

# **CAMBERWELL JUNCTION STRUCTURE PLAN REVIEW**

**DRAFT PLAN  
CIRCULATED FEBRUARY 2008**

**COMMENTS FROM LIZ BURTON**  
(resident representative,  
Camberwell Junction Structure Plan  
Reference Committee)

**MARCH 2008**

## CONTENTS

1. What aspects of the draft plan do you like?
2. What aspects of the draft plan do you dislike? Why?
  - 2.1 Introduction
  - 2.2 Car parking
  - 2.3 Climate change
  - 2.4 Design and development overlays
  - 2.5 Burke Road shopping strip
  - 2.6 Laneway between Camberwell Road and Riversdale Road – street tables
  - 2.7 Open space
    - 2.7.1 Where do you think new public open space should be provided? Why?
    - 2.7.2 Access to sunshine
3. Comments on individual components of proposed structure plan
4. Would you like to see community facilities within a central location of the junction? Which services should be provided and where would they be best located?
5. Do you think that the proposed building height limits will protect the character of the junction and allow for adequate growth? Which height limits should be changed?
6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us?
  - 6.1 Burke Road - 19th and 20th century building stock
  - 6.2 Public conveniences and baby feeding/changing facilities

## **1. WHAT ASPECTS OF THE DRAFT PLAN DO YOU LIKE?**

The concept of introducing more trees in specific locations and attempting to create areas of open space are commendable.

I support the use of building setbacks as a strategy to alleviate bulk but I would like to propose that setbacks commence at level 3 throughout the Junction and that the amount of setback be specified as being of 3 metres at that height and then further setback to 5 metres at levels 4 and 5.

## **2. WHAT ASPECTS OF THE DRAFT PLAN DO YOU DISLIKE? WHY?**

### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

Having read the document in detail I consider that many of the proposals imitate actions taken by other municipalities several years ago, for example the proposal to provide historical plaques on shopfronts (eg City of Yarra), an avenue of illuminated trees (numerous locations), street furniture (eg Cities of Yarra, Port Phillip), extending paving outside cafes (eg City of Yarra). While such measures may entail change, they represent Camberwell copying other municipalities many years after such action has been taken by them. There is very little in the form of innovation or being the first to introduce measures to attract and engage the public. As a long term planning instrument the structure plan needs to find inspiration in the successes of Camberwell and build on them in a manner relevant to the future.

As a suburb associated with a number of high profile performers such as Barry Humphries, Geoffrey Rush, Kylie and Danni Minogue it would be desirable to make a bold statement through the structure plan by introducing a lively performing arts precinct around the Rivoli with the construction of a performing arts venue comprising a concert hall and theatre for musical and theatrical performances. Boroondara has 31 private schools, most of which provide music and theatre as part of the curriculum. A cultural precinct of this kind has the opportunity to link with both private and government schools and provide a central performing arts venue for concerts and productions whilst also being available to non school organizations. The performing arts venue could form part of the (eventual) tram depot development which ought not to be restricted to providing accommodation for older people as suggested in the structure plan but rather to form a vibrant precinct targeting a diverse age group.

A performing arts venue also provides the Junction with diversity in its business mix from retail, offices and cafes to cultural opportunities, consistent with the Boroondara demographic. Consideration can be given to developing a consortia partnership model for example a business philanthropist, the developer of the Tram Depot, State government and other suitable partners.

The clustering of certain activities within precincts also needs to be better addressed including the community facilities which should be clustered in the civic area (Inglesby Road car park – see further discussion below under Element 29 “Community facilities” and under paragraph 4 “Would you like to see community facilities within a central location of the junction? Which services should be provided and where would they be best located?” The fresh food market area designated for that purpose but not as part of a developed market

site. A public plaza with views of the western skyline and access to sunshine should be located at the train station funded by the developer.

As regards car parking, the following principles are advanced for consideration:

- (a) ensure that there is no reduction in the number of overall car parks in the Junction area either through substitution elsewhere or through equivalent car parking provided at the site, preferably above ground;
- (b) that the Structure Plan specifically exclude the market car park in its entirety from development;
- (c) that Council acknowledges that the concept of the underground car park in today's society presents lower safety levels than the current on ground model and that it supports the continued use of above ground open car parking despite the prevailing planning guidelines under Melbourne 2030 which move parking underground;
- (d) in the event of Council deciding to redeploy the use of specific car parks currently owned by Council, that the land be leased, not sold.

Throughout the document there is a lack of response to the prevalent imperative of responding to climate change. The draft structure plan assumes "business as usual" which is not surprising as planning as a discipline in Australia tends to be reactive. However as the development outcomes permitted through the Structure Plan will impact not only the present users but the next generation, it needs to undertake a serious assessment of the needs of users of the junction over the structure plan's 10-15 year timeframe and integrate appropriate measures as part of the plan. This is a serious omission – see more detailed discussion under Paragraph 2.3 "Interpretation of Melbourne 2030 - Direction 7: A Greener City."

## **2.2 CAR PARKING**

Policy 8 of the Melbourne 2030 strategy deals with improvements to transport links and encourages non vehicular transport through improvements to cycling and pedestrian articulation. The difficulty with the Melbourne 2030 policy is that since its inception there has been no tangible improvement in public transport in Melbourne and infrastructure to support cycling is sporadic. During the same period however there has been an extensive injection of funds on road arterials, linkages and vehicular transport infrastructure. At the state government level, the policy therefore seems to be more seriously contemplated in the abstract rather than through demonstrated action. At the same time councils are required to achieve car reduction targets at activity centres through diversification in the means of access.

If Camberwell Junction is to compete with other major retail outlets it has to be recognised that car parking is an essential component of the retail experience. Alternatively if Council intends to further limit car parking then it needs to propose a comprehensive access plan based around public transport and promulgated to the community. At present the approach to car parking availability lacks a transparent strategy and the move away from the provision of car parking is creating unprecedented levels of congestion and frustration by would-be shoppers who are unaware of the reasons why they can't park. Another significant corollary is the monetary loss to traders through shoppers being turned away due to lack of parking and lack of advice by Council on how they ought to be commuting to the Junction. The absence of a strategy also reflects poorly on Council as the responsible entity.

In the draft Structure Plan, the section on “Traffic management and car parking strategies”(p16) does not adequately explain the outcome of the proposed removal of several car parking facilities at the Junction (ie Butler Street, the attempt to substitute community facilities for parking at the Market car park, Fairholm Grove, Mayston Street) and the potential of other proposals encroaching on remaining car parking bays. It is not clear what is planned for the Junction West multideck car park. Most individuals reading this section will not realise that when these car parks are closed down, alternative parking bays may not be provided. At present there is no articulated access framework which explains the strategies to remove car parking.

As a consequence, the removal of these car parking facilities will be experienced through frustration and anxiety. It will be experienced through frustration and anxiety as the strategy to reduce car parking has not been communicated to key stakeholders nor has their input been sought and as a result they are disempowered. Furthermore there are no strategies being put in place to provide viable alternatives in the context of significant growth projections for the Junction.

Although the car is one form of transport to access shopping at the Junction, the alternative forms of less polluting public transport such as train or tram are not always close to peoples’ homes and this creates difficulties when transporting larger purchases including supermarket items to the home owing to their bulk and weight. Cycling and walking are also hampered by the bulk and weight of supermarket purchases.

The issue of successfully changing buyer behaviour requires a considered structure and management strategy owing to the potential for triggering unintended adverse consequences. One potential unintended adverse consequence when parking becomes too difficult is for significant numbers of buyers to simply stop using the Junction for supermarket and other purchases. The shoppers in this municipality are generally not price sensitive and have ample mobility. Therefore they have the capacity to take their shopping purchases either elsewhere within the municipality or outside it. As a consequence projected business growth levels at the Junction may not be met. At present the car is the standard means of transport for shopping at suburban shopping centres and the removal of car parking facilities, regardless of the environmental motive, will reflect negatively until Council has developed and articulated an integrated transport access framework.

