

SUBMISSION NUMBER	ORGANISATION	SUBURB	SUPPORT/ OBJECT?	ISSUES	OFFICER RESPONSE	OPFFICER RECOMMENDATION
SUB1	Knox City Council	WANTIRNA SOUTH	No objection	No Issues	No response required	No response required
SUB2	Friends of Damper Creek Reserve Inc	MOUNT WAVERLEY	Support	1. Supports the broad goals of the amendment and the importance of open space, commends Council on strategy and associated policies.	Council acknowledges support.	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB3	Local Developer	CLAYTON	Object	<p>1. Proposed 10% increase will led to a reduction in housing affordability and quality, and an increase in housing costs to offset the increased contribution.</p> <p>2. Suggests a larger portion of rates revenue should be allocated to public open space, as fairer for the end users (public) rather than new development to pay.</p> <p>3. Requests review of amendment and reduction of rate to a fairer amount which is consistent with the current amount.</p>	<p>1. Not supported. It is considered that the benefits for the community from additional or enhanced public open space funded by the contributions outweigh concerns around housing affordability and development potential (as established by related Planning Panel Reports - see Stonnington C186, Moreland C122). The modelling shows that the open space contributions, along with other "costs" of development infrastructure such as sewerage and electricity connections are factored into the original purchase price of the land prior to development and as such do not in and of themselves translate into an increase in housing cost.</p> <p>2. Not supported. This is contrary to the whole purpose of the planning and open space contribution system where new development, which generates extra demand for open space, contributes to open space up front.</p> <p>3. Not supported. The Monash Open Space Strategy and associated work undertaken by SGS Economics and Planning has concluded that insufficient open space contributions have historically been collected by Monash, resulting in inequitable provision and distribution of open space to meet the needs for future population growth, the increased rate will address this inequitable and insufficient provision. The proposed rate is based on the open space requirements of future residents, mainly created through new development.</p>	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB4	Whitehorse City Council	NUNAWADING	No objection	No objection to the proposed changes. Requests to be informed of any further updates to the amendment.	Noted. Council will keep them informed as amendment progress.	No response required
SUB5	South East Water		No objection	South East Water as the Water Supply and Sewerage Authority has no objection to the proposed amendment.	No response required	No response required
SUB6	Local Developer	DEEPPDENE	Object	<p>1. Challenges the legality of the amendment, considers the POS is a tax not a levy, based on the Eddie Barron decision and associated criteria (need, equity, accountability and nexus).</p> <p>2. Uses the example of purpose built student accommodation (pbsa) to show the financial impact of the POS rate increase on development, bank lending and investment return. (Further detail provided in submission).</p> <p>3. Seeks exemption for this accommodation, given need, other open space requirements in Clause 22.10 Student Accommodation Policy, and the relationship with Monash Clayton Campus.</p>	<p>1. Disagree. The methodology proposed by SGS that supports the change in contribution rate to 10% is considered justified from a planning and equity perspective. The MOSS and SGS report were prepared in accordance with relevant guidelines and practice notes, demonstrating compliance with the principles of need, equity, accountability and nexus. The Eddie Barron case dealt with development contributions not open space contributions.</p> <p>2. Not supported. See Response 1 to SUB3.</p> <p>3. Not supported. The Student Accommodation Policy requirements are for communal open space, not public open space. In addition, student accommodation creates more intensive housing with greater demand on Council public open space.</p>	No Change Refer to Panel

SUBMISSION NUMBER	ORGANISATION	SUBURB	SUPPORT/ OBJECT?	ISSUES	OFFICER RESPONSE	OPFFICER RECOMMENDATION
				4. Argues that the proposed POS increase will further restrict smaller scale subdivision in GRZ land, and will not meet intended population levels on open space demand.	4. Not supported. The application of the flat 10% POS rate will ensure an even achievement of future open space infrastructure regardless of planning zones and land use.	
