

Sub No.	Submission Summary
1	<p>Support the Amendment and Guidelines</p> <p>Suggested changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figure 7 Access and Movement: more bus stops in reality than shown and should be added to figure.</li> <li>Route 109 tram should be shown in correct location to the east of the pedestrian crossing.</li> <li>• Figure 8: the street tree symbol only shows indicative tree numbers and should be labelled in legend.</li> <li>• Page 31: terms such as 'patische' and 'kitsch' needs to be replaced.</li> <li>• Page 43: suggested grammar and spelling changes, meaning of 'urban presence' needs to be clarified.</li> </ul>
2	<p>Minimum height 4 storeys in all precincts</p> <p>Need land on southern side of Box Hill for parklands</p> <p>Pedestrian experience around shopping centre disjointed</p>
3	Support Built Form Precinct B in Structure Plan being included in Built Form Precinct D or F as Box Hill is growing
4	<p>Support the proposed amendment to include new building heights.</p> <p>Proposed changes would help Box Hill become a vibrant, modern and prosperous city, encouraging business growth and employment</p> <p>Proposal consistent with encouraging increasing population density and improving supply of affordable housing</p>
5	<p>Concern about aggressive development</p> <p>Concern about infrastructure required for new development, including train and bus interchange and car parking</p> <p>Sub-precinct F2/F3: 2-3 storeys, F5: 8-10 storeys, F9: 2-3 storeys</p>
6	<p>Support intent of proposal</p> <p>Insufficient recognition of origins of Box Hill as a small town</p> <p>Roads are not wide enough, can create overshadowing and wind tunnel</p> <p>Precinct C/F1 should be expanded further and take in all of Carrington Road, from Station Street to the roundabout, encompassing shopping centre and train station. The height limit should be 4 storeys, with increased setbacks</p> <p>Minimum car parking requirement must be reinstated to requirements before car parking overlay was implemented as using public transport is not realistic and could result in greater unemployment</p>
7	<p>Buildings should not be higher than 4-8 storeys</p> <p>Building towers is making traffic in side streets very heavy, traffic noise, pollution and car parking</p>
8	<p>Think the Box Hill Mall is a Key Open Space, will there be controls to prevent overshadowing of the Mall?</p> <p>Is it possible to include street level setbacks at strategic locations along Station Street to allow for trees and seating</p> <p>What can be done to minimise wind tunnel effects as seen by the ATO?</p> <p>Walking and cycling needs to be encouraged and car travel minimised</p> <p>Can the guidelines provide for increased bike storage capacity?</p> <p>Set down spots are needed for car passengers</p>
9	<p>Amendment appears to cater for at least one massive high rise building</p> <p>Hard to imagine planners are giving consideration to environmental matters</p> <p>No building in Australia should be allowed unless it provides at least 25% of its land area to gardens that includes canopy trees</p> <p>Infrastructure concerns including car parking and congestion</p> <p>Planners should be insisting that each apartment is allotted at least 2 car parks as using public transport is not attractive or viable</p> <p>Major concern is plan to rezone more areas for high rise</p>
10	<p>All further buildings in Box Hill no more than 10 storeys for the following reasons:</p> <p>Buildings create wind tunnels</p> <p>Create areas of little to no sunlight</p> <p>Buildings only have 1 and 2 bedroom apartments which will not ease the housing crisis</p> <p>People do not use, or want to use, public transport as it is dirty, unsafe and standing room only</p> <p>Not a sufficient amount of car spaces being provided</p> <p>Number of people will create traffic congestion</p> <p>Berlin has wide streets with 10 storey apartment blocks, why can't Box Hill be similar?</p> <p>Residents feel ignored, undervalued and shoved aside by Council</p>
11	<p>Owner and occupier of 716 Station Street, Box Hill</p> <p>Support proposed rezoning from RGZ to MUZ</p> <p>Suggest F2 include two further properties along Station Street to the laneway between 718 and 720 Station Street as the laneway is a natural dividing line</p> <p>Would alleviate confusion and inconsistency between the Guidelines that apply to a property zoned MUZ and those included in Precinct B of the Structure Plan</p>
12	<p>Director of company which owns 718 Station Street, Box Hill</p> <p>Supports Submission 11</p>

13	<p>Proposal for 20 storey buildings in F4 and 30 storey buildings in F5 will significantly impact the quality of life in area</p> <p>Buildings will be visible from all parts of yards and significantly change the family character of the neighbourhood</p> <p>Proposed heights inappropriate near heritage precinct</p> <p>More appropriate height limit for F4/F5 would be 8 storeys, like in F9</p>
14	<p>Issue is speed of development, dramatic increase in population density and inadequate commitment to parallel development of infrastructure</p> <p>F1/F2/F3/F7/F8/F9: 8 storeys, F4:15-20 storeys, F5: 25 storeys, F6: 10 storeys</p> <p>Council should be insisting that Federal/State Governments commit to funding infrastructure before major changes to Planning Scheme are considered</p> <p>Council and government should negotiate with developments to form partnerships with community e.g provision of open space, adequate car parking, social housing etc</p> <p>Infrastructure should include: major investment in Box Hill Transport hub, new schools/child care, social/affordable housing, new sporting/recreational facilities, examine parking flow/congestion/car parking overlay, health/community services</p> <p>Proposed changes only talk about how high buildings can go, should also talk about the mix of development</p> <p>Not sure why changes are being pushed through when the rate of development occurring in Box Hill is not occurring in other MACs, can only think that other Councils are taking time to ensure the accompanying infrastructure is in place before approving changes to the planning scheme</p>
15	<p>Object to 100% site coverage in F1, F2, F3, F4, F5 and F8. Ground level should be setback from the street frontage to allow for planting of canopy trees</p> <p>100% site coverage will result in the urban heat island effect</p> <p>Has consideration given to a wider footpath?</p> <p>Green space is important to prevent flooding and there is no provision for new public open spaces</p> <p>Object to the bulk of the proposed height as Box Hill does not need extra large developments</p> <p>Is there any plan to upgrade the Box Hill interchange?</p> <p>F1/F3/F6/F7/F8: 8 storeys, F2: 12 storeys, F3: 8 storeys, F4: 12 storeys, F5: 20 storeys, F9: 5 storeys</p>
16	<p>Regret that control of Building inspector functions rest with private sector, elected Government must now try to control via planning regulations</p> <p>Opportunity to showcase good modern urban planning, as private sector will not provide this</p> <p>Pedestrians should not be overwhelmed by building bulk, able to move through ground floors or buildings</p> <p>Higher buildings should be setback at upper levels</p> <p>Retain a sense of space and ability to see the sky and horizon</p> <p>Higher buildings should provide open ground level areas</p> <p>Broader open space, such as Whitehorse Road, should be protected</p> <p>More shade trees, planting, seating and less intrusion of built form</p> <p>Pedestrian and road traffic should be separated over Whitehorse Road</p> <p>What regulations control Built Form Precinct A of the Structure Plan?</p> <p>Solar panels should be protected from shadows cast by taller new buildings</p>
17	<p>F1/F9: 6 storeys, F2/F3/F4/F5/F6/F7: 10 storeys, F8: 8 storeys</p> <p>All towers above 4 storeys should be setback from the footpath to allow canopy trees to be planted, and reduce loss of greenery, wind tunnels impact</p> <p>Towers should not be allowed to have highly reflective cladding as it can reflect to other buildings and drivers/pedestrians</p> <p>Council needs to make car sharing schemes mandatory in apartment blocks</p> <p>Apartments need to have minimum floor sizes eg. at least 50sqm for a 1 bedroom apartment</p> <p>Council should greatly increase the number of required car parking spaces unless it can successfully lobby for the duplication of the rail line from Box Hill to the city and a new tram line along Canterbury Road</p> <p>Possible that there will be a glut of apartment buildings</p> <p>Council needs to know, per storey, the additional number of people that it will bring to the resident or employee population in Box Hill and what proportion each storey will need in the provision of green space, waste disposal, use of public transport, libraries, health, schools etc, If this cant be provided now or when the building process is finished then council needs to restrict development</p>
18	<p>Object to current planning standards, height limits of 30 storeys or more is unnecessary</p> <p>Work in Box Hill and walk amongst litter, dumped trolleys, hard waste rubbish in front of apartment blocks, which is only going to get worse.</p> <p>Not enough all day parking and public transport is not convenient or suitable for all</p>
19	<p>Concern that number and size of buildings proposed and general height limits are creating a satellite CBD and apartment residential area in Box Hill</p> <p>Road and transport infrastructure is unlikely to withstand rapid increase in population and are already congested</p> <p>No obvious planning for longer term capacity of vital infrastructure such as signalling capacity of train system, capacity of trains, additional tracks etc</p> <p>Accidents will occur where there is congestion on the track</p> <p>Developers are not contributing significantly to the real cost of bulding the neccessary support infrastructure</p> <p>What is being done to cater for primary and high schools in the area?</p> <p>For each precinct, what is the impact on the infrastucture of increase in density, and what advance action has been taken to absorb the growth?</p> <p>What steps is Council taking to protect the neighbourhood character of surrounding suburbs from the expansion of Box Hill?</p> <p>Dark lines on the proposal showing Precinct A and Precinct B of the Structure Plan suggest that expansion is foreseen and inevitable and inevitable creep will occur</p>

