

SOS

S A V E
• O U R •
SUBURBS

INC.

RESIDENTS

Voice

President's Address

It seems the Residents' Voice has been loud enough to be heard in Spring Street - by both the major political parties!

Residents are now in a fortunate position.

Both the State Government and the State Opposition appear to have heard and heeded the widespread clamour for planning reform.

The coalition has responded with promises of significant changes to its planning policy.

The ALP's planning policy also positively addresses community concern about major town planning issues.

In this issue of the Residents' Voice, we have given the Premier, Jeff Kennett and Opposition Leader, Steve Bracks, the opportunity to set out their party's planning vision for Victoria so SOS members can make up their own minds.*

However, residents should remain cautious. The battle may not be over.

All we have to date are electoral promises. The devil will be in the detail!

Until those promises come to fruition and our suburbs are truly saved, planning will remain a hot issue.

Planning is the one issue which literally strikes home.

Home is where the heart is. For many people, too, the family home is their major investment.

When the home territory is threatened, people react defensively. That is an age-old truism.

Residents' fury with the State Government's planning policies have cut across party loyalties and electoral boundaries, affecting hundreds of thousands of residents.

Town planning concerns have united the residents of Victoria. We are now a formidable force!

Members and supporters of SOS come from all walks of life and live in suburbs across Melbourne, along the Mornington Peninsula and Surf Coast, in Geelong and also in Ballarat where residents' concerns about town

planning and the loss of heritage are running high. (see inside)

Those advising governments should now realise that residents must be consulted and listened to.

Just in the last couple of weeks, we have had a telling glimpse of the kind of advice Planning Minister Maclellan has been receiving from his top advisers. On 20 August, Dr John Paterson, the secretary of the Department of Infrastructure, made the alarmist statement that the middle suburbs would become a slum wasteland belt if residents and councils did not stop opposing medium-density development.

He told a stunned audience of councillors, municipal CEOs and planners assembled to hear Mr Maclellan deliver his annual August statement on the state's planning system, that if resistance to medium-density housing continued, the middle suburbs could be relegated to a grim future as an urban BADLANDS**.

Those middle suburbs include Armadale, Burwood, Ascot Vale, Essendon, Brighton, Camberwell, Canterbury, Surrey Hills, Box Hill, Heathmont, Bulleen, Northcote, Preston, Maidstone, Ashburton, Northcote, Fairfield, Essendon, Ivanhoe, Oakleigh, Moorabbin, Kew, Malvern, Thornbury, McKinnon and Altona and others in between

According to Dr Paterson, the residents of the middle band were consigning themselves to a 'poverty-stricken old age' and their children to 'zero inheritance' if they continued to resist the forces of re-development in their suburbs.

He said property values would fall dramatically if councils and residents persisted in protecting suburbs built for a 1950s style world 'which no longer existed'.

(It should be noted that Dr Paterson himself lives in the middle suburbs).



inside

ALP Planning Policy	2
Coalition Planning Policy	3
Battle for Ballarat	4
Crackdown on Demolition	5
'The Suburban Backlash'	5
Jenny Declares War on Developers	6-7
Heather's on the Warpath	8
Viva! Our Street	8
Local Issues Local Policies	9
Crowded Houses	10
The Residents Bill of Rights	10
Media Watch	11
Municipal Representatives	11
The Future of Our Suburbs	12

He told his audience that it was not enough just to have a '(planning) priesthood that knows and believes' in the need for change, that it was necessary 'to share that knowledge with the community'.

Dr Paterson's curse on the middle suburbs is not going to convince anyone to his view. It is pointless trying to scare people into submission.

The debate over medium-density housing is heated enough. Dr Paterson's comments do nothing to further it in a productive fashion

Residents, many of whom live in the middle band of suburbs, contact SOS daily with their concerns that medium-density developments would adversely affect neighbourhood character, their residential amenity and subsequently, their property values.

Those residents share the view of SOS, that it is inappropriate development which harms property and amenity values in the middle suburbs, not the lack of development.

* SOS is a non-party political organisation. Concerns about town planning issues cross all political and geographical boundaries. We do not stand nor endorse candidates. However we do urge voters to support candidates who support SOS policies.

** Funk & Wagnall's New Encyclopedia, Vol. 3, refers to BADLANDS as a wasteland areas located in the wild west of North America describing them as:

'Rugged, inhospitable regions of fantastically shaped rock masses and hills almost bare of vegetation, separated by labyrinthine valleys'

The bleakness of the BADLANDS image has been reinforced by a well-known 1973 film of that name, starring Martin Sheen and Sissy Spacek who played a couple who went on a real-life killing spree in a western wasteland during the 1950s.



State Opposition Leader
Steve Bracks

Planning policies are obviously important to the growth and development of the Victorian economy. But they must be much more than just that. They must recognise the enormous impact that planning decisions and processes have on the quality of life of all Victorians in their homes, neighbourhoods and communities.

Labor seeks a planning system that reflects a sensible balance between economic development, social growth and cohesion and the sustainability of Victoria's environment.

In particular our planning policy seeks to

- give Victorians back their voice and influence over decisions that affect their lifestyles,
- provide greater certainty for individuals, communities and business, and
- protect Victoria's standing as one of the most liveable environments in the world.

Planning and development in Victoria in the 21st Century requires the fostering of partnerships between all those involved - residents, councils and the development sector. The current Government has divided the community and attempted to shift blame to others for the current crisis in planning. It has alienated local government from important planning and development decisions and, in so doing has disenfranchised local government and communities from having a say in local issues.

Victorians need new solutions for today's problems

The Kennett Government's blind faith in allowing the market to rule at the expense of local amenity and community interests is at the core of Victoria's planning crisis.

The character of our urban environment is under threat because of inconsistent and inappropriate interventions from the Kennett Government and its Planning Minister allowing high rise bayside development and subdivision in environmentally sensitive areas, for example in the Macedon Ranges, Upper Yarra Valley and Dandenong Ranges.

Victorians are increasingly being frozen out of decisions that vitally affect their own neighbourhoods and the amenity of the communities in which they live.

Planning decisions are being made in an erratic and ad-hoc way. The opinion of an individual Minister can never be a substitute for a process that respects and involves the wider community and all of those with a stake in a planning outcome.

Ministerial powers

The current Ministerial powers, and the erratic way they are being administered, allow too much intervention in local planning issues and are creating uncertainty and concern in the community and within the development industry.

Labor will guarantee that Ministerial planning powers are transparent and accountable, and that Ministerial intervention will be restricted to issues of genuine State or regional significance. Labor will draw up guidelines to define clearly the scope and limits of Ministerial intervention.

Local Government's role in planning

Labor will clearly define and strengthen local government's role in planning based on proper strategic and policy statements that maximise the benefits to the community at large. These include neighbourhood character, local heritage and protection of the natural environment.

Labor will produce a simple guide for residents to use in making planning applications, objections and for appeals to VCAT.

