

1 SALE OR LEASE OF PROPERTY - 20 STOREY DRIVE, PAKENHAM

FILE REFERENCE INT1644510

RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER Derek Madden

AUTHOR Russell Hodges

RECOMMENDATION

That Council consider the submissions received in relation to the sale or lease of Council owned property, 20 Storey Drive Pakenham, in accordance with section 189 and section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989 and further consider the matter at the Council Meeting to be held on 18 July 2016.

Attachments

1	Locality map	1 Page
2	Summary of submissions received	20 Pages
3	Copies of submissions, circulated to Councillors only	93 Pages

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On 18 April 2016 Council resolved to commence the statutory procedures to sell or lease the Council owned property, 20 Storey Drive, Pakenham to a Registered Housing Agency/Provider.

The proposed sale/lease was advertised in accordance with sections 189 and 190 of the Local Government Act 1989 and a total of 41 submissions and a petition have been received in response.

Details of these submissions are attached.

Three persons that lodged submissions have requested to speak in support of their submission being:

- Mr Graeme North
- Mr Greg Collins, and
- Ms Jane Foster

BACKGROUND

This parcel of land was identified as a possible site for affordable housing.

Homelessness and the shortage of appropriate housing is a critical social issue for Cardinia Shire. Currently there are limited housing options for those experiencing financial hardship or presenting with crisis and emergency situations. Local service providers are struggling to provide short, long or sustainable rental support.

The objectives of making this parcel of land available for affordable housing are:

- a) To provide long term secure and affordable housing for local residents including single parents with children and families experiencing financial hardship and to:
- b) Broaden the availability of alternative housing options for residents living in Cardinia Shire.

This parcel of land is suitable for residential development, is within walking distance to schools, transport, medical amenities and shops. It is opposite a large reserve and there is a children's playground in close proximity

On 18 April 2016 Council resolved to sell or lease the property 20 Storey Drive, Pakenham and commence the statutory procedures under sections 189 and 190 of the Local Government Act 1989.

As submissions were received a Special Council Meeting has been convened to consider those submissions including the three persons have requested to speak in support of their submission.

CONCLUSION

The proposed sale or lease of 20 Storey Drive Pakenham has been advertised and as submissions were received a Special Meeting of council has been scheduled to consider those submissions.



	<i>Items raised</i>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Structures proposed will be imposing and ugly* Where would the children play?* My safety would be threatened* Don't we already have a problem with the large numbers refugees already causing problems in this area?* The council has said that these houses are for disadvantaged women but will this be the case?* Are not the Councillors voted in by the people of the Shire to provide a safe and better community?* Why not build these houses in a new estate so the people intending to live there know what is proposed for the area
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Anything other than single storey would be incongruous to the rest of the estate* Up to Twelve dwellings will increase the noise pollution both by the number of people on the site and the number of cars* I am very concerned about the number of cars along with visitors cars* Devaluation of the surrounding properties in the area* House Insurance and car Insurance will increase dramatically for everyone
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Copy of the plans wanted* No mention of this type of development* We were not consulted in any way* Our resale value of our house will drop* Aware of issues with this style of housing as in the Western suburbs of Melbourne* Several rental properties within the estate we all maintain our properties and we are sure these properties will not be taken care of long term* Congestion in the immediate area with parking and traffic flow

	<i>Items raised</i>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Larger number of pedestrians going past creating an increase in noise * Parking concerns * fear locals won't be able to utilise the park * should provide single type houses scattered amongst homeowners * Why has the park and lake area not been titled properly as parkland? * Are there plans to develop this block also?
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Increased activity around the park and roads * Wildlife and the environment will be threatened by the increase in traffic * Negative impact on the area and will devalue homes * Close knit community of varying nationalities, ages and cultures happily living together * Volunteers provide valuable support to others within the Shire * Community spirit needs to be retained * People are already considering moving house
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Precedent is already in place after a proposal for units was successfully opposed by residents for the land known As No's 2,4, & 6 Redfern Way Pakenham some years ago * Same as the land on the adjacent side of Redfern Way where already 3 average sized homes Have been established * Impact value of surrounding properties, this will also impact the flow of traffic in this neighbourhood * Street is very narrow, safety of residents * No objection to 3 dwellings just multiple

