

7.1.5 HUNTINGDALE ACTIVITY CENTRE PRECINCT PLAN AMENDMENT C173 - CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS

Responsible Manager:	Sean McNamee, Manager Strategic Planning
Responsible Director:	Peter Panagakos, Director City Development

RECOMMENDATION

That Council

1. **Notes and considers all submissions received in response to the proposed Amendment C173.**
2. **Notes and endorses the officer comments and recommendations to the matters raised in submissions as outlined in this report and Attachment 1.**
3. **Endorses the recommended changes to the proposed Amendment C173 as outlined in this report and Attachment 1 for the purpose of Council's position on the proposed amendment and for the panel hearing.**
4. **Requests that the Minister for Planning appoint an independent planning panel under Part 8 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 to consider submissions to proposed Amendment C173.**
5. **Notes that Section 153(2) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 requires the Minister for Planning to consult with the Minister for the Suburban Rail Loop with respect to the appointment of a panel for Amendment C173 as it is partially within the SRL Planning Area Declaration.**
6. **Refers all submissions on proposed Amendment C173 to the planning panel appointed by the Minister for Planning.**
7. **Notifies all submitters of Council's resolutions on proposed Amendment C173 as set out above.**

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to:

- Consider submissions received during the public exhibition of proposed Amendment C173;
- Consider officer comments and recommendations in response to the submissions received; and
- Make consequential changes to the proposed amendment in response to some submissions for presentation to the panel hearing.

As there are submissions objecting to the amendment or seeking changes to the amendment that are not supported, Council is unable to adopt the amendment at this stage. It is therefore recommended that Council requests that the Minister for Planning appoint an independent planning panel to review the amendment and consider all submissions received.

COUNCIL PLAN STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Sustainable City

Ensure an economically, socially, and environmentally sustainable municipality.
Prioritise sustainable transport options, including walking/ cycling paths and public transport.

Enhanced Places

Prioritisation of pedestrians and active transport over vehicles.
Pursue a planning framework that meets Monash needs.

Good Governance

Effectively communicate and engage with the community.

BACKGROUND

In March 2020, Council adopted the Huntingdale Precinct Plan. This followed a formal period of consultation (together with the Clayton Precinct Plan) from July to September 2019, and a second period of consultation and community meeting in February 2020.

In March 2023, Council resolved to seek authorisation to prepare and exhibit Amendment C173 to implement the strategic work actions from the Huntingdale Precinct Plan. At the same meeting, Council also noted the content of the Huntingdale Precinct Plan Implementation Plan 2022-2028.

Amendment C173 was subsequently prepared, provided to the Department of Transport and Planning (DTP) in draft form and then formally submitted for authorisation in October 2023. The Amendment was then authorised by DTP (under delegation from the Minister for Planning) on 17 April 2024 (with conditions).

DTP was required during the authorisation process to refer to the amendment to the Minister for the Suburban Rail Loop as roughly half of the Huntingdale Precinct is within the declared SRL Planning Area, although the SRLA did not request any changes.

Amendment C173 proposes the following changes to the Monash Planning Scheme:

- Replacing the existing Design and Development Overlay (DDO1) with new Design and Development Overlays (DDO20 & DDO21) to facilitate development in industrial, commercial and mixed use areas of between 3 and 8 storeys.
- Rezoning a limited number of industrial properties within the commercial core and near the train station to the Commercial 1 Zone, and applying the Environmental Audit Overlay.
- Rezoning residential land along Huntingdale Road to the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ4).
- Changing other residential land within the precinct boundaries to a new schedule to the General Residential Zone Schedule (GRZ12) - with no change to the existing setback and height requirements.
- A new planning policy for the precinct to support decision-making.
- Other minor administrative and policy changes.

DISCUSSION

The Amendment was exhibited from 23 May to 1 July 2024.

A total of 17 submissions were received to the Amendment, including 4 late submissions. A summary of the submissions, the issues raised and the officer comments and recommendations in response to the submissions is provided in the table in Attachment 1.

Of the submissions received:

- 5 submissions were from residents in proposed General Residential zone – Schedule 12 areas
- 8 submissions were from landowners/occupiers in the Industrial 1 Zone areas
- 2 submissions were from government agencies (Melbourne Water, DTP)
- 2 submissions were from other interested people, or where a location was not provided.

In terms of the position on the proposed amendment:

- 3 submitters supported the amendment without changes or provided a neutral position
- 8 submitters wanted changes to the amendment; and
- 6 submitters opposed the amendment (including raising issues beyond the scope of the amendment)

Key issues raised in submissions

The following key issues were raised in the submissions:

- Issue 1 – Impact of increased density on traffic congestion and public car parking supply
- Issue 2 – Limited amount of rezoning of industrial land
- Issue 3 – Limited housing capacity within residential areas in the precinct
- Issue 4 – Specific built form and drafting issues

A more detailed response to each submission and issues raised in submissions is provided in Attachment 1.

Issue 1 – Impact of increased density on traffic congestion and public car parking supply (raised in 5 submissions)

Five submitters raised the issue that traffic congestion (particularly in manoeuvring around the Huntingdale Road / North Road intersection) and consider that the lack of public car parking within the centre was already so limited that increasing residential and employment density within the Precinct should not be encouraged without addressing these issues first.

Officer response

In relation to public car parking, the amount of land within an activity centre that can be used to provide car parking is quite limited and outside the scope of this amendment. Council is currently undertaking a parking review of 10 main activity centres and areas across the municipality including Huntingdale. The review will look at, amongst other things, parking provision, restrictions and enforcement.

Additionally, State and Council planning policy directs density to areas around train stations, and the aim of the amendment is to direct much of that density to Huntingdale Road where people are more likely to choose other options to get around than a car.

The most significant contributor to traffic congestion is car traffic navigating the Huntingdale Road / North Road intersection. As part of the arterial road network this intersection is under the control of the State government. The issue of the difficulty in navigating this intersection is acknowledged in the Precinct Plan and the Precinct Plan contains an action for Council to advocate for the removal of the North Road overpass to make this intersection simpler to navigate.

Issue 2 – Limited amount of rezoning of industrial land (4 submissions)

Four submissions from owners of industrial land raised the issue of the limited nature of rezoning of industrial land in the amendment.

The submissions call for land in Areas 2A, 4A and 7A to be rezoned to allow residential uses – mostly in the form of the Mixed Use Zone.

Specifically, in relation to Area 2A, the submitter pointed to ‘residential’ being a use contemplated in the precinct. Another submitter wanted the Mixed Use Zone applied to most of Areas 2A and 4A.

Two submitters from Area 7A which is the industrial area on the west side of Huntingdale Road, south of the railway, wanted the whole of Area 7A rezoned to the Mixed Use Zone.

Officer response

A key direction of the Huntingdale Precinct Plan is to retain the integrity of the industrial areas for primarily employment purposes. The current planning policy framework strongly encourages the retention and development of existing industrial precincts.

In relation to Areas 1A and 2A, there are small sections of land along the southern side of Burlington Street that are existing residential areas and these are being retained as residential areas. The purpose is not to widen the application of zones that allow residential uses in these areas.

As part of the finalisation of the Huntingdale Precinct Plan there was significant discussion and investigation into the potential for the rezoning of employment land in Precinct 7, including with land owners in the Precinct.

This issue was comprehensively considered at the Council meeting of 23 March 2023 as part of the adoption of the Huntingdale Precinct Plan Implementation Plan. The rezoning of employment land (Industrial 1 zone) was not supported, and in adopting the Huntingdale Precinct Plan Implementation Plan Council specifically resolved that:

- *Notes that officers have held several discussions with landowners and their consultants in Area 7. 2.*
- *Notes that throughout these discussions, representations and written reports the landowners have not demonstrated the need to change the zone to include residential development in order to encourage the future development and rejuvenation of this area with a focus on employment consistent with the principles of the precinct plan.*

Consequently, the adopted Huntingdale Precinct Plan Implementation Plan does not recommend the rezoning of employment land in Precinct 7.

The following points are made with respect to Area 7A but are also relevant to all four of the submissions seeking residential rezoning:

- Monash has state, regional and local employment precincts that are identified in both the Monash Planning Scheme and the Melbourne Industrial and Commercial Land Use Plan (MICLUP). The designation of employment areas under the MICLUP as being of state, regional or local significance indicates their importance and supports the directions in the Huntingdale Precinct Plan.
- The retention of industrial areas in and around the Huntingdale Precinct provides a unique opportunity for business to go from idea, to start up, to expansion, all within Monash. It is noted that there has been a significant amount of redevelopment activity in the Huntingdale Precinct, including Area 7 over the last 2-3 years. Officers are of the view that recent developments clearly demonstrate a strong market demand for development in Area 7 with the main constraint to redevelopment being the willingness of landowners to sell or redevelop the land themselves.