As regards new developments the structure plan should apply the wording from the 1993 structure plan, ie

“New development fully providing car parking required by the development, ie they all be self-sufficient in car parking and make provision for loss of any car parking displaced by the particular development.” This provides a clear directive regarding car parking provisions by developers and additionally, it requires developers to not only provide full parking but to also replace the existing parking which the development displaces.

As noted in the Introduction, I recommend that the community facilities be clustered in the civic area using the site of the Council car park in Inglesby Road. In so doing Council would be providing an exemplar of its aim to encourage the use of alternative transport. Council’s retention of the Inglesby Road car park otherwise displays a lack of confidence in its intention to reduce reliance on the car as a means of transport. The proximity to the Council offices has the advantage of enabling closer links to be developed with the staff of the

community facilities and facilitates the sharing of facilities located in the main Council building.

**Recommendations:**

That before closing any car parks including the peripheral car parks (ie those at Butler Street, the attempt to substitute community facilities for parking at the Market car park, Fairholm Grove, Mayston Street and any other locations) that Council:

- (a) develop a transport access plan aimed at reducing dependence on the car, which provides a smooth transition for users of the Junction;
- (b) prepare a transport access consultation plan aimed at engaging the community and key stakeholders to obtain input to the plan
- (c) prepare a transport access communication plan aimed at informing all categories of users
- (d) prepare a review cycle aimed at responding to feedback
- (e) commence its transport access planning through canvassing input from a range of focus groups
- (f) initiates modelling on the impact of the car parking aims contained in the draft structure plan.

### **2.3 CLIMATE CHANGE**

Although the new structure plan has a 10 – 15 year time horizon, the buildings and developments constructed during this period will have a potential minimum 30 year lifespan. Accordingly it is imperative not to miss the opportunity to be innovative and daring in the interpretation of current planning policies rather than merely compliant with them. The current planning framework, already under severe pressure, is likely to be superseded within the timeline of the structure plan's implementation.

One important component which is lacking in the draft structure plan is the need to put in place environmental measures aimed at conservation of water and energy as the minimum responses to environmentally sustainable development (ESD). The Structure Plan's Urban Design Principle 14 has identified that "...that all new development incorporates the highest available standards of environmentally sustainable design".

Although I acknowledge that there is currently a dissonance between the building code and the planning framework and the relationship of both of these areas to the green aspirations of State government, it is vital at this moment in the planning of the principal activity centre to respond to the impacts of climate change through a range of environmental measures. Such planning is consistent within the broader framework being led by the Prime Minister through initiatives such as the Garnaut Climate Change Review and of course its antecedents in the reports of the IPCC and Nicholas Stern. Through the leadership being provided at the Federal level it is likely that State governments will be required to adopt a more tangible approach to controlling carbon emissions and climate change impacts. It is therefore appropriate to anticipate these changes and to include them in the structure plan.

Garnaut, R, in his assessment of the implications of addressing climate change for Australia writes:

"Australia would be a big loser – possibly the biggest loser amongst developed countries – from unmitigated climate change. The pace of global emissions growth under "business as usual" is pushing the world rapidly towards critical points, which would impose large costs

on Australia directly and also indirectly through the effects on other countries of importance to Australia”.<sup>1</sup>

The inclusion of ESD measures should also be advanced from the perspective that it is far more economical and efficient to factor them in at the development planning stage than to retrofit, which is a likely outcome if the measures are not implemented now.

As local governments are required to seek approval from the State government for their structure plans, there can be a paralysing inertia to change by local government through anticipating a negative response perhaps based on past responses. There is a view that imposing more stringent environmental mitigation on building developments is a disincentive to development but this view is counteracted by the consideration that investors and indeed commercial and retail tenants now demand higher performing buildings in recognition of environmental damage through greenhouse emissions and also that environmentally efficient buildings place less impact on infrastructure and cost less to operate and maintain.

Additionally it can be argued by those putting up barriers to such changes, that they belong in the building code and that projected changes to the building code will deal with it. The response to this argument is to point out that the building code is aimed at minimum performance standards and planning provisions are needed to bring about improved standards and innovation. I understand that the Planning Minister is resisting the inclusion of specific environmental measures in planning schemes on the grounds that this will be addressed via a comprehensive state wide approach. However in the absence of a tangible plan and timeframe from State government, the opportunity presented by the Structure Plan will be lost and buildings will get approval without needing to comply with more progressive environmental standards. I consider that this will disadvantage the Camberwell Junction Principal Activity Centre and endeavours to block it need to be strongly resisted by Council on the grounds of lacking a plan to respond in a timely manner to the need to curb carbon emission.

It should be noted that in Australia, commercial buildings produce almost 9% of our national Greenhouse gas emissions.<sup>2</sup>

An exemplar has been provided by Melbourne City Council, which in its Clause 22.19 “Environmentally Sustainable Office Buildings” of the Melbourne Planning Scheme has introduced 4.5 star base building ratings for offices – see attached copy of clause.

I recommend the inclusion of such provisions in the Camberwell Junction Structure Plan to address the need for Camberwell to make a significant contribution to carbon reduction. This is not negotiable when taking into account the considerable expansion of building in the form of housing, retail and commercial complexes envisaged in a principal activity centre.

However it would be a conceptual failure to not address retail, mixed use and apartment complexes with similar provisions to those pertaining to offices. I therefore recommend the inclusion of same provisions that apply to commercial under Clause 22.19 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme to capture retail, mixed use and apartment complexes in addition to offices.

---

<sup>1</sup> Garnaut Climate Change Review. Interim Report to the Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments of Australia. February 2008, p56.

<sup>2</sup> University of Sydney, Building Green website  
[http://www.facilities.usyd.edu.au/projects/enviro/su\\_build.shtml](http://www.facilities.usyd.edu.au/projects/enviro/su_build.shtml)

These measures are consistent with the following directions in the Melbourne 2030 planning policy:

Direction 7 “A Greener City” of the in particular, Policy 7.3 “Adapting to climate change”, Initiative 7.3.5 “Update the Victoria Planning Provisions and related guidelines to reflect and support the goals and directions of the Victorian Greenhouse Strategy”; Initiative 7.3.1 “...and encourage the inclusion of new energy efficiency standards for commercial development in the Building Code of Australia”;

Carbon reduction is consistent with Direction 5 of Melbourne 2030, Policy 5.1 to “Promote good urban design to make the environment more liveable and attractive”.

These provisions should also apply to existing properties as specified in the Melbourne Planning Scheme.

**Recommendation:**

That the entire range of provisions contained in Clause 22.19 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme be included in the Camberwell Junction Structure Plan with applicability to retail, mixed use and apartment complexes in addition to offices for the reasons discussed above.

## **2.4 DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OVERLAYS**

As a planning instrument operating in the context of extensive pressure on Boroondara and in particular Camberwell Junction to deliver economic returns and medium and high density accommodation under the Melbourne 2030 strategy, the draft Structure Plan needs to include specific planning measures in the form of Design and Development Overlays aimed at controlling building outcomes. As noted above, the introduction of improved environmental standards is one aspect of the draft structure plan that needs to be addressed; the other relates to built form outcomes and their contribution to the quality and design of new buildings to the Camberwell Junction landscape.

Craig Czarny, Director of Design, Hanson Partnership (Planners), in his analysis of the structure and format of the Camberwell Junction Activity Centre, observes: “While there is absolutely no doubt that the Camberwell Junction Activity Centre will continue to evolve and in due course absorb considerable new floorspace and activity, these essential urban design structure and activity centre characteristics remain important. This is not to say that new development must emulate an existing status quo, but in urban design terms have a high degree of regard for this prevailing urban pattern”.<sup>3</sup>

The aesthetic freefall enabled by the current Boroondara planning scheme continues to produce “cookie cutter” buildings. Robin Boyd in his 1960 seminal publication, *The Australian Ugliness* refers to the worsening of the “aesthetic calamity” in building design and this momentum is advanced by the current planning scheme which is silent on built form outcomes.

---

<sup>3</sup> Czarny, C. Statement of expert urban design evidence. Application for review P2163/2006 472-480 Riversdale Road & 705 Burke Road, Hawthorn East, November 2007, p5.