Speeding up the appeals process

Labor will support the introduction of rules in the planning appeals process to reduce delays including:

- Filing of statements of evidence before the hearing;

- Pre-hearing mediation and pre-trial conferences in appropriate cases to identify key issues in dispute at an earlier stage and seek a negotiated solution;

- Time limits on presentation of cases;

- Time limits on decisions by the Tribunal.

Replacing the Good Design Guide with a Good Neighbourhood Guide

The current Government's code for medium density developments known as The Good Design Guide is enabling inappropriate developments. More than three-quarters of the planning appeals before VCAT are about medium density housing, creating delays for applicants and unprecedented acrimony within neighbourhoods.

Inappropriate detached housing is also reducing residential amenity in many cases. VicCode 1 which covers detached housing, is not providing adequate protections.

It is time to replace these guides with a more local neighbourhood responsive approach - one, which fosters good neighbour relations, and builds better communities.

Labor will replace the Good Design Guide and VicCode 1 with a single new and comprehensive housing code that will apply to all forms of housing.

Labor's good Neighbourhood Guide will:

- Make neighbourhood character the mandatory starting point for designing and assessing any proposed new housing.

- Recognize that the elements which characterise a neighbourhood can take many forms. Key factors such as established gardens and mature trees, visible rooflines, generous setbacks, consistent building heights etc shape and make a neighbourhood.

- Provide clearer and more prescriptive controls to provide greater certainty for applicants and local residents alike, and quicken the decision making process.

- Ensure that setbacks, privacy, density and height controls are consistent with the neighbourhood character.

- Reduce the complexity of factors to be taken into account in the assessment process of new housing development.

- Guarantee fast approval for complying proposals with the new code for housing.

- Be cast in language and processes which neighbours can better understand and work with.

- Encourage creative design and a broader spectrum of housing types which meets current and future needs.

- Be capable of implementation and provide a quicker and less costly process based on good planning practice in neighbourhoods.

A better understanding of local character and amenity

At the core of local planning processes must be a better understanding of the urban character of each locality. New development should enhance and improve the character and amenity of an area. It should be designed and sited to 'fit in' with its surrounds.

Labor will reform planning processes to better protect the residential character of our suburbs and towns.

Labor will protect local communities by:

- Abolishing the 7 kilometre rule that allows higher density developments within an arbitrary 7 kilometres of the CBD;

- Fixing the loophole that allows developers to subdivide land of more than 600 square metres and build dwellings without a permit;

- Restoring proper controls over take-away and fast-food stores in residential areas.

- Requiring that an application for removal or variation of a restrictive covenant is made separately and before the granting of a planning approval for development on the site.

The incentive for developers to subdivide land of more than 600 square metres to avoid the Good Design Guide will be removed because there will only be one guide for all residential developments.

Building controls and enforcement

The prevalence of problems such as building permits that are issued that do not comply with planning permits, illegal building works and delays in responses to problems with building works must be addressed.

There are also too many examples of demolition permits being issued without proper scrutiny of planning or heritage considerations.

The Kennett Government has placed the onus on the local community to act as both the watchdog and instigator of enforcement action.

Labor will introduce tougher penalties for illegal demolitions and breaches of planning laws. New laws will encourage reinstatement orders to reduce the incentive to ignore planning and building controls.

Building and demolition permits will be required to be consistent with relevant planning permits for the site. Any required planning permit will have to be obtained before a building or demolition permit is granted.

Building surveyors will be required by law to check relevant planning permits before issuing a building or demolition permit.

Planning strategies for regional Victoria

Ad-hoc developments, unilateral decision-making and an obsession with central Melbourne projects, are creating serious decline in many regional and provincial areas and particularly in smaller towns in country Victoria.

The Kennett Government is allowing ad hoc and inappropriate subdivision in environmentally sensitive areas of Victoria. A Labor Government will put the protection and enhancement of the natural and urban environments at the forefront of planning decision-making.

Labor will introduce effective legislation to control the ad hoc subdivision and inappropriate development of Melbourne's green belts and sensitive areas such as the Dandenong Ranges, the Upper Yarra Valley, Macedon Ranges and the Mornington Peninsula.

A review will be undertaken of the current code for buffer zones for quarrying which is in proximity to residential zones and significant conservation areas.

Planning to save our heritage.

An important ingredient of a responsible planning system is the protection of those assets that enhance our architectural, historical and cultural heritage.

Labor has a strong commitment to the protection of our architectural, historical and cultural heritage, and will act to ensure that heritage protection is inherent in planning strategies and processes.

Port Phillip Bay Foreshore

The Kennett Government is allowing inappropriate high-rise developments around Port Phillip Bay. The views from these high-rise developments will be shared by the relatively few Victorians who are able to afford them. The vast majority of Victorians who use and enjoy the foreshore and its surrounds will have their views blocked and their enjoyment diminished by overshadowing and overlooking.

There are many locations in Melbourne that are appropriate for high-rise development and where the demand for views can be met. Proper planning should encourage high-rise development in these locations where it has already commenced and not start a new market and new expectations in an inappropriate location.

Labor will protect the foreshore through:

- Stopping high-rise development on the foreshore of Port Phillip Bay;

- Introducing clear prescribed height controls that are certain and not mere recommendations;

- Promoting new development around the Bay which does not damage its existing amenity and heritage;

Note: This is an edited version of the ALP planning policy see

Home page: www.vic.alp.org.au for the full version.



The Premier of Victoria Jeff Kennett

Planning Goals

Tougher Guidelines

Changes implemented by the Government since 1992 have greatly simplified Victoria's planning system. Councils now have greater opportunity to consult with their communities on planning

changes, and much stronger powers to recognise special precincts and properties or areas of heritage value.

The Government has recently undertaken a review of the Good Design Guide for medium density housing, encompassing the issues of overlooking, overshadowing and visual bulk in regard to VIC Code 1. The review was designed to examine the concerns of residents, especially in the inner and middle suburbs, about new developments which have been out of keeping with the amenity of their particular area.

Following the review, new rules will be put in place for new development. A revised Good Design Guide No.2 will provide greater protection to property-owners and pays greater attention to the quality of streetscapes in established residential areas.

Councils and communities will now have more say in planning, and control over their residential amenity through tougher guidelines governing these issues.

- the introduction of new requirements on the minimum setback of residential developments from property boundaries, to reduce the likelihood of overshadowing onto neighbouring properties and preserve consistency of streetscapes.

- new provisions to provide greater protection of visual and acoustic privacy in residential areas, particularly through requirements on placement of windows on and near property boundaries.

- provision for councils to introduce higher minimum lot sizes for residential lot subdivision, by increasing the minimum resultant block size for the development of single dwellings in established suburban areas to 500 square metres - as opposed to the current 300 square metre minimum requirement stipulated in the current Good Design Guide.

Stronger recognition of the role of restrictive covenants

The Government recognises the importance of restrictive covenants on land use, particularly in established residential areas which prohibit certain types of development, for example, two-storey houses in a single-storey housing precinct.

