

# Specific matters for referral


Suburban Rail Loop East Precincts Standing Advisory Committee



Department  
of Transport  
and Planning

## General issues common to all precincts

Topic	Key issue
<b>Contaminated land</b>	Whether the approach to the application of the Environmental Audit Overlay (EAO) to potentially contaminated land is appropriate
<b>Diversity &amp; mix of housing types</b>	Whether the draft Structure Plans and draft Planning Scheme Amendments facilitate the delivery of diverse housing types
<b>Floor space capacity</b>	Whether the floor space capacity which would be facilitated by the draft Structure Plans and built form controls as discussed in the Land Use Scenario and Capacity Assessment is appropriate, taking account of the projected population and employment growth
<b>Social &amp; affordable housing</b>	Whether the draft Structure Plans and draft Planning Scheme Amendments facilitate the delivery of social and affordable housing
<b>Sustainability</b>	Whether the approach adopted in the draft Structure Plans and the draft Planning Scheme Amendments is suitable to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Achieve the draft Structure Plan’s sustainability objectives</li><li>– Support sustainable building design in new development</li></ul>
<b>Transport – Mode shift</b>	Whether the draft Structure Plans, and associated draft Implementation Plans and draft Planning Scheme Amendments facilitate a suitable and achievable modal shift, including having regard to the proposed population density increases and projected demand for on-street and public parking
<b>Voluntary Public Benefit Uplift Framework – Uplift calculation</b>	Whether the uplift calculation in the Voluntary Public Benefit Uplift Framework supports its practical application, including public realm improvements and commercial (office) floor space as a category of public benefit



Topic	Key issue
<b>Draft Planning Scheme Amendments – Drafting of schedules</b>	<p>Whether the schedules to the proposed Precinct Zones (PRZs) and/or Built Form Overlays (BFOs) are appropriate, in respect of the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The identification of sites for which master plans need to be prepared</li> <li>– The preparation and approval of master plans</li> <li>– The deemed to comply provisions in the BFOs</li> <li>– The specific objectives, and any built form outcomes to be achieved, for strategic sites</li> <li>– Achieving a reasonable level of privacy</li> <li>– Managing the impacts of overshadowing on private open spaces</li> <li>– Managing the impacts of overshadowing on the public realm, including public open spaces</li> <li>– Supporting high-quality design outcomes</li> <li>– Managing the potential for offsite amenity impacts including with respect to potential dust, odour, noise and vibration impacts arising from existing uses</li> <li>– The identification of pedestrian connections and links</li> <li>– Waste management</li> <li>– Integrated water management</li> <li>– Measures to support tree canopy cover</li> <li>– Third party review rights</li> </ul>

## Box Hill precinct specific issues

### Built form

Topic	Key issue
<b>Building height, distribution &amp; transition</b>	<p>The suitability and distribution of the proposed building heights specified in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment, and transition to surrounding residential areas, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Whitehorse Road</li><li>– Station Road</li><li>– The Laburnum neighbourhood</li><li>– South of the railway line in Laburnum</li><li>– Bishop Street and Oxford Street</li><li>– Dorking Street</li><li>– The Former Box Hill Brickworks site (14 Federation Street)</li><li>– Zetland Road</li><li>– Central Box Hill</li><li>– St Andrews, Habitat Uniting Church and St Peters site</li><li>– Residential streets and neighbourhood areas above 2-3 storeys</li><li>– 58-60 Williams Street</li><li>– 709-713 Station Street</li><li>– Central Core Box Hill</li><li>– 11 Irving Street, 13 Irving Street, 9 Bruce Street and 11 Bruce Street</li><li>– land between Box Hill gardens and Whitehorse Road, bound by Shipley Street (west) and Station Street (east)</li><li>– 16-28 Nelson Road</li><li>– 853 Whitehorse Road</li><li>– 875-887 Whitehorse Road</li><li>– 1000 Whitehorse Road</li><li>– 16-18 Spring Street</li><li>– 465 Elgar Road</li><li>– 466 Elgar Road</li><li>– 3 and 5 Ellingworth Parade</li><li>– 702-706 Station Street</li><li>– Potential conflict with existing approved planning permits</li><li>– Transition between areas of different height expectations</li><li>– Transition to sensitive interfaces</li><li>– Wind effects on the public realm and private open space</li><li>– Heritage areas</li></ul>
<b>Setbacks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Whether the building setbacks specified in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment are appropriate, including with respect to:</li><li>– Street and rear setbacks for properties fronting Bishop Street</li><li>– Street setbacks along Station Street</li><li>– Street setbacks along Nelson Road</li><li>– Street and rear setbacks for properties fronting Ellingworth Parade</li><li>– Rear boundary setback requirements for podium levels of the Central Flank place type areas</li></ul>