SUB7	Local Developer	OAKLEIGH SOUTH	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned with increased development costs, reduced development and housing affordability, property values, rate revenue, and adverse impacts on small business. 2. Suggests higher contribution rates for apartment buildings or high density development, but retaining current rates for smaller developments (3-5 units). 3. Hopes Council reconsiders the plan and undertakes more consultation before making a decision. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not supported. See response 1 to SUB3. 2. Not supported. See response 4 to SUB4. 3. The MOSS was adopted after extensive community consultation, with the amendments authorised by the Minister for Planning to be prepared and exhibited and has been drafted in accordance with State Policy and requirements. Following the receipt of the Planning Panel report the amendment will be reconsidered by Council. 	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB8	Local Architect	GLEN WAVERLEY	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned with reduced development potential and housing supply (including affordability), as the proposed amendment will exacerbate these issues. 2. Suggests a small increase to the contribution only in the Neighbourhood Residential Zones, where Council is seeking less development. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not supported. See response 1 to SUB3. 2. Not supported. See response 4 to SUB4. 	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB9	Local Resident		Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considers the proposed flat rate of 10% as outrageous as it is higher than the majority of other councils. 2. Concerned with increased development costs and property prices, which will further worsen the affordability of housing in Monash. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not supported. See response 2 to SUB3. 2. Not supported. See response 1 to SUB3. 	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB10	Local Resident	CLAYTON	Support	Supports increase in required open space	Support noted.	No Change Refer to Panel

SUBMISSION NUMBER	ORGANISATION	SUBURB	SUPPORT/ OBJECT?	ISSUES	OFFICER RESPONSE	OFFICER RECOMMENDATION
SUB11	Local Resident	MOUNT WAVERLEY	Support	<p>1. Commends Council for thorough assessment of open space, strongly supports increase to 10% POS contribution and proposed planning scheme changes.</p> <p>2. Suggests changes to Cl 21.10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>21.10.3 Strategies</i> <i>9th dot point could be strengthened by adding ... protect significant flora and fauna "and enhance biodiversity values".</i> <i>Add a dot point regarding the need to maintain liveability and increase urban greening to ensure a cool, resilient and healthy city.</i> • <i>21.10.4 Reference documents</i> <i>Consider adding "Living Melbourne; our metropolitan urban forest" as a reference document.</i> 	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Supported in part. It is considered that these suggested changes should be incorporated in the amendment currently under preparation to implement the Monash Urban Landscape and Canopy Vegetation Strategy 2018 (MUCLVS).</p>	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB12	Environmental Protection Agency	MELBOURNE	No objection	No formal response, as amendment in its current form, does not fall within the scope of their role. Provides opportunity for further contact if the assessment is not aligned with Council's view of the environmental risk, or if the proposal is amended.	Noted. Council will contact the EPA if required.	No response required
SUB13	Resident near Talbot Quarry	OAKLEIGH SOUTH	Object	<p>1. Response to separate enquiry to Amendment C129 and the Talbot Rd Quarry</p> <p>2. Formal Objection to C148.</p>	<p>1. Noted. Not relevant to this amendment.</p> <p>2. Objection recorded. No response required</p>	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB14	Planning Consultant	CREMORNE	Object	<p>1. Submission on behalf of landowner in the in the Monash Technology Precinct and the State Significant Monash NEIC. Seeks exemption or reduction from 10% contribution, given location, historic requirements, main users (mainly non-Monash workers/residents), the GAA 2% contribution cited in the background report, and other similar council's contribution rates and benchmarks, in particular Greater Dandenong (Further detail provided in submission).</p> <p>2. Comments that the 30sqm public open space benchmark is an arbitrary figure chosen to suit the proposed contribution rates, compared to other Council examples in the MOSS and their research. (Further detail provided in submission).</p> <p>3. Suggest consultation error, with Council's website indicating that the amendment applies to all subdivisions of 3 lots or more, however, the proposed schedule at Clause 53.01 applies to all subdivision.</p>	<p>1. Not supported. See response 1 to 3 to SUB6, See Response 2 to SUB3.</p> <p>2. Disagree. See response 1 to SUB6.</p> <p>3. Disagree. Whilst the Amendment C148 documentation indicates that Clause 53.01 applies to all subdivisions of 3 lots or more, the schedule correctly indicates that the 'type or location of subdivision' applies to all land.</p>	No Change Refer to Panel

SUBMISSION NUMBER	ORGANISATION	SUBURB	SUPPORT/ OBJECT?	ISSUES	OFFICER RESPONSE	OPFFICER RECOMMENDATION
