

Submission Number	Issues	Officer Response
1, 2A & 2B	<p>Three submissions from the same person, all oppose rezoning. Residential Growth Zone 5 is inappropriate due to the neighbourhood character of the area that will be overdeveloped. Other issues raised -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and parking issues in the surrounding streets, particularly in Ross Street and Berkeley Street will worsen. • Residential Growth Zone 2 is more in keeping with the character of the area. • Pleased factory is going but not proposed outcome. • Proposed development is too big, two storeys is acceptable. • Why is the entrance off Ross Street, not Huntingdale Road? • How will rubbish collection be managed? 	<p>Amendment C131 does not include the planning application initially proposed, therefore comments relating to the impacts of and future proposed development are not relevant.</p> <p><i>(It is assumed that the submitter is referring to the General Residential Zone Schedule 2 which is the current zoning of the surrounding land)</i></p>
3A & 3B	<p>Would support rezoning to general residential but totally oppose rezoning to Residential Growth Zone 5 (RGZ5) for the following reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezoning to build 4 storey apartment comprising 82 dwellings. • overlooking, overshadowing • loss of property values • additional hard rubbish and rubbish bins on street • inadequate infrastructure provision • odd and visually disproportionate development • safety risk due to more residents and increased pollution, dust and noise. • Development is inconsistent with existing neighbourhood character. • Cultural heritage (post WW 1950s houses) will be lost. • Lack of local amenities- Huntingdale is a small village. • Will set a precedence for further developments of this size in the area. • Negatively impact many small, diverse owner operated businesses as larger • Businesses (such as Coles) will want to locate in Huntingdale. • Water/ sewerage infrastructure is inadequate. • Existing traffic congestion issues will worsen. 	<p>See comments above.</p> <p>The RGZ5 is an appropriate zone for the site given its strategic location, large size and location abutting three streets.</p> <p>The site is located within the environs of the Huntingdale Activity Centre. A Precinct Plan is currently being prepared for the Huntingdale Activity Centre that will identify opportunities for the transformation of Huntingdale into a vibrant centre with expanded employment, innovation and residential activity with improved amenity and sense of place.</p>

Submission Number	Issues	Officer Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social/psychological impact of development on existing residents- significant change. • Potential site contamination and asbestos- fully test site prior to demolition or development. • Request a meeting with residents for further discussions. 	
4	<p>Object to building 4 storey apartment with 82 dwellings, specifically –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development impacts Ross Street and neighbouring streets. • Existing traffic and parking issues will be exacerbated. • Narrow streets- Ross and Berkeley- safety concerns reversing cars. • Inadequate space for rubbish bins due to parked cars. • Loss of property values. 	See response to submission 1
5	<p>Do not oppose rezoning to a general residential zone, but do oppose the proposal to build a 4 storey apartment block with 82 dwellings because –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development is inconsistent with existing neighbourhood character. • Lack of local amenities- Huntingdale is a small village. • Will set a precedence for further developments of this size in the area. • Cultural heritage (post WW 1950s houses) will be lost. • Negatively impact many small, diverse owner operated businesses as larger businesses (such as Coles) will want to located in Huntingdale. • Water/ sewerage infrastructure is inadequate. • Social/psychological impact of development on existing residents- significant change. • Potential site contamination and asbestos- fully test site prior to demolition or development. 	<p>See response to submissions 1 & 3</p> <p>Regarding potential site contamination, an Environmental Audit Overlay is proposed to be applied to the site and was exhibited as part of the Amendment. This ensure that the requirement for an environmental audit is triggered prior to the commencement of a sensitive use or the construction or carrying out of buildings and works associated with a sensitive use.</p>
6	<p>Duplicates comments in submission 3, with additional comment that it is incomprehensible how Council can classify this as a growth residential area.</p>	See response to submissions 1 & 3
7	<p>Duplicates points made in submission 5</p>	See response to submission 5