Officers consider that there has been no change in circumstances that would warrant a change of position with regard to rezoning employment land in the Huntingdale Precinct.

Issue 3 – Limited housing capacity within residential areas in the precinct (1 submission)

One submission raised the issue of the amendment failing to address key housing priorities within Area 8B, and specifically requested that the Residential Growth Zone be applied along the southern side of North Road (allowing heights up to 4-5 storeys) in place of the GRZ12.

Officer response

Prior to exhibition, it was a condition of authorisation to consider the capacity of the precinct, including the residential areas in proposed GRZ12, to accommodate forecast housing growth. This information was included in the Explanatory Report.

The Precinct Plan has sought to centralise housing growth and change along Huntingdale Road and near the station in the C1Z and MUZ, whilst accommodating housing diversity in the established residential areas. Since the exhibition of Amendment C173, the State Government has released draft housing targets for each municipality across the state for consultation which may impact on future projections for dwellings in Huntingdale. It is however premature to be pivoting the amendment to address housing targets that have only just been released and where a reform roadmap has not yet been established.

Issue 4 – Specific built form and drafting issues (4 submissions)

4A – Pedestrian links: Two submitters raised the issue of pedestrian links or new roads shown on the maps in proposed DDO21 that extended over their land.

Officer response

Pedestrian links, widened laneways and new roads shown in the Precinct Plan and in DDO21 are indicative only and express a desire to make these areas more permeable for pedestrians and cyclists. Council is not pursuing a public acquisition process for any of these connections over private land. The wording in the DDO schedule can be changed to note that these connections are indicative only.

4B – *Minor drafting changes*: One submitter sought several minor changes to the amendment, mostly to improve clarity. This included:

- Deleting an application requirement in the new local policy
- Revising DDO21 schedule content, including definition of the precinct core, building form and design requirements (re-use of existing buildings), pedestrian priority, landscaping location, weighting of upper level setback requirements, car park sleeving, building separation within industrial areas, ‘public realm’ areas on private land, referencing the maps when referring to new and widened connections, and application requirement for landscape plans.

Officer response

Some of these drafting suggestions are accepted or partly accepted as they will improve the amendment, however, many of the changes were not considered to add any value. A separate table addressing each of these suggested changes from this submission is included in Attachment 1. The changes that are acceptable are included with the other changes in the table below.

4C – *Revised building heights in industrial area*: One submitter raised the issue of a significant drop in preferred maximum building heights between Area 4A (21m / 6 storeys) and 4B (13.5m / 3-4 storeys) and wanted Council to consider extending Area 4A further east to the mid-block point between Shafton and Fenton Streets – between Hume Street to the north and North Road to the south.

Officer response

The building heights within the proposed DDO20 and DDO21 schedules are discretionary. The amendment is implementing the Huntingdale Precinct Plan, and changes to the preferred heights are not strategically justified. It is not necessary to extend the 6-storey / 21m height limit further away from the Precinct Core. Understanding that a boundary needs to be drawn, it is more orderly and appropriate for this to be at Shafton Street. However, it is acknowledged that there is a significant difference in the preferred heights of 21m and 13.4/14.1m – and it would make sense to allow these heights to transition when away from residential interfaces.

In response to the submission, an additional decision guideline is proposed that would allow heights to transition up in scale between lower scale areas (without a residential interface) and higher scale areas. This would include sites near the boundaries between Areas 2A and 2B and 4A and 4B (except on Hargreaves Street). This is not considered to be a transformation of the amendment.

Summary of recommended changes to the amendment

The table below outlines the recommended changes to the amendment in response to the submissions received, and the rationale for the changes.

Recommended change	Rationale
Redraft the policy changes to align with new PPF structure (as per exhibited supporting documents)	Recent gazettal of Amendment C166mona deleted Clauses 21 and 22 in the Monash Planning Scheme and incorporated the policies into the State and Regional policy sections in Clauses 11-19 and

	Clause 02 – Municipal Planning Strategy, and other consequential changes.
Add the Huntingdale Precinct Plan as a Background document to the schedule to Clause 72.08.	This omission was identified during exhibition.
Changes to DDO1 schedule to remove sites within the Huntingdale Precinct from the Roads/Streets setback table.	The amendment removed sites in Huntingdale from DDO1 so the setbacks no longer apply.
Interface arrangements for industrial sites abutting residential areas	Most of the interfaces are along roads, however, there are instances in some precincts where development could be constructed immediately on the boundary up to 3-4 storeys in height. DDO21 should specify setback requirements in those instances to protect the amenity of the adjacent residential land.
<p>Revised DDO schedules to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove and replace 'grit' which referred to an inner urban feel to more appropriate wording • Clarify on which setbacks landscaping is required • Clarify that sleeving of podium car parking levels should occur above the 'ground level' • Clarify that building separation for amenity purposes is only required where near or adjacent to land where residential development is permitted • Clarify what 'public realm' may be in the context of private land • Clarify that the connectivity shown in the DDO maps, is indicative only • Align height requirements in Area 4B in DDO21 in the text to match the map and the Huntingdale Precinct Plan • Allowance in decision guidelines for buildings in lower scale areas to scale up to higher scale areas where there is no residential abuttal. 	Accommodating recommended minor changes from submitters that assist in providing clarity.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The amendment process and any subsequent panel hearing can be accommodated within existing operating budget allocations.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Council Plan 2021-2025

The Amendment and the Huntingdale Precinct Plan addresses the following strategies from the Council Plan:

- Ensure an economically, socially, and environmentally sustainable municipality
- Prioritise sustainable transport options, including walking/ cycling paths and public transport
- Improve public spaces and local employment by revitalising our employment hubs, activity centres and neighbourhood shops
- Prioritisation of pedestrians and active transport over vehicles
- Pursue a planning framework that meets Monash's needs

CONSULTATION

Exhibition of the amendment was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Planning and Environment Act 1987. The amendment was formally exhibited between 30 May 2024 and 1 July 2024 with the first notices sent out one week prior and the Shape Monash and other webpages available to the public from 23 May 2024.

Notice was undertaken by:

- Writing to all affected owners and occupiers (2,408 letters, 23 May 2024)
- Automated notification to relevant consultation subscribers on Shape Monash (23 May 2024)
- Writing to relevant government agencies and utility providers (27 May 2024)
- Writing to Prescribed Ministers (28 May 2024)
- Notice in the public notices section of The Age (28 May 2024)
- Notice in the Victorian Government Gazette (30 May 2024)

In addition to the statutory notice requirements, an article with the link to the Shape Monash website was included in the Monash Bulletin (circulated from 17 June 2024).

Strategic Planning staff were available during the exhibition period to respond to counter and phone enquiries about the amendment, and information about the amendment was provided to Customer Experience and Statutory Planning.

A dedicated Shape Monash page was created with basic information, all the amendment documentation, FAQs, instructions for how to make a submission and a submission portal, and a detailed information page that explains in detail the changes proposed in the amendment.

SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no social implications to this report.

HUMAN RIGHTS CONSIDERATIONS

There are no human rights implications to this report.

GENDER IMPACT ASSESSMENT

A GIA was not completed because this agenda item is not a 'policy', 'program' or 'service'.

CONCLUSION

As there are objecting submissions and submissions that are requesting changes to the Amendment that are not supported, it is recommended that Council refer the submissions and the Amendment to an independent planning panel.

While the number of submissions is limited, the issues raised are wide ranging and complex. These have been duly considered and, where possible, changes are recommended to improve the amendment – both in response to submissions and in dealing with changing circumstances.

In terms of the process going forward, a panel hearing will enable all parties to have the opportunity to present their comments and concerns. At the completion of the hearing, the panel will prepare a report for Council's consideration that will include recommendations about the amendment and whether it should be adopted with or without changes or abandoned.

ATTACHMENT LIST

1. Attachment 1 C173 Feedback Report August 2024 [7.1.5.1 - 28 pages]



Feedback Report

AMENDMENT C173 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HUNTINGDALE PRECINCT PLAN

August 2024



Feedback Report – Amendment C173

PROJECT BACKGROUND

In March 2020, Council adopted the *Huntingdale Precinct Plan*, which provides a transformative, long term vision outlining opportunities to revitalise the Huntingdale NAC and immediately surrounding areas. Consultation on the Precinct Plan occurred in parallel with the Clayton Precinct Plan in July to September 2019. A shorter phase of consultation occurred in February/March 2020. In resolving to adopt the Precinct Plan, Council also resolved for officers to consult further with landowners in Area 7 (in the south east of the precinct) about improvements in that area. This meeting was delayed due to the Covid-19 pandemic, and was subsequently held in May 2021.

In March 2023, Council noted the *Huntingdale Precinct Plan Implementation 2022-2028* and resolved to seek authorisation and exhibit an amendment to implement the parts of the Precinct Plan that are relevant to the Monash Planning Scheme.