20	<p>Disappointed and dismayed with the current massive development of highrise towers in Box Hill</p> <p>If new heights are adopted it will only further destroy the character of the city and will become a concrete and glass jungle</p> <p>Box Hill is already crowded and unable to cope with the additional population</p> <p>Roads are choked with cars and trucks and public transport cannot cope</p> <p>Access to the railway station is inadequate</p> <p>Quality of shopping centrea has declined with the loss of major stores and retailers</p> <p>Heritage and character of Box Hill should be protected</p> <p>Heights of 20 and 30 storeys should be reduced to 15 and 20 storeys</p>
21	<p>Fail to see:</p> <p>how creating further CBD type neighbourhoods on top of an existing city will improve the quality of life for original inhabitants</p> <p>why anyone would want Melbourne to grow to 8 million people when the rest of the state is empty</p> <p>how it is in the national interest to have Melbourne grow to 8 million people</p> <p>why it is in the national interest to be following United Nations visions of 20 minute neighbourhoods as we are not China or India</p> <p>why we do not develop a number of rural centres such as Ballarat, Bendigo and Geelong with high speed rail</p> <p>Australia and Victoria are empty, yet considering 30 storey buildings with no setbacks and no landscaping</p> <p>We are not Singapore, Hong Kong, India, China or Soviet Union - it would not happen in Toorak, Brighton, Middle Park, St Kilda Road where they have taxi pick up facilities, fountains, landscaping and setbacks</p> <p>F1: 8 storeys, F2/F4: 12-15 storeys, F3: 10-12 storeys F5: 20 storeys, F6: 15 storeys but 4 storeys on Thames Street and facing Box Hill Gardens, F7: 12 storeys but 6 storeys on Elgar Road and Thames Street, F8: 12-15 storeys but 6 storeys on Irving Avenue, F9: 12 storeys but 6 storeys when abutting Kingsley Park</p> <p>Quality of buildings is very important to consider - most important aspect is whether new flats are owner/occupied or rented</p> <p>How much space will medical/education interests take up?</p> <p>Are government agencies planning to move to Box Hill?</p> <p>Need effective representation continually in Box Hill</p>
22	<p>In F3, Watts Street should not be grouped in with Rutland Road and Carrington Road as Watts Street is primarily established residential areas</p> <p>Do not believe that the proposed height limit of 10-12 storeys is suitable for Watts Street, should not exceed 3-5 storeys</p> <p>Any future development of the Watts Street car park should be mindful of the existing residential character</p> <p>F2 should be 8-10 storeys to prevent overshadowing</p> <p>Council needs to consider the negative impacts of the proposed changes on car parking within Box Hill</p>
23	<p>Support the prompt adoption of Amendment C175 as concerned at the lack of controls over high rise development in Box Hill</p> <p>10 storeys, with setbacks, is appropriate for Station Street</p> <p>F3 should be no more than 5 storeys</p> <p>Other concerns include visual blight, overshadowing, potential wind tunnels, lack of social housing, lack of infrastructure, removal of tree cover, lack of amenity and disruption</p>
24	<p>Too many high rises in Box Hill, have residents been asked?</p> <p>Prefer a suburban area</p> <p>Local infrastructure not set up to cope with proposed population density causes by high rises</p> <p>Do not want approal of anything more than a few storeys high</p> <p>Want an investigation into who approved the current high rises and how they demonstrated this is what residents want</p> <p>Want better infrastructure to mitigate risk of traffic congestion</p>
25	<p>Do not recall any consultation about high rise buildings such as ATO and twin towers on Whitehorse Road, and further towers have been approved without regard for ratepayers views</p> <p>New towers intrude into homes and visible like next door</p> <p>Current proposal to set height limits and design guidelines are so inappropriate and will destroy amenity for the area</p> <p>Proposed height limits should be halved and generous setbacks and landscaping requirements should be mandated</p> <p>Bureacratic letter sent to residents only include a poor quality, black and white map with no explanation about what is being proposed</p> <p>Many loyal ratepayers are elderly and a referendum on greedy pro-growth policy would be a better way to gauge community views</p> <p>No consideration or provision has been given to problems of increased pedestrian and vehicle traffic</p>

26	<p>Disappointed in belated attempts to confront planning issues of pre-eminent MAC</p> <p>Impact of this proposed development will detrimentally impact on quality of life</p> <p>Assumption that bulk of MAC residents place little value on matters such as trees, gardens, nature strips, amenity</p> <p>Decision making of councillors could be distorted, Elgar Ward Councillors became ambivalent about development proposals whereas other Ward Councillors content to support accelerated growth in Box Hill to ensure it doesn't occur in their Wards</p> <p>No evidence in Guidelines about present vehicle movement in and around the MAC</p> <p>No attempt to assess how many vehicles will move into and out of the MAC</p> <p>No attempt to assess how many pedestrians will need to be catered for</p> <p>No provision for safe bicycle paths and adequate bicycle storage</p> <p>No consideration for probable need for shuttle bus service</p> <p>MAC is not an attractive place and will get uglier as setbacks are reduced</p> <p>Green spaces in the centre and south of the MAC should be created by using contributions from developers</p> <p>Council is naively allowing developers to set their own height limits</p> <p>All decisions suggest the possibility of corruption in the planning process</p> <p>Suggest height limits be halved unless, or until the issues of accessibility and transport are properly resolved</p>
27	<p>Rising towers look like they are almost in the backyard of a neighbour, visually offensive</p> <p>Hot days the metallic cladding reflects heat and sunlight</p> <p>Local developers like to remove trees, Asian buyers like to remove trees</p> <p>Council is allowing Box Hill to become a dumping ground for unwelcome, high concentrations of people</p> <p>None of the other MACs has allowed the same pace and scale of development</p> <p>Governments need to cut immigration or develop a decentralisation policy to move people to regional areas</p> <p>Assume Council is greedy and/or corrupt</p> <p>Why doesn't Council hold a referendum about these ultra-growth proposals?</p> <p>Author of letter to residents about Amendment is incompetent or intending to undertake a fake consultation</p> <p>Consultation process was resident unfriendly</p> <p>Huge, ugly towers will inevitably create traffic chaos, no provision for widening roads and setbacks removed</p> <p>No provision for bike paths and pedestrian traffic appallingly congested</p> <p>This is not Hong Kong, Asian developers and Councillors want to make it like Hong Kong</p> <p>Developers should be required to contribute significantly to the cost of infrastructure</p> <p>Propose a complete ban on any new approvals of towers more than 10 storeys high</p> <p>Built Form Precinct A in the Structure Plan should be only 2 storeys</p> <p>Precinct B and D should be only 2 storeys, setback requirements should not be reduced</p> <p>F1: 5 storeys, F2: 4 storeys, F3: 3 storeys, F4: 4 storeys west of Nelson Road, 20 storeys east of Nelson Road, F7: 3 storeys, F8: 5 storeys but 2 storeys along Irving Avenue, F9: 4 storeys but 2 storeys abutting residential areas</p> <p>Towers are monuments to rampant self delusion and greed</p> <p>Council should immediately undertake consultancy to identify what tree plantings and tree protection are required in neighbouring areas to screen the stark ugliness that has been foisted upon the neighbourhood</p> <p>No thought has been given to climate change and the need for more trees</p>
28	<p>Agree that there should be maximum building heights in Precinct F</p> <p>F5: 20 storeys</p> <p>Infrastructure needs to be sufficiently wide enough to carry additional traffic</p> <p>Must be sufficient parking for residents of new towers</p> <p>Must be better and more frequent public transport</p> <p>Height restrictions and size of buildings should not be altered in other Built Form precincts</p>
29	<p>Submission for 1011-1023 Whitehorse Road, Box Hill</p> <p>Supportive of Council seeking to implement more tailored planning controls but strongly oppose the Amendment as it relates to the site at 1011-1023 Whitehorse Road</p> <p>Amendment fails to recognise the site's contextual and strategic opportunities as the site is located in Activity Precinct F and Built Form Precinct B in the Structure Plan</p> <p>Requests that the property and land located on the northern side of Whitehorse Road be included in Built Form Precinct F because of the site's size, current zoning of C1Z, location on Whitehorse Road, adjoining planning permits</p> <p>Request that the property and land also be included within Activity Precinct A of the Structure Plan and within Precinct F3 in the Guidelines and DDO6</p> <p>The requested changes will provide an appropriate strategic and statutory document that allows the future development potential of the site and land to the immediate east and west to be achieved</p>

30	<p>Submission for 16-28 Nelson Road, Box Hill</p> <p>Generally supportive of Council's amendment, in particular the proposed rezoning of the site to MUZ</p> <p>Opposes the introduction of the DDO as it is inappropriate for the site and should be varied to better suit the site context</p> <p>Proposed setback is completely different in the Guidelines to those that currently exist in the Planning Scheme</p> <p>The Structure Plan states avoid front and side setbacks however the Guidelines request an 8m setback</p> <p>Guidelines do not recognise legacy situations where incremental changes are made to existing facilities</p> <p>Proposed setback requirements do not reflect the prevailing circumstances</p> <p>Given the disparity, there is a reasonable case to include the east side of Nelson Road in a different Precinct or Sub-Precinct to recognise the particular issues</p> <p>Believe the height limit of 15 storeys is unreasonably restrictive given the height of the approved adjacent development</p> <p>Seeks change to the front setback provisions (adopt a zero front setback)</p> <p>Seek a change to the preferred height limit to 20 storeys</p>
31	<p>Believe the number and height of buildings proposed is excessive</p> <p>What are the plans for infrastructure</p> <p>Transport and parking is already a problem</p> <p>F1/F2/F3: 6 storeys, F6: 15 storeys, F7/F8/F9: 4 storeys</p> <p>Concerned that the Structure Plan boundary will be expanded into residential areas.</p>
32	<p>Do not agree to the heights</p> <p>What proof is there that these will be lived in, or sold to international buyers?</p> <p>When is Council going to have meetings with residents?</p>
33	<p>Object to the proposed amendment because of overshadowing due to the change of heights, increased stress on narrow streets, increased congestion and increased strain on infrastructure</p> <p>Recommend that Built Form Precinct F in the Structure Plan be reduced to Precinct D for the area west of Elgar Road</p>
34	<p>F1/F2/F3/F6/F7/F8/F9: 3 storeys, F4: 4 storeys, F5: 5 storeys</p> <p>Do not wish to live in a city, do not want to see a satellite city</p> <p>Box Hill and surrounds are already too congested and it is difficult to find a carpark</p>
35	<p>Insufficient infrastructure to support the proposed increases in housing density</p> <p>Should include much lower height limits - F1/F2/F3/F4: 8 storeys, F9: 4 storeys, F5/F6/F7: 8 storeys</p> <p>Separate western part of F6 should be included in F7 precincts</p> <p>Consultation process has been inadequate</p> <p>No details were provided in the mailout about the proposed height limits</p>
36	<p>No towers should be allowed west of Elgar Road</p> <p>8 storeys too high for Kingsley Gardens</p>
37	<p>Object to the massive heights proposed as preferred maximum heights</p> <p>Current tall buildings have become a wind tunnel and an eye sore and overshadow pedestrian walkways</p> <p>Traffic congestion will get worse</p> <p>Environment will suffer greatly</p> <p>Essential services will also be affected</p> <p>Single or double storey only near Kingsley Gardens</p> <p>Do not want to see any buildings on the north side of Elgar Road TAFE on Victoria Crescent</p>
38	<p>Agree that there should be maximum building heights in Precinct F</p> <p>Height in F5 should be 20 storeys</p> <p>Infrastructure needs to be sufficiently wide enough to carry additional traffic</p> <p>Must be sufficient parking for residents of new towers</p> <p>Must be better and more frequent public transport</p> <p>Height restrictions and size of buildings should not be altered in other Built Form precincts</p>
39	<p>Submission for 517-521 Station Street, Box Hill</p> <p>Supports Council's approach to updating the design and development controls applicable to the Box Hill MAC</p> <p>Amendment C175 sets out a positive direction for the future development of the MAC and it establishes an appropriate framework to facilitate the development of the proposed design brief for the site.</p>
40	<p>Amendment is only about built form and shows no areas allocated for education/open space or improve east-west and north-south movement</p> <p>Sites for education and open space cannot be found on the amendment map</p> <p>Roads are already overloaded</p> <p>Close alignment of the proposed high rise buildings and lack of quick accessibility to sites could lead to potential problems in a crisis</p> <p>Amendment lacks any knowledge of the current problems, including traffic congestion and water pressure</p> <p>Built form amendment fails the practical and social needs of the future and current communities</p>
41	<p>F1, F4 and F5 should have no height limits, however this should be applied with consideration of the impact on wind and light to the surroundings</p> <p>In all precincts residential accommodation should include a wide range of dwelling types to enhance community diversity and include design standards for a significant proportion of dwellings to enable older residents to age in place</p>

