This paper has been prepared to enable Council to consider further options in relation to the translation of New Residential Zones, in the context of feedback received during community consultation. It presents:

1. An overview of the strategic intent of the Housing Policy
2. Opportunities to increase development potential
3. Precinct/site specific changes in response to comments received during consultation
4. Minor adjustments and corrections
5. A recommended approach.

I. STRATEGIC INTENT OF THE HOUSING POLICY

The translation of the new residential zones is based on Council’s existing Housing Policy. The strategic intent of the Housing Policy is to:

- **Provide significant opportunities for housing growth within Port Phillip**. (This recognises the important role of the inner region in supporting a more sustainable metropolitan Melbourne).

- **Maximise well-located housing growth** through proactively directing the majority of new development (at higher densities) to locations that offer greatest proximity to shops/services and public transport (i.e., areas that will achieve greatest sustainability benefits).

- **Ensure development occurs in locations with greatest capacity for change** (with the scale of development generally defined by built form policy and controls such as the Design and Development Overlay and Character Statements).

- **Manage the level of change and nature of development** in established residential areas to respond to neighbourhood character and heritage values.

This policy intent is best delivered through clearly differentiating between ‘preferred housing growth areas’ and areas where housing growth should be more limited. Application of the three new residential zones provides the opportunity to clearly reflect and achieve the strategic intent of Housing Policy, and also deliver certainty for the local community and the development sector.

The Housing Policy does not seek to prevent development in areas designated for more limited change, but rather to encourage the majority of housing growth to occur in locations where access to shops, services, and transport is greatest. The translation to New Residential Zones proposes to achieve this through:

- Providing increased development yields and planning certainty via the General Residential and Residential Growth Zones – to incentivise housing development in ‘preferred’ locations.

- Implementing a ‘sliding density scale’ in the Neighbourhood Residential zone relative to site size, rather than limiting all sites to two dwellings (default density).
This would result in only a modest reduction in development potential within NRZ areas. Housing development would be expected to ‘transfer’ to other ‘preferred’ areas with little overall impact on development rates across the City of Port Phillip.

2. OPPORTUNITIES TO INCREASE DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

While some feedback was very supportive of Council’s proposed approach, an alternate view was also expressed that the translation of zones is too restrictive on development potential across the municipality.

In developing options, consideration was given to retaining the broad intent of Council’s adopted Housing Policy but providing for a more flexible application of the zones and schedules to increase development potential.

Key opportunities to increase development potential include:

- Opportunity 1 – Alter the sliding scale and/or building heights and/or reduce the extent of the Neighbourhood Residential Zone.
- Opportunity 2 – Increase the extent of the General Residential Zone.
- Opportunity 3 – Increase the extent of the Residential Growth Zone.

(Note – These options are not mutually exclusive.)

OPPORTUNITY 1 – NEIGHBOURHOOD RESIDENTIAL ZONE

WHAT WAS PROPOSED AT CONSULTATION

The consultation version of the new residential zones applied the Neighbourhood Residential Zone to:

- Existing Heritage Overlay precincts
- Existing Neighbourhood Character Overlay area (i.e. Beacon Cove Residential Precinct)
- Areas outside of a Heritage Overlay:
  - which have a highly consistent neighbourhood character or
  - which do not offer proximity to a large activity centre or the fixed rail Principal Public Transport Network (PPTN).
### KEY POINTS FROM CONSULTATION – COUNCIL’S APPROACH TO THE NRZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Comments in support</th>
<th>Comments against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • 135 comments received on the NRZ. **Mixed views received:**  
• 33 per cent of respondents (45 respondents) whose property was included in the NRZ supported it.  
• 45 per cent (59) did not and would prefer to be in the General Residential Zone (offering more flexibility). | • 42 per cent (37) supported proposed mandatory building heights.  
• 37 per cent (32) supported the proposed limits on the number of dwellings on a site. **Key Comments:**  
• Protects neighbourhood character and heritage – “village feel”.  
• Provides certainty in development outcomes.  
• Prevents further inappropriate development and protect single dwellings.  
• Will help address existing issues with on-street parking / traffic. | • 25 per cent (22) said height limit is too restrictive.  
• Suggested 3 storeys should apply or the GRZ (with its flexible height).  
• 21 per cent (18) thought the height limit was too generous.  
• 26 per cent (23) did not support the proposed density controls as it would limit development. **Issues raised:**  
• NRZ used too extensively and will restrict development opportunities.  
• Does not promote urban consolidation – will increase pressure on urban fringe.  
• Will reduce housing affordability and housing diversity.  
• Inconsistent with the existing built form and density (e.g. in East St Kilda and Elwood).  
• Criticised weight given to heritage and neighbourhood character. |

### OPPORTUNITY 1.1 - AMEND THE ‘SLIDING (DENSITY) SCALE’ TO INCREASE DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

**OPTIONS**

The Neighbourhood Residential Zone has a default setting of two dwellings on a lot unless, otherwise specified. The consultation proposal allowed an increased number of dwellings on larger lots (600m² or greater) with a ‘sliding scale’ applied to manage site density and help protect neighbourhood character.

This ‘sliding scale’ recognises that reasonable development potential should be maintained across Port Phillip, including in the NRZ. This recognises the prevailing intensity of development across the City.
An option which allows for increased development yield, without changing the extent of the NRZ, is to amend sliding density scale. Three options are presented:

**Option A**
Consultation version

- 0-599m²: 2 dwellings
- 600-799m²: 3 dwellings
- 800-999m²: 4 dwellings
- 1,000-1,199m²: 5 dwellings
- 1,200m² +: 6 dwellings

**Option B**
Reduce minimum site size in the sliding density scale from 600m² to 450m² and increase development potential for sites over 1,200m².

- 0-449m²: 2 dwellings
- 450-599m²: 3 dwellings
- 600-799m²: 4 dwellings
- 800-999m²: 5 dwellings
- 1,000-1,199m²: 6 dwellings
- 1,200m² +: 7 dwellings (plus 1 dwelling per 150m² of site area over 1,200m²)

**Option C**
Similar to Option B but also increase site density.

- 0.399m²: 2 dwellings
- 400-549m²: 3 dwellings
- 550-699m²: 4 dwellings
- 700-849m²: 5 dwellings
- 850-999m²: 6 dwellings
- 1,000m²+: 1 dwelling per 150m² of site area

* NB – Sites in the low-rise area of Beacon Cove and Fishermans Bend Estate, Garden City Estate and Dunstan Estate would remain at a maximum of two dwellings per site (as proposed in the consultation). No comments were received on this issue in these areas.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Amending the sliding scale allows for increased development opportunities, whilst retaining the Neighbourhood Residential Zoning to differentiate from ‘preferred’ housing growth areas (ie where the GRZ and RGZ are applied to facilitate well-located housing development at higher densities).

- The use of the sliding scale is in line with Council’s Housing Policy. Whilst Policy does not specifically ‘encourage’ medium density in locations that are distant from public transport and shop, it does not seek to restrict it entirely.

- It is important to ensure that the sliding scale provides the opportunity for some new multi-unit development (but that higher densities / yields are achieved in ‘preferred’ areas that can deliver the best located housing):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT DENSITY - NRZ (2004-2011)</th>
<th>OPTION A – Consultation version</th>
<th>OPTION B</th>
<th>OPTION C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I dwelling per 120m² (Average) (Range from: 1 dwelling per 35m² to 1 dwelling per 513m²)</td>
<td>I dwelling per 250m² (Average)</td>
<td>I dwelling per 187m² (Average)</td>
<td>I dwelling per 150m² (Average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range from: 1 dwelling per 200-300m² (for sites of 600m² and more)</td>
<td>Range from: 1 dwelling per 150-224m² (for sites of 450m² and more)</td>
<td>Range from: 1 dwelling per 133-166m² (for sites of 400m² and more)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Council’s Housing Policy also seeks to achieve housing diversity and housing affordability. The NRZ limits the number of dwellings on a lot is likely to result in an increase in the size of dwellings.

• **Housing affordability** – Larger dwellings in the NRZ will be less affordable – noting however that this will affect only a small percentage of overall dwellings constructed across Port Phillip. Smaller, more affordable dwellings will still be delivered in the GRZ, RGZ and the Mixed Use and Commercial 1 zones – with these occurring in areas that offer greatest access to services and transport (thereby reducing overall living costs).

• **Housing diversity** – New residential developments across Port Phillip is dominated by 1-2 bedroom dwellings. As indicated above – the majority of future residential development (which occurs outside areas proposed to be zones NRZ) is likely to continue this trend. The potential for larger dwellings in the NRZ may create increased opportunities for accommodating larger/family households.

DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

Amending the sliding scale would increase development opportunities.

• The **application of the NRZ** will result in some reduction in development opportunities / yields, compared to that achieved under the current Residential 1 Zone, however this will not equate to a significant reduction in development capacity across the City of Port Phillip.

• The Residential 1 Zone (sites across the three new zones), only accounts for a minor proportion of overall housing growth across the municipality:
  - Only one-third (1,855 or 265 net dwellings per annum) of new housing development between 2004 and 2011 was constructed in the Residential 1 Zone.
  - The majority, 64 per cent, was constructed in a commercial or mixed use zone.

• Between 2004 and 2011, only 15 per cent of net dwellings (769 dwellings or 109 dwellings per annum) were constructed on properties proposed to be translated to the Neighbourhood Residential Zone. The potential reduction in dwellings per annum (from current development rates) is therefore not significant, even under the consultation proposal (see Appendix 1). This reduction could however, be further minimised through altering the ‘sliding scale’ to increase permitted site density:
  - Option A (consultation proposal) - a reduction of 74 dwellings per year.
  - Option B – a reduction of 59 dwellings.
  - Option C – a reduction of 53 dwellings.

• As indicated by the analysis provided in Attachment 1 – Larger sites (over 800m²) would be most impacted by density restrictions in the NRZ. These sites are predominantly located in East St Kilda and Elwood.