Topic	Key issue
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Street, side and rear boundary upper level setbacks above street walls (podium) for Central Core and Central Flank place type areas</li><li>– Zero metre side boundary setbacks for residential neighbourhood place types</li></ul>
<b>Floor Area Ratios</b>	Whether the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) controls proposed in the draft Planning Scheme Amendment are appropriate

## Urban design


Topic	Key issue
<b>Pedestrian access &amp; links</b>	Whether the planning for active transport in the Box Hill Structure Plan Area is appropriate, including with respect to:
<b>Cycling access &amp; infrastructure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– The indicative pedestrian link over land at 20 Ashted Road</li><li>– The proposed footpath widening in central Box Hill areas</li><li>– Weather protection between Watts/Harrow Streets and the SRL East station</li><li>– The role of Nelson Road</li></ul>
<b>Public open space</b>	<p>Whether the planning for open space in the Box Hill Structure Plan Area is appropriate, having regard to the needs of future residents, visitors and employees to the Structure Plan Area, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Whether additional open space should be provided south of the railway to Brougham Street, between Elgar Road and Station Street; south of the railway, between William and Barcelona Streets; East of Station Street and south of Severn Street; South of Maroondah Highway, between Miller Street and Short Street; South of Maroondah Highway to the railway, east of Middleborough Road</li><li>– Depiction of future Ellingworth Parade car park as open space in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment Whether the Former Box Hill Brickworks site ought properly accommodate future public open space</li></ul>
<b>Overshadowing &amp; shading (public)</b>	Whether the proposed measures in the draft Structure Plan and controls in the draft Planning Scheme Amendment are appropriate to minimise overshadowing and maintain solar access to the public realm, including Whitehorse Road Linear Reserve, Box Hill Gardens and Ellingworth Park and other public spaces and streets in the Box Hill Structure Plan Area
<b>Public realm safety</b>	Whether the draft Structure Plan makes provision for enhancing public safety in areas where higher density development is proposed or where high levels of traffic and congestion occur

## Land use

Topic	Key issue
<b>Land use mix &amp; capacity</b>	<p>Whether the Land Use Plan in the draft Structure Plan and relevant planning provisions provide for an appropriate land use mix across the Box Hill Structure Plan Area, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– The extent to which residential uses should be encouraged/discouraged in the Health and Education neighbourhood</li><li>– The extent of the Mixed Use Zone generally, particularly along Station Street and Canterbury Road</li><li>– Whether the application of the applied Residential Growth Zone at 6-8 Archibald Street (Central Flank place typology) is appropriate</li></ul>

## Other matters concerning the implementation of the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment

Topic	Key issue
<b>Car parking availability &amp; rates</b>	<p>Whether the car parking rates as set out in the Precinct Parking Plan for Box Hill are appropriate, including to encourage a shift towards more sustainable transport modes</p> <p>Whether sufficient car parking availability (including on-street and public car parking availability) will be provided having regard to potential additional parking demand (particularly in the Health and Education Neighbourhood)</p>
<b>Community infrastructure</b>	<p>Whether the planning for community infrastructure in the Box Hill Structure Plan Area is appropriate, having regard to the needs of future residents, visitors and employees</p>
<b>Draft Implementation Plan</b>	<p>Whether the approach to implementing the actions and projects contained in the draft Implementation Plan for Box Hill and the timing and pathways for their implementation are appropriate for the purposes of the draft Structure Plan</p>
<b>Strategic sites</b>	<p>Whether the identification and treatment of strategic sites in the Box Hill Structure Plan Area are appropriate, including with respect to the Former Box Hill Brickworks site, and whether additional sites should be considered as strategic sites such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Land bound by Maroondah Highway / Whitehorse Road (to the north), the railway corridor (to the south), Middleborough Road (to the east), and Linsley Street (to the west)</li><li>– Box Hill institute (853 Whitehorse Road, 16-18 Spring Street, 1000 Whitehorse Road, 465 Elgar Road and 466 Elgar Road)</li><li>– 16-28 Nelson Road</li><li>– 11-13 Irving Street and 9-11 Bruce Street</li><li>– Zetland Road</li></ul>
<b>Road &amp; street network</b>	<p>Whether the road/street network shown in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment is appropriate, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– The western end of Whitehorse Road</li></ul>



