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1 Introduction

1.1 Background

In December 2011, Moonee Valley City Council commissioned Capire Consulting Group to undertake a preliminary Social Impact Assessment (SIA) of the proposed redevelopment of Moonee Valley Racecourse, as detailed within the Moonee Valley Racecourse Redevelopment Draft Masterplan. This report provides an overview of the positive and negative impacts associated with the proposed redevelopment, as detailed in current plans dated October 2011.

The assessment is considered preliminary because it is based only on a limited range of consultation with the community. The primary intent of this document is to inform further discussion regarding the Draft Masterplan, to make preliminary recommendations for mitigating negative social impacts associated with the development, and to provide an overview of further information that may be required from the proponent.

1.2 Methodology

A number of steps have been undertaken in developing this Social Impact Assessment:

1. A visit to the proposed development site.
2. A review of the proposed Draft Masterplan, and accompanying documentation and technical reports prepared by various consultants (including ASR Research and GTA Consultants).
3. A review of existing community consultation undertaken relating to the Draft Masterplan. Specifically, notes from consultation sessions held by both Council and the Racecourse during 2011 were provided to Capire.
4. An analysis of the size and profile of the population that is likely to reside at the proposed redevelopment.
5. An analysis of the likely changes to the demographic profile of the local population as a consequence of the redevelopment.
6. A comparison of the proposed redevelopment to other inner city and middle-ring large-scale, residential developments in Melbourne.
7. A discussion of the social impacts associated with the redevelopment, both positive and negative, informed by the steps undertaken above.
8. Preliminary recommendations regarding the steps that may be taken to maximise the positive social impacts of the development, and mitigate negative impacts stemming from the redevelopment.
9. Details of further information that is required in order to comprehensively assess the social impacts of the proposed redevelopment.

1.3 Limitations

There are a number of limitations that need to be considered when interpreting this Social Impact Assessment:

1. Capire undertook no consultation while preparing this assessment, primarily due to time constraints. Capire was provided with notes from consultation sessions previously undertaken by Council and the Racecourse. These notes detailed the opinions of the local community present at these sessions, but do not necessarily capture a representative view of the local community.
2. The Draft Masterplan provides limited detail in many instances, primarily due it being a high-level document. Consequently, it is difficult to more precisely identify and quantify many of the potential social impacts associated with the proposal until there is more detail available.
2 Overview of the Proposal

2.1 The Moonee Valley Racecourse Redevelopment

Moonee Valley Racing Club (MVRC) has lodged a proposal with Moonee Valley City Council to amend the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme.

The proposed amendment will rezone land at the Moonee Valley Racecourse from Special Use Zone (SUZ) to an Activity Centre Zone (ACZ). The Racecourse has also submitted a Draft Masterplan for the proposed redevelopment. The major land-use and built-form changes, as proposed in the Draft Masterplan are detailed in Table 1.

Table 1: Proposed major changes to Moonee Valley Racecourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Change</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track re-alignment</td>
<td>• Re-alignment and upgrade of the existing racetrack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential development</td>
<td>• The development of medium and high density residences, varying in height between 2 and 25 storeys, on the Racecourse site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Located on the southern, western and northern edges of the Racecourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use / commercial areas</td>
<td>• The Masterplan provides for the inclusion of a mix of non-residential uses on the site, such as retail, commercial, education, health and accommodation services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Located in the south-western corner of the Racecourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandstand redevelopment</td>
<td>• The relocation of the grandstand from the existing location at the corner of McPherson and Dean Streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The development of a new 4-tier grandstand abutting Wilson Street, providing facilities for up to 40,000 patrons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional events</td>
<td>• The MVRC intends that redevelopment of the site will provide the opportunity to host up to 40 race meetings per year, many of which will be during night-time hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community facilities</td>
<td>• The potential development of a community facility including Early Years facilities (kindergarten and Maternal Child Health services), as well as multi-purpose community spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public space</td>
<td>• Provision of a new park of at least 3,000 square metres fronting McPherson Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provision of an ‘urban plaza’ of an unspecified size</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Population and Demographic Projections

The MVRC Draft Master Plan document does not detail the estimated number of dwellings or population that are projected to be accommodated on the Racecourse site. However, accompanying documents, including those produced by ASR Research and GTA Consultants, provide dwelling and population numbers that may be accommodated on the site. The GTA Consultant’s report also provides estimates of commercial floor space in the proposed redevelopment.

Table 2 provides an overview of projections for development on the site, as contained within GTA Consultant’s report.
Table 2: Estimated floor space figures for the redevelopment (GTA Consultants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land-use</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>3,000 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>16,000 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>8,500 sqm of medical, education, retail etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 provides an overview of estimates for the mix of residential stock on the Racecourse site, as contained within ASR Research’s report.

Table 3: Estimated housing stock composition (ASR Research)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>Percentage of stock</th>
<th>Total number of dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom apartment</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedroom apartment</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedroom apartment or townhouse</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ASR Research report notes that: “…that this yield assumption is preliminary at this stage and will most likely continue to change as the implications of market demand over the development period are more clearly understood.” (Page 18)

Using the dwelling yield described in Table 3, and assuming each bedroom will accommodate an average of 1.1 persons, ASR Research estimates that the residential population of the development will be 5,940 persons.

The ASR Research report does not provide detailed demographic projections for the proposed redevelopment. However, it does provide a breakdown of the expected number of persons in the development that are expected to utilise various community services (e.g. early years’ services, neighbourhood houses etc.).

2.3 Major Changes in Built Form

The major changes to built form on the Racecourse site, as proposed in the Draft Masterplan, are described in Table 4 and Figure 1.
Table 4: Proposed major changes to built form at Racecourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandstand</td>
<td>The existing grandstand is located in the southeast corner of the Racecourse site. It is a three-tier structure, set back approximately 100 metres from McPherson Street.</td>
<td>A new grandstand has been proposed on the northern edge of the site. Current plans show the new grandstand will directly adjoin Wilson Street with minimal set back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-density residential towers</td>
<td>There are currently no residential uses located on site, with the exception of the Manager’s Residence.</td>
<td>Several high-density residential towers would be developed upon podiums along the western and northern edges of the Racecourse. These towers would vary between 9 and 25 storeys. The proposed heights are shown in Figure 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium density residential and</td>
<td>There are currently no residential uses located on site, with the exception of the Manager’s Residence. There are currently no commercial uses located on the site, outside of the Racing Club operations.</td>
<td>Several medium density structures (3-8 storeys) are located primarily in the south-western corner of the development, located adjacent to McPherson, Thompson and Dean Streets. These buildings would hold a mix of commercial and residential land-uses. The proposed heights are shown in Figure 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed use structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonee Valley Legends</td>
<td>The Moonee Valley Legends, a function and gaming venue, is currently located at the corner of Thomas and Wilson Streets on the site.</td>
<td>It would appear that the current location and structure is to remain following redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The venue contains 105 Electronic Gaming Machines (EGMs).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Traffic and Transport Changes

2.4.1 Car Parking

The redevelopment proposes a total of 2,300 car spaces on-site for racing events (2,000 spaces in the middle of the track, and 300 spaces under the grandstand).

This represents a reduction from the current parking provision on the site. Parking for 3,400 vehicles is currently provided within the infield of the Racecourse and an unknown quantity of parking is located on the McPherson Street side of the site.

The GTA Consultants report does not quantify the amount of parking that is likely to be provided for mixed use and commercial developments on the site.

2.4.2 Traffic Generation

GTA consultants estimate that the Racecourse proposal will generate an additional 13,000 vehicle movements per day. This comprises:

- + 9,000 daily vehicle movements generated by new residential uses.
- + 4,000 daily vehicle movements associated with commercial and mixed-use developments.
The report assumes vehicle movements associated with racing activities / functions will remain at current levels. The report does not provide any detail of increased volumes as a result of expanded events at the Racecourse.

Expected changes to traffic volumes on key roads surrounding the Racecourse, following redevelopment (as calculated by GTA Consultants), are described in Table 5. The projected volumes of traffic, following redevelopment, assume that several traffic mitigation measures will be undertaken in the area. This includes the installation of new traffic signals and roundabouts (see Section 2.4.3).