42	<p>Will wind modelling be done before developments are given approval?</p> <p>Setbacks need to ensure pedestrians do not feel overwhelmed, and should be setback from the 3/4 storey</p> <p>Wide footpaths, treed avenues and seperated bike lanes need to be integrated into the development of C175</p> <p>No east-west or north-south bike riding route through Box Hill central or the transport hub</p> <p>Not possible to ride to Aqualink from the north</p> <p>How can we get people out of cars and using active transport?</p>
43	<p>Object to the way Council is progressing the proliferation of high rise building in a suburban environment</p> <p>Shopping centre and station is Asian ghetto</p> <p>Previous ward councillors didn't answer questions about voting on the new high rise building applications and residents were never consulted</p> <p>Council wants to extend the northern boundary past the hospital to another further residential block to Severn Street, therefore assume that extension will continue</p> <p>Council should hold a referendum about high rise in Box Hill</p> <p>Council needs to develop an easily understood planning document about what is planned for the future</p> <p>Maintain 2 storey maximum number of houses to built on existing residential sites, pushing for 1 storey</p> <p>Have a maxium coverage rule, 60% buildings</p> <p>Have a rule that all vehicles should be garaged or parked on site</p> <p>Any high rises have room measurements to stop small room developments</p> <p>Any high rise building must have adequate car parking, 2 spots for each dwelling</p> <p>New buildings limited to 2 storeys in existing residential areas</p> <p>All councillors and council employees must declare any interest in any development taking place in Whitehorse. If they do they must stand aside, resign and be removed from any voting on planning issues</p>
44	<p>Invited by Councillors to nominate preferred height limits for towers</p> <p>Absence of coherent rationale for the scales proposed and therefore impossible to respond to the document</p> <p>Council should provide residents with a concise and coherent account of its reasoning</p> <p>Council has not had detailed discussion about the consequences in terms of traffic, overshadowing, pedestrian amenity, transport availability, wind effects, water run off and impact of aesthetic appreciation of nearby residential areas</p> <p>No estimate of expected daytime and nighttime population under projected height limits</p> <p>Already developments approved exceeding preferred height limits</p> <p>Traffic and congestion has reached saturation point</p> <p>Councilors engaged in tokenisic attempt to consult residents</p>
45	<p>Strongly oppose the height limits outlined as it will destroy the amenity of the area</p> <p>Regularly read the local paper/council publications however only found out about this through local councillors</p> <p>Council has been trying to hide the plans as there have been no articles in the local paper/council publications</p> <p>Council should hold a referendum about heights</p> <p>None of the other MACs have allowed the same pace and scale occuring in Box Hill</p> <p>What are the motives of Council, Box Hill should not have take more people</p> <p>Box Hill interchange cannot cope with current population</p> <p>Box Hill does not need high rise buildings, they should be restricted to the capital city</p> <p>Huge, ugly towers will create traffic chaos and there will be a need to upgrade infrastructure</p> <p>Developers must be made to contribute significantly to the cost of infrastructure that will be required</p> <p>F1: 10 storeys, F2/F3: 5 storeys, F4: 10 storeys, 4 storeys west of Elgar Road, F5: 10 storeys, F6: 4 storeys, F7:3 storeys, F8: 5 storeys but 2 storeys along Irving Avenue, F9: 4 storeys but 2 storeys abutting residential areas</p>
46	<p>Object to the proposed new height limits of 8 storeys around the Kingsley Gardens.</p> <p>Suggest height limit of 3 storeys or the existing height of TAFE buildings west of Elgar Road</p> <p>Encroachment of tall buildings outside the central precinct will decrease the ambience of the suburban area, therefore encroaching on the values of surrounding properties</p>
47	<p>Council applied heritage overlay, extremely dissapointed about changes in neighbourhood</p> <p>Box Hill Police station at rear of property creates noise, overshadowing and overlooking of property</p> <p>Rezoning of the block and southern neighbours to RGZ creating the likelihood of high density, large development to the south</p> <p>Neighbours second floor extension casts a shadow on backyard in winter</p> <p>Dominos Pizza outlet to the north of property is noisy, damages fence and has over flowing rubbish</p> <p>The amendment will mean the house is bordered by large bulk developments</p>
48	<p>Since first submission, received a further letter and coloured sheet requesting comments about heights</p> <p>Very unhelpful, and detrimental, to focus on building heights alone</p> <p>Built form guidelines should deal with, and balance, all aspects of buildings. Building shape, setbacks and overshadowing controls have more productive application than height</p>

49	<p>Support the general intent of the Guidelines, but believe it is too late as VCAT believes that approved towers set benchmark for height</p> <p>Massive buildings detract from the suburban nature of Box Hill and create many new problems, especially in relation to infrastructure such as transport</p> <p>All buildings should have minimum setback at the street frontage</p> <p>Long range view and vista to Dandenong Ranges is a myth</p> <p>Built form defines an area, but the use is also important</p> <p>Shops along Station Street between railway line and Whitehorse Road looks like an Asian ghetto</p>
50	<p>Enormous and extended areas of Built Form Precinct F is alarming</p> <p>Where is the state government investment in the current plans, including expansion and upgrading of infrastructure and utilities, roads and circulation, school and kindergarten and the tired public transport interchange</p> <p>Lack of results from Council advocating to upgrade the interchange is ominous</p> <p>Proposed spread of massive built structures will dominate, dwarf and shade the immediate neighbourhood</p> <p>Traffic congestion is already a problem</p> <p>Key open spaces are totally inadequate and there must be more mandated green space</p> <p>No clear provision for linked bicycle and pedestrian movement</p> <p>Absence of transitional building scale zones in several areas</p> <p>Lack of obvious commitment or requirement for housing diversity, affordable housing or social housing</p> <p>Potential for creep into adjoining areas</p>
51	<p>Submission on behalf of Blackburn Village Residents Group</p> <p>Interface with residential areas outside the city needs careful management</p> <p>Prefer allowable heights to be lower particularly near the interface and open space</p> <p>If heights are to remain as recommended then setbacks should be applied at street and upper levels</p> <p>Amendment and proposed DDO do not demonstrate progressive design</p> <p>Concerns about how the future amenity and permeability of Box Hill will be maintained and enhanced</p> <p>Street walls should be set further back to contribute to landscape planting</p> <p>No justification for 100% site coverage, space should be provided as setback or private open space</p> <p>Planning amendment should recognise the value of generous footpath widths, landscaping and street level open spaces</p> <p>Tall well designed buildings should return public and private open space to the city centre as a trade off for height</p> <p>Sustainability only refers to the existing Structure Plan which is light on</p> <p>Scant reference to meeting the present or future cycling needs of community including dedicated cycle lanes</p> <p>No reference to cycling nor street design that envisages a cycling network</p>
52	<p>New buildings need to be designed to minimise wind at street level</p> <p>Traffic is already bad and will become worse</p> <p>New buildings should only be 10 storeys high, with a preference for 5-8 storeys</p> <p>Taller buildings should have upper storeys stepped back</p> <p>Current buildings have highly reflective surface which creates a hazard for motorists</p> <p>Poor TV reception as a result of the current tall buildings</p> <p>Concerned that the proposed building heights in the vicinity of Box Hill mall will result in overshadowing of the mall</p>
53	<p>The changes do not address any housing shortage but provide opportunity for developers to produce an oversupply of overpriced and poor quality apartments. If Amendment is to address the shortage of affordable housing it will need to be far more prescriptive in determining a minimum percentage of low cost housing in each development</p> <p>Proposed major development area is too vast and the proposed heights are too great</p> <p>20-30 storeys should be restricted to a smaller area south of Whitehorse Road</p> <p>Rest of major development area should have a reduced limit of 8-10 storeys with 1-2 storeys adjacent to residential areas and open spaces</p> <p>This would ensure overshadowing, overlooking and wind tunnels could be better managed</p> <p>Introduction of a large number of buildings in small location will place a burden on existing infrastructure, such as stormwater, sewer, gas, water and power supplies. Any upgrades should be borne by the developers</p> <p>New multi level developments should not be dependent on Council waste collections but have off street collection with private waste management plans</p> <p>Insufficient car parking - developments must consider the provision of adequate car parking</p> <p>Public parking must remain affordable</p> <p>Influx in dwellings will cause a change in the traffic patterns, before current proposal is accepted a comprehensive traffic management plan should be produced</p> <p>Amendment remains silent on the protection of existing buildings, particularly those of heritage or local significance</p> <p>Little provision for the protection of existing open spaces and the introduction of new open spaces</p> <p>Better protection from over shadowing and wind tunnelling must be provided</p> <p>More consideration needs to be given to the public transport precinct, and developers should be made to contribute to the upgrading this hub</p> <p>Provision should be made for educating the younger residents and land should be identified now</p> <p>No confidence to existing residents that development will not encroach on existing residential areas</p>
54	<p>Concern about the way Box Hill is heading with regard to high rise apartment blocks</p> <p>Please reject applications to retain the character of the city</p>

