

Meeting: The Valley Tomorrow Community Reference Group #2

Date: 23/05/18 Meeting began at 6:07pm

Location: Champions Room South, MVRC

Attendees:

- Matthew Malseed and Alice Dore - Hamton (H)
- Michael Browell (CEO) - Moonee Valley Racing Club (MVRC),
- David Sinclair, Head of Development - Moonee Valley Racing Club (MVRC),
- Cr. Nicole Marshall - Moonee Valley City Council (MVCC)
- Colin Harris - Moonee Valley City Council Planning Department (MVCC)
- Olga Kenny - Moonee Ponds Chamber of Commerce and Rate Levy Association (MPCCRLA)
- Sarah Ambrogio - Save Moonee Ponds (SMP)
- Mike Holtz - Moonee Ponds Primary School (MPPS)
- Jenni Chappell - Office of Danny Pearson MP
- Jeanette Lambert - Brickfields Consulting
- Sean Sammon, Claudine Foley - Bastion Engage

Apologies:

- Paul Hameister - Hamton (H)
- Cr Jim Cusack - Moonee Valley City Council (MVCC)
- Jenny Nola - Save Moonee Ponds (SMP)
- Matthew Bott - Moonee Ponds Primary School (MPPS)
- Frank Dinoto - Office of Danny Pearson MP
- Jordon Elliott - Puckle Street Traders Association
- Erin Rhoads - Community Representative (Environment Portfolio)

Agenda Items:

1. Introduction to new members
2. Review actions from last meeting
3. Developer update
4. MVRC update
5. Website update
6. Survey update
7. Next meeting date

1. Introduction to new members

1.1. Introduction and apologies

- 1.1.1. The group went around the room and introduced themselves. Apologies were noted.

1.2. Michael Browell

- 1.2.1. Michael Browell (MB) from MVRC gave an update on the project. MB said over the last 6 months we've made significant process. MB noted Hamton were chosen as the preferred developer in August. MB praised the amount of work the team has managed to achieve in last 6 months, in particular the development of the visioning and framework. MB also noted that the project will have minimal impact on traders and residents.

2. Review Actions from last meeting

2.1. Actions

- 2.1.1. Sean Sammon (SS) went through the following actions from the last CRG meeting and provided a status update:

- *Promote the shuttle bus* – SS confirmed that Council promptly promoted the shuttle bus on the website
- *Distribute a map of where the quarterly newsletter will be sent* – confirmed that the map has been distributed.
- *Distribute survey questions to CRG* – confirmed that survey will be actioned at this meeting.

2.2. Shuttle Bus Update

- 2.2.1. Cr. Nicole Marshall (NM) asked how the shuttle bus is going. David Sinclair (DS) said it has been a slow start but now upward of 20 cars are in the carpark. DS suggested that the number of cars has picked up in last 4-5 weeks.

3. Developer Updates

3.1. Introduction - Matt Malseed

- 3.1.1. Matt Malseed (MM) provided the development update and highlighted the following:

- 3.1.2. As outlined previously JV partners are trying to resolve the project vision. There are a number of partners here and the JV partners are embarking on a large project. JV partners are taking stock and trying to get on the same page internally at the start of the project. The second of three visioning workshop happened on May 23. At the end of the process, the JV partners want to have a number of statements about what the collective vision is. What the JV partners are not doing is finalising the design and every aspect of the development as it is a complex and long project. The JV partners want to

have a set of principles they can refer back to throughout the development. The only thing that is fixed is the planning framework the JV partners inherited when they came into the project. What the JV partners are looking to do is generate a framework to filter ideas from the community and stakeholders.

- 3.1.3. The JV partners are creating a special project and it's clear that the community want to contribute idea. They want to ensure that all ideas, regardless if they are internal or external, are put through the same process.
- 3.1.4. Once the visioning process is complete the JV partners will be distributing the outcomes and will discuss and present to the CRG.

