

Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Organisation	Submission summary	Submission themes
1		Against the Amendment as Box Hill is very crowded, has traffic and law and order problems Melbourne doesn't need to become Hong Kong, wants Australian life and high science and technology industry to be developed	Traffic and public transport
2		Currently there are hindrances and safety concerns about traffic along Station Street Imagines approval of buildings will only place more burden on Box Hill Central Traffic and height will place enormous burdens on currently infrastructure Buildings beyond 6-8 storeys will appear ostentatious and inappropriate	Traffic and public transport Infrastructure Building height and amenity
3	Landream	On behalf of Australia Jinjia Investments Pty Ltd for 942 - 946 Whitehorse Road, Box Hill Supports the proposed Amendment because of the benefits: - Full site utilisation - Enhancement of MAC as a destination - Economic benefits to local retail and business - Public benefits through retail, offices, medical centres, apartments and child care - Public realm improvements	Support
4	PTV	PTV Referral authority comments Application does not address existing bus stop on Station Street and whether this needs to be relocated and/or altered PTV requests additional information about existing bus stop and if funds will be collected for the provision of a pedestrian crossing on Station Street south of Harrow Street	Traffic and public transport
5	EPA	EPA referral authority comments Supports requirement of an audit under Environment Protection Act which was completed in Jan 2016	Support
6		Objects to the planning permit application as will be directly affected by proposed building Feels that it violates current and acceptable building restrictions Size is inappropriate for neighbouring residents Height contravenes Australian Living Standard as it will give residents full view into the submitters property Deprives submitter of valued privacy and lowers value of land Property sale had billboard which stated that STCA a planning permit was possible for 10 storeys Shadow from proposed development will cast my entire front yard and windows in permanent shade during winter solstice Concerned about development impact on church property Development will increase traffic problems	Building height and amenity Traffic and public transport Heritage
7		Objects to the planning permit application: 1. Traffic increase 2. Effect on access to Carrington Health building, particularly two way section 3. Reduced car parking for Carrington Health clients and staff 4. Environmental concerns during construction including dust from excavation causing/exacerbating existing health issues 5. Noise during construction and when completed 6. Concerns about emergency procedures for fire/earthquake evacuation as currently for Carrington Health it is the cnr of Station Street/Cambridge Street	Traffic and public transport Car parking Building height and amenity Construction impacts
8		See Submission 7	
9		Reason for moving to area was for Council childcare centre and if this removed will not have a convenient centre Current carpark is convenient for residents	Car parking Land uses and infrastructure

10		<p>Proforma response. Oppose rezoning and development because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developers should use commercial sites rather than rezoning residential sites which are cheaper. 2. City of Whitehorse has a conflict of interest and should not be allowed to decide on this matter. It owns the land in Cambridge Stand Station St (currently used for car parking and a childcare centre) and will benefit financially if this proposal goes ahead to facilitate a highly profitable sale to the developer. 3. There is a dire shortage of car parking. A proposed new multi-storey parking site in Harrow St will be less convenient - future from shopping/transport and forcing many people to cross busy Station St. 4. The proposed 3 towers will be noisy and dusty in construction, will overshadow residential properties, and will reduce the value of residential properties nearby. 5. These proposed 18 storey towers are even higher than what is proposed in Council's highly controversial "Amendment C175" draft that aims to belatedly set some height limits for Box Hill Central. 6. Rezoning in Oxford St will facilitate future high-rise development in this quiet residential street- creating future problems of construction noise, dust, overshadowing and reduction of property value. 7. The proposal suggest the Oxford St rezoning is necessary to create a 'transition' from high rise to residential areas. This is only a problem because of the proposed towers in Cambridge St are too high and too close to the boundaries of neighbouring properties. Any development in Cambridge St should be severely to provide its own 'transition' to residential areas. 8. The proposed three towers come a 'reduction in the standard requirements for car parking' - which will further worsen Box Hill's appalling car parking situation. 9. Whitehorse Council is approving high-rise developments without doing any modelling to see how the huge influx of population and cars will adversely affect our neighbourhood - for example with congestion on roads, footpaths, rains and trams, plus noise, heat and traffic fumes. 10. Whitehorse Council has done nothing to plan for 'growth' - no widening of roads or footpaths, no provision for bicycle paths, no planned open spaces to moderate the impact of ugly concrete towers. 	<p>Consultation and Amendment process Car parking Building height and amenity Land uses and infrastructure</p>
11		See Submission 7	
12		See Submission 10	
13		<p>Concerned about new proposal as it will worsen all the issues that are currently an issue, including:</p> <p>Traffic, congestion, noise and limited parking which is already an inconvenience and cause must frustration</p> <p>Concerned about impact of accessibility as a local resident, but also as someone who works in the area</p> <p>Two way section of Cambridge Street will impact on the Carrington Health building</p> <p>Already insufficient car parking for Carrington Health staff and clients and the new carpark that is proposed will not contain sufficient parking spaces to accommodate current needs as well as additional needs</p> <p>Excavation and building works will also have an environmental impact and be a risk to the health of workers</p>	<p>Traffic and public transport Car parking</p>
14		See Submission 10	
15		<p>Objects to the planning permit application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic congestion 2. Insufficient car parking for Carrington Health clients and staff 	<p>Traffic and public transport Car parking</p>