- Restrictive covenants will now receive stronger legal protection.

- Loopholes which allow the granting of a planning permit before the consideration of removal of a covenant on the same piece of land will also be closed.

- Changes will be introduced to ensure an application for the removal or variation of a restrictive covenant is made separately and prior to the granting of planning approval for a new development on the same site.

Tougher demolition controls

New controls will be introduced to govern the demolition of houses in residential zone R1, which covers most residential areas, and zone R2, which covers higher density development. In response to community concerns, the Coalition in 1998 introduced a requirement that owner/developers provide councils with 15 working days' notification to ensure councils are aware of properties that are proposed to be demolished.

We will act to strengthen further the rules governing demolition.

- The Coalition will introduce a requirement for owners/developers first to obtain a building permit (for a single dwelling) or a planning permit (for medium density development) to be issued before any demolition permit is granted in the R1 and R2 residential zones. Buildings which pose a safety risk and require urgent demolition would be outside this provision.

This tougher approach will ensure the proposed development planned for all sites will be clearly identified

and approved before the existing dwelling can be demolished. It will provide greater certainty to the council, the community and developers and prevent the destruction and subsequent moonscaping that often occurs when a property is demolished and the site sits vacant for a long period of time.

Increase the input of municipal councils and communities into planning decisions.

The Government's commitment to restructuring local councils and their planning schemes has transformed Victoria's planning system.

The new planning schemes promise three things:

- consistency - consistent set of planning provisions across the State;

- a strategic focus - a much stronger emphasis on State and local strategic directions in terms of development planning for the future; and

- relevance and ability to evolve - regular monitoring and review of the new schemes.

Greater council and community input on planning

The new format planning schemes have been the result of four years' work by councils to craft their own schemes, which take special account of local circumstances and requirements. In conjunction with the new planning schemes, Municipal Strategic Statements are being prepared to set out the future directions of each municipality. This enables councils to direct their future planning needs from a strategic base, and it has been guided by extensive community consultation undertaken across metropolitan, regional and country Victoria.

At present about half the councils have been given approval for their new planning schemes. By July, 2000, all schemes will be in operation across Victoria

Under the new schemes, councils - and local communities - will have greater autonomy on planning issues, with the new planning formats providing greater definition and fewer anomalies and ambiguities over land use.

Councils will have the framework of their own planning schemes and municipal strategic statements to guide them on making sound, practical, commonsense planning decisions.

- Except in exceptional circumstances, the Government will not intervene in residential planning decisions.

The Coalition is committed to continuing to empower local councils in the decision making process in regards to new development and redevelopment in their municipalities.

People have wide opportunity to object to development proposals. This is backed up by the strengthened powers in the hands of councils, along with fast, informal appeal procedures.

It should be emphasised that of the appeals submitted to the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal, two-thirds of the decisions support the original decision by the local council.

- As a safeguard to ensure its decisions continue to reflect local wishes, the Coalition will set up a process to monitor VCAT's decisions. Reports will be provided annually to councils and their feedback will be sought in order to assess any areas in which further changes may be required.

- The Coalition will legislate to require that where an appeal goes to VCAT and the applicant makes substantial changes to the application, VCAT will adjourn the appeal and refer the application back to the council for their consideration. This will prevent alternative plans being approved by VCAT without prior council consultation.

New development sites

Victoria's changing demographics and changes in lifestyle preferences make it imperative to look at new living options, particularly in the light of the trend to inner city living which has seen a concentration of high density accommodation being developed in areas such as Southbank, Jolimont, Richmond, Collingwood, Fitzroy and Carlton. A further significant change has occurred in the

number of household occupants. Already, half our households accommodate only one or two people.

The Coalition is committed therefore to providing the widest choice of housing for our community.

In order to meet these changes, the Coalition will foster new residential development that provides wider housing and location choices to meet social need and lifestyle preferences, while taking advantage of existing services.

To enhance this choice while lessening the effects on established areas, significant residential development will be directed to inner city development precincts, such as the Melbourne Docklands and former industrial land in the inner west of Melbourne, which is close to public transport and existing retail and community facilities.

Impose tougher penalties for planning breaches.

- The Coalition will launch a formal review of current planning penalties, with the aim of introducing significantly higher penalties for those who deliberately flout planning or building rules.

- The review into penalties will consider offences such as contravention of a planning scheme, permit or agreement or providing misleading information on an application. For contravention of a planning scheme, permit or agreement, the penalty will be increased fivefold from \$200 to \$1000 for an individual, or \$5000 for a body corporate. Individuals or companies which carry out illegal or unauthorised demolitions will face fines of up to \$10,000 for each offence, and, in the case of a body corporate, fines of up to \$50,000;

- The tougher penalties will ensure developers, property or business owners do not contravene planning or building rules that jeopardise the amenity and surroundings of our suburbs and towns.

Mornington Peninsula

Mornington Peninsula to be locked up to protect its natural amenity from over-development. The Coalition will legislate to protect rural areas of the Mornington Peninsula from future residential and commercial over-development.

The Mornington Peninsula Shire Council's new format planning scheme was gazetted in May, 1999, and recognises the major features and lifestyle amenity of the Peninsula. The lock-up will be aligned with the shire boundaries and will be effective immediately.

The future strategic goals for the Peninsula region are also identified in the shire's Municipal Strategic Statement. In conjunction with the council, the Coalition will develop legislative protection based on the planning scheme and strategic statement to preserve the unique character of the Peninsula by preventing further development in rural areas.

Heritage Protection

Victoria to have the strongest and best heritage protection in Australia. In adopting new format planning schemes, councils have had the opportunity to protect heritage properties and enshrine in law their preservation. Applicants can clearly identify, from the new planning schemes, properties of recognised heritage significance.

Heritage Victoria will continue to deal with permits under the Heritage Act 1995 for any place registered on the State Heritage Register with a minimum of delay. We will also continue to direct resources and energy into the development of local government as a critical player in the delivery of heritage protection throughout the State.

Beginning in 1999-2000, a further \$15 million is being committed to fund a broader public heritage program over three years. This program will make funds available to councils for their own heritage asset management programs.

In addition to heritage controls, councils also have the opportunity to introduce vegetation controls to protect significant trees and vegetation, ensuring important streetscapes and amenity are not jeopardised by future development.

Note: This is an edited version of the coalition's planning policy. See web site .www.jeff.com.au. for the full version.

THE BATTLE FOR

BALLARAT

HEATED BALLARAT BATTLE OVER SUB-DIVISION IN HERITAGE AREA

There was no Sunday morning sleep-in for SOS president Jack Hammond on 25 July. At 5 a.m. he was at the wheel, heading towards Ballarat where he addressed about 60 residents angered by a contentious sub-division for a dual occupancy in one of the city's most important heritage areas.

A loophole in the planning system had allowed the sub-division without being advertised.