Submission Number	Issues	Officer Response
8	<p>Support residential rezoning but not the Residential Growth Zone 5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed rezoning would allow the development of apartments buildings up to 4 storeys in height- would set the development apart from surrounding buildings, breaking the local character of the area. • Inconsistent with strategies in C21.04-3- Residential Development- to maintain the predominantly single storey detached dwelling style and direct medium rise development towards Brandon Park, Mount Waverley and Clayton major activity centres. • Suggests rezoning to a general residential zone to match surrounding zonings. • The Residential Development and Character (22.01-3) states that <i>"it is policy that development complements the current character statement and contributory elements and satisfies the intent of the desired future character statement and contributory elements and satisfies the intent of the desired future character statement for the applicable residential character type identified in C22.01-4"</i>. • Rezoning to Residential Growth Zone 5 would mean that we can expect an application for a 4 storey apartment development on site. • The site is not sufficiently isolated from the surrounding residential area to not impact on the neighbourhood. • It would neither respect the current character statement nor the intent of the desired future character statement 	See response to submissions 1 & 3
9	<p>Strongly object to 4 storey, 82 dwellings plan for 4 main reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building height- 3-4 storeys is not marginally taller than surrounding development and is completely out of character for the existing neighbourhood • Loss of privacy and overshadowing. • Traffic flow – problems created by additional car movements particularly in Ross St. • Street Parking – inadequate if residents don't park in the basement parking area. 	See response to submission 1
10	Duplication of submission 5.	See response to submission 5

Submission Number	Issues	Officer Response
11	Duplication of submission 5.	See response to submission 5
12	Duplication of submission 5.	See response to submission 5
13	<p>Support redevelopment of the site, but oppose the rezoning – it should be in a general residential zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14.5m maximum building heights is monstrous and not in keeping with the housing in the rest of the area and too bulky. • Loss of property value. • Such high density is a recipe for disaster. • Haven for crime, don't need the high building culture. • Traffic congestion will worsen and there will be a lack of parking. • Infrastructure pressures- water and drainage. • Weren't formally notified by Council regarding the Amendment. • Should be developed for 8 double storey units, don't need any further diversity in this area, our neighbourhood would be threatened. 	<p>See response to submissions 1 & 3</p> <p>Formal notices about the Amendment were sent to surrounding property owners who it was considered may be materially affected by the Amendment. This included all properties in Berkeley Street and Ross Street between Huntingdale Road and Shafton Street, and properties adjacent and opposite the site in Huntingdale Road. In addition 3 notices were displayed on site to notify people from the wider area. It is considered that this complies with the notification requirements of Section 19 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.</p>
14	<p>Oppose rezoning as it will allow too many residences to be squeezed in. Residential Growth Zone 5 is inappropriate due to the neighbourhood character of the area. Traffic issues will worsen. Residential Growth Zone 2 is more in keeping with the character of the area.</p>	See response to submissions 1 & 3
15	<u>Transport for Victoria</u> advise that they have no objection to the amendment.	Noted
16	<p>Proponent's response to submissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Amendment C131 • Generally supportive of Council's and the Department's approach to the proposed planning controls. 	Noted

Submission Number	Issues	Officer Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed site analysis was undertaken to inform proposed controls. We submit that the site is suitably located to accommodate the level of change anticipated in a Residential Growth Zone, and is within a location where a change from Industrial purposes to Residential is highly appropriate. 	
17	<p>Opposes the rezoning of the site to the Residential Growth Zone 5 because it –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opens the site to high density developments, not in keeping with surrounding dwellings. Impact to existing occupants with traffic, infrastructure and parking Did not receive notification or see any notice on the property itself. 	See response to submissions 1, 3 & 13
18	<p><u>EPA Submission</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objection to the proposed amendment. Comments predominantly relate to the separation between sensitive land uses and those with potential adverse amenity impacts. Supports the application of the EAO on the site as part of the amendment. Site context in explanatory report is not accurate- no reference is made to the IN1Z to the west of the site. This should be updated. Council needs to consider how the proposal will influence future land use planning, particularly in relation to protecting both industry and sensitive land uses from encroachment through appropriate application of separation distances. EPA Publication 1518 contains a list recommended minimum separation distances that aim to minimise off site impacts on sensitive land uses arising from unintended industry-generated emissions. In relation to the IN1Z land on the western side of Huntingdale Rd, the EPA recommends considering reverse buffers given the proposal is a sensitive use which is encroaching on industry. Should consider whether there are any potential impacts from nearby industry and whether there are uses with adverse amenity potential listed in Clause 53.10. 	<p>Comments noted. Will amend the Explanatory Report to reflect nearby industrial land uses. Reverse amenity issues to be considered further.</p>