55	<p>Welcome the concept of the Box Hill MAC</p> <p>Amendment does not given consideration to how road and public transport can be enhanced</p> <p>Amendment must demonstrate how public transport can be developed and enhanced</p> <p>Amendment needs to make explicitly provision for cyclists and pedestrians</p> <p>Amendment must include provisions of setbacks from building line, particularly for those buildings greater than 20 storeys</p>
56	<p>Submission for 902-911 Whitehorse Road, Box Hill</p> <p>Supports the overall direction of the guidelines</p> <p>Adjust maximum height of F4 as it is the most suitable to be the area with the highest built form</p> <p>This will mean the greatest number of people in the community will be close to public amenities</p> <p>The site should be identified as the most significant location and it has the potential to become a new landmark</p> <p>Focus of community activities located at subject site, demonstrates acknowledge of soft core</p> <p>Flexible and more adaptive building setbacks should be introduced as the current setbacks are onerous</p> <p>Current setbacks will likely result in an undesirable style and can stifle innovative architectural design</p> <p>A gradual increase of setbacks can be encouraged</p> <p>A negotiable and more practical overshadow policy should be introduced</p> <p>A reasonable building setback should be able to be negotiated with positive contribution to the community, including provision of amenities and activation of street level</p> <p>Overall, suggest a removal of standard building height, setbacks and shadow restrictions on the site and other socially important locations</p> <p>Land should be encouraged to contribute to the community, including creation of community hub, provision of community facilities and improvement of urban landscape</p>
57	<p>F1: 3-4 storeys as concern that it will become a wind tunnel</p> <p>F5: 10 storeys as it will create a canyon if higher</p> <p>Developers could be required to provide more greenery</p>
58	<p>The proposed guidelines do not go far enough in protecting the amenity of the local area</p> <p>Proposed changes to the density and height of buildings should not occur at the expense of existing public spaces</p> <p>Particular issues include significant overshadowing, significant impairment of views, glare from reflected light from buildings, domination of the green spaces and demand on limited public space</p> <p>Proposed guidelines reduce street setbacks and this will increase hard surfaces, run off, and temperatures</p> <p>Development should provide substantial areas of green space</p> <p>Provide designs that provide clear evidence of planning for environmentally sustainable dwellings</p> <p>Maintain existing or increased setbacks to enable green space</p> <p>Already substantial increased pressure on local streets</p> <p>Existing public transport is already outdated</p> <p>Council needs to achieve a substantial upgrade in public transport by the State Government</p> <p>Developers need to be required to make substantial financial contribution to the local government to offset the demands placed on the community by their developments</p>
59	<p>Object to parts of the draft that relate to Poplar Street</p> <p>Not opposed to change in zoning, opposing rezoning if it is used to support glut of high density apartments</p> <p>Object to proposed height limits, a maximum of 5 storeys should be on Poplar Street</p> <p>There are already parking issues and an overflow from surrounding uses</p> <p>Traffic movement is also an issue and this will get worse</p> <p>Construction of high density developments is causing overshadowing and loss of natural light</p> <p>Concerns about personal safety and wind tunnel</p>
60	<p>Would be directly affected by proposed heights and argue that the height restrictions are too high</p> <p>Development to the heights contained in the amendment close to Churchill Street will completely negate the aim of the heritage overlay</p> <p>F5: 30 storeys is a least 10 storeys too high</p> <p>F4: 20 storeys is too high and should be reduced by 10 storeys. Part of the precinct bordering Elgar Road should be 5 storeys</p> <p>Height restrictions in all precincts will cause an enormous increase in traffic, safety issues and pollution concerns</p> <p>Would like all height restrictions reduced considerably</p>
61	<p>Environment is being heavily impacted because of the intrusion of the unabated development and destruction of older style homes</p> <p>Parking is already at a premium in several areas of Box Hill including shopping centre, railway stations</p> <p>Congestion has flow on effects caused along the local streets from the increased traffic</p> <p>Councils or developers need to more parking options</p> <p>Need to improve bus and train connections and tram priority</p> <p>Where is the climate change plan? None of the tower blocks seem to have any setback or green space</p> <p>Towers cause reflection, noise pollution, lights and wind tunnels</p> <p>Trees are allowed to be cut down and roads are damaged by trucks</p> <p>Damage to storm water covers, pollution from traffic idling, footpaths are cracked, rubbish is allowed to accumulate</p> <p>Council needs to improve infrastructure and traffic flow on roads, ensure there is green space and ensure residents local areas are maintained</p>



62	<p>Too many high rises constructions diminishing character</p> <p>Cluttered car parking causing traffic congestion and lack of car parking</p> <p>Community infrastructure has been ignored - not enough carparking and transport hub needs upgrading</p> <p>High rise buildings moving further into residential areas</p> <p>10 storeys or more should be setback from the street to allow for garden, trees and art pieces</p> <p>Units going up beyond CBD appear to have no regulations as to design or colour and no restrictions on washing being visible from the street</p> <p>High rise causes concern over TV and wifi connections being blocked</p> <p>Views of Dandenongs being obscured</p>
63	<p>Submission for Box Hill Centro</p> <p>he Guidelines and DDO has the potential to negatively impact assets and their development potential</p> <p>Preferred heights for F2 and F4 do not respond to the opportunity of the MAC nor do they reflect the context of established and improved developments</p> <p>Greater height can be considered without off side amenity impacts</p> <p>Rationale for heights is unclear in documentation</p> <p>Request Guidelines and DDO be updated to reflect both north and south shopping centre sites be reflected as Strategic Development sites as they are currently in different sub precincts which could constrain outcomes</p> <p>No guidance on what constitutes a positive contribution</p> <p>Surety is required around the plot ratio concept</p> <p>Degree of flexibility should be retained for setbacks to allow for different design outcomes, they could be referenced as preferred</p> <p>Overshadowing requirements is different between Structure Plan and Guidelines</p> <p>Overshadowing requirements are not clear for Carrington Road</p> <p>Application of the Better Apartment standards and their requirements is more useful than requirements that are open to interpretation, such as "to Council satisfaction" for cross ventilation</p> <p>Request that Council amend the documentation to reflect the ownership of the centre and their names - Box Hill Central (North) and Box Hill Central (South).</p>
64	<p>Documents contain language which is meaningless and daunting, need a glossary to explain the terms to interpret the document</p> <p>Heritage precinct needs major enhancement to enable it to be more prominent, remove business signage</p> <p>Box Hill identity and culture confused by demographic changes</p> <p>Suggest open spaces with different horticultural styles to embrace changes</p> <p>Has a feasibility study been completed on new jobs that will emerge in Box Hill?</p> <p>Has population projections been completed that identify people wanting the type of housing proposed?</p> <p>Cannot see how vistas and sight lines will be preserved</p> <p>Who was responsible for approving a sprawl of opportunistic developments?</p> <p>Where is the discussion of the residents experience living in the buildings proposed with the hard environment and overshadowing and blocking of views?</p> <p>Lack of open space in plan</p> <p>Concern about the impact of the high use of air conditioning that will be needed and effect on climate change</p> <p>Concern about the amount of water required for new buildings</p> <p>How will existing soft and hard infrastructure cope with increased demand?</p> <p>Concern about impact on traffic and lack of parking spaces</p> <p>Concern about reduced setback requirements</p> <p>Guidelines bring oppressive buildings, diminishing sunlight and glare</p>
65	<p>Submission for St Paul's Lutheran Church at 709-713 Station Street, Box Hill</p> <p>Generally supportive of the proposed amendment and Built Form Guidelines</p> <p>Request that Council reviews the content of DDO-Table 4-sub-precinct F2 guidelines - Station Street in the "Street Walls and preferred maxium heights" section under "Built Form Response" and remove wording under the 5th dot point that refers to "subject to a sepearate design brief for built for and urban design".</p> <p>This refers to propects over 1,500sqm but should only refer to 519-521 Station Street in the 7th dot point</p> <p>See no need to apply a requirement for a separate design brief for built form and urban design though feel that the site should be given the same opporunities for development as 519-521 Station Street</p>
66	<p>Writing in response to the have your say on height limits leaflet</p> <p>Surprised and alarmed that Council has not done more to advertise the opportunity to comment about the height of buildings in Box Hill</p> <p>Horrified to see development over recent years which has happened without consultation or residents approval. Residents in Mont Albert, Surrey Hills and Box Hill feel amenity has been sacrificed for money for City of Nunawading</p> <p>View of hills is obliterated by high rise, no longer shop in Box Hill as there is no parking</p> <p>Poorly designed high rise bedside apartments, exemptions from parking</p> <p>Like to see lower height limits across the whole area, 6 storeys should be the maximum</p> <p>Schools are already at capacity</p> <p>Where is the green space?</p>

67	<p>High towers are too tall, unattractive and totally changes streetscapes</p> <p>Do not promote a neighbourhood, community feeling</p> <p>Overshadowing will occur, Wind tunnel is already there</p> <p>Not enough car parking spaces already</p> <p>Dreadful appearance of rubbish bins everywhere as each apartment will have its own bin and high rise creates more landfill</p> <p>Fewer open spaces for people's wellbeing and relaxation</p> <p>There is not enough infrastructure at present to cope with the area, including public transport and schools</p> <p>Residents are concerned that development is crossing Elgar Road into F9, and want guarantee that no high rise will be built west of Elgar Road</p>
68	<p>Submission for 13 Prospect Street, Box Hill and 31-35 Prospect Street, Box Hill</p> <p>Does not support the proposed preferred maximum height for F4 as it is inappropriate and will detrimentally impact the development of the land in the precinct</p> <p>The properties on the southern side of Prospect Street are capable of building heights above 20 storeys because:</p> <p>they are identified as being medium, large or extra large sites and having large or extra large frontages.</p> <p>they are separated from the residential properties to the south by the train line and this separation will be further exaggerated by the requirement in the guidelines for buildings to be sited close to the street frontage</p> <p>the properties on the northern side of Prospect Street are identified as being medium sites however are included in F5 and have a maximum height of 30 storeys</p> <p>the height of any development on the southern side of Prospect Street will be informed and constrained by the overshadowing provisions in DDO6</p> <p>Therefore the preferred maximum height of properties on the southern side of Prospect Street should be removed or the properties should be included in F5</p> <p>The reference to heights should be in metres to avoid confusion between retail/commercial developments and residential developments having different floor to ceiling heights</p> <p>The introduction of the built form controls will create a disconnected, inconsistent streetscape, contrary to the objectives of the Guidelines, particularly as there are existing approvals for developments in Prospect Street that do not have a street wall</p> <p>The proposed minimum setback from site boundaries will create a wedding cake approach and stifle innovative and site responsive design</p> <p>Clarification is required as to whether the 30 degree setback profile for buildings above 15 storeys is required for properties separated by the train line from residential uses in Built Form precinct A</p> <p>The reference to a 1.5 m setback from a laneway for vehicle access should be removed for clarity as there is no reference to the requirement in the guidelines</p>
69	<p>Support the Amendment</p> <p>Suggest rezoning Built Form Precinct B to MUZ</p>
70	<p>Object to the proposed amendment</p> <p>F9: 4 storeys as 8 storeys will significantly change the current landscape character and impact on privacy of existing residents</p> <p>Like clarification about whether student housing will be constructed in F9 as it is unwelcome as it is often cheaply made, unattractive, poorly maintained with very little parking</p> <p>Need to mandate much higher levels of off street parking for all developments</p> <p>High density means more street congestion</p>
71	<p>Submission for 34-36 Prospect Street, Box Hill</p> <p>Guidelines and height limit supported</p> <p>Objects to several specific built form requirements:</p> <p>Setbacks in table 7 are considered excessive and will limit development, should be removed and replaced with a performance based approach to building separation contained within the Better Apartment Design Standards</p> <p>Objects to the proposed preferred minimum front setback in table 7 and the identification of a defined physical setback as this can be achieved by various ways and with lesser setbacks</p> <p>Seeks deletion of policy relating to overshadowing of Built Form Precinct A and residential land and open space as this should be on a case by case basis, as there is no analysis of the built form impacts of the shadowing controls</p> <p>Protection of front gardens and balconies does not provide for occupier amenity and is inappropriate where it affects the development potential in a MAC</p> <p>Policy guideline about widening laneways should be deleted or clarified as to what laneways it applies to as it has not been demonstrated that widening of Fairbank Lane is required</p> <p>Matters covered by the Better Apartment Design Guidelines, such as internal amenity, cross ventilation, borrowed light, building adaptability and lightwells, should not be replicated by the Guidelines</p>
72	<p>Submission for Box Hill institute</p> <p>Objects to several of the specific built form requirements:</p> <p>F6: Discretionary height limit should be increased to accord with the strategic direction for a higher density outcome</p> <p>Site coverage, setback and building separation requirements is inconsistent with development within this precinct, where commercial and institutional buildings are built for boundary and frontages</p> <p>Campus style is a vague term and needs to be clarified</p> <p>F9: Setbacks and site coverage may be inconsistent with existing built form pattern</p> <p>Precinct E: Not clear if controls within DDO6 apply to Precinct E when looking at Maps 1 and 2 - would be better for both maps to be consolidated to eliminate confusion over the application of the DDO and where sub precinct built form requirements apply</p>

