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Appendix A
1 Introduction

1. My name is Penelope Jane Homewood and I am a Director at the firm Urbis Pty Ltd that conducts its business at Level 12/13 120 Collins Street Melbourne. My qualifications and experience are described in Attachment 1.

2. I have expertise in the local and state government policy and planning frameworks, the funding, development and delivery of community infrastructure, development contribution frameworks, strategic planning, urban design (with a particular focus on urban renewal and cities) and the provision of affordable housing. Over the last 18 months I have undertaken a number of Social Impact Assessments as outlined in my CV at Appendix A.

3. I have been requested in writing by Minter Ellison on behalf of Victorian Racing Club, to provide expert evidence regarding the Social Impact Assessment to the Flemington Hill and Epsom Road Advisory Committee (the Advisory Committee). In this correspondence, Minter Ellison provided the Committee’s set of notes which outline the matters the Committee would like to be addressed as part of each party’s submissions and I have received a copy of the submissions received by the Advisory Committee up to 1 March, 2016. In addition I attended a meeting with Ms Emily Porter of Counsel and Ms Stephanie Gale of Minter Ellison where we discussed the Advisory Committee’s requirements in regards to my expert advice.

4. As the Urbis Director of Social Planning, Melbourne, I was responsible for overseeing and contributing to the two Urbis Social Impact Assessment reports submitted to the Advisory Committee in 2015 and 2016 outlined below.

   b. Response to Flemington Hill and Epsom Road Advisory Committee Report: Social Impact Assessment, Open Space and Affordable Housing: Working Draft 23.02.16 (Urbis, 2016)

I note that prior to my involvement, Social Impact Assessments for each of these two sites had previously been prepared by Urbis. These SIA’s dated June 2014 were prepared in advance of the Advisory Committee process.

5. In the November 2015 and February 2016 work I took the lead role to assess and inform myself of:

   a. the appropriate community infrastructure to meet the proposed development impacts;
   b. the provision of Affordable Housing including the status of the provision of affordable housing proposals including the former Channel 9 site in Richmond and Moonee Valley Racecourse Redevelopment;
   c. the Advisory Committees recommendations dated 17 December, 2015 requiring further consideration and resolution of the following matters:
      ▪ 6b) Define the extent of development contributions required for the Project in consultation with the Cities of Melbourne and Moonee Valley; and
      ▪ 7a) Work with the Cities of Melbourne and Moonee Valley to develop a proposal to identify reasonable affordable housing opportunities.
   d. development of costing of the proposed infrastructure contributions proposed by Urbis, the City of Melbourne and the City of Moonee Valley.
   e. the adequacy of the provision of the open space contribution
   f. the two community consultation sessions held at the Victorian Racing Club on 2 and 7 February, 2016, including to engage with attendee’s in regards to their concerns and/or feedback on the
development, particularly on regards to social planning, open space and community infrastructure matters.

6. I have been informed by Minter Ellison that Mr Matt Ainsaar has been engaged by the VCR to undertake an independent peer review report on the social impact assessment, including commentary on public open space, development contributions and affordable housing and that he will provide expert advice in regards to the appropriate provisioning of community infrastructure given the envisaged population of the residents of the Flemington Hill and Epsom Road as outlined in the Indicative Development Concepts for the project.

7. As advised by Minter Ellison I will focus my evidence on the submissions from the City of Melbourne and the City of Moonee Valley in regards to proposed provision of community infrastructure, open space and affordable housing. In addition I will familiarise myself with social planning issues raised by the other submitters in preparation of the Advisory Committee hearing.

8. As outlined in the Advisory Committee’s set of notes dated 1 March, 2016, I also address the following additional matters in my statement:

   a. The letter from Minter Ellison on behalf of the Victoria Racing Club on 1 February, 2016 advising that it was unlikely to be able to comply with the recommendation to provide "an independent peer review on social impact assessment, including commentary on public open space, development contributions and affordable housing" as it has not been able to engage with the Councils on the key issues;


   c. Further commentary on the incorporation of affordable housing.

   d. Commentary on adaptable housing.

9. I have relied on the following experts and work to inform this report:


   c. Mr Latham Conley WT Partnership: Costing of IDC and SIA Infrastructure contributions 18 February 2016 who used information from:

      ▪ Mr Simon Dick, Principal Woods Bagot: Open Space Area Calculations

      ▪ Flemington Life Book of Plans Exhibition Version Jan 2016, Indicative Concept Designs to identify proposed physical infrastructure for costing calculations.

   d. Impacts of the Proposed Flemington Life Development on Community Facilities in Moonee Valley Report dated January 2016, MVCC (and received 4 February, 2016);

   e. Correspondence from GTA Consultants dated 19 February 2016, regarding transport infrastructure cost apportionment;

   f. Correspondence from the MVCC dated 5 February 2016, regarding development contributions;

   g. Correspondence from the MVCC dated 8 February clarifying open space provisions

i. National Quality Standards for Long Day Care Centres

j. Community infrastructure Quantitative Analysis, EDG Consulting, 19 October, 2014

k. Standard Development Contributions Advisory Committee Report 1 and 2 (2012-3)

l. Flemington Life Social Impact Assessment, Updated Report, November 2015, Urbis

m. Response to Flemington Hill and Epsom Road Advisory Committee Report: Social Impact Assessment, Open Space and Affordable Housing: Working Draft 23.02.16

10. I adopt the exhibited reports assuming the expert reports I relied on are true and correct and with the following exceptions:

Development Contributions Costs

I confirm that only that proportion of the physical infrastructure that provides benefit to the broader community in general, rather than those costs attributed directly to the impact of the development, should be attributed to the Development Contribution cost.

