

## Response to submissions to Amendment C116

Issue	Submission no.	Response	Recommendation
<p>Supportive of the amendment, including reduction of maximum mandatory height.</p> <p>Would like to see Caroline and Henry Streets included in the Neighbourhood Character Overlay (NCO).</p>	8	<p>Built form (alterations and additions), materiality and siting in Caroline and Henry Streets is less consistent than elsewhere in Jubilee Park, and the application of the NCO would be difficult to justify. There are also only two properties of heritage significance in the precinct, reducing the argument for the NCO as a tool requiring respectful adjacent development.</p>	<p>No change to proposed Amendment C116 as exhibited.</p>
<p>Supportive of the amendment.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the planning scheme support the neighbourhood and community amenity.</p>	15	Noted.	No change.
<p>Objects to the amendment, specifically the rezoning of Caroline Street to Neighbourhood Residential Zone (NRZ).</p> <p>Believes the existing planning controls are adequate, and that the change will devalue the property.</p>	18, 19, 31, 45, 12, 26, 38, 42, 46, 47, 48, 41, 13	<p>The rezoning to NRZ and application of neighbourhood character objectives is considered appropriate due to the consistent low scale nature of the precinct, and the existence of simple, single dwellings in garden settings. It is intended that the NRZ will highlight the still existing elements of special character, and prevent further erosion of these cherished qualities.</p> <p>The potential financial impact of changes to planning provisions has been considered by several Planning Panels (though mostly in relation to the application of the Heritage Overlay). It is considered that personal financial implications are not a relevant planning consideration in determining the neighbourhood character (or heritage significance) of a place.</p>	No change.

Issue	Submission no.	Response	Recommendation
Continued...		Further, it is understood that properties in Caroline Street are subject to a single dwelling covenant, and the only material change of the rezoning therefore, is a reduction in the mandatory maximum height.	
<p>Supportive of the amendment.</p> <p>Believes that there have been too many dwellings demolished and replaced with inappropriate high-density development, ruining the neighbourhood character.</p>	60, 3	Noted.	No change.
<p>Supportive of the amendment.</p> <p>Notes that there are many “fabulous 1950s weatherboards” and many character filled homes in Jubilee Park, as well as outside the proposed amendment area.</p>	17	Noted.	No change.
<p>Supportive of the amendment.</p> <p>Notes that the area holds special heritage and neighbourhood character value, and is under threat due to the proximity to the Ringwood Major Activity Centre. Believes the area’s history and character will be protected by the proposed controls.</p>	7, 24, 25, 16, 11, 56, 65	Noted.	No change.

Issue	Submission no.	Response	Recommendation
<p>Supportive of the amendment.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the planning scheme will preserve the historical value and special character of the area, and the unique style of houses around Federation Estate.</p>	36	Noted.	No change.
<p>Supportive of the amendment in principle.</p> <p>Concerned that 62A Ford Street is the only property in Ford Street that is included. Believes that the proposed NRZ should be extended to the southern part of Ford Street, or that 62A Ford Street should be removed.</p>	9	<p>Agree with the removal of 62A Ford Street from the proposed NRZ.</p> <p>This property comprises a relatively contemporary low scale brick and tile dwelling on a small lot, which has been subdivided from the rear of 9 Emerald Street. This property was included as part of 9 Emerald Street, and has no relationship to the neighbourhood character of Emerald Street.</p>	Remove 62A Ford Street from the proposed amendment, and retain the GRZ.
<p>Objects to the inclusion of Greenwood Avenue properties (1/28, 2/28, 3/28, 30 &amp; 30B) in the proposed rezoning to NRZ.</p> <p>Notes that all properties to the north, in Greenwood Avenue, are not included in the proposed amendment.</p> <p>Believes that the properties contrast with those elsewhere in the precinct, and cannot understand why they have been included.</p>	71, 2, 69, 70, 68	<p>Agree with the removal of the Greenwood Avenue properties from the proposed NRZ.</p> <p>The sites in question have been developed at the rear with small brick villa units. There are two units to the rear of no. 28 and one unit to the rear of no. 30.</p> <p>In both cases, the original 1950s weatherboard dwellings have been retained at the front of the sites, remnants of the era of the original subdivision and in keeping with the character of the wider Jubilee Park precinct.</p>	Remove the Greenwood Avenue properties from the proposed amendment, and retain 1/28, 2/28, 3/28, 30 & 30B Greenwood Avenue in the GRZ.