The GTA report projects increased congestion and queuing around the Moonee Ponds Junction during AM and PM peak periods, even with the installation of significant traffic mitigation measures.¹

Table 5: Projected traffic volumes following redevelopment of Racecourse (GTA Consultants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Conditions Volumes</th>
<th>Projected Volumes (with mitigation works)</th>
<th>Volumes Difference</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pascoe Vale Road</td>
<td>North of Coats Street</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Alexander Road</td>
<td>South of the Junction</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Alexander Road</td>
<td>North of Taylor Street</td>
<td>2483</td>
<td>2396</td>
<td>-87</td>
<td>-3.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascot Vale Road</td>
<td>South of Gladstone Street</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson Street</td>
<td>Between Coats Street and Thomas Street</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>69.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Street</td>
<td>Between McPherson Street and Wilson Street</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>690.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Street</td>
<td>Between Pascoe Vale Street and McPherson Street</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Street</td>
<td>East of Fanny Street</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>84.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Street</td>
<td>Between the Junction and McPherson Street</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>14.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Street</td>
<td>East of McPherson Street</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>26.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ See: Figures 7.11 and 7.12, Page 54, GTA Consultant’s Traffic Modelling (24/10/11)
2.4.1 Traffic Mitigation Works

The GTA Consultants report suggests that a number of traffic mitigation measures will need to be undertaken in order to minimise the impacts of additional traffic. Mitigation works that are proposed for consideration include:

- A signalised T-intersection at Dean St/McPherson St.
- A signalised intersection at Wilson St/Thomas St.
- It would appear from diagrams in the GTA Consultants report that the new signalled intersections would involve widening of roads surrounding the Racecourse, with the removal of street trees and on-street parking in the local area, to make way for new lanes.\(^2\)
- Clearways on Pascoe Vale Road between Dean Street and Wilson Street.
- A roundabout at Coats St/McPherson St.
- A roundabout at Alexander Av/McPherson St.
- Additional mitigation measures proposed in the Moonee Ponds Structure Plan.

![Figure 2: Traffic mitigation measures surrounding the redevelopment (GTA Consultants)](image)

2.4.2 Public Transport Demand

GTA Consultants estimate that new residents on the site will generate additional public transport demand, as detailed in Table 6.

\(^2\) See: Figures 7.3 to 7.5, Page 45, GTA Consultant’s Report (24/10/11)
Table 6: Estimated change in public transport demand (GTA Consultants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Mode</th>
<th>Additional passenger trips per day</th>
<th>Additional passenger trips in peak hour periods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>+3,720</td>
<td>+930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>+420</td>
<td>+106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tram</td>
<td>+1,860</td>
<td>+466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The report estimates that the proposed residential development would generate an additional 116 passengers per train and 42 passengers per tram in AM and PM peak hour periods.

The GTA report does not appear to provide any estimates regarding additional demand for public transport services stemming from:

- Commercial / mixed use development at the site.
- Additional race meetings and functions at the Racecourse.

2.5 Social Infrastructure and Open Space Changes

The Draft Master plan suggests the following additional community infrastructure and open space items will be developed:

- A new park located on McPherson Street. The park is intended to have a passive recreation function, and a minimum size of 3,000 square metres.
- A new ‘urban plaza’, of an unspecified size, located on the western side of the Racecourse.
- The development of a multi-purpose community facility on the site, or the contribution toward a new facility off-site. The facility would include early years services (kindergarten, maternal and child health facilities), as well as general community spaces.

In addition, the Draft Masterplan suggests that the developer will consider opportunities to contribute toward additional off-site infrastructure including pedestrian and cycle paths, and additional open space.
3 Overview of Community Consultation

As discussed in Section 1, Capire has not directly undertaken consultation during the preparation of this preliminary assessment of social impacts. The assessment relies upon existing consultation undertaken by both MVRC and Moonee Valley City Council up until this point.

In June and July 2011, the Racing Club undertook consultation with the local community. Moonee Valley City Council held two community information meetings regarding the MVRC Redevelopment. The objective of the meetings organised by Council was to:

- Explain the process for assessing the proposed Draft Masterplan, and the Council’s process for consulting with the community.
- Outline and confirm community comments regarding the Draft Masterplan.

Council has provided Capire with a summary of the discussion that occurred at the community meetings organised by both the MVRC and the Moonee Valley City Council. The key comments and concerns raised in these meetings are detailed below.

Council intends to conduct formal consultation with the local community within the first half of 2012, as part of the assessment process for the proposed planning scheme amendment.

Table 7: Summary of Previous Community Consultation undertaken by MVRC and Moonee Valley Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Traffic, Parking and Transport| - Potential for increased use of local streets as a short-cut to avoid traffic on major roads such as Mt Alexander Road. Areas between Dean Street and Ormond Road were highlighted a number of times.  
- The location of the proposed development on small, narrow streets rather than major roads.  
- Lack of adequate, on-site parking for residents and visitors of the development.  
- Increased traffic through areas of Brunswick West.  
- Congestion on key roads is highlighted as a potential issue, as is the potential impact of additional traffic around rail crossings.  
- Existing parking shortages within the Moonee Ponds Activity Centre, and the impact of increased residents in the local area.  
- Concerns regarding the capacity of public transport services, and the capacity to expand services in the future.  
- Concerns regarding sickness from increased pollution from traffic in area. |
| Heights, Density and Local Character| - Those commenting saw the proposed heights and density as inappropriate. Similar developments in the local area were seen as generally lower in height and density.  
- Impacts such as wind tunnels, overshadowing, glare stemming from the proposed towers is of concern.  
- There was concern regarding the impact that the scale of development would have on the ‘village’ character of Moonee Ponds area and community. The pre-existing dominance of small lots in the area was highlighted. Development is seen as out of character with the scale of local area – particularly small, detached homes with heritage value.  
- The buildings along streets were seen to lack adequate set-back from the street.  
- Concerns regarding a reduction in ‘liveability’ in the local area.  
- Concerns regarding the impact of proposal on property values in local area.  
- Perceived lack of sensitivity of proposed grandstand to existing setbacks and heights along Wilson Street. |
| Social Issues Associated with Housing and| - There is some concern relating to the formation of a ‘ghetto’ on the site.  
- Some discussion of the potential issues with low income housing on the site, and potential for negative impacts on the local community. |
| Residents | • Concerns regarding increased crime in the local area from the development.  
• The need for affordable and diverse housing options in the development. |
| Social Infrastructure and Open Space | • Concerns regarding a shortage of social infrastructure in the local area to accommodate the development (in particular kindergarten, school infrastructure, open space).  
• Concerns regarding the lack of open space for children living in the development, the need for additional parkland in the local area, including on the proposed site.  
• Concerns regarding the impact of the Racecourse activities on Moonee Valley Central School, and students attending this school. |
| Construction Activity | • Traffic impacts during the construction phase of the redevelopment. Disruptions during the recent resurfacing of the racecourse were noted as precedent.  
• Concerns regarding the hours of the day that construction may occur.  
• Concerns regarding noise and dust from construction activity.  
• The potential impact of construction activity along Wilson Street on students attending Moonee Central School. |
| Racecourse Activity | • The location of the grandstand and its compatibility with the residential areas north of Wilson Street is seen as inappropriate. Problems associated with alcohol, gambling, crowds in the area.  
• The potential for noise along Wilson Street, including potential ‘noise tunnel’ effects along Wilson Street due to the construction of towers and grandstand.  
• Inappropriate location for a major entrance to the Racecourse on Wilson Street on race-days.  
• Taxi-rank location on Thomas Street is considered as an inappropriate location.  
• Particular concerns regarding night racing at the venue, including any increase in the number night-time race meets, and the impact on local community.  
• Concerns regarding gambling activity and alcohol consumption directly opposite a primary school. |
| Commercial Uses | • Impact of commercial uses on the existing traders in area.  
• The compatibility of proposed commercial uses within existing residential areas, particularly along Dean Street. |
4  Population and Demographic Forecasts

This section contains population and demographic forecasts that Capire has developed for the proposed development. These figures provide an understanding of the potential social profile of the future community. The section also provides a comparison to population and demographic forecasts that have been undertaken by ASR Research, on behalf of the developer. It then goes on to discuss the implications of these forecasts for social infrastructure provision in the Racecourse development.

