. Surely growth development such as along Jack Road, CSIRO etc. preferable. Parts of plan 3 ok as it takes this into account. Commercial are important but could be mixed development as not heavy industrial. Happiest with first plans growth density near train station. This is an isolated myopic view. What additional development being allowed for. If Laminex turns into supermarket as suggested - why could that not have residential over. 6 storey is not moderate near train station. Population projection for the area. Need to consider mixed development West of Jack Road - They want it!

Anything else! Parking restrictions 7 days including Public holidays - charged parking fees for visitor permits. Do the structure plans around Hampton + Bay Street cover the same amount of area e.g.. acreage (square metres) as the Pennydale / Southland structure plan . Council to review C125 data + feedback from the proposed independent review panel which deemed C125 proposed changes more inappropriate given the nature of Pennydale. Leave Pennydale alone! Look to growth in other brown field areas.

Traffic lights instead of pedestrian operated at the corner of Jack Road and Bay Road. Definitely no 3 storey dwelling - double at the maximum. Traffic lights at the corner of Park and Jack roads.

More robust traffic capacity analysis to consider Mirvac, Southland S centre future expansion, sites around Cheltenham Station + the increased flow due to the Park road level crossing being removed. A response into whether , under the scenario of current awareness knocking back selling on Bay, Jack + Park Roads, will that then mean expansion will be looked at within the parcels of land further inside Pennydale.

Introduction of more open space through redevelopment.

If the site of the Mirvac development was able to be rezoned from commercial to residential then why can't the Laminex site be rezoned?

What is the Highett Sandringham structure plan? Further consideration of area west of Jack Road. What about more development planning near the train station? A non - walled city option. Very strict protection for neighbours to the 4 storey potential development - if not opportunity to be incorporated with these monstrosities. Consider transfer industrial - mixed development on west of Jack Road.

Improvement in traffic analysis taking into consideration developing area outside or on the boarder of Pennydale. Can out growth be contained in the Southland shopping centre precinct, development of apartments as part of level crossing removal.

The surrounding areas such as Laminex site, north of Bay Road , Cheltenham Road need to be included. Information on population needs to be accommodated. How does 1 +2 address this - just not covered. Impact of train station just not addressed - this is the obvious growth areas. Neither options consider this. Charman Road + Cheltenham + Kingston council areas not considered - We cannot consider Pennydale in isolation. More options need to be developed and presented. Laminex keen to sell + Bayside will not consider mixed development. This is ridiculous!

What is the predicted requirements of growth for the Pennydale area?

The next stage of community discussion around the development of a draft plan.

What amenities are planned for these options - schools - Kindergarten - doctors.

Meetings / consultation in Pennydale. Have these plans be mailed to all Pennydale residents? Pennydale is not an activity centre. The consultants have not consulted with goverment / non goverment experts on realistic options.

We must protect the character of the area. There must be a restriction on building size. We have to protect the greenery and of course the incredible bird life in this area. What is three storey? Houses? Apartments - how many per site? There should be many many more houses listed as heritage. Take a look at the area. There are many beautiful houses built in the 1920's , 1930's and the 1940's, that must be listed. There must never be buildings over 2 storeys. Three storeys properties should never ever be approved. What ever happened to the Aussie house? One on a quarter of an acre with space for trees and an area for the children to play in safety. Oh and space to the family car. Also there are so many errors on the option sheets. (a) who stood and counted the traffic ? How? All absolutely wrong, for instance at the corner of Park Road and Tulip Grove am peak shows only 3 cars turning into Park Road! Probably more like a 100+ Have a look at all the other intersections around the area. (b) The land on the east side of the Laminex site will never be available tfor building housing. (c) There will never be a way through 60 Tulip Grove to Southland station. (d) One map shows Siede Court being extended through to Bay Road. This can never happen. Microphone at future meetings.

More community consultations, like this one but for it to take place in Pennydale , like initially planned. I find it extrodinary at vest and more likely duplicitious that the council officers can present overviews based on 165 'exchanges' how many people were excluded. Why wasn't there a mail out to every address in Pennydale. Also the way the questions on the survey were formed was biased. Made to choose from undiserable outcomes, choose the least worst, not what was actually desired - Manipulated? Yes!

Shared responsibility for the need to develop the 'activity centre' with Kingston. I feel we've been made a scapegoat for activity. A constriction on 2 storey for plots that border a single storey residential property or a very gradual set back. It is not right to take away someone's privacy + light + enjoyment of their property. Not just set backs on front and back of new developments bt set backs (big set back) on any side of new developments that borders an existing property.