73	<p>Submission for Epworth Eastern</p> <p>Supportive of proposed rezoning</p> <p>The proposed guidelines do not recognise and support the need for employment related uses, particular health services, vision of Structure Plan has not be reflected</p> <p>No justification for low density campus style built form typology</p> <p>Built form restrictions do not respond to specific requirements for hospital and health care development</p> <p>Site coverage requirements are extremely low and does not allow sufficient development opportunities</p> <p>Site coverage requirements are uncharacteristic for the area and do not reflect the existing character of the area</p> <p>Site coverage requirements do not support the functionalities required for enhancing the health and education precinct</p> <p>Landscaping setback is not characteristic of the area</p> <p>Building separation are not useful in the context of health projects which requires connections between buildings</p> <p>Delete the objective for taller forms with smaller footprints and generous separation as this constrains interconnecting buildings in a hospital setting</p> <p>Revise the site coverage to 80% to allow for efficient and functional hospital floorplates, would still allow for open space and setbacks</p> <p>Requirement for 10m building separation to apply to residential development only</p> <p>Remove or reduce landscaping buffer from 8 to 6m as it impedes the use of land for hospital use</p> <p>Crossovers and drop off areas should be able to be included within landscaped areas</p>
74	<p>Submission for 535 Station Street, Box Hill</p> <p>Supports discretionary built form controls</p> <p>Council may consider incorporating performance criteria that demonstrates a public benefit</p> <p>Preferred maximum height is inappropriate and additional height could be accomodated if sites are consolidated</p> <p>Building height guideline should be rephrased to be 15 storeys where it can be demonstrated that site characteristics and location do not negatively impact on the area. 20-25 storeys should be contemplated on larger sites</p> <p>Building height should be demonstrated by design response not solely by the site size and therefore maxium height above 15 storeys on sites greater than 1500sqm should be removed</p> <p>Side and rear setback requirements is inappropriate for residential development but could apply to commercial office developments</p> <p>Setbacks above 10-15 storeys shold be subject to amenity implications and if it can be demonstrated there are no negative impacts, then setbacks should not be a requirement</p>
75	<p>Submission for 702-706 Station Street, Box Hill</p> <p>Supports discretionary built form controls</p> <p>Council may consider incorporating performance criteria that demonstrates a public benefit</p> <p>Street wall guideline should be rephrased to read "street wall should be responsive to site context and not exceed 5 storeys"</p> <p>Preferred maximum height proposed is inappropriaite and should be rephrased to be 15 storeys where it can be demonstrated that site characteristics and location do not negatively impact on the area.</p> <p>Building height should be demonstrated by design response not solely by the site size and this guideline should be removed</p> <p>Side and rear setback requirements is inappropriate for residential development but could apply to commercial office developments</p> <p>Setbacks above 10-15 storeys shold be subject to amenity implications and if it can be demonstrated there are no negative impacts, then setbacks should not be a requirement</p> <p>Site responsive approach to built form based on ameity outcomes is appropriate</p>
76	<p>Submission for 436 Elgar Road, Box Hill</p> <p>Supports discretionary built form controls</p> <p>Council may consider incorporating performance criteria that demonstrates a public benefit</p> <p>Rephrase guideline about street wall to read "street wall height to achieve a preferred 1:1 ratio, or a 5 storey street wall where the height does not exceed the 1:1 ratio"</p> <p>Rephrase guideline about setback above podium to read "preferred minimim setback of 5m above podium to all site boundaries" reduced setback may be appropriate where it can be demonstrated that site characteristics and location do not negatively impact on the amenity of surrounding area</p> <p>Rephrase guideline about building height to include reference that higher built form may be appropriate if it can be demonstrated that site characteristics and location do not negatively impact the amenity of the surrounding area</p> <p>30 degrees angled setback profile should be removed as this control is more appropriately regulated by over shadowing guidelines</p> <p>Minimum setback requirement above 6-20 storeys would be redudant if previous setback above podium is rephrased</p> <p>Site responsive approach to built form is more appropriate</p>
77	<p>Submission for 28 Main Street, Box Hill</p> <p>Supports discretionary built form controls</p> <p>Council may consider incorporating performance criteria that demonstrates a public benefit</p> <p>Rephrase guideline about building height to include reference that higher built form may be appropriate if it can be demonstrated that site characteristics and location do not negatively impact the amenity of the surrounding area</p> <p>Rephrase guideline about minimum 10 m setback to read "preferred minimum setback of 10 metres above the street wall for additional levels"</p> <p>No guideline as to the preferred street wall height at the Main Street frontage, suggest a 4 storey street wall is appropriate as it would create a 1:1 street wall width ratio</p>

78	<p>Submission for 18-20 Prospect Street, Box Hill</p> <p>Supports discretionary built form controls</p> <p>Council may consider incorporating performance criteria that demonstrates a public benefit</p> <p>Rephrase guideline about street wall to read "street wall height to achieve a preferred 1:1 ratio, or a 5 storey street wall where the height does not exceed the 1:1 ratio"</p> <p>Rephrase guideline about building height to include reference that higher built form may be appropriate if it can be demonstrated that site characteristics and location do not negatively impact the amenity of the surrounding area</p> <p>Rephrase guideline about minimum setback above podium to read "preferred minimum setback of 5m above the podium on all sides"</p> <p>Setback above podium will be redundant if above guideline is altered</p> <p>Setback from side and rear about 6-20 storeys will be redundant if above guideline is altered</p> <p>Rephrase no setback from side and rear up to 5 storeys to read "no setback from side and rear boundaries at podium levels"</p> <p>Setbacks above 21-30 storeys should be subject to amenity implication - if it can be demonstrated that there are no negative amenity impacts then setbacks should not be a requirement of the building design</p>
79	<p>Submission for 26-28 Prospect Street, Box Hill</p> <p>Supports discretionary built form controls</p> <p>Council may consider incorporating performance criteria that demonstrates a public benefit</p> <p>Rephrase guideline about street wall to read "street wall height to achieve a preferred 1:1 ratio, or a 5 storey street wall where the height does not exceed the 1:1 ratio"</p> <p>Rephrase guideline about building height to include reference that higher built form may be appropriate if it can be demonstrated that site characteristics and location do not negatively impact the amenity of the surrounding area</p> <p>Rephrase guideline about minimum setback above podium to read "preferred minimum setback of 5m above the podium on all sides"</p> <p>Setback above podium will be redundant if above guideline is altered</p> <p>Setback from side and rear about 6-20 storeys will be redundant if above guideline is altered</p> <p>Rephrase no setback from side and rear up to 5 storeys to read "no setback from side and rear boundaries at podium levels"</p> <p>Setbacks above 21-30 storeys should be subject to amenity implication - if it can be demonstrated that there are no negative amenity impacts then setbacks should not be a requirement of the building design</p>
80	<p>Submission for Epworth Eastern</p> <p>The proposed guidelines do not recognise and support the need for employment related uses, particular health services</p> <p>No justification for low density campus style built form typology</p> <p>Site coverage requirements are extremely low where almost all other precincts are 100%</p> <p>Site coverage requirements are uncharacteristic for the area and do not reflect the existing character of the area</p> <p>Site coverage requirements do not support the functionalities required for enhancing the health and education precinct</p> <p>Council should consider more urban-centric campus developments</p> <p>Landscaping setback is not characteristic of the area</p> <p>Building separation are not useful in the context of health projects which requires connections between buildings</p> <p>Delete the objective for taller forms with smaller footprints and generous separation as this constrains interconnecting buildings in a hospital setting</p> <p>Revise the site coverage to 80% to allow for efficient and functional hospital floorplates, would still allow for open space and setbacks</p> <p>Requirement for 10m building separation to apply to residential development only</p> <p>Remove or reduce landscaping buffer from 8 to 6m as it impedes the use of land for hospital use</p> <p>Crossovers and drop off areas should be able to be included within landscaped areas</p>
81	<p>Submission for 813-823 Whitehorse Road, Mont Albert</p> <p>Development of 15 storeys on the site would provide a more appropriate outcome as:</p> <p>taller buildings would create a gateway site and entrance to the MAC</p> <p>taller buildings would provide a smoother transition between 30 storeys in F5 and 4 storeys in the RGZ</p> <p>surrounding buildings would be protected by overshadowing provisions</p> <p>Front setback requirements will unreasonably reduce development on site and has been inappropriately applied considering context and zone</p> <p>Setbacks and site coverage requirements inconsistent with zone</p> <p>Should be greater discretion to vary setbacks between buildings</p> <p>Site should be included in F4 which will allow for greater height, 100% site coverage to facilitate active frontage and canopy and will facilitate appropriate built form separation to achieve amenity, equitable development and visual objectives</p>
82	<p>Submission for 942-946 Whitehorse Road, Box Hill</p> <p>Support for built form guidelines as they relate to about site</p>