• Of developments between 2004 and 2011 on these larger sites, only a small number of developments are achieving significantly higher densities (under the current planning controls) than would be permitted by the ‘sliding scale’ (Option B).

• Reducing the minimum lot size from 600m² to 450m² would increase the number of sites available for development in excess of two dwellings:
  - 17% of sites in the proposed NRZ are 600m² or more
  - 34% of sites in the proposed NRZ are 400m² or more.

• Option B is recommended, providing more development opportunities than the consultation version while still maintaining sufficiently differential development yields to achieve the strategic intent of the Housing Policy - to direct development to the best locations.
OPPORTUNITY 1.2 - INCREASE MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHTS

The consultation raised the option of increasing building heights to allow 3 storey development. Three options are presented:

Option A
Consultation proposal

- Apply an 8 metre height limit (2 storeys) in most areas.
- Apply a 10 metre height limit (3 storeys) in areas where existing heights commonly exceed 9 metres (areas with taller terraces and apartment buildings).
- Maintain existing height controls where sites are already covered by an existing 'Design and Development Overlay'.

Option B
Expand specific locations for 3 storeys

- Expand the 10m height limit (3 storeys) locations where 50% of buildings are over 9m (noting that double storey dwellings often reach this height):
  - South of Glen Huntly Road, Elwood
  - Broadway, Elwood. (See map below)

Option C
Allow 3 storeys across the NRZ

- Apply a 10m height limit across the majority of the NRZ.
- Maintain existing height controls where sites are already covered by an existing 'Design and Development Overlay'.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Raising the height limit would provide more development flexibility in parts of the NRZ, however in a large number of locations, a 3 storey building would be out of character with predominately single and double storey streetscapes.

- Planning policy seeks to clearly identify areas where a new built form character will be created and areas where existing built form character will be maintained.
  - In areas where existing built form character is to be maintained (majority of Port Phillip’s established residential areas), the scale, massing and bulk of new development should respect the scale and form of nearby buildings in areas.
  - It also requires that new development respects and does not detract from heritage places.

DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

Providing for an additional storey may allow some further scope for redevelopment, however development potential will largely be governed by the density controls limiting the number of dwellings on a site.

- Option A is recommended:
  - It provides certainty about the scale of building is expected in the zone.
  - Areas where taller dwellings predominate (70% or more of existing buildings) have been identified and proposed schedules already allow taller buildings of up to 10m (3 storeys).
  - The NRZ does include minor exemptions to the mandatory heights to provide some flexibility for architectural features and to address issues such as flooding.

- Option B would provide for additional opportunities to build to up to 3 storeys in specific locations. The criteria that 50 per cent or more of existing dwellings are taller than 9m, could
see the character of streets change substantially. (In such areas, single and double storey dwellings generally still predominate.)

Spatial implications Option B – additional areas considered for NRZ2 (10m height limit)

- Option C could result in substantial changes to highly valued neighbourhood character and heritage areas across the city. Feedback during consultation indicated considerable support for creating certainty around the height of new development.

OPPORTUNITY 1.3 – REDUCE THE EXTENT OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD RESIDENTIAL ZONE

OPTIONS

A number of 'locational' options are presented that would reduce the extent of the Neighbourhood Residential Zone applied across Port Phillip – by translating these areas to the General Residential Zone instead.

In developing options, consideration has been given to maintaining alignment with the overall intent of Council’s adopted Housing Policy. Whilst the ‘consultation’ proposal has strictly applied the locational criteria detailed in the Housing Policy, it is considered that the overall intent of the policy can still be achieved with a more flexible application of zones (as well as changes to the density of development allowed in the associated schedules as outlined above).

Three options are presented:
**The additional areas recommended for possible inclusion the General Residential Zone (rather than the NRZ) are outlined in detail in ‘Opportunity 2 – General Residential Zone’ (see Opportunity 2.1).

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Substantially reducing the extent of the Neighbourhood Residential Zone would represent a major departure from policy.

- A key element of Council’s policy is to spatially distinguish between areas that are well located (directing higher densities to those locations) and areas that are distant from public transport and shops and other facilities. The application of the NRZ helps to reflect and achieve this.
- Option A is recommended (fully detailed in the next section as Opportunity 2.1).
- Option B - Limiting the NRZ to areas covered by the Heritage Overlay or Neighbourhood Character Overlay would:
  - Still retain the NRZ over a significant extent of the residential areas of Port Phillip - 71 per cent of the proposed NRZ is within a Heritage Overlay (HO) or Neighbourhood Character Overlay (NCO).
  - Not support Council’s policy intent of facilitating well-located housing growth. In this option areas which are distant from shops and public transport (such as parts of East St Kilda and Elwood) would be placed in the GRZ (see map below).

---

**Option A**
Replace NRZ in specific locations whilst still aligning with policy intent (see Opportunity 2.1)

- Main roads with bus routes (excluding intact low scale HO areas)
- Main or collector roads where development is predominantly 2-3 storeys
- precincts along main roads which have existing DDO controls allowing for development of 3 storeys or more
- Heritage precincts close to large activity centres with existing higher scale development.

**Option B**
Retain the NRZ in Heritage Overlay areas and Neighbourhood Character Overlay areas only

- NRZ would apply to Heritage Overlay and Neighbourhood Character Overlay areas only.
- GRZ would apply to other areas in locations, including areas that are distant from shops and public transport.

**Option C**
Replace NRZ with GRZ across the city

- All NRZ would be replaced by the GRZ.
Spatial implications Option B – Including all areas outside of Heritage Overlay in GRZ

- Option C - A broad application of the GRZ across the municipality is not recommended:
  - It would represent little change from the current zoning situation and would not direct housing to the best locations (ie around large activity centres and along public transport routes).
  - It does not make best use of the new zones to manage the intensity of development to protect heritage and neighbourhood character.

DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

Reducing the extent of the NRZ will provide additional development opportunities, however a wholesale reduction of NRZ will weaken Council’s Housing Policy of achieving well-located housing growth.

- The changes to the NRZ proposed in Option A (recommended) would reduce the NRZ to 70 per cent of Port Phillip’s residential areas (a reduction from 80 per cent compared to the consultation proposal).
- Whilst Options B and C would result in some further increase in development opportunities compared to Option A, they would not support the intent of Council’s Housing Policy to promote well-located housing growth.
- As identified in Opportunity 1.1, the NRZ would result in potential reduction in dwellings per annum (from current development rates) (albeit minimal). On top of altering the sliding scale, this reduction could be further minimised by reducing the extent of the NRZ (ie applying Option A in Opportunity 1.3):
  - Option A (consultation proposal) - a reduction of 49 dwellings per year.
  - Option B – a reduction of 37 dwellings.
  - Option C – a reduction of 33 dwellings (see Appendix 1).
OPPORTUNITY 2 - GENERAL RESIDENTIAL ZONE

WHAT WAS PROPOSED AT CONSULTATION

The consultation version of the new residential zones applied the General Residential Zone:

- Along main roads with public transport
  - Sites with frontage to a main road adjacent to fixed rail (Principal Public Transport Network).

- Close to activity centres
  - Areas proximate (within approximately 400m walking distance) of large activity centres identified within a Structure Plan / Urban Design Framework which have capacity for redevelopment based on diverse neighbourhood character (i.e. South Melbourne, Port Melbourne, and Carlisle Street, East St Kilda).
  - Sites fronting Ormond Road and Glen Huntly Road, proximate to the Elwood Junction and Elwood Village activity centres.
  - Areas within walking distance of the St Kilda Activity Centre which have capacity for redevelopment (i.e. a diverse character).

- In locations where existing planning controls allow higher scale development:
  - Sites covered by Design and Development Overlay where the objective is housing growth and/or a diversity of housing.
  - Sites in the Residential 2 Zone (which encourages residential development at medium or higher densities).

- To sites over 5,000m² in single ownership containing existing medium density housing (e.g. public housing estates).

KEY POINTS FROM CONSULTATION - -- COUNCIL’S APPROACH TO THE GRZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Comments in support</th>
<th>Comments against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 95 respondents had an affected property in the GRZ.</td>
<td>• 56 respondents considered approach too conservative. Not made enough use of the GRZ.</td>
<td>• GRZ does not prevent inappropriate development or limit further residential growth. Issues raised – The GRZ would:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 13 respondents (14 per cent) supported the application of the GRZ on their property.</td>
<td>• Suggested application of the GRZ:</td>
<td>• Impact on neighbourhood character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 82 per cent (78 respondents) did not support the GRZ.</td>
<td>- Across the municipality</td>
<td>• Increase traffic / safety issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 60 responses concerned two specific streets in East St Kilda.</td>
<td>- Tram &amp; bus routes and around train stations &amp; activity centres (including heritage areas)</td>
<td>• Impact on heritage areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NB - 57 per cent of respondents with properties in the NRZ wanted to be in a GRZ.</td>
<td>• Impact on adjoining sites in the NRZ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPPORTUNITY 2.1 – INCREASE THE EXTENT OF GENERAL RESIDENTIAL ZONE

OPTIONS - (See summary Map on Page 13)

A number of additional locations (that were proposed NRZ in the consultation) have been identified and assessed for possible inclusion the General Residential Zone.