Initially, Ballarat City Council had rejected a proposal by a developer to build three two-storey units in Frank St on the grounds that the proposed development was not consistent with neighbourhood character and the streetscape.

Essentially it allowed the development of two two-storey units without the proposal having to come before council. However, council subsequently voted 4-3 in favour of allowing the subdivision without it being advertised.

The residents had been unable to object and they were outraged.

Jack Hammond told the residents that the loophole could see Ballarat's heritage areas



SOS President - Jack Hammond talking to Ballarat residents. Pic courtesy The Courier

threatened as sub-division by-passed the requirements of the Good Design Guide.

Commenting in the Courier, Cr John Barnes said previous subdivision applications had been advertised for public comment. According to Cr Barnes the Frank St. decision represented "a fault with the process" and that he was "expecting a report into the process to be tabled before council soon".

Jack Hammond addressed Ballarat City councillors about the matter on 1 September. Last year SOS raised concerns about planning decisions by delegated power after documents

obtained under the Freedom of Information Act revealed that a Ministerial advisory body had suggested that involvement in 'day-to-day' planning issues should be delegated from councillors to council officers.

SOS and other critics believe that such a move would diminish the role of residents in the planning process and result in a further loss of neighbourhood character and amenity.

The 'loophole' referred to allows a development to be minimally setback from a boundary and yet requires no planning permit.

In the vast majority of cases, no planning permit is required by a single house if it is built on a block larger than 300 sq. m. - approximately the size of a typical inner suburban block. Developers are able to exploit a long-standing loophole in planning law by subdividing small blocks and building de-facto medium-density developments without having to apply for planning permits. Nor do they have to comply with the Good Design Guide.



Sixteen objections signed by 52 residents had been received by council.

The developer then applied for a two-lot subdivision on the same land. That was granted by a council officer under delegated authority.

Jack Hammond addressed Ballarat City councillors about the matter on 1 September.

Last year SOS raised concerns about planning decisions by delegated power after documents

PLANNING - AN ELECTION ISSUE

As an anaesthetist, Greg Henderson is quite accustomed to being on call. But these days, when the telephone rings after hours, the caller is more likely to need help with a planning problem.

Greg, the SOS municipal representative in Ballarat, became concerned about the planning system early in 1998 when an application was made to build two, double-storey units at the back of his property in one of Ballarat's heritage areas close to the centre of town.

Greg decided to fight. He bought himself a copy of the controversial best-seller, the Good Design Guide and joined forces with other residents.

The application was rejected by Ballarat Council and the house was saved.

"It was the first medium-density application rejected by council", he said. "The development would have meant pulling down a Victorian house in an intact row as well as overlooking my garden".

He became a committee member of the then newly formed Ballarat Citizens for Thoughtful Development, a group now affiliated with SOS.

The group was started by another concerned resident, Liz Sheedy, who was recently elected to Ballarat City Council as the representative for the heritage rich Central Ward.

"I committed myself to a lightning course on the GDG and the planning process", said Greg. "People ring me all the time seeking advice. Many know nothing about the planning process and have never heard of the GDG".

Greg helps people interpret plans and indicates the areas on which they can base their objections.

He says that participating in the planning process is doubly hard for rural residents.

"Country people have the added difficulty of having to travel to Melbourne for VCAT hearings and some find it very intimidating having to appear before a tribunal in the city", said Greg.

He believes some Ballarat councillors are not as concerned with heritage issues as they should be. After all, he says, Ballarat is one of Victoria's most important, historic, regional cities.

"Rather than realizing the importance of heritage to Ballarat as an attraction for tourists, for instance, some councillors see tourism in

terms of Eureka and Sovereign Hill and pay lipservice to protecting streetscapes", he said.

But, says Greg, planning as an issue is not only confined to heritage concerns.

"People are utterly dismayed by their perceived lack of powerlessness when an application for a medium-density development is lodged for a property adjacent to them", he said.

"It doesn't matter who those people are or how old they are. They could live in the best part of town or be poorly educated. They all feel inadequate and very isolated when suddenly confronted with a development nightmare".

Greg added that single houses built under the limited restrictions of VicCode 1 are having a very adverse effect on Ballarat.

Greg is convinced that planning issues will have an impact at the coming State election.

"Ballarat has two of the most marginal seats in the State and planning concerns have created a great underlying tension", he said. "For instance planning concerns are very intense in Central Ward, which is a true blue Liberal area, Liz Sheedy whose background in social services does not make her the kind of candidate Liberals usually vote for, ran on a planning platform and had a resounding win.

State Government Cracks Down on Illegal Demolition Operators

The wrecker's ball may not be welcome in your street but at least you can now check if a demolition is legally taking place .

After a 12-month campaign by SOS which focused attention on demolitions occurring without permits and demolition by unregistered contractors, the State Government has taken action to crackdown on illegal demolitions.

A new regulation now requires a copy of a demolition permit to be prominently displayed on a site while demolition work is in progress.

This will let you know if the required permit has been issued for a demolition, or removal of a building, and that appropriate registered building practitioners are undertaking the work. Some of the cases caught by the SOS spotlight involved allegedly unsafe asbestos handling procedures.

SOS president Jack Hammond said the introduction of the amendment to the Building Regulations 1994 which came into effect on 1 July this year is a 'step in the right direction'. SOS will continue to campaign for the restoration of the link between building permits and town planning.

Despite the new regulation, residents should be aware that some contractors may prove unwilling to abide by the new regulation. Jack Hammond discovered that on the morning of Saturday, 7 August after Hawthorn residents rang the SOS

hotline about a demolition in progress at 27 Glenroy Rd which has received wide publicity as one of the houses used in the filming of The Sullivans TV series.

The demolishers were at work but no copy of the demolition

permit was on view.

A permit copy was begrudgingly displayed only after Jack Hammond's firm insistence.

Demolition of the 1914 house was halted after the City of Boroondara obtained a Supreme Court injunction over the telephone that morning.

Jack Hammond, a barrister, acted on behalf of the council.

A loophole had allowed the developer - Metro Giant - who bought the house in May this year to use an old demolition permit without consulting council.

Metro Giant had successfully applied to the Building Appeals Board to extend the original demolition permit even though the executive director of Heritage Victoria had refused his consent to a demolition permit being issued.

'The Suburban Backlash'... A new book by Dr Miles Lewis

At a packed residents' rally in Brighton last year, former ABC broadcaster Peter Couchman introduced one of the speakers, Dr Miles Lewis, Reader in Architecture at Melbourne University, as the 'conscience voice of planning'.

Dr Lewis, a co-founder and now a vice president of SOS, has also been praised by Barry Jones as one of Australia's few outspoken academics: a scholar who spearheads public debates on town planning issues.

But not only has Dr Lewis been at the forefront of public debate about town planning and heritage matters for four decades, he actively participates in residents' battles.

In the 1960s, he first went to war to save a large part of Carlton from being flattened and redeveloped in accordance with the dictates of Urban Renewal, the prevalent town planning ideology of the time.