Amendment C173 implements the Precinct Plan through a new local planning policy, minor rezoning of land in the core of the centre to the Commercial 1 Zone and Mixed Use Zone, applying a new schedule to the residential land within proximity to the core, applying a new Design and Development Overlay, and other minor administrative and policy changes.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the engagement is to consult with the community through a formal submission process, particularly affected landowners, about the amendment in full compliance with Section 19 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*.

The amendment is solely dealing with changes to the Monash Planning Scheme and only the parts of the planning scheme that Council has the power to change (i.e. application of zones or overlays, changes to local schedules, local policies and the Municipal Planning Strategy – consistent with State and Regional policies, Ministerial Directions and practice notes). There are other aspects to the implementation of the Huntingdale Precinct Plan that are outside of the scope of the amendment, such as streetscape improvements, changes to on-street parking arrangements and reducing vehicle speeds.

Exhibition occurred between 23 May 2024 (the giving of the ‘first notice’) and 1 July 2024 (the closing date of submissions). We consulted directly with landowners and occupiers of land affected by the amendment, other stakeholders (such as government agencies and utility providers), Prescribed Ministers, and indirectly with other residents, visitors and businesses.

SUMMARY OF ENGAGEMENT

Methods used	Stakeholders	Dates
Letters*	Landowners of affected land Occupiers of affected land	23 May 2024
Letters*	Prescribed Ministers	28 May 2024
Letters / emails	Government agencies Utility providers	27 May 2024
Shape Monash	Registered users of the platform, directed from letters	23 May 2024
Notice in The Age*	Interested people	28 May 2024
Notice in the Government Gazette*	Interested people, planning profession	30 May 2024
Article in the Monash Bulletin	Other interested residents, visitors and business owners	17 June 2024

*Denotes a statutory requirement under Section 19 of the Planning & Environment Act 1987.

ENGAGEMENT RESULTS

Summary of Feedback

17 submissions were received:

- 5 submissions were from residents in proposed GRZ12 areas
- 8 submissions were from landowners/occupiers in the IN1Z areas
- 2 submissions were from government agencies (Melbourne Water, DTP)
- 2 submissions were from other interested people, or where a location was not provided.

In terms of the position on the proposed amendment:

- 3 submitters supported the amendment without changes or provided a neutral position
- 8 submitters wanted changes to the amendment
- 6 submitters opposed the amendment (including raising issues beyond the scope of the amendment)

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Engagement methodology

Information provision, promotion and notification

Description	Methods
Letters to affected landowners and occupiers – describing the amendment, outlining how the property is affected (6 categories of changes), and a link to the Shape Monash to find out more information. Notice enclosed with letter.	Mailout
Letters to Prescribed Ministers. Notice and Explanatory Report attached to emails.	Letters emailed from Mayor's office
Letters / emails to Government agencies and utility providers. Notice and Explanatory Report enclosed with letters or attached to emails.	Letters mailed, emails sent (where relevant), or online form completed (depending on requirements of agency)
Shape Monash – project page created to outline the amendment, provide amendment documents and FAQs. Sub-pages with detailed information and interactive maps, and submission portal.	Platform automatically sends emails to registered users of the platform who have an interest in the same topics or areas as the project. Letters and other information direct people to the Shape Monash page for more information. Amendment page on Council's website also directs people to the Shape Monash page.
Notice in The Age	Notice placed in Public Notices section of The Age
Notice in the Government Gazette	Notice placed in Victorian Government Gazette
Article in the Monash Bulletin	Short article included in the Monash Bulletin, circulated during the consultation period.

Appendix 2: Full summary of stakeholder submissions



Summary of stakeholder responses

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
<p>SUB01 Resident in Beauford Street, Huntingdale (Area 8A)</p>	<p>Having read through the proposed plan to change the zoning of Huntingdale, I have a few concerns that I'd like addressed. The proposal itself is essentially designed to increase density of people living in the area (and thus increase council rate income) without addressing already existing parking and traffic issues.</p> <p>There is nothing I can identify in the planning scheme document located on the planning and transport website that addresses improving the parking situation that the commercial zone of Huntingdale is already struggling to support. Come down around lunchtime on any given working day and see for yourselves that it is virtually impossible to find a place to park your car - local or not.</p> <p>Where in the planning for eight-storey buildings and additional commercial spaces are the people who work or live in these buildings going to park their cars? Are the people like ourselves who own houses on the surrounding residential streets going to give up parking spaces on already congested side streets for this influx of vehicles. It's fine to make bold statements and assumptions that Monash will be encouraging people to walk and take public transport, but you have no ability to enforce how these employees will travel to Huntingdale, nor will you be able to determine what mode of transport visitors attending new commercial spaces will be using. The ability of Monash Council to employ sufficient parking wardens to monitor and manage Huntingdale is virtually non-existent already. We have a 2-hour parking zone covering half of our street (Beauford), and we have never once in 4 years seen a traffic warden, nor seen a warden in the Huntingdale shops area either. As a result, this 2-hour zoned area is regularly flooded with cars that do not move all day, as well as plenty of cars parked all over the nature strips.</p>	<p>Oppose Out of scope</p>	<p>Existing car parking rates will continue to apply – no Parking Overlay is proposed to apply different minimum rates or apply maximum rates. Car parking would need to be provided on site and preferably not within the front setback. The merits of waiving or reducing car parking requirements would need to be considered at the planning permit stage, however, most of the areas of this precinct are within a short to extended walking distance (400-800m) from Huntingdale station.</p> <p>The amount of land within an activity centre that can be used to provide car parking is limited, and has diminishing returns if off-street parking is provided exponentially to meet (and further induce) demand, rather than work to change travel mode to walking, cycling and using public transport.</p> <p>Council is currently undertaking a parking review of 10 main activity centres / areas across the municipality, and this includes Huntingdale. The review will look at, amongst other things, parking provision, restrictions and enforcement.</p> <p>Road rules currently require a clearance of 3m between parked vehicles on both sides of a street – regardless of whether parking is permitted on both sides. The width of many of</p>

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
	<p>Monash Council are fixated on avoiding cars being parked in the front setbacks in town planning, but at the detriment of residents being able to actually navigate cars through our streets. That's what we really care about. If there aren't enough wardens now to protect our rights to navigate freely through our tight streets, what guarantee is there that this will be addressed and policed appropriately with thousands of new residents, workers and visitors each day?</p> <p>The people who live in Huntingdale would obviously walk to attend the shops here, but ignoring a parking problem already present in Huntingdale, and adding thousands more residents and employees in the area would be reckless and impact significantly the amenity of the area. Both permanent and temporary parking needs to be a major consideration in any plan, and it is conspicuously absent from the plan to this point.</p> <p>An increase of 5-8,000 more residents is fine to me as long as you can ensure they have sufficient parking spaces that does not increase the parking of cars on side streets. You must ensure that any residential or commercial approvals have off-street parking to accommodate the owners or employees. Students can absolutely take public transport to get to Monash Uni, but that's not the only place they go to, nor does that make them exclusively public transport users. If one in four of 8,000 new residents own a car then you need to find 2,000 off-street parking spaces for them. Where are these spaces?</p> <p>I'm also suspicious of the General Residential zoning change to encourage more units/townhouses/apartments. I'm someone about to complete a side-by-side townhouse build in Huntingdale myself. During planning however, rather than allowing both properties to have double garages (easily with space to do so) it was Town Planning at Monash Council who determined they would disallow this because they didn't like the idea of the frontage view of the property having two double garages - citing it a problem with amenity. This was</p>		<p>the residential streets in this area can't facilitate parking on both sides. This was factored in when measuring car parking supply in the area, and would be factored in with traffic reports submitted with relevant planning permits.</p> <p>Many of the issues raised in the submission are beyond the scope of the amendment and can be addressed through other implementation actions of the Huntingdale Precinct Plan, or through other actions or projects of Council. The removal of the North Road overpass is a long term advocacy action of the Huntingdale Precinct Plan – but it is both complex and likely to be a low priority of the State Government (given it already achieves grade separation). There are actions in the Implementation Plan to improve connectivity and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>No changes were suggested to the amendment, and the central argument of the submitter is that car parking and traffic management issues should be addressed <i>before</i> we try to facilitate renewal and increased density (both employment density and residential density) – rather than in parallel through other implementation actions and on a case by case basis as part of the planning permit process.</p>