A structure plan that allows only 3 storey development - A structure plan that allows that includes walking + cycling plans for proposal 2. frustrated overall that questions were not completely answered + counter questions not accepted.

No 4 storey development in Pennydale.

As a resident of Heather Grove (near rail) - We have a concern about parking controls + our ability to park any car / visitor / other in street.

An explanation of why high rise is proposed for Pennydale + Frankston railway line . Frankston line is already beyond capacity - How will it cope with even more. Advice from PTV is that Sandringham line as more opportunity for increased passengers. Also: Council has approved development of 5 high rise apartment buildings on south side of Bay Road half way between Sandringham + Southland so they can 60 on areas well beyond railway station. On suitable blocks which do not destroy existing communities such as Pennydale. Enough seats provided at consultations - many people had to stand or sit on floor for 3 hours.

Baseline = Census 2016? Maintain pedestrian access to Southland via Jean Street - (already in place) via crossing at Heather Grove (already in place) unless property is acquired.

The kingston residential adopted for Pennydale is Pennydale picking of the shorfalls. Consideration to the fact 39.97p/m as the highest already in Bayside. What is the timeframe?

Listen to us - Figure out alternatives.

Council to discuss options with Laminex to make this area suitable to develop into commercial + residential. Secure the 'green wedge' that separates us from Laminex and create Parkland. We need more open space! This is our last chance at having parkland + a sense of open space. This land has beautiful big trees + is home to native wild life, like the black cockatoos that come every year! How can you destroy this? Let Pennydale grow organically. Subdividing lots is happening + will continue to happen. Please leave our unique pocket alone and away from inappropriate development! There are many other opportunities in Bayside to develop for population growth. We are already doing our bit!

Open space for strip of land at Laminex. Church St. activity centre has a height limit of 2 storeys to match existing buildings (or 3 storey modern). So why can't Pennydale have the same since it was 'signed off' by state government. The next majority is 2 storeys 7.5m. Spread activity centres out to all bus routes. SBJ urban planners say it can be 400m from a bus stop. So potential greenfield development at Beaumaris Concourse, Sandringham Hospital+ council offices. Survey run by have your say page - Majority of families live in the area. Majority use a car to drive to work you are disadvantaging the residents of Pennydale. limited change - No change.

Cycle track to South side Park Road good. Extend behind 9th T Cheltenham golf club enter park on new path installed recently over hill on upgraded path to railway station.

Maximum 3 storey / higher limits on developments in Pennydale. Fairness / equity in applying population growth across all activity centres in Bayside council. Other areas (North / Sandy, Hampton) to have the same residential development restrictions. Population growth spread evenly . Appropriate development - retention of neighbourhood character (dwelling type, vegetation, heights, traffic). Maximum sub-divisions per block. Minimal lot sizes for sub-division and number of residences on a block ie. xm2 = max 2 dwelling, 3 dwelling etc.

Maximum heights of 3 storeys / 12m on Park, Bay, Jack Roads. Not every block developed into 3 storeys. Maximum number of 3 storey developments along Bay / Park / Jack i.e - max every second block on average.

I would like to see a discontinuation of tying together Pennydale to Southland. I believe they should be two completely separate areas for discussion.

Same as possible future #1.

Should possible future 2 be successful- at what point will that structure plan be reviewed(which presumably will then deem the entire area of Pennydale be increased to 4 storey developments) how many years until this happens?

Examples of similar areas 10 years on to visualise potential neighbourhood.

More clarity in what we could achieve if possible future 1 goes ahead - How could our suburb look while creatively addressing wider population growth?

1. An option for the structure plan based on growth within a medium density framework. Where medium density is per the definition on page 18 (note 6) from the background report. 2. An option to rezone the Laminex site to mixed use, enabling a mix of higher density residential, retail, office, etc.

Change Reserve Road / Jack Road / Bay Road industrial use areas to mix use. Not suggesting remove it but where possible, built apartments on top. This would mean that more of the vegetation would be removed as it's already built on. Acquire land from RSL to build on Reserve Road, we don't need the RSL + pokies. Laminex site -How should be developed do not scarface our neighbourhood, when there is a site that could be used. These are the best solutions for this area.

Change to Jack / Bay / Reserve industrial areas to mixed. Where possible build on top of existing business. Acquire land from RSL on Reserve Road. We don't need the RSL + Pokies. Laminex site - this needs to be rezoned + developed as residential - I am sure you can make this possible, is it just too hard for you? Seriously these are the best solutions for this area.