Four options are presented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Potential precincts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial or collector roads with bus routes (excluding intact low scale Heritage Overlay areas)</td>
<td>• Development would be well-located with direct access to a permanent bus route. • Prevailing character of 2-3 storeys and varied scale and form in the Heritage Overlay mean sites can accommodate higher scale development.</td>
<td>• Grey Street • Princes Street • Hodham Street • Barkly Street, St Kilda (between Alma and Inkerman Street) • Glen Huntly Road (between Elwood Canal and Brighton Road) • St Kilda Street, Elwood • Barkly Street (between Blessington and Dickens Street)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Potential precincts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial or collector roads where existing development is predominantly 2-3 storeys</td>
<td>• Existing scale and character of development, and road widths, mean the location can accommodate more intense development from an urban design perspective. • Varied form and scale of development in the HO area.</td>
<td>• Inkerman Street (northside between Evelyn and Sebastapol Streets) • Alma Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Potential precincts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Precincts along main roads which have existing DDO controls which allow for 3 storeys or more</td>
<td>• Existing built form controls will control the form of development. • Varied form and scale of development in the Heritage Overlay area. • Prevailing character comprises buildings of two-three storeys.</td>
<td>• Ormond Esplanade • Marine Parade • Beaconsfield Parade • Acland Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option D</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Potential precincts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage precincts close to large activity centres with existing higher scale development</td>
<td>• Prevailing character of the heritage precinct is three storeys or more. • Varied form and scale of development in the Heritage Overlay area. The HO will continue to guide the form of development.</td>
<td>• St Kilda (between Acland Street and Grey Street) NB – By comparison, Heritage Overlay areas around Carlisle Street, Bay Street and South Melbourne Activity Centres are predominantly single (and limited double) storey development. No changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The precincts identified for inclusion in the GRZ, while not a strict application of Council’s Housing Policy, are logical and generally reinforce Council’s policy intent to promote well-located housing growth whilst respecting neighbourhood character and heritage areas.

- These locations:
  - Expand the current policy approach which focusses on fixed rail routes to include bus routes.
  - Reflect where the prevailing built form character is 3 storeys and over.
  - Provide opportunities for additional development in locations where the built form outcomes are set through current planning controls (for example Design and Development Overlays).

DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

The addition of precincts / sites into the GRZ will result in increased development opportunities.

- The inclusion of all sites identified above would result in 21.5 per cent of Port Phillip’s residential areas in the GRZ (an increase from 14.8 per cent from the consultation version).
- The inclusion of Options A thru D would increase properties in the GRZ by 1,798:
  - 1,276 sites have only 1 or 2 dwellings on them and therefore may be developable.
- The expected scale and form of development in the GRZ would be similar to current development in the existing Residential 1 Zone.
- While additional development could be achieved, it would still be required to respect neighbourhood character.
OPPORTUNITY 2.1 - GENERAL RESIDENTIAL ZONE

OPTION A - Arterial or collector roads with bus routes (excluding intact low scale Heritage Overlay areas)
- Arterial or busy collector road with bus route
- Prevailing character predominantly 3 storeys or more
- If N.Q.A. area has varied scale / form.

OPTION B - Arterial or collector roads where development is predominantly 2-3 storeys
- Arterial road or busy collector road which can accommodate higher scale development.
- Prevailing character predominantly 2-3 storeys.

OPTION C - Precincts along main roads with existing DDO controls allowing for development 3+ storeys
- Existing DDO allowing heights of 3 storeys or more in place.
- Prevailing character over two storeys.
- Heritage Overlay applies but area has varied scale / form.

OPTION D - Higher scale heritage precincts close to large activity centres
- Close to large activity centre.
- Prevailing character two and three storeys.
- Heritage Overlay applies but higher scale development.
- Existing DDO (in part).
OPPORTUNITY 3 - RESIDENTIAL GROWTH ZONE

WHAT WAS PROPOSED AT CONSULTATION

The consultation version of the new residential zones applied the Residential Growth Zone to:

- Locations identified for substantial residential growth within strategic sites and precincts (in close proximity to a large activity centre).
- Locations identified for moderate residential growth as part of more intense mixed use developments on selected larger sites identified in activity centre structure plans.

The limited areas the RGZ applied to were:

- Queens Road
- Specific sites adjoining the Carlisle Street Activity Centre.

KEY POINTS FROM CONSULTATION - COUNCIL'S APPROACH TO THE RGZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Comments in support</th>
<th>Comments against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 9 comments received from property owners in the RGZ.</td>
<td>• 3 respondents supported the application of RGZ on Queens Road.</td>
<td>• 3 respondents did not support the application of RGZ along Queens Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mixed views on the zone.</td>
<td>• 2 respondents did not support the application of the RGZ along Nelson Street and Camden in East St Kilda.</td>
<td>• Area is overdeveloped and development should be limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 31 respondents (mainly those commenting on the municipality-wide approach) considered the RGZ should be applied more extensively across the city.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 respondent (in a neighbouring zone) concerned with inclusion of the Australia Post site (Chapel Street) and potential impacts on neighbouring properties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPPORTUNITY 3.1 – INCREASE THE EXTENT OF RESIDENTIAL GROWTH ZONE

OPTIONS - (See summary Map on Page 16)

To provide further development opportunities, the RGZ could be applied to additional areas (proposed GRZ in the consultation). Two options are presented:
POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The potential for the Residential Growth Zone is quite limited in Port Phillip given the zone’s intent is to facilitate increased densities at four storeys. This implies an area that will undergo comprehensive renewal and few established residential precincts in Port Phillip meet this criteria. The Mixed Use Zone has been applied to significant renewal areas in Port Phillip (generally former industrial areas which still offer significant residential growth potential).

- Higher density development in Port Phillip has largely occurred in the Mixed Use Zone and Commercial Zones.
  - 64 per cent of new dwellings (3,333 additional dwellings or 476 dwellings per annum) constructed between 2004 and 2011 in the municipality were developed in a commercial or mixed use zone.

- Some minor additions to the RGZ are proposed however, extensive use of this zone is not recommended. The Mixed Use Zone is considered a better tool.

- The inclusion of all sites identified above would equate to 4.5 per cent of Port Phillip’s residential areas in the RGZ (an increase from 1.2 per cent from the consultation version).

- There is also the prospect (based on Plan Melbourne) that the State Government will apply VicSmart and remove third party notice and appeal rights. (NB - The existing Residential 2 Zone, which does not provide for notice and appeal, has not been used extensively across Melbourne.)

DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

Only a minor increase in development potential will be achieved through the inclusion of additional precincts / sites in the Residential Growth Zone as many sites are already developed.

- Some development potential exists around the towers on DHS sites.

- Many of the additional sites are subject to existing planning provisions and policy such as DDOs which will guide the development potential of these areas.
OPPORTUNITY 3.1 - RESIDENTIAL GROWTH ZONE

NB: Limited future development capacity - largely developed.

OPTION A - Precincts / sites with existing DDOs at 4 storeys or more.
- Existing DDO allowing heights of 4 storeys or more in place.
- If in HQ, area has varied scale / form.
- Prevailing character predominantly 3 storeys or more.

OPTION B - Precincts / sites which already have residential development at 4 storeys (or more)
- Prevailing character predominantly four storeys or more (including towers on large sites).
- Sites generally outside of HQ.
- Some capacity for redevelopment.
3. PRECINCT / SITE SPECIFIC CHANGES IN RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Generally responses to the consultation were representing property interests from across the municipality and different zones. There were few ‘hotspots’, however with some concentrations of comments received in relation to:

- Camden Street and Linton Avenue, East St Kilda (60 comments)
- Queens Road (7 comments)
- Brunnings Estate, East St Kilda (5 comments)
- Hotham Street, East St Kilda (3 comments)
- Wellington Street, East St Kilda (3 comments)
- Alma Road, East St Kilda (2 comments and 44 late submissions).

Comments were also received from the Port Phillip Housing Association, Office of Housing and Catholic Education Office about multiple sites (in their ownership).

The following tables identify specific locations raised in responses, summarise comments received for each zone and schedule, and identify proposed changes in response to those comments.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD RESIDENTIAL ZONE** (See summary Map on Page 22)

**HOTSPOTS / PRECINCTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotspots</th>
<th>Comments received / Response</th>
<th>Proposed changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hotham Street (northern end) (NRZ1) | Comments received:  
- Three respondents. Requested application of the GRZ.  
- The properties are close to Dandenong Road and are surrounded by existing unit blocks.  
Response:  
- Hotham Street is proposed for inclusion in the GRZ. It is located on a bus route and has prevailing 3 storey character along most of its length. | See Opportunity 2.1 which proposes to alter the proposed zone along Hotham Street to the GRZ (Option A). |
| Barkly Street, St Kilda (north of Inkerman Street) | Comments received:  
- 8 responses (including 1 late submission). 4 support the NRZ and 4 responses do not support NRZ – seek GRZ. One from social housing provider, another from a hotel and one from a developer  
- Comments in support of NRZ:  
  - Keep the heritage character / village feel of St Kilda.  
  - Impacts of development on infrastructure such as parking and public transport.  
- Comments against:  
  - Higher density development in the area.  
  - Proximity to transport and other services.  
Response:  
- Barkly Street is proposed for inclusion in the GRZ. It has prevailing 3 storey character and is located on a bus route. | See Opportunity 2.1 which proposes to alter the proposed zone along Barkly Street to the GRZ (Option A). |
## ORGANISATIONS WITH MULTIPLE SITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple sites</th>
<th>Comments received / Response</th>
<th>Proposed changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Port Phillip Housing Association - housing sites across the municipality | **Comments received:**  
  - The NRZ would apply to 48% of PPHA properties. Request to have these sites included in the GRZ.  
  - Specific concerns raised were:  
    - Reduced value of the asset to leverage funds for further affordable housing  
    - Preclude redevelopment of under-utilised sites  
    - Limited GRZ will increase land values and preclude PPHA from purchasing properties.  
    - Unclear benefits what benefits there would be if properties are included in the NRZ.  
  
  **Response:**  
  - The issue of constraints for social housing sites in the NRZ will exist metropolitan wide.  
  - Isolated rezoning’s for all existing PPHA sites to GRZ is not recommended. This would not address the desire to provide opportunities to develop new sites (excepting intensification of existing properties).  
  - The GRZ and RGZ would provide future opportunity sites, and in areas that offer greatest access to services and transport.  
  - Given Port Phillip’s long term support for social housing Council could consider seeking an exemption from the density control in relation to social housing uses where a site is in single ownership. (This would align with the definition of a ‘Residential Village’ a use which is not affected by the limitation on dwelling numbers (density). Development would still need to comply with ResCode and other controls in the planning scheme.  
  - Council could:  
    - Request the Minister for Planning change the VPPs (this would apply to all municipalities)  
    - Insert exemption into the Port Phillip schedules (except NRZ3 and NRZ4) to the NRZ to the standard density clause (eg allow a density of 1 dwelling per 50m²).  
  (NB – Advice has been sought from DTPLI.) | Include an exemption to the standard density clause in all schedules to the NRZ for social housing uses where the site is in single ownership (except Beacon Cove and the Dunstan, Garden City and Fishermans Bend Estates in Port Melbourne) – apply a rate of one dwelling per 50m² of site area. |
| Department of Human Services - sites across the municipality | **Comments received:**  
  - Concerns about the significant impact the NRZ could have on density. Specifically the ability to renew and replace existing stock that exceeds the density controls.  
  - DHS identified a number of larger sites which they suggest could be included in the GRZ.  
  - Do not support the application of mandatory heights for sites in the GRZ.  
  
