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Foreword

In May, 2001 the Frankston City Council commissioned Planisphere with i.d. consulting to undertake a Housing Strategy for the municipality. This project was to run concurrently with the development, by Planisphere, of a Neighbourhood Character Study for the municipality. Synergies between the two studies were very important due to the relationship between demand for new forms of housing and managing its impact on Neighbourhood Character.

Planisphere was responsible for the overall delivery of the project, background policy review, developing the Objectives and options, development and implementation of the preferred option and the planning scheme implementation of the strategy.

i.d. consulting undertook the statistical analysis population and housing trends, provided much of the information for the housing issues by suburb sections and developed the continuum.

Kerry O'Neil facilitated a workshop with a number of Frankston Housing providers, wrote up the results and provided general advice on the issues facing social housing.

The Housing Strategy provides the Council with objectives and directions for meeting the municipality’s housing needs for the next 5-10 years. The recommendations provide policy for inclusion in planning scheme, and also other implementation methods to achieve the objectives identified. We believe the Strategy will assist the Council ensuring the liveability of the City is maintained for all residents.

Mike Scott and Lisa Riddle
Directors
Planisphere
Contents

1 Introduction .......................................................................................................................... 1
   Why is Council undertaking a Housing Strategy? .......................................................... 3
   The Brief .......................................................................................................................... 3
   History of Development and Local Profile .................................................................. 4
   Council’s Current Role in Housing .............................................................................. 5

2 Population and Housing Trends ...................................................................................... 7
   Definitions ...................................................................................................................... 8
   Current and forecast population .................................................................................. 9
   Drivers of housing market change ............................................................................. 13

3 Policy Influences Affecting Housing ............................................................................. 17
   Commonwealth Policy .................................................................................................. 19
   State Policy .................................................................................................................. 19
   Local Policy .................................................................................................................. 27

4 Social Housing Issues .................................................................................................... 33
   Special Housing Needs .................................................................................................. 35
   Sense of Belonging ......................................................................................................... 38
   Community Facilities ..................................................................................................... 39

5 Housing Issues by Suburb .............................................................................................. 41
   Description of Elements Analysed .............................................................................. 43
   Carrum Downs/Skye ..................................................................................................... 47
   Frankston Central ......................................................................................................... 52
   Frankston Heights ......................................................................................................... 61
   Frankston North ............................................................................................................ 66
   Frankston South ............................................................................................................. 71
   Langwarrin/Langwarrin South ...................................................................................... 77
   Karingal ......................................................................................................................... 82
   Seaford ......................................................................................................................... 87
   Continuum ..................................................................................................................... 93
Introduction
Why is Council undertaking a Housing Strategy?

Frankston City Council commissioned the preparation of this Housing Strategy in order to provide a sound policy basis for decisions relating to housing within the municipality. A number of questions required answering by the Strategy. These related to accommodating future residents within the city. Who will these residents be? What sort of housing will they require? Where should they be accommodated? And is more land needed to accommodate them?

The residents of Frankston, like many other communities are concerned about the changes that new forms of housing such as medium density housing are having on their suburbs. This along with the debate that will arise with the release of the draft Metropolitan Strategy, places an added incentive to provide clear articulated policies on the future housing needs of the City and a clear and logical methodology for its implementation.

The development of the Neighbourhood Character Study in parallel with the Housing Strategy means that synergies between the two studies can be harnessed particularly where there are significant challenges in achieving more housing due to its potential impact on the neighbourhood character of the area.

The Report of the Panel and Advisory Committee (1999) reviewing the introduction of the Council’s new format planning scheme, commended Council on its application of residential zones and overlays declaring that it “has demonstrated a clear grasp of the outcomes they seek for different residential areas of their city and have used the VPPs to apply controls tailored to the particular situation of different localities in the city.” This is a clear indication that in 1999 the Council had a well justified and forward thinking approach to housing issues in the City.

Under legislation, all Victorian Councils must review their Municipal Strategic Statements every 3 years. It is now timely to re-examine housing issues in the City in order to determine whether the current policies have been achieved and to address new issues that may have arisen in the intervening period, and to feed into that review process.

The Brief

The Project Brief required examination of the following key issues:

- Analysis of Council’s Small Areas Population Forecasts and Community Profile
- Analysis of residential lot size by location
- Analysis of the distribution and number of medium density housing units
- Determining the location and effect of Restrictive Covenants
- Investigating the capacity of various forms of infrastructure and documenting where it will constrain more intensive housing development
- Determining and documenting critical thresholds for the provision of key community facilities
- Making recommendations on optimum housing levels for specific areas
- Determining whether there is a sense of belonging to particular neighbourhoods or communities
- Determining the appropriate geographic size of communities
• Recommending any adjustments to residential zone boundaries.
• Reviewing the existing height controls, particularly along the bayside strip (undertaken within the Neighbourhood Character Study)
• Reviewing the location and extent of the Residential 2 Zone having regard to anticipated demand based on demographic projections, proximity to facilities including public transport and neighbourhood character issues
• Investigating opportunities for housing in the Frankston Central Activity District
• Make recommendations about special housing needs
• Identifying funding strategies for Special housing including private sector, government and non-government housing agencies

A full copy of the Brief is contained in Appendix 1.

The outcome of this Housing Strategy will be the review and recommendation of appropriate changes to the Frankston City Municipal Strategic Statement, Local Planning Policies and statutory sections of the Frankston Planning Scheme to implement the recommendations of this study.

The Strategy was to be undertaken in order to establish firm, realistic and practical housing targets for individual areas that are of lasting value to the Council. A variety of sources were to be used to ensure that there was a sound basis for the targets and to ensure that Council had enough detail to plan each area with confidence.

Focus of this Strategy

This Strategy focuses on the supply and demand of individual dwellings. It is recognised that retirement villages, nursing homes and other special accommodation types are an important component of housing in Frankston, however these are not the focus of this Strategy.

Consultation

Preparation of the Strategy involved a Steering Committee of Council officers involved in various aspects of housing in Frankston. The draft Housing Strategy was released for public comment during August / September 2002, concurrently with the release of the draft Neighbourhood Character Study. A total of 22 submissions were received by the Council. As a result of the comments and a review by Council officers, a number of changes and corrections were made to the Study. The changes were detailed in a report to Council in November 2002.

History of Development and Local Profile

Frankston City is located on the eastern shore of Port Phillip Bay, approximately 40 kilometres south of the Melbourne CBD. Frankston was first settled in the 1850s, the site chosen due of its supply of freshwater from Kananook Creek. The arrival of the railway in the 1880s brought significant population growth. The town functioned as a resort town for Melbourne in the early part of the 20th century.

Significant growth took place from the 1950s through to the 1980s, when areas such as Frankston North, Karingal and Frankston South were developed. The 1980s and 1990s saw significant residential development in Carrum Downs and Langwarrin, both of these areas still having zoned land available for further development.
While most of the City's land is set aside for residential purposes, there are numerous commercial, industrial and retail areas within the City. The Frankston Central Activities District (CAD) is a major regional commercial and retail centre servicing Frankston City, outer suburban Melbourne and the Mornington Peninsula. Major facilities within the CAD or nearby include the Bayside Shopping Centre (part of the Central Activity Centre), Frankston Hospital, Peninsula Institute of TAFE and the Peninsula Campus of Monash University. As the retail and commercial role of the centre has increased in recent decades, residential uses in the centre have decreased. The decrease in residents in the central core of Frankston has resulted in little human activity outside of trading hours.

Frankston City’s population is also served by shopping centres at Karingal Hub, Langwarrin, Carrum Downs and Station Street, Seaford, and numerous smaller centres.

There is a major concentration of industrial and light industrial land located in the north of the municipality around Seaford and Carrum Downs, boasting companies such as Nylex. There are large reservations of public open space, including the Edithvale Seaford Wetlands area, The Pines Flora and Fauna Reserve, Baxter Park and the foreshore area along Port Phillip Bay.

The Frankston railway line serves the City with stations at Seaford, Kananook and Frankston. The major north-south road transport routes include the Frankston Freeway, Nepean Highway, Frankston Dandenong Road, and the Westernport Highway, while Ballarto and Cranbourne-Frankston Roads serve as major connectors to the east.

**Council’s Current Role in Housing**

Council is responsible for the delivery of statutory services related to the housing industry including issuing of town planning permits (for the use and development of land), subdivision and is a supplier of building approvals. It has a strategic role in partnership with the State Government in determining the future location and concentration of housing. It can influence the type of housing and the neighbourhood character, the amenity and appeal of residential areas.

Council also plays a role in the provision and maintenance of roads and other hard and soft infrastructure that supports housing such as drainage, recreational and social facilities etc.

Council does not currently actively play a role in the provision of housing through activities such as the direct construction, funding or partnering of low cost / affordable housing, operation of a housing trust or other such activities.
Population and Housing Trends
Current population and housing trends in Frankston City are examined in this Chapter. To enable more in depth analysis, Frankston has been divided into small areas. The map below shows the boundaries of the small areas. The areas are based on postcode boundaries.

*Figure 1: Frankston City Small Area Geography*

**Definitions**

A number of terms are used throughout the report to enable ease of analysis. These are defined below.

- **Empty nesters**: couple family without children and aged 45 to 65 years.
- **Emerging empty nesters**: families comprising of a couple with children aged 15 years or older.
- **Young lone person households**: people aged between 15 and 35 years living alone.
- **Old lone person households**: people aged 65 years or older living alone.
- **Young families**: families comprising of a couple with children under the age of 15 years.
- **Group households**: unrelated people sharing the same dwelling.
- **One parent families**: families comprising of one parent with children (younger or older then 15 years).
**Mature families**: families comprising of a couple with children (at least one child under 15 years and one over 15 years or older).

## Current and forecast population

### Total population

In 1996, the City’s population was 109,000. In 2001 the population was 115,203, an increase of 6,203, which represents an increase of 5.6% on the 1996 figure.

Based on independent research by i.d. consulting, the City’s population is forecast to grow to around 130,600 by 2011, an increase of approximately 22,000 people from the 1996 population and 15,000 from the 2001 population.\(^1\) This forecast exceeds the Department of Infrastructure’s 2011 forecast (prepared from the 1996 data) by approximately 4000 people. This difference is due to the varying approaches adopted by the two forecasters. The i.d. consulting forecasts are based on more recent development trends in the City, while the DoI’s are more of a ‘top down’ analysis including factors influencing population change at the national and state level. The two forecasts are compared in the following graph.

*Figure 2: Comparison of population forecasts by i.d. consulting with the 1996 Department of Infrastructure*

The growth in population is not occurring evenly across all areas of the City, as shown in the following table. Areas such as Carrum Downs/Skye and Langwarrin form the growth areas of the City while other areas are predicted to experience a decline in population numbers.

---

\(^1\) i.d. consulting, *Frankston City Small Area Population Forecasts 1996-2011*, January 1999. It is noted that since preparation of the statistical analysis, the 2001 census data has been released. The analysis has not been updated to include the new data.
Table 1: Frankston City forecast population statistics by small area 1996 & 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrum Downs/Skye</td>
<td>16,511</td>
<td>28,864</td>
<td>12,352</td>
<td>3.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston Central</td>
<td>9,909</td>
<td>13,463</td>
<td>3,554</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston Heights</td>
<td>13,738</td>
<td>14,195</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston North</td>
<td>6,385</td>
<td>6,265</td>
<td>-120</td>
<td>-0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston South</td>
<td>14,952</td>
<td>15,670</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karingal</td>
<td>14,495</td>
<td>14,168</td>
<td>-327</td>
<td>-0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langwarrin/Langwarrin Sth</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>20,272</td>
<td>4,272</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaford</td>
<td>16,638</td>
<td>17,680</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frankston City</strong></td>
<td><strong>108,629</strong></td>
<td><strong>130,577</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,948</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.23%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Age structure**

Most of Frankston still has a large family component in its population, especially those aged 0-17 and 25 to 49 year olds. Frankston City has a younger age structure than Melbourne, with proportionally more children (0-17 year olds), although there are fewer young adults (18-34 year olds). This age structure is characteristic of many outer suburbs where young adults move closer to the City for education, employment and lifestyle reasons.

*Figure 3: Frankston City age structure 1996*
Forecast changes in the age structure of Frankston City are shown on the graph below. Overall it is predicted that the proportion of middle-aged and older residents will grow. The predicted increase in the adult age groups 30-49 will be driven by in-migration of population from the southern suburbs of Melbourne as well as overseas migration. The comparatively smaller increase in the number of children is indicative of the lower birth rates than can be expected over the period 1996-2011. Some increase in the older age groups (70+) is anticipated.

The forecast increase in the number of persons aged in their fifties and sixties is likely to have a large impact on the household structure of the municipality. A greater share of households will be empty nesters and older families. Yet, there is also a trend toward children staying in the family home longer and parents having children at a later age, which will mean that more people in their fifties and sixties will still have ‘dependent’ children at home.

**Figure 4: Forecast age structure, City of Frankston, 1996 and 2011**

The largest increases in young families are expected in Carrum Downs and Langwarrin, while there are expected to be decreasing numbers of young families in ‘maturing’ areas, such as Frankston North, Frankston Heights and Seaford. The largest increases in the empty-nester and retiree age groups will be in rapidly growing areas such as Langwarrin, Carrum Downs and Frankston Central, which will gain from new housing opportunities as well as the current population ageing in place. There is expected to be a fall in these age groups in Frankston North.

**Household size and type**

The average household size of Frankston City declined significantly from 1991 to 1996 and is now lower than that of Melbourne overall. Frankston City has a very similar household structure to Melbourne. There are similar proportions of family and lone person households in Frankston City as Melbourne as a whole. Frankston City has similar proportions of couple with and couple without children households as Melbourne. Of note is the higher proportion of one parent households in Frankston City compared with Melbourne. The largest increase of any household type from 1991 to 1996 was in lone person households, reflecting a Melbourne wide trend.
Most of the established area of Frankston is populated by a mixture of young and older families, emerging empty-nesters and empty-nesters, while more newly-established areas such as Carrum Downs/Skye and Langwarrin/Langwarrin South have substantially higher shares of young families.

Older, more established areas, such as Frankston Central and Frankston South have greater concentrations of empty nesters and elderly. These areas’ greater share of persons aged 65 and over is heightened as a result of their proximity to large and diverse health-care facilities, such as Frankston Hospital and substantial retirement and hostel facilities, such as the RSL Park War Veterans Home, the Village Baxter facility and the Milpara Park Aged Hostel.

Frankston Central also has a greater share of young adults (18-24), a position which is no doubt at least partly a reflection of the proximity of the Monash University Peninsula Campus and the Chisholm Institute of TAFE. Not surprisingly, this area has a higher share of group households and young, lone person households.

Frankston Heights, Seaford and Karingal also have significant shares of population aged 18-24, which is generally indicative of older families in the area. Frankston North and Karingal have higher shares of one-parent families, which is a reflection of greater housing affordability in these suburbs.

The largest forecast increases in the Frankston population between 1996 and 2011 are in the age groups 40-64, emerging and empty nesters. The significant rise in the number of persons aged in their fifties and sixties is indicative of the large number of persons in their late thirties and forties in 1996 predominantly ageing in place. Some out-migration of these age groups can be expected to places such as the Mornington Peninsula and other retirement locations.
Drivers of housing market change

There are a number of key drivers of housing market change in Frankston. These include demographic components such as age structure and household living arrangements, which act as demands in the housing market. There are also key physical or land supply determinants, such as the types of dwellings in an area and the amount of residential land available or land with potential for rezoning. Changing circumstances such as marriage, childbirth or ageing often act as catalysts for changing demands in the housing market.

Age structure and living arrangements

The changing age structure and living arrangements of the local population impact heavily on the demand for housing types. The age structure of the population and the way in which families and households move through different stages of the life cycle means that people will seek to change their accommodation wants and needs. The need for additional dwellings is driven by the large number of young people that leave home, the number of new households arriving from overseas and from within Australia and household dissolution due to factors such as divorce and separation.

A younger population will tend to have larger, if not growing, households as couples have children. The changing needs due to a growing family are often a major trigger for couples and families to seek out new housing (usually larger). However, as a result of events such as divorce and separation, differing requirements often occur.

An older population is generally characterised by smaller households, as children mature and move out of home, leaving behind the empty nesters. The empty nesters tend to remain in the family home until they decide to move to smaller accommodation, (often when one partner dies). Market research has shown that empty nesters are more likely to move to smaller accommodation if appropriate and affordable alternative housing is supplied in the local neighbourhood that is accessible to established social networks.

The most mobile age groups in the population are the young adults. They tend to move to attend education institutions, seek work and express a change in lifestyle. An increasing number of this age group are choosing to remain childless over time and may not enter into traditional partnering relationships. The result of this trend is that more people in their twenties, thirties and forties are consuming a greater amount of housing space than ever before by living alone or in couple only relationships.

Land supply, residential redevelopment and dwelling stock

While the population of an area is continually changing due to factors such as migration, births and deaths, the dwelling stock is comparatively more stable. The stock of dwellings changes according to the levels of demolition and replacement, development of dual occupancies and multiple dwellings, the supply of vacant residential lots remaining since subdivision, major residential development site opportunties and the supply of green field residential land.

As the stock of housing ages, there is a greater propensity for demolition to occur, particularly in areas where the quality of dwelling stock is poor or where there will be an appreciable increase in the value of property. This often results in significant redevelopment creating an noteworthy increase in the stock of dwellings.

The supply of residential redevelopment sites has also increased in recent years with decline in the manufacturing sector and redevelopment of school sites, defunct quarries and other
surplus land, such as that from State utilities. In areas where there is a significant concentration of services and employment opportunities, there is an increasing demand for new housing including apartments and less traditional forms of housing. This new demand can be linked to the trend toward more singles and couples in the population.

Changes in the supply of land for residential development impact on the dwelling supply of an area and provide opportunities for people to migrate to an area when there is a significant increase in the supply of housing. The supply of dwellings in Frankston City is forecast to increase over the next 10 years.

Table 2: Frankston City forecast dwelling stock by small area 1996 & 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrum Downs/Skye</td>
<td>5,470</td>
<td>6,885</td>
<td>8,060</td>
<td>9,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston Central</td>
<td>4,770</td>
<td>4,718</td>
<td>5,601</td>
<td>6,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston Heights</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>5,207</td>
<td>5,303</td>
<td>5,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston North</td>
<td>2,405</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>2,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston South</td>
<td>5,835</td>
<td>6,103</td>
<td>6,451</td>
<td>6,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karingal</td>
<td>5,503</td>
<td>5,552</td>
<td>5,643</td>
<td>5,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langwarrin/Langwarrin Sth</td>
<td>5,396</td>
<td>5,820</td>
<td>6,411</td>
<td>7,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaford</td>
<td>6,911</td>
<td>7,069</td>
<td>7,293</td>
<td>7,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston City</td>
<td>41,422</td>
<td>43,548</td>
<td>47,156</td>
<td>50,626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If current trends continue, it is predicted that the continuing development of Carrum Downs/Skye and the Langwarrin/Langwarrin South areas will provide the most significant growth in households and population in Frankston in terms of absolute numbers. These opportunities are based on remaining ‘greenfield’ land and should provide for a large part of the new housing demand, with most of the housing stock reflecting traditional suburban housing forms.

There are some significant differences between the areas within Frankston City in terms of housing cost and development type. Frankston North provides more affordable housing opportunities and has a much greater component of public housing, while the cost of housing is notably higher in Frankston South. The Langwarrin area is much more rural in nature than other parts of the City, providing rural residential opportunities for residents. Carrum Downs and Skye have been the major residential development areas for the City over the past decade.

The dwelling types across most of Frankston reflect decades of demand for large, detached housing (three and four bedroom family homes) in new residential subdivisions. This has been primarily driven by the creation of new couple households and growing families. More than 80% of all dwellings in Frankston are comprised of separate houses. Between 1991 and 1996, the share of medium and high density dwellings increased, albeit at a comparatively slow rate.