16		<p>Concerns about longer term health and environmental impacts for people who live in the area</p> <p>Volume of cars and congestion has increased and the proposed developments will put a lot of pressure on already busy roads and surrounding junctions</p> <p>Will be significant truck traffic turning into Cambridge St and the increase in car and trucks is a hazard for pedestrians</p> <p>Public transport is only a benefit for people who are able to access these options</p> <p>Development will result in the loss of one of the few all day parking options</p> <p>Environmental impact of the developments is likely to be significant, including increased noise during construction and increased traffic and population</p> <p>Greater population density increases risk of spread of disease</p> <p>Driving in Box Hill is like a tunnel, sunlight is blocked by tall buildings, wind tunnels and noise amplified</p> <p>Unpleasant, unfriendly and uninviting environment</p> <p>Concerns about lack of emergency infrastructure</p> <p>How will anyone get out 24 hour traffic jam? How will emergency services get in?</p> <p>Where will residents be re-housed?</p>	<p>Traffic and public transport</p> <p>Car parking</p> <p>Construction impacts</p> <p>Building height and amenity</p>
17		See Submission 10	
18		See Submission 10	
19	HWL Ebsworth	Council in its corporate capacity as the landowner supports the development	Support
20		<p>Concerned with the proposal because of:</p> <p>Insufficient car parking - car parking falls short of statutory requirement</p> <p>Traffic congestion - will get worse with new developments</p> <p>Built form - is too tall and bulky, out of character for the centre</p> <p>Open space - has impact on existing open space ben considered?</p> <p>Mixed use zone - will allow too many inappropriate uses</p> <p>Amenity - has council considered loss of amenity of current residents e.g. noise, invasion of privacy, overlooking, rubbish and nuisance? Rubbish truck is noisy, vehicles speeding through the street, motorcyclists revving engines</p> <p>Integrated decision making - council needs to adequately address and balance all of the relevant objectives appropriate to the combined process. Council needs to be satisfied that the site can be developed without causing unacceptable impacts</p> <p>Apartment guidelines - has council considered the apartment guidelines in assessing the Amendment?</p>	<p>Car parking</p> <p>Traffic and public transport</p> <p>Building height and amenity</p> <p>Land uses and infrastructure</p>
21		See Submission 10	
22		See Submission 10	
23		See Submission 10	
24		See Submission 10	
25		See Submission 10	
26		See Submission 10	
27		See Submission 10	
28		See Submission 10	
29		See Submission 10	
30		See Submission 10	

31	<p>An overdevelopment of the site without a plan to address the crucial issues of transport and living environment.</p> <p>Traffic and parking provision inadequate</p> <p>Are there safe and direct pedestrian routes to the station?</p> <p>No mention of safe bikeways</p> <p>Height is completely out of scale and unacceptable</p> <p>Pedestrian path between Tower A and Tower B will be a wind tunnel</p> <p>Council as planning authority has a conflict of interest</p> <p>Residential hotel will become sub-standard permanent apartments</p> <p>Many of the conditions on the proposed permit are mandatory and unlikely to be enforced</p> <p>No attempt to address the flaws of the development, it is too large and dense, inappropriately located and limited landscaping</p>	<p>Traffic and public transport</p> <p>Car parking</p> <p>Consultation and Amendment process</p> <p>Planning permit</p> <p>Building height and amenity</p>
32	<p>Poor consultative process - paid rates for 20 years but wasn't notified of proposal</p> <p>Information about amendment can only be found by typing in URL</p> <p>Council has conflict of interest and should not be allowed to support or make the final decision</p> <p>Application for the amendment seems to have been drawn up by council staff, planning section of Council will gain resources, status and remuneration if large proposals are encouraged and approved.</p> <p>Council staff, whose salaries are paid for by our rates, have a conflict of interest.</p> <p>Did not read comments about Amendment C175 but discussed how staff called some submissions racist</p> <p>Suggest staff and Councillors inspect Cambridge Street and Oxford Street where you will see sub-standard properties - including belongings crammed on balconies, overcrowded flats, with litter, fire risk, garbage and rats</p> <p>Question the high levels of immigration that Australia allows - current influx is placing too much pressure on environment and infrastructure</p> <p>Why is Box Hill shouldering most of the burden of accommodating the population?</p> <p>Queries the diversity of the developments who are changing the face of Box Hill and suggests that most residents are concerned about the developments, not that nationality of developers</p> <p>Glib rejection of views under the term racist suggests that planning staff and councillors may have an alternative agenda</p> <p>Not unreasonable for local residents to be sceptical about the influence of Chinese developers as the built environment in China is different</p> <p>Are staff too close to developers?</p> <p>Do staff hope to gain lucrative jobs or other advantages by sympathising with developers?</p> <p>Buildings are too large</p> <p>Councillors unable to come to an agreement on C175, therefore C194 should be shelved</p> <p>Amendment will set a precedent to extend commercial areas further south and encroach on residential areas</p> <p>The 6 storey block will contain 'serviced apartments' but can find no detail about</p>	<p>Traffic and public transport</p> <p>Car parking</p> <p>Consultation and Amendment process</p> <p>Planning permit</p> <p>Building height and amenity</p> <p>Land uses and infrastructure</p>