1. Why not a 'Cheltenham' structure plan which includes the area around Cheltenham Station surrounded by Charman Road, Wetherall Road, Vic Golf Club + Cheltenham Park. This area is within 'walkability' distance of transport. 2. Why not create a structure plan based on existing planning requirements with added guidelines where required + identified. 3. How is the feedback already received by council + listed under the headings of People, love, improvements, concerns + desires, being considered + incorporated into any structure plan? 4. 'Council can influence where growth is focused' - so why concentrate Bayside growth to the Pennydale area in a disproportionate way to the land area available + the existing population density within the Pennydale boundary. 5. If Kingston are not currently working on their Southland Station plan, how can Bayside council ensure that the Pennydale structure plan is compatible with the Kingston plans? Traffic impacts, population density, pressure on existing infrastructure etc? Question to be answered by council - Thank you.

Option - whole of Pennydale zoned for medium density. Option - density concentrated around the activity centre with appropriate transitioning of density as you move out from centre.

The slides from presentation.

There has already been an increase in population in this area with lot subdivision and the Mirvac development, stretching Pennydale to it's limits. I understand that Bayside council needs to find housing solutions to cope with an increased population, but destroying the soul of established suburbs may not be the best solution. There are many areas where high density housing could be an option e.g Bay Road, (RSL?, run down industrial buildings), George St., Tulip St. etc. The council also needs to consider investing in amenities to cope with the proposed development.

Here is a novel idea: consult with the community before you present such ; pie in the sky' possible futures. Consult with all relevant stakeholders... Vic Roads, P.T.V. , DWELP, plan Melbourne, level crossing authority. Consult in the community - the kindergarten as proposed. Contact all the residents, by mail, after all, we are the rate payers and we are the electors. Do not continue to treat us as idiots.

There is not evidence that Pennydale meets the criteria for an activity centre let alone a principal or major one. Despite the presentations of both council officers was underwhelming and they based these plans on 165 interactions, selective interpretations of plan Melbourne, based on the much criticised Bayside housing strategy 2012. This strategy did not include any consultation of Pennydale, Cheltenham. I found Katanya in particular rude + dismissive and not at all interested in consulting with the community that had turned up in their own time. I would like to see thorough genuine and comprehensive community consultation and decisions based on this. Not flawed external consultants too lazy to consult the experts.

Unfortunately I continue to be astounded by the repeated mistakes of the B.CC. They constantly push their developments agendas, the way they pay for ill conceived surveys, the way they fail to consult their rate payers , the way they impose their planning policy. Have they learnt nothing from C125, C140 debacle, the amount of money wasted on planning beggars belief. Revisit the housing strategy! I wonder if B.CC hadn't locked up 87% of it's land in NRZ, whether they would be trying to force development in all the periphery boundaries of the municipality.

Given that the council feels that some sort of structure plan will provide planning certainty in the Pennydale area , why don't council and the advisory panel work together to try and find a compromise which meets the needs of all of the stakeholders and one which the residents of Pennydale can live with? In order to meet State Government requirements for each Council to accommodate predicted population areas to approximately 200 meters which is well within walkability distance. Utilise existing brownfields sites as they become available and where retail / commercial development is approved ensure that residential development is provided as well. Similar to Woolworths developments in Highett (but not the Aldi development in Bay Road). Allow 2 -4 unit developments per block (depending on land size) throughout Bayside, but in some areas where neighbourhood character has been identified as important permit development on every 3rd or 4th block only. There is a precedent for this in Sydney. Ensure that population growth is distributed evenly throughout the three council wards and suburbs. disregarding areas which cannot be developed such schools, parks , golf courses, playing fields and other such 'no go' areas thus spreading population density evenly and sharing the burden of development . Adopting such strategies may provide the compromise we all need and facilitate the growth Bayside is required to accommodate. Just some thoughts for your consideration.

The Pennydale residents are obviously deeply concerned about the amenity of their area. High rise development options should not be forced upon them. We instead should be exploring options for improving the amenity further, not minimising the damage to us . A very negative and discouraging approach.

WORKSHOP EVALUATION

61 Participants offered some reflections on how they felt the workshops had been conducted

HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE FORMAT OF THE SESSION TODAY?



HOW MUCH OPPORTUNITY DID YOU HAVE TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE DISCUSSIONS?



WHAT IMPROVEMENTS, IF ANY, COULD BE MADE TO HOW WE WORKED TOGETHER TODAY?

Facilitation was excellent! I've worked in government and facilitated planning processes before and this gave great opportunity for people to have their say, comments captured, echoed back...hard audience!

This was excellently facilitated well done! Very professionally organised and produced. Great speakers very knowledgeable.