3.2. STAGE A - Alice Dore

- 3.2.1. MM handed over to Alice Dore (AD) to talk about Stage A
- 3.2.2. AD provided the following updates about Stage A:
- 3.2.3. Stage A is townhouses. At last meeting it was in conceptual phase. Since then Hamton have met with immediate neighbours along McPherson St and sent letters to 127 neighbours. Hamton and MVRC representatives met with 8-10 people to get their feedback on the proposal. After that Hamton lodged a permit for Stage A which is 67 townhouses over a basement carpark. Hamton worked on the plan before we lodged with Council and met with neighbours. A key design consideration is the parking in the basement which promotes walkability. Subject to when a planning permit application is issued, the JV partners will then look to launch sales towards the end of this year,. The display suite will be completed prior to the end of the year.
- 3.2.4. AD presented the Stage A ground plan, landscape plan and some preliminary elevations of the townhouses and provided explanation about the masterplan and design philosophy:
- 3.2.5. The townhouses that front McPherson street have to be designed to create a street frontage to the existing houses so it's dual frontage rather than single as it currently is. To integrate to the community, a pedestrian link which connects through to Thomas St which allows people to walk through the site is a key design element. In addition it is proposed that Kenna St and Coats St are extended across McPherson St into the site to create further connections.
- 3.2.6. Michael Browell (MB) said the roundabout (Kenna and McPherson) which currently is on the plan, was a recommendation of the Integrated Transport Plan. DS confirms.
- 3.2.7. AD showed the landscape plan for Stage A and immediate surrounds, including the proposed 5000 sqm park. AD showed another ground plan that showed the different size and types of housing product in Stage A. The Stage A design is made up of a mix of different housing typologies to suit different occupant make up's (ie downsizers, families, young professionals etc) sizes and price points.

- 3.2.8. Cr. Nicole Marshall (NM) asked for the breakdown of bedrooms. AD said majority are 3-4 bedroom and a couple that are 2 bedroom.
- 3.2.9. AD showed the architectural renders of the townhouses and noted that Rothelowman have spent time thinking of the front design. AD explained that there is a range of different materials and some of those (ie bricks) tie into what already exists on other houses in the neighbourhood.
- 3.2.10. Sarah Ambrogio (SA) asked a question about the setback for the Stage A townhouses and the positioning of vehicle access. AD said the setback is compliant and there are two basements for cars with 1-2 car parks per dwelling. AD noted that some visitor car parking will also be provided on the other side of the pedestrian link as well.
- 3.2.11. AD said the ratio of the visitor parking is compliant with clause 52.06 of the planning scheme and will provide more detail at next meeting. AD said Stage A is considered compliant. David Sinclair (DS) and MB were of the view the housing setback to McPherson St is 3m.
- 3.2.12. SA asked a question regarding the height of the townhouses. AD replied and said they were three storeys and that this was compliant and within the mandatory height control for this part of the site. NM clarified if the height was three storeys to the street. AD said the basement is underground and then there are three storeys of housing above ground level.
- 3.2.13. SA asked if the basement is fully underground. MM noted the site does slope, but that the basement is designed to stay underneath the ground.
- 3.2.14. SA asked how it's being ventilated. MM said it's mechanically ventilated.
- 3.2.15. Colin Harris (CH) said that Council needs to consider their own reliance on the racecourse for 'greening' of the street scape as there are no street trees present in the vicinity of Stage A. Whist the new landscaping within the development will provide some greening, Council will need to consider the need to install street trees on McPherson Street.
- 3.2.16. MM highlighted that the underground carpark takes cars off the street, makes the spaces walkable, creates backyards for the occupants and will increase ability to have landscaping in the frontage.
- 3.2.17. AD said in relation to Stage A, when the JV partners are ready to commence the "Expression of Interest – building enquiry phase" they will put signage on McPherson street. Once they have gone through Request For Information process with council, they will put plans on the website too. AD notes that under the planning scheme for this area of the site, there is not a need to notify so plans will not be exhibited at Council as they would normally be.
- 3.2.18. NM put an idea forward to put a real estate board on the street notifying people of the plan. NM asked about a Construction Management Plan. AD said they can get workers to park on site in the infield. NM said as long as the Management Plan is consistently used.

- 3.2.19. SA asked if it's possible to have a community-facing person regarding construction management issues rather than having community going to talk to Council. MM said this was discussed at last meeting and the development partners would rather call a construction company and a 1800 number which will be provided. SS said a number will be provided (at an appropriate time when there is a construction contractor on board) and neighbours will be sent letters, and the website will be continually updated.
- 3.2.20. AD said the neighbours they met with have their business cards and their mobiles and encouraged neighbours to report any issues with construction. AD said neighbours have been encouraged to call the Hamton as the development manager.

3.3. STAGE B - Alice Dore

- 3.3.1. AD outlined there would be 3 apartment buildings in Stage B. AD explained that the development partners are in schematic design for the first apartment building that will face Thomas St and they will meet with neighbours in the immediate area in the coming month. AD noted that proposal is compliant with the mandatory height controls for this portion of the site and the development partners were seeking to lodge the application with council by the end of August this year. AD further noted that with regard to the Thomas St location, the development partners are looking at a downsizer owner/occupier with apartments that will be of a high quality. AD notes that plans are not available as yet.
- 3.3.2. SA asked a question about the height of the apartment buildings. AD said the development partners are proposing six storeys.
- 3.3.3. SA asked what about the other two apartment buildings? AD said the development partners will start on Building 1 first and work that through with Council. AD noted the development team first want to get comfort on Thomas St with the council and then move onto the second apartment building. AD also said the development partners want to finish the visioning process to feed into the design.