In the absence of a municipal wide development contributions plan and affordable housing contribution charge or levy, it is valid that the physical infrastructure that provides benefit to the broader community in general, community infrastructure contributions and the provision of affordable housing should all be considered as part of the proponents development contribution.

Community infrastructure Quantitative Analysis, EDG Consulting, 19 October, 2014

This work has been used to calculate the areas required to meet the identified impact of the proposed development on Maternal and Child Care Health, Kindergarten places, Libraries, Senior Group meeting spaces and Planned Activity Groups. This work was prepared for the City of Melbourne. It is recognised that the population forecasts used to generate these benchmarks do not reflect the current population forecasts for the City of Melbourne (e.g. the inclusion of the growth forecast in the urban renewal precinct Arden Macaulay) and Community infrastructure provisioning and floor space benchmarks are from (ASR, 2008). These are intended for growth areas and may not be applicable to an inner city area like Flemington Green and Epsom Hill.

11. Questions falling outside the expert’s expertise:

While I understand the SIA method to calculate the physical and community infrastructure impacts and requirements, I am not an expert in calculating the provisioning and apportionment of the development contribution. This particularly applies to the appropriate apportionment of the benefit of the proposed physical infrastructure to the general benefit of the community.

12. Is the exhibited report incomplete or inaccurate in any respect?

In reviewing the previous reports, I note an error on page 11: Response to Flemington Hill and Epsom Road Advisory Committee Report: Working Draft 23.02.16. The fifth paragraph is incomplete. The sentence should be amended to replace “to provide time for VRC to” with “by VRC”.

13. I have made all the inquiries that I believe are desirable and appropriate and no matters of significance which I regard as relevant have to my knowledge been withheld from the Panel.
2 Correspondence from Minter Ellison regarding the ability to complete the Development Contributions Plan

A letter was sent to the Advisory Committee from Minter Ellison on behalf of the Victoria Racing Club on 1 February, 2016 advised that it was unlikely to be able to comply with the recommendation to provide "an independent peer review on social impact assessment, including commentary on public open space, development contributions and affordable housing" as it has not been able to engage with the Councils on the key issues.

Response

In consultation with Urbis Planners regarding the Council submissions to the Advisory Committee, I understood that the Cities of Melbourne (CoM) and Moonee Valley (MVCC) had completed and would be able to provide their respective Community Infrastructure requirements to ameliorate the impact of the proposed developments outlined in the IDC, as soon as the Stage 1 Advisory Committee Report was circulated to all parties (i.e. in December 2015).

When the letter from Minter Ellison was sent to the Advisory Committee on 1 February, 2016, the Community Infrastructure requirements work either Councils had not been provided so there was concern that Urbis would be unable to comply with the Advisory Committees recommendations. Urbis received MVCC community infrastructure requirements on the 5th February, 2016 and the City of Melbourne’s on 16th February, 2016.

This work was used to calculate the indicative development contribution costs and is outlined in the Urbis report: Response to Flemington Hill and Epsom Road Advisory Committee Report: Social Impact Assessment, Open Space and Affordable Housing: Working Draft 23.0216.

It is titled a Working Draft as we were unable to work with the Councils to agree on the extent of the development contributions or the affordable housing opportunities by the submission date. We do however agree to continue to work with the Councils in the endeavour to achieve the Advisory Committees objectives in regards to these matters.
3 Assessment of Submissions

3.1 OVERVIEW OF SUBMISSIONS

I have had a general overview of the submissions and in regards to community infrastructure provision and affordable housing. I note that the key social planning, community infrastructure and affordable housing themes relate to:

- the need for additional infrastructure to support the new population demands
- there is a lack of adequate open space both currently and as proposed by the draft amendments
- existing facilities cannot cope with the current demands
- lack of consultation on the Advisory Committee process
- needs more family apartments
- no commitment to affordable housing

Many of these matters will be addressed in greater detail in the more detailed response to the Cities of Melbourne and Moonee Valley submissions below. Those matters that are seen as exceptional to the general and consistent matters raised in the submissions will be addressed at Section 3.4 of this report.

3.2 SUBMISSION BY THE CITY OF MELBOURNE

The MCC submission outlines that (4.3) There is currently no proposal for the funding and provision of local infrastructure and community facilities to accommodate the additional demand for services. At pages 8 and 9 of the submission, further detail is provided regarding MCC’s physical infrastructure, community infrastructure and Housing Affordability requirements.

These matters are discussed below:

Physical infrastructure

City of Melbourne recommends the developer should construct all infrastructure, including the proposed park (forming part of the Flemington Green development), the various intersection upgrades as shown in the GTA exhibition report, and the signalised pedestrian crossing at Epsom Road at their own cost and to the satisfaction of Council.