Frankston City has a significantly higher proportion of separate dwellings compared with Melbourne, a feature of most outer metropolitan areas. The City has a correspondingly lower proportion of flats and apartments and semi-detached dwellings. The significant increase in the number of flats and apartments was responsible for the proportional decrease in separate dwellings. Frankston City has a significantly different tenure pattern than Melbourne. Around 39% of dwellings are currently being purchased, significantly above the Melbourne proportion.
of around 28%. Correspondingly, the proportion of dwellings owned in Frankston City is well below that of Melbourne.

The pattern of tenure in Frankston City is directly related to the era of development of much of the dwelling stock. Many areas of the City have been developed in the last 25 years such as Carrum Downs, Langwarrin, and parts of Frankston South, Frankston Heights and Karingal. It is these areas where mortgages predominate.

The proportion of dwellings owned has increased from 1991 to 1996 as residents have paid off their mortgages. Of note is the increase in dwellings being rented in Frankston City, well above the equivalent increase in Melbourne overall.

*Figure 6: Dwelling types, City of Frankston, 1996 and 1991*

As a result of the ageing of the population and the establishment of large educational and health facilities, Central Frankston has experienced the greatest transformation in its housing stock. A greater share of the dwellings are rented and the sorts of housing available are more diverse, reflecting the more diverse population of the area. The significant ageing of the population in many of the suburbs of Frankston (Karingal, Frankston Heights, Frankston South and Seaford) means that there may be a growing demand for different housing types in large parts of the City. Most suburbs of the municipality have between 80% and 90% of their dwelling stock as separate houses.

There are significant challenges and implications of a changing age structure and housing market demand in Frankston. The population’s characteristics can change relatively quickly as a result of ageing and migration, but housing stock is more fixed. Although younger and older singles and couples may be happy to consume more housing space and live in larger dwellings, there is little choice available in many areas if people are seeking different forms of accommodation.

Different forms of housing might include smaller dwellings on smaller land parcels, while others may want housing space without gardens and their associated up-keeping issues. The importance of a varied housing stock in a diverse or changing area is especially significant given that most people seek housing in their local and adjacent areas, before looking further afield.
Role in the region

The Frankston housing market plays a variety of roles within the southern Melbourne and Peninsula region. The traditional role of many of the Frankston suburbs was to house couples and families seeking out new and affordable residences that would allow for growing families. As a result of the ‘waves’ of development that have occurred in Frankston over many decades since the 1950s, many areas have an ageing population, providing new opportunities for residential development and redevelopment. The proportion of medium and high density dwelling stock in Frankston is much lower than Melbourne as a whole.

The overall size of Frankston and the number of new households created each year by children leaving home means that much of the new housing demand will come from within the municipality itself. The configuration of the City as a narrow coastal strip along Port Phillip Bay means that there is comparatively less population movement between Frankston’s suburbs and the southern suburbs of Melbourne, than would otherwise be the case.

Central Frankston has already experienced considerable changes in its housing market role. The suburb acts as a ‘stage post’ area for younger people in the southern region of Melbourne, particularly the Mornington Peninsula. Central Frankston has a higher proportion of smaller, attached and medium density dwellings, with an associated larger share of rental stock, than other areas of the City. Consequently, the population of this part of the municipality is much more transient, with a greater turnover of population than other areas.
Policy Influences Affecting Housing
Commonwealth Policy

The Commonwealth Government’s role in housing largely relates to income support and housing affordability. It supplies funds through the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement (CSHA) for the construction of public housing stock or the delivery of housing services. This financial arrangement between the Commonwealth and the States is subject to negotiation every 3 -5 years. The contribution to the CSHA by the Commonwealth Government has declined in real terms throughout the 1990’s and is the subject of some contention between the two spheres of government.

The Commonwealth Government’s other roles in setting monetary and fiscal policy also have an impact on the supply and demand for housing by affecting interest rates, income levels employment levels, taxation policies, pension benefits etc.

State Policy

State Planning Policy Framework

Through the State Section of all Planning Schemes, state policy is articulated through the State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF). This outlines specific principles that elaborate on the objectives of planning in Victoria and describes the factors that influence good decision making in land use and development planning. These policies must be taken into account when preparing amendments to the planning Scheme or making decisions under the scheme. The principles relating to settlement, infrastructure and social needs are of most relevance to housing.

Settlement

Planning is to anticipate and respond to the needs of existing and future communities through provision of zoned and serviced land for housing, employment, recreation and open space, commercial and community facilities and infrastructure. Planning is to recognise the need for, and as far as practicable contribute towards:

- Health and safety
- Diversity of choice
- Adaption in response to changing technology
- Economic vitality
- A high standard of urban design and amenity
- Energy efficiency
- Prevention of pollution to land, water and air
- Protection of environmentally sensitive areas and natural resources
- Accessibility
- Land Use and transport integration
Environment
Planning is to contribute to the protection of natural ecosystems, resources, energy and cultural heritage. In particular, planning should

- Prevent environmental problems created by siting incompatible land uses close together.
- Protect areas and sites with significant historic, architectural, aesthetic, scientific and cultural values.

Infrastructure
Planning for development of urban physical and community infrastructure should enable it to be provided in a way that is efficient, equitable, accessible and timely. Growth and redevelopment of settlements should be planned in a manner that allows for the logical and efficient provision and maintenance of infrastructure, including the setting aside of land for the construction of future transport routes.

Strategic planning should facilitate efficient use of existing urban infrastructure and human services.

Social Needs
Planning is to recognise social needs by providing land for a range of accessible community resources, such as affordable housing, places of employment, open space, and education, cultural, health and community support (mental, aged, disabled, youth and family services) facilities. Land use and development planning must support the development and maintenance of communities with adequate and safe physical and social environments for their residents, through the appropriate location of uses and developments and quality of urban design.

More specific information is provided in relation to a number of issues including:

Settlement

14.01 Planning for urban settlement
14.01-1 Objective
To ensure a sufficient supply of land is available for residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, institutional and other public uses.

To facilitate the orderly development of urban areas.
14.01-2 General implementation
Planning authorities should plan to accommodate projected population growth over at least a 10 year period, taking into account of opportunities for redevelopment and intensification of existing urban areas as well as the limits of land capability and natural hazards, environmental quality and the costs of providing infrastructure.

In planning for urban growth, planning authorities should encourage consolidation of existing urban areas while respecting neighbourhood character. Planning authorities should encourage higher density and mixed use development near public transport routes.
14.02 Metropolitan development
14.02-1 To assist achievement of a metropolis which has:
- A business environment conducive to sustainable long-term economic growth.
• An international transport and communications hub function.
• Strengthened links with regional Victoria to increase economic competitiveness,
• Enhanced environmental quality and livability for the metropolitan population.
• Improved functioning through best practice management of its infrastructure and urban development.

14.02-2 General implementation

Outward metropolitan growth must be confined to designated growth areas in accordance with Minister’s Directions under the Planning and Environment Act 1987.

Consolidation of residential and employment activities is encouraged within existing urban areas and designated growth areas. Development in existing residential areas should respect the neighbourhood character.

Higher land use densities and mixed-use developments should be encouraged near railway stations, major bus terminals, transport interchanges and tram and principal bus routes.

Local area planning should assist and complement improvements in the metropolitan, state-wide and international transport system to maximise opportunities for economic growth, residential development, employment increase and accessibility for the community.

Environmentally sensitive areas with significant recreational value such as the Dandenong and Macedon Ranges, the Upper Yarra Valley, Western Port and Port Phillip Bays and their foreshores, the Mornington Peninsula, the Yarra and Maribyrnong Rovers and the Merri Creek, as well as nominated conservation areas, historic buildings and precincts should be protected from development which would diminish their environmental, conservation or recreational values.

Planning decision should assist the creation of linked parkland and open space systems and the protection of high quality agricultural land, important open landscapes and native vegetation.

16 Housing

16.01 Residential development for single dwellings

16.01-1 To encourage:

• Subdivisions in locations with access to physical and community infrastructure and providing a range of lot sizes, a convenient and safe network, appropriate pedestrian and cycle paths, sufficient useable public open space and low vulnerability to fire.
• Residential development that is cost-effective in infrastructure provision and use, energy efficient, incorporates water-sensitive design principles and encourages public transport use.
• Opportunities for increased residential densities to help consolidate urban areas.

16.02 Medium density housing

16.02-1 to encourage the development of well designed medium density housing which:

• Respects the neighbourhood character
• Improves housing choice
• Makes better use of existing infrastructure
• Improves energy efficiency of housing

16.03 Rural living and rural residential development
16.03-1 To identify land suitable for rural living and rural residential development.

16.03-2 Land should only be zoned for rural living or rural residential development where it:

- Is located close to existing towns and urban centres, but not in areas that will required for fully serviced urban development.
- Can be supplied with electricity and water and good quality road access.

*Land should not be zoned for rural living or rural residential development if it will encroach on high quality productive agricultural land or adversely impact on waterways or other natural resources.*

18 Infrastructure

18.01 declared highways, railways and tramways

18.01-1 To integrate land use and transport planning around existing and planned declared highways, railways, principal bus routes and tram lines.

18.01-2 Higher land use densities and mixed use developments should be encouraged near railway stations, major bus terminals, transport interchanges, tramways and principal bus routes. Pedestrian access to public transport should be facilitated and safeguarded.

Other documents are referred to in the SPPF, that planning authorities should have regard to when preparing planning scheme amendments. These include the document *Living Suburbs* (1995) which provides a policy for metropolitan Melbourne. Direction 4 of the strategy ‘Enhance Melbourne’s environment and livability’ refers to the policy of ‘Preserving Melbourne’s urban character and heritage’ and refers to elements such as intensity of land uses, public spaces, building design, urban design parking and access and urban art. Direction 5 is to ‘Create a more functional city by better managing Melbourne’s infrastructure and urban development.’ A number of statements in the policy are of relevance to housing:

- Encouraging the efficient use of land and infrastructure and greater housing choice
- Encouraging higher residential densities and a diversity of housing forms
- Providing public housing that matches peoples needs
- Making better use of existing urban land by protecting those areas with particular characteristics for example landscape or recreational areas.
  - *Encouraging redevelopment in areas with underused infrastructure capacity*
  - *Integrating land development with transport systems, particularly at major transport nodes and activity clusters*

The implementation of the Strategy is to be undertaken at the local government level through reflecting the Objectives of the strategy via tools such as the Municipal Strategic Statement and local policy framework.

**The New Metropolitan Strategy**

A new Metropolitan Strategy is currently being developed by the State Governments’ Department of Infrastructure. The Strategy is due for release in mid-late 2002. Many issues have been raised in the development of the Metropolitan Strategy that are important to this Housing Strategy particularly the management of urban growth on the fringe, the development of new houses in established areas and the implications of population change on the city. The relationship to issues such as the environment, transport and accessibility, activity centres and employment and infrastructure must also be considered.
The discussion paper ‘Challenge Melbourne: Issues in Metropolitan Melbourne for the 21st Century’ posed a number of important challenges and questions to stimulate debate. These provide a good starting point for thinking about the challenges that the Frankston Housing Strategy must address. Questions raised included:

To meet the future housing needs of the community without consuming excessive land and other resources.

- Will we need a different mix of housing to meet future community needs?
- Can we use fewer resources to meet housing needs?
- Should urban consolidation continue to be encouraged in all areas of Melbourne?

To accommodate more households in established areas while protecting existing neighbourhood character, improving environmental outcomes and maintaining an adequate supply of affordable housing

- How can additional housing be provided in existing suburbs in ways which improve the liveability of the area?
- Are there locations outside the central city where high-density development should be encouraged?

To meet the housing needs of future generations in ways which create liveable communities.

- What features are important for people to build a ‘liveable community’?
- Once land in the growth corridors is consumed, how should demand for housing be accommodated?
- Should the idea of growth corridors – where development is concentrated in certain areas on the fringe of Melbourne - be continued?
- Should new buyers be expected to pay the full cost of infrastructure needed for future land development?

The principles of ecologically sustainable development are planned to underpin the strategy to create a more sustainable city. This will ensure a sustainable environment, a sustainable economy and a sustainable community.

As part of the development of the Strategy a number of technical reports have been published. Housing Past, Housing Futures\(^2\) looks at how housing is provided in Melbourne; the building and land development industries, the real estate market, rental accommodation, house prices, affordability and where and why people live where they do. Part 1 of the report reveals that the major trends in Melbourne’s housing over recent decades have been:

- The rise in popularity of flats and apartments (multi unit and medium density dwellings)
- More choice in the types of housing
- Most multi unit development is occurring in the middle and inner suburbs.
- Costs of extending an existing house are beginning to exceed the price of a new two storey home.
- The number of low cost private rental homes has been declining.
- Housing and home ownership may be increasing economic and social divisions in a way not seen before in Melbourne.
- Overall housing is more affordable but is concentrated in the outer and fringe areas
- The trend is towards more high priced housing in the inner suburbs and lower priced housing in the outer suburbs.

---

• Some outer areas are characterised by rising levels of social deprivation, falling real
  house prices, excessive concentration of low cost rental stock, high unemployment and
  relatively low incomes.

Part 2 suggests observations about the future and possible policy actions including:

• Multi unit developments will continue to bring a permanent change to Melbourne’s
  housing market
• Areas such as Frankston are ‘at risk’ of stagnating or declining in terms of economic and
  social activity.
• ‘At risk’ areas are well suited to smart forms of public-private partnership interventions
  such as projects for urban renewal and advocating for containing rates of growth on the
  fringe by forcing more new development into existing outer areas
• changing demographics will continue to create the demand for new types of housing
• the private rental market will become more important and more problematic particularly
  for people on low incomes.

With the current development of the new Metropolitan Strategy by the State Government, it is
of prime importance that Council is well prepared to participate in the debate that will ensue
regarding Frankston’s role in the provision of housing in the metropolitan context.

Rescode

In August 2001, the State Government replaced The Good Design Guide for Medium Density
Housing and Victorian Code for Residential Development – Subdivision and Single Dwellings
(VicCode 1) with Rescode - New Provisions for Residential Development in Victoria. This
new document applies to all of Victoria through the Victorian Planning Provisions.

Urban Consolidation

Urban consolidation has been a feature of State and Federal Government policy for several
years. This calls for the more efficient use of existing and future residential land and
infrastructure to deal with issues such as environmental sustainability and rising infrastructure
costs. It suggests that opportunities for more consolidated new development and the
revitalisation of older areas through medium density developments will be important in
maintaining physical services and community interaction as the broader trend for smaller
household size continues.

Green Wedge Policy

“Breathing spaces such as the green wedge between Dandenong and Frankston are an
important regional asset. Their preservation is essential to the livability of the south east
“(Victorian Government, A Place to Live, 1990)

Land on Frankston City’s predominantly northern and eastern borders forms the non urban or
‘green wedge’ between Frankston City’s urban areas and the south eastern urban corridor.
The retention of these large tracts of land acts as a breathing space between the urban
corridors and has been recognised in the Melbourne metropolitan context since the late 60’s.
They are recognised as performing an important role in the urban context often ensuring the
retention of scenic landscapes, farming areas, native vegetation, wildlife habitats and
extractive industries. Frankston’s green wedge supports sand and stone extraction, intensive
flower growing, horse training and plant nurseries. The location of the Eastern Treatment
Plant in the north has been recognised as providing opportunities to establish horticultural
uses capable of reusing waste water on sites close to the Plant.
Frankston’s green wedge is currently protected by rural zonings including the Rural Zone and the Environmental Rural Zone. Addressing pressure to use the land for housing through the introduction of low or conventional density zones has been examined in the South East Non Urban Study which provided broad objectives that Council has commenced more detailed planning of. Preliminary objectives that relate to housing provide the following guidance:

- That some low density residential development be accommodated in the southern area
- That limited urban conversion is acceptable assessed against specific criteria.

The Metropolitan Strategy consultation has revealed strong community support for the retention of the green wedges and stronger demarcation of the ‘line’ between urban and rural areas. A significant number of participants in the consultation disagreed with creating low density or rural residential areas on Melbourne’s fringe. It may well be that the Department will require Councils to review their Green Wedge policies.

**Mornington Peninsula**

A recent strategy titled ‘Protecting the regional role and values of the Mornington Peninsula’ (2001) was undertaken for Mornington Peninsula Shire Council. This was undertaken to ensure that the regional role and values of the Mornington Peninsula are properly reflected in and protected by the Mornington Peninsula Planning Scheme. This report has many important implications for Frankston.

Central to the report is the question of where the Peninsula begins. Discussions found there was no agreed understanding of where the northerly boundary of the Peninsula lies, however there was a commonly held view that is lies generally south of Frankston (not the municipal boundary) with a range of particular markers giving a sense of gateway, arrival or departure. These features included roundabouts, hills, open spaces and escarpments.

Another generally held view was that there is an area of transition on the urbanised western boundary extending from Frankston through Mt Eliza and South Frankston to the open rural plains of the Balcombe Valley and the open break between Mt Eliza and Mornington.

---

The report suggests that parts of Frankston and Casey need to be included in the concept of what is the ‘Mornington Peninsula’. It recommends the ownership of Peninsula policies by Frankston and Casey to ensure that inappropriate development is discouraged in the sensitive areas overlapping the municipal boundaries.
Local Policy

Municipal Strategic Statement

The Municipal Strategic Statement in the Frankston Planning Scheme sets out the Council’s strategy for the City’s future growth and development. The Frankston Municipal Strategic Statement contains a number of objectives and a range of strategies related to housing issues. Of most relevance is the direction related to Housing.

21.04 Housing

21.04-2 Key Issues

- Providing greater diversity in the City’s housing stock.
- Encouraging medium density housing in appropriate areas.
- Community concerns about the impact of medium density housing development.
- Maintaining areas of low density development for its contribution to housing diversity and landscape quality and in areas that are beyond the reach of reticulated sewerage.
- Ensuring that residential development is responsive to significant environmental, landscape and cultural features including streetscape values.
- Coordinating development in new housing areas and ensuring the timely provision and equitable funding of infrastructure.
- Ensuring that non residential uses are accommodated without loss of residential amenity.

21.04-3 Objectives, strategies and implementation

Objectives

- To provide a range of living environments and a diversity of housing stock to meet the needs and aspirations of the City’s residents.
- To ensure that new housing areas are developed in an orderly and coordinated way.

Strategies

Strategies to achieve these objectives include:

- Encourage a greater diversity of housing stock.
- Encourage medium density housing, particularly around the Frankston CAD, other activity centres and transport nodes.
- Retain low density and rural residential areas for their contribution to housing diversity.
- Protect the landscape character and biological values of low density and rural residential areas.
- Ensure that on-site waste disposal is adequately addressed in rural residential areas particularly in the sensitive Westernport catchment.
- Identify opportunities to use surplus land held by Council, government departments and servicing authorities for housing.
- Encourage new residential development as infill on surplus non-residential sites, including sites within the Frankston CAD.
- Ensure that medium density housing is of a high design standard and, where appropriate, respects and complements neighbourhood character.
• Ensure that residential development is responsive to biological, landscape, cultural heritage and land capability issues.
• Ensure that new housing are developed in an orderly and coordinated way and that provision is made to fund essential infrastructure and community facilities.
• Establish an appropriate basis to define the boundary between residential and rural zones.
• Ensure that any non residential uses are responsive to their residential setting and maintain appropriate standards of residential amenity.
• Ensure high quality streetscapes and consistency in streetscape themes.

21.06 Frankston Central Activity District

21.06-2 Key issues

• Housing in the CAD

21.06-3 Objective

• To reinforce the role of the CAD as a regional activity centre and to enhance its image by building on its unique bayside location.

Strategies

• Consider making key Council owned sites available for appropriate development.
• Encourage housing or accommodation on vacant or under utilised sites and buildings.

21.09 Rural Areas

21.09-2 Key Issues

• The location and rationale of the urban/rural edge.
• Dealing with pressure for urban conservation.

21.09-3 Objective

To maintain rural landscapes and predominantly rural uses in the City’s rural areas.

Strategies

• Encourage urban related uses to locate in nearby urban zones.
• Establish a sound basis for the boundary between urban and rural zones, particularly in the area between Langwarrin and Carrum Downs.

21.11 Natural environment and Cultural Heritage

Objectives

• To maintain areas of landscape quality

Strategy

• Protect areas of landscape significance to the north of Carrum Downs, east and south of Langwarrin, at Frankston South and along the Baxter- Mt Eliza escarpment.