Bureaucrats had convinced the then Liberal Housing Minister, Ray Meagher that the 19th century architecture of the inner suburbs was obsolete and needed to be rebuilt.

At the time Dr Lewis was a Ph.D. student, a junior member of staff at Melbourne University and a resident of Carlton. And as a conservation architect he was determined to save our heritage for future generations.

Dr Lewis is now writing a book called The Suburban Backlash which is to be published by Bloomings Books and available in

late November.

The book will investigate the development of the suburbs from 1840s onwards, how and why our suburbs differ from the European model and how they are enshrined in Australian culture and tradition.

Dr Lewis will address a variety of issues including the Australian preference for home ownership, the development of flats in the 1920s through to the medium density developments of the present day, building and town planning controls, the origin of the quarter acre block, existing infrastructure capacity and obsolescence, population policy and the rise of local residents' groups including the formation of SOS

Dr Lewis has written many books including the award winning 'Melbourne: The City's History and Development', 'Victorian Churches', 'Victorian Primitive', 'The Essential Maldon' and 'Don John of Balaclava'.



Dr Miles Lewis & Gaelene

JENNY LAW TRIES TO E

JENNY DECLARES WAR ON DEVELOPERS AND HEATHER'S ON THE WARPATH

Residents who lose an appeal against a development will often seek solace in any modifying conditions attached to the planning permit.

Other people may withdraw their objection to a development because of assurances that planning permit conditions will limit adverse effect upon their residential amenity.

Naturally enough, it is expected that such hard-fought-for conditions will be enforced by local councils which have a duty to administer and enforce their municipalities' planning schemes.

But this does not always happen as many dismayed residents find out.

Such residents are then forced to decide whether to enforce planning law themselves.

But taking that course can involve considerable inconvenience as well as financial and emotional costs as sixty-five-year-old Jenny Law of Brighton knows only too well.

Frustrated by what she believed to be inadequate action by Bayside Council over the enforcement of planning permit conditions for a development being built next door, Jenny served the enforcement orders herself.

She had been distressed by the removal of two trees and failure to provide root protection for a 70-year-old elm on her property. Provision of root protection and the retention of six trees had been conditions of a planning permit granted for two double-storey and one single storey units on the adjoining property.

However, after being informed by Bayside enforcement officer, Mark Bernhardt that she could incur costs of between \$5000-\$20,000 if she lost, she decided to withdraw the enforcement orders she had served on the developers of the property and Bayside Council.

"I would have liked to see it through to the end but I had been threatened with the prospect of having to pay huge costs if I lost. I was in no position to take the chance", said Jenny sadly.

Further down the Nepean Highway, Heather Redpath, 47 of Edithvale has just lost a battle to save a 28-year-old Norfolk Island pine tree despite its retention being a condition

of the planning permit granted by Kingston Council for a dual property on an adjacent property.

Heather withdrew her objection to that development after she had been assured that the retention of the tree would be one of the conditions of the planning permit.

Both Jenny and Heather are appalled that planning permit conditions have not been honoured by the developers or enforced by their local councils.

Furthermore, Heather Redpath feels let down by the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal which upheld Kingston Council's granting of a permit to remove the Norfolk Island pine.

Jenny and Heather are eager to share their experiences with readers of the Residents' Voice.



Jenny Law making her feeling felt.

Two years ago an auction board went up outside a house built between the wars - on the corner of Martin and St Kilda Sts. Brighton.

Jenny Law, who lives next door, was dismayed to notice that the house: two stories with five bedrooms, swimming pool, wine cellar and a large garden with established trees and shrubs, had been advertised as a re-development opportunity.

"Oh no!" she thought.

She said her "heart went to her boots" when, several months later, she first saw the developer's plans for the property: three double storey, mock Georgian units with underground parking.

"I cried out: 'Oh this is terrible'", said Jenny.

"One of the two developers involved replied:

'Oh you will LOVE it!' "

"I answered back crossly: 'I'm telling you I won't LOVE it. You can't put this here'."

"One of the men said: 'Oh yes we can. We have put it into council already'".

However Bayside Council were to knock back two applications for three double-storey units.

The developers went to appeal on 7 July, 1998 with a third set of plans for three units - two double-storey and one single storey.

Six months later, on January 4, 1999 the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal ordered that a permit be granted subject to thirteen conditions including the retention of six trees and root protection for Jenny's elm.

Furthermore, before the development began, a plan was to be submitted to the Responsible Authority (Bayside Council) showing the location of the six trees and proposed protection works for the root system of the elm tree.

In February, 1999 the house next door was demolished and construction work began.

One day Jenny became aware that the machines next door were excavating:

"I went to the fence and asked one of the workmen about the root protection. He didn't know anything about it. I was very upset", she said.

"The tree is only one and a half metres in from the fence line and is as tall as my house. Trees like that need open ground and there was going to be all that concrete next door and digging".

Bayside sent out a couple of enforcement officers - Steven Boyce and Mark Bernhardt.

"I was told by Mark Bernhardt that everything would 'probably be alright because the tree would probably not have spread under the fence'. I was amazed. A tree that size was only going to extend its root system west, east and south, not north?"

Jenny then complained to the Registrar of VCAT and heard nothing for three weeks until she made a follow-up phone call. She received an application form for an enforcement order in the post.

So began what Jenny calls a 'bureaucratic nightmare'.

"I had to go to Bayside and get a copy of the

ENFORCE PLANNING LAW

planning permit, then go to the Titles' Office for a copy of the title certificate for the land next door", she said.

"I couldn't get that on the spot. I had to wait five days but the title certificate was only good for 14 days. The clock was ticking over for the tree.

"I filled out the enforcement order application, had my signature witnessed at VCAT and lodged the application with all the paper work. All done!

"Two days later, a Friday, it all came back again. I should have paid \$23 and they needed to see my pensioner's concession card. Nobody had told me. More days were gone.

"The next Monday I went back to VCAT and lodged the application. Two days later the title certificate would have been out of date".

On May 31, Jenny noticed one of six trees to be retained was propped up against the fence. It still had a ribbon on it identifying it as a tree to be left!

"I went down to council to see if they had permission to remove the tree. The planner told me the developer would have to replace the tree", said Jenny.

"When I got home I realised another tree, a much bigger one near the Martin St. boundary had been cut down.

"I had to write another letter to VCAT to add the removal of the trees to my enforcement application".

Jenny said Bayside Council issued an infringement notice about the removal of the small tree and eventually informed her that the bigger tree had been 'diseased'.

On July 12 Jenny received a letter from VCAT advising her that she had seven days to serve the enforcement order:

"Three days had already gone before I received the letter", she said.

"I had to get a copy of the developer's business registration from the Australian Securities Commission to add to copies of the enforcement order and the subsequent letter about the removal of the trees.

"Copies had to go to everyone involved - the developer and his partner and their wives, the National Bank and Bayside Council. "Then I had to advise VCAT of all the names and addresses of everyone I had served with an enforcement order including the time of day and date as well as copies.