Response

In the Urbis Report: Response to Flemington Hill and Epsom Road Advisory Committee Report: Social Impact Assessment, Open Space and Affordable Housing: Working Draft 23.02.16, WT Partnership costed all physical infrastructure works to determine the indicative cost the developer was contributing to the proposed new residents and workers on the site as well as for use by the wider community.

I agree with GTA’s view that a number of proposed road network mitigation works, bicycle and public transport improvement works would assist mitigate the impacts of the development but also benefit the broader community in general. Also that to accurately calculate the cost apportionment was too complex and time consuming given the timeframes but more importantly to estimate a percentage would be speculative.

The total cost estimate for both sites including the components of: open space, bicycle links, pedestrian links, road improvements, bus stops, contingencies and project management fees (Refer Table 2 Urbis, 2016) was $12,730,000 which equates to $11.2K/dwelling (based on the number of dwellings as shown through the Indicative Concept).
My understanding from discussions with the project team is that VRC propose to construct the proposed park (the central green shown in the Flemington Green exhibited Comprehensive Development Zone), the intersection upgrades as shown in the GTA materials, and the signalised pedestrian crossing as Epsom Road at their own cost and to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.

Community Infrastructure

The City of Melbourne response outlines a $sum/dwelling should be provided to contribute to the upgrade to the community Infrastructure in the area.

Council suggests the following developer contribution approach to upgrading of community infrastructure in the area (namely the development of a community hub), a $7,000 per sqm cost to deliver community infrastructure should be applied, and from the information provided, the development will generate a need for 311sqm additional community floor space (based on a projected 750 population increase/398 new dwellings). The cost of delivering the additional floor space requirement for the community infrastructure demand was therefore calculated as 311 x $7,000 = $2,177,000 which is the equivalent to $5,500 per dwelling.

Council state that the preferred mechanism for implementing this approach is through an Incorporated Comprehensive Development Plan or as a Schedule to the Comprehensive Development Zone that makes it a requirement that a condition be included in any development permit that the owner of the land enter into an agreement with the Responsible Authority pursuant to Section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 to pay the developer contribution.

Response

WT Partnership has costed the Community Infrastructure amelioration measures outlined in the Urbis 2016 Report. The Community Facilities are listed below:

- Contribute to a new early years recreation hub in Kensington based on the need to accommodate an additional 74 children in kindergarten
- Open Space and Recreation enhancements
- Provide, or contribute to, a multipurpose community hub. The facility should offer accessible, flexible and culturally appropriate community spaces. This may be located onsite at Flemington Green or at another location nearby pending discussion with Council. The facility should include:
  - a local e-resource centre;
  - areas suitable for ‘maker spaces’ for local art and cultural activities catering to increasing youthful population in area;
  - places that residents can hire for children’s parties and other social activities;
  - suitable areas for book clubs, study groups, table tennis.

The area for the Community Hub (220m2) was based on the provision of a kitchen, male and female toilets, 2 large meeting rooms and a multi-purpose room subject to discussion with the Council.

I agree that the community hub model is an appropriate response to accommodate future community needs given the Melbourne model is designed to be flexible to adapt to changing community needs. Therefore, if the proposed location of the Community Hub is not suitable to the Councils, Urbis’ proposed that the contribution/dwelling cost could be provided to the Councils to invest in a multipurpose community hub in a location that was more suitable to the Council. WT Partnership cost estimate for the above works was $1.5 million which equates to $1.32K/dwelling.

In regards to the City of Melbourne’s calculation of $5,500/dwelling to contribute to the Community Hub, this seems excessive in terms of construction costs, as WT estimate $3,000/m2. The development contribution should reflect the predicted use of the proposed facility by the residents of the proposed
development in light of the development demographic profile and the predicted use by others in the catchment area.

Further, the additional development contributions should be considered comprising:

- the cost/dwelling of the physical infrastructure improvements that can be apportioned to benefit the broader community;
- the cost of the proposed 15 1 and 2 bedroom apartments for worker housing for low income Flemington racecourse workers proposed by the Victorian Racing Club (and discussed in later subsections of this report).

**Open Space**

The City of Melbourne has requested a 7.06% of open space contributed as land. It is unclear where this is to be located.

**Response**

The Urbis SIA (2015) identified that existing best practice benchmarks indicate that passive open space should include more than 2.5ha per 2km radius and active open space should achieve a minimum of 8ha per 6,000 people. The areas of passive open space within a 2km radius of the site equates to 10.4ha of passive open space, which meets best practice benchmark requirement and will continue to supply a suitable amount of passive open space after the arrival of all new residents.

The existing quantum of accessible active open space in the Study Areas is 62ha. This equates to 9.1ha of active open space areas per 6,000 people, which adequately meets benchmark standards for a future population.

Urbis recommended encouraging greater pedestrian and cycling movement across the Fisher Parade bridge which will provide access to the extensive areas of open space and recreation facilities that exist at the Victoria University Footscray Park campus as well as providing improved access to the extensive areas of formal and informal parklands along the Maribyrnong River including the 15ha Footscray Park.

The proposed provision on the Flemington Green site equates to a 5% open space contribution and will adequately meet the open space requirements for the development given the site’s context and access to open space in the local area.