Planning for the proposed Moonee Valley Racecourse Redevelopment remains in its early stages. The population and demographic forecasts lack detail at this time due to a number of unknown variables. The following factors will influence the population and demographics of the proposed redevelopment, and further clarity is required surrounding these factors before more accurate projections can be produced:

- The precise number of dwellings to be developed on the site.
- The composition and size of housing stock on the site (e.g. bedroom numbers, medium density versus high density dwellings, floor size of apartments).
- The likely population segments these apartments will be marketed toward, including price points
- The time-line for development of the proposed dwellings.

Given the absence of detail in the current plans, as described above, the following section provides a rough estimate of the population on the site. Further clarity is required to provide more accurate projections, and to fully understand the potential impact on the local community.

4.1  Dwelling Forecasts

As described in Section 1, reports prepared by ASR Research and GTA Consultants on behalf of the MVRC estimate the number of dwellings on the site at 3,000. The ASR document estimates that 90% of dwellings are to be 1-2 bedroom apartments and 10% of stock will be in the form of 3 bedroom apartments or townhouses.

MGS Architects and Planning, on behalf of Moonee Valley City Council, has reviewed the Draft Proposal. Based on the floor plates and heights outlined in the Draft Masterplan, MGS estimates that the current plan provides for the development of up to 4,400 dwellings.

There is obviously a need for further clarity surrounding the number of dwellings that are likely to be developed on the site in order to fully understand the development’s social impacts on the existing and future community.

4.2  Population Projections

In the absence of a precise dwelling yield for the site, population projections have been based on both of the scenarios described above:

- MVRC Redevelopment with 3,000 dwellings (MVRC 3000); and
- MVRC Redevelopment with 4,400 dwellings (MGS 4400).

During 2011, Capire undertook work on the social implications of high-density, in-fill development in the City of Yarra. The project involved a survey of residents living in townhouses/terraces and higher density apartments and units. The average household sizes were found to be:

- 1.9 persons for units and apartments.
- 2.5 persons for townhouses and terrace houses.

These figures are roughly consistent with research on household sizes in apartments in Docklands, undertaken to inform the same project.

These figures have been applied to the dwelling forecasts (MVRC 3000 and MGS 4400 scenarios) to determine the potential population of the development.

It is projected that the population accommodated on the racecourse site would be in the order of 6,240 persons under MVRC 3000, or 8,900 persons under MGS 4400. These estimates are detailed Table 8 and Table 9.
### Table 8: Projected population under the 3,000 dwelling scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>Number Dwellings</th>
<th>Average Household Size</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse /3 Bed Apartment</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6,240</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9: Projected population under the 4,400 dwelling scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>Number Dwellings</th>
<th>Average Household Size</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse/3 Bed Apartment</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,400</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted in **Section 1**, ASR Research estimates the population of the development at 5,940 persons. The estimate under the 3,000 dwelling scenario is roughly consistent (+5%) with the ASR Research estimate. However, the estimate under the 4,400 dwelling scenario varies significantly from the ASR estimate – increasing the potential population on the site by 50%.

### Table 10: Comparison of population projections under different scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Difference to ASR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASR Research Estimate</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capire estimate based on 3,000 dwellings (MVRC 3000)</td>
<td>6,240</td>
<td>+300 (+5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capire estimate based on 4,400 dwellings (MVCC 4400)</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>+2,960 (+50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences in population estimates highlight the need to clarify the potential dwelling yields on the site.

### 4.3 Age Projections

Unknown variables, such as the type of stock to be developed, timelines for development, and potential market and price points, makes it difficult to provide accurate age projections for residents of the new development. However, a rough estimate of the age structure of future development has been based on research of households living in apartments in the City of Yarra in 2011.

**Figure 3** shows the age structure for apartment dwellers in the City of Yarra in 2011 and of the Docklands population from the 2006 Census (Docklands consists almost entirely of apartment dwellings). It is likely that the City of Yarra research in 2011 underestimates the proportion of persons in apartments between the ages of 18 and 24. This is due the fact that the research was conducted using a household survey method, and participation rate was low.

---

3 Figures are from ASR Research Report undertaken for the MVRC.
4 Total number of dwellings from the MGS Peer Review of the Draft Masterplan (Draft Version, Dated December 2011). The proportion of townhouses to apartments is assumed to remain the same between the two scenarios.
by 18-24 year olds was likely to be low. If this fact were taken into account, the age structure for Docklands 2006 and City of Yarra 2011 apartment dwellings would be roughly similar, with the exception of the proportion of the population in the 0-4 year old age group.

**Figure 3: Age structure for dwellings in Docklands (2006) and apartments in City of Yarra (2011)**

![Age Structure Graph](image)

Source: Capire Consulting Group (2011); ABS (2006)

The figures suggest that households living in apartments are primarily within the 18-34 year old age group. These age groups generally equate with young professional households, normally associated with well-located high-density housing. However, the research also demonstrates that there is significant demand in the 35-49 year old market, possibly coming from families that are being priced out of the detached dwelling market or singles without children.

From Capire’s research in the City of Yarra, a number of other trends should be noted:

- There is an increasing propensity for families with children 0 to 4 years old to live in apartments, presumably due to affordability and location advantages. Once children begin to mature (>5 years) it would appear the family may move to a larger home due to space constraints.
- An increasing number of apartments are marketed toward empty nesters (50+ years) that wish to downgrade from a house in outer lying areas, to a better-located dwelling with minimal maintenance. From research undertaken by Metropolis Research in 2006, Docklands appears to be the most attractive location to these ‘empty nesters’.

Taking into account the points above, a preliminary estimate of age structure of the proposed development is detailed in Figure 4.
The forecasts show that:

- Future residents would be predominantly aged between 18 and 34 years old. These age groups generally represent young professional households.
- There is also likely to be a significant 35-49 year old market, possibly coming from families or singles without children.
- The ‘empty nester’ market (50-69 years) may be expected to account for around 10% of the population.
- Around 5% of the population would be expected to be children between the ages of 0 and 11 years old. This equates to around 450 children in the 3,000 dwellings scenario.

### 4.4 Social Infrastructure Implications

At this stage, it is not useful to provide a more thorough analysis of social infrastructure needs for the redevelopment, based on age groups, due to the unknown factors surrounding the variables that will influence future age structure.

However, the forecasts above have been compared to figures contained within ASR Research’s report, where they have quantified the demand for different types of social infrastructure. It appears that for some age groups, the ASR Research report underestimates population and for other age groups, it overestimates population. Specifically, the ASR Research report tends to:

- Underestimate the number of 0-4 year olds, and therefore the demand for early years’ services such as kindergarten and Maternal and Child Health services.
- Overestimated the number of 5-17 year olds, and therefore the demand for services used by this group, such as schools and after school care.
- Significantly overestimates the number of seniors, and therefore the demand for services for seniors (70+ years).

If we assume the population of the development is more likely to represent the second population scenario, based on 4,400 dwellings then the social infrastructure analysis undertaken by ASR Research obviously significantly underestimates demand for all items of social infrastructure and open space.

Either way, more detailed estimates of the social infrastructure demand stemming from the site need to be developed as more detail regarding the proposed development becomes available.
5 Local Demographic Change

This section provides an analysis of the demographic profile of the existing local community surrounding the Moonee Valley Racecourse. It also provides an overview of the expected demographic changes in the community following the proposed redevelopment. The purpose of this analysis is to establish a ‘base-line’ of the existing community, which is then compared to the expected changes.

The analysis of existing local demographic profile, and potential for change, focuses on two areas:

1. The locality of Moonee Ponds; and
2. The neighbourhood that surrounds the Moonee Valley Racecourse. The extent of this area is shown in Figure 5. In determining this ‘neighbourhood area’, significant barriers such as main roads and the Moonee Ponds Creek were taken into account, as well as the general character of the surrounding area.