The Structure Plan attempts to address the State Government's Melbourne 2030 guidelines through a range of proposals but one of my major concerns is that the economic objectives which are embedded in the Structure Plan do not promote ideas which differentiate Camberwell Junction from any other activity centre anywhere in Melbourne.

In the Melbourne 2030 policy, Direction 5 "A great place to be", Policy 5.2 "Recognise and protect cultural identity, neighbourhood character and sense of place", and Initiative 5.2.1 "Strengthen tools in the planning system to ensure development responds to its context in terms of built form, landscape character and cultural identity" recognise the importance of differentiation and building upon existing strengths, whether they be in the architecture, building materials, building form and scale, response to topography or other characteristics which identify different suburbs of Melbourne.

Any planning objectives for a municipality such as Boroondara need to take account of the demographic data of the municipality's residents. An analysis of this reveals that the residents have the highest level of university qualifications of any municipality in Melbourne, the highest salaries and Boroondara has the greatest number of employees working in professions and as managers. The residents are therefore more likely to have higher expectations of their shopping experience than is afforded through chain store predictability available at any retail complex.

Secondly, the "brand name" of Camberwell as a suburb is associated with high quality and some of the most valuable housing stock in Melbourne. Residents and visitors therefore have expectations that the commercial and retail experience complements the standards presented by the residential stock. It follows that visitors coming to this precinct seek to participate in the character of the suburb and to experience the quality it evokes. Accordingly the retail experience needs to be supported by high quality architecture based on internationally benchmarked architectural and design principles as well as quality building materials. It is disappointing not to see any advances on this in the Structure Plan even though quality building design is highlighted in Urban Design Principle 15 of the Structure Plan which states: "Ensure that all new development reflects the highest standards and quality of architectural design, taking account of the existing heritage context and values." This principle is intended to contribute to the differentiation of Camberwell Junction into the future as it seeks to compete with other retail destinations.

The current building code has allowed new retail/commercial/ mixed use buildings and apartment blocks in Camberwell and throughout the municipality to be characterised by low cost building materials (ie concrete tilt slab construction) with extensive window treatment, a design combination which is environmentally damaging as it relies heavily on air conditioning in summer and heating in winter, resulting in high CO<sup>2</sup> emissions and needs high maintenance over the duration of its lifespan.

**Recommendation:**

That design and development overlays be introduced or flagged for introduction, as appropriate, in the Camberwell Junction Structure Plan to ensure quality of new and renovated commercial, retail and multipurpose building stock together with apartment blocks, consistent with the brand name of Camberwell so that the reputation of Camberwell Junction is not undermined and that the retail experience of the activity centre maintains parity with the residential sector of the suburb.

## 2.5 BURKE ROAD SHOPPING STRIP

According to Craig Czarny, “The Burke Road spine is the principal retail corridor and key to the image and presentation of the Centre. It presents a largely intact traditional double storey attached streetscape rising from the low land at Riversdale Road to the north to Victoria Road.”<sup>4</sup>

The Structure Plan demonstrates ambivalence towards the Burke Road strip as a core retail precinct. It is ambivalent in that the draft Structure Plan contains the potential to undermine the Burke Road strip with other initiatives it promotes in the Plan. Examples include:

1. “A department store at least 2000 square metres in area within Camberwell Junction west”
2. “Encourage a major retail outlet at 171-193 Camberwell Road...”
3. Proposed development of the multi deck Junction West car park.

The Burke Road strip, if it is to remain as the core retail attraction, must be supported through its integration in the business vision of Camberwell Junction. Otherwise the strip has the potential to be marginalised as the western precinct gathers momentum and shifts the axis of attention away from the strip.

**Recommendations:** 1. That Council clarifies its intention regarding the Burke Road strip as the core retail precinct and reviews the place of the measures identified above in points 1-3 above in relation to their potential impact on the viability of the strip.  
2. That in the event that Council supports the three proposals identified above, that it provides an explanation of how it views them as compatible with the Burke Road spine as the core retail precinct.

## 2.6 LANEWAY BETWEEN CAMBERWELL ROAD AND RIVERSDALE ROAD – STREET TABLES

(Element 22 under “Spaces Plan”, p17 refers).

This lane is used extensively by cars which fill up with petrol at the Safeway petrol station in Riversdale Road. A right hand turn can be difficult to negotiate when leaving the petrol station as Riversdale Road is traversed by trams and cars and right hand turns from the petrol station can hold up both trams and cars. The lane is an efficient and effective alternative to driving to the Junction and is used by residents. Additionally this lane services a number of building car parks which are accessed only via the lane. As such this proposal would not be feasible and appears to be a mistake. Furthermore, with regard to amenity, this lane is surrounded by high fences and buildings and does not provide adequate sunshine, a necessary prerequisite for enjoyable alfresco dining.

---

<sup>4</sup> Czarny, C. Statement of expert urban design evidence. Application for review P2163/2006 472-480 Riversdale Road & 705 Burke Road, Hawthorn East, November 2007, p5.

**Recommendation:**

That item 22 under the “Spaces Plan”, Pedestrian Access (p17), be deleted on the grounds of: (a) being incompatible with the existing structure of buildings and their car parking requirements and usage; and (b) the laneway does not offer adequate sunshine and would not provide an attractive amenity.

**2.7 OPEN SPACE**

A flaw of the Melbourne 2030 planning policy is that it facilitates development and infill but it does not deal with open space creation. Consequently the ratio of public open space to population in metropolitan Melbourne has declined. The question of providing open space is one which local councils are required to administer and each local council approaches open space in various ways.

I consider that the principle needs to be established that public open space is a vital form of infrastructure and become mandatory for major developments. It needs to be incorporated into the planning scheme together with the requirement that it must have access to sunshine between 10am and 3.00pm. Accordingly any major development would be required to incorporate a public plaza / green open space as a feature of the development. Trade offs / substitutions should not be permitted.

Alternatively if the provision of open space is not incorporated into the planning scheme for major developments, then the principle of establishing open space as infrastructure needs to be adopted by Council and budgeted annually. In this case, the best way to approach new open space is to purchase land that provides it.

The draft Camberwell Junction Structure Plan generally replaces parking spaces with areas of recreational “open space”. This approach substitutes one amenity for another but the outcome creates a deficit for the user of the Junction. It is incumbent on Council to ensure that the creation of public open space is not seen as an “either”/“or” proposition which is created as a result of taking away an existing facility such as on-ground car parking. The suggested location of a new public open space facility at the junction of Burke Avenue and Evans Place<sup>5</sup> appears to be an example of displacement of car parking with public open space.

**2.7.1 WHERE DO YOU THINK NEW PUBLIC OPEN SPACE SHOULD BE PROVIDED? WHY?**

With regard to the location of new public open space, the two new developments at the FKP / Henly Honda site and at Camberwell railway station should have public open space as a feature of the development, funded by the developer. In accordance with my proposal that major new developments be required to provide public open space as a feature of the development, specific sites at which a public plaza or green<sup>6</sup> open space should be provided in future include:

- (a) the tram depot if/when developed;
- (b) 171-193 Camberwell Road (current Dan Murphy site);
- (c) any development of the multi deck car park in Junction west;
- (d) any development of the car parks at Butler Street, Fairholm Grove, Mayston Street.

<sup>5</sup> Item 1 under “Public Open Space”. Draft Camberwell Junction Structure Plan, 2008, p17.

<sup>6</sup> By “green” is intended an area including trees, shrubs, natural (ie not synthetic) grass.

The reason for these proposals is outlined in the paragraph above.

### **2.7.2 ACCESS TO SUNSHINE**

Of significance to pedestrians is enjoyment of sunshine and this needs to be included in the pedestrian environment as the right to solar access. With increasing pressure to allow higher developments the amenity of sunshine can be eroded without a specific policy in place.

#### **Recommendation:**

That Council prepare an amendment to the Boroondara Planning Scheme designating public open space as infrastructure and requiring major developments (definition to be determined) to include the requirement that this facility has access to sunshine between 10am and 3.00pm. The amendment should specify that no trade offs / substitutions are permitted.

## **3 COMMENTS ON INDIVIDUAL COMPONENTS OF PROPOSED STRUCTURE PLAN**

Comments and recommendations on individual components of the proposed structure plan are outlined below.