  **Cont.** | Include a social housing exemption (as above).  
  Expand the site size criteria for the GRZ from “Sites over 5,000m² in a single ownership currently developed for medium density housing” to “2,500m²” and include these sites in the GRZ:  
  - Ross Street and Evans |
### OTHER SITES BY ZONE AND SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Comments received / Response</th>
<th>Proposed changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **NRZ1** - Neighbourhood residential areas – 8 metre height limit | **Comments received:**  
- 67 responses were received from property owners in NRZ1.  
- Comments across the NRZ1 area. Majority were in Balaclava / East St Kilda / Ripponlea (21), followed by St Kilda (17), Elwood (11), Albert Park / Middle Park (6), Port Melbourne (8) and South Melbourne (4).  
- 25 responses considered the zone appropriate.  
- 19 did not support the zone and preferred the GRZ. Some also supported the RGZ. Considered medium density infill development appropriate in their area.  
**Response:**  
- NRZ1 was applied to areas within the Heritage Overlay and areas distant from shops / facilities and public transport. It applied an 8m mandatory height.  
- Some areas of NRZ1 fronting main roads with bus routes or where the prevailing character is 2-3 storey (and therefore can accommodate increased densities) have been now been recommended for included in the GRZ. | See Opportunity 2.1 re: increased extent of GRZ.  
See response to DHS: re expansion of site size criteria for large sites. |
Additional private and publicly owned sites will be added to the GRZ by expanding the site size criteria for large sites from “Sites over 5,000m² in a single ownership currently developed for medium density housing” to “2,500m²” (see response to DHS comments for explanation).

**NRZ2 - Neighbourhood residential areas – 10 metre height limit**

| Comments received: | 31 responses were received from properties in the NRZ2. These were located in St Kilda (14), Elwood (10), Balaclava / East St Kilda / Ripponlea (3), South Melbourne (3) and Port Melbourne (1).  
14 respondents supported the zone. (5 did not specify.)  
12 respondents preferred that the GRZ (or RGZ). Several requested that more land should be zoned GRZ or RGZ.  
6 respondents thought the 10m (3 storey) height limit was too high in their location.  
Response:  
- NRZ2 was applied to heritage overlay areas and areas distant from public transport and shops / facilities where prevailing building heights are 9m and over.  
- A number of precincts in the NRZ2 are now recommended to be included in the GRZ. These areas already have prevailing heights of generally 3 storeys and meet the strategic intent of well-located housing which responds to the existing neighbourhood character (ie are along key main roads). |

**NRZ3 - Port Melbourne Heritage Estates**

| Comments received: | One response received. Did not support the zone. Stressed the need for much stronger protection for the heritage estates.  
Response:  
- NRZ3 recognises the important heritage values of Garden City, Fishermans Bend and Dunstan Estates and limits sites to two dwellings and 9m in height.  
- The Heritage Overlay remains in place to protect the significance of the Estates (with detail Design Guidelines providing additional development parameters specific to each estate).  
No change to zone is recommended. |

**NRZ4 – Beacon Cove**

| Comments received: | 3 responses. All support the zone. Two wanted the NRZ extended to 1-7 Waterfront Place.  
Response:  
- Process does not include changing zoning from non-residential zones to a residential zone.  
No change to zone is recommended. |

**NRZ5 - Beaconsfield Parade, Port Melbourne and Middle Park**

| Comments received: | 2 responses received. One did not support the zone and would prefer area zoned RGZ. The other supported the zone but thought the 15m height was too high.  
Response:  
- The 15m height reflects the existing DDO that applies to the area.  
See Opportunity 2.1 re: increased extent of GRZ (Option C). |
- NRZ5 has been considered for inclusion in the GRZ.

NRZ6 - Acland Street, St Kilda

Comments received:
- One response received.
- Supported the zone to preserve the heritage of the area and stop medium density apartments at the rear of heritage buildings.

Response:
- NRZ6 has been considered for inclusion in the GRZ based on the proximity to the St Kilda Activity Centre and also the existing higher scale of development in this area.
- Heritage Overlay would continue to apply to the area.

See Opportunity 2.1 re: increased extent of GRZ (Option D).

NRZ7 - Marine Parade, St Kilda/Elwood

Comments received:
- One response received. Would prefer area zoned RGZ.
- 11m building height and density are too low.

Response:
- Height reflects the existing DDO that applies to the site.
- NRZ7 has now been recommended for inclusion in the GRZ based on proximity to a bus route and existing controls/development at 3 storeys.

See Opportunity 2.1 re: increased extent of GRZ (Option C).

NRZ8 - Marine Parade and Ormond Esplanade, Elwood

Comments received:
- Two responses received. Would prefer area zoned RGZ.
- 9m building height and density are too low.

Response:
- Height reflects the existing DDO that applies to the site.
- NRZ8 has now been recommended for inclusion in the GRZ based on proximity to a bus route and existing controls/development at 3 storeys.

See Opportunity 2.1 re: increased extent of GRZ (Option C).

### INDIVIDUAL SITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Comments received / Response</th>
<th>Proposed changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Between Glen Huntly Road and Dickens Street, Elwood | Comments received:  
- 6 submissions supporting NRZ. Supported the height and density controls and considered the NRZ would help protect neighbourhood character.  
- Tennyson Street:  
  - 1 response. In NRZ2 – Seeking NRZ1 to protect single dwellings.  
- Kendall Street:  
  - 1 response. Neighbour in the GRZ but they are in NRZ. Seeking consistency in zoning.  
- Hood Street:  
  - 1 response. Seeking GRZ.  
  - Area characterised by 3 storey medium density developments.  
  - Strong demand for higher density development.  
  - Close to Acland Street shops and public transport. | No change to zone is recommended. |
**Response:**
- NRZ2 was applied to heritage overlay areas and areas distant from public transport and shops/facilities where prevailing building heights are 9m and over.
- GRZ applies to properties fronting Brighton Road. Brighton Road is identified as a key tram route with some capacity for development. (Kendall Street runs off Brighton Road and therefore a different zone has been applied.)

**Ormond Road, Glen Huntly Road and surrounds, Elwood**

**Comments received:**
- Ormond Road:
  - 1 response concerned about development in Ormond Road (proposed to be included in GRZ). Will increase the population density and traffic.
- Bendigo Avenue
  - 1 response. Street should be in NRZ1 rather than NRZ2. Street is nearly completely residential family homes.
- Glen Huntly Road
  - 2 responses. GRZ / RGZ should apply.
  - On a major local road and bus route.
  - Close to Elwood Village and Ormond Road Activity Centres.
- Pine Avenue (Near Ormond Road)
  - 1 response. Seeking GRZ. Adjoins shopping centre and is surrounded by four storey.
  - Should not allow four storeys on Ormond Road frontage and restrict development to the rear.
- Spray Street
  - Seeking GRZ or RGZ. Adjacent to Elwood Village and other amenities.
  - 3-4 storey development would be compatible with the existing character.

**Response:**
- NRZ2 was applied to areas where prevailing building heights are 9m and over, including Bendigo Avenue. Many single buildings in this area are over 9m.
- Part of Glen Huntly Road (east of the Elwood Canal) and St Kilda Street is proposed to be included in the GRZ. These areas have a 3 storey prevailing height and are along key main roads.
- Properties directly fronting Ormond Road are proposed to be included in the RGZ (from GRZ). Properties immediately behind will be maintained as NRZ. These properties are not covered by the Ormond Road DDO and have a low scale character.

**Ferrars Street, South Melbourne (north of Dorcas Street)**

**Comments received:**
- 1 response. In NRZ but seeking GRZ.
- Adjacent to light rail. Close to South Melbourne Central activity centre.
- In Heritage Overlay but area is not intact. Mixed character and development.

**Response:**
- Ferrars Street is a main road adjacent to the light rail, however it is within an intact HO.

See Opportunity 1.2 re: increasing maximum building heights (Option B) in NRZ1 areas.

See Opportunity 2.1 re: increased extent of GRZ (Option C) – including along part of Glen Huntly Road (east of the Elwood Canal).

No change to zones is recommended.
- Some main roads with tram routes are considered less suitable for redevelopment due to the degree of intact and significant heritage buildings. The sites fronting the main roads in these cases were placed in the NRZ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Zone Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raglan Place, South Melbourne</td>
<td>1 response received (late)</td>
<td>The NRZ was applied to established residential areas identified as ‘Heritage Overlay Residential Areas’ in the South Melbourne Central Structure Plan. This Structure Plan has been incorporated into the Port Phillip Planning Scheme.</td>
<td>No change to zones is recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Melbourne (Ingles Street north of Bay Street)</td>
<td>1 response – two properties should not be included in NRZ. Reasons include: Inconsistent neighbourhood character in Heath Street. Mix of buildings and styles and the commercial nature of Ingles Street. Inconsistency of zoning along Heath Street (different zoning near Ingles Street). Close to light rail, main roads and Southbank.</td>
<td>The NRZ was applied to sites identified for limited or minimal residential growth in the Draft Bay Street Structure Plan (and proposed Planning Scheme Amendment C103) which has recently been on public exhibition. Additionally these sites are in a Heritage Overlay. The extent of the HO was reviewed recently as part of Amendment C89.</td>
<td>No change to zone is recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Melbourne (1-7 Waterfront Place)</td>
<td>3 responses seeking a residential zone for 1-7 Waterfront Place. Concerns that there are no restrictions on the land.</td>
<td>This site is located in a non-residential zone and is outside the scope of this project.</td>
<td>No change to zone is recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Kilda East (north of Inkerman Street to Dandenong Road)</td>
<td>7 responses received supporting NRZ in this general area and lower density development. 44 late submissions were received concerning Alma Road (generally east of St Kilda Road). The submissions opposed any proposed changes to Alma Road from NRZ to GRZ or an increase in development heights. Alma Road and Inkerman Street: 2 responses from Inkerman Street and 2 from Alma Road (in NRZ). Seeking the GRZ. Properties on a main road in a strategic location close to an activity centre. Westbury Street (between Inkerman and Alma): Mix of housing - no prevailing neighbourhood character.</td>
<td>See Opportunity 2.1 re: increased extent of GRZ (Option B) along Alma Road and Inkerman Street.</td>
<td>No change of zone recommended to majority of area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- NRZ inconsistent with the existing built form.
- Impacts on viable development.