4. MVRC Update – David Sinclair

4.1. Childcare Centre

- 4.1.1. DS said the Childcare Centre permit was provided this week and is the first part of construction for the redevelopment. DS noted that once the MVRCs get a permit they will be on site within four-six weeks and it will be a nine-month process. DS said the 91 space childcare centre is fully compliant with the planning scheme. MB said there's been a good resolution and noted that original issues with parking have been resolved.

4.2. Grandstand precinct

- 4.2.1. DS said the emphasis was to get the briefing correct and that is has all been done. DS also said that the reverse brief from Cox Architects is expected shortly and that once complete, the development partners will analyse their concept plan and undertake a cost validation process. DS said if all sales go

well the development partners, MVRC will start the schematic design and work with the community through issues of noise, light spill, traffic management. The racetrack is also going through its own design phase at the moment. The track's final level will determine the height of the grandstand.

4.3. Construction issues

- 4.3.1. NM asked: Given you will both be constructing at the same time will there be a united site manager?
- 4.3.2. DS responded and said that the major civil works will be done with one contractor. DS added that it is not the development partners intention to end up with two contractors and that infrastructure and co-ordination issues are being dealt with at the moment. DS said that the development partners are working closely together to ensure disruption to events is minimal. DS added that the MVRC has its own internal management group to prevent disruption to the business and that the MVRC is still running events and racing.
- 4.3.3. Olga Kenny (OK) had a question about how the traffic will be managed while construction materials are being brought to the site.
- 4.3.4. AD said that once the development partners have a construction company on board the development partners will work with them to develop a construction. AD added that tools should be kept on site within the builders compound. The development partners will work with traffic engineers and the construction contractor to prepare a traffic and construction management plan to manage how all construction traffic, MVRC traffic and general traffic moves in and out and around the site.. AD said that the traffic management plan will be extremely comprehensive and Council would need to approve prior to works starting onsite. OK said it has to be comprehensive to ensure that the project doesn't impact on businesses.
- 4.3.5. SA said it has to be followed and that based on experience with other developers, there is a bit of a 'cowboy attitude' and this is where things go from good to bad. MB said the development partners don't plan to "cut and run" and that the Race Club has been there for 100 years and plans on being there for 100 more.
- 4.3.6. OK said it impacts on the traders a lot. CH said Council have learnt some lessons and that council anticipates that this site given its distance from the activity centre will not impact as much. SA said from a community level we expect traffic and truck idling would be managed on site. NM said that as long as JV partners appoint good contractors. MB said if the JV partners can put the compound in the site they will

5. Survey Update

5.1. Survey Update - Jeanette Lambert (JL)

- 5.1.1. Survey update brought forward in the meeting to accommodate NM leaving at 7.00pm.

- 5.1.2. JL described the survey as not finalised and noted that the aim is to create a good base survey so that data can be relied upon for a number of years and comparisons can be made from year to year. JL added that the approach has been informed by the themes of some of the previous meetings.
- 5.1.3. JL said that the first section asked for core demographics of the respondents for accurate comparison. JL explained that this approach allows the report to be written with awareness of any skews in the data based on demographics. JL described the second section of the survey and the Net Promoter Score (NPS) scale. JL explained that the second section asks respondents about community assets and how satisfied people are with them and how important it is to them. An 'other' category is also included so that respondents can add options that were not in the survey. JL said that the survey asked:
- What are the best and worst bits of the Moonee Ponds area?
 - What are pressing issues for the area?
 - What information would you like to know about the development?
 - Are you aware of the development?
- 5.1.4. JL said that several questions were then posed about awareness of the development in order to track responses over future years. JL added that the JV partners are considering providing a prize and also looking at having a research panel.
- 5.1.5. SS asked if people can promote the survey within their own networks. SS said the survey is only as powerful as the number of people who complete it and it will
- 5.1.6. NM asked if we wanted feedback on it. SS said if there is anything alarming to send an email, but Brickfields indicated we want to keep the survey as independent as possible. NM highlighted a typo on the draft survey for question 3 and queried the usefulness of the category. NM questioned how employees are related to Q7 in the draft survey. MM picked up on the same issue. NM said in relation to Q10, the survey mentioned childcare options in schools but didn't mention kindergartens. Mike Holtz (MH) said that the survey needed to separate primary and secondary schools as well.
- 5.1.7. AD asked attendee's to not put the surveys on any websites (and or distributes amongst groups) until the final version is released.
- 5.1.8. SA asked if it will be hard copy as well online as online is not always accessible for the older generations. JL said there are many older people that can do it online and that Council might be able to give the JV partners some information on how to reach them. JL added that SMP has found that there are some residents that don't have computers and don't check council website.
- 5.1.9. SA asked if the survey will be sent out with any information about the development and noted that it is hard for people to answer if they don't know about hard form and density. SS said there's a section on the website that can provide some information about the development and that it is important to note that this is the first year and that the survey needs to have the questions still relevant across all the years for tracking purposes.