83	<p>Commentary about rationale for proposed built form, including scale and intensity of development</p> <p>Who are towers being built for and how are they contributing to the objectives of Plan Melbourne?</p> <p>With a glut of high rise apartments looming in the CBD and high vacancy rates, such investment may not provide more diverse and increase housing options</p> <p>Will the proposed density and form of the proposed developments result in an urban form which meets the key principles articulated in Plan Melbourne? Current planning frameworks lack key elements of the requirements for the MAC which are articulated in the most recent refresh</p> <p>There is already a significant infrastructure deficit in Box Hill which is increasing traffic congestion, car parking issues, difficulty in accessing the centre, transport capacity issues in the interchange and shortage of public open space.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bike access difficult, limited protection for heritage built form</p> <p>Nature of private investment raises issues about lack of cultural and racial inclusiveness in the recent development</p> <p>Raises questions about the extent to which the form of urban development is consistent with a diverse cosmopolitan urban centre which is accessible to different demographics, inclusive and celebrates a diversity of culture and traditions</p> <p>How will Box Hill meet the broader requirements for an inclusive and diverse offering of cultural, housing and employment</p> <p>Current infrastructure risks being dwarfed by scale and density of the tower development, proposed removal of heritage protection from original buildings along Whitehorse Road is not supportive</p> <p>Guidelines have removed height limits from part of the heritage precinct and no rationale has been provided for this</p> <p>Need more careful consideration of the capacity and potential of the former heart of the Box Hill centre</p> <p>Retail centre is struggling under weight of traffic congestion</p> <p>No additional or improved provision of open space</p> <p>High rise apartment towers which are built to solicit investor interest and are not design for young families</p> <p>Who are the towers intended to house? Why have Chinese investors stumped up the money and not others?</p> <p>Investor led developments not welcomed housing supply but opportunistic private development</p> <p>Proposed distribution of building heights across the precincts is now inconsistent with the original intentions of the Structure Plan and are more consistent with tower development in the CBD</p> <p>All the high rise planned and proposed development is located well outside the heart of the precinct on its western boundary</p> <p>F1: Proposed height will destroy the scale and sense of place</p> <p>F2: Podium setbacks do not constitute a pedestrian friendly environment and this may create wind and light access issues</p> <p>5m setback should be instituted for all development along this street</p> <p>No landscaping is made for private properties</p> <p>No provision for car parking is to be made</p> <p>Street to wall frontage is unacceptable</p> <p>How will interfaces be managed?</p> <p>F3: 4 storey street walls unacceptable, no side and rear setbacks will create amenity impacts and proposed height will change intent of the precinct as per the Structure Plan</p> <p>Access to key open spaces is negligible</p> <p>F4: No design rationale for height limit, what will be the composition of the developments?</p> <p>F5: 30 storeys is strongly rejected</p> <p>Inconsistent with intention to create a sense of place</p>
84	<p>Support walking objective in Section 22.07.2, but footpaths need to be widened where possible</p> <p>Mandate a front setback of at least 0.5m to allow for better pedestrian access</p> <p>Support cycling objective, but more bicycle parking facilities are needed in narrow streets or in front of buildings, not just in underground car parks</p> <p>Support intention of Section 22.07.3 around Built Form, but wording needs tightening to include stronger language than encourage</p> <p>Mandatory heights should be sought, otherwise heights should be reduced to allow for extra levels that will be sought at VCAT</p> <p>Height in F1 should be 6 storeys, but prefer 4 storeys to ensure pedestrian areas are not permanently shaded and the effects of wind tunnels be avoided</p> <p>Support environmental impact statement with emphasis on larger developments generating renewable energy where possible</p> <p>Lot consolidation wording needs to be stronger in traditional precinct</p> <p>Area between Harrow Street and Ellingworth Parade is shown as key open space link, however it is a car park</p> <p>Pioneer Park at the corner of Harrow Street and Station Street is not shown on map - both of these need to be updated</p>
85	<p>Submission for 874-878 Whitehorse Road, Box Hill</p> <p>Supportive of discretionary, performance based controls</p> <p>Supportive of intent of Guidelines but feel that they do not provide sufficient flexibility to respond to constraints on individual sites</p> <p>Further guidance should be provided to identify circumstances where variation to height and setbacks could be acceptable</p> <p>Consider strict adherence to side and rear setbacks would unreasonably stifle development opportunities</p> <p>Submit that Clause 2.0 of the proposed DDO be amended to identify a wider range of performance based considerations to respond to unique constraints and opportunities for each site</p>

86	<p>Submission on behalf of Box Hill Historical Society</p> <p>Height limit in traditional town centre is not supported as it is a substantial and excessive increase to the current situation</p> <p>Potential overshadowing, wind concentration and lack of direct sunlight will impact significantly on public space</p> <p>F2 and F4: 1-2 storey street wall with 4 storey height limit to protect pedestrian and public amenity</p> <p>Amenity of Whitehorse Road median strip needs to be preserved and not overshadowed</p> <p>F4 between Shipley and Bruce Streets should be 6 storeys with 1-2 storey street wall</p> <p>F3 between Station Street and Court Street should have same height as F4 above</p> <p>Recommend that height limits be mandatory</p> <p>Recommend that former Post Office and Payne and Boyland building be given heritage protection and latter also considered a contributory building</p>
87	<p>F2/F6/F8/F9: Boundary with Box Hill/Kingsley Gardens should be no more than 5 storeys, F5: 20 storeys</p> <p>Insufficient open space for potential new residents, small scale open spaces should be provided for workers and residents close to Whitehorse Road</p> <p>Developer contributions should be used in Box Hill to compensate existing residents and provide for new residents</p> <p>Object to lack of setback provided by new buildings</p> <p>F3/F4/F5/F8: Setback to building frontage should be provided to allow for public amenity along streets</p> <p>Concerned about potential for increased traffic congestion in Whitehorse Road and main north-south roads</p> <p>Will other existing infrastructure be sufficient?</p> <p>Developers should be required to contribute to upgrade of services</p> <p>Guideline about awnings should be altered to require continuous awnings</p>
88	<p>Object to the proposal because it does not consider the impacts of high rise buildings</p> <p>Increased local and surrounding traffic and the situation will get worse if the number of storeys is increased</p> <p>Facing issues like noise, road safety, emissions and parking</p> <p>Proposed new scheme will push us out of the area</p> <p>Creation of wind tunnels, the number of storeys needs to be halved in each precinct</p>
89	<p>Submission for 6-10 Shipley Street, Box Hill</p> <p>Amendment should be varied having regard to the preferred height for the site and precinct on the basis that the site can accommodate a taller building without unreasonable offsite amenity impact</p> <p>site where higher scale development might be contemplated, as it was is proposed is too low because:</p> <p>the site area and proportions of the land which could accommodate increased building heights</p> <p>orientation of the land and dual street frontages would assist in mitigating any offsite amenity implications</p> <p>proximity to PPTN and access to education and health facilities/shops/services and areas of public open space</p> <p>Similar development opportunity warranted to 20 storey permit at 12-14 Nelson Road</p> <p>If higher heights not accepted then request being nominated as a strategic development site</p>
90	<p>Do not support amendment and it should be deferred</p> <p>Guidelines do not provide any proposals that could implement strategies around accessibility, amenity, sustainable transport, walking and cycling</p> <p>Should not be implemented until adequate analysis has been done to address hard infrastructure issues such as traffic, public transport and cycling and walking infrastructure</p> <p>The Guidelines will lead to a significant increase in mass of built form in Box Hill</p> <p>The Guidelines little analysis to support specific height proposals</p> <p>No information in Guidelines on project population figures that might result in implementation of Guidelines</p>
91	<p>Unhappy about new towers being built in Box Hill, grow higher every day and intrude into quiet, leafy neighbourhood</p> <p>Box Hill will become an ugly concrete jungle</p> <p>Towers bring appalling congestion, traffic jams, vehicle exhaust fumes, lack of parking, pedestrian congestion, crowded trains and trams</p> <p>Request at least halve the proposed height limits</p> <p>Should require developers to allow generous space for trees, landscaping, road widening and bike paths</p>
92	<p>Submission on behalf of Whitehorse Active Transport Action Group Inc</p> <p>Initiative may be too late in balancing current large scale development with the need to meet the Victorian Planning objectives</p> <p>Guidelines pay scant attention to catering for new residents/workers/hotel guests whether it be services like active transport infrastructure, sewerage, storm water run off, flood mitigation, schools/kinder, medical, active sporting facilities and passive open space areas</p> <p>Existing public transport and roads are inadequate to cope with increase</p> <p>Fear that a modern day slum will be inevitable result</p> <p>Amendment will have a significant effect on the Box Hill transport system</p> <p>Council is abrogating its responsibility to advocate for a complete overhaul of the existing public transport system</p> <p>Transport chaos will result if the current rail, tram, vehicular, pedestrian, cycling and active transport infrastructure is not reviewed and improved</p> <p>Guidelines don't discuss pedestrians and cycling, need to consider infrastructure such as active transport underpasses/overpasses for major roads/railway line, traffic calming, shared paths, way finding signage, safe bicycle storage, suitable front setbacks, education campaigns etc</p> <p>Amount and quality of open space currently available for active and passive transport recreational activities fall well short of the amount required</p> <p>Council should purchase and ameliorate Federation Street brickworks for public parkland</p> <p>Guidelines make no mention of a number of existing strategy and policy documents that are directly relevant</p>

93	<p>Submission for 843 Whitehorse Road, Box Hill</p> <p>Supports discretionary built form controls</p> <p>Council may consider incorporating performance criteria that demonstrates a public benefit</p> <p>Mandatory height controls are not supported</p> <p>Rephrase guideline about street wall to read "street wall height to achieve a preferred 1:1 ratio, or a 5 storey street wall where the height does not exceed the 1:1 ratio"</p> <p>Rephrase guideline about building height to include reference that higher built form may be appropriate if it can be demonstrated that site characteristics and location do not negatively impact the amenity of the surrounding area</p> <p>Rephrase guideline about minimum setback above podium to read "preferred minimum setback of 5m above the podium on all sides"</p> <p>Setback above podium will be redundant if above guideline is altered</p> <p>Setback from side and rear about 6-20 storeys will be redundant if above guideline is altered</p> <p>Rephrase no setback from side and rear up to 5 storeys to read "no setback from side and rear boundaries at podium levels"</p> <p>Setbacks above 21-30 storeys should be subject to amenity implication - if it can be demonstrated that there are no negative amenity impacts then setbacks should not be a requirement of the building design</p> <p>Site responsive approach to built form amenity is appropriate and should not be curtailed by definitive controls about height and or setback requirements</p>
94	<p>First opportunity to comment on guidelines</p> <p>Difficult to comment on guidelines without knowing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>projected increase in residentail population</li> <li>expected changes required in provision for additional schools and early childhood centres</li> <li>capacity expansion required in infrastructure services for water, gas and electricity</li> <li>capacity of the public transport system to expand at peak times</li> <li>capacity of the road network to absorb increase in vehicles</li> </ul> <p>Amendment only offers a single option for heights</p> <p>Density and height of buildings in amendment will exacerbate wind issues</p> <p>Overshadowing of street realm is inevitable</p> <p>Setback principles contradict landscaping</p> <p>Site coverage contradicts retention of canopy trees</p> <p>Guideline silent on walls incorporating solar panels</p> <p>Pedestrian links need off Thurston Street and in/out of station</p> <p>Crossing Whitehorse Road at the Tax Office is not possible in one go and pedestrians must wait in the elements</p> <p>Developer contributions should be sought to purchase Federation Brickworks</p> <p>Marketing of the high density residential developments is focused on a single cultural group, which has been to the detriment of multi-culturalism and longer established residents from other backgrounds find it hard to relate to the centre</p>
95	<p>Submission on behalf of Blackburn and District Tree Preservation Society</p> <p>Creation and implementation of the documents may be too late in attempting to balance the profit-driven goals of developers with the need to create a sustainable, healthy, high quality local environment wiith the appropriate infrastructure</p> <p>Question whether the objectives of planning in Victoria will indeed be met</p> <p>Amount and quality of open space currently available for active and passive recreational activities will fall short of that required for the increase in population</p> <p>Council must purchase and ameliorate the Brickworks site, and other strategic, smaller properties within the MAC to ease the parkland congestion that is inevitable</p> <p>Safe access to the open space by pedestrians and cyclists is problematic due to major road and rail barriers</p> <p>People friendly, reasonably sized open spaces and plazas within the high rise precinct with connectivity needs to be provided</p> <p>Suitable front setbacks and landscaping requirements need to be mandated to provide suitable landscaping and mitigate wind tunnels and overshadowing</p> <p>Providing suitable environment conditions to optimise the growth, health and longevity of trees</p> <p>Lower building heights and less site coverage to facilitate a smooth transition from higher density areas through to the residential areas</p> <p>Guidelines pay scant attention to catering for new residents/workers/hotel guests whether it be services like active transport infrastructure, sewerage, storm water run off, flood mitigation, schools/kinder, medical, active sporting facilities and passive open space areas</p> <p>Major barriers to pedestrian and cyclist traffic must be designed out</p> <p>A network of wide shared use paths need to be installed</p> <p>Safe pedestrian, cyclist and disabled connectivityneeds to be provided to public transport, schools, residential, commercial areas</p> <p>Installation of safe bicycle storage facilities at all active transport destinations</p> <p>Minimise conflict between vehicles and active transport modes</p> <p>Guidelines and amendment make no mention of a number of relevant policies and strategies that are relevant</p>
96	<p>Disappointed and displeased to walk around Box Hill and see height of new towers</p> <p>New towers intrude into the neighbourhood</p> <p>Energy required required to power towers, traffic congestion and over crowding on trains and trams</p> <p>Request at least halve the proposed height limits</p> <p>Should require developers to allow generous space for trees, landscaping, road widening and bike paths</p>