SUB15	Planning Consultant	MELBOURNE	Object	<p>Submission on behalf of owners of 1221-1249 Centre Road, Oakleigh South (Talbot Quarry site).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to 10% rate, as it will result in inequitable subdivision outcomes, increase development costs and housing affordability. 2. Compares proposed rate to other similar middle ring Councils, citing no blanket 10% contribution, nor 30sqm figure (with exception for specific sites, growth areas or peri-urban municipalities), contends that 30sqm figure may not be able to be reached with an unjustifiable 10% rate, as Monash has limited land for new public open space, and is more reliant on upgrading existing infrastructure rather than acquiring new land. 3. Seeks exemption from contributions as it is a large renewal site, with rehabilitation costs and requirements for off road pedestrian access, which should contribute to the overall open space contribution for the site. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not supported. See response 1 to SUB3. 2. Not supported. See response 1 to SUB6, responses 2 and 3 to SUB3. 3. Not supported. Owners new that the land was contaminated when purchased. The open space contributions for larger, more complex sites will be determined having regard to a range of issues including the quality and diversity of open space proposed, the population density of the proposed development and the anticipated demographics of the additional population, and other planning requirements. Pedestrian paths are part of the traffic and movement network not part of the public open space contribution, 	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB16	Resident near Talbot Quarry	OAKLEIGH SOUTH	Object	<p><u>Talbot Quarry Pro-forma</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposal not meet with support. 2. Council has not demonstrated how an increase in the open space contribution rate will benefit the community and which properties it would purchase with this money in the area around 1221- 1249 Centre Road, Oakleigh South (The Talbot Quarry Site). 3. Council has repeatedly refused to explore the purchase of the Talbot Quarry site though the S173 agreement on the property title, nor sought State and Federal financial support to do so, despite repeated requests from its constituents. Council denies that the site is the only viable and affordable site for open space in the area, and has not provided a viable alternative. 4. Rejects the increase in the contribution rate through C148 without clear and specific indication of how and where this money would be applied in the communities of Clayton and Oakleigh South, given that, in the past, there has been a decrease in open space in these areas. 5. Has no confidence in the amendment unless Council buys the Talbot Quarry Site, as there are no other comparable sites that would become available for the purposes of public open space. 6. Logic, history, and experience cause no support for C148 unless the communities of Clayton and Oakleigh South are to benefit in a clear and significant way. 7. Additional Comments provided on the environmental and traffic impacts on the redevelopment of the site, and the need for 	<p>Not supported.</p> <p>The residents in the vicinity of the former Talbot Quarry have previously been advised of Council's position on the future of the quarry and planning scheme Amendment C129. When abandoning that amendment in September 2018, the Council resolution included <i>"That Council resolves not to purchase part or all of the site for Public Open Space."</i></p> <p>Funds raised from the Public Open Space Contributions will be used to provide additional open space and improve the diversity and functionality of existing open space areas across Monash depending on need and in accordance with the objectives of the Monash Open Space Strategy (MOSS).</p>	No Change Refer to Panel

SUBMISSION NUMBER	ORGANISATION	SUBURB	SUPPORT/ OBJECT?	ISSUES	OFFICER RESPONSE	OPFFICER RECOMMENDATION
				spaces and gathering in the area, which due to large-scale population growth, has insufficient area for sports and recreation.		
SUB17	Resident near Talbot Quarry	OAKLEIGH SOUTH	Object	See above (points 1- 6)	See response to SUB16	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB18	Planning Consultant	SOUTHBANK	Object	<p>Submission on behalf of 52 Golf Road, Oakleigh South</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considers proposed 10% flat rate is an inappropriate and unjustified increase from the current rate of 2-5%, with no sound basis for this increase on strategic redevelopment sites, such as this site. Questions the methodology in calculating the rate, noting no other similar councils have a blanket 10% contribution, except specific sites or in growth areas or peri-urban municipalities. Cites a lack of justification, no alignment with state and local policy, and exclusion of existing Monash open space or details of the calculation of net developable land. 2. Suggests site will have to provide more than 10% rate, which is unjustifiable due to site-specific constraints such as easements and existing open space requirements, cites other Panel decision in relation to this. Seeks clarity on how increased rate will affect the development of this site. 3. Considers proposed rate is unjustified given no critical details of future budgeting or predicted public open space spending is included in the calculation of the rate, especially given the preference for cash rather than land contributions. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disagree. See response 1 to SUB6, responses 2 and 3 to SUB3. 2. Not supported. See response 3 to SUB15. 3. Disagree. The amendment seeks to apply the new contribution rate and introduce a new planning policy for its application and the provision of open space in Monash. Amendment C148 is one element of the implementation of the Monash Open Space Strategy, which is likely to include strategic assessment of park infrastructure and preparation of action plans for each of the precincts for future capital works investment, As such an implementation plan is not required as part of the amendment process. 	