21.12 Transport

Strategy

• Encourage increased housing densities along public transport routes and around public transport nodes.
Implications for the Housing Strategy

The MSS provides existing strategic direction for housing within the City within a number of categories within the MSS. The accompanying housing map shows a number of locations for the encouragement of increased housing densities within the city. These are centred around the CAD into Karingal, along the highway at Seaford, around the Seaford Railway station and the activity centre of Carrum Downs. Low density areas in Frankston South are shown, as are rural residential areas in Langwarrin and Langwarrin South. The Housing Strategy may make recommendations regarding the

Local Planning Policies

22.09 Nepean Highway – Mile Bridge to Central Activity District Policy

This policy aims to improve the Nepean Highway entrance to the City through improved treatment as a boulevard entry. It calls for development on the western side of Nepean Highway to enhance the environment of Kananook Creek and for buildings to address the creek.

Implications for the Housing Strategy

This strip is mostly zoned Business 5 and while that zone does provide for medium density housing as well as offices, it seems likely the area will develop for commercial purposes and the policy primarily addresses that form of development. There is also potential for shop top housing to be encouraged in this area, (already occurring in the CAD).

22.12 Outline Development Plans – Carrum Downs, Langwarrin and Baxter Policy

A system of Outline Development Plans provide a framework to guide the development of remaining growth areas in the City. It is likely that the Metropolitan Strategy will require an approach to ODPs and subdivisions to deliver sustainable city goals.

Implications for the Housing Strategy

The ODPs are agreed and approved plans that must be incorporated into the formulation of the Strategy.

Use of Residential 2 Zones

The Residential 2 Zone was introduced with the new format Frankston Planning Scheme in 2000. Its intention of this zone was that it be used to encourage the development of medium density dwellings in key areas such as around railway stations and public transport routes.

In some areas their success in achieving higher densities has been limited. In Carrum Downs for example, land zoned Residential 2 around Hall Road has resulted in the development of a number of facilities other than medium density housing.

In other areas widespread community concern has been raised over the rezoning of areas for higher densities and the lack of third party appeal rights available under this zoning.
Environmentally Significant Areas

A number of environmentally significant areas can be found within Frankston. The Frankston City Vegetation Study 1997 found some 130 sites as having botanical and zoological significance and occupy approximately 15% of land in the City. The most important sites are the Seaford Wetlands, which is of International significance for migratory birds, and the Pines and Langwarrin Flora and Fauna Reserves, which are of State significance and support rare and threatened plant species.

These sites are found on both public and private land and Council has recognised through the MSS that many of these sites are earmarked for urban development and “present a challenge in terms of dealing with competing demands and values.”

Scattered River Red Gums that pre-date “European” settlement can be found in the northern part of the City. They make an important contribution to the landscape quality of the area, sometimes creating a visual backdrop to residential areas.
Figure 8: Sites of Botanical and Zoological Significance

Source: Frankston Planning Scheme.
Social Housing Issues
Special Housing Needs

Understanding the extent and nature of special housing needs within the City of Frankston requires a detailed examination of housing needs within the context of the local housing market, and State and Federal government policy trends in relation to housing affordability. It requires an analysis of the infrastructure that supports people with special housing needs, the housing sector in the region, and the number and type of people with special needs. This has not been within the scope of this project. However a general analysis of special housing issues is has been undertaken through examining available data and discussions with special housing providers and support groups in Frankston City.\(^4\)

In overall terms, the special housing needs in Frankston City are similar to those in many other high need areas in Victoria, ie:

- there is a need for more diversity in housing stock so that housing is more appropriate to the needs of different people and life circumstances;
- there are significant issues regarding the poor quality of housing stock for people with special needs and those on low incomes, in both private rental and public housing markets;
- there is a lack of affordable housing stock;
- there is a lack of appropriate accommodation for people in crisis or emergency situations including families in crisis, women experiencing domestic violence, people who are homeless, and people with disabilities and complex needs.

High priority or special housing issues for particular groups in Frankston City include:

- the extent to which people’s access to housing is restricted by affordability issues;
- the supply of good quality student housing in close proximity to public transport, tertiary education facilities and services;
- the high levels of demand for short term emergency housing or crisis accommodation currently not being addressed;
- the need for a range of appropriate housing options for people as they age in local communities;
- the increasing use of caravan/mobile home parks as an affordable housing option.

Within this context the following key issues for the municipality have been identified:

A need for a greater range of housing options more appropriate to people’s needs and circumstances. This need is indicated by:

- An increasing proportion of households with people who are ageing and require housing that is more appropriate to their life situation, and emerging demands for supported housing for elderly persons;
- High proportion of single parent families in almost all local areas, with a particularly high proportion (19% of households) in Frankston North;

\(^4\) This Special Housing needs section is based on a seminar held with a number of people involved in the provision of special housing in the Frankston City area. It is not based on statistical evidence (except where indicated) or detailed analysis of the issues, hence the recommendation that further work be undertaken in this area.
• Increasing proportion of households comprising a person 65 years or older living alone in all local areas with Frankston Central and Frankston South having the largest proportions with 16% and 13% of households respectively. Increases in older person lone households between 1991 and 1996 were most notable in Frankston South and Frankston North;

• A high proportion of single person households in Frankston Central particularly young people and students;

• Higher percentage of people needing single person dwelling or couple dwelling compared with what is available;

• Evictions from caravan parks (e.g. Nepean Highway Caravan Park) and increasing costs as a way of forcing people out of parks that have become desirable for medium density housing redevelopment.

A need to improve the quality of housing that is available. This is indicated by:

• Poor maintenance standards in lower cost private and public rental properties leading to negative perceptions of particular streets and local areas. This is seen to contribute to a lack of a sense of belonging and people who can afford to, relocating to other areas.

• A shortage of good quality housing for students and young people in areas that are close to services, retail, transport and educational institutions.

Indications of possible high levels of financial housing stress in particular local areas, including.

• Frankston North and Frankston Central have a significantly higher proportion of households in the lowest income quartiles and a higher than average proportion of households spending more than 25% of their income on housing (as per the standard measure of poverty)

Table 3: Proportion of household income spent on housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% of households spending more than 25% of their income on housing</th>
<th>% of households in lowest income quartile ($0-$370 per week)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrum Downs/Skye</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston Central</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston Central</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston North</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston South</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karingal</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langwarrin/Langwarrin South</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaford</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston City Total</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne Statistical Division (MSD)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Indications of increasing pressure on the demand for housing support services and short-term or crisis accommodation, such as:

• A shortage of accommodation to cater for more than an estimated 400 homeless persons; and
• shortage of accommodation crisis for families in crisis; domestic violence, persons aged 30-40 years with psychiatric illness, disability and drug and alcohol related issues.

Role of Local Government in Special Housing Needs

Housing circumstances are a measure of the overall health and well-being of the community. Access to secure and affordable housing can contribute to people’s capacity to take part in education, maintain employment, build social connections and be involved in community life.

Local government is potentially in a unique position to develop an overview of housing issues across a municipality and has a number of mechanisms available to it to influence housing outcomes on the ground. While the south-eastern metropolitan area has a range of housing support agencies and housing providers, Council no longer has a direct role in housing. This has perhaps limited the current Council’s general awareness of special housing needs and relationships to other housing support agencies and providers.

There are a number of roles local government could have in responding to special housing needs within the City. These include a role in:

• advocating to State and Federal government for special housing projects;
• providing land and other resources to support social or special housing initiatives;
• co-ordinating cross sector partnerships to address local housing issues;
• sponsoring innovative housing projects in conjunction with other agencies;
• monitoring and analysing data on housing in the municipality;
• developing and managing housing projects;
• facilitating integrated planning and policy development to ensure that appropriate linkages are made between different policy areas so that there is a ‘whole of council’ approach to needs (eg. drug use, community safety, transport planning, urban design, proximity to local shopping centres, all have an important bearing on access to housing);
• working with other levels of government, developers and non-government organisations to leverage additional funds for social housing or more diverse housing options within particular developments.

There is an increasing trend toward partnership arrangements in Government policy as a mechanism for leveraging additional funds towards addressing housing needs. This is exemplified in the Victorian Government’s Social Housing Innovations Project where $94.5 million has been made available to leverage funds for more affordable housing options. Potential partners include non-government and church organisations, and local government.

The State Government has a number of housing assistance programs funded through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. These include:

• Crisis Accommodation
• Transitional housing
• Public housing
• Aboriginal Rental Housing Program, and,
• Community housing (including boarding houses)
Sense of Belonging

The following information is from the Frankston City Health Plan, Community Research Project (2001). This information was collected via an extensive written survey mailed out to over 4000 residents of Frankston. Some 777 responses were received. While the information was targeted to look at issues of health and wellbeing of the community, it provides this study with some interesting information in relation to housing and the environment in which people live.

*Figure 9: Sense of belonging*

Some 55.98% of people felt a Sense of Belonging in the Local Community/Neighbourhood with 17.53% feeling they did not have a sense of belonging. A further 26.4% did not respond to the question which the study felt it may have indicated that they were unsure as to whether they felt a sense of belonging.

*Figure 10: Perceived future*

38.4% felt the future of the local community/neighbourhood was going to get better with 37.1% believing it would remain the same. A smaller proportion had a more pessimistic view of the future of their neighbourhood.
A the local area level, the majority of respondents felt a Sense of Belonging in their local areas/neighbourhoods with the highest level of 72.6% recorded in Frankston South and the lowest level in Karingal/Frankston.

A number of relevant comments were also provided by the community in relation to housing and the built environment. There were a large number of comments relating to:

- The maintenance or upkeep of rental properties;
- Maintenance of footpaths, parks, street trees, public areas;
- Some fear about using the Central Activity District of Frankston however a real desire to see it as a focal point for the city;
- Concern over the encroachment of urban development into sensitive environmental areas and similarly a desire to protect the environmental areas;
- A desire for a high level of amenity and reduced traffic on the roads;
- A desire to help disadvantaged people gain access to appropriate housing and services and facilities, however some wanted to reduce elements that might assist in this such as the quantity of housing commission homes;
- A desire to improve the public image of Frankston.

Community Facilities

In September 1999, a Community Needs Analysis was prepared for Frankston City Council by BG Urban Solutions and GHD Planning. This study identified, documented and prioritised the key needs of various age groups across the city’s neighbourhoods. A summary of the type of services required for Frankston City at the neighbourhood level can be found in the relevant section titled ‘Housing Issues by Suburb’. A number of recommendations were also made for the Frankston community in general. These included:

- Urban design and the Economics of Amenity/Convenience (i.e parking);
- Information needs of community;
- Holistic and preventative approach to community support services;
- Managing actual and perceived priorities;
- Sense of community and promoting the social function of commercial/shopping centres;
- The need to redress actual and perceived problems associated with crime;
- Recreation, health and leisure trends;
• Housing strategy to facilitate greater choice re: dwelling and tenure type;
• the needs of youth; older adults; people with disabilities and people with different cultural backgrounds;
• economic and social of gambling;
• the need for an audit of existing community facilities;
• the need for Infrastructure and development contribution plans for the whole municipality, not just recognised growth areas.
Housing Issues by Suburb
The following is a summary of issues discussed previously in this report, as they relate to the eight suburb areas. They are important in highlighting the various roles played by each suburb in the provision of housing for Frankston City including specific strategies related to or issues faced by the area. An analysis of likely housing development trends if current market trends and Council policies remain, is provided. The preliminary findings of the Neighbourhood Character Study are then discussed in relation to the potential to limit the ability of the suburb area to accommodate new types or numbers of additional housing. This is then summarised or shown graphically on what is referred to as the ‘Continuum’.

### Description of Elements Analysed

#### Household Composition/Population

Provides highlights of the suburb’s household composition and population. Important for understanding the drivers of household change as people move through the life cycle over the next ten years.


#### Dwelling Type

Provides information on the types of dwellings found in the suburb such as composition of dwelling (ie number of bedrooms), style (ie flat, separate dwelling, semi-detached etc) and information on the building material. Broad trends can be determined for some categories from this table particularly the growth in medium density housing types.

Source: 1996 Census of Population and Housing, Frankston City Council Rate Base

#### Dwelling Quantity

Provides information on the number of dwellings currently and in the future for the suburb. Vacant lots provide information on the opportunities for new housing and will vary depending on what stage the suburb is at.

Source: 1996 Census of Population and Housing, Frankston City Council Rate Base

#### Restrictive Covenants

The location and number of restrictive covenants that will impact on the quantity of future housing has been determined. Restrictive Covenants are legally binding restrictions placed on land titles at time of lodgement (eg at time of original subdivision). These restrictions can range from something as relatively minor as the construction material of dwellings to more severe restrictions such as those prohibiting the construction of an additional dwelling on the allotment.

Source: Frankston City Council subdivision database

---

5 The Continuum has been developed by i.d consulting as a way of identifying all constraints and opportunities affecting housing provision in the City.
Housing Tenure

Provides information on where households are at in relation to owning, buying or renting their house. High percentages of renting can indicate populations with high mobility or high levels of financial stress.

Source: 1996 Census of Population and Housing

Residential Lot sizes

Provide an analysis of the size and quantity of residential lots by suburb. The size and quantity of lots is further broken down by zoning. Provides an understanding of the subdivision pattern in the development of the area, highlights areas that have experienced alterations to the subdivision pattern through subsequent subdivision of dual occupancies and multi unit development, and highlights opportunities for further subdivision.

Source: Frankston City Council Digital Cadastral Property map base

Zoning

Provides information on the current residential zonings that exist within the suburb. Useful for determining the tools currently being used by Council for the development of housing.

Source: Frankston Planning Scheme

Health and Wellbeing indicators

The following are used to develop a ‘health and wellbeing’ measure for each suburb:

Age Structure: age specific propensity to experience particular health outcomes and as a result require specific health and wellbeing infrastructure/capacities and opportunities.

Attending education institutes: Youth unemployment levels are relatively high. High levels of youth not engaged in education is potentially indicative or higher levels of youth inactivity, resulting in boredom and numerous factors possibly becoming an outcome because of youth boredom include drug use, small level crime etc.

Age left school: Indicative of ability to gain information and knowledge and make informed decisions about health and well being.

Religion: Concentrations of religious groups may point to higher levels of connectivity and community interaction, particularly for minorities which could increase one’s feeling of inclusion and affect their self-esteem.

Proficiency in English: Low proficiency in English leads to problems accessing information and services, can lead to increased isolation.

Car ownership: Accessibility to services and generally mobility to visit friends, family etc. If no adequate public transport reaches one’s destination then there could be feelings of exclusion which could lead to depression.

Labour force status: Unemployed people have the lowest incomes. This generally results in lower levels of connection to community, higher levels of isolation on all friendship levels. They may also have less flexibility to pursue community connections, information and knowledge. Workers may not get the chance to experience the benefits of social interaction in the workplace and instead may have to deal with the increasing pressures to meet community mores through rigorous means testing and job seeking tests, which could potentially lead to higher levels of depression and increased anxiety, and could possibly result in substance
abuse. Part time and casual employees may not feel like their job is stable and insecure jobs can be just as harmful as unemployment to physical and mental health.

One parent families: Less flexibility to be able to pursue community connections. There could perhaps be greater financial pressures because of the single lower incomes which could lead to less opportunities for the children in life and potentially more health complications.

Housing costs: High levels of income going into housing costs. Standard poverty measure. Poverty is generally considered if one is paying 25% of one’s income for house rent.

Family and household weekly income: In general lower household incomes suffer specific health issues and engage in higher risk behaviours. Less able to achieve wellbeing goals and less able to access information and knowledge.

Infrastructure and Land Capability

Highlights any issues relating to infrastructure or land capability that will affect the development of additional housing within the suburb.

Source: Developed following discussions by id with infrastructure providers.

Identified Strategic Directions

 Highlights any strategic directions that have been set out for the suburb through the MSS or other Council policies.

Source: Frankston Planning Scheme

Locational Opportunities and Constraints

Highlights opportunities and constraints provided by the location of the suburb such as proximity to services and facilities, proximity to sensitive environmental areas that would limit housing development within or adjacent to areas.

Source: Synthesis of a variety of reports

Affordability

Provides the median house price in the suburb. Enables comparison with the entire City, other suburbs and the Melbourne Metropolitan area.

Source: Valuer General’s Office

Special Housing needs

Highlights key issues arising out of the Special Housing Needs section of this report that may have relevance to this suburb or have been specifically mentioned in the analysis.

Source: Seminar and report prepared by Kerry O’Neil for this study

Dwelling Stock Quality

Provides information on the state of the dwelling stock. Good housing quality often means it was recently constructed and therefore under less pressure for redevelopment. Conversely, poor housing quality is under increased pressure for redevelopment due to cheaper acquisition and redevelopment costs.

Source: Neighbourhood Character Study survey
Pressure for Housing redevelopment

There are a number of areas that are under significant pressure for housing redevelopment. This is due to a number of factors including changing housing preferences, decline of housing stock and changing housing demand.

Source: Neighbourhood Character Study
Carrum Downs/Skye

**Population (1996):** 16,511

**Number of dwellings (1996):** 5,263

**Average household Size (1996):** 2.88 persons

**Household Composition/Population**

Highest percentage of young families in Frankston (36.2%) reflected in the high rates of 0-17 yr olds (5,163 or 33.8%) and of 25-34 (25%) and 35-44 year olds (16.4%).

Population expected to grow by 12,352 between 1996 – 2011 while average household size will fall very slightly to 2.83 persons.

**Dwelling Type**

Separate housing predominates 90.6% with only 3.0% medium density. 2001 Council rate base shows a growth in separate houses to 96.7%. Dwellings are largely single storey.

### 1996 Census – Dwelling Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate dwellings</td>
<td>4,770</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached (incl. Row/terrace/townhouse)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat, apartment</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total medium density</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/not stated</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (dwellings)</strong></td>
<td>5,263</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2001 Council Rate base – Dwelling Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House - structure unidentified</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Brick</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Brick Veneer</td>
<td>5,480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Clad</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Concrete</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Fibro Cement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Weatherboard</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEPARATE HOUSE - TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>5,583</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In House Flat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Flat/OYO Unit 161  
Retirement Unit 32  
Retirement Village - Apartment 0  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEDIUM DENSITY - TOTAL</th>
<th>193</th>
<th>3.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subdivisional Land - Englobo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5,776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vacant Residential Lots 436

Housing in the Carrum Downs/Skye area is dominated by separate houses; this is to be expected given the relatively recent development of much of the area. At the 1996 Census, over 90% of dwellings in Carrum Downs/Skye were separate houses (including not stated). Since the 1996 Census, the proportions of separate houses appeared to have remained relatively stable. Also of note is the large number of vacant lots in Carrum Downs/Skye.

**Restrictive Covenants**

There are no restrictive covenants that will restrict the development of housing in this area.

**Dwelling Quantity**

There are 5,263 dwellings (1996) with 436 vacant residential lots. Projections are that an additional 3,199 dwellings will be developed between 2001 and 2011.

**Housing Tenure**

20.3% of households own their home while 15.7% are renting, and 59.1% are buying.

**Zoning**

Residential 1

Residential 2 (concentrated around Hall Road and the regional Shopping Centre)

Environmental Rural

**Residential Lot Size**

Lots of 500-800m² predominate with 5,205 lots or 82.6% of the Residential 1 and Residential 2 Zones. 501 lots are 800m² or larger in the Residential 1 and Residential 2 Zone. There are currently 6,297 residential lots (Res 1 and 2)
While Carrum Downs/Skye area is dominated by Residential 1 allotments, there are significant areas of land zoned Residential 2. These Residential 2 areas are concentrated around Hall Road and the Regional Shopping Centre. Environmental Rural allotments are concentrated around the Ballarto Road/Dandenong-Hastings Road area. As would be expected in an area developed predominantly from the 1970s onwards, the overwhelming majority of Carrum Downs/Skye's residential allotments are between 500 and 800 m$^2$ in size.

**Health and Well Being Indicators**

- 30.9% under 15 years
- High than average for Frankston speak English not well but it is much lower than MSD.
- High car ownership per household with only 5.2% of households with no car.
- Lower than average unemployment.
- 5.7% households spending more than 25% of their income on housing ((Frankston 6.5%)
- Only 15.6% of households in lowest income quartile.