Topic	Key issue
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– A road extension from Mont Albert Road to Albion Street</li> </ul>
<b>Vegetation &amp; Ecology</b>	Whether it is appropriate to remove Significant Landscape Overlay – Schedule 9 and Neighbourhood Character Overlay – Schedule 2
<b>Voluntary Public Benefit Uplift Framework</b>	Whether the proposed Voluntary Public Benefit Uplift Framework is appropriate in respect of the spatial application of the framework in Box Hill, and whether proposals meeting Environmentally Sustainable Design (ESD) requirements should be able to access the framework

## Burwood precinct specific issues

### Built form

Topic	Key issue
<b>Building heights, distribution and transition</b>	<p>The suitability and distribution of the proposed building heights specified in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment, and transition to surrounding residential areas, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– SRL Station Development Area</li><li>– Gardiners Creek (Kooyongkoot) corridor</li><li>– Burwood Highway corridor</li><li>– Education neighbourhood and at the Fountain Court Retirement Village site</li><li>– McComas Grove and its intersection with Coppard Street</li><li>– Residential neighbourhoods around Barlyn Road, Chandler Grove, Roslyn Street</li><li>– The built form interface with Gardiners Creek (Kooyongkoot), including via building setbacks</li><li>– The building height transition along McComas Grove to adjoining residential areas to the east</li><li>– Wind effects on the public realm and private open space, particularly in relation to new development along Burwood Highway and the Gardiners Creek (Kooyongkoot) corridor</li></ul>
<b>Floor Area Ratios</b>	<p>Whether the mandatory Floor Area Ratio (FAR) controls proposed in the draft Planning Scheme Amendment are appropriate</p>

### Urban design

Topic	Key issue
<b>Pedestrian access &amp; links</b>	<p>Whether the planning for active transport in the Burwood Structure Plan Area is appropriate, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– The strategic cycling corridor alongside Gardiners Creek (Kooyongkoot)</li><li>– Pedestrian and cycle crossing of Burwood Highway at Gardiners Creek (Kooyongkoot)</li><li>– Links through the Mount Scopus strategic site and Fountain Court Retirement Village</li></ul>
<b>Public open space</b>	<p>Whether planning for open space in the Burwood Structure Plan Area is appropriate, having regard to the needs of future residents, visitors and employees to the Structure Plan Area, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– The size and type of the new open spaces proposed around McIntyre Street/Cromwell Street; and around Delaney Avenue/Milford Avenue</li><li>– The public open space investigation area near Burwood Highway/Station Street encompassing some of the Fountain Court Retirement Village</li><li>– Additional open space north of Burwood Highway, between Warragul Road and Parer Street; north of Burwood Highway, east of Station Street; south of Burwood Highway, east of Station Street; south of Highbury Road, west of Gardiners Creek</li></ul>



Topic	Key issue
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Improvements to specific existing open spaces, including in Lundgren Reserve and Gardiners Creek Reserve at Fletcher Parade</li></ul>
<b>Impacts on the Gardiners Creek (Kooyongkoot) corridor</b>	Whether the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment mitigate ecological impacts along the Gardiners Creek (Kooyongkoot) corridor
<b>Overshadowing &amp; shading (public)</b>	Whether the proposed measures in the draft Structure Plan and controls in the draft Planning Scheme Amendment are appropriate to minimise overshadowing and maintain solar access to the public realm in the Burwood Structure Plan Area
<b>Public realm safety</b>	<p>Whether the draft Structure Plan makes suitable provision for enhancing public safety in areas where higher density development is proposed</p> <p>Whether the controls proposed in the draft Planning Scheme Amendment for active frontages suitably address public safety issues</p>


## Land use

Topic	Key issue
<b>Land use mix &amp; capacity</b>	<p>Whether the Land Use Plan in the draft Structure Plan and relevant planning provisions provide for an appropriate land use mix across the Burwood Structure Plan Area, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Encouraging delivery of employment floorspace, including suitable mixed-use and commercial development in the Burwood Central neighbourhood</li><li>– The extent to which residential uses should be encouraged/discouraged in employment and commercial areas</li></ul>