Issue	Submission no.	Response	Recommendation
<p>Continued...</p> <p>Argues that there would be minimal impact on Maroondah Federation Estate if the properties were developed due to the separation of the Greenwood Avenue properties by a car park and vegetation buffer.</p>		<p>However, it is accepted that the remainder of Greenwood Avenue to the north has been redeveloped, almost without exception, with three and four multi-unit developments. The eastern side of Greenwood Avenue is also occupied by Greenwood Park and an adjacent kindergarten, resulting in an open, 'non-traditional' residential streetscape, differing from James, Kendall, Ellison and Haig Streets.</p> <p>It is also accepted that the Greenwood Avenue sites containing the 1950s dwellings (and units to the rear), are physically and visually separated from the original Ringwood Primary School buildings by a garden area supporting substantial vegetation, and car parking.</p> <p>As such, the Greenwood Avenue sites exist in 'isolation' and are somewhat removed from the wider heritage and neighbourhood character precinct.</p> <p>On balance, it is considered reasonable that the GRZ be retained on these properties. Any future development will be required to have regard for the neighbourhood character objectives in the schedule (proposed GRZ1), and other proposed variations to Clauses 54 and 55.</p>	

Issue	Submission no.	Response	Recommendation
<p>Objects to the amendment.</p> <p>Primary objection is to the proposed HO in Haig Street, but also objects to the rezoning of Haig Street to NRZ, believing that the current GRZ protects the area from inappropriate and multi-unit development.</p>	<p>22, 52, 53, 10, 14, 23, 32, 37, 40, 54, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 43, 44</p>	<p>Given the heritage (and neighbourhood character) significance of Haig Street, the objectives of the head clause of the NRZ, and the ability to tailor additional neighbourhood character objectives via the schedule, the proposed rezoning is considered appropriate i.e. for properties covered by the HO or NCO, the NRZ is the most appropriate and logical zone to apply, in most cases.</p> <p>The only material difference in rezoning the precinct from GRZ to NRZ in this case is the lower (two storey) mandatory maximum height, and the requirement for neighbourhood character objectives to be included in the schedule to the zone.</p> <p>Based on recent VCAT decisions, and the proximity of the street to the Ringwood MAC, the NRZ and associated objectives will also provide more clarity and certainty to both property owners and VCAT members.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Objects to the amendment.</p> <p>Opposed to the rezoning of Henry Street, and considers the current planning scheme controls to be very strict and/or adequate.</p> <p>Expresses concern about loss of property value as a result of the rezoning.</p>	<p>20, 30, 39, 49, 50, 51, 21, 28</p>	<p>The neighbourhood character of Henry Street is not considered significant enough to justify the application of the NCO. However, the NRZ is considered appropriate given the prevalence of simple post war dwellings, and the need to deter applicants from over-scaled alterations and additions, and car parking spaces and structures being provided within the front setbacks.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Issue	Submission no.	Response	Recommendation
Continued...		<p>The low scale, single dwelling character of Henry Street (apparently attributed largely to the single dwelling covenant that applies to these properties, TBC by Council's solicitors) can be further strengthened through the introduction of neighbourhood character objectives via the schedule, together with appropriate decision guidelines.</p> <p>Personal financial implications are not considered an appropriate planning consideration, and the proposed rezoning does not materially affect the development potential of the property (also owing to the one dwelling covenant).</p>	
<p>Supportive of the amendment.</p> <p>States that Jubilee Park is a unique part of Ringwood, which needs protection from overdevelopment. Believes that the current planning scheme provisions are limited in their effectiveness.</p> <p>Believes that the proposed amendment will assist in protecting neighbourhood, heritage and landscape character.</p> <p>Concerned however that the proposed NRZ does not extend far enough and should include parts of Wantirna Road and Wilana Street, and more of James, Kendall, Thomas and Ford Streets to prevent development creep.</p>	55	<p>The study area was initially defined by Council, and confirmed through the Scoping Study process. The recommendations follow detailed heritage and neighbourhood character assessments and are considered justifiable.</p> <p>Further extension of the additional neighbourhood character controls would be difficult to argue given the area's close proximity to the Ringwood MAC, and the need to accommodate housing growth in such locations.</p> <p>The Maroondah Neighbourhood Character Study Review does however cover all residential areas in Maroondah, and introduces new schedules to the residential zones across the municipality.</p>	No change.