	<i>Items raised</i>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 3 homes will be more suited to the look and feel of the estate * Parking will be a problem with that many more residents * Hidden agenda with the inclusion with the reserve being part of 20 Storey Drive * negative impact on housing prices * Need to look at areas where this sort of housing is already established - oppressive environment and social impact of people jammed in together * Council should look at vacant land near the Pakenham Station or in Officer * Why didn't we receive a letter in writing personally? * Would Council confirm if the park remains zoned as residential? * Do you acknowledge that the Reserve/Park was a gift to the residents of the community by the developer and given with the express intention that it be used as such? * Why has this not been correctly zoned as a reserve/park? * will council rectify this immediately to ensure it remains a reserve/park?
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Overshadowing, access to site, security and other building regulation concerns * As outlined in the Cardina Planning scheme a full socio-economic assessment should be conducted before developments of this nature occur * More appropriate solution would be the sale and development of three single residential blocks * Proposal for the site does not cover how the development aligns with the residents needs * Access into the estate through existing roads can already be difficult for larger vehicles * Significant media attention has highlighted that the council plans to use this accommodation for people from violent situations * council should address concerns on the impact to resident safety and security

	<i>Items raised</i>
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Struggling to understand is how people needing social housing should have this prime location that we worked so hard to obtain * Significantly alter the look of the area * The added traffic would cause huge congestion in my street especially the intersection of Red fern Way and Clifford Drive * Spreading units/houses throughout Pakenham would be a much better idea than creating a concentration of disadvantage in the one location * Impact on property prices
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lack of Community Consultation * Density & Safety * Impact on People & Community * Impact an Properly - devaluation
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Maximum of 6 houses can be built on the medium density land use * Lower density housing would create a better living environment * Would not oppose 3-4 dwellings * Can yo confirm whether or not there is a known paedophile living within a few minutes walk of the land? * Concerned for the parkland as zoned residential - Does not want to see any portion of the pakrland to be developed for any use
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Devalue the properties on Henty Park * Parking problems * Please provide a copy of the Not ice of Intention to all residents * Would have been good for Councillors to speak with the residents before making their decision

	<i>Items raised</i>
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* shouldn't have so many units* Parking is limited now and will be made worse* Cramming of people together will be of no benefit
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Greatly affect the value of my property* Building would not blend into the area* Road is rather narrow and the parking there is almost impossible as it is* Affect everyone's privacy multistorey will see into backyards* Where will the children play if the parkland is taken?* Better suited to 3 residential private dwellings
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Not consulted residents should be able to choose to live near development* Multi storey does not fit in with the estate* Who will maintain the dwellings?* Will lower the price of my house* Roads are not big enough to take so many extra cars* No parking available around that area* Noise pollution* Land supposed to be a childcare centre* Land is not big enough for the number of dwellings* Houses won't be safe as they have been stated in the media*Subdivide into 3 houses and sell privately receiving money from the sale as well as rates

	<i>Items raised</i>
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Unfair to change the plan to have multistorey units * More cars will make the intersection more dangerous and cause major traffic problems * Mayor said 10 units single storey - doesn't add up with the setback of the property * Divide the block into 3 - sell 2 and build one unit for housing * unfair social and financial level for residents * scatter the housing throughout the Shire * Building this development will add to the percentage facing financial hardship as the property will drop in price
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Impact significantly on property value and traffic increase along narrow roads restricting emergency vehicle access due to lack of parking * High density housing for people in need of emotional and community support fair better when placed through out the whole community in single dwellings * Disappointed in the lack of communication from council with residents who will be directly effected by this proposal.
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lifestyle, safety and financial position effected negatively * Ghetto style environment impacting negatively on the entire community * Strain on the police force if they are needed constantly
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Concerned at the size of the dwellings, block will only fit 3-4 at the most * No parking at the moment and more residents will make it worse * More cars are danderous for children crossing the road to go to the park * Rezone to parkland to protect it for the future