The base-line demographic profile for both Moonee Ponds and the local neighbourhood surrounding the Racecourse is based on data from the 2006 ABS Census of Population and Housing. There is likely to have been some change in the demographic profile of the local area since the Census, and this should be considered when interpreting the results. However, it appears that no large-scale residential developments have been developed in this area since the 2006 Census, and therefore population and dwelling profiles should remain relatively consistent with 2006 levels.

Figure 5: Extent of the Moonee Ponds locality
5.1 Population

At the 2006 Census, the population of Moonee Ponds was in the order of 12,600 residents. The local neighbourhood surrounding the Moonee Valley Racecourse accounts for approximately 30% of this total, or 3,800 residents.

As detailed in Section 4.2, the proposed development is expected to increase the local population by between 6,240 and 8,900 persons, depending on the dwelling forecast that is utilised. Table 10 details the impact of this increase on the total population of Moonee Ponds and the local neighbourhood.

Figure 7 shows that:

- The population of Moonee Ponds would increase by +50% - from 12,600 residents in 2006 to 18,900 residents if 3,000 dwellings were constructed on the site. If 4,400 dwellings were constructed on the site, the population would increase by +70% on top of 2006 levels.
- The increase in the population of the Moonee Ponds locality between the 2001 and 2006 Census was only 5%.
- The population of the local neighbourhood would increase by at least +164% - from 3,800 residents to 10,026 residents if 3,000 dwellings were developed on the site. If 4,400 dwellings were constructed on the site, the population of the local neighbourhood would increase by +235%.
5.2 Housing Stock

The suburb of Moonee Ponds and the neighbourhood surrounding the development is dominated by one storey, detached housing. In Moonee Ponds, 60% of all dwellings are detached. In the local neighbourhood 70% of dwellings take this form, as shown in Figure 8.

The suburb of Moonee Ponds currently has very few apartments in buildings four or more storeys, as shown in Figure 8. In the immediate neighbourhood surrounding the proposed development there are no apartments over four storeys.\(^5\)

The proposed development would involve a significant change in the structure of housing stock in the suburb and the local neighbourhood. The proportion of apartments or units in four or more storey buildings in the suburb would increase from 4% of dwellings to at least 34%. The proportion in the local neighbourhood would increase from none to at least 58% of the stock.

Figure 8: Changes to housing stock in Moonee Ponds following development

---

\(^5\) As at the 2006 Census.
5.3 Age Structure and Family Composition

A preliminary profile of the potential age structure of the proposed development is outlined in Section 4.3. This age profile has been compared to the existing age structure in Moonee Ponds and the local neighbourhood surrounding the development in Figure 9.

In 2006, the age profile of Moonee Ponds and the local neighbourhood were roughly similar. Both areas have a higher proportion of families, with a larger proportion of children (0-17 year olds), and a larger proportion of adults between 35 and 50 years old, when compared to the age projections for the development.

Figure 10 shows that in the local neighbourhood surrounding the development, almost 40% of dwellings are occupied by families with children. This compares to less than 10% in Docklands. Docklands is used as a reference here because it represents a rough approximation of the composition of those households living in apartments.

Figure 9 shows that the development is likely to have a much higher proportion of 18-34 year olds, when compared to the local neighbourhood and Moonee Ponds. Moreover, Figure 10 demonstrates that Moonee Ponds has a much smaller proportion of non-family (i.e. single person or group households) than an area such as Docklands.

In general, Figure 9 and Figure 10 demonstrate that there would be a notable difference in the household and family composition of the existing community, and that of the community in the proposed redevelopment.

In the absence of other data, the demographic profile of Docklands is used as a study area to approximate the composition of the households that generally reside in apartments. Over 95% of dwellings in Docklands are apartment dwellings, making these statistics the most reliable of any study area. It is noted that local factors between different areas, and in differences in housing stock, would lead to a different composition in the Racecourse development. Therefore the Docklands figures are intended only as guide, in the absence of more detail regarding the types of apartments that are likely to be developed at Moonee Valley Racecourse.

In the absence of other data, the demographic profile of Docklands is used as a study area to approximate the composition of the households that generally reside in apartments. Over 95% of dwellings in Docklands are apartment dwellings, making these statistics the most reliable of any study area. It is noted that local factors between different areas, and in differences in housing stock, would lead to a different composition in the Racecourse development. Therefore the Docklands figures are intended only as guide, in the absence of more detail regarding the types of apartments that are likely to be developed at Moonee Valley Racecourse.
5.1 Tenure Composition

Tenure composition refers to the proportion of dwellings in a local area that are rented, owned or being purchased (i.e. mortgaged). Tenure composition in Moonee Ponds and the local area surrounding the proposed redevelopment is compared to Docklands using figures from the 2006 Census in Figure 11.

Again, Docklands is used as a reference here because it represents an approximation of the composition of those households living in apartments.

Moonee Ponds, and the local neighbourhood surrounding the development have a high level of home ownership (either fully owned or being purchased). This figure is between 60 and 70%. This compares to a relatively lower figure of less than 20% in Docklands (see Figure 11).

Docklands has a much higher proportion of renters (at more than 60%) compared to Moonee Ponds and the local neighbourhood, at between 20 and 30% (see Figure 11).

The figures suggest that the proposed redevelopment is likely to have a much higher proportion of renters than currently exists in the local area. The exact scale of this difference will depend on variables unknown at this stage (e.g. marketing of the proposed apartments, apartment sizes etc).

Figure 11: Tenure composition in Moonee Ponds and the local neighbourhood compared to Docklands (2006)

Source: ABS (2006)
6 Review of Similar Developments

This section provides an overview of approaches to residential development in similar circumstances to the proposed Moonee Valley Racecourse redevelopment. This is one method that can be used to help understand the potential impacts associated with the development, and how the redevelopment might compare to similar case studies.

The comparison focuses on some of the primary concerns that community members have raised about the Moonee Valley Racecourse redevelopment in consultation sessions. It also focuses on the potential demographic and population changes that these large-scale developments generate. Issues that have been dealt with primarily in other consultant’s reports (e.g. traffic and transport) are not considered here.

The comparable developments are listed in Table 11. They include both completed and proposed developments. In choosing the comparable developments, a number of factors have been considered, including, the site size, public transport access, existing residential context, and the context to activity centres.\footnote{For the purposes of this comparison Docklands has not been included as one of the study areas. Its unique context makes it less relevant to the MVRC proposal. For example, there are no existing residential areas surrounding the development, there is no existing community directly adjoining the area and it is within walking distance to both Melbourne CBD and Victoria’s largest railway station.}

Of course, no two developments are directly comparable, and the many contextual differences between developments need to be taken into account when making comparisons. Therefore, the case studies below are not intended to be entirely comparable or transferrable to the MVRC proposal. They do, however, provide a starting point to better understand the potential impacts of the development.

6.1 Beacon Cove, Port Melbourne

The Beacon Cove development is a partnership between the State Government and Mirvac, developed from the late 1990s. It involved the redevelopment of industrial land adjoining Port Phillip Bay in Port Melbourne.

The site is approximately 30 hectares in size, and includes a mix of low, medium and high-density residential development, as well as a very small proportion of commercial uses.

6.2 GTV 9 Site, Richmond

The former Channel 9 site, approximately 3 hectares in size, is to be developed by Lend Lease in the coming years. The development is to include 550 dwellings.

6.3 Caulfield Village

A five-hectare site to the north of the Caulfield Racecourse, currently used as a carpark, is to be redeveloped to accommodate residential and commercial uses. The site directly adjoins Caulfield Railway Station – a major interchange station in the south-east of Melbourne.

The proposal includes the development 1,200 apartments and 12,000sqm of retail space. A short-term accommodation service is proposed for the site.

Glen Eira Council approved the proposal in 2011. The community raised concerns related to car parking, traffic and the lack of infrastructure in the local area to accommodate the new residents.