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
	<p>despite zero objections to the plans submitted to council. The residents seriously don't care about whether they are looking at a single garage or a double garage when they are walking their dog down the street - what they do care about is being able to negotiate their own car down the street and not have only centimetres spare on either side. If you are going to encourage higher density development, then please do so in collaboration with what the residents wants and needs are, not what Council considers "amenity".</p> <p>An expected influx of new residents, new workers, and new visitors to Huntingdale Road means that there needs to be serious consideration made to the fact that Huntingdale Road cannot be negotiated from one end to the other - that is to say that the looping of Huntingdale Road onto North Road and down residential side streets to access the other end of Huntingdale Road needs to be fixed. This is particularly important considering the high density living that is being planned for Clayton as part of the Suburban Rail loop.</p> <p>If we are adding tens of thousands more residents to Clayton and Huntingdale and thousands more daily commuters yet doing nothing to address the blocking of this main thoroughfare at Peak Hour then we are in big trouble. It is already very difficult to get our children to their schools and back in Oakleigh South by having to merge onto North Road (with no right of way) in order to get down to the other side of Huntingdale Road. At a minimum, the North Road bridge overpass should have three lanes on each side so those merging from Huntingdale to North Road (and vice versa have their own lane at a minimum. At best, Huntingdale Road should be a continuous road connecting Oakleigh South and Huntingdale suburbs. This needs to be addressed as part of any plan to increase the commercial workforce, shopping patronage, or residential density of the area. To not do so would be acting in total disregard of the people of Huntingdale to increase Council income streams through rates. Please plan in the interests of all people using Huntingdale,</p>		<p>State and Council policy already directs density to areas around train stations, the aim of the amendment is to direct much of that density to Huntingdale Road where people are more likely to choose other options to get around than a car.</p> <p>There are no recommended changes to the amendment in response to this submission.</p>

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
	both guests, residents and workers. We all deserve a well thought out and implemented plan here.		
SUB02 Industrial land landowner (Area 4A)	<p>[Part 1] General review of the plan proposed, we have the following feeling and suggestions to you to consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Making the area upgrade is great idea, we are happy to see this will be happening soon. 2. Rezoning area is too small to match with the population increasing from the area, means it is not enough to provide whole area continue to be developed in the next 5 years. 3. As Monash Council have to be compare with nearby city council like Whitehorse, Kingston, etc, the rezoning is a key activity to make the area economic growth faster, so at least it should support next 10-20 years area development instead of only 5. 4. Enlarge mix used zone as photo showed. <p>[Image provided showing MUZ4 drawn into IN1Z areas to west and east of C1Z areas – north to Hargreaves Street, south to North Road, east to between Shafton and Fenton Streets and west to between Moller and Hamilton Streets]</p> <p>[Part 2] Additionally, we also can look around far away further of Huntingdale outside area, Westall train station area growth very well for high density apartments buildings, Park Royal new shopping centre been developed just recently which is a more than 10 levels big mix used building and IKEA building shopping mall in Sprivale opening less than 10 years.</p> <p>Thinking Clayton Railway new station comes into construction now by state government, council also have to release the traffic and population pressure a greater range than normal.</p>	Changes sought	<p>Changes sought are inconsistent with the adopted Precinct Plan. The mixed use areas in the Precinct Plan are in Area 3 north of the existing commercial area. However, only the residential land along Huntingdale Road is being rezoned as part of this Amendment.</p> <p>The submitter wants parts of Activity Area 2 and 4 rezoned to MUZ4 to facilitate urban renewal. There remain important industry anchor tenants in these areas, and retaining a non-residential zone in this location will allow employment uses to continue. The MUZ is primarily a residential zone and doesn't have capped limits for accommodation uses unlike the Commercial 3 Zone.</p> <p>There is no evidence to support the rezoning of well-located industrial land to MUZ would increase economic growth in the long term (beyond of the construction sector) – and limiting the range of employment uses through new land use conflicts.</p> <p>There is sufficient land within the precinct that allows residential uses – within the proposed mixed use, existing residential and existing / proposed commercial areas.</p> <p>There are no recommended changes to the amendment in response to the submission.</p>

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
	<p>So above, If this amendment is not right step to meet with the area demand for the next 10-20 even 30 years planning, definitely will obstacles the area economy development.</p> <p>I believe, for currently C173 plan, less than 5 years, Monash Municipal Council have to come back to do another amendment, that means waste more funds and energy both, as council rate payer, I really do not want to see this happening.</p>		
SUB03 Resident in McIntosh Street (Area 8B)	<p>I believe that though the idea of rejuvenating the Huntingdale precinct is worth undertaking, what has been proposed here does not implement progress, but rather causes more problems. As a home owner who lives in McIntosh St, the flow of traffic is a key impact. This is not because of the use of cars over other vehicles but due to the parking of vehicles of residents and the area being used as a thoroughfare between Oakleigh and Clayton. By increasing the density of housing then the amount of cars will increase and although I agree with the concept of reducing the usage of cars, the council needs to be realistic about what it will be able to achieve. By increasing the density of the housing then more cars will need to be parked, with not every car being parked in dedicated parking, but rather left on the street. This will increase the congestion in the area.</p>	Mixed, mostly oppose	<p>Similar issues as raised in SUB01.</p> <p>Council can manage existing on-street parking restrictions in order to provide enough parking for residents and visitors.</p> <p>McIntosh Street is a local street and Council can make layout changes and speed reduction techniques to discourage drivers using this street instead of North Road, Houghton Street and Maroney Streets. However, this is beyond the scope of the amendment.</p> <p>There are no recommended changes to the amendment in response to the submission.</p>
SUB04 Industrial landowner in Edward Street, Oakleigh (Area 1A)	<p>The proposed amendment indicates a proposed a pedestrian link or road which will split [our] properties into two parcels and severely affect the site coverage.</p> <p>There is no indication of compensation should the pedestrian link or road go ahead.</p> <p>The material is unclear as to whether it is to be a pedestrian link or a road, making the effects of the amendment on [our] properties ambiguous.</p> <p>Reading the material, 4 storeys will be allowed, however if it's not to be predominantly residential and/or commercial use, then multi-</p>	Oppose	<p>The response to this submission is mostly clarification about what the amendment intends to do and the purpose of planning controls and policies.</p> <p>The subject site consists of a number of industrial properties in contiguous ownership {located on corner of Edward and Westminster Streets} with a total site area of around 1.2ha.</p>

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
	<p>storey industrial is not viable or appropriate when industrial functions are considered (i.e. truck loading docks).</p> <p>There is no guidance or clarification on parking ratios that are to be adopted, and the suggested carparking at first floor makes it very difficult for site realisation as they compete for valuable ground floor space. The proposal to have zero street setbacks has the added problem of needing to provide sightlines. For example, a 15 m wide frontage would lose the 6m ramp plus 4m for sightlines, leaving only one third of the width of the site as building.</p> <p>The wording regarding 'limited residential' use does not give us confidence in being able to access the number of floors able to be given over to residential use. For example, will council approve one, two or three residential floors, or only the equivalent of a caretaker's unit.</p> <p>The site currently consists of 10 lots with a number of excellent buildings able to be refurbished.</p> <p>The proposed amendment adds little value, but increase in rates and outgoings will be reflected in the general uplift of the value in the neighbouring properties should the amendment be adopted, leading to a potential disadvantage for [our] properties.</p> <p>From [our] point of view, we are being penalised because we have the potential to be consolidated into a larger site but with no planning offsets, such as more intensive development when compared to those of the neighbouring small sites (ie additional floors of residential or height).</p> <p>If the 10 lots are to be consolidated and re-subdivided, council is likely to ask for a number of costs and charges in association with the consolidation, and once the site is fully developed, subdivision. It is impossible with the information to hand what impact this will have on the value a large property should the amendment be adopted and development go ahead.</p>		<p>The HPP and DDO21 seek to have a pedestrian link that would go through this site (extending south from Wells Road). The pedestrian link is desirable, not mandatory, and would only be something that is considered when and if the land is being developed. This pedestrian link could also be a road, and the future development of the site may benefit from additional internal roads – particularly if subdivided.</p> <p>Car parking requirements continue to be as per the rates in Clause 52.06, as no Parking Overlay is proposed with the amendment. The zero metre setbacks are not mandatory and setbacks where ramps are proposed may be necessary for practical reasons. However, the amount of space given over to vehicle access should be minimised and pedestrians and level footpaths should be prioritised.</p> <p>There is no reference in the amendment to 'limited residential', however, the HPP did contain a reference in Activity Area 1 because there are residential properties on Burlington Street – not because we want to introduce residential uses into the industrial areas.</p> <p>It is recommended to change the language in the DDO schedules to mark the pedestrian links as being indicative only. There are no other recommended changes to the amendment in response to the submission.</p>