## Other matters concerning the implementation of the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment

Topic	Key issue
<b>Car parking availability &amp; rates</b>	Whether the car parking rates as set out in the Precinct Parking Plan for Burwood are appropriate, including to encourage a shift towards more sustainable transport modes
<b>Community infrastructure</b>	Whether the planning for community infrastructure in the Burwood Structure Plan Area is appropriate, having regard to the needs of future residents, visitors and employees
<b>Draft Implementation Plan</b>	Whether the approach to implementing the actions and projects contained in the draft Implementation Plan for Burwood and the timing and pathways for their implementation are appropriate, for the purposes of the draft Structure Plan





Topic	Key issue
<b>Precinct Zone – Application to specific sites in the Burwood Structure Plan Area</b>	Whether the PRZ should be applied to Greenwood Business Park
<b>Strategic sites</b>	Whether the identification and treatment of strategic sites in the Burwood Structure Plan Area are appropriate, including Greenwood Business Park, Mount Scopus College and 127 Highbury Road
<b>Public Acquisition Overlay – Application to a specific site in the Burwood Structure Plan Area</b>	Whether the Public Acquisition Overlay (PAO) should be applied to 141 Highbury Road, Burwood
<b>Road &amp; street network</b>	Whether the road/street network shown in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment is appropriate

## Cheltenham precinct specific issues

### Built form

Topic	Key issue
<b>Building heights, distribution &amp; transition</b>	<p>The suitability and distribution of the proposed building heights specified in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment, and transition to surrounding residential areas including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Residential areas within the Cheltenham Structure Plan Area</li><li>– Pennydale and Highett neighbourhoods</li><li>– Bay Road and Nepean Highway</li><li>– The former Highett Gasworks site</li><li>– Highett Common strategic site</li><li>– The former CSIRO site</li><li>– Commercial areas</li><li>– In proximity to and at Southland, including on the land at the north-east corner of Nepean Highway and Karen Street</li><li>– Along the eastern side of Chesterville Road</li><li>– Along Enright Street, Mathieson Street and Karen Street</li><li>– Whether high rise buildings should be restricted to along main roads, including Bay Road and Park Road and Nepean Highway with reduced heights in residential localities</li></ul>
<b>Floor Area Ratios</b>	<p>Whether the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) controls proposed in the draft Planning Scheme Amendment are appropriate, including with respect to strategic sites such as Southland Shopping Centre</p>
<b>Setbacks</b>	<p>Whether the proposed building heights in combination with the proposed setbacks in each neighbourhood, having regard to the preferred future character and relevant draft Planning Scheme Amendment controls, are suitable, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– The built form interface between residential neighbourhoods (i.e. Pennydale, Highett and Jean Street areas) and commercial/retail centres (i.e. Highett Activity Centre, Bayside Business District, Southland Shopping Centre)</li><li>– The transition in building height between Southland and properties on Nepean Highway</li><li>– The built form interface adjacent to key links and open space</li><li>– Landscaping, particularly in relation to canopy trees</li><li>– Minimising adverse wind effects on the public realm and private open space</li></ul>

### Urban design

Topic	Key issue
<b>Pedestrian access &amp; links</b>	<p>Whether the planning for active transport in the Cheltenham Structure Plan Area is appropriate, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– New key links as shown in the Pennydale area</li></ul>



Topic	Key issue
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Near Jean Street and Karen Street</li><li>– Safety for pedestrians and cyclists including along Bay Road</li><li>– Weather protection for key pedestrian connections including between Cheltenham SRL East station, Southland Station, Charman Road and Southland Shopping Centre</li></ul>

<b>Public open space</b>	<p>Whether the planning for open space in the Cheltenham Structure Plan Area is appropriate, having regard to the needs of future residents, visitors and employees to the Structure Plan Area, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Any potential additional open space requirements for the Laminex Site</li><li>– Recognition of the open space values of Sir William Fry Reserve</li><li>– The investigation areas in/near Bayside Business District</li></ul>
--------------------------	--