There is a limited amount of residential area in proximity to the development site. Residential areas are located to the west of the site. To the north-east of the site is a railway reserve, commercial areas, the Monash University campus and Princes Highway. To the south of the site is the Caulfield Racecourse.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparable Development</th>
<th>Caulfield Racecourse Masterplan</th>
<th>Beacon Cove, Port Melbourne</th>
<th>GTV9 Redevelopment, Richmond</th>
<th>Moonee Valley Racecourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport Access</td>
<td>Rail interchange station, tram</td>
<td>Light rail</td>
<td>Tram</td>
<td>Train, tram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Centre</td>
<td>Caulfield Major Activity Centre</td>
<td>Located &lt;1km from Bay Street MAC</td>
<td>Swan Street Major Activity Centre</td>
<td>Principal Activity Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>~5ha</td>
<td>~30 ha</td>
<td>~ 3 ha</td>
<td>40ha - total, 11.6ha - to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential context prior to the development</td>
<td>Limited residential in area, but generally 1-2 storey, detached housing</td>
<td>Generally 1-2 storey detached housing, some low-rise units to west, some high rise to the east</td>
<td>Generally 1 storey, detached housing</td>
<td>Generally 1 storey detached housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 Housing Affordability and Social Housing

Table 12: Comparison of Similar Developments - Housing Affordability and Social Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beacon Cove, Port Melbourne</th>
<th>GTV9 site</th>
<th>Caulfield Racecourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The housing in the Beacon Cove development is generally targeted at the higher income end of the housing market. This is primarily due its proximity to Port Phillip Bay and the Melbourne CBD.</td>
<td>• It would appear that the properties will be marketed as premium properties, targeting young professionals and households with higher incomes.</td>
<td>• The approved proposal does not contain a dedicated proportion of dwellings to be provided as social housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In 2006, 11 dwellings were considered public housing and 3 dwellings were considered community housing. This represents 1.5% of dwellings in the area.</td>
<td>• At least 5% of dwellings within the GTV9 development are to be developed by Lend Lease as social housing stock. It is intended that these dwellings will be transferred to a registered community-housing organisation upon completion.</td>
<td>• The development will contain 500 dwellings allocated as student housing. It can be assumed that this stock will generally be smaller in size and consequently more affordable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is already a high proportion of social housing in the Port Melbourne locality, at about 8% of stock. The majority of this stock is in the ‘Garden City’ public housing area located directly north and west of Beacon Cove.</td>
<td>• It appears from the Masterplan that the social housing/affordable housing component of the development would be clustered together in the southern section of site.</td>
<td>• The likely affordability of housing to be released to the market is also unknown at this stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wintringham Housing, a community-housing provider, operates a hostel within the Beacon Cove development area. The Hostel is located on the north-eastern edge of Beacon Cove.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The entrance to the hostel is located on a road outside of the Beacon Cove development. The hostel has no direct access into the internalised Beacon Cove development. It would appear the location and entrance of the Hostel serve to minimise interaction between those living in the Hostel and the wider Beacon Cove community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implications

• The level of social housing in the benchmarked developments varies widely. The Beacon Cove development is unlikely to have included a large proportion of social housing due to the large amount of public housing already directly adjoining the development. The Caulfield development does not provide any social housing targets, however it does offer student housing.

• The 5% social housing component in the GTV9 development should be considered as a benchmark for inclusion in the MVRC proposal.

• It is unclear how affordable the housing proposed in the Racecourse redevelopment will be. It is possible that housing may be more affordable than locations such as Port Melbourne and Richmond, primarily due to the distance from the Melbourne CBD. However, housing stock overlooking the Racecourse may be considered as premium or exclusive depending on the type of stock, and marketing.
6.5 Social Infrastructure and Open Space

Table 13: Comparison of Similar Developments – Social Infrastructure and Open Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beacon Cove, Port Melbourne</th>
<th>GTV9 site</th>
<th>Caulfield Racecourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The central piece of social infrastructure in the Beacon Cove development is a private clubhouse called the ‘Southport Recreation Centre’ that includes tennis courts, swimming pool and gymnasium. This facility appears to be a private club that is primarily used by residents in the new development.</td>
<td>• The GTV9 development will include a multi-purpose community space, as well as a public square. The 400sqm multi-purpose community space is to be transferred to the City of Yarra, to own and operate. It will focus programs on the wider community, beyond the development area.</td>
<td>• The development is intended to fund the ‘opening up’ of the Racecourse to increased public access and activity. This is amongst other proposed improvements to the Racecourse. Specifically, a junior soccer pitch, jogging track, picnic areas and playground will be constructed on the racetrack’s infield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There would appear to be no attempt to integrate the new and existing communities in the area through the development of new social infrastructure that could be shared between these groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consequently, the social infrastructure adds to the perception of exclusiveness, and separation from existing communities around the Beacon Cove development.</td>
<td>• The GTV9 development will include 2,500sqm of public open space. This includes a pocket park, as well as a large public square. A number of additional private, open space areas are allocated as ‘communal resident open spaces’ in the plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The total area of new public open space developed in the Beacon Cove development is in the vicinity of 8,000sqm (see Appendix 1). This is in addition to the large expanse of existing public open space north of Beacon Cove, and public open space located along the bay-front. The total new public open space in the development is equivalent to about 4.5sqm per resident.</td>
<td>• The public open space proposed in the plan equates to 2.8sqm per resident.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implications

• It appears standard for developments of this scale to make a contribution toward local social infrastructure and open space.
• Any new social infrastructure to be located at the Racecourse should help promote interaction with the existing community, rather than reinforce a separate community within the Racecourse site.
• The Caulfield Racecourse example provides precedent for allowing opportunities for public recreation in racing venues, when not in use for racing events. This is important in areas with limited open space. Similar opportunities should be considered at Moonee Valley Racecourse.

---

8 Lend Lease (2011) GTV9 Richmond Development Plan, p. 95
6.6 Scale of Change to Local Population

Table 14: Comparison of Similar Developments – Scale of Change to Local Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beacon Cove, Port Melbourne</th>
<th>GTV9 site</th>
<th>Caulfield Racecourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Beacon Cove is said to have included the development of approximately 1,000 dwellings. At the 2006 Census the population of Beacon Cove was approximately 1,800 persons living in 930 dwellings. The development is now complete.</td>
<td>• The GTV9 proposal involves the development of 550 apartments, with an expected increase in population of approximately 926 persons. • In 2006, the population of Richmond was approximately 22,000. • The development represents 4% increase in the population of the suburb on 2006 levels.</td>
<td>• The proposal involves the development of 1,000 to 1,200 apartments. It is expected that 500 apartments will be targeted toward the student market, given the proximity to Monash University. Up to 2,500 persons will reside in the development. • In 2006, the population of Caulfield, Caulfield East and Caulfield North was approximately 20,000 persons. • The proposal represents a 12.5% increase in the population of these combined suburbs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implications

• The proposed redevelopment of Moonee Valley Racecourse would see a significant increase in the number of dwellings and population in the local area. The proposal would add at least another 6,000 residents to the local area. This represents a 50% increase in the population of Moonee Ponds. The scale of this population change is far greater, in both real and percentage terms, than in the case studies identified above.

• The potential social impacts of such a significant increase in the local population in Moonee Ponds needs to be carefully considered – especially on factors such as community identity and cohesion.