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
SUB05 Industrial landowners in Connell Road and Downing Street, Oakleigh (Areas 1A and 2A)	Correction of drafting errors – refer to separate table.	Changes sought	Refer to separate table. Some minor changes are recommended to the amendment in response to the submission.
SUB06 Resident outside of precinct	What are the plans to ensure enough parking space in the area, especially for the Huntingdale Shops? Currently there is not enough car spaces for the shops, the religious institutions in the area and the surrounding factories. What are the plans to cater for the increased traffic in the proposed area? Obviously the proposal is to allow for new apartment buildings. What is the plan to ensure each apartment has two car spaces?	Oppose / clarification sought	Similar issues raised in SUB01 around the impact of increased density on existing traffic congestion and parking demand. As discussed above, the existing car parking requirements apply. Only 3+ bedroom dwellings require 2 spaces, and would be overkill for apartments with 1 bedroom to require two car spaces. This is a well-located area within close proximity to train and bus services – it is not necessary to increase the current minimum rates. There are no recommended changes to the amendment in response to the submission.
SUB07 Industrial landowner in Burlington Street, Oakleigh (Area 1A)	I wish to support the above amendment and be advised of what type of mixed use development can be explored [for my] properties.	Support	Support noted. Query mostly in relation to what is permissible in the Industrial 1 Zone. Submitter was responded to directly by email.
SUB08 Resident on Huntingdale Road (Area 3D or 8B)	I am a resident (of Huntingdale Road) and would like to seek additional information regarding the planning on community infrastructure services around the impacted areas due to rezoning. Based on the C173 and rezoning, there will be a lot of multi-storey buildings/facilities both commercial and residential that may come up in near future and considering already under stress infrastructure specifically roads (entry from North Road into Huntingdale Road,	Oppose	Similar issues raised in SUB01 around the impact of increased density on existing traffic congestion. Queries by the submitter was responded to directly by email, pointing to the Implementation Plan.

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
	<p>Exit of Huntingdale Road into Centre Road and Clarinda Road) will be in a severe congestion with the proposed rezoning.</p> <p>With the construction on Huntingdale Road for commercial facilities, the local area is already facing several challenges i.e. long delays and congestion during school times, traffic safety for children, single lane road making it difficult for residents to approach Huntingdale Road due to heavy traffic and noise levels during the day and night.</p> <p>Also, with a large commercial complex coming up at the corner of Centre Road and Huntingdale Road will create even more in-bound and out-bound traffic between North Road and Huntingdale Road. Considering two big primary schools in the vicinity of the area, it would be imperative to have futuristic infrastructure planning in the area.</p> <p>Can I please request any additional planning information on the basic infrastructure such as roads, traffic safety, and planning for heavy traffic and congestion and thereby causing noise pollution in the area due to high density population and what plans do council have in place for such changes for the residents? Appreciate if you can point me to any existing plans or information available on the council website that we can refer to?</p>		<p>There are no recommended changes to the amendment in response to the submission.</p>
SUB09 Melbourne Water (Agency)	<p>[Final submission only, and summarising verbatim comments]</p> <p>Melbourne Water would like to advise that we are not seeking to alter the PSA or propose any alternate wording. Primarily we want to note that the below information and maps are intended to provide high level information to council officers in relation to the future development of the areas highlighted in relation to possible flooding constraints.</p> <p>Furthermore, the indicative maps that we have provided are likely to be superseded within 12 months. It is important for Council to be aware that new flood mapping for the entire municipality is currently being undertaken and due for completion June 2025. It is understood that the flood modelling incorporates climate change inputs which may alter the risk and hazard relating to flood. Any</p>	Neutral	<p>The neutral position and information from Melbourne Water is noted.</p> <p>Melbourne Water has supplied information around flooding impacts in Areas 4 and 7.</p> <p>In Area 4, the flooding impacts are isolated to a small section of North Road (near the overpass / Huntingdale Road) and do not cross property boundaries. Melbourne Water has indicated that it can support the proposed intensified development in this area if access is provided at the rear.</p>

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
	<p>strategic planning scheme amendment should take into consideration the upcoming flood information.</p> <p>Melbourne Water does not intend on participating in a planning panel hearing as the comments and feedback we have provided are intended for information and not an objection to the amendment. However, this is not intended to discourage Council from altering the PSA if they wish to respond to the information provided.</p> <p>Some precincts/area within the PSA are liable to current 1% AEP flooding from the East Oakleigh Drain DR5041. Based on current 1%AEP points data, the Area 4 and area 7 of precinct are subject to flooding overland flow of Oakleigh MD in the 1%AEP storm event.</p> <p>The properties at North Road within Area 4 have safe access at rear of the properties, hence Melbourne Water could support intensified development within area 4, but only when access is provided from the rear of property as well.</p> <p>The 1%AEP flood depth at two properties at Valley Street (adjacent to Oakleigh MD) are subject to deep flooding. Melbourne Water do not support intensification in areas where flood depth, velocity and velocity x depth factor are unsafe ('safe' is considered depth <0.3m, Velocity <2m/s and VxD <0.3m2/s). However, if safe access is provided to the two properties at Valley Street outside of deep flooding (greater than 0.3m), then Melbourne Water would have no objection to a development at these properties as well.</p>		<p>Flooding impacts in Area 7 are mainly problematic for two properties at 7-15 & 17-27 Valley Street. Melbourne Water has indicated that if access is provided away from unsafe flood depth areas, then development could proceed. It should be noted that Amendment C173 does not propose intensification in Area 7 – above and beyond what is already permitted in DDO1.</p> <p>There are no flooding impacts shown to the urban renewal, C1Z area or mixed use area, which are proposed for more intensive development.</p> <p>The heights in the DDOs are not mandatory and so accommodating raised floor levels, where necessary, could be achieved with a marginal increase above the preferred height limit.</p> <p>There are no recommended changes to the amendment in response to the submission – mostly noting that new flood modelling is being prepared and it would be premature at this stage to address specific issues in the amendment.</p>
<p>SUB10 Industrial landowner in Coora Road, Oakleigh South (Area 7A)</p>	<p>[Our property] currently has a mix of land use of industrial and retail spaces. {Retail space being the corner of Coora Rd and Natalia Ave.}</p> <p>The challenges in the industrial area 7 had been the poor amenities, poor interfaces with residential area, poor safety and walkability as identified in the report. Hence, we advocate for the recommendation of Charter Keck Cramer report 2020 and 2019 PWC</p>	<p>Changes sought</p>	<p>These issues were comprehensively considered by Council at its meeting on 23 March 2023.</p> <p>It has been a long standing position of Council to retain the existing industrial zoning in Area 7, and to not transition it to allow residential</p>

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
	<p>report published by Monash Council. The recommendation for Precinct area 7 to possibly be gradually transition to residential. Area 7 is located as a 20 minute neighbourhood with close proximity and accessible to transport, shops and amenities. We implore the council and state government to consider the support the rezoning of this corner of our site to be mixed use zone.</p> <p>As the objective is stated in the Economic Mix under 4.4 to balance residential growth with employment uses to complement the transformation of industry, to attract knowledge intensive industry sectors and support green open space, we propose the precinct plan point 4.5 Place P14 Public space for your consideration. The new open space would form part of the large strategic redevelopment site in the mixed use of a plaza, green open space and residential usage. We envision this site to be a balance place of work, rest and play.</p> <p>We believe mixed use development is vital in revitalising this derelict industrial area and breathing new life into the neglected part of this neighbourhood. We are confident in coming up with a master plan that would allocate a percentage of ground floor to public space and contribute to the affordable housing and numerous job opportunities. This mixed use project would also serve as economic engine by offering spaces for commercial and retail activities thus making significant contributions to Huntingdale being the Monash employment cluster. With human scaled site planning and diversity of spaces, we believe the design would be a driving catalyst for change and create a vibrant and open urban life across the neighbourhood.</p> <p>[Images included]</p> <p>We are looking forward for the council and state government to explore the opportunity to work together in maximising the Huntingdale Precinct transformation for the interest of residents and business alike.</p>		<p>uses. Having large employment-only areas is useful in protecting the amenity of surrounding residential areas and allowing industries to continue to operate or expand while meeting the buffer distance requirements – even if there are arguments around the usefulness of the zoning in the interface areas. Council continues to see value in Area 7 as a place for employment intensive industry.</p> <p>The PwC report formed some background analysis that was never incorporated into the finalised precinct plan. It has perhaps emboldened a minority of landowners in Area 7 to continue to make submissions requesting rezoning.</p> <p>It is quite possible to retain the existing zoning and to allow the area to transition to cleaner, employment intensive, and high tech industries, and to improve the amenity of the place for workers and visitors – through street tree planting, better quality footpaths and public open space.</p> <p>There are no recommended changes to the amendment in response to the submission.</p>