**Affordable and Diversity of Housing**

The City of Melbourne has requested that the Advisory Committee consider an affordable housing requirement in accordance with their housing strategy Homes for People Housing Strategy, 2014. The Strategy has been adopted by Council, it has not been incorporated into the Melbourne Planning Scheme, nor has any planning scheme amendment been proposed at this time. The Housing Strategy target is to provide an additional 1,721 affordable homes for low and moderate income earners which is based on 15% of new dwellings estimated to be built between 2016 and 2021. In addition the Strategy aims to increase a more diverse range of dwellings and improve the design and environmental standards of new apartments.

The Housing Strategy assumes that of the 20,000 apartments in the Melbourne pipeline, approximately 96% will be one and two bedroom apartments, which is not meeting the requirement for family-friendly three bedroom apartments which is forecast to make up at least 8,000 households by 2031.

**Response**

In the current housing market it seems difficult to accurately forecast the future apartment mix and there is an important role for Councils and the property industry to promote the need for larger apartments to meet the needs of more diverse and larger households.

Further, in the absence of either a municipal or state wide affordable housing levy I reiterate our previous advice that:
The proposed Flemington Green development consciously increases the diversity of housing choice in the study areas by seeking to deliver a significant number of one, two and three bedroom dwellings (including apartments and townhouses) to cater for the changing demographic profile of the study area.

Flemington Green and Epsom Road development proposals propose over 13% of apartments will be three bedrooms. Given increasing traffic congestion and the ongoing forecast of agglomeration of jobs to the central city, it is foreseeable that the demand for family-friendly apartments will increase across the inner city and that the developer of Flemington Green will respond to market demand and further increase the number of 3 bedroom dwellings available in the area.

The Advisory Committee referenced the Channel 9 redevelopment in the City of Yarra (DPO Schedule 5) and the Moonee Valley Racecourse Redevelopment in the City of Moonee Valley (Amendment C155) in regards to the provision of affordable housing as part of the developments. Urbis has discussed these projects with the respective Councils and understand the details of the provision of the affordable housing on these sites is not resolved due to lack of clarity of how it will be funded.

In support of the provision of affordable housing for workers, it is proposed that VRC purchase apartments for the sole purpose of worker housing for low income Victorian racing industry (VRI) employees /track workers.

At the planning permit stage, the developer and Councils can be more specific regarding the opportunity to designate housing for subsidised rental housing in association with a Registered Housing Association (RHA) provider. Issues around developer incentives and bonuses could then be considered to “fund” the affordable housing component of the development. If funding is available, it is recommended that the planning controls at planning permit stage should be clear regarding:

- who pays for the housing
- the housing location
- flexibility regarding the tenure mix
- the opportunity to ensure any development accords with the RHA’s design guidelines
- the standard of construction minimises ongoing maintenance costs and body corporation fees.

Further discussions with VRC regarding the details of the provision of worker housing are outlined below:

VRC proposes to use 15 dwellings for the purpose of affordable housing with a mix of these being one and two bedroom within Flemington Green. VRC would assign a dwelling to stable tenants who have a commercial lease with the VRC. Housing would then be made available to staff of the business the commercial lease is with that are on low income roles such as stable hands. An estimate of the value of this contribution assuming 10 apartments are one bedroom and 5 are 2 bedroom equates to $8.37m or $3859/dwelling.

The VRC is exploring the opportunity to expand his program within the broader racing industry. The Victorian Racing industry has traditionally and continues to have a high volume of residents in the area with it being the centre of the VRI with not only Flemington racecourse and training centre but also the principal racing authority Racing Victoria located on Epsom Road and various subsidiaries of the racing industry. The dwellings would be rented as per guidelines for affordable housing and managed by the VRC. The VRC has over 20 existing stable lease tenants and manages the properties agreements and maintenance internally.
3.3 RESPONSE TO THE MOONEE VALLEY SUBMISSION

Community Infrastructure

The MVCC submission outlines its commitment to continue to work with the proponent and stakeholders to reach agreement on the sufficient provision of on-site public space and infrastructure contributions. It goes on to outline that:

‘At this time it is not possible to ascertain how large facilities will have to be or where they have to be located to address the needs arising from the proposal. The parties cannot agree on a facility capacity or location absent of a development proposal…Until Council has the opportunity to review this material Council will not be in a position to finalise its considerations and determination of what is an appropriate level of contributions.

Urbis and the Moonee Valley submission support the use of adaptable multi-purpose spaces.

In addition, in regards to the 2.32 outdoor playing ovals and fields, Urbis received an email response regarding its query of this calculation that outlined that “in regard to the demand for sports fields the 2.2 fields represents increased use across the entire year and does not include seasonal sports so for a 12 month period this would equate to 1.1 and not 2.2 ovals.

Response

In regards to the proposed provision of at least $6000 /dwelling, this seems excessive in terms of construction costs as well as the additional development contribution comprising:

- the cost/ dwelling of the physical infrastructure improvements that can be apportioned to benefit the broader community;
- the cost of the proposed 15 x 1 and 2 bedroom apartments for worker housing for low income Flemington Race Course workers proposed by the Victorian Racing Club.

Further, a development contribution should reflect the predicted use of the proposed facility by the residents of the proposed development in light of the development demographic profile and the predicted use by others in the catchment area.