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB19	Urban Development Institute Australia (Victoria)	MELBOURNE	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does not support the 10% flat rate and the methodology used (30sqm figure), requests the rate is changed to a revised and reduced figure determined through an evidence-based assessment of open space needs, considering locational need, type and scale of development. 2. Considers that there is no relationship between the MOSS and the SGS report, with no implementation costs provided, and with no consideration of existing open space in the calculations, or case studies or research that indicates 20-25sqms is more appropriate. Notes that the there is no estimate of likely public open space receipts resulting from the proposed increase to contribution requirements. 3. Comments that the proposed flat 10% rate does not allow for different land uses, development scale, the overprovision of space in some areas, restricted areas, communal private open space for residents or workers, the impact on development feasibility, housing and employment for Monash and wider Melbourne, particularly the Monash NEIC. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not supported. See response 1 to SUB6, responses 2 and 3 to SUB3. 2. Not supported. See Response 3 to SUB18. 3. Not supported. See Response 4 to SUB6. 	No Change Refer to Panel

SUBMISSION NUMBER	ORGANISATION	SUBURB	SUPPORT/ OBJECT?	ISSUES	OFFICER RESPONSE	OFFICER RECOMMENDATION
SUB20	Resident near Talbot Quarry	OAKLEIGH SOUTH	Object	1. See SUB16 (1-6)	See response to SUB16	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB21	Resident near Talbot Quarry	OAKLEIGH SOUTH	Object	See SUB16 (points 1- 6) Also requests Council consider the old quarry site for an extension of Talbot Park.	See response to SUB16	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB22	Resident near Talbot Quarry	OAKLEIGH SOUTH	Object	See SUB16 (points 1- 6) Also comments on a loss of confidence in the Council in implementing the Open Space policy, given support for high density residential on the site which is clearly and historically best suited for green and open space.	See response to SUB16	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB23	Resident near Talbot Quarry	OAKLEIGH SOUTH	Object	See SUB16 (points 1-7) Also, urges Council to purchase the site as the only viable site for open space in the area.	See response to SUB16	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB24	Friends of Scotchman's Creek and Valley Reserve Inc.	MOUNT WAVERLEY	Support	1. Offers strong support for the overarching aims for equitable provision of open-space areas, and increased POS contribution. 2. Comments on the conservation role of Valley Reserve and impacts of surrounding development, and seeks rezoning of reserve to recognise this status.	1. Noted. The important role of Valley Reserve is acknowledged 2. Not supported. The amendment introduces a new contribution rate and a local planning policy only. No rezoning of land is proposed as part of this amendment.	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB25	Neighbours for Public Green Space, Oakleigh South, Inc.		Object	1. Comments that Council has no intention of increasing open space in Clayton and Oakleigh South, despite the MOSS identifying the area as being underserved in open space. 2. Considers 10% rate change as premature as funds would not be allocated to Clayton and Oakleigh South, with no other indication for allocation of funds, including for local benefit. 3. Discusses the former Talbot Quarry site and council's obligations in its maintenance, considers that if C148 were aimed at addressing this issue, it would have full support, and suggests Council purchase the site for open space to resolve an environmental hazard, and reduce associated costs.	See response to SUB16	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB26	Resident near Talbot Quarry	OAKLEIGH	Object	See SUB16 (points 1-6) Also comments on the need for a real commitment for green space and exercise areas in the area.	See response to SUB16	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB27	Planning Consultant	MELBOURNE	Object	Submission on behalf of 807-811 Warrigal Road and 1513-1517 Dandenong Road, Oakleigh, which is currently under development as a mixed use development 1. Considers that the blanket 10% rate across the entire municipality fails to recognise areas that already have excellent access to public open space (such as Oakleigh); therefore a higher contribution rate does not appear to be justified or equitable. 2. Request inclusion of transitional provisions to exempt subdivision proposals that are associated with an approved planning permit before the approval date of this Amendment, with the continued application of the current rates.	1. Disagree. See response 1 to SUB6. 2. Transitional provisions are not considered appropriate or necessary. The whole process from exhibition to final decision by the Minister for Planning will take in excess of a year – which is in effect a transitional period. The open space contributions for larger, more complex sites will be determined having regard to a range of issues including the quality and diversity of open space proposed, the	No Change Refer to Panel

SUBMISSION NUMBER	ORGANISATION	SUBURB	SUPPORT/ OBJECT?	ISSUES	OFFICER RESPONSE	OPFFICER RECOMMENDATION
					density of the proposed development and the anticipated demographics of the additional population, and other planning requirements.	