### **SPACES PLAN**

#### **PUBLIC OPEN SPACE**

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | Explore opportunities to create public open space facility at the junction of Burke Avenue and Evans Place | See comments above under paragraph 2.7 “Open space”.   |
| 2 | Encourage upgrade of public open space around Camberwell Market  | Agree, subject to the considerations referred to under paragraph 2.7 “Open space”, not allowing the substitution of one facility for another.  |
| 3 | Explore redevelopment of Market Car Park for public open space directly to north and west of market.       | <p>Disagree – Market Car Park to remain as is. This is the cornerstone of public enjoyment of convenient and safe parking while providing close access to the Junction. There is no other preferred activity for this site.</p> <p>People prefer on-ground parking as it is the most user-friendly form of parking. It provides the highest level of passive surveillance at all times of the day and night and criminal activity is virtually unknown. Council’s insistence to deny the community of this facility is misconceived and inappropriate.</p> <p>As note above, open space should not be provided at the expense of removing another valued form of infrastructure – ie car parking. This Council-promoted initiative is particularly</p> |

- |    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
|    |   | inappropriate in the absence of an access strategy based around public transport.   |
| 4  | Explore opportunities to open up the Fritsch Holzer Park to the north and south.  | Agree, with the proviso that this is done without reducing the dimensions of the park.  |
| 5  | Encourage an upgrade of Civic Parkland and surrounds through the preparation of a landscape concept plan.   | Disagree. The current landscaping is appropriate and attractive. This initiative is a waste of public funds, particularly in the light of the significant sum being spent on refurbishments of the Council buildings. Council needs to be accountable for its spending in a more productive manner. The capacity to establish new gardens now at a time of severe drought is questionable. The main aim ought to be capturing run off from the buildings and constructing an underground water tank to water the existing parkland. |
| 6  | Create an open public forecourt around the existing ES&A Bank building at the south-west corner of the Six-Ways Junction.   | Disagree. Any public forecourt must be funded by the developer as part of the design and plan for site to attract people over. It is an inappropriate use of public funds to provide a facility at the site which should form an integral part of the development design concept. This proposal is rejected outright.   |
| 7  | Explore opportunities to create a new public place at Burke Road adjacent to the train station as an open viewing deck.   | Query why this should be funded by Council. As noted above under paragraph 2.7 "Open space", public open space at the train station should be provided and funded by the developer.   |
| 8  | Limit overshadowing of public open space and major pedestrian routes.   | This proposal does not go far enough and would be subjected to endless compromise resulting in overshadowing. It needs to specify at what time of the day overshadowing must not occur. <b>Recommendation:</b> That this proposal be rewritten as: "No overshadowing of public open space and major pedestrian routes" between 10am and 3.00pm.   |
| 9  | Explore the redevelopment of the Market Car Park for open space and community uses with existing parking provided at basement level.  | Disagree. See comments under element 3 above.   |
| 10 | Develop a new, north facing high quality landscaped public plaza and promenade south of Camberwell Station, including community uses which enhances the station environs through quality lighting, shelter, directional signage, seating, public art, heritage interpretation and design that encourages safe and | Query why developer is not providing this or some components of it as part of the development. Alternatively is it possible for Council to work with the developer in having some or all of these components included?  |

convenient use of, and movement through, the space.

## STREETSCAPE

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 11 | Improve enhancements to Redfern Road including tree planting, lighting and wider footpaths.  | Agree   |
| 12 | Encourage strong landscape links along Cookson Street to link with Read Gardens  | Agree   |
| 13 | Investigate the potential to establish a strong tree lined boulevard along the commercial areas of Camberwell Road east and west of Junction. Additional landscaping to be introduced to all possible roads, particularly Camberwell Road. | <p>The Camberwell Junction Structure Plan Reference Committee considered that the boulevard effect should be positioned along the commercial areas of Camberwell Road east and west of Junction. It also considered that large canopy trees should be introduced to all possible roads, mainly Camberwell Road. The version in the draft structure plan has diluted the impact of the Reference Committee recommendations, based on the Officers' recommendation but there is no rationale provided for the variation. In the absence of reasons for the change, and as I believe the original would provide more beneficial outcomes for the community, I recommend that it be reconsidered. It is not clear how a boulevard effect would be achieved if it was not along Camberwell Road. The original wording was: "Establish a strong tree lined boulevard along the commercial areas of Camberwell Road east and west of the Junction. Additional landscaping including large canopy trees to be introduced to all possible roads, but mainly Camberwell Road." This is a recommendation with a clear vision; the one in the draft structure plan can be interpreted in so many ways that the eventual outcome may be more suggestive than actual and would result in a missed opportunity. I am therefore opposed to the proposal advanced.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> That Council considers reinstating the original version of this element outlined above.</p> |

- 14 Encourage additional awnings and canopies to footpaths to provide continuous all weather cover. Restoration of original verandas should be encouraged where suitable evidence is available.
- Once again the wording has been changed by the Officers but it is not clear why they are insisting on “suitable evidence”. Surely the point of canopies is one of providing a contiguous shelter for users of the precinct. It is entirely immaterial whether or not evidence of a previous one in that location can be found and such an approach is a complete waste of time and effort. I therefore disagree with the approach contained in this proposal.
- Recommendation:** That Council considers reinstating the original version of this element ie “Encourage additional awnings and canopies to footpaths to provide continuous all weather cover.”

#### PEDESTRIAN ACCESS

- 15 Allow for selective footpath widening, particularly in front of restaurants, provided that there is minimal loss in street parking or loss to pedestrian safety.
- Disagree. Burke Road, where this is most likely to occur, is already a highly compromised thoroughfare. If Council has a plan to intrude on the flow of traffic then such a plan needs to be set in a wider context which then includes the management of traffic which would otherwise use Burke Road for the north/south flow. As it stands this proposal is unsatisfactory and possibly irresponsible as it will further impede the traffic flow and exacerbate the congestion while not providing solutions to traffic management. **Recommendation:** That Council considers withdrawing this element for the reasons outlined above.
- 16 Introduce new pedestrian crossing at Evans Place, Camberwell Road, Redfern Road, Railway Parade, Cookson Street and Burke Road near the station.
- There is already a crossing with lights over Camberwell Road from Evans Place. If by “pedestrian crossing”, the black and white lines are intended then this seems fine. I am not in favour of crossings with lights over these streets.
- 17 Maintain and enhance east/west links from car parks through to Burke Road strips.
- Agree
- 18 Improve pedestrian networks with appropriate street furniture and increase legibility of pedestrian access within car parks
- Agree
- 19 Provide a more direct link from Burke Road and surrounding areas to Camberwell Railway Station
- It is not clear what form such direct links would take but any such initiative would need to await finalisation of the final station design and layout. This proposal seems premature.

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 20 | Require access from the rear of shops through to the shop to the main street, particularly shops on Burke Road.  | This may not be feasible in all cases and it is not clear how a local Council can mandate such access through private property.                   |
| 21 | Investigate increasing traffic signal timing for pedestrians and decreasing cycle length in areas of high pedestrian concentration.  | Once again this measure would place further strain on Burke Road as an arterial. The current pedestrian timing across Burke Road is satisfactory. |
| 22 | Investigate reducing vehicle access and improving pedestrian amenity by providing active frontages with alfresco dining along the laneway between Camberwell and Riversdale Roads, subject to sufficient pedestrian volumes. | See comment above under Paragraph 2.6 above, "Laneway between Camberwell Road and Riversdale Road and Camberwell – street tables"                 |

#### **VISUAL FRAMEWORK**

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 23 | Explore opportunities to incorporate art elements into building forms  | Agree   |
| 24 | Maintain the open character of the Burke Road and Cookson Street corner to allow views of the station.         | Agree   |
| 25 | Provide historical plaques on shopfronts and other appropriate locations.                                      | Agree. See also to comments made in Paragraph 2.1 "Introduction" about imitating other municipalities.  |
| 26 | Explore opportunities to provide an avenue of illuminated trees along the new Evans Place/Burke Avenue access. | Disagree, unless the illumination is 100% from solar power. Illumination from the traditional grid contributes to carbon emissions and is highly undesirable. See also comments under Paragraph 2.1 "Introduction". |

#### **COMMUNITY FACILITIES**

- |    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 27 | Continue to facilitate the Camberwell Sunday community market   | Imperative that this is held at the ground level Safeway/fresh food market car parks.   |
| 28 | Explore the opportunity for community facilities including library at the station, or the Butler Street car park. | The reduction of car parking at the Junction through removal of the Butler Street car park and others are both contentious and a cause for significant concern. The plan on p13 shows only 3 key car parking cells: 2 on the eastern side and 1 on the western, other than those beneath supermarkets. Access to car parking after several smaller car parks are removed will be even more competitive and frustrating. Attempts to engineer behavioural changes to use public transport or bicycles to attend the Junction need to be accompanied by communication and marketing campaigns. At |



- 29 Explore the opportunity for providing a comfort station in the Market Car Park precinct and an integrated community hub, including the Boroondara Young People's Centre, the Camberwell Community Centre, Camcare and childcare in a central location.

present, Council is imposing restricted facilities without explanation and this leads to an unsatisfactory outcome. I therefore disagree with the redeployment of Butler Street car park for other purposes.