"All in all I made 53 copies of all the paperwork. I nearly went mad. It took three days with seven piles on the floor so I wouldn't miss anything".

On 16 July Jenny served the enforcement order on all parties concerned.

She received a registered letter from one of the developers on July 29 informing her of his grounds for opposing the enforcement order.

"He claimed that no breaches of planning permit conditions had occurred and that all work had been carried out to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority", she said.

"As I read that I was all too aware that one of the trees was still propped up against the fence and the other cut to the ground!"

On July 15, the day before she served the enforcement orders, Jenny became aware that the roots of her tree had been cut. That had been drawn to her attention by her ward



councillor, Libby Francis who had come to her home to discuss a separate planning matter concerning a friend who was also present.

"Libby removed the loose palings and indicated a spot right on the fenceline where loose roots were sticking out of the ground", she said. "That excavation was in a different area to the one investigated earlier by the enforcement officers".

Jenny said Cr Francis has subsequently told her that she reported the matter to Bayside Council.

"However I heard nothing until I visited council offices to see the file which was at the council's solicitors. It was suggested that I speak with enforcement officers Mark Bernhardt which I did. He rang me the following day on 5 August", she said.

"During the conversation, Mark informed me I could be liable for costs between \$5000-\$20,000 if the developer successfully appealed against the enforcement order", she said.

"That put me in a state of confusion and distress because I would have to sell my home to pay costs of that nature", she said.

Jenny said Mark Bernhardt told her a plumber HAD cut through the roots and agreed that she had not been officially informed of the fact by Bayside Council.

According to Steven Boyce, a report by Bayside arborist Damien Carr who investigated the damaged roots, said Jenny's tree has been attacked by the elm leaf beetle which posed a greater danger to it than the cut roots. Mr Boyce said the arborist reported that no 'big root' had been cut and that the best treatment was to cover the roots with soil.

Jenny said she had informed council several months ago about the beetles and had been put in contact with a firm of arborists who told her to wait until Spring when remedial action would be more effective.

She is now waiting to see what happens next. She has been told by an arborist that she will not know until spring or summer if her elm tree has been damaged by the roots being cut.

Jenny withdrew from her enforcement action in mid-August and feels that she has abandoned a principle.

"I told the Bayside CEO that the council had let me down and that I felt I had been intimidated by all the talk about costs. That certainly influenced me to change my mind", she said.

"There are dozens of residents like me, just minding our own business and along comes a developer. Suddenly we have to become builders, architects, landscapers, planners and watchdogs. It is not fair!

"My family has paid rates on this property for 90 years and I have had no support from Council. I've got a red brick wall close to my boundary - I can reach over the fence and touch it - with a little porthole to break up the expanse. My front garden is overshadowed. My kitchen looks out on the wind tunnel between two of the units. I've got the light on all day in the family room and a brick wall outside the window and I'm many hundreds of dollars out of pocket.

"But you have to laugh. Two months ago I received a letter from the council that my house is to be included in a heritage precinct that will include the units next door!"

According to Steven Boyce root protection would only have been provided if the roots of Mrs Law's elm had been exposed. He said that was not the case when he and Mark Bernhardt made their investigation. He agreed that a plumber had cut through the roots on a subsequent occasion. He said the removed trees would be replaced and that the developer had agreed to provide porous paving to allow more water to reach the elm.

Heather Redpath and her husband were not happy when an application was lodged with Kingston Council to build two double storey units close to the boundary along their back fence.

But they withdrew their objections when the owner developers agreed to conditions which were subsequently part of the planning permit granted by the council.

The conditions involved frosted glass and screens for two windows that overlooked their back garden and, even more importantly, the retention of a 10 metre high Norfolk Island pine.

“As far as the obscured glass and screening goes, we have had to fight every inch of the way”, said Heather. “All we have managed to get, so far, is one fixed, obscured window but the other involves sliding windows so it is a waste of time.

“The other night my husband was in the spa and he got out in the nude. He thought it was too bad if the neighbours got a shock.”

But the fate of the Norfolk Island pine has really concerned Heather and her neighbour Glenda Byrne who have fought hard to save it.

“The tree was the main thing. After we withdrew our objections, we consoled ourselves that it could be a lot worse and that we still had the tree and a bit of open space to look out on”, said Heather.

“Without the tree all we will have is an expanse of brick. The tree softens the whole development. However, within a month of moving in, just after Christmas,



Heather's on the Warpath

the owner developers applied to Kingston Council for a permit to remove the tree. And the council granted it!”

On 2 August, 1999, Heather lost her appeal to the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal against the council's granting of

their house”, she said.

Indeed, a survey undertaken by Kingston Council showed that the distance between the unit and the tree was less on site (1.60 m) than shown by the endorsed plans (2.10 m) and that the tree appeared to be shown in an incorrect location on the endorsed plans.

“But it all comes down to common sense. Why didn't they build further away from the tree and adjust the house to it. After all, the tree is where it has always been. It was there when the foundations were being laid”, said Heather.

When the Vanderwyks presented an arborist's report supporting their position, Heather engaged an arborist who came up with the opposite view.

“My arborist said there was no justification for removing the tree and that the house would fall down before the tree did. He said the tree's roots had tapped into the subterranean water table and would go nowhere near the house and that it was worth about \$50,000”, said Heather.

“In the end, VCAT accepted the opinion of the developer's arborist but the question still remains how is it that a planning permit condition can be abandoned within six months?”

In her 18 August, 1999 decision VCAT member Mrs Julia Bruce stated that she had accepted that it was ‘likely the root system (of the Norfolk Island pine) was damaged during excavation’ and ‘if the root system recovers, there will be lateral development which has a potential to damage the wall of the dwelling’.

a permit to remove the tree.

Heather says the experience has cost her emotionally and financially and that she is disappointed with the system.

“We are losing so many trees in Kingston. We are just being concreted over”, she lamented.

“Trees soften the new developments so much particularly when they are seen from the side and back. The front facades are often prettied up a bit but the rest is just hideous raw brick. It's like looking at toilet blocks.

“In this area too, the pine trees contribute to the character of an area near the beach”.

According to Heather, her neighbours, brother and sister, Brett and Melissa Vanderwyk were concerned that the tree was too close to their unit. Their parents live in the other unit.

“They had an arborist's report which claimed the tree would eventually damage

VIVA! OUR STREET

A rebellion is taking place in a small, quiet Glen Iris Street.

Signs have appeared in almost every picturesque front garden proclaiming the same message:

WARNING RESIDENTS OF THIS STREET WILL OPPOSE INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT S.O.S.



Viva Street residents are dismayed that a demolition permit has been issued for two Edwardian cottages - No. 2 and No. 4. The residents told the local Malvern/Prahran Leader (4 August) that they would appeal to Planning Minister, Mr Robert Maclellan to withdraw a demolition permit and save their street from ‘inappropriate development plans’

Viva Street is an almost intact street of charming, weatherboard cottages with ‘gingerbread’ fretwork trims.