SUB28	Local Resident	CLAYTON	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considers that the amendment does not met nexus test, with no connection between the MOSS and SGS report, which analyses provision based on precincts but calculates the 10% rate for entire municipality as a single planning unit, disregarding existing variations in provisions for precincts. Misleading and complicating to compare the 10% figure to growth area PSP benchmarks, with no detail on what context the rate and 30sqm ratio has been developed for. 2. Suggests a lack of details on allocation of funds, concern with allocation of funds, including lack of details, given preference for embellishment of existing facilities and not resolving open space access. 3. Considers the blanket 10% approach as flawed with no distinguishing between various land use or development types, which highlights the lack of rigour underpinning the approach. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disagree. See response 1 to SUB6, responses 2 and 3 to SUB3. 2. Not supported. See Response 3 to SUB18. 3. Not supported. See Response 4 to SUB6. 	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB29	Resident near Talbot Quarry	CLAYTON	Object	<p>See SUB16 (points 1-6)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Also offers in principal support to the intention of C148, suggests revenue should be directly to where it was collected, with more community involvement in the allocation and reporting of funds. 	See response to SUB16	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB30	Planning Consultant	MELBOURNE	Object	<p>Submission on behalf of Salta Properties West Pty Ltd in relation to its various landholdings within the City of Monash.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considers the proposed 10% POS contribution rate to be excessive, inappropriate in its application, and contrary to all other municipalities in Victoria, with no blanket POS contribution rate applied. 2. Suggests the amendment be abandoned, as it is short-sighted, would impose unreasonable and unjustified costs, and hinder reasonable development opportunities. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disagree. See response 1 to SUB6, responses 2 and 3 to SUB3. 2. Not supported. See response 1 to SUB 3. 	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB31	Resident near Talbot Quarry	OAKLEIGH SOUTH	Object	See SUB16 (points 1-6) Also comments on the need for Council to address the lack of open space and spending in this area.	See response to SUB16	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB32	Resident near Talbot Quarry	OAKLEIGH SOUTH	Object	See SUB16 (points 1-6) Also comments on Council's role in the area and potential benefits for their family and the area.	See response to SUB16	No Change Refer to Panel

SUBMISSION NUMBER	ORGANISATION	SUBURB	SUPPORT/ OBJECT?	ISSUES	OFFICER RESPONSE	OFFICER RECOMMENDATION
SUB33	Resident near Talbot Quarry	MOUNT WAVERLEY	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Owners of land in Oakleigh South near Talbot Quarry, submits that the proposed inclusionary approach has not worked in practice, with an unequitable distribution of open space services across the southern portion of Monash, including not purchasing former school sites suburbs that may have resolved this under provision. 2. Requests Council provide details of all projects that were funded by the open area contribution and/or the general Council rates over the past 20 years and for the next 20 years including how the increased POS rate will be used as no certainty that the Council has the ability to manage the open space funding it is seeking to have increased. 3. States that the MOSS is aspirational and cannot be relied upon with no viable open space projects in stated poorly serviced area, particularly Clayton. Comments on the implications of the MNEIC and open space provision for Clayton and Oakleigh South. 4. Suggests a regional facility such as Central Reserve at the former Talbot Quarry site; which has been completely ignored in the MOSS, instead indicating a potential residential development for the site. 5. Discuss the history and issues of the Talbot Quarry site, including Council's decision not to purchase, cites Kingston as an example of Council rehabilitating old landfill sites. 6. Seeks the application of Public Use, Public Acquisition Overlays or other means), for potential future open space in the southern part of Monash, especially the former Talbot Quarry site. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disagree. See response 1 to SUB6. 2. Not supported. The historical acquisition of land and open space spending is not considered relevant to this amendment, See response 3 to SUB18. 3. Not supported. See responses 2 and 3 to SUB3. 4. See response to SUB16 5. See response to SUB16 6. Not supported. See response 2 to SUB 24. 	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB34	Planning Consultant	MELBOURNE	Object	<p>Submission on behalf of 588-869 Ferntree Gully Road, Wheelers Hill.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Repeats SUB30, issue 1. 2. Considers that the proposed rate is excessive for this area, with 35sqm open space per person currently, achieved with the current 2-5% POS rate, with unreasonable and unjustified costs and loss of reasonable development opportunities. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disagree. See response 1 to SUB6, responses 2 and 3 to SUB3. 2. Not supported See responses 1 and 3 to SUB 3. 	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB35	Planning Consultant	MELBOURNE	Object	<p>Submission on behalf of 209 Carinish Road and 31-49 Browns Road, Clayton.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Repeats SUB30, issue 1. 2. Requests site be exempted from proposed rate, due to specific POS requirement through rezoning process occurring with Council and VPA; unreasonable and prejudicial to impose an additional 10% contribution on this. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disagree. See response 1 to SUB6, responses 2 and 3 to SUB3. 2. Not supported. See Response 3 to SUB15. 	No Change Refer to Panel