33		<p>Object both to this planning application on the whole and specifically to the request for a reduction in the standard requirement for car parking facilities.</p> <p>Already significant issues with insufficient parking being available for residents, commuters and other users of the area.</p> <p>Further reducing available car parking will add to local traffic congestion and create a further safety risk with people parking illegally and in unsafe locations due to an insufficiency of legal parking options.</p> <p>Object to the construction of a high rise development in the currently residential Oxford Street.</p> <p>No further upgrade to public transport, road, parking or pedestrian facilities.</p> <p>Further growth without first developing local infrastructure will reduce the quality of life for all local residents.</p> <p>Development will only add to problems with traffic congestion on surrounding roads and there is nothing in the proposal outlining a plan to manage these issues.</p> <p>See no justification for going against current regulations and reducing the standard requirements for car parking facilities.</p>	<p>Car parking</p> <p>Traffic and public transport</p> <p>Land uses and infrastructure</p>
34		See Submission 10	
35	Vicinity Centres	<p>Supports the ongoing development of the Box Hill MAC</p> <p>Object to the planning permit application and seek certainty of replacement of public parking and control over the transitional provision of public parking during the construction process</p> <p>The amendment is silent on the replacement of public car parking lost from the site</p> <p>Existing car park is one of the highest utilised car parks within the MAC</p> <p>The amendment and permit do not require the replacement of the car park</p> <p>Construction of any replacement car park should not commence until any replacement public car parking is available, having regard for existing demand and additional demand</p> <p>The application form provided is silent in relation to the specific "shop" uses sought</p> <p>Vicinity Centres is concerned about the various definitions/interpretations of the word "shop" in the documentation</p> <p>If the permit were to be interrelated to allow a "supermarket" and "department store" then Vicinity Centres would object to these uses being permitted on the site</p> <p>Request that "except for Supermarket and department store" be added after "Retail premises" in the draft permit</p>	<p>Car parking</p> <p>Land uses and infrastructure</p>
36		<p>Object to both the proposed rezoning and proposed planning permit application</p> <p>Never consulted about the proposed sale of the Council car park and consultation was pathetic and non-existent</p> <p>Ratepayers should have been directly notified</p> <p>Existing car park is great and provides open space</p> <p>The aesthetic amenity of the adjacent church will be diminished and destroyed</p> <p>Council has a conflict of interest as both the vendor and responsible authority for planning</p> <p>Too many high rise apartments built and planned for Box Hill and we do not need any more</p> <p>We should not be approving any more foreign development as there is too much already</p> <p>Council is selling out and selling off the amenity of the suburb</p> <p>Object to the rezoning of the church land as this is not relevant</p>	<p>Consultation and Amendment process</p> <p>Car parking</p> <p>Building height and amenity</p> <p>Land uses and infrastructure</p> <p>Heritage</p>
37		See Submission 10	
38		See Submission 10	