---


10 Urbis, Community Facilities Analysis Plan: 22 Bendigo Street (Dec 2011)
6.7 Housing Stock and Household Composition

Table 15: Comparison of Similar Developments – Housing Stock and Household Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beacon Cove, Port Melbourne</th>
<th>GTV9 site</th>
<th>Caulfield Racecourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The composition of housing stock in the Beacon Cove development, at the 2006 Census, is shown in Appendix 1. 47% of stock was in the form of semi-detached terrace or townhouses, 41% was in apartment buildings four storeys or more, with the remaining stock being detached housing or medium density apartment buildings.</td>
<td>• The mix of housing stock to be developed on the GTV9 site is outlined in Appendix 2. 13% of dwellings are to be townhouses, with the remaining 87% to be apartments.</td>
<td>• The exact mix of housing in the Caulfield redevelopment example is unclear. It would appear that the majority of dwellings included in the development are apartments. A small number of town houses are likely to also be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The composition of household types in the Beacon Cove development, at the 2006 Census, is shown in Appendix 1. 36% of households were couples without children, 24% were couples with children, 34% were group or single households, 8% were one-parent families or other.</td>
<td>• 20% of dwellings will have 3 bedrooms, with the remainder being a mix of 1 and 2 bedrooms.</td>
<td>• There is a large amount of existing apartments in the North Caulfield area. These are generally lower scale, two to three storey apartments. Consequently, there is probably less need for affordable and smaller housing stock in the Caulfield area when compared to other areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The low proportion of single parents families is likely to reflect the limited affordability of housing stock at Beacon Cove.</td>
<td>• The apartments are to be provided across 16 buildings. These buildings vary in heights, from medium density buildings of 4-5 storeys to higher density apartment buildings of 6-8 storeys.</td>
<td>• The plans suggest that 500 apartments for student accommodation will be provided on the site. Plans also suggest that an ‘over-55s lifestyle village’ will be included in the development. In this sense, there appears to be some variety of housing stock in the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overall, the household type and housing composition statistics suggest that there is a good variety of housing stock in the Beacon Cove development, catering to a broad array of household structures and family types. This is especially the case when compared to composition statistics in areas such as Docklands (see Section 5.3).</td>
<td>• Compared to the Beacon Cove development, there is a limited variety of housing stock in the GTV9 development. However, there would appear to be good a variety in the density of apartments buildings (i.e. a mix of medium density and higher density apartment buildings).</td>
<td>• The plans suggest that 500 apartments for student accommodation will be provided on the site. Plans also suggest that an ‘over-55s lifestyle village’ will be included in the development. In this sense, there appears to be some variety of housing stock in the development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implications

• The variety of housing stock varies considerably between the different developments. The Beacon Cove development has a large proportion of detached housing and townhouses at approximately 50% of stock. The proportion of townhouses and three bedroom apartments in the GTV9 development is 20%. The mix of housing stock in the Caulfield example is unclear – but some stock is to be dedicated to different groups such as students and over 55s, promoting diversity.

• The Beacon Cove development is the only study area out of the three examples that has been constructed. The composition of household types is diverse (at the 2006 Census) when compared to other new areas such as Docklands. This reflects the wider variety of housing stock available in the development. This diversity is seen as positive.
• Moonee Ponds only has a limited supply of apartments and townhouses at the moment, when compared to the case study areas above. Therefore, the development of apartments at the Racecourse is likely to make a positive contribution to the overall variety of housing available in the local area.

• However, the case studies highlight some concern with the variety of housing stock available within the development itself. 90% of stock is expected to be one or two bedroom apartments, and 10% to be townhouses or three bedroom apartments. There is no stock dedicated to student or over 55s housing. This represents less variety than the case studies above. There is some concern that this lack of variety will create an ‘exclusive’ community on the Racecourse site, with a limited demographic profile that contrasts significantly with the existing community.
6.8 Physical Integration with Existing Community

Table 16. Comparison of Similar Developments – Physical Integration with Existing Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beacon Cove, Port Melbourne</th>
<th>GTV9 site</th>
<th>Caulfield Racecourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The scale of development at Beacon Cove varies between low-rise, detached housing of two storeys, through to large residential towers of 9-14 storeys in height.</td>
<td>• The scale of the development varies between two storey townhouses and eight storey apartment buildings. The heights are detailed in Appendix 2.</td>
<td>• The proposed development varies in scale between three and twenty storeys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The higher density housing in the development is located adjacent to Port Phillip Bay, a significant distance from any existing residences outside of the development. Lower density housing adjoins the existing residential areas in the suburb.</td>
<td>• The larger scale buildings are located within the centre of the site, away from detached dwellings that characterise the local area. Two to three storey townhouses are located along the edge of existing residential areas.</td>
<td>• Three to four storey residences are to be developed along the western and north-western edges of the development. These areas border existing low density, residential areas in the neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This configuration of densities and heights helps to reduce the physical and perceptual separation between the development and existing urban areas.</td>
<td>• The scale of the development responds to the existing neighbourhood, helping to integrate the new development into the existing community.</td>
<td>• In the central sections of the site, the buildings will be eight and twelve storeys in height. A single, twenty-storey building is be located to the east of the site, within proximity to the railway station and further away from more sensitive sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overall, there is poor integration between the internal street layout of the Beacon Cove development and that of the existing area. This feature, as well as Beacon Cove’s internalised street structure, serves to separate the development from the existing community, physically and perceptually.</td>
<td>• The size of the buildings on the site serves to integrate it physically into the existing community. For example, Appendix 2 shows that the townhouses developed adjoining existing residential streets have similar floor plates as existing residences in the area, promoting a consistent built form.</td>
<td>• The development proposes a number of new streets and laneways that improve permeability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pedestrian access through the development from outside areas is generally good. However, the large areas of open space (such as Garden City Reserve) that separate the northern edge of the development from the surrounding neighbourhood have a similar effect on forming a perceptual barrier around the community.</td>
<td>• The footprint of the apartment buildings is relatively small, which helps to break up the scale of the development. This is in contrast to the large-scale towers with large podiums. This feature helps to integrate the built form into the existing area and community.</td>
<td>• The limited detail in the plan makes it difficult to understand the extent to which it may integrate with the existing community. For example, building footprints are not specified in the plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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development is generally consistent with, and well connected to, the existing street layout in the area. There is good permeability, and the layout will minimise perceptions of difference between the new and existing communities.

- Overall, the development would appear to be designed in such a way that helps to integrate it into the existing physical layout of the area. The development acknowledges and responds to, the existing physical character of the local area, which is likely to contribute to local community identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The physical integration of a development within its surrounding area can influence the social integration of a new development within an existing community. By minimising physical and perceptual differences between a new development and existing areas, social integration and interaction can be promoted. The development of separate or exclusive communities is generally a negative social outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The physical character of a community is often linked to a community’s social identity. There is a need for developments to respond and build upon the existing character of built-form and therefore local community identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The case studies have generally sought to integrate their built form with the existing character of an area. For example, all three examples locate higher density buildings away from existing residential areas. They generally propose lower scale development adjoining existing residential areas that respond to the lower density, detached character of the area such as the townhouses proposed in GTV9. The GTV9 site can be considered to have the best integration with its existing area. It achieves this through site permeability, consistency with the surrounding street layout, and built form that responds to the context of detached housing in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In comparison to practice identified in the case studies, there is concern that the Racecourse Masterplan pays limited attention to integrating with the existing community and responding to local character.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Preliminary Assessment of Social Impacts

This section provides an overview of the positive and negative impacts that the proposal is likely to generate, for both the existing community and new residents in the local area.

In some instances there is not enough detail available to assess the potential impacts. Instances where further information is required have been highlighted.

The section also provides recommendations in regard to how negative social impacts may be mitigated.

7.1 Impact on the Size of the Local Population

- This section provides an assessment of the changes to the local population size following the proposed redevelopment. The assessment is based on the number of dwellings to be developed as forecast by ASR Research and GTA Consultants.

- As discussed in Section 4.1, MGS Architects has developed alternative dwelling forecasts based on their analysis of the Draft Masterplan. If the MGS figures were to be utilised, the scale of the impacts described within this section would be much greater.

7.1.1 Summary of findings

- The Draft Masterplan proposes 3,000 dwellings on the site. This would increase the local population by 6,240 persons.

- This figure represents a 50% increase in the size of the Moonee Ponds population. Should the development proceed, it would account for one third of the population in Moonee Ponds. This figure is significantly greater than the 5% change in the population of Moonee Ponds between 2001 and 2006.

- The scale of population change in the local neighbourhood immediately surrounding the Racecourse would be in the vicinity of +165% under the current proposal.

- The scale of this change, in both real and proportionate figures, is significantly greater than in similar developments benchmarked.

7.1.2 Description of impacts

- The development will lead to a significant increase in the local population.

- The degree of this change in population is greater than current trends in both Moonee Ponds and other benchmarked areas. There are concerns about the ability of the existing community to adapt to such significant change in population. This is reflected in community consultation undertaken to date.

- Concerns relate to negative impacts on the connectedness, cohesion and character of the local community, with increases in anonymity and rapid changes in community identity.