As outlined in the Urbis 2016 report:

- Urbis is of the view that the proposed development contributions comprising the physical and community infrastructure and the affordable worker housing is a very generous developer contribution rate and that the developer contributions per dwelling should more accurately consider the percentage of growth expected from the developments at the planning permit stage.
- Table 19 of the Urbis SIA (2015) summarises the percentage of use for each recommended community infrastructure item generated from the two development sites. For example, MVCC has provided unit costs for additional MVCC library facilities (see Table 1 earlier). An appropriate formula for calculating a developer contribution rate for future library facilities might be:

\[
\text{Developer Contribution Rate per dwelling} = \frac{L \times S \times P}{D}.
\]

Where:

- \( L = $4,000 \) per sqm of new library development
- \( S = 886 \) sqm (size of additional facilities required by MVCC)
- \( P = \) Percentage of additional demand generated by new developments (estimated to be
  - approximately 5% in total for both precincts (see Table 19 of SIA report), which shows 2%
  - demand generated by the “youth” cohort and 3% demand generated by the “aged” cohort for both precincts combined)
- D = 1,134 total dwellings to be provided by the development.

Based on this formula, a contribution rate for library facilities would estimate to be $156.00 per dwelling (if this was the extent of addition required). This formula could be used as the basis for calculating a range of other community facilities, including open space, in order to develop an equitable and specific developer contribution rate.

Open Space Provision

The City of Moonee Valley has requested additional open space or cash in lieu contributions for infrastructure, to allow for access to the Racecourse and or provide connections to open space resources adjacent to the Maribyrnong River.

Response

As outlined in response to the City of Melbourne, the proposed provision on the Flemington Green site adequately meets the open space requirements for the development.

Affordable, Diverse and Adaptable Housing

The City of Moonee Valley has requested a 10% provision of affordable housing in a project of the proposed indicative development. In addition, that 10% of the proposed housing should designed to be adaptable to meet the needs of the future population. 5% of the adaptable housing should be included as minimum percentage in the private housing stock.

Response

There is an increasing requirement for adaptable housing to meet the needs of the community, particularly around DDA access and the design of kitchen and bathroom facilities. For this reason, the consultations with the social housing providers reinforced the need for the opportunity to ensure any development accords with the RHA’s design guidelines that include designs for accessibility. In addition, the developer should be encouraged to offer apartments that are designed to enhance accessibility.

As outlined in the response to the City of Melbourne submission in regards to affordable housing, in the absence of a municipal or state wide affordable housing levy I reiterate our previous advice that:

- The proposed Flemington Green development consciously increases the diversity of housing choice in the study areas by seeking to deliver a significant number of one, two and three bedroom dwellings (including apartments and townhouses) to cater for the changing demographic profile of the study area.

- In support of the provision of affordable housing for workers, it is proposed that VRC purchase apartments for the sole purpose of worker housing for low income Victorian racing industry (VRI) employees /track workers.

- At the planning permit stage, the developer and Councils can be more specific regarding the opportunity to designate housing for subsidised rental housing in association with a RHA provider. Issues around developer incentives and bonuses could then be considered to “fund” the affordable housing component of the development. If funding is available, it is recommended that the planning controls at planning permit stage should be clear regarding:
  - who pays for the housing
  - the housing location
  - flexibility regarding the tenure mix
  - the opportunity to ensure any development accords with the RHA’s design guidelines
  - the standard of construction minimises ongoing maintenance costs and body corporation fees.
Further discussions with VRC regarding the details of the provision of worker housing are outlined below:

- VRC proposes to use 15 dwellings for the purpose of affordable housing with a mix of these being one and two bedroom within Flemington Green. VRC would assign a dwelling to stable tenants who have a commercial lease with the VRC. Housing would then be made available to staff of the business the commercial lease is with that are on low income roles such as stable hands. An estimate of the value of this contribution assuming 10 apartments are one bedroom and 5 are 2 bedroom equates to $8.37m or $3859/dwelling.

- The VRC is exploring the opportunity to expand his program within the broader racing industry. The Victorian Racing industry has traditionally and continues to have a high volume of residents in the area with it being the centre of the VRL with not only Flemington racecourse and training centre but also the principle racing authority Racing Victoria located on Epsom Road and various subsidiaries of the racing industry. The dwellings would be rented as per guidelines for affordable housing and managed by the VRC. The VRC has over 20 existing stable lease tenants and manages the properties agreements and maintenance internally.

3.4 ADDITIONAL MATTERS RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS

3.4.1 A LOCAL HEALTH PROVIDER (SUBMITTER FLE009) HAS OUTLINED THEIR INTEREST IN ACCESS TO 250M2 OF RETAIL SPACE FOR ALLIED HEALTH SERVICES INCLUDING POTENTIAL CLINICAL TREATMENT ROOMS AND GROUP REHABILITATION SPACES.

Response

In a Council rate constrained environment, it is envisaged that more innovative mechanisms will be required to provide the community infrastructure required to meet community needs, including through the private market.

A local Health provider (Submitter FLE009) has outlined their interest in access to 250m2 of retail space for allied health services including potential clinical treatment rooms and group rehabilitation spaces.

Epsom Road proposes 500 m2 of non-residential uses and Flemington Hill proposes in the order of 2,000 to 2,900 m2. The envisaged uses include: Food and beverage venues, a small independent supermarket, gourmet delicatessen/bakery, liquor/wine store, doctor/medical facility, professional suites, a gym and a child care centre. These potential commercial and community uses will be used by the proposed residents as well as be of benefit to the broader community.

