

Inquiry into the protections within the Victorian Planning Framework

Mr Geoff Langford

Organisation Name:
Your position or role:

YOUR SUBMISSION

Submission:

1/. Mandatory heights

The current position of the government is to add as many new residents as possible. It is having the effect of trashing our city and our suburbs given that the infrastructure is not in line with the developments.

I fought long and hard to secure mandatory heights in my suburb, against the wishes of the planning Ministers advisers. The Minister signed off on the mandatory structure plan for my area, only to now have the local council throw the plan out and to revise it. We are now 6 years into the fight and now pretty much back to square one.

Mandatory heights are an important tool to stop the complete disregard of VCAT to consider ratepayers wishes when discretion is allowed to be used as a tool to assist developers. Without mandatory heights, a large number of inappropriate developments are occurring in many areas,

2/. Heritage concepts.

I am very dissatisfied with the current heritage policy of my council. The most recent heritage policy has defined areas of significant heritage, with restrictions to what homes designated as 'significant' being severely affected while other homes in the street are not. My street in a designated as significant street, even though out of 56 dwellings, 11 could be considered to meet the new heritage requirements, with 3 of the 11 not saveable. We have all sorts of double story and 'side by side' properties in the street, but under the new rules, if I want to improve my residence as many other have done, I must ensure that and upstairs improvement must not be visible from the other side of the street. This is completely dumb and totally unfair. A further consequence by being deemed 'significant' is that I am very restricted in obtaining home insurance given my property is deemed significant heritage.

FILE ATTACHMENTS

File1:

File2:

File3:

Signature:

Geoff Langford