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
<p>SUB011 Industrial landowners in Valley Street, Coora Avenue, Natalia Avenue, Oakleigh South (Area 7A)</p>	<p>[Executive summary only] It is the Owners’ primary submission that the Plan, first adopted by Monash City Council in March 2020 and not substantially altered in the later 2023 version, is an outdated strategic document and that it does not provide a sound strategic basis upon which to proceed with this Amendment. Not only has it failed to implement key recommendations of the background studies which initially informed its preparation, it has failed to take into account changes to the broader strategic context since the Plan was first prepared. This includes the progress of the Suburban Rail Loop Project East and the formation of the Suburban Rail Loop Authority (SRLA) as a planning authority. There is also the more recent and heightened focus on housing supply, the Housing Statement and the whole-of-government approach to facilitating and securing additional and much needed housing into the future. The Amendment, the proposed controls and the direction of the Plan all fail to recognise the strategic potential for the broader precinct and Activity Area 7, including our client’s land. Our clients were submitters during the initial exhibition of the draft Plan in September 2019 and continue to hold the view that Council’s vision for the precinct and, in particular, Area 7, will not be achieved by merely introducing new built form controls and cosmetic public realm improvements. There is a significant volume of expert analysis, including in the areas of planning, economics and urban design, which is before the Council, and which confirms that a zoning change is necessary and desirable to allow Activity Area 7 to be utilised effectively. Unfortunately, this direction has not been effectively incorporated into the Plan and, in turn, into implementing policy and planning controls that form the Amendment. It is submitted that Activity Area 7, as identified within the Plan, is no longer appropriate for traditional industrial uses, for the following reasons: — It is physically disconnected from other industrial areas.</p>	<p>Changes sought</p>	<p>The HPP was adopted by Council in March 2020 and the HPP 2023 version incorporates the adopted changes but didn’t update the document. The issues raised in the submission were comprehensively considered by Council at its meeting on 23 March 2023. The Amendment was referred to the SRL Minister as the precinct is partially within the Clayton SRL planning area. They requested no changes to the amendment. There is a fundamental question here about retaining the integrity of the industrial areas for primarily employment purposes. Overall, the current policy framework strongly encourages the retention and development of existing industrial precincts. Monash has state, regional and local employment precincts that are identified in both the Monash Planning Scheme and the Melbourne Industrial and Commercial Land Use Plan (MICLP). The designation under the MICLP of state, regional or local is an identification of the major role the area serves it is not considered to be an indicator of the overall use and value of that area as employment land. This provides a unique opportunity for business to go from idea, to start up, to expansion, all within Monash. It is noted that</p>

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
	<p>— There is poor connectivity between Area 7 and the broader road network, resulting in large trucks being forced to move through residential areas to access the industrial properties.</p> <p>— The area is in decline, with multiple vacancies and many sites which are underutilised. The existing building stock is not suitable for new-generation manufacturing and warehouse activities. Our client’s submission is that Area 7 has attributes that require a more nuanced planning approach, including the following considerations:</p> <p>— The site has strategic significance as it is close to the Monash Medical Precinct, railway stations, the future Suburban Rail Loop, and the Monash National Employment and Innovation Cluster (NEIC). (See Figure 2, below)</p> <p>— The proximity of Area 7 to the rail station also provides a catalyst for new and differing employment uses to locate.</p> <p>— The inclusion of some residential into Area 7, as part of a mixture of uses, is appropriate given its interface with low-rise residential areas in the General Residential Zone.</p> <p>— A rezoning to a Mixed-Use Zone (MUZ) would allow for uses in Area 7 with a higher employment density including those that would provide services for adjoining residential areas, such as child care, aged care facilities, small supermarkets.</p> <p>— Rezoning to the MUZ would also provide the potential for affordable or social housing options, key worker housing and built-to-rent in a well-serviced location.</p> <p>This submission will detail the context of the Owners’ land and Area 7 more generally, the planning policy context, and the merits of and suggestions for the introduction of alternative controls for the Area.</p>		<p>there has been a significant amount of redevelopment activity in the precinct, including Area 7 over the last 2-3 years.</p> <p>Officers are of the view that recent developments clearly demonstrate a strong market demand for development in Area 7 with the main constraint to redevelopment being the willingness of landowners to sell or redevelop the land themselves. Whilst it is not suggested that a change of zoning would not increase property values and potentially act as an incentive for redevelopment, given the uplift that would be created, this is not the role of either the planning scheme or the Precinct Plan. Additionally, where such uplift occurs, redevelopment will primarily be the higher value use – in this case residential – which is contrary to the objectives of the Precinct Plan and State policy.</p> <p>Rezoning Area 7 (presumably including their clients’ land and all other properties in this precinct)</p> <p>Such a change, if incorporated now, would represent a transformation of the amendment and would require re-exhibition if it were to be entertained. A piecemeal approach to rezoning is also not supported. Furthermore, Melbourne Water would object to further intensification of development in the southern areas of Area 7, which a MUZ would facilitate.</p>

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
			<p>There are some contradictions in the submission. Area 7 is physically disconnected from other industrial precincts but is also a great location for higher employment density in a MUZ and well-located close to technology and health precincts and railway stations.</p> <p>The land use background report prepared by PwC in 2018 proposed rezoning Area 7 to C1Z in the short/medium term (0-10 years) and RGZ / GRZ in the long term (10-20 years). This represents a significant departure from ‘proper and orderly planning’ and it is understandable why it was not entertained in the draft HPP and ultimately the adopted HPP – despite submissions from property speculators.</p> <p>There are no recommended changes to the amendment in response to the submission. This includes entertaining the rezoning of Area 7A, and splitting and re-exhibiting the amendment only as it relates to Area 7A.</p> <p>These issues can be explored in more detail should the amendment proceed to a panel hearing.</p>
SUB012 Industrial landowner in Hamilton Street, Oakleigh (Area 2A)	Having reviewed the exhibited material accompanying proposed Amendment C173 to the Monash Planning Scheme, we are generally supportive of the implementation of the balance of the Huntingdale Structure Plan in encouraging future growth and opportunity in the centre.	Changes sought	There is a small area of existing residential properties on Burlington Street, which is why the land use mix in the Precinct Plan includes residential for Area 2. In addition, the amendment has sought to rezone some properties on Railway Avenue that are

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
	<p>We however object to the following aspects of the proposed amendments:</p> <p>The proposed retention of the Industrial 1 Zone as it applies to our site. This zone does not appropriately enable the envisioned land use and built form outcomes set out within the Huntingdale Structure Plan and in turn Amendment C173 to be accommodated appropriately on our land. "Activity Area 2" as applicable to our property seeks for a mix of "residential, retail, commercial and industrial uses", and contains aspirations of built form which are activated through a combination of setbacks and visual permeability commensurate with residential, commercial and retail uses. The purpose of Industrial 1 Zone does not align with the intended mixed-use and activated built form outcomes envisioned for the site as part of the amendment. This zone instead outlines a distinct purpose to: To provide for manufacturing industry, the storage and distribution of goods and associated uses in a manner which does not affect the safety and amenity of local communities. The Industrial 1 Zone does not appropriately accommodate these uses as the use of land for residential purposes is a Section 3 Use (Prohibited), with Retail and Office uses requiring a permit for consideration due to the nature of the zone.</p> <p>The proposed pedestrian link proposed through our property and adjacent to the southern boundary. Whilst recognising the intent of the proposed pedestrian link to connect Jack Edwards Reserve to the broader activity area in creating a network of connections. These should be marked as "indicative street/laneway" given the location across private land parcels.</p>		<p>opposite the station to the C1Z, allowing for a wider range of uses (including residential at upper levels).</p> <p>The Precinct Plan has not contemplated wider provision of residential uses within Area 2, and the Industrial 1 Zone on the submitter's site is appropriate.</p> <p>It is recommended to change the language in the DDO schedules to mark the pedestrian links as being indicative only. There are no other recommended changes to the amendment in response to the submission.</p>
SUB13 Residents on North Road, Oakleigh South (Area 8B)	Area 8B in the Huntingdale Precinct Plan 2023 is identified as a 'housing diversity area' with a focus for residential development within walking distance of the Precinct Core and public transport. Amendment C173 proposes to rezone the subject land from GRZ2 to the GRZ12. The proposed changes to Area 8B seek to retain the 3-storey building height limit.	Changes sought	Prior to exhibition, it was a condition of authorisation to consider the capacity of the precinct, including the residential areas in proposed GRZ12, to accommodate forecast housing growth. This information was included in the Explanatory Report. The