The applicant should be encouraged to provide additional commercially viable facilities to meet the development proposals future residents as well as to be accessible to benefit members of the broader community.

3.4.2 HOUSING CHOICES AUSTRALIA (SUBMITTER FLE087) CLARIFIED THAT THEY EXPRESSED PREFERENCE FOR EPSOM ROAD RATHER THAN FLEMINGTON GREEN

Response

Registered Housing Associations are encouraged to liaise with the developer at planning permit stage, the developer and Councils can be more specific regarding the opportunity to designate housing for subsidised rental housing in association with a RHA provider. Issues around developer incentives and bonuses could then be considered to “fund” the affordable housing component of the development. If funding is available, it is recommended that the planning controls at planning permit stage should be clear regarding:

- who pays for the housing
- the housing location
flexibility regarding the tenure mix

- the opportunity to ensure any development accords with the RHA’s design guidelines
- the standard of construction minimises ongoing maintenance costs and body corporation fees.

3.5 CONCLUSION

The role of a Social Impact Assessment

In summary, my evidence is based on the role of an Social Impact Assessment (SIA) to understand and assess the impacts of change on individuals, families, communities and society as the result of a proposed development so that there is a clear nexus between the impacts of proposed development and the development contribution by the proponent.

As outlined in the Urbis Planning Reports prepared as part of the application, the impact of the proposed development as outlined in the IDC will have an impact on the demand for community services provided by the Council.

As outlined in the submission by the City of Moonee Valley, in the absence of a specific planning permit application and a long term capital works program that is based on the future services to be provided by the Council, it is difficult to ascertain what should be contributed at this stage of the process to ensure that there is a clear nexus between proposed community infrastructure and the demands generated by the proposed development. As suggested by Moonee Valley, Urbis is happy to continue to meet with the Councils and agree on the impacts on services of the proposed development.

Accordingly, Urbis is of the view that the proposed development contributions comprising the physical and community infrastructure and the affordable worker housing provide a very generous developer contribution rate. In finalising the developer contributions per dwelling, the percentage of growth expected from the developments that will use additional community facilities being recommended by Council or recommended in the SIA needs to be calculated more accurately.

As outlined in the Response to Flemington Hill and Epsom Road Advisory Committee Report: Social Impact Assessment, Open Space and Affordable Housing: Working Draft 23.02.16, an appropriate formula for calculating a developer contribution rate for future facilities is proposed:

\[
\text{Developer Contribution Rate per dwelling} = L \times S \times P / D. \quad \text{Where:}
\]

- \(L = \$4,000\) per sqm of new library development
- \(S = 886\) sqm (size of additional facilities required by MVCC)
- \(P =\) Percentage of additional demand generated by new developments (estimated to be approximately 5% in total for both precincts (see Table 19 of SIA report), which shows 2% demand generated by the “youth” cohort and 3% demand generated by the “aged” cohort for both precincts combined)
- \(D = 1,134\) total dwellings to be provided by the development.

Based on this formula, a contribution rate for library facilities as an example would estimate to be \$156.00 per dwelling (if this was the extent of addition required). This formula could be used as the basis for calculating a range of other community facilities, including open space, in order to develop an equitable and specific developer contribution rate. Once final costing for additional infrastructure (especially open space and recreation infrastructure beyond what will be provided with the developments) are provided by both Councils, then similar per dwelling contribution rates can be developed for each item.
Disclaimer

This report is dated 8 March 2016 and incorporates information and events up to that date only and excludes any information arising, or event occurring, after that date which may affect the validity of Urbis Pty Ltd’s (Urbis) opinion in this report. Urbis prepared this report on the instructions, and for the benefit only, of The Victoria Racing Club (VRC) (Instructing Party) for the purpose of Report (Purpose) and not for any other purpose or use. Urbis expressly disclaims any liability to the Instructing Party who relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose other than the Purpose and to any party other than the Instructing Party who relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose whatsoever (including the Purpose).

In preparing this report, Urbis was required to make judgements which may be affected by unforeseen future events including wars, civil unrest, economic disruption, financial market disruption, business cycles, industrial disputes, labour difficulties, political action and changes of government or law, the likelihood and effects of which are not capable of precise assessment.

All surveys, forecasts, projections and recommendations contained in or made in relation to or associated with this report are made in good faith and on the basis of information supplied to Urbis at the date of this report. Achievement of the projections and budgets set out in this report will depend, among other things, on the actions of others over which Urbis has no control.

Urbis has made all reasonable inquiries that it believes is necessary in preparing this report but it cannot be certain that all information material to the preparation of this report has been provided to it as there may be information that is not publicly available at the time of its inquiry.

In preparing this report, Urbis may rely on or refer to documents in a language other than English which Urbis will procure the translation of into English. Urbis is not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of such translations and to the extent that the inaccurate or incomplete translation of any document results in any statement or opinion made in this report being inaccurate or incomplete, Urbis expressly disclaims any liability for that inaccuracy or incompleteness.