Disagree with the proposal that these facilities be located in the market car park. As noted above, Council needs to engage the community in a conversation about the removal of several car parks with the expectation that the community will attend by other means of transport before it advances plans for alternative uses for the car parks.

**Recommendation:** That Council demonstrates its own commitment to diversification of the means of transport by redeploying its own car park in Inglesby Road for use for these facilities (ie an integrated community hub, including the Boroondara Young People's Centre, the Camberwell Community Centre, Camcare and childcare in a central location).

#### BUILDINGS PLAN (P14)

- 1 North of Prospect Hill Road development between the existing parapet height and 11m in height to be setback from the parapet so that it is not visible from the street.

I do not support the infill proposal between the current parapet level and 11m along the Burke Road as I consider that diversity in building height is a desirable feature of the strip.

Alternatively if this element is retained, then the placement of the word "existing" in this sentence creates an immediate vulnerability. In the event of any development being able to exceed the current height, the new height will become the measure for the next development.

**Recommendation:** The wording of this proposal needs to be rewritten to either specifically refer to the existing parapet height being xx m or alternatively, there needs to be reference to the acceptable height expressed in terms of storeys, as included elsewhere in the plan.

- 2 South of Prospect Hill Road development between 9.5m and 11m in height to be setback so that it is not visible from the street

Once again, the wording needs to be tightened up. It is possible to conceive of a development exceeding 11m in which case either the entire development or part of it will not be set back.

**Recommendation:** As the intent is to provide set backs over 9.5m the wording needs to be changed to reflect just that, ie all heights over 9.5m to be set back and the setback itself specified in terms of metres.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>3 Rationalise signage, advertising, visual clutter along the full extent of the Burke Road spine.</p> <p>4 Maintain and improve existing pedestrian linkages to Burke Road and encourage all new retail development in the Junction to have strong pedestrian links to Burke Road.</p>   | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> This element should be reworded to read: “Rationalise signage to <b>minimise</b> advertising...spine.”</p> <p>Having experienced the “improvements” to the walkway between Gazman and the former Suncorp site I am very concerned about the use of black and dark grey materials which are drab, austere, sombre and unevocative all year round. The concrete blocks which provide seating are similarly austere, unremittingly hard and damp in winter.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> I recommend that Council reviews its strategy on the aesthetic outcomes it wants to achieve before going any further with improvements. Camberwell Junction should be a vibrant centre and the use of colours and materials should complement this concept. While I am not suggesting the substitution of black with bright hues, I consider that the use of natural materials in nuanced earthy shades would provide a more positive, warm and appealing outcome than is currently being achieved.</p>   |
| <p>5 New development behind the Burke road spine must not be visible from the opposite side of Burke Road adjacent to the site.</p> <p>6 Encourage extensions and enhancements to rear of shops facing Burke Road where possible.</p> <p>7 Maintain traditional shopping strip character and encourage refurbishment and improvement to the existing shops.</p> | <p>In regard to pedestrian links, I support the encouragement of new retail developments having strong pedestrian links to Burke Road.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> As part of the strategy on strong pedestrian links, I recommend that Council give consideration to safety issues through appropriate lighting and the installation of security cameras at appropriate “hot spots”.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> This element needs to be strengthened to specify that the visibility is taken from a standing position rather than seated and from the point at which the footpath meets Burke Road.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> That the principal be established that extensions to the rear of the Burke Road shops are not approved at the expense of reducing parking bays.</p> <p>I consider this element to be ambiguous and vulnerable on the grounds that maintaining “character” is a different proposition to maintaining the shopping strip as a strip.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> That this element be strengthened to read: “Traditional shopping strip to be retained and its character enhanced through Council encouraging refurbishment and improvement to the existing shops.”</p> |

## Fairholm Grove

- 8 Investigate opportunities to enhance the appearance to rear of Target and Safeway buildings

**Recommendation:** That Council enter into discussions with Target and Safeway building owners and/or these companies to provide the enhancements. Both Target and Safeway belong to listed companies which have programmes involving key partnerships with a range of stakeholders – see Woolworth’s “Responsibility Report 2007” at the following website:

<http://www.woolworthslimited.com.au/>

One suggestion is to introduce green foliage cover over the walls watered by rain captured by the installation of water tanks.

Agree.

- 9 Maintain and enhance existing residential scale and character to this street.

## Market place

- 10 Maintain and enhance as an open street with shopfronts on the western side.

Agree with proposition to “maintain as an open street with shopfronts on the western side” but unsure what is intended by “enhance” especially if this entails removal of car parking bays.

**Recommendation:** That any enhancements to Market Place do not entail the displacement of car parking bays.

- 11 Improve access and visibility around the Camberwell market by either re-using the existing PTC tram sub-station building for an alternative use with active frontages or by demolition of the building for an alternative use with active frontages or by demolition of the building as part of redevelopment of the area.

Disagree. The substation building is historic and provides an elegance of design that new retail/commercial/mixed-use buildings in the area lack. It should be valued as a fine example of a utility building of style and character rather than being considered a nuisance.

There is no issue of visibility as the market building itself is of poor design and has no inherent character or quality. It is not in the same league as the substation and I am strongly opposed to its demolition.

I also oppose alternative uses as they would interfere with the site usage as a car park.

**Recommendation:** That the PTC tram sub-station building be retained as is.

## Junction Six Ways

- 12 Retain and upgrade traditional frontages to the six-ways junction. Development should not exceed the height of existing buildings.

The wording of this element needs strengthening to avoid ambiguity of interpretation due to lack of specificity. The reference to “upgrade” does not appear to have any practical application as the properties are

privately owned.

**Recommendation:** That this element be reworded to read: “Retain traditional frontages to the six-ways junction. Development may not exceed (insert the current maximum expressed as metres)”.

### **Junction West Precinct**

- 13 Achieve infill of up to 5 storeys in junction west stepped to emphasise sloping topography.

This element needs to specify minimum standards in achieving stepping. As currently worded the stepping could be commenced only at 4<sup>th</sup> level and thus maximise bulk. Element 14 below is an example of a more precise descriptor.

**Recommendation:** That this element be reworded to read: “Achieve infill of up to 5 storeys in junction west stepped in by 3m from level 3 and by 5m from level 4 to emphasise sloping topography”.

- 14 Establish a clear active front of 5 storeys to Camberwell Road west from Evans Place to Monteath Avenue with setbacks at levels 4 and 5.

**Recommendation:** That the setback commence at level 3.

### **Redfern precinct**

- 15 Encourage 3-4 storey mixed use infill development in the “west wedge” to the rear of the Tram Depot and the Rivoli.

**Recommendation:** That setbacks be applied commencing at level 3.

- 16 Create new 3 storey (with upper level setback) forms to Riversdale Road north to screen rear side of Rivoli.