	<i>Items raised</i>
20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Proposal won't fit the aesthetic of the street* Social stigma to surrounds - quality of residents* Families and retirees deserve to feel safe in their neighbourhood* Social housing will place downward pricing pressures on existing abodes* Restriction of community activities in the parkland
21	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Proposal won't fit the aesthetic of the street* Social stigma to surrounds - quality of residents* Families and retirees deserve to feel safe in their neighbourhood* Social housing will place downward pricing pressures on existing abodes* Restriction of community activities in the parkland
22	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Precedent in place with the successful opposition of the units at 2,4 & 6 Redfern Way* Greatly impact property value, my privacy and that of my family, road traffic and parking* No objections to 3 dwellings
23	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Devalue the properties on Henty Park* Currently a lot of police presence this will increase the problem* Don't feel safe to bring up family* Will need to sell property

	<i>Items raised</i>
24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Strict guidelines within the section 32 regarding building in our estate, yet council have decided a proposal outside those restrictions. Why? * Lack of consultation with residents would appear to be outside legal requirements according to sections 189 and 190 of the Local Government Act 1989 * Lack of ample parking in this estate due to narrow roads * Research clearly shows that these types of cluster type buildings for the disadvantaged do not work in a positive way * A more logical approach would be single housing
25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * When were the residents to be informed? * Land is too small * Property values would decline 25-35% * increase in drugs, alcohol, violence and crime * police resources are stretched as it is without adding more problems to the area * Council is being underahnded not advising residents of the estate <p>The land is too small for 8-12 dwellings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The roads are not wide enough for extra traffic. * There is no parking due to the number of intersections surrounding the property. There is a T-intersection and a roundabout * The park is not an option to solve the traffic issues as it was a park donated to the residents of the estate by Mr Andrews. * Multiple double storey dwellings will take away from the feel of the estate. * Multiple storey dwellings will block the view for pedestrians crossing the surrounding roads. Many of the residents crossing the road are children or the elderly. <p>The number of children crossing the roads is high due to the adjacent park.</p>

	<i>Items raised</i>
26	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Not enough police coverage now and adding high density housing will not help* High density will ruin the feel of the estate and lower the value which I cannot afford to lose* Should be placed in an estate where the residents are aware of the development and chose to live near it or not* Abhorrant that residents were not consulted before voting* Obligation to look after rate paying residents* Why do the residents have until the 27th to voice their objections when tenders for the site close on the 17th?* Taking away from the aesthetic appeal of the neighbourhood* Will fear for safety walking at night* Housing together such as this will be detrimental to the people needing the support* Devalue property price* Who will maintain and run housing?* Roads are not big enough for extra cars* Added noise pollution* Land not big enough for number of dwellings* House not safe enough for victims of domestic violence as address has been stated in the media

	<i>Items raised</i>
27	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Evidence of an increase in the crime rate* Traffic Problems* People living in the dwellings are being subsidised by full paying Rate payers bearing the costs of Building, infrastructure and services* Reduction in the price & value of properties* The aesthetic or look of 2, 3, & 4 Storey dwellings on the property* The extra pressure on Water, Sewage and Storm water in the Estate* This piece of land was given to the Council by the late Mr Ronald Andrews for a Community Or Health Centre & Not low cost housing* This Council has not consulted all residents of Henty Park in the main local newspaper, leaflet drop or mail out* The sale price of the propeerty should be the full market value not reduced* The LAND should be split up into 3 Blocks & Sold off for private dwellings

	<i>Items raised</i>
28	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* significant impact on surrounding housing such as overshadowing, access to site, security and other building regulation concerns* more appropriate solution would be the sale and development of three single residential blocks* Cardina Planning scheme ordinance 15.01-1 site does not cover how the development aligns with the resident's needs and no consideration given to the impact of the development of 8 - 10 houses within residential blocks zoned for three houses* development will result in full block utilisation, multiple stories and additional congestion on roadways* Any proposal should specifically address design and safety concerns along with ongoing safety management of high density housing and surrounding areas* section 16.02-2 location of Crisis accommodation and community care units should be kept confidential - media attention has highlighted this area* As outlined in the Cardina Planning scheme a full socio-economic assessment should be conducted before developments occur* council should address the social impact caused through the creation of consolidated areas of emergency government housing within small residential blocks, how safety and livability standards will be maintained and housing values of existing residents* council should create a community consultation forum to specifically address the concerns of the local residents* local government act 1989 Subsection 2 (a) ensure that public notice of intention to do so is given at least 4 weeks prior to selling or exchanging the land