This report has been prepared with due care and diligence by Urbis and the statements and opinions given by Urbis in this report are given in good faith and in the belief on reasonable grounds that such statements and opinions are correct and not misleading bearing in mind the necessary limitations noted in the previous paragraphs. Further, no responsibility is accepted by Urbis or any of its officers or employees for any errors, including errors in data which is either supplied by the Instructing Party, supplied by a third party to Urbis, or which Urbis is required to estimate, or omissions howsoever arising in the preparation of this report, provided that this will not absolve Urbis from liability arising from an opinion expressed recklessly or in bad faith.
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Expert Witness

Jane Homewood CV

QUALIFICATIONS:
PhD Candidate, Melbourne University  current
The Transformation of Cities
Australian Institute of Company Directors Diploma  2012
Advanced Negotiation & Mediation, Faculty of Law, Melbourne University  1999
Masters Planning and Design, (Urban Design) Melbourne University  2000
Graduate Diploma in Urban Planning and Policy RMIT  1996
Bachelor Architecture Hons, Melbourne University  1985

Current Role

Jane was employed as a Director at Urbis in the Economic and Social Advisory group in 2014. Jane leads the Social Planning Practice in Melbourne. Projects to date include:

- DEWLP: a evaluation of the Community Infrastructure Fund and pilot Community Infrastructure Broker Program to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of each program to deliver better quality, more timely, integrated community infrastructure that meets the needs of the community. (2016 current).
- Dennis Reserve, Hobsons Bay. Community engagement and master planning for the redevelopment of this centrally located park in Williamstown (2016 current)
- Future Estate: Cumulative Impact Assessment for a proposed boutique brewery and bar as part of the Pentridge redevelopment (2016)
- Werribee Integrated Community Learning Hub proposal. The development of a brief and the services for an integrated library and community learning hub in Werribee City Centre. (2016)
- Assessment of the state and local government community infrastructure needs for the Arden Macaulay precinct procurement options for early delivery of this infrastructure.
- Social Impact Assessment Dan Murphy’s, 1s Linsell Boulevard, Cranbourne East.(2015)
- A detailed social impact assessment (SIA) to inform the decision making on a proposed Dan Murphy’s packaged liquor licence.
- Social Impact Assessment for the expansion of Westfield Doncaster with an additional 43,000 square metres of additional floor space, (including restaurants and cinema) and 18,000 square metres of additional commercial floor space for office and associated uses in a commercial tower.
- Community Infrastructure Assessment for Yang Clarendon Pty Ltd (2014)
- Community Infrastructure Assessment for Yang Clarendon Pty Ltd to assess the community infrastructure needs in Southbank and identification of an appropriate community use to be incorporated in the development.
- Social planning assessment of the proposal by Jewish Care incorporating 120 aged care beds
- Cumulative Impact Assessment, Publican Group Australia Pty Ltd. (2015)
- Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA) The Village Melbourne at 557 St Kilda Road, (2015)
- cohealth Capital Infrastructure Strategy 2014-2025. (2015) a review of cohealth’s assets, their locational context and an initial assessment of how well these assets meet cohealth’s current and future service needs for board review and feedback.
- Strategic alliance between cohealth and a social housing provider. (2015).
- The project assessed the benefits and conditions to expand delivery of services.

Previous Roles

General Manager Development Frankston City Council 2010 - 2014

The Directorate has included responsibility for Planning and Building, Economic Development, Tourism and Events, the Regional Frankston Arts Centre, Major Projects, Urban Design and Development, Environment and Compliance and Safety.

Acting CEO Frankston City Council July –December 2012

Overall responsibility for management and leadership of the City of Frankston, an outer metropolitan municipality with a population of 129,000, operating revenue of $140 million and 1100 staff. During a time of instability, I was able to lead the organization so that it focused on the Council and community interest.

Strategic Outcomes - Urban Consultants 2009 - 2010

- Corio Norlance Urban Renewal Business Case for Cabinet consideration.
- MAV Councillor Training
- Birrarung Pools – A precinct partnership development proposal for a zero net water and energy water polo and swimming pool facility for CBD on the banks of the Yarra River;
- Planning and development for Far East Consortium including Upper West End;
- Activity Centres Toolkit: A toolkit to assist local government, business associations, property owners and other government agencies implement activity centre policy and structure plan initiatives to improve activity centres and attract investment for development.

Priority Development Panel (PDP), DPCD 2009 – 2010

Appointed by the Minister for Planning, the PDP was formed to provide advice to the Minister in relation to Victoria’s major developments. The PDP co-ordinated input and advice from a range of government departments and agencies, the relevant local Council, developer, community and other stakeholders to provide advice to the Minister of Planning on the best possible development outcomes for major Victorian development proposals.

Victorian Civil Administrative Tribunal 2008 – 2010

Sessional Member, Planning & Environment List.

Senior Associate Arup 2007 - 2009

- ‘Medina’, a 900 ha development site in Malaysia’s Iskandor Region, for Mubadala. This was a multi-billion dollar project expected to bring in Gross Development Value in excess of $20bn over a period of 15 to 20 years. The project development model was based on the Dubai development model;
- Development of a sustainability framework and urban design guidelines for i) Nepal Hill, an education and residential redevelopment project in Singapore and ii) Clean-Tech Hub, a technology precinct, for JTC Corporation, Singapore. JTC is the Singapore government's development arm. The project was looking at leading technology to grow sustainable business in Singapore;

- Provision of strategic advice to the Qatar Government for master planning major cities;

- Guidelines and principles for Transit Orientated Development for the New Zealand Transport Authority;

- Integrated urban design and transport solutions to local and state government agencies and private developers including:
  - VicTrack development adjacent to rail lines;
  - Box Hill tower development integrating bus interchange, DPCD;
  - Werribee Technology Precinct Review, Department of Treasury;
  - Coburg Activity Centre, Equiset;
  - Community consultation and urban design frameworks for the Cities of Cambridge, Busselton, and Port Hedland in Western Australia.