97	Amend height limits Consult on population versus services Maintain the integrity of the area Quality of life is not first priority
98	Unhappy about new towers being built in Box Hill Direct impact on the quiet, leafy suburbs of Mont Albert which is a heritage protected area Request at least halve the proposed height limits Should require developers to allow generous space for trees, landscaping, road widening and bike paths
99	Do not support the amendment Built form precinct plan promoting development into standard residential zones is very aggressive Amendment does not flag any new parks, education facilities, and public amenity Built Form Precinct A and B should be removed and more half the heights proposed in Precinct F Benefits are clearly limited to foreign investors, those in construction and Council as leaving no parameters in Precinct F
100	Keep current height limits in F9 There will be an increase in the demand for supporting services and facilities, especially primary school It will impact the holistic nature view of Mont Albert
101	Object to all proposed height limits Plan Melbourne identifies as an Activity Centre, but in the main it is a Health and Education Precinct Residents bear the brunt of high rise buildings that are largely unattractive and many have balconies displaying mattresses and other household furniture Parking and traffic study is now obsolete, lack of car parking and more vehicle congestion Structure Plan talks about transitional building heights from Box Hill to surrounding residential area but having 30 storeys does not allow for this Box Hill is intended as a MAC not CBD, and infrastructure already needed an update prior to current construction Streets in the MAC and surrounding area can not accommodate densely built high rise buildings and create wind tunnels Lack of setbacks required for towering buildings, together with minimal vegetation requirements makes the urban heat island effect a major concern Height amendments should be held in abeyance until approved developments are finalised or height limits should be lowered
102	Unhappy about new towers being built in Box Hill, grow higher every day and intrude into quiet, leafy neighbourhood Box Hill will become an ugly concrete jungle Towers bring appalling congestion, traffic jams, vehicle exhaust fumes, lack of parking, pedestrian congestion, crowded trains and trams Request at least halve the proposed height limits Should require developers to allow generous space for trees, landscaping, road widening and bike paths
103	Submission for 811 Whitehorse Road, Mont Albert Concerned about restrictive nature of requirements in F9 and believe that it will compromise ability to adequately develop land Maximum height of 8m will not provide a staggered transition in heights Guidelines do not take into account existing built form and size of site Conflict between requirements in Street Wall and preferred maximum heights which require a minimum 8m landscape setback and in landscape which requires a 5m landscaping setback Difficult to achieve 10 m separation between buildings if the proposed 18 storey building on the adjacent site is approved and constructed Not clear what landscaping elements are to be incorporated into the facade Suggested a new sub-precinct for 811 and 813 Whitehorse Road, Mont Albert Suggested 100% site coverage, 15 storeys, landscape setback of 5m
104	Lack of infrastructure now causes parking and traffic problems How does Council intend to manage the extension of hospital and TAFE services and the parking required? Has Council planned for schools/kinders/green fields? Have demographers been involved in the implications of the proposal and impact on associated services? F2: height could be 12-15 storeys Is there an infrastructure plan to address associated impact on traffic and parking? Is there a plan to upgrade the train station and widen adjacent roads?
105	Concerned about the height limits, particularly those proposed for F3 Watts Street is a residential street with family homes Live amongst monstrosities, rubbish, abandoned trolleys, influx of vermin and crows, which will increase if Council approves further height controls Inability for children to safely walk and ride to school by themselves due to traffic Increasing heights in F3 will encroach on the homes, and heritage properties, which are being lost to apartments Raising the height limit in F3, specifically in Watts Street will set an precedent for increasing height limits in residential streets Families do not want apartments to live, they want gardens The Australian dream is to own a home, not an apartment. Vast country, therefore leave suburbs alone



106	Precinct F3 is major concern as the proposed 10-12 storeys height is in a suburban backstreet with residential housing Do not want to be shadowed by unsightly tall buildings with wind tunnels Council has the opportunity to leave heights as they are and not accept any new height changes
107	Unhappy about new towers being built in Box Hill, grow higher every day and intrude into quiet, leafy neighbourhood Box Hill will become an ugly concrete jungle Towers bring appalling congestion, traffic jams, vehicle exhaust fumes, lack of parking, pedestrian congestion, crowded trains and trams Request at least halve the proposed height limits Should require developers to allow generous space for trees, landscaping, road widening and bike paths
108	Unhappy about new towers being built in Box Hill, grow higher every day and intrude into quiet, leafy neighbourhood Box Hill will become an ugly concrete jungle Towers bring appalling congestion, traffic jams, vehicle exhaust fumes, lack of parking, pedestrian congestion, crowded trains and trams Request at least halve the proposed height limits Should require developers to allow generous space for trees, landscaping, road widening and bike paths
109	Unhappy about new towers being built in Box Hill, grow higher every day and intrude into quiet, leafy neighbourhood Box Hill will become an ugly concrete jungle Towers bring appalling congestion, traffic jams, vehicle exhaust fumes, lack of parking, pedestrian congestion, crowded trains and trams Request at least halve the proposed height limits Should require developers to allow generous space for trees, landscaping, road widening and bike paths
110	Unhappy about new towers being built in Box Hill, grow higher every day and intrude into quiet, leafy neighbourhood Box Hill will become an ugly concrete jungle Towers bring appalling congestion, traffic jams, vehicle exhaust fumes, lack of parking, pedestrian congestion, crowded trains and trams Request at least halve the proposed height limits Should require developers to allow generous space for trees, landscaping, road widening and bike paths
111	Unhappy about new towers being built in Box Hill, grow higher every day and intrude into quiet, leafy neighbourhood Box Hill will become an ugly concrete jungle Towers bring appalling congestion, traffic jams, vehicle exhaust fumes, lack of parking, pedestrian congestion, crowded trains and trams Request at least halve the proposed height limits Should require developers to allow generous space for trees, landscaping, road widening and bike paths
112	Unhappy about new towers being built in Box Hill, grow higher every day and intrude into quiet, leafy neighbourhood Box Hill will become an ugly concrete jungle Towers bring appalling congestion, traffic jams, vehicle exhaust fumes, lack of parking, pedestrian congestion, crowded trains and trams Request at least halve the proposed height limits Should require developers to allow generous space for trees, landscaping, road widening and bike paths
113	Unhappy about new towers being built in Box Hill, grow higher every day and intrude into quiet, leafy neighbourhood Box Hill will become an ugly concrete jungle Towers bring appalling congestion, traffic jams, vehicle exhaust fumes, lack of parking, pedestrian congestion, crowded trains and trams Request at least halve the proposed height limits Should require developers to allow generous space for trees, landscaping, road widening and bike paths

114	<p>Dissappointed Guidelines don't address problems occurring at periphery of Built Form Precinct A where recommended density and height is not being respected</p> <p>Proposed height limits should be mandatory maximums rather than preferred</p> <p>Some height limits do not address protecting amenity of key open spaces, access to sunlight, minimising overshadowing and avoiding wind tunnel effects</p> <p>Document is silent on wind tunnel effects on pedestrians and outdoor eating areas</p> <p>Preferable to further extend the F1 to incorporate both sides of Whitehorse Road, both sides of Market/Main Streets, Station Street to the railway line on the west side, Carrington Road from Station Street to the end of the shops. This would provide better protection for the median and other outdoor areas</p> <p>Guidelines do not mention the removal of trees and landscaping and no provision for replacement at street level</p> <p>The pedestrian link adjacent to the former PO at 16-18 Nelson Road through the Shipley Street also needs to be recognised</p> <p>Where development faces both a street and open space, the private back is more public and needs to be treated differently</p> <p>Better access needs to be provided for service vehicles and set down areas</p> <p>Landscape zone mentioned in some of the sub precinct guidelines not identified elsewhere</p> <p>F2/F3: Carrington Road less than 6 storeys with 1-2 street wall, elsewhere 10 storeys with 5 storey street wall</p> <p>F3: Station Street to Court Street 6 storeys with 1-2 street wall</p> <p>F4: Whitehorse Road, Market Street to Clisby Court and Bruce Street to Shipley Street 4 storeys with 1-2 street wall</p> <p>F4: Prospect Street opposite Hopetourn Parade 10 storeys</p> <p>F5: 20 storeys with setbacks to Whitehorse Road and Elgar Road maintained</p> <p>F6: 10 storeys with ground level setbacks</p> <p>F7: 10 storeys with ground level setbacks at side and street frontage</p> <p>F8: 10 storeys with ground level setbacks front and side, 5m setback Irving Avenue</p> <p>F9: 8 storeys with ground level setbacks and separation, articulation of buildings to ensure sunlight acces</p>
115	<p>Submission for 722 Station Street, Box Hill</p> <p>Land located in Built Form Precinct B</p> <p>Proposed building height of 3 storeys does not provide an appropriate transition between Precinct B and F2</p> <p>More appropriate height for Precinct B needs to be considered</p> <p>Proposed height does not facilitate built form that reflects the purpose and intent of the MUZ</p> <p>Structure Plan is outdated and does not reflect the current and approved built form character</p>
116	<p>Owner of 486-488 Elgar Road, Box Hill</p> <p>Supports the amendment</p>
117	<p>Concerned about standard of developments</p> <p>Opportunity to build a wonderful place to live, but balance is too heavily in favour of developments</p>