**Infrastructure and Land Capability**
- Water Supply: No significant constraints
- Sewerage: No significant constraints
- Drainage: No significant constraints

**Identified Strategic Directions**
- Identified for housing
- Increased housing densities are encouraged around the Carrum Downs Shopping Centre and at the junction of Hall and Dandenong Frankston Road
- Land to the east of Skye development separates the Frankston urban corridor from the south eastern urban growth corridor. (Drainage catchment boundaries have generally been used to define the western edge of the rural area in the City).

**Locational Opportunities and Constraints**
- **Opportunities:** Carrum Downs Regional Shopping Centre
- **Constraints:** Limited access to public transport services

**Affordability**
- Median house prices in Carrum Downs are $115,250 (1999). For Skye it is $125,000.

**Special Housing Needs**
- A need for a greater range of housing options more appropriate to people’s needs and circumstances.
- Indications for increasing pressure on the demand for housing support services and short term or crisis accommodation.

**Dwelling Stock Quality**
- Dwelling stock is of good quality, with most of the stock having been constructed within the last twenty years.

There is significant population growth expected from 1996 to 2011. With this amount of growth, awareness of the needs of all the age groups will be necessary. Needs identified by residents of this area include:

- a multi-purpose, all age, community centre within Botany Park with better planning for comfort, fun and a feeling of safety;
- an employment resource centre is necessary, as are childcare centres, which could incorporate meeting spaces, such as cafés so that parents can meet one another and gain a “community feeling” and sense of belonging;
- improved paths (both pedestrian and cycling) to decrease the number of falls. Also improved interaction between cycles and cars;
- maintenance of the level of aged care support for both residents and visitors would be necessary and identification of priority locations for improved disabled parking locations;
- an increase in the level of local counselling and family support at a proposed new community space in Carrum Downs Shopping Centre, which would then be a venue for related family services; and
- recreation facilities need some improvement to cater for the youth, for example a skate and bike facility and youth activity centre.
Needs identified for specific age groups include:

Aged
- Need for meeting space which could be a venue for range of aged services.
- Mobility and access issues
- Potential housing demand for older residents
- Need for improved transport services

Family and Children
- Need for additional space for other community services, current centre is well used and at capacity.
- Need of range of counselling services
- Need for assistance for longer term unemployed

Youth
- Need for both formal and informal recreational facilities
- Need for closer monitoring and advocacy for secondary college

Disabled
- General mobility and access issues.

**Trends for Carrum Downs/Skye (without Council intervention)**

If current trends continue, Carrum Downs/Skye will continue to act as the ‘outer suburban growth area’ of Frankston, typically attracting young families to newly developed housing on Frankston’s fringe. The existing population will age, while younger couples and families will move into the new residential developments. Teenagers and mature age groups will experience the most significant increases as mature family households grow by 2011. Overall a growth from predominantly ‘young family’ structure to a ‘mature’ family structure in 2011.

Land that is currently zoned Residential 1 and 2 will be gradually subdivided over the next 10 years providing for the additional dwellings forecast. It is unlikely that all the lots in the R1 and R2 zoned land will be constructed on by 2011.

Lot sizes will continue to favour the 500-800m2 lot in line with the Outline Development Plan. The percentage of the medium density dwellings may increase however will still only form a small percentage of the overall housing type.

**Impact of Neighbourhood Character**

As this is a newly establishing area, a new neighbourhood character is being established. Consideration does need to be made of significant stands of native vegetation, which provide a visual backdrop to the emerging character. It is likely that neighbourhood character policies will be able to protect these valued characteristics without any significant impact on projected dwelling construction to 2011.
Frankston Central

Population (1996): 9,496
Number of dwellings (1996): 4,770
Average household size (1996): 2.15 persons

Household Composition/Population

- Highest percentage of lone persons
  Frankston Central contains Frankston's highest percentage of old lone person's at 16.2% and young lone person's at 8.9%. Group households are also high with 6.6%. It has the smallest percentage of young families.

- The highest proportion of people are in the 65+ age group (2,022 persons)

- Population is projected to grow to 13,463 people or 3,554 people between 1996-2011.

- Average household size is projected to fall very slightly to 2.12 persons in 2011.

Dwelling Type

- Contains the highest proportion of medium density housing stock of Frankston with 38.6% (1996). The Council rate base shows increases in medium density housing for Frankston Central, Frankston Heights and Karingal combined which might indicate that this figure has grown).

NB. The figures contained in the tables below include Frankston Central, Frankston Heights and Karingal.

1996 Census – Dwelling Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate dwellings</td>
<td>11,988</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached (incl. Row/terrace/townhouse)</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat, apartment</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total medium density</td>
<td>3,001</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/not stated</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (dwellings)</td>
<td>15,405</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**2001 Council Rate base – Dwelling Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House - structure unidentified</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Brick</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Brick Veneer</td>
<td>9,443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Clad</td>
<td>377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Concrete</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Fibro Cement</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Weatherboard</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEPARATE HOUSE - TOTAL** 11,889 75.1%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In House Flat</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat/OYO Unit</td>
<td>3,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Unit</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Village - Apartment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEDIUM DENSITY - TOTAL** 3,951 24.9%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subdivisional Land - Englobo</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 15,840

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Residential Lots</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frankston Central, Frankston Heights, Karingal comprises a significant proportion of the housing in Frankston City. The suburbs also contain a high proportion of medium density housing. This is logical given the close proximity of the Frankston CBD and associated transport and retail facilities. While the area has similar proportions of medium density housing to Seaford, higher proportions of medium density development are concentrated in the Frankston Central area. The majority of residential development between 1996 and 2001 appears to have been in the form of medium density dwellings. This is logical given the lack of remnant broadhectare land available in the area.
**Restrictive Covenants**

Restrictive covenants exist over 24 sites in the Cliff Road area.

**Dwelling Quantity**

There were 4,770 dwellings in 1996. Projections are that 1,429 additional dwellings will be developed in the area between 2001 and 2011.

**Housing Tenure**

High percentage of renters with 39.0%, 34.6% owned and 20.4% buying.

**Residential Lot Size**

Significant number of lots smaller that 300m2 or approximately 33% (generally single story unit developments, mainly concentrated in the areas south and north east of the CAD. Lots of 500-800m2 still the most prominent with approximately 46%.)
Properties by Size (sq m)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot size</th>
<th>Residential 1</th>
<th>Residential 2</th>
<th>Low Density Residential</th>
<th>Environmental Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;300 m²</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-500 m²</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-800 m²</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-1200 m²</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200 m² - 1 ha</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ha +</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>2,629</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 24 lots are subject to covenants prohibiting the construction of additional dwellings on the lot.

Residential 2 zones dominate Frankston Central’s residential zones. This zoning a reflection of the area’s proximity to central Frankston’s retail, commercial and transport services. Of note is the significant number of lots smaller than 300 m². These are generally single storey unit developments, mainly concentrated in the areas south and north east of the Frankston CAD.

**Zoning**

- Residential 1 (Long Island)
- Residential 2

**Health and Well Being Indicators**

- High % aged 65-85 years (18.4%) and 2.9% over 85 years
- Higher percentage’s attending University of TAFE than
Frankston average

- 33.8% left school at 15 years or younger
- High percentage do not speak English well, 4.0% compared to Frankston 2.6%
- High percentage of households without a car 23.8%
- Unemployment is an issue with 15.7% (9.8% Frankston and 9.1% for the MSD)
- High percentage of households (~40%) are in the lowest income quartile of $0 – $370 pre tax.

**Infrastructure and Land Capability**

Water Supply: No significant constraints
Sewerage: No significant constraints
Drainage: No significant constraints

**Identified Strategic Directions**

The Frankston Project identifies opportunities for additional housing along the Kananook Creek, within the CAD and on the Mechanics Institute Hall site.

Increased housing densities around the CAD.

**Locational Opportunities and Constraints**

Opportunities: Located around the Frankston CAD and associated shopping, transport, activities, educational and medical services.
Close proximity to the beach

**Affordability**

The median house price for Frankston is $119,000 in 1999. (a combination of Frankston Central, Heights and Karingal).

**Special Housing Needs**

A need for a greater range of housing options more appropriate to people’s needs and circumstances.

Indications of high levels of financial housing stress

A need to improve the quality of housing that is available indicated in lower cost rental private and public (including good quality housing for students).

Indications for increasing pressure on the demand for housing support services and short term or crisis accommodation.

**Dwelling Stock Quality**

Dwelling stock of the area is of mixed quality with the stock varying in age and condition. There is a need to create more cohesiveness in the streetscapes.

The major growth age group of local residents is expected to be amongst 25 to 45 year olds, however 4 other groups also need to be addressed including students, youth, older adults and residents with limited physical abilities. The needs identified by the residents of this area include:

- a safer environment;
- improved lighting and better-quality designed public spaces (including better attended amenities, increased seating for elderly);
- greater police on foot presence;
- community places to accommodate all residents.
Other needs expressed include:

- a need for Community Places to include a community art component so as to bring together the residents of the community and build a stronger community spirit;
- access for disabled people also needs reviewing to enable improved access to a wider range of services;
- maintenance of current aged care support services;
- assistance in housing development around schools;
- improved strategy for the maintenance of the toy library;
- increased parenting and counselling services to aid families and children;
- promotion of greater community awareness of the use of various public spaces;
- increase counselling services with various forms of media;
- maintenance of current skateboard facilities; and
- identification of priority locations for improved disabled parking locations.

Other issues relating to specific age groups include:

**Aged**
- Public safety concern
- Access and mobility
- Amenity and convenience
- Need for greater housing choice especially since there would be an increasing demand on public transport

**Family and Children**
- Demand of early childhood and educational services.
- Increased capacity and resourcing strategies provided by various agencies.
- Parental counselling and support services
- Increase employment centres

**Youth**
- Recognise that young people need to “hang out” and allow them to do so and feel comfortable about it.
- Communication and dispute resolution services
- Need for more formal and informal skateboard facilities
- Need for greater housing choice, especially for those students dependent on public transport.
- Increase employment centres

**Disability**
- Ease of access
- Design, detail and level of parking provision

**Opportunities for housing in Frankston CAD**

Two projects focused around the Frankston CAD are underway or in the planning stages which could result in not only significant renewal of the CAD but also offer new housing choices and potentially significant numbers of dwellings.
The Frankston Project

In 1998, Frankston City Council commissioned ‘The Frankston Project’ to provide an urban design future for central Frankston by exploring possibilities and identifying opportunities for its development.

As part of this project, a ‘Frankston Action Plan’ has been prepared. This plan provides a shared vision of the future and operates as an organising mechanism. The Action Plan identifies the need to attract residents to central Frankston as fundamental in creating a City that is ‘vibrant and engaging on a variety of levels during the day as well as after dark’. The possibilities for attracting residents include:

• providing incentives to developers;
• creating incentives for people to live in central Frankston; and
• encouraging the development of facilities required by residents.

In addition to broad strategies to attract residents to central Frankston, the Action Plan identifies two areas in central Frankston where residential development should be encouraged. These areas are:

• the Kananook Creek precinct; and
• the Mechanics Institute Hall site.

In the Kananook Creek area, two to three storey apartments are proposed along the creek, making use of the creek frontage and the outlook to Port Phillip Bay. The Mechanics Institute Hall site has been identified for potential residential redevelopment in the form of a tower of around eight storeys in height. These areas have the potential to add a significant number of dwellings to central Frankston.

While the Kananook Creek precinct and the Mechanics Institute Hall site have been identified for residential development as part of The Frankston Project, there is potential for other parts of central Frankston to accommodate residential development as part of mixed use developments. It is also possible that any large scale residential development in central Frankston will have a ‘seeder’ impact in attracting more residential development to the CAD.

In 1999, i.d. consulting prepared small area population forecasts for eight small areas in Frankston City. These forecasts made explicit assumptions based on the likely residential development yield expected as a result of The Frankston Project.

The i.d. forecasts assumed net dwelling increases in the Frankston Central small area of around 150 dwellings per year from 2004, with development in 2002 achieving 350 new dwellings (see chart). It should be noted that the Frankston Central Small Area includes areas north to the Mile Bridge and east to McMahons Road. The assumed increase in dwellings can be attributed to both The Frankston Project and the development of R2 zoned areas in the areas surrounding central Frankston.

These dwelling increases drive a forecast population increase in Frankston Central from 9,900 in 1996 to 13,500 in 2011.
The Frankston Project has the potential to encourage residential development in central Frankston by identifying suitable locations and incentives for development. The impact of residential development may well be felt on more sites than those identified in The Frankston Project, as the market for residential development in central Frankston is created.

If development takes place as envisaged in The Frankston Project, then the assumptions made in the small area population forecasts will be reasonably close in terms of quantity of dwellings added - if not timing. It is considered unlikely that development of the scale foreshadowed in The Frankston Project will begin in 2002.

It is perhaps too early to identify individual sites for residential development in central Frankston other than those nominated by The Frankston Project. What should be recognised however is that the CAD of Frankston has the potential to cater for significant numbers of residential dwellings should demand for this type of development eventuate.

Transit Cities

Frankston has been identified by the State Government as a possible site for its Transit Cities Program. This program aims to create urban renewal in outer fringe areas focussing initially around railway stations such as Frankston Station. Feasibility studies are being jointly funded by the Department of Infrastructure and local councils for redevelopment of these areas, encouraging designs that support lifestyle precincts and retail centres and integrating shopping malls with established shopping strips. Medium density development is encouraged in and around transport hubs and the Department believes it will take pressure off suburban streets and protect their urban character. The main features of the program and benefits to the community include:

- Providing the opportunity to promote higher density housing developments, commercial and leisure enterprises linked to multi-modal transport facilities and reduces the current car dependent urban form.
• Providing clear and tangible short term and long-term outputs that are linked to the Fast Rail project and the future directions of the Metropolitan Strategy with the potential to leverage further public/private investment in key development sites.

• Providing clear links with the outputs of the Metropolitan Strategy in that the community has identified public transport and environmentally sustainable developments as key issues.

• Having the potential to implement place management arrangements to encourage integrated developments involving a number of stakeholders and builds on the current strong partnerships with Local Government, the business sector and the community.

• Promoting the usage of public transport and reducing the current car dependant urban form.

This initiative sits well with Council’s ‘Frankston Project’ including the redevelopment of the Frankston Foreshore, and the Frankston Interchange Feasibility Study by the State Government and Frankston City Council to redevelop Frankston Railway Station and bus interchange.

It is too early to determine the impact this will have on numbers of dwellings and the population likely to be housed within them at this stage. As noted above in ‘The Frankston Project’, what should be recognised however is that the CAD of Frankston has the potential to cater for significant numbers of residential dwellings should demand for this type of development eventuate.

**Trends for Frankston Central**

If current trends persist, two phenomenon are likely to occur. The current population of Frankston Central is expected to remain and ‘age in place’ (age in their homes) over the forecast period, whilst new residents will move into new medium density development in and around the CAD and surrounding areas. Many of these will be in ‘young’ and ‘mature’ family households. A wide variety of housing markets will be attracted to the area.

Frankston Central’s housing stock will continue to be redeveloped, resulting in a move away from a predominance of single detached dwellings to medium and high density dwellings, possibly in new built forms, as a result of the strategic projects such as the Frankston project and the State Government’s Transit Oriented Development project.

**Impact of Neighbourhood Character**

The areas of Long Island and those abutting the Sweetwater Reserve/Olivers Hill area contain special neighbourhood character qualities that need to be protected. Their prominent locations by the Bay, access to views of the creek and ocean and a built form that responds to that location require sensitive housing forms in those areas. This will limit the quantity of additional housing that can occur in these areas.

Other areas of Frankston Central however, could have their neighbourhood character strengthened by changes to the housing stock due to changes to the built form encouraged by Council’s strategies such as the Frankston Project. If this change is to occur, the challenge then becomes in managing it in a manner that alleviates community concerns over the quality, scale and density of developments.
Frankston Heights

**Population (1996):** 13,738  
**Number of dwellings (1996):** 5,132  
**Average household Size (1996):** 2.62 persons

**Household Composition/Population**  
Households of families with young families making up 20%, mature families 5.8% and emerging empty nesters 12.8%. Young families have fallen from 33% in 1991 to 20% in 1996. (This is also reflected in the growth from 1991 –1996 of people aged 45-64 and 65+ and the fall in 0-17 year olds.

The area is projected to grow by 457 persons from 1996- 2011 with a slight decline in household size to 2.56 persons.

**Dwelling Type**  
Predominance of separate houses with 84.9% of this type, with 13.6% medium density in 1996 and this number has grown to 2001.

NB. The tables below include all of Frankston (comprising Frankston Central, Frankston Heights, Karingal).

**1996 Census – Dwelling Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate dwellings</td>
<td>11,988</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached (incl. Row/terrace)</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat, apartment</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total medium density</td>
<td>3,001</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/not stated</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (dwellings)</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,405</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2001 Council Rate base – Dwelling Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House - structure unidentified</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Brick</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Brick Veneer</td>
<td>9,443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frankston City [Housing Strategy]

House - Clad 377
House - Concrete 72
House - Fibro Cement 270
House - Weatherboard 1,519

SEPARATE HOUSE - TOTAL 11,889 75.1%

In House Flat 3
Flat/OYO Unit 3,730
Retirement Unit 221
Retirement Village - Apartment 0

MEDIUM DENSITY - TOTAL 3,951 24.9%

Subdivisional Land 0

TOTAL 15,840

Vacant Residential Lots 222

Frankston (Frankston Central, Frankston Heights, Karingal) comprises a significant proportion of the housing in Frankston City. The suburb also contains a high proportion of medium density housing. This is logical given the location of the Frankston CBD and associated transport and retail facilities. While the suburb has similar proportions of medium density housing to Seaford, higher proportions of medium density development are concentrated in the Frankston Central area. The majority of residential development between 1996 and 2001 appears to have been in the form of medium density dwellings. This is logical given the lack of remnant broadhectare land available in Frankston (the suburb).

Restrictive Covenants

Restrictive covenants covering 215 lots exist in the Heatherhill Road area. (Shaded area below)

Dwelling Quantity

Projected minimal growth of dwelling stock from 5,207 to 5,378 from 2001 – 2011.

Housing Tenure

High rates of home ownership (40.4%) and those buying their house (35.0%)
**Residential Lot Size**

Lots of 500-800m² predominate making up approximately 77% of lots in Frankston Heights (3,409) while 12.5% (551) are less than 300m².

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>Residential 1</th>
<th>Residential 2</th>
<th>Low Density Residential</th>
<th>Environmental Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;300 m²</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-500 m²</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-800 m²</td>
<td>3,153</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-1200 m²</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200 m² - 1 ha</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ha +</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,343</strong></td>
<td><strong>793</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 215 lots are subject to covenants prohibiting the construction of additional dwellings on the lot

While the large majority of residential lots in Frankston Heights are in Residential 1 zones, the area also has a large supply of Residential 2 land, generally around the Monash University campus. As with most areas, the 500-800m² lots are the most numerous, although some unit developments are located in the area, with over 500 lots smaller than 300m².
**Zoning**

Residential 1 and Residential 2 (around Monash University)

**Health and Well Being Indicators**

- High %’s attending secondary/uni and TAFE courses
- Only 7.9% households without a car
- Low unemployment at 8.7% compared to 9.8% for Frankston
- Lower than the Frankston average number of single parent families
- Households spending more than 25% of their income on housing is lower than the Frankston average
- Lower than the Frankston average of families/households in the lowest income quartile

**Infrastructure and Land Capability**

- Water Supply: No significant constraints
- Sewerage: No significant constraints
- Drainage: No significant constraints

**Identified Strategic Directions**

- Identified for housing
- Increased housing densities are encouraged around Monash University

**Locational Opportunities and Constraints**

- Opportunities: Student population and facilities of Monash University
- Constraints: Lack of frequency of public transport

**Affordability**

The median house price for Frankston is $119,000 in 1999. (a combination of Frankston Central, Heights and Karingal).

**Special Housing Needs**

A need for a greater range of housing options more appropriate to people’s needs and circumstances.

A need to improve the quality of housing that is available indicated in lower cost rental private and public (including good quality housing for students).

Indications for increasing pressure on the demand for housing support services and short term or crisis accommodation.