**Director Design Services, VicUrban** 2005 - 2007

- Dandenong, Geelong and Footscray Transit City developments;

- Docklands development proposal project reviews including new headquarters for ANZ, Waterfront City and public realm works;

- Oversight of public arts;

- Urban fringe developments including Officer, Werribee and Epping master site planning and development guidelines;

- Development of the Environmental Sustainability tools including the Material Selector and Sustainability Charter.

**City of Yarra - Manager Urban Strategy & Director Development** 2003 - 2005

- City Of Moreland Manager Urban Strategy 2000 - 2003

- Team Leader Strategic Planning, City Of Melbourne 1997 - 2000

- Planning Panel Member, Minister of Planning 1999 – 2000

**Projects pre -1998**

- Meadow Heights Community Facility project brief development for the City of Hume.

- Strategic planning including policy development, feasibility studies, preparation of reports for Council with consultants/staff for major projects at the City of Darebin.

- Urban analysis and development of design principles for the redevelopment of Flinders Street Station for Hames Sharley.

- Docklands development Metropont 2001 team member.
- Melbourne University Children’s Centre, Abbotsford provision of a strategic plan, brief and sketch design for the centre’s expansion and development to meet new child care regulations.
- Customer Standards for AMP for shopping centres with Maxine Cooper and Associates.
- Housing Strategy for the City of Moreland.
- Housing Strategy for the City of Darebin with Terry Burke & Sinclair Knight Merz.
- City of Melbourne West End Strategy to address problems with the night club industry in King Street with People for Places and Spaces.
- Flinders Street Station Heritage Study with Allom and Lovell.
- Princess Theatre project feasibility, brief and sketch design, project management, reports and negotiations with the Heritage Council and City of Melbourne.
- Project Manager Community Housing, Department of Housing NSW. Development of community housing projects throughout metropolitan and regional NSW including housing for ageing, aboriginal, single and disability tenants.
- Darling Harbour urban planning and urban design for the Bicentennial project.
- Ministerial Advisory Committee for Housing and Homelessness
- Women for Supporting Housing: Project Officer undertaking research and developing educational texts and reports on women and housing.
- Management of Women’s Refuge in Footscray.
PERSON WHO CARRIED OUT ANY TESTS OR EXPERIMENTS UPON WHICH THE EXPERT HAS RELIED ON AND THE QUALIFICATIONS OF THAT PERSON.

DR MICHAEL GROSVENOR – SOCIAL PLANNING

Qualifications
PhD (UWS), Master of Science (Urban Affairs) (CUNY); Master of Policy and Applied Social Research (MacU), Bachelor Town Planning (USNW)

Experience
Currently Principal, MGC; Previously Associate Director Social Planning, Urbis (2014-2015); PhD Candidate UWS (2010-2013); Principal MGC (2006-2012); Associate PBAI (2004-2006); Principal Planner Maunsell (2002-2004); North Jersey Transport Planning Authority (2000-2001); Various State and Local Government planning roles 1991 to 1999.

Expert’s area of expertise to make the report
Social Impact Assessment specialist with Urbis, including project managing SIA’s for George Street, (Leichhardt) residential development; Parramatta RSL redevelopment and Melrose Park redevelopment. Also contributed to early reporting of VRC Flemington residential development proposal SIA.

Contribution to the report
Contributed to Flemington Life SIA, particularly focusing on urban planning policy and strategic context, quantifying social impact assessment, and development of amelioration measures. Also critically reviewed the community infrastructure developer contribution methodology based on developer contribution experience in NSW.

Contributed to the supplementary report: Response to Flemington Hill and Epsom Road Advisory Committee Report:

All instructions that define the scope of the report (original and supplementary and whether in writing or oral):
As directed by Jane Homewood, Urbis Director

The identity of the person who carried out any tests or experiments upon which the expert has relied on and the qualifications of that person.

Urbis Economic and Market Research Team (Rhys Quick) for population projection figures.

MR RHYS QUICK.
The responsible Urbis Director for the following Chapters of the Report Flemington Life: Social Impact Assessment November, 2015:

- Chapters 3: Existing Situation Analysis
- Chapter 4: Population and Demographic Profile Projections
- Chapter 5 The Proposals (including analysis of the apartment mix and costs)

Mr Rhys Quick, a Director in Urbis’ Economics and Market Research team was responsible for the preparation of population and demographic elements of the report including the current demographic profile of the catchment areas defined in the report, forecasts of how this population and their demographic will change over time, and the influence of the Flemington Life developments in terms of introducing new residents and a changing profile. Mr Quick has over 17 years experience in reviewing the economic and demographic impacts of all types of property development. He was also assisted by Urbis consultant, Jessica Collins.”