## Land use


Topic	Key issue
-------	-----------

<b>Land use mix &amp; capacity</b>	<p>Whether the Land Use Plan in the draft Structure Plan and relevant planning provisions provide for an appropriate land use mix across the Cheltenham Structure Plan Area, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Mixed use and commercial/retail uses, including in activity centres</li><li>– Land uses within the Bayside Business District, including along Bay Road</li><li>– The proposed land use outcomes in the Bayside Business District</li><li>– The proposed applied zones at 223-225 and 227-229 Bay Road and 332-336 Bay Road, and at 13-19 Wangara Road, 2-6 Brixton Road and 266 Bay Road (Brixton West), 270-276 Bay Road, 1-7 Brixton Road and 33-43 Wangara Road (Brixton East), 298-300 Bay Road (Newlink)</li></ul>
------------------------------------	---

<b>Retail</b>	<p>Whether the retail use facilitated by the draft Structure Plan and proposed planning controls are appropriate, including with respect to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Whether the hierarchy of activity centres and retail strips is considered to ensure enhancements of larger centres does not pose a negative impact on smaller centres.</li><li>– Whether the amount and location of proposed retail use is appropriate</li><li>– Whether additional locations for retail uses should be allowed, particularly in the Bayside Business District</li></ul>
---------------	---

## Other matters concerning the implementation of the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment

Topic	Key issue
<b>Car parking availability &amp; rates</b>	<p>Whether the car parking rates as set out in the Precinct Parking Plan for Cheltenham are appropriate, including to encourage a shift towards more sustainable transport modes</p> <p>Whether the proposed car parking rates and areas are appropriate, including with respect to whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– They provide appropriate car parking capacity in the Cheltenham Structure Plan Area (including on-street and public car parking availability)</li> <li>– Proposed bicycle parking rates for employment and education uses are appropriate</li> <li>– The implementation strategy for consolidated carparks and interim parking and transport strategy should apply before station operation</li> </ul>
<b>Community infrastructure</b>	<p>Whether the planning for community infrastructure in the Cheltenham Structure Plan Area is appropriate, having regard to the needs of future residents, visitors and employees, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The provision of a regional community hub and library in the SRL East station precinct/Central Core area</li> <li>– The provision of a multi-purpose community hub and kindergarten at or near the Former Highett Gasworks site</li> <li>– Reliance on Council-owned land as priority sites for new community infrastructure over State-owned sites</li> </ul>
<b>Draft Implementation Plan</b>	Whether the approach to implementing the actions and projects contained in the draft Implementation Plan for Cheltenham and the timing and pathways for their implementation are appropriate for the purposes of the draft Structure Plan
<b>Planning policy – Bayside Business District</b>	The suitability of planning policy guidance to deliver the design outcomes, land use mix and diverse office development sought for the Bayside Business District
<b>Precinct Zone – Application to specific sites in the Cheltenham Structure Plan Area</b>	Whether the PRZ should be applied to Southland Shopping Centre
<b>Strategic sites</b>	<p>Whether the identification and treatment of strategic sites in the Cheltenham Structure Plan Area is appropriate, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Former Highett Gasworks</li> <li>– Southland Shopping Centre – requirements for the Bay Road interface, active frontages, pedestrian permeability and whether land at the north-east corner of Nepean Highway and Karen Street should be added to the Southland Strategic Site boundary</li> </ul>



Topic	Key issue
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Highett Common – whether a master plan should be required for this site and specific controls at the interface with Highett Grassy Woodlands</li> </ul> <p>Whether the following sites should be identified as strategic sites in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 13-19 Wangara Road, 2-6 Brixton Road and 266 Bay Road (Brixton West)</li> <li>– 270-276 Bay Road. 1-7 Brixton Road and 33-43 Wangara Road (Brixton East)</li> <li>– 298-300 Bay Road (Newlink)</li> <li>– Whether the site on the north-east corner of Nepean Highway and Karen Street be included in the Southland strategic site designation</li> </ul>
<b>Road &amp; street network</b>	Whether the road/street network shown in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment is appropriate, including in locations such as Pennydale and Bay Road
<b>Voluntary Public Benefit Uplift Framework</b>	Whether the proposed Voluntary Public Benefit Uplift Framework is appropriate in respect of the spatial application of the Framework in Cheltenham, specifically along parts of Bay Road