	<i>Items raised</i>
29	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Estimated timeframe* Disrupt the peace and tranquility as this will be directly opposite the park causing noise and traffic in the area* parking will be an issue as the roads adjacent to this land are not wide enough* not appear as aesthetically appealing* house prices in the area will fall as much as of 20%* proposed dwellings very small and hardly suitable for 'families'* development have been hidden from residents as there was no indication of intentions to home owners* letdown by the council on this matter and certainly do not have confidence in communication from council members* Instead of 8-12 dwellings, I feel 3-4 medium sized homes is more than suitable for this size of land
30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* People who come from desperate, low socio-economic or violent situations can tend to create an enclave breeding further disharmony, crime and violence* Potential buyers are pulling out when learning of the proposal* Is the park reserved as a park?* Will the property be gated to prevent estranged associates from attending, harassing, absuing and assulting or murdering victims?* Would you be happy having this development right next door to you?* Would you be happy with a devalue of your property by as much as \$50,000?* Doesn't see how lumping people in homes all together will foster a positive healing environment

	<i>Items raised</i>
31	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Parking, privacy, devaluation of my property and those around* Objection to any sale of property
32	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* people in need you require full-time, on site care workers to ensure that the negative people in their lives are not welcome and to guide them towards a positive future* large groups of disadvantaged people living within close quarters does not improve their situation and does little more than bring down the quality of the rest of the neighbourhood* residents in this area have spent a lot of time and money to ensure that they get the maximum return from their property and have a good environment to raise their children* high density which is out of character for the area and will most certainly create parking issues
33	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Disappointed at failure to consult* Purchase the house as an investment and wouldn't have done so if they had known about the proposal for social housing

	<i>Items raised</i>
34	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Not in keeping with other residents in the estate - single storey and one dwelling per block of land* Parking will be an issue* Preferable use of land for 3 single storey residences
35	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Current proposal is being made without any forethought as to its effect on current/future property values in the area* Council has a 'Duty of Care' to its existing residents to ensure that their interests are being given the highest priority* Our fear is that high density housing, as proposed, will impact negatively on our future lives
36	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Houses around are all single storey impacting streetscape* Would like some consultation around proposal* Safety and security concerns
37	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Too many apartments for the land size* Parking headaches and not safe for children crossing roads* Parkland was gifted to Henty Park Estate and shouldn't be used for anything else* Does not fit into the current estate* Land could be cut up into 3 blocks to return some Council Rates
38	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Major concern is the parking area for cars, visitors etc is too close to the intersections of storey drive and clifford drive. Where is everyone going to park?* Devalue of property

	<i>Items raised</i>
39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * No respect for existing residents * Will compromise our safety * Better used to develop 3 units for short term housing * Traffic congestion with the amount of cars already and then the cars from the units * Emergency vehicles will find it difficult to get to homes * Childrens safety at risk with more cars * Blue Horizons is for lower income housing and should be place there or in Officer * Children won't have backyards and will get up to no good and harass neighbours * Increased level of crime and potential violence * Council will not maintain the appearance of the units * Devalue the existing homes * increased noise from parties and animals introduced by the new residents * Crime in Pakenham is up 5.1% over the year (Liberal Victoria web page) * This may stop the children using the park area due to syringes
40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Significant negative effect on the value of our property * Traffic in our estate will also be negatively affected as there are already parking issues * Proposal of at least 8 dwellings is unreasonable for the size of land and we are concerned that this large collection of affordable housing tenants will create an unhealthy and volatile environment * Concerned with the prospect of loitering in the park by these tenants who will have very restricted indoor and outdoor space due to the small size that these dwellings * Double storey which will be an eyesore to the area and we feel that this land and the location it is in would be much better suited to either 2 or 3 average size residential homes * Disappointed in the lack of communication and consultation between council and the residents
41	Resident supported proposal.