- The groups likely to be affected by this impact include:
  - The existing local community.
  - New residents in the development, who may feel disconnected from the existing community.

7.1.3 Further information required

- Further community consultation should be undertaken to fully appreciate the effects of such a significant population change on the local community.

7.1.4 Recommendations

- A reduction in the scale of the development to a level that is more proportionate to the existing size of the local community should be considered. An increase of 3,000 persons, or +25%, may be a more appropriate figure to be accommodated on the site.

- This figure is based on the population of similar developments discussed in Section 6.6, and considers the scale of population change in the local area between 2001 and 2006.
7.2 Impact on Housing Diversity and Demographic Composition

7.2.1 Summary of findings

- The Draft Masterplan proposes 3,000 dwellings on the site. Of these dwellings, 90% are likely to be 1 and 2 bedroom apartments.
- This figure represents a significant departure from the current profile of housing stock available in the local area – dominated by detached housing.
- The proportion of one and two bedroom apartments proposed is higher than the proportions in the developments benchmarked in this assessment.
- As a result of the housing stock, the demographic profile of residents in the new development is likely to be significantly different to the existing community. The development is likely to have a lower proportion of families with children, and a higher proportion of persons renting.

7.2.2 Description of impacts

- The development is likely to have a positive impact on the variety of housing options that are available locally. The variety of housing options, as well as the potential demographic diversity that this will create at the suburb level should be welcomed.
- At the development level however, there are concerns that the housing options will be overly homogenous, with a high proportion of one and two bedroom apartments. This has the potential to create a homogenous demographic profile of residents on the site and in turn limit integration with the existing community.

7.2.3 Further information required

- Clarification regarding the composition of housing stock proposed on the site is required to fully assess this impact.

7.2.4 Recommendations

- Greater variety in housing stock on the site should be considered. Consideration should be given to increasing the proportion of larger dwellings with generous private outdoor spaces (e.g. townhouses or large apartments) to 20% of dwellings on the site. This will promote demographic variety and better integrate the development with the existing community. This figure is benchmarked against the composition of housing stock in the GTV9 development in Richmond, however is still significantly lower than the Beacon Cove development.

7.3 Physical Integration with the Existing Community

7.3.1 Summary of findings

- The demographic profile of the development will vary significantly from the existing demographic profile of the local community. Therefore, there is a need to consider how integration between existing and future residents is promoted.
- Compared to the case studies reviewed in this assessment, the Racecourse proposal promotes limited physical integration with the existing community in the surrounding area:
  - The interface with existing residential areas along Dean, McPherson (southern end) and Wilson Streets, does not respond well to the character of these areas. Large-scale podiums contrast with detached housing along these edges. The finer grain development proposed at the intersection of Thomas Street and McPherson Street responds better to the local character.
  - North-south permeability through the new residential areas on the western part of the Racecourse site is limited. For example, the new street proposed to run north-south through the development does not connect to Dean Street, nor is it integrated with the existing north-south street layout (e.g. Capulet Street and McNae Street). East-west permeability is less problematic.
7.3.2 Description of impacts

- The proposed scale of change in the local area is likely to impact on the social and physical character and identity of the existing community.
- The limited community consultation undertaken so far has highlighted concern with the impact of the development on community character.
- The limited physical integration with the surrounding area will promote the new development as a separate entity, differentiating it from the existing community.
- The social impacts that relate to such a separation include diminished community cohesiveness and identity. This is especially the case given the significant scale of change expected in the local community.

7.3.3 Further information required

- More detailed plans of proposed building footprints and sizes are required. These plans should show the proposed built form within the context of the local area.

7.3.4 Recommendations

- Consider the development of semi-detached housing, rather than podiums, along the Dean Street, McPherson Street and Wilson Street edges of the development. This built form would integrate better with the existing area and better blur the boundaries between the development and existing areas.
- Consider extending, and modifying the proposed North-South Street through the site to connect to McNae and Capulet Streets.

7.4 Impacts relating to transport and mobility

7.4.1 Summary of findings

- The proposed residential areas within the development are all within walking distance to tram routes. The residential areas located in the south-west corner of the site are within walking distance to the Moonee Ponds Train Station.
- GTA Consultant’s review of demand for public transport services suggests that there is currently inadequate capacity in the railway system to cater to new demand from the development. Patronage on the Craigieburn line is expected to grow in the coming years as a result of residential development along the northern corridor. This will put further pressure on capacity on the line.
- GTA Consultant’s traffic modelling suggests that there will be a significant increase in traffic on some local roads in the area following the development. Waiting times at many intersections will also increase.
- Distance from the Moonee Ponds Train Station to the Racecourse grandstand will increase from 850m to 1.6km after the grandstand relocation.
- Pedestrians entering the Racecourse from the west (e.g. from the Train Station and Moonee Ponds Junction) will be required to walk an indirect and largely illegible route to reach the infield of the Racecourse and grandstand on race days (see Figure 1.)
- GTA Consultant’s have proposed a number of traffic mitigation works to reduce congestion in the local area. From the documentation it would appear that an increased number of lanes on Dean and Wilson Streets will widen these roads and require the removal of street parking and street trees. Additional traffic signals will also be required along Wilson and Dean Streets.

7.4.2 Description of impacts

- The proximity of the new dwellings to public transport routes will have a positive impact on transport affordability and sustainability for new residents.
- A reduction in access to public transport services for the existing community is a concern, following increased demand for train services from the proposed community. There is insufficient capacity in the existing train system to cater for the expected increase.
- The proposed traffic mitigation work is likely to have a negative impact on the amenity of the local community with increased road widths and apparent removal of street parking and street trees.
Increased waiting times with the introduction of new traffic signals along Dean and Wilson Streets will also reduce amenity in the area.

- There will be a negative impact on pedestrian and public transport access to the grandstand and the infield of the Racecourse. This is due to the longer, more indirect pedestrian route to these areas from the train station and Moonee Ponds Junction.

### 7.4.3 Further information required

- More detail is required in regard to way-finding mechanisms and crowd management on event days.

### 7.4.4 Recommendations

- Consider reducing the scale of residential development, as described in Section 7.1. This will reduce transport related amenity impacts such as congestion, increased traffic volume on local streets, and changes associated with mitigating increased traffic volumes. It will also ease pressure on the public transport system.
- Consider the development of a more direct pedestrian route from Moonee Ponds Train Station and Moonee Ponds Junction to the Racecourse infield.
- Ensure shuttle bus services operate between Moonee Ponds Train Station and the Racecourse when any racing events are operating, not only during large events.

### 7.5 Impacts on Crime, Health and Safety

#### 7.5.1 Summary of findings

- A large proportion of racing events at Moonee Valley Racecourse occur during night-time hours.
- The Draft Masterplan refers to an increased number of events at the Racecourse, but provides no further detail regarding the type, expected capacity, and times of events.
- The majority of events would be hosted in the new grandstand that will directly adjoin Wilson Street, directly opposite a primary school.
- Following the relocation of the grandstand, persons taking public transport to events at the grandstand are likely to walk through residential areas to access events. This is in contrast to the current grandstand, where pedestrian access is obtained by walking through less sensitive areas.
- The largest gaming venue allowed under current regulations in Moonee Valley is currently located in the north-west corner of the Racecourse site. The venue has 105 Electronic Gaming Machines. In its current context, the venue can generally be characterised as a destination style gaming venue.
- Moonee Valley has a high number of EGMs per person, and a high level of EGM expenditure per person when compared to the Victorian average.

#### 7.5.2 Description of impacts

- The development of medium and higher density apartments provides the opportunity for more passive surveillance of streets and open space in the area, potentially increasing local safety.
- The development of an additional 3,000 dwellings within walking distance to a large gaming venue will increase the accessibility to gaming activity for persons vulnerable to problem gambling. There is a particular concern given the prevalence of single person households likely to be living in the proposed development, and the possibility of more affordable housing options being provided on the site. Single and low-income households are considered more vulnerable to problem gambling. There is also the potential for the gaming venue to become more characteristic of a convenience gaming venue with a change in surrounding land uses.
- There is the potential for expanded events at the Racecourse to negatively influence crime and safety in the local area. This is especially the case if additional night-time events, that involve substantial alcohol consumption, are held at the Racecourse and are not well managed. The need for pedestrians to walk through predominately residential areas to access the new grandstand may exacerbate this negative impact.
7.5.3 Further information required

- More detail regarding the additional events at the Racecourse is required. The Racecourse should provide details such as the type of events, the number of events, and times that these events are to be held, expected capacity of these events, security precautions and crowd management procedures.
- Modelling of pedestrian flow outside of the grandstand and Racecourse when exiting the venue to access taxis, car parking and public transport is needed. This will help to identify the scale of potential negative impacts on the local residential community.