## Clayton precinct specific issues

### Built form

Topic	Key issue
<b>Building height, distribution &amp; transition</b>	<p>The suitability and distribution of the proposed building heights specified in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment, and transition to surrounding residential areas, including in relation to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Madelaine Road</li><li>– Browns Road</li><li>– Kanooka Grove</li><li>– Audsley Street</li><li>– North Road</li><li>– Residential areas, including Fulton Street, Manton Road, Edinburgh Street, Margaret Street, Alice Street and Ormond Road</li><li>– 2 Rockbeare Court</li><li>– 465-469 Clayton Road</li><li>– 409 Clayton Road</li></ul>
<b>Floor Area Ratios</b>	<p>Whether the mandatory Floor Area Ratio (FAR) controls proposed in the draft Planning Scheme Amendment are appropriate, both generally within the Clayton Structure Plan Area and at specific sites, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– 2 Cooke Street</li><li>– 6-18 Cooke Street</li><li>– 20-22 Cooke Street</li><li>– 16 Dunstan Street</li><li>– 261 Clayton Road</li><li>– 205-211 Clayton Road</li><li>– 409 Clayton Road</li><li>– 1400 &amp; 1380-1388 Centre Road</li><li>– 8 Audsley Street</li></ul>
<b>Setbacks</b>	<p>Whether the building setbacks specified in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment are appropriate, having regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– The urban structure and built form objectives for the Clayton Structure Plan Area</li><li>– Amenity impacts on adjoining sites</li><li>– The provision of landscaping, including the planting of canopy trees</li></ul>

### Urban design

Topic	Key issue
<b>Pedestrian access &amp; links</b>	<p>Whether the planning for active transport in the Clayton Structure Plan Area is appropriate, including at the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– 233 Clayton Road</li></ul>

Topic	Key issue
	– 205-211 Clayton Road

<b>Public open space</b>	Whether the planning for open space in the Clayton Structure Plan Area is appropriate, having regard to the needs of future residents, visitors and employees to the Structure Plan Area
--------------------------	--

## Land use

Topic	Key issue
<b>Land use mix &amp; capacity</b>	Whether the Land Use Plan in the draft Structure Plan and relevant planning provisions provide for an appropriate land use mix across the Clayton Structure Plan Area
<b>Demand for apartments</b>	Whether the anticipated future demand for apartments within the Clayton Structure Plan Area is reflected in the proposed distribution of housing growth levels in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment

## Other matters concerning the implementation of the Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment

Topic	Key issue
<b>Car parking availability &amp; rates</b>	<p>Whether the car parking rates as set out in the Precinct Parking Plan for Clayton are appropriate, including to encourage a shift towards more sustainable transport modes</p> <p>Whether sufficient car parking availability (including on-street and public car parking availability) will be provided having regard to potential additional car parking demand</p>
<b>Community infrastructure</b>	Whether the planning for community infrastructure in the Clayton Structure Plan Area is appropriate, having regard to the needs of future residents, visitors and employees
<b>Draft Implementation Plan</b>	Whether the approach to implementing the actions and projects contained in the draft Implementation Plan for Clayton and the timing and pathways for their implementation are appropriate for the purposes of the draft Structure Plan
<b>Strategic sites</b>	Whether the identification and treatment of strategic sites in the Clayton Structure Plan Area are appropriate
<b>Public Acquisition Overlay – Application to a specific site in the</b>	Whether the Public Acquisition Overlay (PAO) should be applied to 31 Dunstan Street, Clayton



Topic	Key issue
<b>Clayton Structure Plan Area</b>	
<b>Road &amp; street network</b>	Whether the road/street network shown in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment is appropriate
<b>Aviation</b>	Whether requirements for the Monash Medical Centre and Victorian Heart Hospital helicopter flight paths have been considered



## Glen Waverley precinct specific issues

### Built form

Topic	Key issue
<b>Building heights, distribution &amp; transition</b>	<p>The suitability and distribution of the proposed building heights specified in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment, and transition to surrounding residential areas, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– The central core of Glen Waverley</li><li>– 281 Springvale Road (Central Car Park) and 285-287 Springvale Road (Century City Walk)</li><li>– Sites fronting the private road at Lakeview Court</li><li>– Along Springvale Road between High Street Road and Madeline Street</li><li>– Along the eastern side of Kingsway between Railway Parade North and O’Sullivan’s Road</li><li>– Along the eastern side of Springvale Road to support the built environment as a gateway to Glen Waverley</li><li>– Height and density in Stanfield Court</li><li>– Varying building heights proposed along Kinnoull Grove.</li><li>– The medium rise (4 storey) height transition adjacent to high rise development</li><li>– Sensitive interfaces</li></ul>
<b>Floor Area Ratios</b>	<p>Whether the mandatory Floor Area Ratio (FAR) controls proposed in the draft Planning Scheme Amendment are appropriate</p>