39		<p>Object as this appears to remove a significant amount of public use land that is primarily public parking.</p> <p>This public parking is available 24 hours a day 7 days a week and is available at low cost and at times free of charge.</p> <p>It provides a place for parking for many people visiting the restaurant and shops around Carrington Road and surrounds.</p> <p>The removal of this parking will degrade the amenity and value of our property and damage the businesses in the area as parking will spill onto the streets creating a larger street parking issue than present, which is already significant.</p> <p>A condition for maintaining the same or greater amount of public access parking and the same rates as current (at times free of charge) should be included into this permit.</p> <p>In addition the building heights seem excessive for the surrounds that are predominately 3 stories.</p>	Car parking
40	Carrington Health	<p>Vast majority of clients use cars to get to appointments and need a safe driving environment and accessible parking.</p> <p>50 of our staff use the public car park on the corner of Station and Cambridge St</p> <p>Additional vehicles will put significant pressure on traffic flows on already busy roads and intersections</p> <p>Increased traffic and parking in this area will cause additional traffic and safety hazard for motorists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Proposed car park entrance in Cambridge St is very close to our car park entrance, and will likely increase potential traffic hazard for those needing to access and exit our car park. In addition, the entrance to the truck loading bay proposed is across the road from the entrance to our premises.</p> <p>Would be expecting to expand the Community Health services to match substantial growth. These buildings will significantly limit the opportunities for clients and for staff.</p> <p>Development will result in the loss of the car park where many of our staff currently park</p> <p>All day parking is currently very limited, and even without the loss of the car park in question, there is a significant shortage of all day parking options in Box Hill, with existing car parking spaces filling quickly and parking in residential streets within a 1km radius filling very early in the morning.</p> <p>When construction commences, cars parking in the existing carpark will be displaced and forced to look for alternative all day parking, adding extra pressure to local residential streets</p> <p>Potential for staff to use spaces allocated to retail/commercial is likely to be limited by time restrictions and cost – they currently pay \$7 per day in the council operated car park.</p> <p>Only 6 allocated disabled spaces in the new building car park which will drastically limit easy access for our clients and others with disabilities visiting the Box Hill precinct.</p> <p>Excavation works for basement car park will likely generate dust and debris that may exacerbate existing health conditions for clients and the general public.</p> <p>There will be an increase in noise levels when completed, but even more worrying is</p>	Car parking Traffic and public transport Construction impacts
41	Uniting Church of Australia	<p>Support application of MUZ to land included in the Amendment</p> <p>Support the development of the neighbouring property as shown</p> <p>Unnecessary for the building to transition to church land as it currently provides</p> <p>Rather it is the view of the submitter that the scale transition should be to the residential precinct to the south on the opposite side of Oxford Street and therefore a more robust and aggressive built form edge could be allowed for at the boundary interface with the church land</p> <p>Abuttal to the church land should allow built form potential for at least 6 storeys, not 2-4 as shown</p> <p>Church land is large enough and has the potential to attract greater development potential than what the amendment currently appears to anticipate</p> <p>Request that the incorporated document be amended to include the church land to provide built form guidance at a level of intensity befitting its potential</p> <p>Generally supportive of amendment, but believe that the amendment should go further than it presently does in addressing the potential for the church land</p>	Support Building height and amenity

42	Time and Place	<p>On behalf of the proponent for 517 - 521 Station Street, supports amendment</p> <p>Have reviewed draft permit conditions and seek changes to some permit conditions - refer to written submission for entire list</p> <p>Responds to DELWP authorisation letter</p> <p>Based the proposed apartment numbers on current market demands and trends</p> <p>Interface to west is appropriate and will not impact on the amenity of adjacent properties</p> <p>Believe proposal generally complies with the objectives and majority of the standards in the BADS</p>	Support Planning Permit
43		<p>Hold a disabled parking permit and reduction or illumination of adequate parking may mean no longer able to physically get to my place of work.</p> <p>Many clients with mobility issues already find it difficult to access the building due to parking limitations making it prohibitive to accessing services that are provided for them.</p> <p>Traffic increase will make it additionally difficult for clients to access our services as many rely on Cambridge St and surrounding roads to access our services.</p> <p>This will put a lot of pressure on already busy roads and intersections, despite the end section of Cambridge St to become two-way.</p> <p>Currently no pedestrian crossings to access building from Cambridge St and increased traffic will pose a safety risk for both staff and clients crossing as pedestrians, especially those that are slower with mobility.</p> <p>The car park entrance of the proposed building being so close to the entrance to our driveway from Cambridge St will slow traffic and pose a safety risk for staff and clients alike who are accessing the building on foot from behind.</p> <p>Losing the current car park where many clients and staff park.</p>	Car parking Traffic and public transport
44		<p>Object as a regular to the area. Is concerned about:</p> <p>Access to parking for shoppers, residents and clients of the various health and community support services in the immediate area.</p> <p>The effect of additional traffic on already congested streets</p> <p>The effects of the building process itself - dust, noise, congestion etc. on shoppers, employees and those accessing community health services</p> <p>Access to daylight</p> <p>If there will be apartments with disability access (large, level entry bathrooms etc.) for older or disabled residents.</p>	<p>Traffic and public transport</p> <p>Car parking</p> <p>Building height and amenity</p>