**Dwelling Stock Quality**

Dwelling stock of the area is of mixed quality with variations in condition although similar in age.

There is a population decrease to 2011 expected in this area for people in younger age groups, however, it is expected that this area will have moderate growth for 56 to 69 year olds and the frail aged (80+). This has implications in the services that they require such as:

- HACC and accommodation and issues of safety; and
- Provision of formal and informal meeting places.

Other needs expressed by the local community include:

- Additional housing requirements for students of Monash University;
- Reassessment of the current network to provide a more multi-purpose facility tending to the needs of older people, and other age groups;
- Need for greater co-ordination within council functions and local service providers;
• decrease the number of kindergartens and upgrade them into multi purpose community centres; these could also include parental guidance support services for families and children;
• provide space for skateboards, bikes in parks and areas in which young people can feel comfortable in just “hanging out” preferably using input from the people who are going to be using it; and
• more awareness of areas that need footpath upgrade and safe pedestrian crossings; and
• increase in home care for disabled residents.

The following issues were identified for specific groups:

Aged
• Increase social opportunities
• Improve access/mobility support through improved transport
• Increase services such as meals on wheels, home help and carer support

Family and Children
• Despite the decrease in numbers, there is still the need for maintenance of current services available
• Need of parental guidance, dispute resolution/education

Youth
• Need for greater space for informal recreation
• Need for housing for Monash University students that is close to public transport

Disability
• General mobility and access issues
• Need for home based support services

Trends for Frankston Heights

If current trends persist, Frankston Heights will continue to ‘age in place’ and mature as families move through the family cycle. Population decline is forecast in the child, teenage and young adult age groups, while an increase is expected in the retiree age groups as the large numbers of 35-49 year olds age over the next ten years. This will result in a decline in young family households and an increase in the emerging empty nesters and empty nesters.

Limited development sites mean that new housing will be largely in the form of medium density development. Lot sizes mean this type of development is possible.

Impact of Neighbourhood Character

The neighbourhood character in Frankston Heights requires consideration of elements such as mature vegetation cover or treed skylines, and front fence treatment. It is likely that neighbourhood character policies will be able to protect these valued characteristics without any significant impacts on the projected dwelling construction to 2011.
Frankston North

Population (1996): 6,167  
Number of dwellings (1996): 2,333  
Average household size (1996): 2.61 persons

Household Composition/Population

Highest percentage of one parent families of Frankston (18.7%).  
High rates of empty and emerging nesters. 1/3 of the population is aged 45 years or more. Significant losses of 18-24, and 25-34 year olds between 1991 and 1996.  
Population is forecast to decline by ~120 people between 1996 and 2011 as a result of stable dwelling stock.  
Average household size is expected to fall slightly to 2.54 persons.

Dwelling Type

Frankston North has the highest percentage of separate housing in Frankston City with 95.1%. Only minimal medium density 3.2% in 1996. 2001 Council rate base shows a slight decline in the amount of separate houses to 94.4%.

1996 Census – Dwelling Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate dwellings</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached (incl. Row/terrace/townhouse)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat, apartment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total medium density</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/not stated</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (dwellings)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,405</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2001 Council Rate base – Dwelling Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House - structure unidentified</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Brick</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Brick Veneer</td>
<td>1,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Clad</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frankston North has a generally uniform type of housing, both in type and in lot size. Medium density housing comprises a relatively small component of housing in the suburb. There appears to be some discrepancy between the number of medium density units at the 1996 Census and in the Council rate base. This can perhaps be explained by the definition of dwellings used by Census collectors in the area.

**Restrictive Covenants**

There are no restrictive covenants that will restrict the development of housing in this area.

**Dwelling Quantity**

There are currently 2,374 residential lots with only 4 vacant residential lots.

Dwelling stock is forecast to remain largely the same to 2011.

**Housing Tenure**

Large percentage of households are purchasing 46.5% (nearly as high as Carrum Downs and Langwarrin) however there are much higher rental rates than these areas (26.9%)

**Residential Lot Size**

Lots of 500-800m2 predominate with 5,205 lots or 82.6% of the R1 and R2 zones. 501 lots are 800m2 or larger in the R1 ad R2 Zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House - Concrete</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Fibro Cement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Weatherboard</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEPARATE HOUSE - TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In House Flat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat/OYO Unit</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Unit</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Village - Apartment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEDIUM DENSITY - TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subdivisional Land - Englobo</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Residential Lots</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2,240 | 94.4%

134 | 5.6%

2,374
Frankston North is the smallest of the small areas of Frankston City with around 2,300 lots. All residential land in Frankston North is zoned Residential 1, with the overwhelming majority of these lots being between 500 and 800m² in size. This lot size profile is consistent with an area that developed in a relatively short period of time.

### Zoning

- **Residential 1**

### Health and Well Being Indicators

- 25% of population under 15 years
- 44.8% left school at 15 years or less. Very high compared to the MSD.
- Higher level of households with no car 13.2% compared to 10.1% for all of Frankston.
• High levels of unemployment (17.8%)
• High percentage of single parent families (19.4%).
• High % of households spending more than 25% of income on housing (12.8% - Frankston City 6.5%)
• Around a third of households/families are in the lowest income quartile (nil to $370 per week before tax)

**Infrastructure and Land Capability**

- Water Supply: No significant constraints
- Sewerage: No significant constraints
- Drainage: No significant constraints

**Identified Strategic Directions**

- Identified for housing

**Locational Opportunities and Constraints**

- **Opportunities:** Affordable housing, good access to park and recreation facilities.
- **Constraints:** Isolated physically by the Dandenong-Frankston Road.

**Affordability**

- The median house price in Frankston North in 1999 was $80,000 making it Frankston's most affordable suburb.

**Special Housing Needs**

- A need for a greater range of housing options more appropriate to people's needs and circumstances.

  - Indications of high levels of financial housing stress
  - A need to improve the quality of housing that is available indicated in lower cost rental private and public (including good quality housing for students).
  - Indications for increasing pressure on the demand for housing support services and short term or crisis accommodation.

**Dwelling Stock Quality**

- Developed largely by the Housing Commission in the 50’s and 60’s, some of the housing stock is beginning to deteriorate.

Whilst there is no overall population increase expected here, there is an expected slight increase in older adults. This results in an increased need for the elderly services, including:

• access to health, increased meeting areas to reduce the feeling of isolation etc; and
• greater household opportunities suiting the specific needs of older adults.

Other needs expressed include:

• the youth need to somehow create a more positive atmosphere and increase their sense of safety, which may be achieved with increased positive police interaction with young people;
• locally based alcohol, gambling, psychological etc counselling services for adults;
• assistance in redesigning landscapes for pedestrians and a cycle path from Monterey Secondary School to Karingal neighbourhood. The area needs to be promoted as an ideal location for affordable housing especially for families;
• improved streetscape design around existing shops, and improve the public safety during and after business hours; and
- improve The Pines swimming pool and enable access to disabled persons also for disabled persons, detection of areas that need footpath upgrade and safe pedestrian crossings is necessary.

Issues identified for specific groups in the area include:

**Aged**
- Modification of existing home or alternative accommodation
- Increase support services to match growth in number of frail aged

**Family and Children**
- Perceived and actual safety concerns
- Established network of social and transport facilities
- Need for range of life skills education and counselling programmes

**Youth**
- Improve recreational opportunities and facilities
- Need for dispute/youth support services locally and promotion of services available
- Need for range of life skills education and counselling programmes

**Disabled**
- General mobility and access issues

**Trends for Frankston North**

If current trends continue without intervention, Frankston North’s population will largely ‘age in place’. The largest forecasts are for the retiree and frail aged age groups with significant declines in the number of young family households in particular.

The lack of residential development opportunities in the area will contribute to the ‘ageing in place’. Single detached houses on large blocks will remain the dominant housing form. There have been little signs of pressure for redevelopment and medium density housing in the area even though the area is very affordable. The selling of the houses by the State government to private owners may result in some improvement of the housing stock, however low socio-economic circumstances of many of the residents may mean that this occurs over a longer period of time.

**Impact of Neighbourhood Character**

The Neighbourhood character in Frankston North requires consideration of elements such as horizontal emphasis of dwelling form, front gardens open to the street and an emerging garden character. It is likely that the Neighbourhood character will be able to protect these valued characteristics without any significant impact on projected dwelling construction to 2011 and could assist in developing the emerging garden character.
Frankston South

**Population (1996):** 14,488

**Number of dwellings (1996):** 5,172

**Average household Size (1996):** 2.53 persons

### Household Composition / Population

Maturing Housing Market

Most significant housing market indicator in Frankston South in the high percentage of old and lone persons (13.3%) and empty (11.3%) and emerging empty nesters (13.9%). There are still a number of young families (17.1%) and mature families (5.9%). Young families have dropped from 30.4% in 1991 and it would seem likely that this number will be even lower when the results of the 2001 Census are released.

Age structures have seen increases in the 45-64 and 65+ age groups.

Population is expected to grow only marginally between 1996 and 2011 with an increase of 718 people in that time period.

Average household size is expected to drop to 2.34 persons.

### Dwelling Type

Separate houses predominate with 86.0% with medium density making up 10.9% of the housing stock. The level of medium density housing appears to have grown to around 14% in 2001 (according to the Council Rate Base).

#### 1996 Census – Dwelling Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate dwellings</td>
<td>5,021</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached (incl. Row/terrace/townhouse)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat, apartment</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total medium density</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/not stated</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (dwellings)</strong></td>
<td>5,835</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2001 Council Rate base – Dwelling Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Frankston City  

House - structure unidentified  25  
House - Brick  105  
House - Brick Veneer  4,475  
House - Clad  41  
House - Concrete  18  
House - Fibro Cement  40  
House - Weatherboard  554  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEPARATE HOUSE - TOTAL</th>
<th>5,258</th>
<th>86.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In House Flat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat/OYO Unit</td>
<td>441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Unit</td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Village - Apartment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEDIUM DENSITY - TOTAL</th>
<th>856</th>
<th>14.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subdivisional Land - Englobo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>6,115</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant Residential Lots</th>
<th>270</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Frankston South has a similar proportion of medium density housing compared to Frankston City overall. The suburb itself ranges from normal density development closer to Frankston to lower density forms of development closer to Mount Eliza. Much of the medium density development in the suburb is in the form of retirement village apartments, many of these being part of the Village Baxter. The number of both medium density dwellings and separate houses appear to have increased since 1996.

**Restrictive Covenant**  
Restrictive covenants covering 200 blocks exist in the Kars St area.  
(Shown shaded below)

**Dwelling Quantity**  
There were 5,835 dwellings in the area in 1996.  
Forecast growth in dwellings of 386 dwellings between 2001 and
Frankston South has the highest rate of home ownership in all of Frankston City with 45.5% owning their own home. It also has the lowest rental tenure with only 12.5% of households renting houses in the area.

**Residential Lot Size**

Of the Residential 1 Zone, lots of 500-800m² predominates with 2,811 lots. 46.6% of lots (2940) are 800m² or larger.

- 200 lots are subject to covenants prohibiting the construction of additional dwellings on the lot.
Residential lots in Frankston South are almost exclusively zoned Residential 1. The exception being the Environmental Rural zones in the Golf Links Road and Stott Lane area. Frankston South has the lowest residential densities in Frankston City, with around half of the residential lots being larger than 800m². These lot sizes are generally similar to neighbouring Mount Eliza.

**Zoning**

- Residential 1
- Environmental Rural (in Golf Links Rd and Stott Lane area)

**Health and Well Being Indicators**

- High % 65+ age groups
- High % attending education institutions
- High 5 of people nominate as having a religion particularly Anglican and Uniting Church.
- Low unemployment rates
- Low % of single parent families
- High levels of car ownership
- Low % of households spending 25% or more of their income on housing
- 23.4% of families are in the lowest income quartile

**Infrastructure and Land Capability**

- Water Supply: No significant constraints
- Sewerage: No significant constraints
- Drainage: No significant constraints
- Land constraints exist in the Oliver’s Hill area where the land is subject to slippage

**Identified Strategic Directions**

- Identified for housing
- Maintaining and enhancing the low density treed character
- Protection of the landscape qualities of the escarpment that defines the northern edge of the Mornington Peninsula.

**Locational Opportunities and Constraints**

- Opportunities: Views
- Constraints: Increasing pressure to maximise opportunities for sea views without affecting tree coverage
- Maintaining tree coverage

**Affordability**

- Frankston’s least affordable suburb

**Special Housing Needs**

- A need for a greater range of housing options more appropriate to people’s needs and circumstances.
- A need to improve the quality of housing that is available indicated in lower cost rental private and public (including good quality housing for students).
- Indications for increasing pressure on the demand for housing support services and short term or crisis accommodation.

**Dwelling Stock Quality**

- Dwelling stock of the area is generally of good quality.
There is not much expected population growth in this area between 1996 to 2011, however it is expected that there will be significant increase in 56 to 69 year olds. As a result there will be:

- issues of traffic safety;
- need for increased level of aged care support for both residents and visitors;
- identification of “black spots” and establishment of a remedial treatment program, including driver care;
- greater household opportunities that suit the specific needs of older adults; and
- increase provision and promote awareness of supported transport service.

Other needs expressed include:

- establishment of remedial treatment programs;
- access to café facilities with childcare minding centres as a means of getting parents to socialise;
- development of promotional strategies to endorse Frankston South as an ideal location for families and their children;
- promotion of parenting and youth issues and provision of access to counselling services;
- provision of enough space on the footpaths to allow all users (skateboards, bikes) space to get around;
- areas in which young people can feel comfortable in just “hanging out”; and
- to locate areas that need footpath upgrade and safe pedestrian crossings are necessary for disabled members of society.

Issues identified for specific groups include:

**Aged**

- Home care support, carer support, special accommodation needs
- Traffic management, pedestrian safety (prevent falls), special transport needs
- Access to specialist medical needs
- Areas in which they can socialise with access to the services they require.

**Family and Children**

- Pedestrian Safety
- Social Opportunities
- Use of exiting facilities

**Youth**

- Recognise that young people need to “hang out” and allow them to do so and feel comfortable about it.
- Parental guidance, dispute resolution and life skills counselling services

**Disabled**

- General mobility and access issues continue to work upon this good foundation
Trends for Frankston South

If current trends persist, Frankston South will continue to mature as its population ages and families move through the final stages of the family cycle. Development in the Stott’s Lane area estates will stem the loss of population through the declining household sizes in the older areas of Frankston South. The area will continue to attract households that have accumulated enough wealth to afford the real estate (third and fourth home buyers). These households are typically mature families with older children/teenagers and retired couples.

Empty nesters and older lone persons may choose to age in their homes. As many of the blocks and houses are large, residents may find their properties increasingly difficult to maintain. Medium density housing will continue to grow to serve the needs of the shrinking households and as households capitalise on their properties to fund their retirement.

Impact of Neighbourhood Character

There is a strong neighbourhood character identified in Frankston South with some areas containing a strong landscape character due to vegetated landscapes (native and exotic), and location by the coast. This will place limitations on the development of new housing in those areas of Frankston South. Some areas to the north and east may be capable of accommodating some change which enhances or strengthens the neighbourhood character.
Langwarrin/Langwarrin South

Population (1996): 14,872
Number of dwellings (1996): 3,857
Average household size (1996): 2.85 persons

Household Composition/Population
High proportion of young families 29.3% and mature families (7.5%). Growing numbers of emerging empty nesters (11.6%).

4,880 people or 32.8% re aged 0 –17 years and 25-34 (18.3%) and 35-44 (17.9%). Significant growth in 45 – 64 year olds between 1991-1996.

Population is expected to grow by 4,272 people between 1996 and 2011.

Average household size is expected to fall slightly to 2.78 persons.

Dwelling Type
89.9% of housing is separate housing with a growth in medium density housing between 1991-96 (most likely new development not conversion of old) which appears to have continued into 2001 with 11.6% now estimated to make up medium density housing.

1996 Census – Dwelling Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate dwellings</td>
<td>4,667</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached (incl. Row/terrace/townhouse)</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat, apartment</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total medium density</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/not stated</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (dwellings)</td>
<td>5,189</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2001 Council Rate base – Dwelling Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House - structure unidentified</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Brick</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Brick Veneer</td>
<td>4,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Clad</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Langwarrin/Langwarrin South has a relatively small proportion of medium density housing. This would be expected in what is probably the least ‘urban’ small area within Frankston City. While the numbers of both medium density and separate houses have increased since 1996, it appears that medium density housing has increased at a higher rate than separate houses.

**Dwelling Quantity**
There are currently 5,438 dwellings, with an estimated 601 residential lots vacant.

**Housing Tenure**
Projections are that an additional 1,258 dwellings will be developed between 2001 and 2011.

**Residential Lot Size**
554 lots of less than 300m2 in Res 1 Zone
1672 lots in Res 1 zone are 800m2 or greater with 59 sites of 1 ha or more
Lots of 500-800m2 predominate with 3,358 lots or 56.8% of lots zoned Res 1.
2/3 sites in Low Density Residential Zone are 1 ha or more.
Most of the sites in the Environmental Rural Zone are over 1 ha.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lot size</th>
<th>Residential 1</th>
<th>Residential 2</th>
<th>Low Density Residential</th>
<th>Environmental Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;300 m²</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-500m²</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-800m²</td>
<td>3,358</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-1200m²</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200m²-1ha</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ha +</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5,910</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the majority of residential lots in Langwarrin/Langwarrin South are less than 800m², there are substantial areas developed for low density residential uses. Langwarrin/Langwarrin South has the largest number of low density lots in Frankston City.

**Zoning**
- Residential 1
- Low Density Residential
- Environmental Rural
Health and Well Being Indicators

- High percentage under 15 years (27.8%).
- High rates of secondary school attendance and TAFE
- Very small percentage of households without a car (2.8%)
- Low rates of unemployment 5.7% compared to 9.8% for all of Frankston
- Lower than Frankston’s average for single parent households
- Higher than MSD but less that Frankston households spending more than 25% of their income on housing
- Low percentage of families/households in the income quartile 13.7% (Frankston City 26.9%)

Infrastructure and Land Capability

Water Supply: No significant constraints
Sewerage: No significant constraints
Drainage: No significant constraints

Identified Strategic Directions

- Identified for housing
- Land to the east separates the Frankston urban corridor from the south eastern urban growth corridor. (Drainage catchment boundaries have generally been used to define the western edge of the rural area in the City).

Locational Opportunities and Constraints

Constraints: Lack of access to public transport
Opportunities: Potential longer term opportunity for additional land to be converted to residential uses as existing extraction areas in the north of Langwarrin come to the end of their use.

Affordability

Median house prices in the area are $129,725 (1999) making it Frankston’s least affordable area.

Special Housing Needs

A need for a greater range of housing options more appropriate to people’s needs and circumstances.

A need to improve the quality of housing that is available indicated in lower cost rental private and public (including good quality housing for students).

Indications for increasing pressure on the demand for housing support services and short term or crisis accommodation.

Dwelling Stock Quality

Generally very good, with most development recently constructed.

There is moderate growth expected amongst the numbers of young people in this area, however the population growth amongst older citizens is expected to be much more significant. As a result, services facilities required include:

- increase in HACC services;
- better access to health;
- improved pedestrian paths;
- disabled access locations to shops; and
- public transport access etc.

Other requirements noted include:
• Lloyd Park should be redeveloped to provide more facilities to meet the needs of the wider community, it could have an area designated for younger people to use as a skate park; and
• an acknowledgment of the areas that require improvement in access for disabled persons.

Issues identified for specific groups include:

Aged
• Need for recreational opportunities
• Need for greater housing choice
• Increased demand for aged services

Family and Children
• Anticipated need for parental guidance, gambling and dispute resolution support services

Youth
• Need for alternate recreational opportunity

Disability
• General improved access for people with disabilities

Trends for Langwarrin/Langwarrin South

If current trends persist, Langwarrin will continue (along with Carrum Downs) to provide the most significant growth in households and population in terms of absolute numbers in Frankston City. It will continue to attract young and mature families along with some increases in the empty nester and elderly age groups due to the ageing in place of the first to settle in the suburban subdivisions over 30 years ago. The most significant growth will be in mature family households and relatively stable populations in the young children, 25-39 and elderly age groups. Overall a change from ‘young’ and ‘mature’ families to ‘mature’ families is expected by 2011.