### Urban design

Topic	Key issue
<b>Public open space</b>	<p>Whether the planning for open space in the Glen Waverley Structure Plan Area is appropriate, having regard to the needs of future residents, visitors and employees to the Structure Plan Area, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– The open space needs of workers being considered</li><li>– Whether the reliance on future shared user agreements is appropriate</li><li>– Whether investment in creation or upgrades of larger centralised park/s should be prioritised over new smaller areas of open space that may be underutilised</li></ul>

### Land use

Topic	Key issue
<b>Land use mix &amp; capacity</b>	<p>Whether the Land Use Plan in the draft Structure Plan and relevant planning provisions provide for an appropriate land use mix across the Glen Waverley Structure Plan Area, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– The areas identified in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment having sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed land use intensification</li></ul>

Topic	Key issue
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Whether a greater mix of land uses should be provided for on the eastern side of Springvale Road</li> <li>– The draft Structure Plan having appropriate regard for minimising adverse impacts to residential properties adjacent to the Aristoc Road Employment Area</li> </ul>

## Other matters concerning the implementation of the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment

Topic	Key issue
<b>Car parking availability &amp; rates</b>	<p>Whether the car parking rates as set out in the Precinct Parking Plan for Glen Waverley are appropriate, including to encourage a shift towards more sustainable transport modes</p> <p>Whether sufficient car parking availability (including on-street and public car parking availability) will be provided having regard to potential additional car parking demand</p>
<b>Community infrastructure</b>	Whether the planning for community infrastructure in the Glen Waverley Structure Plan Area is appropriate, having regard to the needs of future residents, visitors and employees
<b>Strategic sites</b>	Whether the identification and treatment of strategic sites in the Glen Waverley Structure Plan Area are appropriate
<b>Draft Implementation Plan</b>	Whether the approach to implementing the actions and projects contained in the draft Implementation Plan for Glen Waverley and the timing and pathways for their implementation are appropriate.
<b>Precinct Zone – Application to specific sites in the Glen Waverley Structure Plan Area</b>	<p>Whether the PRZ should be applied to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Council land in the Glen Waverley Structure Plan Area</li> <li>– 3/19 Montclair Avenue</li> <li>– 1/1 Richard Street</li> <li>– 2/13 Panoramic Grove</li> <li>– 627-629 Waverley Road</li> <li>– 5 Stanfield Court</li> </ul>
<b>Road &amp; street network</b>	<p>Whether the road/street network shown in the draft Structure Plan or draft Planning Scheme Amendment is appropriate, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The possibility of pedestrianising Kingsway by removing car parking to provide improved areas for walking, cycling, community events and outdoor dining</li> <li>– Traffic and movement in the area bound by High Street, Springvale Road, Wilson Road and Panoramic Grove</li> <li>– Traffic and movement on Fernhill Street</li> </ul>

## Monash precinct specific issues

### Built form

Topic	Key issue
<b>Building height, distribution &amp; transition</b>	<p>The suitability and distribution of the proposed building heights specified in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment, and transition to surrounding residential areas, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Monash Central</li><li>– Residential areas and along residential streets</li><li>– Transition along Normanby Road</li><li>– Density in the Notting Hill neighbourhood</li><li>– Density in the Monash Central neighbourhood</li><li>– 591-599 Blackburn Road and 352-368 Ferntree Gully Road, Notting Hill and 399 Ferntree Gully Road, Mount Waverley and 101-105 Clayton Road, Oakleigh East</li><li>– 1887-1889 Dandenong Road and 135 Clayton Road, Oakleigh East</li></ul>
<b>Setbacks</b>	<p>Whether the building setbacks specified in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment are appropriate, having regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– The urban structure and built form objectives for the Monash Structure Plan Area</li><li>– Amenity impacts on adjoining sites</li><li>– The provision of landscaping, including the planting of canopy trees</li></ul>
<b>Wind considerations</b>	<p>Whether the planning controls minimise adverse wind effects on the public realm and private open space in the Monash Central neighbourhood</p>
<b>Floor Area Ratios</b>	<p>Whether the mandatory Floor Area Ratio (FAR) controls proposed in the draft Planning Scheme Amendment are appropriate</p>