The wording of this element is perplexing. The structure plan ought not denigrate an icon which has heritage listing by stating that one of its facades should be screened. If the aesthetic nature of a building’s profile was a criterion to be considered within the structure plan then there would be a multitude of other buildings which would need to be added to it; at present only the Rivoli comes in for this treatment which I consider to be conceptually fraught. A development on the west side will almost certainly screen that profile and possibly attempt to go higher. The issue is whether there needs to be a height protection next to the Rivoli of 3 storeys.

**Recommendation:** That this element be reconsidered and restated to read: “That development at rear and west side of Rivoli not to exceed 3 storeys and setback from level 3”.

- 17 In the event of sale, protect existing tram depot shell and establish new 4 storey form within.

Agree. However does this go far enough? The depot grounds provide scope for other developments but the structure plan is silent

about that. There needs to be a statement about maximum heights and bulk controls added to cover the site. **Recommendation:** That the maximum height of development within the tram depot be limited to 4 storeys, setback from level 3.

- 18 Step down development scale from the Camberwell Road frontage to Riversdale Road and the six ways intersection.

Agree.

#### **Riversdale Road**

- 19 Establish new 4 storey building form on large corner site at Butler Street and Riversdale Road with 3<sup>rd</sup> level setback to Butler Street. The 4<sup>th</sup> level must also be setback so it is not visible from the opposite side of Riversdale Road and Butler Street, adjacent from the site.

Agree.

- 20 Maintain a domestic scale to development to outer edges of Riversdale Road east and west (2 or 3 storeys) with the upper level setback of a minimum 3m from the street.

Agree.

#### **Camberwell Road**

- 21 Encourage new infill development of up to 14m between Tram Depot and Rivoli theatre setback from Camberwell Road to respect the massing of existing structures.

The term “respect” has no effect on the character of development and needs to be removed as its interpretation is highly subjective. Substitute with specified measurements. The term “encourage” should be replaced with “Allow”.

**Recommendation:** Reword element to read: “Allow infill development of up to 14m between Tram Depot and Rivoli theatre setback by 5m from Camberwell Road from level 3.

- 22 Establish larger building frontages to Camberwell road up to maximum of 5 storeys (18m in height, with 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> level setbacks), stepping down to the rear and set behind a landscaped setback to the street frontage of 3m. Buildings fronting Harold Street should incorporate a minimum 3m upper level setback from the street.

Agree with following amendment:

**Recommendation:** commence setback for 5 storey buildings at 3<sup>rd</sup> level and a landscaped setback to street frontage of 5m for buildings higher than 3 storeys.

#### **Station complex**

- 23 Ensure new development south of the Railway Bridge along Burke

**Recommendation:** That Council establish a consultation committee comprising

Road is consistent with the streetscape character, including subdivision pattern, zero street setback, awnings, fenestration and 2 storey built form at the street frontage.

- 24 Ensure the design, bulk and setback of new development is responsive to the heritage significance of the Station complex and allows for view lines to the Station Buildings from Railway Walk.

#### **Henly Honda site**

- 25 Encourage retail development along the Riversdale Road frontage of the Henly Honda site that is consistent with the scale of the surrounding buildings with splayed corners to provide views of the ES&A Bank building and the Camberwell Baptist Church.
- 26 Buildings internal to the Henly Honda site and fronting to Burke Road (to the south of the laneway) must be constructed within a sightline taken from the opposite side of Riversdale Road from the site to the top of the high rise office building to the south of the site. Development should step down towards the west

representatives of key stakeholder groups to liaise with the developer.

Agree but also consider that the trees on both the north and south side should be retained.  
**Recommendation:** That Council meet with the developer to advocate retention of the trees on environmental grounds.

**Recommendation:** That this element be more clearly specified in terms of maximum height levels and setbacks rather than in terms of consistency “with the scale of surrounding buildings.”

Not sure if this is relevant as VCAT has made its determination on the development.

## **ACCESS**

### **Vehicle Access Strategies**

- 1 Encourage the use of Redfern Road and Monteath Avenue as alternative access by the introduction of new traffic signals and turning lanes at Camberwell Road, Monteath Avenue and Redfern Road and channelisation works at Harold Street.  
Disagree with proposed traffic signals at the intersections of Monteath Avenue and Camberwell Rd and Harold Street. Combined with the traffic lights at intersection of Redfern Road and Riversdale Road, this creates a de facto ring road that will result in the degradation of the Hawthorn East residential precinct and increased traffic flowing into Prospect Hill Road via Harold Street. The proposal is contrary to Urban Design Principles 12 and 13. A comprehensive strategy is needed which then puts these individual proposals into perspective. Putting up proposals in this

fragmented manner does not allow the community to engage in the bigger picture and creates tensions for affected residents, all of which reflects adversely on Council.

**Recommendation:** That Council prepare a comprehensive traffic management strategy and plan to deal with the traffic issues at the Junction.

- 2 Introduce new traffic signals at intersection of Riversdale Road and Redfern Road and limit access to Havelock Road.

See comments above under Element 1 above.

- 3 Explore opportunity for new one way avenue connection from Evans Place to Burke Avenue to link new development in the western car park with the Burke Road spine.

Disagree. This does not reflect Council's target for increased adoption of alternative commuting types and again emphasises the motor vehicle in a very tight precinct.

**Recommendation:** That Council reviews the compatibility of this proposal with its objectives of diversifying the means of access to the Junction and its (unstated) policy of reducing car parking.

- 4 Explore opportunity to restore Camberwell Grove as a new north-south street as part of any western car park redevelopment.

Disagree. See comments above under Element 3 above.

- 5 Establish Porter Street as new car park access and service access to western car park development site.

Disagree. This element is inconsistent with element 15 below:

"Minimise non-residential traffic in residential streets".

There is clearly a broader plan for this precinct, but these individual proposals make it difficult to comment until the bigger picture is announced. The proposals announced under the "Vehicle Access Strategies" ought to arise from the planning vision for this area. Rather they are advanced out of context. This element would impact adversely on Porter Street residents. See comments under 1 above. Porter Street includes a number of residential houses and this proposal gives them no protection of residential amenity. **Recommendation:** (1) That this element be deleted as it is in conflict with element 15 below. (2) that the multi deck car park retained.

## Pedestrian and cyclist access strategies

- 6 Introduce new pedestrian crossings at Railway Parade/Prospect Hill Road and Cookson Street and

Agree.

- relocate the existing Burke Road crossing adjacent to the Station.
- 7 Maintain and improve existing laneway linkages by restricting vehicular access where possible and providing active frontages and create new linkage off Burke Road at 793 Burke Road. Name unnamed laneways after local identities.
- Disagree with the demolition of one of Burke Road's early shops on the grounds that this sets a counterproductive precedent for the Burke Road strip. Essentially this can provide a message for developers that the incremental demolition of the strip is acceptable. Access to the western precinct is clearly stated in the structure plan through a range of other devices and this proposal is unbalanced and excessive.

If Council insists on this measure then I wish to query who is paying for the lane and whose responsibility is its upkeep and maintenance? I consider this to be a case of developers defraying part of the cost of their development overheads to the community and I oppose this on principle.

**Recommendation:** (1) That Council review its proposal to create a laneway through 793 Burke Road with the aim of withdrawing it; (2) that if (1) proceeds, Council to provide an itemised costing of the establishment, upkeep and maintenance of the laneway, including lighting costs in its next budget. Refer also to comment on element 7, under "Public Open Space".

- 8 Investigate opportunities to provide dedicated on road bicycle lanes to areas around the Junction, including Redfern Road, Harold Street, Fairholm Grove, Prospect Hill Road, Monteath Avenue and Fritsch Holzer Park.
- While I support in principle the introduction of bicycle lanes I have safety concerns about their inclusion in narrow streets such as Harold Street and Prospect Hill Road. This proposal needs investigation as to whether this measure is in conflict with the use of Harold St as part of the traffic flow from the substantial new developments in and proposed for the western precinct.

The current width of Harold Street demonstrates that it was never designed to accommodate the type of traffic flows advanced in the Structure Plan. The flow through to Monteath and on to Camberwell Rd. is planned to take some of the traffic pressure off Burke Road and if this goes ahead the introduction of bicycle lanes would exacerbate the pressure which increased traffic flows would put on Harold Street and be counter productive. Additionally I am very concerned that it would endanger the safety of cyclists.