Local Issues

Local Policies

By Mark Marsden, Acting Director Planning & Economic Development, City of Boroondarra.

Councils across the metropolitan area are introducing local policies to address shortcomings of the Good Design Guide. The City of Boroondarra is the second municipality to propose a formal local variation to the Guide (the first was the City of Monash, however Monash's local variation was not supported by the panel.) Boroondarra's local variation was exhibited early 1999 and over 300 submissions were received. It is envisaged that a panel hearing will be held later this year to hear these submissions.

The City of Boroondarra provides a well recognised high quality urban environment for people to live, work and play. Changes to this environment, which is under substantial pressure from development, need to be managed to ensure that the very fabric of the residential area is not lost.

The City of Boroondarra's Local Variation to the Good Design Guide looks at a number of aspects of the Guide which Council considers does not lead to appropriate outcomes of medium density development in established areas. Council then applied the local variation as an interim policy from 11 February, 1999 and it has been generally well received by many designers and architects. It has resulted in less intensive developments in areas less suited for densities envisaged by the Guide, where in turn it has provided more certainty for developers and the community.

The area which the local variation addresses includes the following:



Front setbacks

Front setbacks are often a strong character element in the City and often reflect the application of local laws and covenants over many years. The reduction of a setback from 9 metres to 6 metres or 7 to 5 metres

often has a significant impact on the streetscape.

It is proposed to replace the Good Design Guide technique with that contained in Council's Residential Urban Character Study. This means that setbacks will be linked to the prevailing setbacks in a street, using a formula viz, acceptable setback shall be no less than 1 metre less than the average of setback within 100 metres of the site.

Front fences

Low and unobtrusive fencing is often a strong character element in the City. High solid fencing creates visually hard streetscapes and impacts on the social aspects of interaction at the street level.

It is proposed to replace the Good Design Guide technique with that contained in the Residential Urban Character Study. Fence heights shall be constructed in a material and to a height that reflects the established characteristics of properties within 100 metres of the site.



Private open space

The majority of the City's residential areas are characterised by generous gardens which support an array of mature trees. A common concern with medium density development is that existing vegetation is lost and limited space and opportunity is provided for new vegetation to grow.

In this context initiatives are proposed to increase the area and dimension of private open space as specified in the Good Design Guide. Council has used the findings of the Residential Urban Character Study to link the



desired area of private open space to the nature of the established vegetation in the area or street.

For example, whereas the Good Design Guide specifies a minimum private open space area of 40 sq. m., of which only 25 sq. m. has to be secluded, in certain areas of Boroondarra, where Council's Residential Urban Character Study identified vegetation as very important to the character of an area, Council's desired private open space could be as much as 120 sq. m. or which 100 sq. m. has to be secluded.



Scale

There are a number of areas identified in the Residential Urban Character Study where the contribution of the single dwelling building scale is a strong contributor to the character of an area. It is proposed that within these areas, new building scale should be either single storey or sensitively designed two-storey. Sensitively designed two-storey form could include, but not necessarily always be, attic form.

7 km radius

In the City of Boroondarra, the 7 km radius in the Good Design Guide is an arbitrary line. It cuts through like communities and bears little resemblance to any local strategic, topographical or physical characteristic. The Good Design Guide states that within the 7 km radius, densities of new development can be greater than 1:200 sq. m.

It is proposed to lift the 7km radius completely from the Good Design Guide.

It is noted that the independent advisory committee looking at the City of Monash local variation to the Guide supported, in principle, changes to the Guide with respect to the extent of private open space associated with medium density developments, the front setbacks and front fence heights of these developments and the management of stormwater drainage.

The City of Boroondarra's local variation is proposing many similar changes to the Guide, and Council is hopeful that its local variation will be supported by the Department. For further information on Boroondarra's local variation proposal please contact Noel Matthews, Colin Singleton or Justin O'Meara at the City of Boroondarra.

CROWDED HOUSES

Knox residents will rally at their

Civic Centre, 511 Burwood Highway, Wantirna South on September 30 at 7.30 p.m.

to express concern about the extent of inappropriate development in their municipality.

The meeting's convenor, Gillian Wright, is now the SOS municipal representative for Knox.

Gillian says the purpose of the meeting is to gauge the level of community concern. She hopes an on-going residents' group will emerge from the meeting.

A possible name for such a group is KROWD - Knox Residents against OverWhelming Development.

“People are very concerned about the disappearance of trees from our neighbourhoods. Trees are very important in this part of the world. After all we are in the foothills of the Dandenongs”,

said Gillian.

“People realise there has to be some change. What we can't live with is whole streets being taken over by units”.

Gillian can be contacted on 9762 7632

The Residents BILL OF RIGHTS

The processes of planning and government frequently operate to serve interests other than those of the individual who is affected by them.

These interests are usually to do with economic development, rationalisation of resources, creation of desired forms of development, and maximising profits or employment in the development industry.

Such goals are valid only to the extent that they reflect the aims of the commonality of people, and that they respect the rights of individuals. We therefore assert:

- 1 That the government of residential areas must be in the hands of democratically elected local representatives, and must be administered for the common good of constituents, without interference from other levels of government except in matters of national or general public interest.
- 2 That where intervention by higher levels of government is or purports to be in the public interest, the nature of that interest must be made explicit.
- 3 That any intervention by higher levels of government in individual localities must so far as possible be by way of inducements to cooperate in the desired goals, rather than by way of compulsion.
- 4 That no citizen may be deprived of property or property rights except by negotiated agreement or for reasons of overriding public interest and upon the payment of full and fair compensation.
- 5 That property rights include the enjoyment of amenity in the form of privacy, daylight, views, accessibility, public and common space, and a compatible environment in terms of both built form and vegetation. These characteristics may change in an evolutionary way over a period of time, but they must not be significantly changed in any short period or in order to benefit any specific individual unless by agreement with all those affected.
- 6 That any development must pay to the community (usually through the relevant government instrumentality) a due proportion of the value of the existing infrastructure and the whole cost of any improvement or extension of the infrastructure necessitated by and attributable to that development.
- 7 That property owners and residents must be given full information and full opportunity to comment upon or to appeal against any development proposal which they believe to affect them.
- 8 That property owners and residents must not be put to expense or to undue labour or worry as a result of development proposals by others. All *bona fide* costs arising from the consideration of development proposals must be borne by the initiators of the proposals.
- 9 That all developments in a given area must be subject to the same constraints in terms of built form and amenity. Single houses, multi-unit developments, apartment blocks and non-residential uses must all be subject to the same controls.
- 10 That the process of approvals and appeals in relation to development proposals must be speedy, equitable, consistent and readily understandable.

Knox News 1 September

"The older areas of Knox are really going to turn into slums, with overcrowding, loss of trees and problems with parking.