### Urban design

Topic	Key issue
<b>Pedestrian access &amp; links</b>	<p>Whether the planning for active transport in the Monash Structure Plan Area is appropriate, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Key links within Monash University land</li><li>– Links between the Monash SRL East station and the Clayton Bus Interchange</li><li>– The future role and objectives for the Notting Hill neighbourhood as set out in the draft Structure Plan</li><li>– The Employment Growth, Monash Central and Notting Hill neighbourhoods</li><li>– The proposed approach and mechanisms to deliver these links</li><li>– The cycling infrastructure facilitated by the draft Structure Plan</li></ul>
<b>Public open space</b>	<p>Whether the planning for open space in the Monash Structure Plan Area is appropriate, having regard to the needs of future residents, visitors and employees to the Structure Plan Area, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Existing and potential public open space at Monash University</li></ul>




Topic	Key issue
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Open space investigation areas</li></ul>

## Land use

Topic	Key issue
<b>Land use mix &amp; capacity</b>	<p>Whether the Land Use Plan in the draft Structure Plan and relevant planning provisions provide for an appropriate land use mix across the Monash Structure Plan Area, including with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Weighting between uses, including residential and employment uses</li><li>– Removing or reducing constraints on the provision of student accommodation</li><li>– The potential for a change in land use mix displacing existing manufacturing, industrial and other employment activities</li><li>– The proposed applied zones both generally in relation to Commercial 1 Zone land and 2071-2091 Dandenong Road, Clayton</li></ul>

## Other matters concerning the implementation of the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment

Topic	Key issue
<b>Car parking availability &amp; rates</b>	Whether the car parking rates as set out in the Precinct Parking Plan for Monash are appropriate, including to encourage a shift towards more sustainable transport modes
<b>Community infrastructure</b>	Whether the planning for community infrastructure in the Monash Structure Plan Area is appropriate, having regard to the needs of future residents, visitors and employees
<b>Draft Implementation Plan</b>	Whether the approach to implementing the actions and projects contained in the draft Implementation Plan for Monash and the timing and pathways for their implementation are appropriate for the purposes of the draft Structure Plan
<b>Noise &amp; vibration</b>	Whether the PRZ and BFO schedules that apply in the Monash Structure Plan Area are appropriate to address construction noise and vibration impacts on Monash University land and CSIRO Clayton
<b>Precinct Zone – Application to specific sites in the Monash Structure Plan Area</b>	<p>Whether the PRZ should be applied to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Land owned by Monash University in the Monash Structure Plan Area</li><li>– The Monash Waste Transfer Station and other Council land in the Monash Structure Plan Area</li><li>– The land at 20-22 Gardiner Road, Notting Hill</li></ul>
<b>Strategic sites</b>	Whether the identification and treatment of strategic sites in the Monash Structure Plan Area are appropriate



Topic	Key issue
<b>Monash University</b>	Whether the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment provide appropriate recognition of the role of Monash University and its landholdings
<b>Public Acquisition Overlay – Application to specific sites in the Monash Structure Plan Area</b>	Whether the Public Acquisition Overlay (PAO) should be applied to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 601-609 Blackburn Road, Notting Hill</li> <li>– 352-368 Ferntree Gully Road, Notting Hill</li> </ul>
<b>Road &amp; street network</b>	Whether the road/street network shown in the draft Structure Plan and draft Planning Scheme Amendment is appropriate
<b>Street cross sections &amp; spatial plans</b>	Whether the designation of Activity Streets is appropriate, and whether their expected form and function requires clarification including with respect to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– All of Normanby Road between Howleys Road and Blackburn Road</li> <li>– All of Howleys Road between Normanby Road and Ferntree Gully Road</li> </ul>
<b>Voluntary Public Benefit Uplift Framework</b>	Whether the proposed Voluntary Public Benefit Uplift Framework is appropriate in respect of the application of the Framework in Monash, including at 16-18 Howleys Road and Mannix College