Harold Street already contains car parking along the north side of the street which further narrows the road width.

**Recommendation:** That the cycle paths be included along Burwood Road and Camberwell Road and that the proposal to include them in Harold Street and Prospect Hill Road be abandoned on the grounds of safety and mutually conflicting traffic interests in a narrow streets.

- 9 Explore opportunities to provide regional cycle / walking networks through Fritsch Holzer Park and along Camberwell Road.

Agree however the cycle / walking networks in Fritsch Holzer Park should not be paved but rather made of scoria.

- 10 Where external levels permit, aim to provide barrier free pedestrian access across the centre, including entrances within shops.

This should already be covered by legislation regarding disabled access.

- 11 Improve pedestrian and bicycle accessibility and facilities, in particular around key pedestrian spaces, parks and transport nodes.

Where feasible, pedestrian and bicycle paths should be separated for safety reasons.

### Public transport strategies

- 12 Improve existing tram stops on Burke Road and Riversdale Road and where possible extend kerbs and/or provide centre platforms.

Disagree. The Camberwell Junction Structure Plan affects a very limited section of these tram lines and extending kerbs and /or providing centre platforms in this sporadic and unsystematic manner is tokenistic rather than effective. I do not support the expenditure of public funds on such poorly conceptualised devices, particularly when no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that they improve accessibility. Additionally I am concerned by the traffic impact of either of these measures in Burke Road in particular. A centre platform or kerbside extension has the distinct potential to create a traffic hazard in an arterial as narrow as Burke Road and increase the accident rate. I therefore question whether this proposal is accountable to the public in terms of safety for pedestrians, tram and car users.

Instead, I recommend that the tram stops be improved through the provision of adequate and sturdy shelters. This would benefit everyone.

**Recommendation:** that improvements to tram stops on Burke Road and Riversdale Road be implemented through the provision of adequate

- |    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 13 | Relocate major tram stop on Burke Road to connect with Camberwell Railway Station. | and sturdy shelters.<br>As there is already a tram stop on Burke Road outside the station no further action is required. The creation of a major tram stop would be a waste of public funds. |
| 14 | Improve the connection between the station and bus services.                       | Not clear exactly what is intended by this element.  |

### **Traffic management and car parking strategies**

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 15 | Minimise non-residential traffic in residential streets   | Agree. However a number of the elements in the structure plan conflict with this proposal. For example the proposed traffic flow through Harold Street, Redfern Rd, Monteath Ave and Porter Street will not be minimising traffic in these streets but rather escalating it. It is therefore not clear how the structure plan intends to implement this element.   |
| 16 | New development must provide full parking provisions in accordance with the Planning Scheme and replace any reduction in existing car parking. Car parking may be provided by cash in lieu for parking or a development contributions plan at either the Butler Street Car Park, the Market Car Park, the Fairholm Grove Car Park, the Mayston Street Car Park, or the Junction West Multi-deck Car Park. | It is not clear from the wording of this element as to what prevails: is it fully complying with parking requirements in accordance with the planning scheme or replacing any deficits in car parking? It is possible to imagine a development which may comply with the planning scheme without replacing all the lost car parking. How can this be addressed at these sites to ensure that all lost parking is replaced? With regard to the alternatives suggested in lieu of providing car parking, it is imperative that Council sets up a separate account (or uses an identifying budgetary code) for developer contributions for car parking so that it can identify the funds available and account for them in the annual budget document.<br>I am very concerned about the proposal to develop the Junction West multi-deck car park and to move parking to Porter Street. This is further away from the Burke Road precinct and less convenient to users than the current location. In a structure plan which purports to aim at improving accessibility, linkages and convenience for users, the document contains a number of conflicting measures. More attention needs to be applied to correlating the outcomes of the totality of the proposals to avoid inherent contradictions. Alternatively the structure plan needs to overtly address the hidden drivers behind the proposals governing car parking. See also my comments about parking above under paragraph 2.2 above and the lack of |

success in public transport arrangements at state government level.

**Recommendation:** 1. That Council, as a matter of urgency, addresses the impact of the implementation of the full range of car park removals and substitution measures contained in the draft structure plan; 2. That the management of the roll out of parking changes be identified; 3. that a clear plan be developed as outlined paragraph 2.2 (Car parking) and that the community be informed about it.

This will be mandatory if the parking changes take place as envisaged, due to the increased pressure for parking.

- 17 Introduce resident only parking permits for selected residential streets around the Junction determined on a street by street basis.

- 18 Explore opportunities for private/Council funded multi-deck or basement car parks to be constructed in existing Council car parks.

As noted above I consider that the draft structure plan contains serious deficiencies regarding car parking and significantly reduces the desirability of the Junction precinct as a destination for shoppers.

**Recommendation:** That Council reflects on the car parking comments contained in this submission and actively addresses the issues raised with the aim of ameliorating the reduction envisaged.

- 19 Green Travel Plans may be considered as a means to lower the car parking rates in the Boroondara Planning Scheme in association with permit applications for large employers.

This element is an example of the contradictions contained in the structure plan – see element 16 above.

- 20 Explore the opportunity to provide a link between the Junction West Car Park and the car park at 13-14 Burke Avenue, East Hawthorn.

This element does not correlate with element 16 which refers to the redevelopment of the Junction West Car Park and its substitution with parking in Porter Street. I am opposed to any links being made which then further reduce car parking bays.

- 21 Permit applications must be accompanied by written advice from the relevant Road Authority that confirms that either the new development will not exceed existing road capacity or that specifies what must be done to accommodate the development.

**Recommendation:** That this element be rewritten as follows:

“Permit applications must be accompanied by written advice from the relevant Road Authority that confirms that the new development will not exceed existing road capacity”..

## ACTIVITIES PLAN

### 1 Core retail area

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | Support an expanded retail offer within the Junction consistent with its role as Principal Activity Centre within Boroondara's retail hierarchy.   | The principles which will govern such expansion and its impact on the core retail strip needs to be articulated.  |
| 2 | Encourage a vertical mix of uses throughout the Junction where possible, with retail or commercial uses at ground level and residential above, subject to parking and access requirements. | The residential components should be focussed on Camberwell and Riversdale Roads.   |
| 3 | Provide community facilities in central junction location.   | Disagree. Community facilities such as those currently located at Fairholm Gve should be located in the civic precinct. The proposed developments at the Junction, combined with lack of parking facilities and poor public transport infrastructure, will create congestion. It is imperative that community facilities do not add to the pressure for space and cramped development profile which the principal activity centre allows at the Junction. See also comments under paragraphs 2.1 "Introduction" and 2.2 "Car parking" above.                                |
| 4 | Reinforce the role of the Camberwell Fresh Food Market as an important retail element within the centre.   | Not clear what outcome is intended by this element. I have concerns that the space occupied by the market will be viewed as a major development opportunity with an upmarket fresh food market component as part of the development. Such a development which displaces the current nature of the market and imposes consequential higher food costs in the context of escalating food prices is counterproductive.<br><b>Recommendation:</b> That Council makes a clear and unequivocal statement of support to retain the market in its current form at the current site. |
| 5 | Encourage consolidated residential development opportunities in the form of shop top housing.  | Disagree. There will be numerous other developments which provide residential accommodation without encouraging housing on top of existing retail and commercial shops. The built form outcome of such development is often inconsistent with the existing architecture leading to opportunistic outcomes which devalue the precinct.   |
| 2 | <b>Mixed use (Burke Rd Hill precinct)</b>  |   |
| 6 | Reinforce office and retail role in this area.   | Agree.  |
| 7 | Encourage mixed use development with opportunities for residential at  | Disagree. See above.  |