45	Terrain Consulting Group	<p>On behalf of the Wesley Uniting Church at 2 - 8 Oxford Street. Grounds of objection:</p> <p>The proposed rezoning of the church land to MUZ will result in pressure to sell the land and relocate</p> <p>The proposed Amendment has not considered the impact on the historic church building</p> <p>The proposed amendment will result in potential long term impacts on nearby residents</p> <p>The proposed Incorporated Document is ill conceived as it does not apply to the church land</p> <p>The proposed development is inconsistent with the Box Hill Structure Plan</p> <p>The proposed development is inconsistent with Amendment C175</p> <p>The proposed development is inconsistent with the Incorporated Document</p> <p>The proposed planning permit conditions suggest the development is unresolved</p> <p>The proposed development has adverse implications on existing buildings on the church land</p> <p>The proposed development has adverse amenity impacts on the church and surrounding land including overshadowing, visual bulk, increased noise and activity, loss of trees and inadequate landscaping, overlooking and traffic and parking implications</p> <p>The proposed development threatens the continued use of the heritage listed pipe organ</p> <p>The proposed development comprises the continued operation of the Church</p>	Heritage
46		<p>Preferred a more modest height limit due to overshadowing concerns</p> <p>Site was the location of Blood's Cottage</p> <p>No acknowledgement of the sites heritage in either the planning application documents or the proposed planning conditions and this needs to be rectified</p> <p>In addition to the retention of the interpretative sign, the applicant should be asked to carry out a careful excavation of the cottage site to allow for the recovery of any items of historical interest and the submitters wish to retain the bricks from the underground tank for an on-site display</p> <p>Survey of existing vegetation should be undertaken prior to any works being undertaken</p> <p>Small increase in the setback on the western boundary would allow the retention of eucalyptus in this space</p> <p>Noted that changes to traffic management will be needed to allow the traffic to enter Station St from the proposed new car park</p>	Building height and amenity Heritage
47	Inner East Primary Care Partnership	<p>Already, the traffic congestion around our worksite contributes to significant inefficiencies as my team members are frequently required to attend meetings off site that are not accessible by public transport.</p> <p>Believe the changes will impact on the ability of staff to find car parking close to work on their return from meetings – this is already a significant issue for the team which will be exacerbated by the new development. The traffic congestion and lack of parking also affect our partner agency's abilities to attend meetings on site.</p> <p>Concerned about the environmental impact of the work and the effect of the noise from the building.</p>	Traffic and public transport Car parking Construction impacts
48	VicRoads	<p>VicRoads referral authority comments. No objection to Amendment</p> <p>Traffic assessment is inadequate and sought further information to form a view</p> <p>Requested additional information in the form of an update traffic assessment</p> <p>Raised concerns in relation to proposed two way movements and introduction of a shared zone on Cambridge St</p> <p>VicRoads requested consideration of removing of on-street car parking along Station Street</p> <p>VicRoads requires conditions to be included in the NOD to issue a planning permit/planning permit</p> <p>See submission for full list of conditions</p>	Traffic and public transport Car parking Planning Permit
49		See submission 10	

50		<p>Primarily on the basis for car parking</p> <p>Believes that Council should conduct an independent review into car parking in the Box Hill MAC and develop a strategy for it prior to considering any requests to waive the statutory car parking rates</p> <p>Regularly see cars parked illegally on street</p> <p>Traffic Impact Assessment fails to take into account the propose development is on top of existing short term facilities</p>	Car parking
51		Should be no more than 5 storeys, as the proposed height is too high.	Building height and amenity
52		LATE SUBMISSION -See submission 10	
53	Church community of Wesley Uniting Church Box Hill	<p>LATE SUBMISSION This submission from the Wesley Uniting Church community is a petition with 98 signatures.</p> <p>Objects to the proposed rezoning of the Church site at 2-8 Oxford Street being rezoned from Residential Growth Zone to Mixed Use Zone.</p> <p>Objects to the height, location and built form of the development proposed for the adjoining land.</p> <p>Believes that the Amendment and proposed development will have significant structural and adverse amenity impacts on the historic Church with its heritage listed Willis Organ and its surrounding neighbourhood land will compromise the continued operation of the church at its location.</p> <p>Requests that Council abandon the Amendment or modify the Amendment to exclude the Church site at 2-8 Oxford Street and exclude the adjoining land at 517 Station Street from the Incorporate Document which allows an 18 storey development on this land.</p>	