5.1.10. SA asked what's the purpose of the survey. SS said later in the year there will be an annual update and explained that it is an independent view of the community and development. SS said the development partners will use the data to ensure that the community is being engaged appropriately. SA asked if the purpose can be put on the survey.

5.1.11. **ACTION:** add *purpose* to the survey

5.1.12. SA said she thinks it's a good idea to add the purpose. SA said she had suspicions the survey was a 'tick box' exercise. SS said the purpose is to hold the JV partners accountable as well. MM said the survey results will also inform the broader development's thinking and planning for the future.

6. Newsletter - Sean Sammon (SS)

6.1. SS said second edition of newsletter will be coming out in next few weeks.

6.2. SS noted that the next CRG meeting will be late August early September and dates will be communicated.

7. Other business

7.1. Grandstand - community engagement plan

7.1.1. SA wanted to return to the grandstand and understand to what extent the MVRC's briefing to the architects and get a better understanding of how the brief to the architects spoke to concerns within the community.

7.1.2. DS said architects were walked down Wilson street and they had included community concerns within the brief. DS added that the MVRC picked Cox Architecture because they responded well to the brief. DS reiterated that it won't be a submission straight to Council, it will be a discussion with residents impacted directly.

7.1.3. SA asked when that consultation will take place.

7.1.4. DS said the MVRC needed to investigate issues such as the traffic management process and crowd control and once the MVRC had that information they could progress the drawings to a level of feasibility and then look at taking that to the community. SA commented that it's too late if the plan is a finalised design to present to community.

7.1.5. DS said the plan not finalised, it is schematic. DS said the architects were walked down Wilson St and that all issues were raised. SS said that both DS and SA were discussing hypotheticals and that the aim of the CRG is to only discuss elements of the development that are real.

7.1.6. SA said that SMP did not want a plan presented that's not up for changes. SA said the architects were asked to put together a concept design. DS noted as an example that the initial concepts were all too big and would be too costly. DS said the MVRC is just setting the design levels at the moment and that development of a finite design will take a while.

- 7.1.7. MM said the quality of renders look like they are the finished thing, which they are not. MM said the renders are just concepts to win a job and are not finalised.
- 7.1.8. SA said it's been prepared on the basis by selling that design to the racecourse, so not only can it look final to the community but it can look final to the racecourse. MB responded saying it's still a very fluid process. SA said they still haven't had any commitment from the racecourse on how they will engage the community.
- 7.1.9. MB said the setback and height are all locked in. MB asked what is their greatest concern? SA said the community didn't have a lot of information. DS and MB confirmed that setbacks and height controls will be as determined by Council
- 7.1.10. **ACTION:** to come back to next meeting with more information and detail about the grandstand.
- 7.1.11. DS said very hard to provide more specifics on the grandstand development as the Club has only engaged the architect, with no other consultants, such as a traffic engineer, engaged as yet. DS said there will be discussions with the neighbours and that only the architect is working on the grandstand at the moment.
- 7.1.12. SA said they were more concerned about negative impacts of the grandstand could have on the community, rather than specifics of design. MM said this would be the forum for community engagement across the development, including the grandstand.
- 7.1.13. MB asked whether previous discussions the Club has had about issues like light spill, noise, people exiting the area late at night were what SMP wanted addressed? SA confirmed that these are the major concerns.
- 7.1.14. SA asked what measures are being taken to reduce the impacts on the school and the neighbouring communities?
- 7.1.15. MH said if the Club could accelerate that because the school are looking to engage architects based on how that impacts us.

8. Date of next meeting

8.1. Meeting closure

- 8.2. SS said there will be an email with the survey and for it to be forwarded onto relevant groups and that Bastion will email CRG members with the date of the next meeting.

Meeting concluded at 7:24PM.