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
	<p>It is considered that this amendment fails to address key housing priorities and parts of Area 8B should be designated for higher density housing. The proposed GRZ12 supports housing diversity in the form of units, townhouses, and apartments, however the built form along North Road will result in an underdevelopment and population growth in the area as the height limit of 11m and 3 storeys.</p> <p>Clause 16.01-1S Housing Supply policy is to: “Encourage higher density housing development on sites that are well located in relation to jobs, services and public transport”</p> <p>The land adjacent to North Road should therefore be zoned Residential Growth Zone and allow at least 4-5 storeys. The lower-scale and medium density housing should transition into the local neighbourhood and street network.</p> <p>We also recommend an addition to the Clause 22.17-3 and Clause 21.06 to address housing form in Area 8B (North Road) to have higher density built form.</p> <p>The Huntingdale Precinct Plan (2023) was adopted on 27 March 2020. There has been significant adjustment in the Victoria housing market, most notably the critical shortage and affordability of housing. The Victorian Housing Statement (September 2023) sets an ambitious target of 800,000 new homes in Victoria in the next 10 years. The recent release Draft Housing Target for Monash will require an additional 72,000 dwellings in the municipality by 2051. Located near a key transport node and employment precinct, the land in and around the Huntingdale Precinct provides a strategic opportunity to provide increased housing. Residential land on major road corridors should be zoned Residential Growth Zone to facilitate higher-density well designed housing to meet the future housing needs. The RGZ zoning along North Road would also deliver on the ‘20-minute neighbourhood’ and ‘place through responsive design’ principle for the Huntingdale Precinct.</p> <p>Many of the lots along North Road, including the subject land, are identified as a part of the Victorian Government’s Future Homes</p>		<p>Precinct Plan has sought to centralise housing growth and change along Huntingdale Road and near the station in the C1Z and MUZ, and accommodating housing diversity in the established residential areas.</p> <p>However, the State Government’s ambitious housing targets were released during the exhibition of this amendment. At the time of writing these are draft targets put out for consultation. The State Government has not released the data that underpins their assumptions, and there are questions about the feasibility of the targets in the absence of significant (state-wide) reforms, and infrastructure contributions. It is perhaps a little premature to be pivoting the amendment to address housing targets that have only just been released and where a reform roadmap has not yet been established.</p> <p>The Draft Precinct Plan was prepared anticipating the use of the RGZ in Areas 8A and 8B (and the existing residential areas of Areas 1 and 2). However, it was amended post consultation in response to submissions to retain the existing height and setback requirements.</p> <p>There is significant time between now and 2051. There is the potential to consider the future of the residential areas in a future amendment, while focussing growth in the meantime within the Precinct Core – where</p>

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
	<p>program. It is a logical inclusion to identify this land for higher density residential development.</p> <p>It is understood that there is under-supply of community infrastructure in the precinct, however the opportunity for increased housing density should not be compromised by the community infrastructure provision. The Precinct Plan projects the population to increase by 3000 residents by 2051 and additional residents would generate more Council revenue to reinvest into the community. The proposed RGZ to North Road would require this amendment to be reconsidered and reexhibited. It is considered an appropriate strategy given the changes in housing and economic conditions since the adoption of the Precinct Plan in 2020.</p>		<p>access to local goods and services, and infrastructure (including community infrastructure) is at its best.</p> <p>There are no recommended changes to the amendment in response to the submission. This includes entertaining the rezoning of parts of Area 8B to RGZ, and re-exhibiting the amendment. These issues can be explored in more detail should the amendment proceed to a panel hearing.</p>
SUB014L Resident (unknown location)	<p>I would like to object to the planned proposal for increasing the residential building height limit to 11 metres or 3 stories high. This would be a blight on the Huntingdale neighbourhood. There would be no natural sunlight in certain residential backyards at different times of the year and also no privacy from neighbouring 3 storey windows looking in to private backyards.</p>	Changes sought	<p>There is no change to the default height in the residential areas in the Huntingdale Precinct when going from GR22 to GRZ12 – it remains at 11m / 3 storeys. Officers have explained this in an email back to the submitter.</p> <p>There are no recommended changes to the amendment in response to the submission.</p>
SUB015L Industrial land owner (Area 4B)	<p>[Relevant verbatim comments are included]</p> <p>We note that there appears to be a disparity between the provisions of proposed Clause 2.3.8 to DDO21 for Table 8 - Area 4B, which states that development in Area 4B should deliver a maximum building height of 14.1m (up to 4 storeys). This appears to not align with Map 2 of the controls, which appears to show sub-precinct 4B as being included in the '13.5m/3-4 storeys' Building heights category (i.e. light blue colour on the map).</p> <p>It is our client's position that the subject site should have a higher maximum building height than what is proposed (which is currently proposed as either 13.5m/3-4 storeys or 14.1m - up to 4 storeys (which requires clarification as noted above). This is based on the following considerations:</p>	Changes sought	<p>There is a disparity between the heights in the table for Area 4B and what is shown on the corresponding map, and this will be corrected.</p> <p>The amendment is faithfully implementing the Huntingdale Precinct Plan, and changes to the preferred heights are not strategically justified.</p> <p>It is not necessary to extend the 6-storey / 21m height limit further away from the Precinct Core. A boundary needs to be drawn somewhere and it is more orderly to put the</p>

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subject site is in close proximity to the precinct core where higher maximum building heights are being promoted. • The subject site is in the south-west corner of sub-precinct 4B, directly opposite sub-precinct 4A, where a substantially higher maximum building height of '21m-up to 6 storeys' and maximum street wall height of 13.5m is proposed. • The subject site has no sensitive residential interface, having a robust corner frontage to North Road and built to boundary side abuttal to Shafton Street, which has the attributes for allowing higher maximum building height. • Applying Shafton Street as the boundary between sub-precincts 4A and 4B appears arbitrary, and a more nuanced approach should consider properties on the east side of Shafton Street within sub-precinct 4A to allow similar built form to flank both sides of the street at a maximum of 21m-up to 6 storeys, then allowing the height transition to occur in the balance of sub-precinct 4B further to the east and north. • The southern end of sub-precinct 4B fronting North Road is a robust environment which has a wide arterial road frontage, with relatively larger lot sizes, and with no residential interface, which provides the attributes for larger strategic redevelopment opportunities, including encouraging greater building height in this part of the Huntingdale precinct. • The HPP notes that Activity Area 4 is located close to the Precinct heart with a valued, robust character that will be retained and enhanced (refer p43 of HPP); which are indicators that consideration should be given to higher maximum building height in that part of the sub-precinct immediately east of Shafton Street. • The HPP and DDO21 encourage the retention and adaptive reuse of existing industrial buildings to retain the 'grit' of the 		<p>boundary at Shafton Street. It is also noted that the heights are discretionary and it is possible to have a good or acceptable outcome that exceeds the preferred height.</p> <p>However, it is acknowledged that there is a significant difference in the preferred heights of 21m and 13.4/14.1m – and it would make sense to allow these heights to transition when away from residential interfaces.</p> <p>In response to the submission, we can provide an additional decision guideline to allow heights to transition up in scale between lower scale areas (without a residential interface) and higher scale areas. This would include sites near the boundaries between Areas 2A and 2B and 4A and 4B (except on Hargreaves Street).</p>

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
	<p>existing character, which by the nature of their built form have greater floor to ceiling heights than more contemporary buildings. It is not feasible to provide up to 3 or 4 storeys with a maximum height of 13.5m (or 14.1m), where the floor to ceiling heights of original factories/warehouse constraining opportunity to provide upper additions to create 3/4 storeys within this maximum height.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is submitted that Council should consider reviewing that part of sub-precinct 4B [between Hume Street and North Road, extending from Shaftton Street to mid-block] to be included in sub-precinct 4A in lieu of 4B. This land does not have the constraints of residential interface where there is a need to transition to lower height needs to be considered, as is required in the northern part of sub-precinct 4B.</p> <p>These sites fronting North Road are in close proximity to the precinct core and have the robust character and larger lot sizes that should be able to absorb a higher maximum building height as proposed for sub-precinct 4A.</p> <p>While our client is generally supportive of the proposed planning scheme amendment to implement the HPP, it is considered that the context of the subject site should allow it to be developed for a greater maximum building height than 3/4 storeys (13.5m) or 14.1m - up to 4 storeys. It is submitted that consideration should be given to include the subject site in a sub-precinct that would facilitate its development for 4 storeys but at a greater height than 13.5/14.1m given the adaptive reuse of the building fabric and the site context.</p>		
SUB16L Department of Transport & Planning	[Raised some minor issues with respect to the already adopted Huntingdale Precinct Plan, namely no discussion in Section 2.5 about cycling and walking, provided some background information on regional cycling routes, a minor correction of a bus route number, support for upgrades and expansion of cycling network in Section 4.6, unlikely support for reducing vehicle speeds on North Road, in Section 5.3 consideration in road space allocation for bus	Neutral	Noted If we need to make future changes to the Precinct Plan, we can accommodate the minor changes as suggested.