Land that is currently zoned for Residential 1 and 2 will be largely subdivided over the next 10 years providing the 1,258 dwellings that are forecast for the area. Most of the housing stock will reflect traditional housing forms and provide a mix of lot sizes.

Langwarrin’s land within the Low Density Residential Zone will continue to subdivide into smaller 1ha lots.

Impact of Neighbourhood Character

In the newly establishing areas of Langwarrin, a new neighbourhood character is being established. Consideration does need to be given to significant stands of native vegetation, which provide a visual backdrop to the emerging character. Therefore the neighbourhood character places minimal constraint on the housing development in this area. In areas such as Langwarrin South, the rural and bushland qualities of the area require maintenance and enhancement placing limitations on housing design. However minimum lot sizes will assist in maintaining the neighbourhood character. It is likely that neighbourhood character policies will be able to protect the valued characteristics without any significant impact on the dwelling construction to 2011.
**Karingal**

**Population (1996):** 14,003  
**Number of dwellings (1996):** 5,503  
**Average household Size (1996):** 2.58 persons

**Household Composition/Population**  
Karingal is beginning to mature with growing rates of empty nesters (9.9%) and emerging empty nesters (13.8%) and drops in the % of young families from 1991 to 1996 (27.7% down to 16.4%). Small growth has occurred over the period of old lone persons, group households and one parent families. Population increases in the age groups of 45-64 and 65+ with declines in all other age groups over the period 1991 – 1996. Population is expected to decline by 327 people between 1996 and 2011. Average household size is expected to decrease to 2.38 persons.

**Dwelling Type**  
Significant proportion of separate houses 87.0% with 8.4% medium density. This percentage may have grown slightly since 1996.

NB. The tables below include figures for the whole of Frankston (comprising Frankston Central, Frankston Heights, Karingal).

**1996 Census – Dwelling Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate dwellings</td>
<td>11,988</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached (incl. Row/terrace/townhouse)</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat, apartment</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total medium density</td>
<td>3,001</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/not stated</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (dwellings)</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,405</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2001 Council Rate base – Dwelling Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House - structure unidentified</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Brick</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frankston City [Housing Strategy]

| House - Brick Veneer       | 9,443 |
| House - Clad               | 377   |
| House - Concrete           | 72    |
| House - Fibro Cement       | 270   |
| House - Weatherboard       | 1,519 |

**SEPARATE HOUSE - TOTAL** 11,889 75.1%

| In House Flat              | 3     |
| Flat/OYO Unit              | 3,730 |
| Retirement Unit            | 221   |
| Retirement Village - Apartment | 0   |

**MEDIUM DENSITY - TOTAL** 3,951 24.9%

| Subdivisional Land - Englobo | 0     |

**TOTAL** 15,840

**Vacant Residential Lots** 222

Frankston (Frankston Central, Frankston Heights, Karingal) comprises a significant proportion of the housing in Frankston City. The suburb also contains a high proportion of medium density housing. This is logical given the location of the Frankston CBD and associated transport and retail facilities. While the suburb has similar proportions of medium density housing to Seaford, higher proportions of medium density development are concentrated in the Frankston Central area. The majority of residential development between 1996 and 2001 appears to have been in the form of medium density dwellings. This is logical given the lack of remnant broadhectare land available in Frankston (the suburb).

**Restrictive Covenants**
There are no restrictive covenants that would limit the redevelopment of the area.

**Dwelling Quantity**
There were 5,503 dwellings in Karingal in 1996. Projections are that an 208 dwellings will be developed between 2001 and 2011.

**Housing Tenure**
High levels of home ownership (40.1%) with 33.6% buying and 21.6% renting.

**Residential Lot Size**
Approximately 1/7 of lots are zoned R2 (930 of 4,721 lots). Over 100 lots in the R2 zone are 800m2 or larger. Predominance of lots are 500-800m2 with some unit development with over 400 lots less than 300m2.
While the large majority of residential lots in Karingal are in Residential 1 zones, the area also has a large supply of Residential 2 land, generally north of Beach Street and Cranbourne Road. As with most areas, the 500-800m² lots are the most numerous, although some unit developments are located in the area, with over 400 lots smaller than 300m².

**Zoning**

- Residential 1
- Residential 2 (north side of Beach St and Cranbourne Road)

**Health and Well Being Indicators**

- High percentage attending educational institutions
- 9.6% of households are without a car
- High unemployment (10.8%) compared to Frankston Central
• High percentage of single parent family households (14.4%)
• 5.6% of households are spending more that 25% of their income on housing
• 25.8% of households in the lowest income quartile

Infrastructure and Land Capability
Water Supply: No significant constraints
Sewerage: No significant constraints
Drainage: No significant constraints

Identified Strategic Directions
• Identified for housing
• Increased housing densities are encouraged north of Beach and Cranbourne Roads

Locational Opportunities and Constraints
Opportunities: Good access to schools and facilities
Constraints: Lack of frequency of public transport

Affordability
The median house price for Frankston is $119,000 in 1999. (a combination of Frankston Central, Frankston Heights and Karingal).

Special Housing Needs
A need for a greater range of housing options more appropriate to people’s needs and circumstances.
A need to improve the quality of housing that is available indicated in lower cost rental private and public (including good quality housing for students).
Indications for increasing pressure on the demand for housing support services and short term or crisis accommodation.

Dwelling Stock Quality
The dwelling stock is generally good quality.

There is a small decline in younger age groups forecast, and just like other neighbourhoods, an increase in older age groups, especially in the frail aged category. As the older population is increasing, the implications include:

• increasing older adult needs (eg increase HACC services, access to health and meeting spaces, pavement repair to decrease falls etc); and
• redevelopment of current facilities to cater for the ageing population, but also to meet the needs of a wider range of residents.

Other needs expressed include:

• more interaction between police and school children to address various issues that the youth may face;
• recreation strategies need to be improved in order to be able to provide the younger residents with better equipped recreation spaces;
• footpath upgrade and safe pedestrian crossings; and
• increased home care and better disabled parking access.

The following issues were identified for specific groups:

Aged
• Need for recreational opportunities to promote a community meeting place for them, to avoid isolation
• Greater need for housing choice

Family and Children
• Address concerns about availability of facilities
• Playground supervision at schools
• Family and youth counselling, with the major issues being drug use, gambling and conflict resolution

Youth
• Need for a greater number of formal and informal recreational facilities
• Need for aquatic centre and gym

Disabled
• General improved access for people with disabilities to assist in independent mobility
• Appropriate design of disabled car park at local shopping centres

Trends for Karingal
If current trends persist, Karingal will continue to ‘mature’ as a suburb with families ageing and moving through the emerging empty nester and the empty nesters phases of the household cycle. This is due to the children of this area (settled largely in the 1960s) now being aged in their twenties and likely to leave home over the next ten years. This will create an increase in the empty nester households and a decline in the household size for the area.

Limited development sites mean that new housing development will be in the form of new medium density dwellings.

Impact of Neighbourhood Character
The neighbourhood character in Karingal requires consideration of elements such as the sense of openness and the backdrop of native trees. It is likely that Neighbourhood character policies will be able to protect these valued characteristics without any significant impact on projected dwelling construction to 2011.
Seaford

Population (1996): 16,049
Number of dwellings (1996): 6,569
Average household Size (1996): 2.39 persons

Household Composition
Seaford has a diversity of households, however it is characterised by a significant ageing of the population and households shrinking. Rising percentages of Seaford’s households are now in the empty nesters (9.3%), old lone persons (9.7%) and emerging empty nesters (9.9%) phases. Also a significant number of 18-24 year olds with group households and young lone person households also significant (4.2% and 5.6%).

Population is expected to increase by 1,043 to 17,680 people between 1996 and 2011.

Average household size is projected to fall to 2.29 persons.

Dwelling Type
Seaford has the highest proportion of medium density housing if any suburb within Frankston City with 25% of housing stock classified as medium density.

1996 Census – Dwelling Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate dwellings</td>
<td>5,267</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached (incl. Row/terrace/townhouse)</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat, apartment</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total medium density</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/not stated</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (dwellings)</td>
<td>6,911</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2001 Council Rate base – Dwelling Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House - structure unidentified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House - Brick</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
House - Brick Veneer 3,576
House - Clad 249
House - Concrete 58
House - Fibro Cement 164
House - Weatherboard 944

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEPARATE HOUSE - TOTAL</td>
<td>5,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In House Flat</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat/OYO Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Village - Apartment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM DENSITY - TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivisional Land - Englobo</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Residential Lots</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seaford has the highest proportion of medium density housing of any suburb within Frankston City. This is consistent with the area’s coastal location and access to transport. There appears to be a significant increase in medium density housing from 1996 to 2001, however problems with classification of dwellings at the 1996 Census is the likely cause rather than dwelling construction and demolition.

**Dwelling Quantity**

There are currently 6,624 residential lots, with 123 vacant residential lots.

Projections are that an additional 400 dwellings will be developed between 2001 and 2011.

**Housing Tenure**

36.0% of households own their home while 23.9% are renting, and 33.2% are buying.

**Residential Lot Size**

Lots of 500-800m² predominate with 4,496 lots or 68%. There are 776 lots greater than 800m². Over 100 lots are smaller than 300m².
While the large majority of residential lots in Seaford are in Residential 1 zones, the area also has a large supply of Residential 2 land, generally around Seaford and Kananook railway stations and the foreshore. As with most areas, the 500-800m² lots are the most numerous, although significant numbers of unit developments are located in the area, with over 1,000 lots smaller than 300m².

**Properties by Size (sq m)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lot size</th>
<th>Residential 1</th>
<th>Residential 2</th>
<th>Low Density Residential</th>
<th>Environmental Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;300m²</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-500m²</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-800m²</td>
<td>4,047</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-1200m²</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200m²-1ha</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ha +</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,917</strong></td>
<td><strong>707</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Zoning**

Residential 1

Residential 2 along the foreshore to just before Station St, an area
Health and Well Being Indicators

- High levels of unemployment compared to MSD (12.9% vs 9.1%).
- High % of families/households earning less than $370 per week (before tax).
- High % left school at 15 or before (35.1%).

Infrastructure and Land Capability

Water Supply: No significant constraints
Sewerage: No significant constraints
Drainage: No significant constraints (however development should be elevated above the 100 year flood level)

Identified Strategic Directions

Increasing housing densities around Kananook Railway Station and along the coastal strip between Seaford and Frankston

Locational Opportunities and Constraints

Opportunities: Well located, close to Seaford and Kananook Railway Stations and shops
Constraints: Close to desired beachside location and sea views

Affordability

The median house price in 1999 was $115,200.

Special Housing Needs

A need for a greater range of housing options more appropriate to people’s needs and circumstances.

Indications of high levels of financial housing stress
A need to improve the quality of housing that is available indicated in lower cost rental private and public (including good quality housing for students).

Indications for increasing pressure on the demand for housing support services and short term or crisis accommodation. (Caravan Parks in the area provide a vital source of affordable and crisis accommodation for the Frankston area. Their location puts them under significant pressure.)

Dwelling Stock Quality

Some of the dwelling stock particularly along the foreshore and nearby is of poorer quality having been constructed as holiday homes throughout the last century. In other areas the stock is recently constructed and of good quality.

There is a small increase in population expected between 1996 and 2011, especially in older adult population. As a result of this, issues raised have included:

- more safety, which could include increased lighting and modifying of landscape near Seaford Community centre;
- an increase in the level of aged care support for both residents and visitors;
- identification of “black spots” and establishment of remedial treatment program;
- establishment of driver care programs, greater household opportunities that suit the specific needs of older adults;
- an increased provision and promotion of awareness of supported transport service would become necessary for older citizens; and
location of the areas that need footpath upgrade and safe pedestrian crossings has been raised by people with disabilities.

Other needs expressed include:

- there should be some consideration given to the upgrading and broader use of primary schools;
- there should be improvement of pedestrian facilities around Seaford and there should be greater use of Seaford community centre by expanding library facilities and providing community support services; and
- an increased level of local counselling and family support, which could address possible solutions to vandalism at the Seaford skateboarding facility.

The following issues are identified for specific groups:

**Aged**

- Significant growth in number of older adults, with support services and housing implications being priority
- Need to address perception of crime

**Family and Children**

- Some growth in school aged children
- Need for parental guidance, dispute resolution services
- Need for informal and no-cost recreation opportunities
- Address lack of rental accommodation
- Need to address perception of crime
- Need for assistance for longer term unemployed and with gambling problems

**Youth**

- Need for informal and no-cost recreation opportunities
- Need to address perception of crime

**Disability**

- General mobility and access issues

**Trends for Seaford**

If current trends continue without intervention, Seaford’s diverse households will continue to ‘mature’ and ‘age in place’ with households generally shrinking with increasing age of residents forming the empty nesters and old lone persons. The level of housing development activity will attract new households to Seaford, keeping the total population at a stable level, but will not significantly impact on the ageing of the suburb by the current residents.

The foreshore along the Nepean Highway will be largely redeveloped for housing that takes advantage of sea views and the beach side location.

With most lots built on (other than 123 vacant lots), the main sources of dwellings will be multi unit developments. This will increase the number of medium density units in the area. Multi unit development will continue to occur throughout the suburb but with concentrations around the railway stations and gradually creeping east from the foreshore.
Impact of Neighbourhood Character

Many neighbourhoods of Seaford are in need of strengthening of their character elements such as the coastal bush vegetation and the 'suburb by the sea' character. Housing development would need to be undertaken in a way that is respectful of these important elements. It is likely that Neighbourhood character policies will be able to protect these valued characteristics without any significant impact on projected dwelling construction to 2011.
Continuum

The Continuum (Figure 12) provides a graphic representation of a local area’s current potential to accommodate changes to its housing pattern through an analysis of the opportunities and constraints of the area. All factors that influence the potential to provide more housing stock are listed on the continuum. The left hand side shows the ideal condition for providing more housing (or opportunities). Constraints are presented on the right hand side. Each small area is charted for each variable, providing an overall feel for the level of housing opportunity or constraint. The continuum, developed in conjunction with Frankston Council officers provides a tool to assess likely opportunities and patterns of change at the small area level.
## Figure 12: The Continuum

### OPPORTUNITIES

**Demographic**
- old lone persons/empty nesters/ emerging empty nesters

**Structural**
- grid pattern streets/large lots
- high proportion of unoccupied dwellings/vacant lots
- poor quality old dwelling stock
- urban area, good access to services, transport and employment
- affordable housing
- serviced (water, drainage & sewerage)
- diversity of dwelling types
- favourable zoning, eg Residential 2
- large ownership parcels (broadhectare)
- sparsely treed neighbourhood
- conversion & infill opportunities eg CAD office, former school sites
- Favours Interface eg ?Bay, foreshore, views

### CURRENT STATUS/POTENTIAL

### CONSTRAINTS

- young families/ mature families/single parent families
- spaghetti pattern streets/small lots
- low proportion of unoccupied dwellings/vacant lots
- heritage area/new dwelling stock
- rural area, poor access to services, transport and employment
- expensive housing
- unserviced (water, drainage & sewerage)
- predominance of single detached dwellings
- predominantly owner/purchaser tenure
- unfavourable zoning/covenants eg built form, vegetation, heritage, flooding, Eastern Treatment Plant odour overlays
- fragmented ownership (broadhectare)
- leafy garden neighbourhood
- Regional planning policies, eg Green Wedge, Mornington Peninsula
- Unfavourable Interface eg freeway, industry, Eastern Treatment Plant

### KEY TO SMALL AREAS

- Carrum Downs/Flinders
- Frankston Central
- Frankston Heights
- Frankston North
- Frankston South
- Karingal
- Langwarrin/Langwarrin South
- Seaford

AO: All others
The Future for Housing
Summary of Key Housing Issues and Trends

A number of key housing issues and trends have been highlighted in previous sections of this report which will require consideration in the development of the final strategy. The main issues facing Frankston can be summarised as:

- The population of Frankston is predicted to increase to 130,000 by the year 2011, which represents a 15,000 increase on the 2001 population.

- A majority of this population increase is projected to occur within the Carrum Downs/Skye, Langwarrin and Central Frankston areas. Other areas will either remain static or decline slightly in numbers as the population ages, unless the current trends are changed through Council or government policy.

- The age structure of the City is increasing in the 30-64 year age group in particular, with increases in the 65+ population also.

- Household size is decreasing rapidly primarily due to ageing of the population that originally moved into the area as it developed in the 1960s – 1980s.

- The significant changes to Frankston’s population need to be matched by changes to the area’s housing stock, which is overwhelmingly detached dwellings.

- Approximately 7,000 additional dwellings (from the 2001 estimate) need to be provided within the municipality by 2011 to accommodate the projected population. (This estimate may change upon release of the metropolitan strategy.)

- State and Commonwealth policies are advocating consolidation of urban areas for environmental and infrastructure cost reasons.

- Areas along the coast are experiencing significant pressure for redevelopment, including medium density housing.

- There is community concern over the design and location of medium density housing, particularly in the southern areas of the City, and a strong desire to protect and enhance neighbourhood character and residential amenity.

- Neighbourhood character places some limitations on redevelopment in some existing built up areas, particularly along the coast and in the south of the City.

- Housing affordability is declining in some areas that have traditionally provided lower cost housing.

- Some of Frankston’s residents have special housing needs that should be addressed.

- Public transport access is concentrated along the coastal areas, with the remainder of the City reliant upon buses and private transport.

- Housing issues cannot be looked at in isolation. They are intrinsically linked with issues such as urban design/neighbourhood character, infrastructure provision, accessibility and social impacts.

- The suburbs of Frankston are each serving different housing needs. Some are quite homogenous such as Carrum Downs/Skye and Langwarrin, while others such as Seaford and Frankston Central already contain a variety of housing types.

- Frankston Council is investing significantly in the revitalisation of the CAD through the Frankston Project and the Transit Cities Project. The potential of this area to provide significant additional housing, including areas identified for higher residential development, has not been realised to date.
The significant employment and other economic and social opportunities of major facilities such as Peninsula Campus of Monash University, and Chisholm TAFE in Frankston require support to ensure their staff and students can gain access to appropriate housing within Frankston City.

There is on-going pressure for development of greenfield land, and intermittent pressure for urban conversion in the greenwedge areas.

There are areas of ecological significance in the City that can be detrimentally affected by encroaching urban development or insensitive development.

There are opportunities to manage and improve the social and environmental sustainability of greenfield and major infill development.

The map overpage summarises some of these locationally based issues.

Local government is well placed to play a role in influencing the housing market. The Council has the ability, through statutory and non-statutory means, to influence, encourage, discourage, advocate for housing in certain locations or of certain types. The following sections will explore the Council's options and methods for addressing these issues.
Figure 13: Summary of Housing Issues
Housing Objectives

Based on the main themes and issues arising out of the information presented in the previous chapters and summarised above, the following Objectives for housing in Frankston have been developed. Commonwealth and State policies are implicit within the Objectives. These provide a framework for determining the most appropriate future for housing in Frankston.

Objective One

Accommodate the population growth and housing demand in the municipality in areas best suited to provide a quality living environment for the intended residents.

The City’s population is growing and the number of dwellings required to accommodate the growth is increasing at a greater rate due to decreasing household sizes, as the population ages. A high proportion of the future growth will occur as a result of in-migration, particularly by families seeking detached housing in Carrum Downs and Langwarrin. Other growth in household demand results from ageing residents seeking smaller dwellings in the area with which they are familiar. While individual choice as to the form of housing differs, the appropriate location of housing, having regard to the availability of public transport and shopping, recreational and community facilities and the likely needs of the residents must be determined.

Objective Two

Provide a diversity of housing stock for all residents of Frankston to enable a wide range of choices for residents as they progress through the life cycle.

This Objective aims to ensure that housing will meet the needs of Frankston residents now and in the future and ensure that residents have the option to remain in Frankston regardless of their life cycle stage. Frankston’s development until recently largely accommodated families in traditional housing forms of three or four bedrooms. These families are now ageing and should be provided with opportunities to remain within the City, close to their community and services and facilities.

Objective Three

Protect ecologically sensitive areas from urban development.