- **Alexandra Street**
  - Seeking GRZ. Alexandra St faces the cemetery.
  - Near the tram routes along Dandenong Road and mix of 3 storey apartment blocks with some houses.

- **Wilgah Street**
  - 1 response. Prefer GRZ.
  - Diverse area. Area where moderate housing growth should be encouraged.

- **Graylings Grove**
  - 1 response seeking GRZ.
  - Mix of dwellings. Directly abuts existing medium density developments along Alma Rd.

- **Fulton Street**
  - 1 response. Site owned by not-for-profit organisation providing social services and housing.
  - Site over 7,000sqm. Meets criteria for ‘Sites over 5,000sqm in a single ownership currently developed for medium density housing’.
  - Would be a vast underdevelopment.

**Response:**
- NRZ1/2 was applied to heritage overlay areas and areas distant from public transport and shops / facilities.
- A number of precincts (along Alma Road and Inkerman Street) are now recommended to be included in the GRZ. These areas already have prevailing heights of generally 3 storeys and therefore can accommodate increased densities.
- Property in Fulton Street is proposed to be included in GRZ. Property meets site size criteria. Was previously unclear that the property was in one ownership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St Kilda (between Fitzroy Street and Barkly Street)</th>
<th>Comments received:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 5 responses supporting NRZ in this area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Comments in support:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recognise importance of HO and protect from inappropriate development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need for open space and to address parking issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Jackson Street;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 responses. Should be in GRZ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does not consider proximity of retail strip / commercial uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grey Street (near Fitzroy Street)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 response. NRZ will result in reduced feasibility for development in this area / on this site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Close to public transport and Fitzroy Street. Should be developed for medium / high density.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:**
- Area of St Kilda between Acland Street and Grey Street proposed for GRZ.
- Area is close to the activity centre and within an HO. However the form and scale of development in the HO is varied. Prevailing character is 3 or more storeys. The HO would continue to apply to guide the form of development.

See Opportunity 2.1 re: increased extent of GRZ in St Kilda (Option D).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Park</td>
<td>• 3 responses support NRZ in this area. 2 others did not.</td>
<td>No change to NRZ1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Neville Street:</td>
<td>See Opportunity 2.1 re: increased extent of GRZ (Option C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 1 response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSULTATION OVERVIEW - NEIGHBOURHOOD RESIDENTIAL ZONE

NRZ3 - Port Melbourne Heritage Estates
- One response.
- Did not support the zone.
- Wanted stronger protection for heritage.
  Response: No change proposed. Important heritage values recognised by limit of two dwellings and 15m height.

NRZ4 - Beacon Cove
- Three responses.
- All support the zone.
- Two wanted the NRZ extended to 1-11 Waterfront Place.
  Response: This process is restricted to implementing the new residential zones to replace the existing residential zones only. No change proposed to NRZ4.

NRZ1 - Neighbourhood residential areas – 8 metre height limit
- 67 responses.
- Mixed views with comments scattered across the NRZ1 area.
- One-third supported the NRZ. Over 50% preferred the GRZ (or RGZ).
- Many considered medium density infill development was appropriate in their area.
  Response: Minor changes to extend not recommended. Extent of the GRZ has been expanded to include some NRZ1 areas.

NRZ5 - Beaconsfield Parade, Port Melbourne and Middle Park
- Two responses.
- One did not support the zone. Too restrictive and would prefer area zoned RGZ.
- The other supported the zone but thought the 15m height was too high.
  Response: Height reflects the existing DDO. NRZ5 recommended for GRZ. (See Opportunity 2.1)

NRZ6 - Acland Street
- One response.
- Support the zone in order to preserve the heritage of the area and stop medium density apartments at the rear of existing heritage buildings.
  Response: This is a well-located area with capacity for medium density infill whilst still maintaining heritage character. Recommend for GRZ. (See Opportunity 2.1)

NRZ7 - Marine Parade, St Kilda/Elwood
- One response received.
- Would prefer area zoned RGZ. 11m building height and density too low.
  Response: Height reflects the existing DDO. NRZ7 recommended for GRZ. (See Opportunity 2.1)

NRZ8 - Marine Parade and Ormond Esplanade, Elwood
- Two responses received.
- Would prefer area zoned RGZ.
- 9m building height and density too low.
  Response: Height reflects the existing DDO. NRZ8 recommended for GRZ. (See Opportunity 2.1)

Hotham Street (northern end) (NRZ1)
- 3 respondents.
- Seeking GRZ.
- Close to Dandenong Road and are surrounded by existing unit blocks.
  Response: Hotham Street recommended for GRZ. (See Opportunity 2.1)
### GENERAL RESIDENTIAL ZONE *(See summary Maps - Pages 27/28)*

#### HOTSPOTS / PRECINCTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Comments received / Response</th>
<th>Proposed changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Camden Street / Linton Street, East St Kilda (GRZ4)                     | **Comments received:**  
- 60 responses received. Did not support the GRZ and supported the application of the NRZ.  
- New development should be limited to 8m (2 storeys) to retain the character of the street and limit traffic pressures.  

**Response:**  
- The GRZ was applied to established residential areas identified for ‘incremental change’ in the *Carlisle Street Major Activity Centre Structure Plan*. This Structure Plan has been incorporated in to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme, including local policy which applies Neighbourhood Character Statements to guide future residential development. Extensive community consultation occurred during this process.  
- Neighbourhood character is strong consideration under the GRZ. Applying the NRZ would depart from the Structure Plan / Planning Scheme Policy, and would reduce the opportunity for well-located housing growth.  

No change is recommended. The zone is considered appropriate and is underpinned by significant strategic work. |
| Grosvenor Street and The Avenue, Balaclava (GRZ1 & 4)                    | **Comments received:**  
- 8 responses. Concerns that the GRZ will allow for more “inappropriate” development – loss of heritage houses and more apartments.  
- All but 2 respondents sought the NRZ. One (1) did not specify and the other supported the GRZ.  

**Response:**  
- The Avenue is identified in the *Carlisle Street Activity Centre Structure Plan* as a location for ‘incremental’ residential growth. Grosvenor Street immediately abuts the activity centre and already has a high proportion of medium density housing.  
- Neighbourhood character is strong consideration under the GRZ, with additional local policy and Neighbourhood Character Statements to guide future residential development.  
- Applying the NRZ would represent a departure from the Structure Plan and would diminish opportunities for well-located housing growth.  

No change is recommended. |
| Brunnings Estate - Brighton Road, Albion Street, Los Angeles Court and Maryville Street, Balaclava / Ripponlea (GRZ2) | **Comments received:**  
- 4 responses. 2 responses are from residents in the GRZ with the other 2 in the NRZ in Albion Street.  
- Application of GRZ along Brighton Road would diminish the heritage significance of the Brunnings Estate as an intact heritage place.  

No change to the zone is recommended. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Heaton Avenue single dwelling covenant area - Heaton Ave, Burns St, Brighton Rd and Glenhuntly Rd, Elwood (GRZ2) | I response representing 8 properties. GRZ would contravene the covenant.         | The zone does not override the Heritage Overlay and development still needs to meet the Heritage Policy.  
GRZ applies to properties fronting Brighton Road. Brighton Road is identified as a key tram route with some capacity for development.  
All existing covenants would remain in place regardless of which zone is applied to the property. |
| 26-84 Wellington Street and 3-7 Robertson Street (GRZ1)                   | 3 responses. All suggest NRZ1 should be applied to this area (rather than the GRZ).  
NB – 1 response was also received from the western end of Wellington Street from a property in the NRZ. They wished to see the GRZ applied.  
If the GRZ is maintained, one suggestion was to apply a mandatory (10m) height limit.  
Concerns about development ‘creep’ and pre-empting the current St Kilda Road South Study. | The GRZ (on the part of the street not in the HO) recognises the existing medium density and the precinct’s context.  
A review of land use and built form controls, the St Kilda Road South Study, is underway.  
An interim 10m (3 storey) mandatory height limit is recommended until the Study is completed. |
| Alma Park Precinct (eastern side of Chapel Street from Dandenong Road to Alma Road) | I comment received raising concerns about impact of the proposed GRZ on the group of important heritage buildings in this location (eg Cloyne, All Saints Church, St Georges Church). Should be a NRZ not GRZ. If the GRZ is retained, it should include specific design guidelines in a schedule to recognise the iconic heritage buildings. | The HO will offer significant protection for sites in the GRZ. Development of places on the Victorian Heritage Register will be considered by Heritage Victoria.  
NRZ is not recommended as it may restrict development which is necessary to support the reuse / refurbishment of these important heritage buildings. |

No change to the zone is recommended.
### OTHER SITES BY ZONE AND SCHEDULE

| Precinct                                      | Comments received / Response                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Proposed changes                                                                                      |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **GRZ1 - Individual Sites and Precincts**     | **Comments received:**  
- 10 comments from property owners in GRZ1. 2 supported the GRZ. The remainder did not. Of these, 4 preferred the NRZ. Others did not specify.  
- Specific issues included:  
  - the desire to preserve heritage buildings  
  - existing parking problems  
  - impacts of existing unit developments  
  - some areas in GRZ1 are low scale with small sites.  