Submission no. and details	Verbatim comments	Submission Position	Officer comments and recommendations
	<p>prioritisation on Huntingdale Road, and support for the importance of the bus interchange] [Comments on Amendment C173] Overall, the Head, Transport for Victoria has no submission to make against the Amendment as exhibited and thank you for the opportunity to review the Amendment.</p>		
<p>SUB17L Resident (Area 8B)</p>	<p>Having read the information available to us on the proposed changes we have several concerns and wish to advise the council of our objection to some of the proposed changes to our zoning and its broader context. We have (not that long ago) been through an extensive review of the zoning around our home and while we had some concerns we agreed with its intent and status, we felt the dwelling type(s) and other guidelines were suitable for our area, this included the 7.6 meter front setback and the 5 meter rear setbacks, we agreed that this was reasonable given our location and the land sizes and residential types. We understand the concept and construct of the strategic planning changes to our area, we as always support the evolution of our suburb, I note the plan literally stops on our street, indeed on OUR side of the street. As I am reading the available information it appears to not allow for any gradual transition to higher density buildings. I would refer the council to the our last correspondence on the zoning mater in that for all the I recently received your feedback document outlining the draft plan for Huntingdale Neighbourhood, on a personal note our family sought out an opportunity to move and live in the Oakleigh area, We find it some what offensive that after our planning and effort we are now being asked to be part of some kind of Huntingdale 20 minute city it is unreasonable. [Questions asked as well, which were responded to by email]</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>While GRZ12 will allow increased housing diversity, this is also something that is currently permitted by state, regional and local planning policies. The GRZ allows development to a range of density and the schedules do not set a defined density.</p> <p>Being part of “some kind of Huntingdale 20 minute city” is something that is inevitable due to the submitter’s location – within very short walking distance to a train station and shops.</p> <p>Through Amendment C173, we are allowing more intensive development within the core of the activity centre so that more people can benefit from this location as well.</p> <p>There are no recommended changes to the amendment in response to the submission.</p>

Submission 5

Clause or schedule and content	Requested change by submitter	Comment by submitter	Officer comment
New local policy Clause 22.17-4 Application requirements <i>All applications must include a written statement outlining how the proposal meets the objectives and relevant strategies of this policy, and any other relevant provision of the Huntingdale Precinct Plan 2023.</i>	Insert wording: If in the opinion of the responsible authority an application requirement is not relevant to the evaluation of an application, the responsible authority may waive or reduce the requirement.	The application requirements should allow for the discretion of the responsible authority to take into account the relevance for each application.	The revised clause (to fit the new PPF structure) no longer contains this application requirement. The HPP is included as a document to consider as relevant.
DDO21 2.1 – Definitions <i>Precinct core: All land within Design and Development Overlay - Schedule 20, forming the boundaries of the Huntingdale Neighbourhood Activity Centre.</i>	Replace '20' with '21'.	Correction of Schedule number.	Drafting is correct. The precinct core is contained within DDO20, not DDO21 (which applies to the broader industrial/commercial precinct).
DDO21 2.2.1 – Building form and design requirements <i>Encourage adaptive reuse of suitable existing buildings to retain the 'grit' of the existing character.</i>	Delete	Retention of existing buildings for reuse is inconsistent with the Schedule's objectives to facilitate and encourage taller development. Additionally, the term 'grit' is not a relevant planning terminology.	The DDO is simply encouraging the adaptive re-use of buildings and may not always be feasible. Shorter form development can be accommodated in taller building forms, particularly in areas where a street wall and upper level setbacks are encouraged. Agree about the comments on the term 'grit'. We will find a more suitable term to use.
DDO21 2.2.2 – Ground level requirements <i>Designing vehicle crossover to maintain pedestrian priority to a minimum width of 1.6 metres.</i>	Reword to provide clarity of outcome sought.	The requirements of this statement are unclear. If the requirement relates to pedestrian paths being 1.6 metres wide, this is unnecessarily excessive	For clarification, the width is measured perpendicular to the road. 1.6m is standard and suitable footpath width – allowing two pedestrians to pass, and allowing

		and inconsistent with the preference to provide landscaping opportunities.	<p>unobstructed access to those with mobility aids.</p> <p>The requirement here is when designing vehicle access, part of the driveway should be flat to a minimum of 1.6m to allow pedestrian priority.</p> <p>This requirement applies to lots of areas, some without existing footpaths. It is not a mandatory requirement but the needs of pedestrians should always be considered when designing vehicle access, along with specific requirements for vehicles. This would be assessed on a case by case basis.</p>
<p>DDO21 2.2.2 – Ground level requirements <i>Setbacks, where provided, are to include at least 60% garden landscaping.</i></p>	<p>Reword to: Front setbacks, where provided, are to include at least 60% garden landscaping.</p>	<p>Specify that the requirement applies to front setbacks consistent with the HPP. As drafted, it would suggest that this provision also applies to rear and side setbacks.</p>	<p>To clarify, the requirement is meant to apply to setbacks with a road interface – in most instances this is a front setback but may also be a side or rear setback if the site is on a corner or has access to a rear street – and those streets have setback requirements.</p> <p>Agree to revise for clarification purposes but not in the way the submitter has suggested.</p>
<p>DDO21 2.2.3 Upper level requirements <i>To minimise the overshadowing impacts on the public realm and open space (existing and proposed), levels above 13.5m street wall must be set back...</i></p>	<p>Reword to: To minimise the overshadowing impacts on the public realm and open space (existing and proposed), levels above a 13.5m street wall should be set back...</p>	<p>Revised wording to demonstrate this is a discretionary requirement. The proposed use of the term “must” implies a mandatory application of the control which then fails to enable development to respond to site</p>	<p>The DDO schedule does not say a permit cannot be granted to vary any of the requirements of the schedule. Therefore all requirements are ultimately discretionary, however, it may be useful to distinguish between design outcomes that are merely</p>

		context and site opportunities and constraints.	desirable from those that are more fundamental and given higher order consideration. The use of this wording within the schedule has been very deliberate, and they are deliberate in relation to the upper level setback requirements.
DDO21 2.2.3 Upper level requirements <i>Encourage the provision of sleeved active uses where podium car parking is proposed above the first floor.</i>	Revise. Encourage the provision of sleeved active uses where podium car parking is proposed above the ground floor.	Current wording suggests that car parking at the first floor does not need to be sleeved with active uses.	Agreed. This appears to be an error, and can be corrected in line with the submitter’s recommendation.
DDO21 2.2.3 Upper level requirements <i>Encourage sufficient separation between buildings to maximise outlook and amenity. Development should be setback from common boundaries at the upper levels a minimum of:..</i>	Reword to: Encourage sufficient separation between buildings to maximise outlook and amenity, where appropriate. Development should be setback from side and rear boundaries at the upper levels a minimum of:	Amenity requirements would not be applicable to industrial areas. Specify that the requirement applies to side and rear boundaries.	Agreed in part, although DDO21 does have areas that interface with areas that allow residential development (e.g. western side of Huntingdale Road). Could probably shift this requirement to precinct-specific requirements.
DDO21 2.2.4 – Landscaping and connectivity requirements <i>Provide generous public realm, where front setbacks are required, including opportunities for canopy planting, pedestrian pathways, and casual seating.</i>	Reword to: Where front setbacks are required, provide landscaping including opportunities for canopy planting.	Deletion of reference to public realm as the requirement suggests that front setbacks are required to be vested to Council. Within private land, there should be no requirement to provide pedestrian paths and casual seating.	We can review the terminology used to distinguish between true public realm areas from areas that are in private ownership but may be accessible to the public. In some instances, such as along new and long pedestrian links, for developers to include amenities for workers and visitors – even if the land remains in private ownership. This is only likely on particularly large sites.

<p>DDO21 2.2.4 – Landscaping and connectivity requirements <i>Improve the pedestrian connections within the Precinct through providing sufficient setbacks for laneway widening, where applicable, and providing new laneways through larger blocks.</i></p>	<p>Insert additional wording at end of sentence: ... as identified in Maps 1 and 2.</p>	<p>Provide reference to Maps 1 and 2 to the Schedule to ensure clarity on where pedestrian connections are desired.</p>	<p>Agreed. We can add this wording to provide clarity as recommended.</p>
<p>DDO21 2.2.4 – Landscaping and connectivity requirements Introduce new through-site links and courtyard spaces within new development to improve site permeability and reintroduce a fine grain within the sub-precincts.</p>	<p>Insert additional wording at end of sentence: ... as identified in Maps 1 and 2.</p>	<p>Provide reference to Maps 1 and 2 to the Schedule to ensure clarity on where site links are desired.</p>	<p>Agreed. We can add this wording to provide clarity as recommended.</p>
<p>DDO21 5.0 - Application requirements Where street setbacks are required, plans showing landscaping works, including canopy tree species and mature height, other vegetation (including ground cover) and permeable surfaces.</p>	<p>Delete</p>	<p>This is a preferred design response rather than an application requirement. The preferred design response is sufficiently provided in Clause 2.2.4 Landscaping and connectivity requirements.</p>	<p>It is appropriate and common to have both design requirements in Section 2.2.4 and an application requirement to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in Section 5.0.</p>