7.5.4 Recommendations

- An investigation should be undertaken regarding the appropriateness of the number of gaming machines on the site given the substantial proposed changes in land use in the vicinity to the venue, and the potential for the venue to become more characteristic of a convenience venue.
- The Racecourse should formulate a plan to manage and mitigate the effects of events on the local residential community and the school, given changes in the location of the events venue.

7.6 Impacts on Local Amenity

7.6.1 Summary of findings

- A large proportion of racing events at Moonee Valley Racecourse occur during night-time hours.
- The Draft Masterplan refers to an increased number of events at the Racecourse, but provides no further detail regarding the type, expected capacity, and times of events.
- The majority of events would be hosted in the new grandstand that will directly adjoin Wilson Street, within direct proximity to a primary school and within close proximity to existing residences.
- The relocated grandstand will have minimal setback from Wilson Street. It appears the grandstand will have no forecourt or similar area to buffer the effect of crowds entering and exiting the venue.
- Following the relocation of the grandstand, persons taking public transport to events at the grandstand are likely to walk through residential areas to access events. Pedestrian access to the grandstand in its current location is obtained through less sensitive areas.
- The construction of this large-scale development is likely to extend over a long period of time and create substantial inconvenience for existing residents.

7.6.2 Description of impacts

- The potential for noise and general disorder in proximity to existing residential areas is likely to increase following the proposed relocation of the grandstand. Residential areas within proximity to Wilson and Thomas Streets are of particular concern, due to the increased number of pedestrians likely to use these streets for access. There is particular concern around the night-time events at the grandstand, such as the potential negative impacts stemming from alcohol consumption amongst patrons.
- Similar amenity impacts would be likely to affect new residents living within proposed residences around McPherson Streets, especially during large events, when the proposed pedestrian tunnel to the racecourse infield is opened.
- Events held at the grandstand on weekdays may have a negative impact on the school located along Wilson Street depending on the scale and nature of events.

7.6.3 Further information required

- More detail regarding the additional events at the Racecourse is required. The Racecourse should provide details such as the type of number and times that these events are to be held, expected capacity of these events, security precautions and crowd management procedures.
- The location of taxi ranks, tour bus and shuttle bus drop off points is required to fully assess the impacts on the community.
- Modelling of pedestrian flow outside of the grandstand and Racecourse when exiting the venue to access taxis, car parking and public transport is needed. This will help to identify the scale of potential negative impacts on the local residential community and the primary school.
Further information regarding potential construction impacts on the local community is required. This should include the identification of effects on the local community (e.g. noise, traffic, dust), and measures to mitigate these effects.

7.6.4 Recommendations

- The Racecourse should formulate a plan to manage and mitigate the effects of events on the local residential community and the school, given changes in the location of the events venue.
- Giving consideration to the further information to be provided from the Racecourse, discussed above, Council should consider whether the proposed location of the grandstand is appropriate.

7.7 Impacts on Housing Affordability

7.7.1 Summary of findings

- The Moonee Valley Racecourse has good access to services, and the Melbourne CBD. It should be considered as a good candidate for the provision of affordable housing.
- The median housing price in Moonee Ponds is in the vicinity of $800,000. This figure is significantly higher than the Melbourne median. The provision of additional affordable housing stock in the area is desirable.
- At the 2006 Census, approximately 7% of housing stock within Moonee Valley Council area was public housing. Less than 1% could be considered as community housing (operated by a community housing organisation, church or housing cooperative). The majority of this housing was located in large housing estates in Kensington, Flemington and Ascot Vale, away from the proposed redevelopment.
- The benchmark developments in Section 6 have very different levels of social and public housing provision.
- Social housing targets in Australia are generally within the vicinity of 5%. For example, the South Australian Government, and the Eastern Affordable Housing Alliance in Melbourne promote a 5% target. The GTV9 development in City of Yarra includes 5% of social housing. The Victorian Government has indicated that it will not make social housing targets mandatory.
- At the 2006 Census, 3.5% of housing stock in the Melbourne Statistical District could be considered as social housing.
- There is limited information in the Draft Masterplan about the affordability of housing proposed in the Racecourse development. However, proximity to the inner city and the potential for views of the Racecourse may suggest that many proposed dwellings could be marketed toward the higher-end of the market.

7.7.2 Description of impacts

- Given the lack of information about the affordability or type of housing stock likely to be present in the development, no conclusions can be drawn about the impacts of housing affordability.
- However, there is a need to ensure that a mix of household types is accommodated on the site, and that the development does not become an income enclave.

7.7.3 Further information required

- More detail regarding the type of housing stock that is to be provided in the development is required to assess the potential affordability of the development. Information should include: house sizes (in sqm), potential price points, market segments that the development will target, and the private facilities likely to be provided on site.
- Information should be provided regarding the provision (if any) of social housing.

7.7.4 Recommendations

- The development should include a social housing target of between 3.5 and 5%. The Racecourse could partner with a registered community-housing provider to realise this target. The figure of 5% is based on the proportion of social housing stock in the GTV9 development, and social housing targets developed in other jurisdictions. A minimum figure of 3.5% would maintain the current proportion of social housing
stock in Melbourne. Any less than this, would effectively create a decrease in the proportion of social housing in the Melbourne metropolitan area.

7.8 Impact on Social Infrastructure and Open Space

7.8.1 Summary of findings

- The Masterplan proposes the development of new community facilities upon the site, or the financial contribution toward new facilities off-site, in order to absorb expected demand for infrastructure from the development.
- The Masterplan also proposes a new public park and plaza to be located on the western edge of the development.
- The benchmarked developments all provided a contribution toward new public open space and community infrastructure due to increased demand from new residents.

7.8.2 Description of impacts

- It would appear that additional demand for community facilities could be absorbed through the development of new infrastructure either on the site or in another location in proximity to the site. Consequently, there is expected to be no impact on the existing or new community.
- The development proposes only a limited increase in the supply of public open space when compared to the benchmarked areas. No new active open space is to be provided on the site despite the substantial increase in population. The proportion of open space per person for the existing community is likely to decrease following the development. Consequently, there will be negative impact on access to open space for the community.

7.8.3 Further information required

- More detail regarding the type of housing stock that is to be provided in the development is required to assess the potential demographic profile of residents, and therefore more comprehensively determine demand for social infrastructure. Information could include: house sizes (in sqm), potential price points, market segments that the development will target, and private facilities likely to be provided on site.

7.8.4 Recommendations

- Consideration should be given to opening up parts of the infield of the Racecourse when events are not in progress. This would provide additional open space in the local area, absorbing additional demand for open space from the new community. Caulfield Racecourse provides precedent for this potential.
- If adequate space was available within the centre of the Moonee Valley PAC, then it would be the preferable location for any new community infrastructure. Locating new community infrastructure on the Racecourse site would make it less accessible to the existing community, and may serve to promote the development as a separate entity if not well designed and located.
8 Appendices

8.1 Appendix 1: Beacon Cove, Port Melbourne

Distribution of open space

Study area

Composition of housing stock in Beacon Cove, Port Melbourne (2006)
Household composition in Beacon Cove, Port Melbourne (2006)
8.2 Appendix 2: GTV9 Redevelopment, Richmond

Mix of housing stock to be developed on the GTV9 site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of stock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bed apartment</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed apartment</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed apartment</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed townhouse</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed townhouse</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total dwellings</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed building heights, GTV9 site (Lend Lease Development Plan)
8.3 Appendix 3: Caulfield Village

Caulfield Racecourse car-park and surrounds