**Response:**  
- GRZ1 was applied to various individual sites and precincts throughout the municipality including large sites (over 5,000sqm in single ownership) and specific precincts (Port Melbourne), with existing medium density development (eg Office of Housing sites).  
- The scale and location of these sites are suitable for GRZ.  

No change to the zone is recommended.                                                                 |
| **GRZ2 - Main roads**                         | **Comments received:**  
- Comments related to Brighton Road, Carlisle Street, Chapel Street and Dandenong Road.  
- 13 respondents. 7 supported the zone. 6 did not.  
- Of those who did not support the zone, 5 wished to see their property included in the NRZ. One owner in Carlisle Street, St Kilda is seeking the RGZ for their site.  
- Issues raised included:  
  - concerned about the discretionary height limit  
  - questions why sites in HOs were not included in the NRZ  
  - areas are almost at capacity with a high number of existing units.  

**Response:**  
- The GRZ was applied to sites fronting selected main roads with tram routes, as appropriate locations for well-located medium density infill development.  
- Development still needs to be in accordance with the Heritage Overlay.  
- GRZ2 is now proposed to be applied more broadly to other main roads (to include those with bus routes (see Opportunity 2.1 – Option A).  

No change to the zone is recommended.                                                                 |
| **GRZ3 – Residential Precincts - Bay Street Activity Centre Environments** | **Comments received:**  
- 6 responses were received from around Bay Street. 4 did not support the application of the GRZ and wish to be included in the NRZ. 2 did not specify.  

No change to the zone is recommended.                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRZ4 – Residential Precincts - Carlisle Street Activity Centre Environs</th>
<th>Comments received:</th>
<th>Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(See also Camden Street and Linton Avenue comments)</td>
<td>• 5 comments were received from around the Carlisle Street centre. 3 supported the zone and 2 did not and want the NRZ to be applied.</td>
<td>• The GRZ was applied to sites identified for ‘incremental’ residential growth in the <em>Carlisle Street Activity Centre Structure Plan</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Issues included:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• impacts on heritage houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• inconsistencies in zoning ie some locations closer to the centre have been zoned NRZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the view that the GRZ does not provide adequate protection for neighbourhood character.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|  | No change to the zone is recommended. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRZ5 – Residential Precincts - Ormond Road Neighbourhood Centre Environs</th>
<th>Comments received:</th>
<th>Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 responses which supported the application of the GRZ.</td>
<td>Application of the RGZ is now recommended – with development parameters clearly set by the existing DDO (see Opportunity 3.1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• GRZ was applied to sites fronting Ormond Road and Glen Huntly Road given the proximity to the Elwood Junction and Elwood Village activity centres.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The area is now proposed to be included in the RGZ (see Opportunity 3.1) to recognise that it has some further capacity for development up to 4 storeys. Existing DDO18 provides for effective management of the scale and form of buildings, to ensure they contribute to the streetscape of Ormond Road and protect the amenity of adjoining residential properties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRZ6 - Residential Precincts – St Kilda Activity Centre Environs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No comments received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDIVIDUAL SITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Comments received / Response</th>
<th>Proposed changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chapel Street, St Kilda (between Inkerman Street and Alma Road) | **Comments received:**  
• Chapel Street (between Kipling and Argyle)  
  - 1 response. Area should be considered for NRZ.  
  - One of few areas of Chapel Street where heritage homes remain.  
  - At capacity with traffic and parking problems from existing and new development.  
• Odessa Street  
  - 1 response from a property in NRZ but concerned about impacts of GRZ.  
  - Concerns include: impacts on heritage houses, capacity of public transport to cope with demand and impacts on quality of life.  
**Response:**  
• GRZ was applied to sites fronting selected main roads that accommodate fixed rail public transport (i.e. tram).  
• Planning scheme policy in Clause 21.04-1 identifies these locations as Incremental Residential Growth Areas. They are identified as locations appropriate for well-designed medium density infill development.  
• HO will continue to apply. Development still needs to be in accordance with the Heritage Overlay.  
No change to the zone is recommended. |
| Carlisle Street, St Kilda (between Brighton Road and Barkly Street) | **Comments received:**  
• 1 response from the owner of a hotel supporting the zone. Identified an error in with GRZ on the property.  
• 1 response. Seeking RGZ for site. Site has a planning permit for 70 dwellings which is at odds with GRZ.  
**Response:**  
• GRZ was applied to properties on main roads with a tram route. GRZ allows scope for development of the site.  
• Error re hotel is proposed to be corrected.  
No change to the zone is recommended.  
See Section 4 – Minor Adjustments and Corrections re correction of zoning for the Hotel. |
| Carlisle Street (National Theatre) | **Comments received:**  
• 1 response from Theatre. Long established use and venue.  
• Seeking change from a residential zone to a non-residential zone.  
**Response:**  
• Rezoning the site to a non-residential zone and is outside the scope of this project.  
No change to the zone is recommended. |
| Bay Street, Port Melbourne (north of Bridge Street) | **Comments received:**  
• 3 responses. All did not support the GRZ.  
• Concerns include:  
  - Impacts on amenity and privacy from multi-storey development.  
  - Parking issues (including from commercial devt)  
  - Flooding and drainage issues in the area.  
  - Impacts on rates.  
  - Desire to maintain heritage and character.  
No change to the zone is recommended. |
- In Little Ingles Street - Area does not meet the criteria for GRZ – single storey, low density dwellings on small blocks
- NB – An additional response was received in this area which supported the application of NRZ but questioned the boundary of the GRZ.

**Response:**

- GRZ3 was applied to sites identified for incremental residential growth in the Draft Bay Street Structure Plan (and proposed Planning Scheme Amendment C103).
- Neighbourhood character is a primary consideration of the zone. Preferred character statements have been developed as part of the Structure Plan to guide development.
CONSULTATION OVERVIEW - GENERAL RESIDENTIAL ZONE (PART B)

**GRZ2 - Residential Precincts - Bay Street Activity Centre Environments**
- 6 responses.
- 4 did not support the application of the GRZ and wish to be included in the NRZ. 2 did not specify.
- Concerns about heritage, amenity & flooding.
- GRZ applied to sites identified for incremental residential growth in Draft Bay Street Structure Plan.
- Preferred character statements were developed as part of the Structure Plan to guide development.

**GRZ1 - Individual Sites & Precincts**
- 10 comments. 2 supported the zone. The remainder did not. Of those, 4 preferred the NRZ. Others did not specify.
- Concerns about inappropriate development and traffic and parking.
- GRZ1 applied to various large sites and specific precincts with existing medium density development.
- Well located large sites and precincts close to activity centres / public transport.

**GRZ4 - Residential Precincts - Carlisle Street Activity Centre Environments**
- See comments re Camden St and Lenton Ave.
- 5 comments from elsewhere around Carlisle Street.
- Mixed views. 3 supported the zone and 2 did not and want the NRZ to be applied.
- GRZ applied to incremental residential growth identified in the Carlisle Street Structure Plan.
- Preferred future character statements, developed as part of Structure Plan, will help guide the form of development.

**GRZ3 - Residential Precincts - Bay Street Activity Centre Environments**
- 13 respondents.
- Mixed views - 7 supported the zone. 6 did not. Of those, 5 wish to be included in NRZ. 1 owner in Carlisle Street/St Kilda seeks RGZ.
- Areas already filled with units. Concerned about heights and loss of heritage.
- GRZ applied to main roads with tram routes. Reinforces principle of well-located housing growth.
- Heritage Overlay still applies to guide development.
- Proposed to extent GRZ2 to other main roads including those with bus routes.

**GRZ6 - Residential Precincts - St Kilda Activity Centre Environments**
No comments received.

**GRZ5 - Residential Precincts - Ormond Road Neighbourhood Centre Environments**
- 2 responses which supported the application of the GRZ.
- GRZ applied to sites proximate to the Brougham Junction and Brough Road activity centres.
- Identified in planning policy and DDDO 18 for additional development compatible with the existing character.
## RESIDENTIAL GROWTH ZONE
(See summary Map on Page 31)

### HOTSPOTS / PRECINCTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Comments received / Response</th>
<th>Proposed changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RGZ1 - Queens Road and Queens Lane, south of Arthur Street and north of Union Street | Comments received:  
- 3 respondents supported the application of the RGZ in Queens Road. 3 did not support the zone and 1 did not specify.  
- Acknowledged as an area appropriate for further development.  
- Concerns about the RGZ included:  
  - traffic and impacts on infrastructure  
  - impacts on Queens Lane (access and rubbish collection)  
  - over-development.  
Response:  
- Location identified in the planning policy as a *Substantial Residential Growth Area*. This is reinforced through built form controls, DDO4 which encourages medium to higher-rise development.  
No change to zone is recommended. |                                                                                           |
| RGZ2 - Alfred Street (north side) / Camden and Nelson Streets (part)  | Comments received:  
- 2 responses. Concerns about impacts of 4 storey development.  
- One respondent raised concerns about:  
  - amenity including overshadowing and overlooking  
  - impacts of traffic on one way Nelson Street and pedestrian safety  
  - existing mix of housing styles.  
- One respondent would prefer the NRZ, the other is seeking stronger conditions to ensure the 4th storey is set back.  
Response:  
- *Carlisle Street Structure Plan* identified the area as a ‘residential renewal’ area.  
- The *Carlisle Street Structure Plan* recommends a height of 3 storeys for the precinct. This is reflected in Local Policy in the Planning Scheme (and of recent development).  
- Whilst the purpose of the RGZ is to allow development up to 4 storeys (applies a 13.5m /4 storey discretionary height) the established Local Policy defines a 3 storey height for future development (with a supporting Neighbourhood Character Statement). ResCode provisions will be applied manage impacts on neighbouring properties.  
No change to the zone or schedule is recommended. |                                            |
| RGZ2 - Australia Post Site, 170-172 Chapel Street, East St Kilda | **Comments received:**  
- Property owner of neighbouring property expressed concern at the impacts of the RGZ.  
**Response:**  
- Site was identified as a ‘strategic site’ in the Carlisle Street Structure Plan with future development potential.  
- DDO21 applies (with site specific controls) and will guide future development. This includes specific design requirements to respond to the lower rise residential ‘interfaces’ adjacent the site. | **No change to zone is recommended. Schedule includes the DDO as a decision guideline.** |
CONSULTATION OVERVIEW - RESIDENTIAL GROWTH ZONE

**RGZ1 - Queen Road & Queens Lane, south of Arthur St & north of Union St**
- 7 responses.
- 3 respondents supported RGZ, 3 did not support the zone, and 1 did not specify.
- Those who supported the RGZ thought location is appropriate for development.
- Others concerned about traffic, infrastructure, and overdevelopment of the area.