Much more information than Wed. 2018 need another group meeting but not til end at least of Feb - before residents on holidays.

More time for questions.

None - pleased with all the information + discussion. Specialists answered all questions fully. Ran smoothly + swiftly.

Presentation was very well run + content very relevant. Kim facilitated extremely well with what could have become very passionate amongst some people, so glad I came! Well done everyone!

Facilitators controlled very well.

Longer time - more facilitators - smaller groups - council reps?

Keith handled the meeting well and prevented it being hijacked throughout.

Keith was very good at keeping the peace - Kim was also excellent.

There was not enough time to cover everything but discussions were great. People raised valid points on all subjects.

Allocate time to cover each component. there was too much rush at the end. Frustrated that we are being presented with 3 options that just don't reflect community in to date. Feeling powerless!

Good effect at allowing participation and informing us. The system is with the pre ordained outcomes being forced on the community.

Give more time to review all options / feedback.

More time for questions! Improved layout of space difficult to see PowerPoint.

Think need a Q + A session next. Nery limited questions only time for a few answers. Have much more, need more time.

More time for residents questions.

Larger venue.

Roving microphone.

Appropriate discussion time achieved - well run and organised - appreciate the opportunity to participate.

Need more sessions with smaller audiences.

More time - answer more questions.

More time to consider info presented. Kim did really well at keeping things ticking along.

More questions to be asked. Time was a problem.

Facilitator did well to keep people on track - gave people opportunity to ask questions. Thank you.

Need more recognition of the massive difference between what is planned + what residents feel is reasonable. Despite the invitation to comment + influence the outcome, it feels like residents views + needs are being ignored.

Councillors in attendance would be good - not enough time to discuss all the issues.

Where was the Bayside CEO today? Were any councillors for this area invited and were they in attendance?

Need to allocate more time. Manager of planning (Aya) comparatively talked too long and needed to stand out front so she could be better understood.

I would like the presenters to commence with the presentation and not be distracted by questions and interruptions at the outset. Took too long to get through presentations questions and discussions should be confined to the last hour.

More time at future sessions are require. Facilitators have worked very hard. How will the information gathered today be used and acknowledged - This is a gaping hole.

Microphones + speakers hard to hear. More time for discussion with Urban designer + traffic consultants less time from the council - needed to get through this more quickly.

Questions on notice in writing.

Site consultants are disrespectful . They were asked to do a 10 minute total presentation and STB took about 30minutes total. This meant the community only had half an hour for questions (extended by quarter of an hour).

Less presentation time as they didn't keep it brief - more time for discussion and show of hands for how people feel affected.

I thought the session was well co ordinated and gave me the opportunity to interact.

The speaker could have used microphones. The discussion was difficult to follow, I have a hearing problem.

Need seating for the participants - many people had to stand up throughout or sit on the floor . Amanda was excellent in explaining - much better situation than Saturday but still very frustrating.

Council need to meet with residents because there are more questions than answers and people are frustrated and angry. Slides did not contain factual information or numbers - just statements. Think the residents also want to discuss parking issues but no one was here to address this either!

More, many more consultation. Community consultations with thorough planning not just 'higher thinking'.

I asked a question about timelines when is the end point of 'consultation', when will 'structure plan' be completed? This was not addressed!

Much more consultation with people who live in the area of Bayside 'Pennydale'.

Have a microphone - It was hard to hear the presenters.

Needs to have people register at these workshops and provide information in advance of the session for people to digest. Councillors need to get involved in these sessions. Support needs to be available for residents at the sessions. Hard to consider a trust worthy process going forward. Too hard to hear people/ need a microphone.

Distribute all reading material to interested people ahead of time, including via Bayside city council website + Pennydale Railways action groups. Also check registration of people attending ahead of time. The session was extremely mislead with limited opportunity to adequately provide feedback on the proposed plans. There were way too many issues that needed to be covered when discussing this , matters were rushed through.

Did not get to ask a question that I felt was important to ask. Too bloody rushed!

You need to give accurate information! Answer questions that the people have and allow time for residents to ask questions.

Some people took control of asking questions others then were overlooked. Hard to hear many but male facilitator takes no bull! To be heard! Special mikes / speakers were available should be used instead of p/a system.

I would like to see the business case.

Facilitators were professional but am unable to comment due to the nature of the topic.



REPORT PREPARED BY:

mosaicLAB

www.mosaiclab.com.au

PLEASE NOTE: While every effort has been made to transcribe participants comments accurately a small number have not been included in this summary due to the legibility of the content. Please contact Keith Greaves at Keith@mosaiclab.com.au for any suggested additions.