Issue	Submission no.	Response	Recommendation
<p>Objects to the amendment.</p> <p>Primarily concerned with the rezoning of Henry Street to NRZ, and the impact this will have on the mandatory maximum height i.e. reducing it to two storeys or 9 metres.</p>	67	<p>The built form character of Henry Street is low scale, with simple single dwellings set in well-established gardens. While originally primarily weatherboard, materiality is now mixed, and many alterations and additions to existing dwellings have occurred. However, a consistent characteristic is the low scale nature of the built form, where a three storey or 11 metre high dwelling would be considered incongruous.</p>	No change.
<p>Supportive of the amendment.</p> <p>Recognition and protection of these streets will bring the area up to speed with precincts adjacent to railway lines in other suburbs.</p> <p>Believes community consultation process revealed strong support for the proposed amendment.</p> <p>Notes that concerns regarding impact on property value are not supported by evidence, and should be balanced against the greater community interest of protecting Ringwood's heritage and character.</p> <p>Concerned that the amendment should extend beyond the area proposed e.g. northern areas of James and Kendall Streets.</p>	29	<p>Regarding expansion of the proposed planning scheme controls, the study area was confirmed during Stage 1 (Scoping Study) of the process, and assessed in detail as part of Stage 2. The character of the northern parts of James and Kendall Streets is considered significantly altered and bears little or no relationship to the southern ends of the streets. Due to the close proximity of the area to the Ringwood MAC, and the need to accommodate growth in such locations, the extension of the NCO and/or the NRZ would be difficult to justify.</p>	No change.

Issue	Submission no.	Response	Recommendation
<p>Supportive of the amendment.</p> <p>Believes however that the controls (either the HO or NRZ) should be extended to the northern part of Kendall Street.</p> <p>Expresses concern regarding the redevelopment occurring in the northern section of the street, and believes that it will increase and that the area will be dominated by built form due to the allowable height limit in the GRZ and the elevated topography.</p>	27	<p>Further extension of the proposed NRZ would be difficult to argue given the area's close proximity to the Ringwood MAC, and the need to accommodate housing growth in such locations.</p> <p>The character of the northern part of Kendall Street is not consistent with the southern area, where a HO/NRZ are proposed. It is altered (with contemporary infill, a car park at the rear of commercial properties, and vacant blocks) and bears little/no relationship to the proposed heritage precinct.</p>	No change.
<p>Supportive of the amendment.</p> <p>Queries the application of the HO/NRZ to the southern end of Kendall Street, and not the northern area, as it may result in two differing styles of architecture being constructed on adjacent sites.</p>	57	<p>Regarding the application of the NRZ to the northern area of Kendall Street, it is considered unjustifiable due to its proximity to the Ringwood MAC, and eroded streetscape, including a number of vacant blocks, infill housing and a car park.</p> <p>Residential development within the GRZ will still be assessed against neighbourhood character objectives, and should have regard to the siting, scale and other characteristics of adjacent development.</p>	No change.
<p>Supportive of the amendment.</p> <p>Includes support for the methodology employed in the study, and its findings.</p>	34	Noted.	No change.

Issue	Submission no.	Response	Recommendation
<p>Continued...</p> <p>Also supports the integrated approach in applying the HC and NCO controls, and believes that the application of VPP tools has been done in an integrated and complimentary way.</p> <p>Believes that the proposed NCO is strategically justified.</p> <p>Strongly supports the proposed NRZ and agrees that it is the most appropriate zone in an area of heritage and character significance, including the lower mandatory maximum building height.</p>			
<p>Supports the amendment.</p> <p>However, believes that the NRZ should be extended to include the whole of Thomas Street, up to Bedford Road.</p>	4	The northern area of Thomas Street (i.e. north of Caroline Street) was not included within the study area at any stage of the project and has not been assessed in detail.	N/A
<p>Objects to the amendment.</p> <p>Grounds of objection are specifically that the Heritage Overlay (HO) is not appropriate / cannot be justified.</p>	33, 5, 6, 35, 1, 64, 66	Response provided by Council's heritage expert witness.	N/A