The protection of ecologically sensitive and significant areas from urban development and the impacts of urban development is of importance to Council and the community. Frankston has many sites of zoological and botanical significance identified through studies. The possible conflicts between urban development and these sensitive areas are already recognised within the MSS. Options for resolving these conflicts are needed.

Objective Four

Provide affordable housing options.

The provision of affordable housing options ensures that all in Frankston’s community have access to housing. The location of this housing is also very important in ensuring that residents have access to the services and facilities they require. This Objective also assists in ensuring there is a diversity of housing options within the City.
Objective Five

Manage areas targeted for redevelopment.

Areas identified for increased housing and therefore under significant pressure for redevelopment, require clear and consistent direction and management of change to ensure that the best outcomes are delivered for the community from that change. Change in any community can be very unsettling and the process needs to be managed appropriately.

Objective Six

Protect the ‘green wedge’ from urban encroachment.

The policy to maintain green wedges within the metropolitan area has been in place for some decades now and the development of the Metropolitan Strategy shows continued support for this policy direction. This requires ensuring that competing pressures to develop and use land in the green wedge are balanced and resolved.

Objective Seven

Provide for the special housing needs of the City’s residents.

Frankston has a number of groups within the City whose housing needs require special consideration. There is a need for a greater range of housing options more appropriate to the variety of people’s needs and circumstances. There is increasing pressure on the demand for housing support services and short-term or crisis accommodation and a need to improve the quality of housing that is available. There are also indications of possible high levels of financial housing stress in particular local areas that need addressing.

Objective Eight

Ensure new development respects and enhances the preferred character of Frankston City’s neighbourhoods.

New development needs to respect the character of the neighbourhood which is highly valued by residents and contributes to people’s sense of place. An understanding of the elements that contribute to the neighbourhood character and design responses will assist in ensuring that new development does not diminish the character of a neighbourhood.

Objective Nine

Coordinate new development to ensure the efficient use and timely provision of social and physical infrastructure.

Communities require large amounts of physical and social infrastructure to enable them to function. There is a large investment in infrastructure in existing areas. The provision of new infrastructure is expensive particularly in fringe areas. Existing infrastructure should be capitalised upon where possible to ensure its timely and efficient use.

Objective Ten

Ensure new development and uses maintain the amenity enjoyed by adjoining and nearby residential uses.

As in all residential areas, the community of Frankston is concerned to ensure that new development and non-residential uses, do not diminish the level of amenity they currently
enjoy on their individual properties and immediate vicinity. A Strategy needs to embody these concerns in the decision making processes for the City.

**Urban Form Models for New Housing Development**

There is an important link between the urban form of the city and the housing patterns it provides. The desired future urban form will impact on the city’s Objectives for housing and alterations to one will have impacts on the other. Three broad urban form models are presented for consideration against their ability to meet the desired Objectives. These should not be seen as mutually exclusive as combinations are possible. To some extent they are a matter of emphasis and the willingness of Council to actively intervene in processes.

**Model One – Status Quo**

This urban form model would involve allowing the current pattern of housing development to continue to occur within the City. This is characterised by new households being largely accommodated through the continued development of the fringe areas of Carrum Downs/Skye and Langwarrin. Smaller amounts of new development would continue to be accommodated by the ongoing pocket development of infill housing within the more established suburbs of Frankston and within the Residential 2 Zones of the City. Further subdivision would eventually occur at the fringes of the City.

Based on population forecasts developed (derived from the assumptions built into this model), this would deliver approximately 4457 new households to the fringe by 2011 out of 7078 forecast for the City. This is approximately 63% of the predicted households for the City by 2011. The other 37% of required households would be accommodated within the established areas of the City through ad hoc infill development.

**Model Two – Dispersed Growth**

This urban form model would involve halting the development of infill housing in Frankston’s established suburbs in favour of accommodating all new households on greenfield sites such as the fringe. New subdivisions and associated hard and soft infrastructure would be required to service these areas. Rezoning of current rural ‘green wedge’ areas would be required.

To achieve the projected population to 2011, the 2621 households projected for the established suburbs would need to be accommodated on new greenfield sites.

**Model Three – Consolidated Development**

This model involves consolidating the City’s pattern of housing development through the halting of development at the fringe and more intensive development in the established residential areas. The location for this development would be clearly defined around sound principles of intensification such as around transport interchanges and railway stations particularly the CAD, intensification around activity centres and intensification within the CAD.

If the City wished to achieve the projected population, it would require the creation of an additional 4000 households (previously projected for the greenfield sites) within established areas by 2011.
Evaluation of Urban Form Models

In order to understand the impacts of these broad Urban Form Models on the City’s ability to meet the Objectives of housing in Frankston, an evaluation has been prepared. The evaluation provides a qualitative assessment of the ways and extent to which each model can achieve the identified Objectives, and concludes with a summary.
### Evaluation of Urban Form Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>1 – Status Quo</th>
<th>2 – Dispersed Growth</th>
<th>3- Consolidated Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective One</td>
<td>Accommodate the population growth and housing demand in the municipality in areas best suited to provide a quality living environment for the intended residents.</td>
<td>Many current development pressures are occurring in areas not identified in the Council's existing strategy to accommodate higher density development. There is concern that the projected population increases and household structure changes cannot continue to be accommodated in areas that are not intended for higher density development.</td>
<td>Development at the fringes of the City in Carrum Downs, Skye and Langwarrin will satisfy certain of the pressures for family style accommodation. Being somewhat remote from fixed public transport and major shopping centres and community facilities these areas are not suited to accommodating older residents and others with mobility restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Two</td>
<td>Provide a diversity of housing stock for all residents of Frankston to enable a wide range of choices for residents as they progress through the life cycle.</td>
<td>Frankston's housing will continue to be dominated by 3 and 4 bedroom family homes. Frankston's changing demographics will result in demand for a variety of housing types that are currently not available within the City. This may result in a more homogenous population as various residents have to look elsewhere to meet their housing needs.</td>
<td>It is unlikely that this Objective could be achieved unless there was a distinct change to the types of housing being built in the areas on the fringes of the City. If alternative styles of housing were made available in the outer areas, the locations may be deemed by residents of some areas of Frankston to be too far from their communities and the availability of services and facilities may be better in other areas of the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Three</td>
<td>Protect environmentally sensitive areas from urban development.</td>
<td>There is pressure on environmentally sensitive areas for housing development recognised in the MSS.</td>
<td>The development of new greenfield sites will place additional pressure on environmentally sensitive areas on the fringe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Four</td>
<td>Provide affordable housing options.</td>
<td>There is evidence that there are currently areas in Frankston experiencing significant housing affordability issues.</td>
<td>Areas on the edge of the municipality such as Langwarrin are amongst Frankston's least affordable suburbs. Measures may need to be introduced to promote affordable housing options in these fringe areas. Their geographical location at the fringe provides additional challenges due to lack of public transport, distance to services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Five</td>
<td>Manage areas targeted for redevelopment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is evidence that this Objective is not being met by this model with areas under significant pressure lacking clear direction for their future development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This model would relieve pressure in older more established suburbs, however would still require management of new developing areas where the burden of development would shift.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Significant measures would need to be introduced to manage those areas that are designated for intensification. This would involve the development of integrated local area plans, urban design frameworks or structure plans etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Six</th>
<th>Protect the ‘green wedge’ from urban encroachment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The green wedge is under pressure at present and this pressure continues as land values around increase. Incremental loss may occur in the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional land to support greenfield development will require encroachment into the green wedge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This model would protect the green wedge from urban encroachment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Seven</th>
<th>Provide for the special housing needs of the City’s residents.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Council is currently not active in encouraging, facilitating or funding the special needs of some groups in the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The provision for some special housing needs is more appropriate at locations close to services and facilities eg. students near the campuses of educational institutions. Their location at the fringe, removed from services and public transport would not be appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Measures to support the special housing needs of the City’s residents would need to be introduced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Eight</th>
<th>Ensure new development respects and enhances the preferred character of Frankston City’s neighbourhoods.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• There is community concern that new development is diminishing the character of neighbourhoods. The implementation of the Neighbourhood Character Study will go some way in addressing these concerns, however results will be intermittent without a Housing Strategy that advocates locations for medium density housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This Objective could be achieved by new development at the fringe being sensitively planned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This model would require careful implementation of the Neighbourhood Character Study to ensure that the character of Frankston’s neighbourhoods was not diminished. Some areas would undergo substantial change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This model will provide the opportunity to direct higher density development to certain areas, and to establish neighbourhood character priorities in other areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Nine</th>
<th>Coordinate new development to ensure the efficient use and timely provision of social and physical infrastructure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A continuation of urban fringe development along with a small amount of infill would not result in an efficient or effective use of infrastructure. Under this scenario, pressure for the provision of new infrastructure and its subsequent maintenance would continue at the edges of the municipality, while established infrastructure in existing urban areas would not be used to full potential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accommodation of all new development at the edges of the municipality would not result in a sustainable use of social or physical infrastructure. This would be inefficient in terms of use of existing infrastructure and costly due to the demand for more services at the fringe. Unchecked development of infrastructure at the edges would also have negative environmental impacts, both in terms of loss of bushland and issues such as increased air pollution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More intensive development within established residential areas would result in a more sustainable use of infrastructure. However, development would need to be monitored in order to plan for maintenance, upgrading and potential future overload on infrastructure. Impacts of activities on infrastructure are easier to manage cost effectively in established urban areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective Ten

Ensure new development and uses maintain the amenity enjoyed by adjoining and nearby residential uses.

- All models have the potential to perform equally as amenity issues are primarily dealt with on an application by application basis.
- All models have the potential to perform equally as amenity issues are primarily dealt with on an application by application basis.
- All models have the potential to perform equally as amenity issues are primarily dealt with on an application by application basis.
Conclusions of the Analysis

Of the models analysed above, Model 3 provides the best vehicle to achieve the nine Objectives. It enables the provision of a diversity of housing stock, protection of environmentally significant areas, provision of affordable housing options, protects the green wedge from housing encroachment, and would allow the special needs of the City’s residents to be met. It does however limit the ability to achieve Objectives 5 and 8. It would require strong measures to manage areas under significant pressure for redevelopment and clear direction on the locations where neighbourhood character is capable of accommodating some change. A number of important issues may not be fully resolved through this model, and could create a potentially difficult situation for Council. In order to halt development at the fringe, rezoning of land would need to occur from residential to rural zones. This may be an expensive option financially and politically for Council if ‘back-zoning’ was to occur. This could also create uncertainty within the development industry and limit Frankston’s longer term growth prospects and economic situation.

Model 3 could also have a significant impact on established residential areas. Medium density development is currently creating a great deal of community concern through development that is deemed to be inappropriate to the neighbourhood character of the area. Placing the burden of providing for all new housing and housing choices only within the established areas would be too great and politically untenable.

Model 2 is better able to meet the two Objectives that Model 3 is less equipped to manage effectively, however is unable to meet a number of the other Objectives including protecting environmentally sensitive areas and the green wedge from urban development. The community’s desire to maintain these elements and the role they play in the metropolitan context means this model is unlikely to gain support.

A more appropriate approach may be a mix of Model 2 and Model 3. This approach would allow existing residentially zoned land at the fringe to be developed to its capacity whilst facilitating and managing infill development within the established areas of Frankston, targeting specific areas for development of housing. This would be a ‘managed approach’ drawing on elements of both models.

The ‘managed approach’ may appear to contain some of the elements of Model 1 ‘status quo’ however this is not the case. Many of Council’s current intentions are built into this model with greater articulation of strategies proposed for the shape and location of housing within the City.

Should the Council wish to achieve the same total population as has been projected for the ‘status quo’ model, the population projected for the fringe areas by 2011 would take longer to reach, and forecasts in other areas would need to be revised slightly higher to reflect areas where managed infill development was directed to occur.

The recommended approach is investigated more fully in the following section, where the methods of achieving each Objective are discussed.
Achievement of the Objectives

Objective One

Accommodate the population growth and housing demand in the municipality in areas best suited to provide a quality living environment for the intended residents.

Current situation

The Council’s current MSS delineates areas of the City where increased housing densities are encouraged. The Frankston South Low Density Area and rural residential areas are also designated, with the remaining residential areas labelled “standard housing” on the Housing and Existing Facilities Map at Clause 21.04. The Council’s current strategy is based on sound principles of focussing higher density development around areas well served by public transport and/or retail and community facilities. The Frankston Central area is the primary focus of increased densities. An area along the Nepean Highway coastal strip of Seaford up to Station Street, and pockets in Frankston North and to the east and west of the Carrum Downs shopping centre are also identified. The location of the Residential 2 zoning in the planning scheme accords with the strategy.

Recommended Strategies

The areas designated for higher density housing in the MSS have been reviewed to consider their suitability in terms of access to public transport, access to recreational and community services and facilities, potential conflict with neighbourhood character objectives and areas of environmental significance. The Housing Issues map on previous pages outlines many of these factors. The results of the analysis are indicated on the ‘Housing Directions’ map below, which indicates the areas considered appropriate for higher housing densities than traditionally occur around these locations.

- Incorporate the Housing Directions Map into the MSS.
- Encourage medium density housing around the Frankston CAD, other activity centres and along the Seaford foreshore as indicated on the Housing Directions Map.
- Allow for medium density housing in other areas in the City provided other objectives relating to amenity are met.
- Ensure that new housing respects the amenity of nearby residents and has regard to the neighbourhood character objectives for the area.
- Identify opportunities to use surplus land held by Council, government departments, servicing and other authorities for housing.
- Encourage new residential development as infill on surplus non-residential sites, including sites within the Frankston CAD.
Figure 14: Housing Directions Map
**Objective Two**

*Provide a diversity of housing stock for all residents of Frankston to enable a wide range of choices for residents as they progress through the life cycle.*

**Current situation**

While this Objective is currently reflected in the MSS and the concept of the need for a diversity of housing recognised, the tools used to create a greater diversity of housing type in appropriate locations are achieving limited success. The MSS states the locations for medium density as being around the Frankston CAD, other activity centres and transport nodes and this is then visually shown on the accompanying map. However the housing mix proposed within this development is not defined. Development at the fringe is driven by the ODP’s with no guidance given on providing a diversity of housing stock. The capacity of local areas to accommodate diversity of housing largely through medium density development is not clearly differentiated.

Local communities are concerned about the form of development that is occurring and what they see as a ‘flat earth approach’ to the city - that all areas are equally suitable for medium density development. This is being driven by a market that is capitalising on opportunities for new housing based on an economy and market that supports this type of development and a planning framework that allows it to occur. This highlights that the tools currently used to encourage housing of specific types, in specific areas are having limited success.

The Metropolitan Strategy’s anticipated focus on development around activity centres could serve to alleviate the pressure on some areas of the City.

**Recommended strategy**

The recommended strategies for the achievement of this Objective are:

- Encourage the development of medium density housing in a variety of forms including different heights, sizes, numbers of bedrooms and sizes of private open space areas. Larger developments should demonstrate the provision of a diversity of housing types within the one proposal.
- Ensure the mechanisms guiding development at the fringe of the residential areas encourage greater diversity of housing. Review existing Outline Development Plans where possible, and ensure new subdivision plans include a variety of lots sizes and forms of housing.
- Ensure the coordinated development of ‘new communities’ at the fringe providing a broad spectrum of services and facilities for a variety of age groups, household types and lifestyles.
- Utilise the zone and overlay controls in the planning scheme to assist in providing a diversity of housing environments and dwelling types within the City.
- Encourage residential development in business zones where the objectives of the zone will not be compromised.
- Ensure that the Frankston Project and the Frankston Interchange Feasibility Study assist in creating a diversity of housing stock within the City.

**Implementation**

- Apply the Development Plan Overlay and review existing Outline Development Plans where appropriate, to ensure development at the City’s fringe incorporates a variety of housing types to provide for different housing needs.
• Use the Design and Development Overlay to control minimum lot size and development densities in parts of Frankston South, Langwarrin and Baxter areas, in order to provide a variety of living and housing opportunities.

Further strategic work

• Identify and undertake detailed integrated planning for areas and specific sites suitable for new forms of housing such as in and around activity centres. Use Planning Briefs for specific sites and Structure Plans for areas undergoing change. Develop local policies for the specified areas on completion of studies.
• Monitor the types of housing that are constructed in the City.

Objective Three

*Protect ecologically sensitive areas from urban development.*

Current situation

There is a strong commitment within the existing MSS to the preservation of ecologically significant areas within the City. The Frankston Vegetation Study (1997) provided an in-depth study into the vegetation of the city. The study’s recommendations have been implemented through the use of the Environmental Significance Overlay which has provided protection for most of these sites. The MSS does however recognise that some ecologically sensitive areas have already been zoned residential and will eventually come under pressure for development. Some guidance on the layout and form of subdivisions is provided through the ODPs. Planning approval is required for the removal of native vegetation and other controls require that subdivision applications detail existing vegetation and vegetation to remain. There is however little direction given to the areas that are of significance as identified in the Vegetation Study. Some of the ODPs were prepared prior to the preparation or finalisation of the Vegetation Study.

Recommended Strategies

The recommended strategies for this Objective are to:

• Further housing development should not occur in areas of ecological sensitivity, as identified on the Map of Sites of Botanical and Zoological Significance.
• Ensure use and development adjoining ecologically sensitive areas is designed to minimise visual and environmental impact on the ecological qualities of the area.
• Prior to the subdivision of greenfield sites habitat and wildlife corridors should be mapped and protected from inappropriate development or removal of vegetation that would threaten the environmental qualities of the area.

Implementation

• Use the Design and Development Overlay to control minimum lot size and development densities in parts of Frankston South, Langwarrin and Baxter areas.

Further strategic work

• Further define habitat and wildlife corridors in the City to determine the need for vegetation policies or controls over specific species.
Objective Four

Provide affordable housing options.

Current situation

There has been limited research into affordability issues within the City with this study providing information on median house prices and indicators of financial stress. The MSS currently makes no mention of affordability issues within the existing housing strategies. The planning scheme is not used as a tool to achieve affordable housing options within the City. Whilst Frankston is one of Melbourne’s most affordable municipalities in the metropolitan context, there are clear signs that affordability is becoming an issue within some suburbs of the City. There is evidence of high levels of financial stress related to housing, and increasing numbers of homeless people within the City. Access to secure and affordable housing can contribute to people’s capacity to take part in education, maintain employment, build social connections and be involved in community life.

Recommended strategies

The recommended strategy for this Objective is to:

- Reflect a Council commitment to maintenance of affordability of housing within the Community Plan. Explore options to implement affordable housing options through a variety of mechanisms.
- Ensure affordable housing options are provided within the CAD through the Frankston Project and the Frankston Interchange Feasibility Study. Set targets for the provision of low cost housing within the CAD.
- Ensure new residential development at Frankston’s fringe incorporates a variety of housing types, sizes and costs, to meet the needs of low income earners.

Further strategic work

- Undertake further research into housing affordability issues and actions within the City. Research should examine indicators of affordability such as property values, loan repayment costs and rent levels to gauge true affordability of home ownership and rental housing, and determine methods by which the Council can assist in addressing affordability issues.

Other Actions

- Liaise with non-government housing providers to encourage the development of low cost housing or demonstration projects.
Objective Five

Manage areas targeted for redevelopment.

Current situation

There are a number of areas experiencing extreme pressure for redevelopment. This is often within older areas where housing stock quality is declining or within areas with a newly desirable geographic location. In many cases these are not areas specifically targeted in the Council’s MSS for higher density housing.

Areas along the coast are experiencing great pressure for housing redevelopment. This is in response to the desire of many for Bay views and beachside living. Areas such as the along Nepean Highway, particularly north of Mile Bridge, have experienced rapid redevelopment of housing stock in the last few years. Long Island is also experiencing significant changes to its housing stock.

Other areas experiencing significant pressure for redevelopment are the fringe of the CAD, which over the past 20 years has seen significant growth in medium density housing developments, often of poor quality and design. This has contributed to a widespread concern about medium density development in the City. It is however the very place where medium density development should be encouraged. It is close to shops, services, facilities, public transport, the beach and other recreation and community facilities.

The challenge therefore in these areas is to manage change to provide good quality urban environments for people to live within and to relieve pressure for housing in other more sensitive areas. This change is related to wider issues than just the housing stock and may require Council to undertake further detailed local area planning to successfully implement its strategic Objectives for this area.