"I believe there are a lot of people like me fighting individual battles and what I'd like to do is bring them together to form a united voice."

- Boronia resident Gillian Wright who is holding a public meeting on 30 September at 7.30 at Knox Civic Centre to form a Knox action group.

The Age 31 August

• "This policy is a policy that reflects the coalition Government (is) listening to the messages we've been getting from the community".

- The Minister for Planning and Local Government, Rob Maclellan announcing changes to the State Government's planning policy, including changes to the Good Design Guide.

• According to State Political Reporter Sandra McKay ..

'Labor's planning spokesman, Mr John Thwaites said there was nothing (in the State Government's planning policy) to stop high-rise development on foreshores, the further destruction of local amenity or changes to Mr Maclellan's power to call in projects'.

• "It (the State Government) has obviously heard the concerns and responded to the anger of thousands of residents'.

- The president of Save Our Suburbs, Mr Jack Hammond, cautioned that the 'devil would be in the detail'.

Planning News 5 August

'If average detached houses can be divided into, say five bed sitters - then hey presto, urban consolidation is achieved without one house being demolished. This would also keep the heritage police happy. Indeed, housing conditions of a bygone era (i.e. industrial revolution) may be encouraged, facilitating a greater sense of community and ecologically sustainable outcomes. There may be a need for additional policies on clotheslines, vermin control and night carts but these can no doubt be addressed'.

- Gavin Turley of Seaford responding to an earlier article on a proposal to subdivide an existing Frankston dwelling into five bed sitters.

Australian Financial Review,

2 August

'Now that the backlog (of permits) has been cleared, a large number of development proposals have come on to the market simultaneously and we will soon begin to see an oversupply of new property relative to the number of interested buyers.

In this kind of environment, it is crucial that builders and developers know which types of new developments are most likely to attract buyers'

- Jellis Craig consultant, Paul Prior who forecasted an oversupply of suburban developments.

Malvern/Prahran Leader, 4 August

'The proposed Airlie Ave Urban Conservation Area is of high local importance for the integrity and interest of its surviving 1890s and 1900s building stock'.

• Heritage consultant Bryce Rayworth recommending the area be added to the Stonnington Heritage strategy. Last year the council received a petition signed by 40 residents calling for heritage protection.

The Williamstown Advertiser,

21 July

"It is extremely pleasing to note the emphasis placed on our local planning guidelines, neighbourhood character studies and conservation guidelines throughout this hearing".

• Cr Dick Murdoch, Mayor of Hobsons Bay commenting on a VCAT ruling to uphold a council decision to refuse a permit for a proposed six-storey office, restaurant and residential complex at 4 to 18 Ferguson St.

Cr Murdoch said council was now in a 'far greater position to challenge and win development proposals such as this one'.

Municipal Representatives

Ballarat

Greg Henderson 5331 3537

Banyule

Chris Siciliano 9434 2023
Sandra Hamlet 9435 3180
Jane Crone 9457 1675
Noel Withers 9435 4513

Bass Coast Shire

Carola Adolf 5678 2286

Bayside

Cheryl May 9596 1823
Derek Wilson 9583 2839
Jocellyn Lee 9596 6835

Boroondara

Keryn Christos 9817 3755
David Tink 9830 5280
Adele Barrett 9836 0640
Gillian Simonson 9813 2186
Luba Copland 9885 1869

Casey Shire

Sharon Beel 9707 4721

Darebin

Liz Gaynor 9484 7361

Frankston

Mark Conroy 9785 9314

Geelong

Judy and Bob Hutchinson 5278 7203

Glen Eira

Cheryl Forge 9576 0099

Hobsons Bay

David Moore 9397 5773

Kingston

Janelle House 9772 4862
Robert Titchener 9580 0102
Ella Hayes 9583 9789

Knox

Gillian Wright 9762 7632

Manningham

Faye North 9848 2752

Maribynong

Alan Ross 9318 5833
Jack Harrison 9317 7843
John Preston 9214 6690

Maroondah

Anne Kaufman 9879 5228

Melbourne

Stephen Pickard 9633 2738

Moonee Valley

Rick Clements 9337 5647
Michael Gill 9379 9624
Diane Adey 9379 4513

Moreland

Lesley Williams 9387 2228

Mornington

Arnold Wallace 5974 3594

Mornington Peninsula

Meg Breidahl 9787 3033
Arthur Moore 5975 6148
Ralph Percy 5974 1222

Nilumbik

Gayle Blackwood 9846 1221

Port Phillip

Philip Shaw 9699 6370
Ian Macrae 9690 7604

Stonnington

Tom Moloney 9510 3540
Dianne Duck 9576 1492
Tony Dawson 9576 0048

Whitehorse

David Scotte 9878 8714
Philip Warren-Smith 9898 6107
John Hodgetts 9809 6966

Yarra

Jo Kinross 9419 8494
Ruth Clemens 9428 0282
Kate Austin 9419 2272
Amy Robson 9419 5170

Yarra Ranges

Paul De Blasius 9726 4311

THE FUTURE OF OUR SUBURBS



IMPORTANT DIARY DATE

Melbourne University's Faculty of Architecture, in association with SOS, is holding a conference on 'The Future of Our Suburbs', at the faculty's Prince Philip Theatre on the weekend of 9-10 October, 1999

The conference will take a broad overview of current and future policies for suburban development and form, housing location, densities, servicing of dwellings, and issues of procedure and equity. The aim is to completely review and reassess the assumptions and principles underlying residential development and redevelopment in Melbourne, with a view to establishing some consensus for the future.

To date the speakers include:

Professor Kevin O'Connor

- Urban form

Dr Michael Buxton

- Medium density housing policy

Mr Paul Goldstone

- Suburban centres

Dr Paul Mees

- Housing & transport

Professor Jon Robinson

- Property values & development

Mr Michael Bromby

- Covenants and agreements

Mr Mark Marsden

- Local variations

Ms Roz Wilson

- Urban character and amenity

Cr Brad Matheson

- Constraints on councils

Professor Kim Dovey

- Architectural quality in developments

Professor Catherin Bull

- Open space

Mr Brendan Johnson

- Enforcement of building & planning permits

Dr Miles Lewis

- Resident rights

John Glossop

- The Good Design Guide

Dr Bob Birrell

- State population policy & forecasts

Professor Graeme Davison

- Closing address: Suburban character

HOW TO CONTACT SOS

By post: PO Box 5042 Y,
Melbourne, 3001

By phone: 9849 0023

Email: sos_melb@hotmail.com

Web Site:

www.creativeaccess.com.au/sos

Sponsorship

Printed generously by Miss Print
Printing Service 9555 1265

Artwork donated by Philip Shaw
& IS Advertising 9596 8000

Website design by Peter
Billingham 0414 227 389

Can you help SOS by offering your
skills? Call Di to find out 9849 0023

RESIDENTS
Voice

GPO Box 5042Y, Melbourne 3001.

ISSUE 6 -SEPT/OCT 1999