**Response:**
- Location identified in the planning scheme as a Substantial Residential Growth Area.
- DDDO 4 guides development and encourages medium rise development.

**RGZ2 - Alfred Street (north side) / Camden and Nelson Streets (part)**
- 2 responses. Concerns about impacts of 4 storey development.
- One respondent prefers security of the NRZ.
- Concerned about amenity, traffic, and character.
- Other wanted to ensure 4th storey is set back.

**Response:**
- Carlisle Street Structure Plan identified the area as a “residential renewal” area.
- Plan proposed height of 3 storeys. Height under RGZ is 13.5m discretionary height (4 storeys).
- No DDDO on precinct to guide development. A mandatory height control of 3 storeys proposed to address issues.

**RGZ2 - Australia Post Site, 170-172 Chapel Street, East St Kilda**
- Owner of neighbouring property in NRZ concerned at the impacts of RGZ.

**Response:**
- Identified as a “strategic site” in the Carlisle Street Structure Plan Environs redevelopment of the site.
- DDDO 21 applies and will guide development. Development needs to meet ResCode standards.
4. MINOR ADJUSTMENTS

During the consultation, a number of minor adjustments were identified as needed (eg two different zones apply to lots in one ownership).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Consultation zone</th>
<th>Proposed correction</th>
<th>Reason for correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1A Tiuna Grove, Elwood                       | NRZ2              | GRZ5 (or RGZ1 if that zone is applied to Ormond Road) | • Proposed zone boundaries reflected the boundaries of DDO18.  
  • Development at 1A and 1B Tiuna Grove is part of the same development (on two lots), however the lots were in different zones.  
  • Correction needed ensure entire development in one zone.  
  • Correction in response to a submission. |
| 3-15 Havelock Street, St Kilda               | NRZ1              | GRZ2                 | • GRZ applied to lots fronting Carlisle Street.  
  • A hotel occupies 2-8 Carlisle Street and 3, 5 and 15 Havelock Street with a single storey dwelling at 9 Havelock Street.  
  • Entire site should be in the same zone and 9 Havelock Street included in the GRZ2 as it would be isolated.  
  • Correction in response to a submission. |
| Swallow Street, Port Melbourne               | NRZ4              | NRZ1                 | • Properties incorrectly included in the NRZ4 that relates to Beacon Cove. Not part of Beacon Cove.  
  • Should have been included in NRZ1.  
  • Error picked up during consultation. |
| Tom Hills Court, Port Melbourne              | NRZ1              | GRZ1                 | • Meets the current criteria for inclusion in the GRZ – ie a property within an estate exceeding 5,000m² in single ownership.  
  • Correction in response to a submission from the landowner. |
| 1-6 Frangipani Court, Port Melbourne         | NRZ1              | GRZ1                 | • Extends the GRZ from the adjoining site to include the contemporary buildings to the rear of a large housing estate in single ownership. Some of the buildings are part of the housing estate.  
  • Correction was picked up during the consultation process. |
| 31-35 Swallow Street, Port Melbourne         | NRZ1              | GRZ1                 | • Site is 1,600m² and owned by DHS and developed for medium density housing.  
  • Site is proposed to be included in GRZ as it is adjacent to another DHS estate. |
| 482-490 Williamstown Road and 272 Bridge Street, Port Melbourne | NRZ1 | GRZ1 | • Site is 1,300m² and owned by DHS and developed for medium density housing.  
  • Site is proposed to be included in GRZ as it is adjacent to another DHS estate – combined size would be 9,000m². |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>146-156 Victoria Avenue, Albert Park</th>
<th>NRZ</th>
<th>GRZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NRZ1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1700m² site owned by DHS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRZ1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Site is occupied by a 6 storey development in a single storey area – anomalous in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• GRZ recognises this development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To accommodate more development in the municipality while generally maintaining the intent of Council’s Housing Policy, the following changes are proposed to the consultation draft (see attached map).

**NEIGHBOURHOOD RESIDENTIAL ZONE**

The following changes are proposed to the Neighbourhood Residential Zone:

- **Amend the sliding density scale**
  - Amend sliding density scale to allow for increased development yield by reducing the minimum site size in the sliding density scale from 600m² to 450m² and increase development potential for sites over 1,200m²:
    - 0-449m²: 2 dwellings
    - 450-599m²: 3 dwellings
    - 600-799m²: 4 dwellings
    - 800-999m²: 5 dwellings
    - 1,000-1,199m²: 6 dwellings
    - 1,200+: 7 plus 1 dwelling per 150m² of site area over 1,200m²
  - NB – Two dwelling limit per site would continue to apply to Beacon Cove Estate and Dunstan, Garden City and Fishermans Bend Estates (Port Melbourne).

- **Exempt social housing from standard density clause (apply 1:50m²)**
  - Include an exemption to the standard density clause in all schedules to the NRZ for social housing uses where the site is in single ownership (except Beacon Cove and the Dunstan, Garden City and Fishermans Bend Estates (Port Melbourne) – apply a rate of 1 dwelling per 50m² of site area. AND
  - Advocate the Minister for Planning include an exemption to the density provisions in the parent clause of the NRZ for social housing uses where the site is in single ownership.

- **Reduce the extent of the NRZ**
  - See the GRZ below.
**GENERAL RESIDENTIAL ZONE**

The following changes are proposed to the General Residential Zone:

### Increase the extent of the GRZ

Apply the GRZ to the following additional areas identified in Option 2.1 (proposed NRZ in the consultation):

- **A.** Arterial or collector roads with bus routes (excluding intact low scale Heritage Overlay areas)
- **B.** Arterial or collector roads where development is predominantly 2-3 storeys
- **C.** Precincts along main roads which have existing DDO controls (outside of a Heritage Overlay) which allow for 3 storeys or more
- **D.** Heritage precincts close to large activity centres with existing higher scale development

### Reduce the site size criteria for including large sites in the GRZ and include specified sites

Reduce the site size in the criteria for large sites for the GRZ from "sites over 5,000m² in a single ownership currently developed for medium density housing" to sites over "2,500m²" and apply the GRZ to the following sites:

- 304-320 Ross Street and 137-141 Evans Street, Port Melbourne
- 256-268 Bridge Street, Port Melbourne
- 415-419 Coventry Street, 2-8 Normanby Street and 3 Iffla Street, South Melbourne
- 146-156 Victoria Avenue, Albert Park
- 140 Alma Road and 13-27 Fulton Street, St Kilda East
- 2 Southey Grove, Elwood
- 14 Hennessy Avenue, Elwood
- 179 Napier Street, South Melbourne
- 79 Swallow Street, Port Melbourne
- 3-17 Grosvenor Street, St Kilda
- 17 Browning Street, 17-17A Tennyson Street and 28 Milton Street, Elwood
- 100 Argyle Street, St Kilda East (rear of 53 Alma).

*NB – The above sites are in a mix of public and private ownership.*

### Apply mandatory height limits to specific precincts

Apply a mandatory height limit to:

- 26-84 Wellington Street and 3-7 Robertson Street while the St Kilda South Study is completed and implemented - interim 10m (3 storey).

*NB – Other mandatory height controls are not identified for proposed locations for inclusion in the GRZ. Many precincts are within existing Design and Development Overlays. Council would work with property owners such as DHS to develop site guidelines.*
RESIDENTIAL GROWTH ZONE

The following changes are proposed to the Residential Growth Zone:

**Increase the extent of the RGZ**

Apply the RGZ to the following additional areas identified in Opportunity 3.1 (proposed GRZ in the consultation):

- Precincts/sites with existing DDOs at 4 storeys or more.
- Precincts/sites which already have residential development at 4 storeys or more.

**MINOR ADJUSTMENTS AND CORRECTIONS**

- 1A Tiuna Grove, Elwood – change from NRZ2 to GRZ5
- 3-15 Havelock Street, St Kilda – change from NRZ1 to GRZ2
- 23-77 Swallow Street, Port Melbourne – change from NRZ4 to NRZ1
- 31-35 Swallow Street, Port Melbourne – change from NRZ4 to GRZ1
- Tom Hills Court, Port Melbourne – change from NRZ1 to GRZ1
- 1-6 Frangipani Court, Port Melbourne – change from NRZ1 to GRZ1
- 482-490 Williamstown Road and 272 Bridge Street, Port Melbourne – change from NRZ1 to GRZ1
- 146-156 Victoria Avenue, Albert Park – change from NRZ1 to GRZ1.
STAGED APPROACH

If Council chooses to take a staged approach to progressing the new residential zones, the following is recommended:

STAGE 1

NEIGHBOURHOOD RESIDENTIAL ZONE

- Amend the sliding density scale to allow for increased development yield by reducing the minimum site size in the sliding density scale from 600m² to 400m² and increase development potential for sites over 1,200m²:

  - 0-449m²: 2 dwellings
  - 450-599m²: 3 dwellings
  - 600-799m²: 4 dwellings
  - 800-999m²: 5 dwellings
  - 1,000-1,199m²: 6 dwellings
  - 1,200+: 7 plus 1 dwelling per 150m² of site area over 1,200m²

  NB – Two dwelling limit per site would continue to apply to Beacon Cove Estate and Dunstan, Garden City and Fishermans Bend Estates (Port Melbourne).