Recommended Strategies

The recommended strategy for this area is to provide a stronger management framework to manage areas under significant pressure. This framework should:

- Provide a strong management framework to manage the redevelopment of areas identified for medium density housing.
- Develop structure plans to guide the detailed redevelopment of areas identified for higher density housing, including guidelines for building envelopes, siting, car parking, landscaping and other issues of concern to nearby residents. Develop a process that involves the community in undertaking longer term planning in these areas.
- Ensure large scale developments are phased or sequenced to ensure that the construction minimises disruption to local communities and access, and ensure that the local community is informed of the project, its benefits and progress.
- Encourage additional shop top housing within activity centres.

Further strategic work

- Undertake a progressive program of structure plan preparation for the areas identified for medium density housing.
- Where appropriate, include these structure plans in Local Policy or a Development Plan Overlay to provide certainty for the community and the developer.
Other Actions

- Council should play a strong role in the public domain to ensure that new development is accompanied by improvements to the public domain at the time of development, if not prior to it. This development should be seen as creating benefits to the wider community.
- Examine measures to facilitate the market developing areas that have been designated as suitable for redevelopment.

Objective Six

*Protect the ‘green wedge’ from urban encroachment.*

Current situation
The MSS recognises the importance of what is referred to as the ‘rural area’ of the city separating the urban areas of Frankston with those of the south east growth corridor with drainage catchments being used to define the eastern edge of the urban and rural areas of the city. Land in this area is used for grazing, extraction, flower growing, Eastern Treatment Plant, and a ‘breathing space and visual open space. The term ‘green wedge’ is not mentioned in the MSS or the role that this area plays in the metropolitan context.

The MSS recognises the increasing pressure for the rezoning of land from rural to low or conventional density residential zones in this area. The South East Non Urban Study provided preliminary recommendations on the use of land and the process and timing of more detailed studies for the area.

There is strong community support for the retention of green wedges emerging from the consultation for the Metropolitan Strategy. This may result in further development of detailed planning strategies for Melbourne’s green wedges by the State to ensure appropriate uses within these areas.

Recommended Strategies
The development of new policies and strategies for the area needs to clearly define the extent of the green wedge and the appropriate uses to locate within that land. This is clearly linked to the need to define the location of the rural/urban edge. Specific strategies include:

- Define the boundary of the ‘green wedge’ as the limit of urban development in the City.
- Ensure appropriate uses for land within the ‘green wedge’.
- Acknowledge that Frankston forms the north-west border of the Mornington Peninsula and ensure that the interface along this border with Metropolitan Melbourne is defined and appropriately managed to maintain primarily low density development.

Further strategic work

- Define the ‘green wedge’ precisely.
- Determine appropriate zoning for land in the green wedge.
Objective Seven

Provide for the special housing needs of the City’s residents.

Current situation

The population and market trends described in this Housing Strategy, along with discussions with key informants on housing needs, should be considered within the context of a more comprehensive exploration of issues that impact on access to housing within the City of Frankston. Council currently plays a limited role in the provision or facilitation of special needs housing.

Specific special needs such as students provide the opportunity to contribute significantly to a number of Council’s strategic Objectives if their housing needs can be met. These include the revitalisation of the Frankston CAD into a vibrant and lively area of the City.

Discussions with community service providers have emphasised the importance of an approach to housing needs based on developing local solutions to local housing issues. Cross sector partnerships models, such as the Local Learning and Employment Networks that has been funded by the State Government, offer the potential for greater community ownership of the issues and strategies for cross sector collaboration in addressing them. However, such models require a more holistic approach to the allocation of resources across different government programs so that there can be a stronger focus on locally determined outcomes.

Recommended strategies

Council should develop a comprehensive approach to addressing special housing needs affecting the City. It is recommended that the following strategies be pursued to begin this process:

- Encourage the provision of housing that provides for special housing needs of Frankston City residents.
- Identify the range of mechanisms that Council could apply to achieve improved housing outcomes for high needs groups.

Further strategic work

- Identify specific housing needs through undertaking a housing needs analysis identifying:
  - demand for crisis accommodation and waiting lists for public housing,
  - trends regarding homelessness within the city,
  - housing affordability for particular groups by local areas; and
  - the possible role of Council in relation to special housing needs.

- Initiate a ‘Students in the City’ study in conjunction with the tertiary institutions in Frankston. The study should examine broad issues relevant to student housing such as location, services, facilities, transport and specific accommodation needs that will assist in the student experience of the City.

Other Actions

- Facilitate discussion of issues with the region’s housing sector agencies to develop a better understanding of the roles and responsibilities of different agencies in response to special housing needs.
• Facilitate discussion between different sectors of the housing industry (developers, business, housing providers, state government and non-government agencies) to identify ways in which the different sectors can cooperate to respond to housing needs.

• Clarify the Council’s role in responding to high priority and special housing needs within the City.

**Objective Eight**

*Ensure new development respects and enhances the preferred character of Frankston City’s neighbourhoods.*

**Current situation**

The concept of this Objective is implicit within the SPPF and the VPPs through Clauses 54 and 55 of the planning scheme and implied within the current MSS particularly within medium density areas. However there is currently little guidance provided through tools such as the MSS or through a local policy in the Frankston Planning Scheme as to the actual character of Frankston’s neighbourhoods. There is discussion that there are differences between suburbs due to geographic location and landscape types, however there is little detailed clarification of exactly what these are. This provides too much scope for interpretation of the aspects of the area that are important to the neighbourhood character of each area.

Once the neighbourhood character or preferred neighbourhood character of each area has been described, the ability of an area to accommodate additional housing, without diminishing the neighbourhood character of the area, needs to be assessed.

**Recommended Strategies**

A ‘managed approach’ to achieving this Objective requires the implementation of a strategy that recognises the capacity of each suburb’s neighbourhood character to accommodate additional housing, and to manage the implementation of that development to achieve the community’s preferred neighbourhood character. The preferred neighbourhood character has been outlined in the Neighbourhood Character Study and the study’s implementation will ensure that new development does not diminish the character of the suburbs.

Retaining and enhancing preferred neighbourhood character of areas of Frankston South, Oliver’s Hill and Long Island will limit the development of housing due to the desire to protect the landscape character of the area through design objectives such as limiting site coverage or building height. In other areas, such as some parts of Frankston Central, there is a desire to improve the character of the area, and new development of housing that meets the preferred character for the area, would assist in achieving that objective. Carrum Downs and Langwarrin are establishing a new neighbourhood character and thus will be less constrained by existing character. Housing in these areas can achieve a greater variety of development forms. Many Seaford neighbourhoods require strengthening of their character elements such as the link to their location by the sea, however are capable of additional housing. Karingal’s neighbourhood character places minor constraints on housing development. Development that is well designed to meet the objectives of the area as outlined in the Precinct brochures should be approved.

The strategy should include the following elements:

• Implement the findings of the Neighbourhood Character Study 2002 to ensure that new development meets the preferred neighbourhood character for each area of the City.
Implementation

- Apply the Neighbourhood Character Local Policy to proposals requiring planning approval in Residential zones.
- Apply the Design and Development Overlay to specify the maximum height of development along areas of the coast and inland where the excessive height of development threatens the achievement of the preferred neighbourhood character.
- Apply the Significant Landscape Overlay to guide the form of development on the sensitive Mt Eliza-Baxter escarpment.
- Apply the Significant Landscape Overlay to areas of Frankston South where the balance between vegetation and buildings is important to the achievement of the preferred neighbourhood character of the area.

Further strategic work

- Familiarise residents and the development community with the concept of neighbourhood character and its impact on development on housing in the City, through means such as dissemination of the Neighbourhood Character brochures, Council newsletters, local newspapers and seminars.

Other Actions

- Provide Council officers support and training where required to effectively implement the recommendations of the Neighbourhood Character Study.

Objective Nine

*Coordinate new development to ensure the efficient and sustainable use, and timely provision, of social and physical infrastructure.*

Current situation

The MSS recognises the need for timely and efficient provision of infrastructure. Coordinating development with the provision of infrastructure at the fringe has been identified as an issue in the Housing section of the MSS. There is a strategy to ensure new development is developed in an orderly and coordinated way and that provision is made to fund essential infrastructure and community facilities. Council has also undertaken substantial research into the community needs of the City. The Community Needs Analysis identified the human service requirements of each neighbourhood over the next 10-15 years, and identified opportunities for enhanced co-ordination and complementary relationships with other areas of Council and other local area service providers that cover the Frankston community. Development Plan Overlays are used in the developing areas of Carrum Downs, Langwarrin and Langwarrin South to ensure appropriate payments are made towards the provision of infrastructure.

Recommended Strategies

The recommended strategies to ensure that new infrastructure is provided in a timely, efficient and sustainable way are:

- Include the findings of the Community Needs Analysis in preparing a Development Contributions Plan for the municipality. Link the Development Contributions Plan to the Council’s Community Plan and Capital Works Plan.
• Advocate the use of energy efficient design principles in new residential development, including subdivisions, such as lot and building orientation, solar powered street lighting, re-use of grey water, and stormwater management.
• Ensure on-site waste disposal is adequately addressed in rural residential areas, particularly in the sensitive Westernport catchment.
• Address the issue of fire risk associated with residential subdivision in developing areas where remnant vegetation is present.

Further strategic work
• Prepare a Development Contributions Plan for the City.

Other Actions
• Educate the community about the benefits of medium density housing for ecological sustainability, particularly energy efficiency.
• Continue to implement the findings of the Community Needs Analysis.

Objective Ten

Ensure new development and uses maintain the amenity enjoyed by adjoining and nearby residential uses.

Strategies
• Ensure any non-residential uses are responsive to their residential setting and maintain appropriate standards of residential amenity.
• Ensure new residential development respects the amenity of adjoining residents.

Implementation
• Apply the Non-residential uses in residential zones Policy and the Office development and residential amenity Policy in determining proposals for non-residential uses adjoining or within residential zones.
• Ensure development proposals adequately address the requirements of Clauses 54, 55 and 56.
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Implementation
There are a variety of means by which Council can implement the recommendations of this Strategy. The implementation of the Housing Strategy requires consideration of the tools available within the statutory context, as well as a variety of other methods.

Statutory Implementation

Statutory implementation of the Housing Strategy is only one part of the total package of implementation techniques. However, it is perhaps the most important as it legally binds the Council, the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (VCAT) and the community to consider the outcomes of the Study.

Methods

There are a range of options that may be suitable for the statutory implementation of the Study. Many of these options, outlined below, can be used together however each requires individual consideration:

- Refer to the document in the Planning Scheme (Reference Document).
- Incorporate the entire Strategy document into the Planning Scheme (Incorporated Document).
- Alter the MSS in the Planning Scheme to include elements from the Strategy.
- Extract part of the Strategy to form a Local Policy in the planning scheme (in the Local Planning Policy Framework).
- Use the Residential 2 Zone to designate areas for increased residential development.

The advantages and disadvantages of each of these options are summarised below:

Reference Document

The advantage of this option is that it provides some statutory weight to the strategy at VCAT. However the Department of Infrastructure advises that Reference Documents are to be considered as ‘background’ only, and should not contain policies or guidelines that assist in determining upon planning applications. It is not the method preferred by the Department, as policy should be included in the scheme.

Incorporated Document

In this option the whole or part of the Study that is incorporated into the planning scheme becomes a statutory document. The whole document therefore has statutory weight.

The potential disadvantage is that a planning scheme amendment process is required to change any part of the incorporated document. The Department of Infrastructure would also not support this option as it does not provide clarity and ease of use of the planning scheme.

Include elements of the Strategy in the MSS

The Municipal Strategic Statement is the Council’s primary strategic document. It must conform with State policy (which is under review as part of the development of the Metropolitan Strategy), and it must provide clear directions for managing the City’s future growth and other changes. The MSS should include strategic housing directions, such as where new development is to be encouraged, where it is to be discouraged and broad
parameters for the form or type of housing needed to accommodate Frankston City’s future residents.

The Council’s MSS already contains clear strategic directions for housing in the City, and these only need to be updated to reflect any changes due to the recommendations of this Housing Strategy. This involves changes to the words in Clause 21.04 of the MSS and the accompanying ‘Housing and Existing Community Facilities’ Map.

**Local Policy**

The inclusion of a Local Policy within the Local Planning Policy framework (LPPF) would enable the provision of general policy guidance for the assessment of planning and subdivision applications. The Local Policy can serve to provide a set of general considerations that apply to all proposals for which a planning permit is required.

Inclusion of the Policy in the scheme provides the highest level of strategic direction next to the MSS itself, and therefore ensures that the Council’s objectives are clear and all applications are assessed using these objectives.

It is noted that a Local Policy forms part of the planning scheme, and therefore an amendment is required to insert it into the scheme, and to alter it if necessary in future.

**Use of the Residential 2 Zone**

The Frankston Planning Scheme was one of the few Planning Schemes in Victoria that actively implemented the Residential 2 Zone (R2) in the new format planning schemes. The zone was introduced as part of the VPP suite of zones developed as part of the reform of planning systems in Victoria. The intention of the government at the time, was that the zone be used where Councils wished to encourage significant change, particularly redevelopment for residential purposes, usually medium to high density. The zone is similar to the standard residential zone, Residential 1, other than it exempts residential development from the standard advertising requirements and eliminates third party (i.e. Objector) appeals to VCAT. In this way it was intended to provide a ‘fast track’ mechanism for development and reduce uncertainty.

In practice, however the R2 zone has not been as effective in encouraging development as may have been anticipated. This has been the experience of Frankston City Council, where redevelopment in the areas zoned R2 has been slow. A number of issues may have contributed to the failure of the intent of the zone.

A recent study titled ‘Managing Significant Change Areas’ (prepared for the Department of Infrastructure, and Greater Dandenong, Kingston, Maroondah and Monash Councils, by Lisa Riddle Planning Services, 2000) examined the effectiveness of the Residential 2 Zone as an implementation mechanism. It was found that none of the four Councils used as case studies for the project had experienced a substantial increase in residential development applications in the designated areas since introduction of the R2 zones. The study proposed a number of factors which may have contributed including:

- A lack of the understanding of the zone provisions by developers,
- A lack of confidence in the system
- The short time the zones have been in operation.
- Market forces and unwillingness by the development industry to attempt forms of development outside the standard types.
- Potential time savings by the industry through minimising VCAT appeal delays may not have provided sufficient inducement to the industry.
The study concluded that three issues needed to be addressed to assist in effectively implementing the R2 zone:

- Education of developers and estate agents on Council’s strategy and zoning implications;
- Information on the housing market prior to designation of an area for change/ increased development; and
- Use of additional implementation techniques.

These non-statutory implementation methods are discussed in more detail in the following section.

The use of the Residential 2 zone is only one of a range of implementation techniques available both within and outside the planning scheme to manage areas designated for change. A strong, well articulated strategy, that is consistently upheld by the Council in its decision making, is just as effective a planning tool for encouraging medium density housing as the Residential 2 Zone. This is particularly so where a Council is unwilling to exclude residents from the planning approval decision making process. The potential advantages of removing third party rights from the planning approval process are minimal in any case, as we have seen from the examination of other examples.

The use of the Residential 2 zone is not, therefore, generally recommended for broad areas of the City, in the way that it is currently utilised within the Frankston Planning Scheme. It possibly has a place for use on specific sites, such as old school sites or industrial land, where a more detailed redevelopment plan has been developed, with community input.

**Recommended Statutory Implementation Approach**

The aims of the statutory approach should be:

- To give the whole Strategy recognition within the planning scheme, as an important background document;
- To provide appropriate ‘triggers’ within the MSS, to give an umbrella for policy, controls and further recommended work;
- To ensure the objectives of 21.04 reflect the Objectives of the Strategy
- To ensure the Strategies and Implementation of 21.04 reflect the recommendations of the Strategy through the application of zones and overlays, further strategic work and other actions.

It is therefore recommended that the Frankston Planning Scheme be altered to reflect the recommendations of the Strategy by:

- Changing Clauses 21.03 and 21.04 of the MSS to read as shown in Appendix 2;
- Altering the wording and map at Cl. 21.03 to accord with the provisions of the new Cl.21.04;
- Inserting the ‘Housing Directions Map’ to replace the ‘Housing and Community Facilities Map’ in the MSS as shown in Appendix 2.
- Rezone the areas within Residential 2 zone to Residential 1, and develop detailed guidelines (or Local Structure Plans) for the future development of these areas utilising the Neighbourhood Character Study recommendations as a basis.
Non Statutory Mechanisms

Other methods Council could consider undertaking to encourage redevelopment of areas designated in the Strategy as suitable for increased housing development to accommodate Frankston’s future residents fall into four broad categories: Council works, marketing and education, market research and Local Structure Plans.

Council Works

The study has highlighted the need for Council to actively engage in the public domain in order to achieve the needed future housing stock for the City. New types of housing or areas where changes to the housing stock may occur, such as medium or high density housing, or shop top housing, will be assisted by ensuring that works in the public domain are coordinated with these developments. Improvements to the public domain such as creating or enhancing visual and physical linkages to the beach, shops or station, street trees and furniture, and traffic management measures can be undertaken or assisted by the Council.

The benefits of a co-ordinated approach to change in the public and private domains are:

- Providing a catalyst to change through improvement to the appearance of the area, which may in turn make the area more attractive to investment and development.
- Assisting in creating a positive image of the area and of the Council’s role in advocating for the area.
- Benefiting existing residents. This may assist in creating a positive community approach to change in the neighbourhood.

Marketing and Education

Communication and promotion is an essential aspect of the success of the implementation of the Study. Many of the strategies proposed in the Study require Council to work with the community, developers, designers, housing providers etc. The marketing and education mechanisms used to promote the objectives of the Strategy could include:

- Developer liaison such as discussions with particular developers that either operate in Frankston already or market leaders that the Council would like to attract to the City.
- Marketing of the opportunities in Frankston. This could take the form of publishing brochures, holding seminars for developers or estate agents, advertising, signage and other targeted marketing techniques.
- Provision of regular information to the resident community explaining the Council’s strategy and the benefits to the City as a whole, and possibly the benefits to individuals where appropriate.

Market Research

Market research, by interviewing present and possible future residents, could be undertaken as an adjunct to implementation of the strategy in order to:

- Establish the exact forms of residential development preferred by people choosing to live in Frankston. For example, how many bedrooms, appearance/styles of development, amount of open space, single/double storey, car parking etc. do current and future residents prefer? How do these preferences vary between target groups such as students, young families and older residents? Much of this information is taken for granted by developers who have a standard design or formula. However, to be sure of
meeting market needs, as well as Frankston’s housing needs, this research could be carefully targeted to ensure the best outcome for the strategy;

• Provide greater guidance to planners in assessing and approving developments;
• Provide assistance to developers in determining the appropriate form of development to meet the needs of existing and future Frankston residents.

**Structure Plans**

It is also possible to take the implementation of the strategy one further step, by developing specific guidelines and development briefs for defined areas. While the Neighbourhood Character Study provides guidelines for development that respects aspects of the current character of the localities, the Council could provide more detailed Local Structure Plans for small sectors of the areas designated for increased housing development. The Structure Plans could define a new character, including the public as well as the private domain. Aspects such as street tree planting, road treatments and traffic management could be determined, while addressing issues such as lot size, setbacks and height.

The critical success factor in the development of these plans would be community involvement. Genuine participation by the local, and broader community where appropriate, in the content of the Structure Plans will have multiple benefits. Firstly, it will instil confidence in the Council and the planning process. Secondly, it will provide a set of guidelines that can be agreed upon, and adopted by the Council to guide development. It will provide the development community with greater confidence that a development will be successful. In addition, should the Council choose, the Structure Plan/s could be put into Local Policy in the Planning Scheme, or used for the introduction of a Development Plan Overlay. A Development Plan Overlay could deliver certainty similar to that intended by the R2 zoning, but with greater detail and comfort to residents.

A process such as this is not simple or quick. It would involve a high level of commitment by the Council to the achievement of the strategy aims. It would require time and resources. However the outcome has the potential to ensure that the community supports the intent and reality of the changes required to some areas of the City to achieve the desired level of redevelopment.