Proforma No.	Precinct C/F1	Precinct F2	Precinct F3	Precinct F4	Precinct F5	Precinct F6	Precinct F7	Precinct F8	Precinct F9	General comments
1	4	8	8	15	20	12	8	8	4	Area crowded Dirty, non uniform and less attractive
2				10	10					Against any high rise development in Box hill Car parking and traffic impacts
3		2	2	10	10	2	2	2	2	Ratepayers deserve consideration Parking, traffic
4	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	2	Shanghai style skyscrapers Tasteless third world structure Rubbish collection, cleaning and parking
5	8	10	10	8	8	8	8	8	8	Mid rise development Minimum impact
6	8	12	10	15	25	10	10	10	8	Streetscapes should be varied New development takes away from streetscape
7	4	8	6	8	10	8	6	6	8	Overdevelopment has destroyed Box Hill Whose interestes are looked after? Traffic problems will increase Taking in aspects of a Third World country
8	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	The height limits in Box Hill must be less than 10 storeys Box Hill needs to build the underground train, air tracks and bridges
9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	No consultation on Sky One Changes are disappointing, ugly and senseless Parking issues in and around Box Hill Green space and gardens on south side of Whitehorse Road Planning for schools/kinders/bus routes Pedestrian safety
10		5		10	10	8	8			Sufficient car parking spaces needed for developments Landscaping and good insfrastructure Traffic concerns
11	3	3			3	3	3	3	3	Why bother, nothing will stop greed Box Hill is a mess Views to Dandenongs is ruined Disgrace
12										Too much development Height limit in each precinct to be restricted and reduced
13	4	4	4	8	10	8	4	4	4	No concessions for parking in new development Finish of new development should minimise reflection
14	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	Strongly opposed to any high rise development in Box Hill
15	8	8	8	15	20	25	25	20	6	Problems include overshadowing, wind tunnel effects, access to sun and light, parking and traffic congestion, pressure on facilities
16	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	Guidelines represent total overdevelopment Slums of the future Box Hill is not a clone of Hong Kong or Shanghai Insufficient infrastructure and social amenities
17	4	10	8	12	12	12	12	10	8	Greed has prevailed Impact on poor infrastructure including shopping, public transport, parking and roads
18	8	15	12	15	20	15	8	8	8	Lawns, strees and shrubs should be in front setbacks All new buildings should have 2-3 floors of parking underneath
19	4	4	4	6	6	8	4	4	2	Box Hill is not CBD - new high buildings look revolting
20										Don't want 30 storeys high rise buildings in Box Hill
21	8	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	Transport infrastructure is already not coping
22	8	15	12	20	20	15	8	10	4	No towers west of Elgar Road Will have enormous impact physically and culturally on green area

23	5	10	8	20	20	12	12	10	5	Nothing gained by 30 storey buildings Will create a massive strain on infrastructure, pandering to money making interests Will create massive parking, traffic, noise problems, air pollution Will damage liveability of the area
24				15						Traffic management problems Box Hill will be cold, dark and windy
25	2	8	8	8	12	8	12		8	Buildings on perimeter should be 4 storeys to give transition to housing areas
26	8	8	8	8	10	10	10	5	5	Consider traffic safety, don't want Box Hill to become a traffic jam city No privacy from taller builders Atmosphere similar to that of unsafe and unsavoury public housing
27	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	Roads too narrow and no infrastructure Should not allow any expansion to this areas, taking away the uniqueness and character of Box Hill Do not want Box Hill to become a tall building ghetto
28										Oppose high rise buildings in this area, two towers already built look awful, ugly, unnecessary
29	8	12	8	8	20	30	10	10	8	In favour of the heights around the immediate Transit Centre Increased traffic appears to be ignored Concern is the height limits rising as we move further from Box Hill
30										Disagree with heights Slum areas in the future Gardens we need
31	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Sad seeing once lovely city becoming a concrete jungle surrounded by high rise building Lack of car parking Traffic congestion
32	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	Impose strict limitations on new buildings Concern is traffic flow and traffic congestion Side street parking is also a concern Council needs a plan to deal with it
33		8	8	15	15	8	8	8		Over development is a concern Possibility of creating wind tunnels and lack of sun Heights proposed are too high
34	5	5	3	8	5	5	5	5	5	Box Hill is not the new Beijing Tall buildings are close to residential homes, create issues about overshadowing, traffic and car parking
35	4	4	4	8	4	4	4	4	4	Excessive amount of population growth Do not have power, water supply and sewerage to support high levels of growth Concerned that overdevelopment creates would create a wind tunnel, dark and overshadowed areas
36	8	10	10	20	20	10	8	8	4	Current parkin in Box Hill does not cater for the current usage
37	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	
38	3	6	6	3	3	6	6	6	6	No more monstrous buildings to be built spoiling the landscape Infrastructure already not able to cope Traffic congestion is a concern
39	8	10	10	15	15	10	10	10	5	Tiered parking lots, with a maximum of 8 levels is urgently required for access to the developing business district of Box Hill
40		10		15	15	10	8	8	6	Box Hill may become a high rise ghetto Worry about parking, public green amenities and shadows cast from high rise

41	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	Box Hill dirty and smelly Ban all Asian signs on buildings Box Hill CBD looks like a third world country
42	8	10	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	Traffic, parking, streetscape and congestion a nightmare Reduce building height
43		4	4							Concern about traffic congestion, which will increase with multi-storey development Strain on infrastructure Parking a problem
44	6	4	4	10	10	10	10	5	4	The proposal will negatively impact residential homes in terms of light, traffic, communication towers. Neighbouring communities need protection from aggressive developments
45				15	15					Towering office blocks, inadequate parking and no green spaces will destroy the amenity of Box Hill Box Hill is not Melbourne CBD and has none of the cultural or other aspectst that might attract tourists and provide a lively city feel
46	4	4	4	10	10	4	4	4	4	Object due to overshadowing, lack of privacy, wind tunnel, traffic, convection, lack of parking, noise, balconies full of laundry, interference with TV reception, infrastructure issues such as rubbish, water pressure and potential for flooding
47		8	8		15	10	10			Would like to see descending heights from central point in Box Hill
48	5	8	8	8	8	8	4	4	4	More rise means more wind tunnels, less sunlight, more mess being left on nature strips. Far too much washing on tiny balconies gives a real slum appearance
49	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	Box Hill interchange can barely cope with the current passenger levels at Peak hour, proposed buildings will make it impossible for passngers Parking and transport issues
50	8	3	3	8	8	8	8	8	8	The proposed heights in this area are too high, the transport and roads will not cope
51			8	12						Disappointing that the large towers have been permitted to be built Concern about loss of sunlight, provision for cars, bikes and pedestrians
52	6	6	4	4	2	3	2	2	6	Do not want the area to become an overcrowded, concrete, box type dwellings, taking away the sunny, leafy, openness
53	5	5	5	7	7	10	7	7	7	Box Hill central area is very congested, high rise buildings may help to revitalise the city, but it may also make it messier, therefore disagree with the councils proposal
54										All shops and offices shoud have writing and menus in English, all the Chinese writing is reverse racism as we don't live in China Don't want overdevelopment, don't want high rise Leafy, eastern suburbs are being destroyed by poor planning, lack of foresight and greed How does Council intend to address traffic flow issues?
55	8	4	4	8	8	8	4	4	4	Streetscapes and community needs should be consideredmore for ongoing progress and changes, if not Box Hill will beome an unpleasant environment for all Traffic and parking through Box Hill needs to be considered
56		9			20	10		5		Greneral concern is in relation to community amenity and the strain on infrastructure in the area such as medical centees, schools, power supply
57	8	15	12	20	30	15	15	10	8	Traffic management, estimated population density, upgrading services, multistorey carpaking and upgraded transport hub

58	8	8	8	10	15	10	4	5	5	Very high buildings already causing stress on public roads, Council waste collection. High rise need to blend into residential areas without destroying neighbourhood characteristics
59	5	8			20	8				Unsightly to have such a large area with an unnecessary high height limit
60	6				8	10				Building heights should be stepped down from Centro to heights no more than 5 stories abutting Churchill Street Heritage precinct
61	4	8	8	12	15	10	6	4	6	Vehemently opposed to the proposed height limits because of traffic congestion, shadow cast by buildings and possibility of buildings being built over Whitehorse Road.
62	6	6	6	8	8	8	8	8	8	Congestion is already bad and will become worse with more high rise buildings
63	6	6	6	8	8	8	8	8	8	Don't believe that the current building height limit will benefit Box Hill Current traffic in Box Hill is congested and is forcing more traffic down side streets
64	2	2	2	10	10	2	2	2	2	Already have enough development Many problems with high density buildings in the area
65	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	The Box Hill area is already over developed Traffic and parking will be a nightmare Train and tram services are already overcrowded and will get worse
66	5	5	2	5	8	10	10	10	4	Fears about traffic and parking The plan will create a mini Hong Kong of New York with traffic gridlock and lowering of living standards
67	3	6	8	12	16	8	6	5	2	There is no need to have the heights/storeys of the building in Box Hill at such extreme levels Issues with parking, traffic flow, environmental impacts, overshadowing Box Hill will become Chinese Mecca or Hong Kong/Vietnam/Asia Reading documents a complex process Council should meet with residents
68	6	6	6	10						Want to know about car parking for all residents How can the public find out who the developers are and who the residents will be? Residents want a public meeting about this and driving standards in Box Hill
69	10	10	10	12	15	10	8	6	4	Why is the CBD restricted to 8 storeys? Strongly object to over development of multi storey buildings within Mont Albert boundaries, should be restricted to commercial zoning only within Box Hill limits and not include west side of Elgar Road
70	4	6	6	10	8		8	6	4	Concern about overshadowing, impairment of views, glare from reflected light from buildings, domination of public green spaces, demand on limited public space, increased hard/sealed surfaces, demand on local infrastructure
71	6	6	4	10	10	6	6	8	6	Traffic congestion Limit heights near dwellings Any streets such as Whitehorse Road should not be touched
72	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	6	6	General view from around the suburb should not be obstructed by ugly towers

73	8	8	5	6	10	12	8	4	4	No more than 4 storeys abutting parkland Provide more greenspace Require setbacks for planting Reduce hard surfaces Reduce heights to prevent wind tunnels Require adequate car parking Require adequate laundry and store space to prevent washing on balconies Encourage better design of units
74	8	8	10	15	10	4	4	4	4	Concerned about more pollution, light spill, lack of infrastructure, more traffic jams, lack of parking for cars, more rubbish, less greenery, increased wind velocity
75	5	3	3	5	5	3	3	3	3	Loss of amenity is palpable Box Hill is not a suburb of Hong Kong or Shanghai Object to proliferation of multi storey skyscrapers Traffic and parking is intolerable Box Hill will start to resemble a ghetto Heights should be no more than 5 storeys in each precinct
76										Amenity of Box Hill Open space, car parking, advse impacts during construction
77	6	8	8	18	16	12	10	8	6	Highest heights should be in the centre, the other buildings around must be lower
78	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	Restrict all heights to nothing over 8 storeys and then only in Box Hill central
79	8	8	8	8	8	8	2	2	2	Box Hill should not be a mini Hong Kong full of skyscapers 8 stories is ample and will not drastically affect the landscape of Box Hill
80		10				10	6	8	5	Shocked to see the horrors being built on Whitehorse Road
81	4	6	4	8	10	6	4	2	2	High rises look untidy, little often scattered outside, washing on lines, traffic congestion, No buildings over 10 storeys
82	4	3	3	4	4	4	2	4	4	Asians wont make submission. Ghettos are being creaed in Box Hill and Europeans wont live there. The planning and mix of people is terrible
83	3	3	4	4	4	6	6	6	4	Would destroy the main pedestrian thoroughfare The lovely homes make Box Hill a desirable place to live Pulling them down and replacing them with terrible monolithic buildings is an abomination and destroying the character Building will cause nasty wind tunnels around the buildings Who is going to live in the many apartments? Will this become like a deserted city?
84	8		12	12	12	12	12	10	8	Beautiful heritage, and beautiful streets are being destroyed