- Include an exemption to the standard density clause in all schedules to the NRZ for social housing uses where the site is in single ownership (except Beacon Cove and the Dunstan, Garden City and Fishermans Bend Estates (Port Melbourne) – apply a rate of 1 dwelling per 50m² of site area. AND

- Advocate the Minister for Planning include an exemption to the density provisions in the parent clause of the NRZ for social housing uses where the site is in single ownership.

GENERAL RESIDENTIAL ZONE

- Reduce the site size criteria for including large sites in the GRZ and include specified sites:

  - 31-35 Swallow Street, Port Melbourne
  - 482-490 Williamstown Road and 272 Bridge Street, Port Melbourne
  - 304-320 Ross Street and 137-141 Evans Street, Port Melbourne
  - 256-268 Bridge Street, Port Melbourne
  - 415-419 Coventry St, 2-8 Normanby Street and 3 Iffla Street, South Melbourne
  - 146-156 Victoria Avenue, Albert Park
  - 140 Alma Road and 13-27 Fulton Street, St Kilda East
  - 2 Southey Grove, Elwood
  - 14 Hennessy Avenue, Elwood
  - 179 Napier Street, South Melbourne
  - 79 Swallow Street, Port Melbourne
  - 3-17 Grosvenor Street, St Kilda
  - 17 Browning Street, 17-17A Tennyson Street and 28 Milton Street, Elwood
  - 100 Argyle Street, St Kilda East (rear of 53 Alma).

- Apply mandatory height limit to:

  - 26-84 Wellington Street and 3-7 Robertson Street while the St Kilda South Study is underway - interim 10m (3 storey).
MINOR ADJUSTMENTS AND CORRECTIONS

Minor adjustments

- 1A Tiuna Grove, Elwood – change from NRZ2 to GRZ5
- 3-15 Havelock Street, St Kilda – change from NRZ1 to GRZ2
- 23-77 Swallow Street, Port Melbourne – change from NRZ4 to NRZ1
- 31-35 Swallow Street, Port Melbourne – change from NRZ4 to GRZ1
- Tom Hills Court, Port Melbourne – change from NRZ1 to GRZ1
- 1-6 Frangipani Court, Port Melbourne – change from NRZ1 to GRZ1
- 482-490 Williamstown Road and 272 Bridge Street, Port Melbourne – change from NRZ1 to GRZ1
- 146-156 Victoria Avenue, Albert Park – change from NRZ1 to GRZ1.

STAGE 2

(Potentially following further community consultation on recommended changes to zoning.)

GENERAL RESIDENTIAL ZONE

Increase the extent of the GRZ

Apply the GRZ to the following additional areas (proposed NRZ in the consultation):

E. Arterial or collector roads with bus routes (excluding intact low scale Heritage Overlay areas)
F. Arterial or collector roads where development is predominantly 2-3 storeys
G. Precincts along main roads which have existing DDO controls (outside of a Heritage Overlay) which allow for 3 storeys or more
H. Heritage precincts close to large activity centres with existing higher scale development

RESIDENTIAL GROWTH ZONE

Increase the extent of the RGZ

Apply the RGZ to the following additional areas (proposed GRZ in the consultation):

- Precincts / sites with existing DDOs at 4 storeys or more.
- Precincts / sites which already have residential development at 4 storeys or more
RECOMMENDED APPROACH - STAGE 1 AND STAGE 2
RECOMMENDED APPROACH - STAGE 1
APPENDIX 1 – FUTURE CAPACITY FOR GROWTH ACROSS PORT PHILLIP

In considering the new residential zones it is important to understand the impacts and development potential within the proposed residential zones and other areas. The following information examines development opportunities across the City of Port Phillip within:
- Neighbourhood Residential Zone
- Areas outside the residential zones (including Commercial Zones, Capital City Zone and Mixed Use Zone).

DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD RESIDENTIAL ZONE

Lots sizes in the proposed NRZ

The following table shows the distribution of lot sizes in the NRZ. It also illustrates the lots sizes where most development constructed between 2004 and 2011 occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Sizes</th>
<th>Proportion of lots in the NRZ*</th>
<th>Proportion of lots on which development occurred 2004-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-399m²</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-599m²</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-799m²</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-999m²</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,199m²</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200+</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note – excludes lots in NRZ3 and NRZ4 where the sliding scale does not apply.

Current development trends in proposed NRZ (2004 – 2011)

The following table illustrates the average scale of developments and total number of dwellings that were constructed between 2004 and 2011 in the area proposed to be included in the NRZ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Sizes</th>
<th>No. of developments</th>
<th>Net dwellings per development</th>
<th>Total net dwellings constructed (2004-2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median of dwellings in the development</td>
<td>Range of development sizes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-399m²</td>
<td>1 dwelling</td>
<td>1-8 dwellings</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-599m²</td>
<td>2 dwellings</td>
<td>1-15 dwellings</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-799m²</td>
<td>3 dwellings</td>
<td>1-16 dwellings</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-999m²</td>
<td>6 dwellings</td>
<td>1-32 dwellings</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,199m²</td>
<td>5 dwellings</td>
<td>1-11 dwellings</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200+</td>
<td>31 dwellings</td>
<td>1-41 dwellings</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projected dwelling numbers - Applying the sliding density scale

The following table illustrates that number of dwellings that could be constructed if the sliding density scale (released for consultation) was applied. The data is based on lots developed between 2004 and 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Sizes</th>
<th>No. of permitted dwellings per development (based on sliding scale)</th>
<th>Total net dwellings constructed (2004-2011)</th>
<th>Total net dwellings (potential) adjusted for sliding scale</th>
<th>Difference between net dwellings constructed (2004-2011) and net dwellings based on the sliding scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-399m²</td>
<td>2 dwellings</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-599m²</td>
<td>2 dwellings</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-799m²</td>
<td>3 dwellings</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-999m²</td>
<td>4 dwellings</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,199m²</td>
<td>5 dwellings</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200+</td>
<td>6 dwellings</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>888</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>-518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per annum</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The application of the NRZ will result in some reduction in development opportunities / yields, compared to that achieved under the current Residential 1 Zone, however this will not equate to a significant reduction in development capacity across the City of Port Phillip overall (particularly given the percentage of total residential development in the NRZ is low at 15% of net dwellings).

Within the NRZ, greatest development impact is on larger sites 800-999m² and 1,200m²+, with this is concentrated in a small number of developments:

- Of the 18 developments (2004-11) on sites of 800-999m², five (5) involved a net increase of seven (7) or more dwellings (ranging from 12-32 dwellings). The median number of (net) dwellings was six (6) – with the adjusted ‘sliding scale’ allowing five (5) dwellings.
- Of the 12 developments (2004-11) on sites of 1,200m²+, 9 developments resulted in 20 or more dwellings. (The median net dwelling yield was 31). In the NRZ only 3% of sites are 1,200m² or more.

Impact of the revised ‘sliding (density) scale’ options

The option to amendment the ‘sliding scale’ will reduce the development impact in the NRZ by allowing increased densities and a progressive increase in dwelling numbers on site over 1,200m² (see table below). The following table compares each of the sliding density scale options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed changes to the NRZ</th>
<th>Option A – Consultation Version*</th>
<th>Option B*</th>
<th>Option C*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applying the sliding scale (no change to the NRZ area)</td>
<td>-74 dwellings per annum</td>
<td>-59 dwellings per annum</td>
<td>-53 dwellings per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying the sliding scale and reducing NRZ area**</td>
<td>-49 dwellings per annum</td>
<td>-37 dwellings per annum</td>
<td>-33 dwellings per annum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on Opportunity 1.1 – Amend the sliding scale in the Consultation Analysis and Options Paper
**Based on Opportunity 2.1 – Increase the extent of the GRZ in the Consultation Analysis and Options Paper
PRECINCTS OUTSIDE OF AREAS AFFECTED BY THE NEW RESIDENTIAL ZONES

Substantial development opportunities remain outside the residential zones.

FISHERMANS BEND URBAN RENEWAL AREA – 40,000 NEW DWELLINGS

- It is estimated that the Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area (FBURA) could accommodate 40,000 new dwellings over the next 50 years. (The FBURA Draft Vision estimates that up to 80,000 residents could live in FBURA).

ST KILDA ROAD NORTH – 3,100 NEW DWELLINGS

- The St Kilda Road North Precinct Plan identified that St Kilda Road North (which includes part of Kingsway, St Kilda Road, part of Albert Road and Queens Road) has capacity for more than 3,100 new dwellings. Outside of FBURA, St Kilda Road is forecast for the greatest increase in development of new dwellings. (Forecast id).

CARLISLE STREET ACTIVITY CENTRE – 2,000 NEW DWELLINGS

- The Carlisle Street Activity Centre Structure Plan identified there is capacity for more than 2,000 new dwellings within the activity centre boundaries.

- This includes land in the Commercial 1 Zone along Carlisle Street and Mixed Use Zones in Chapel Street and Inkerman / Pakington Street, commercial zone in St Kilda Road and strategic redevelopment sites. (Excludes land in the established residential precincts surrounding the centre.)

SOUTH MELBOURNE CENTRAL – 2,600 NEW DWELLINGS

- Capacity figures undertaken for South Melbourne Central as part of the structure planning process indicate the retail strip and mixed use areas (including Kings Way) could accommodate 2,600 new dwellings (SGS, 2004). (Note - This includes 1,200 dwellings in 10 storey developments in the City Road Precinct at 400 City Road. Taller developments have since been approved on these sites).

ST KILDA ACTIVITY CENTRE – 2,100 NEW DWELLINGS

- Detailed capacity of the St Kilda Activity Centre and its environs has not been calculated as a structure plan has not been developed for the centre. However, growth is forecast to exceed 2,100 new dwellings by 2026 for the suburb of St Kilda (Source: Forecast id).