- upper levels in this area.
- 3 Mixed use (Junction West precinct)**
- 8 Encourage the integrated development of the Junction West precinct, through the co-ordinated re-development of key sites.
- 9 Encourage mixed use development in Junction West with frontage to Camberwell Road and Harold Street.
- 10 Provide new supermarket and new department store with a minimum floor area of 2000 sq m
- Recommendation:** 1. Insert height controls to protect Harold Street; 2. Development frontage to Harold St should be residential only.
- I assume the supermarket referred to is the Coles one already being built, rather than an additional one. As regards a new department store Camberwell Junction needs to aim at differentiating itself from the Westfield and other complexes which provide department stores and ample parking. The inclusion of a department store in this draft demonstrates an indiscriminate approach to bulking up the Junction. The department store model is now effectively superseded as they struggle to sell goods other than clothing and many sections are being consolidated and/or subcontracted eg. Virgin Records now provides the CD / DVD facility at Myer.
- Recommendation:** that Council justifies this element at the next Council meeting which contains the structure plan as an agenda item.
- 11 Encourage a major retail outlet at 171-193 Camberwell Rd with potential upper level residential development.
- Disagree. This is currently the Dan Murphy site which I understand is temporary. As noted above, the Structure Plan does not promote ideas which differentiate Camberwell Junction from any other activity centre anywhere in Melbourne. A major retail outlet is generally found at any of the shopping centres around Melbourne and does nothing to add to the individuality of Camberwell Junction as a destination. The strategy should not be one of competing with same offerings of other shopping centres but to genuinely offer a different product. Otherwise the development of synergies will create a non distinguishable retail precinct which will have difficulties competing as it will not be clear what business mission statement Camberwell Junction represents.
- 4 Mixed use (Redfern Rd precinct)**
- 12 Encourage infill mixed uses in west wedge between Camberwell and
- It is not clear whether this infill applies to upper levels or at the rear of buildings or both.

## Riversdale Road

- Either way I disagree with such an intensive approach to development as it detracts from liveability. Infill quickly reduces the desirability of a precinct which in the longer term can create areas which become dilapidated.
- 13 In the event that the tram depot becomes surplus to the requirements of Yarra Trams redevelop the site for future new residential development suitable for older adults. Disagree. This site should not be restricted to a residential development for older adults. See above under paragraph 2.1 “Introduction” for discussion. The value of this site to the Junction is pivotal and provides the opportunity for synergy with the Rivoli through the development of a performing arts precinct. **Recommendation:** That the residential component be set back to allow for balconies.
- 14 Mixed use development to either side of Redfern Road. **Recommendation:** That the residential component be set back to allow for balconies.
- 5 Mixed use (Butler St precinct)**
- 15 Encourage a mixed use development on the site with a retail or commercial component fronting Riversdale Road at ground floor level and consolidated residential above. Agreed.
- 16 Reinforce office role to Camberwell Road. This is one role but mixed use would be appropriate also. **Recommendation:** Include mixed use in this precinct.
- 6 Mixed use (Camberwell Rd & Monteath Ave)**
- 17 Step down the commercial intensity of land use to the rear of this precinct towards Harold Street. Agree subject to amendment. **Recommendation:** That the step down should be specified to commence at level 3 and the building should be stepped back from Harold Street.
- 18 Establish high profile office environment and provide opportunity for additional office development where possible. There is no reason to exclude a mix of residential above the offices provided there is no height increase. **Recommendation:** That this precinct include a residential component.
- 7 Mixed use (Denmark Hill precinct)**
- 19 Encourage a mixed use development on the Henly Honda site. Decision made by VCAT.
- 20 Encourage refurbishment of existing office buildings. **Recommendation:** refurbishment is an inadequate proposal in the context of climate change. Refer also to
- 8 Mixed use (Camberwell Rd & Crescent Rd)**
- 21 Reinforce secondary retail role in this area. Agree.
- 22 Encourage mixed use development with opportunities for residential at Agree.

- upper levels in this area.
- 9 Active / passive recreational (Fritsch Holzer precinct)**
- 23 Expand active/passive recreational role of Fritsch Holzer precinct.
- With the projected significant increase in developments it is vital to allow Fritsch Holzer to remain as a passive recreational precinct. The plan allows for a vast increase in apartment housing and Fritsch Holzer park will provide relief from the intensive built form. Academic research has highlighted the need for people to have the opportunity to maintain access to nature for mental health and relaxation. Additionally part of Fritsch Holzer should be converted into a wetland to attract biodiversity and provide a focal point.
- 10 Civic & community area**
- 24 Consolidate civic role consistent with precinct masterplan/plan of management.
- Recommendation:** There should be one “civic precinct” in the limited area covered by the structure plan and that is the one between Camberwell Rd and Inglesby Road. If a library materialises at the station then that precinct should be called “community”. If the library is not located at the station then a suitable site is the Council car park in Inglesby Road as part of the civic precinct. As noted above under paragraph 2.1 “Introduction” and in element 10 under “Public Open Space”, the railway station site should contain a public plaza with access to sunshine and views to the western skyline. In the meantime the area referred to as “Civic and community” at Cookson Street should be renamed “Railway station and plaza”.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>25 Encourage commercial development at the Camberwell Railway Station.</p>   | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Amend this element to read:<br/>“Allow commercial development at the Camberwell Railway Station”.</p>  |
| <p><b>11 Office (Railway Pde)</b></p>   |  |
| <p>26 Reinforce office role in this area.</p>   | <p>There is no reason why a mix of businesses should not be located in this area. Brunetti’s has already been allowed to open up at the corner of Railway Pde and Prospect Hill Road and such diversity is desirable.</p>  |
| <p><b>12 Threshold areas</b></p>  |  |
| <p>27 Restrict non-residential uses to protect residential amenity and to limit the extent of the existing commercial area.</p> | <p>This is an important element which needs to be strengthened particularly as mixed use has been proposed between Cookson St and Victoria Road thus breaking down the distinction residential and non-residential.<br/><b>Recommendation:</b> That this element be revised to take account of the above comments.</p> |

**4. WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE COMMUNITY FACILITIES WITHIN A CENTRAL LOCATION OF THE JUNCTION? WHICH SERVICES SHOULD BE PROVIDED AND WHERE WOULD THEY BE BEST LOCATED?**

From the perspective of the Junction as a vibrant retail and business destination it is a fundamental misconception to advance the proposal that community facilities should be located in a central junction location. The area covered by the “central Junction location” is very tight and its focus and desirability as a retail/business destination should not be distracted with the inclusion of a category of service which is outside the business model. I consider it would be a fatal flaw if the model of integrating community facilities in the central Junction location was implemented.

As noted in my discussion on the question of the community facilities under paragraphs 2.1 “Introduction” and 2.2 “Car parking” I consider that the appropriate location of the community facilities is in the Inglesby Road Council car park, adjacent to the main Council building. This co-location has the considerable advantage of promoting the sharing of facilities and staff collaboration and engagement and this advantage outweighs any perceived advantage of a “central” location. Importantly, this location recognizes the association of “community services” with the “civic cluster” and augments and strengthens the link.

**5. DO YOU THINK THAT THE PROPOSED BUILDING HEIGHT LIMITS WILL PROTECT THE CHARACTER OF THE JUNCTION AND ALLOW FOR ADEQUATE GROWTH? WHICH HEIGHT LIMITS SHOULD BE CHANGED?**

I would prefer maximum building height of 4 storeys in the Structure Plan on the grounds of allowing a more human scale to prevail and promoting liveability of the area. However based on a 5 storey maximum, I recommend that setbacks commence at level 3 and specified as 3m at level 3 and 5m at levels 4 and 5.



## **6. IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD LIKE TO TELL US?**

### **6.1 BURKE ROAD - 19TH AND 20TH CENTURY BUILDING STOCK**

That the existing 19th and 20th century building stock be preserved along the Burke Road retail strip and not be allowed to be converted into facades for modern high rise building at the rear. Protection of these buildings is sought through the Boroondara Planning Scheme.

### **6.2 PUBLIC CONVENIENCES AND BABY CHANGING / FEEDING FACILITIES**

The public conveniences/baby changing facilities under Safeway should be considerably improved and upgraded. Their present appearance creates a disincentive but perhaps that's the aim. The public conveniences on the Junction west side need to be retained. In both the east and west sides of the Junction, quality facilities need to be provided which cater to mothers with babies. I consider that the baby changing / feeding facilities should be located in a separate room to the public conveniences. This facility should be welcoming, clean and appropriately maintained.