SUBMISSION NUMBER	ORGANISATION	SUBURB	SUPPORT/ OBJECT?	ISSUES	OFFICER RESPONSE	OPFFICER RECOMMENDATION
SUB36	Housing Industry Association Ltd	JOLIMONT	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considers amendment is a move away from Monash's current proportionate approach to levying public open space, as the proposed rate is not in accordance with S18 of the Subdivision Act, nor tested against the need and nexus principles, or differentiates the need generated by different types of development across the municipality. Considers this amendment will set an undesirable precedent for local councils to follow in setting such a high blanket public open space rate. 2. Concerns with effect on achieving urban consolidation, housing affordability problem, increased development costs and inconsistency with state and local planning policy. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disagree. See response 1 to SUB6, responses 2 and 3 to SUB 3. 2. Not supported. See response 1 to SUB3. 	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB37	Association of Consulting Surveyors Victoria (CSV)	MELBOURNE	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concern with councils advertising of the amendment, with difference between Councils website and official 53.01. 2. Questions the proposed method of calculating open space as not sufficiently addressing the intent and wording of the Subdivision Act and the open space 'need' created by the impact of a particular subdivision,(mainly industrial and commercial land). Considers that the basis of the final rate is to achieve as much income for open space across the whole of Monash rather than assessing an equitable contribution from new development on the basis of the need created by that development. This will impose a development tax above an equitable contribution required as a result of such new development, effectively to subsidise a current perceived shortfall within the municipality. 3. Suggests flexibility in Cause 53.01 for either applicants or councils to assess an application on its merits (including the requirements of the MOSS), simple boundary realignments or re-subdivision of existing lots, or opportunities for innovation in design, when a requirement cannot be varied in individual or exceptional circumstances even if all parties were to agree. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. See Response 3 to SUB14. 2. Disagree. See response 1 to SUB6, responses 2 and 3 to SUB 3. 3. Not supported. Clause 53.01 is a standard Victorian Planning Provision and can only be amended by the Minister for Planning. 	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB38	Resident near Talbot Quarry	OAKLEIGH SOUTH	Object	See SUB16 (points 1-6) Also personally rejects the amendment without Council showing respect for the local residents of the area.	See response to SUB16	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB39	Resident near Talbot Quarry	OAKLEIGH SOUTH	Object	See SUB16 (points 1-6)) Also requests Council to follow Kingston and remediate the Talbot Quarry site for open space and explore all avenues open to the Council in pursuit of this.	See response to SUB16	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB40	Resident near Talbot Quarry	OAKLEIGH SOUTH	Object	See SUB16 (points 1-7) Also comments that Oakleigh South residents need more open space.	See response to SUB16	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB41	Resident near Talbot Quarry	OAKLEIGH SOUTH	Object	See SUB16 (points 1-6) Also comments on the need for developers to contribute to green space, seeks clarification on how amendment will effect a number of large redevelopment sites in the area, and suggests that Council purchase the Talbot Quarry site to provide space as outlined the MOSS Strategy.	See response to SUB16	No Change Refer to Panel

SUBMISSION NUMBER	ORGANISATION	SUBURB	SUPPORT/ OBJECT?	ISSUES	OFFICER RESPONSE	OPFFICER RECOMMENDATION
SUB42	Planning Consultant	MELBOURNE	Object	<p>1. Support objectives of Clause 21.10-3, however questions the equity/fairness of introducing a single public open space contribution rate for all subdivision in Monash which is higher than that for all other inner and middle ring municipalities, (apart from specific sites, growth areas and peri-urban areas). (Provides comparison between all Councils in the submission).</p> <p>2. Comments on a lack of detail in the MOSS and supporting SGS report, including the meeting of PPNote:70 - Practice Note 70- Preparation of Open Space Strategies, with no overall statement of needs and priorities nor implementation plan, uses the methodology of new Greater Dandenong strategy (currently being prepared) for the calculation of the rate in accordance with these principles. Submits that the precinct approach does not take into account other significant areas, such as the implications of the development of the Clayton and Huntingdale precincts and MNEIC.</p> <p>3. Considers that a contribution rate is not the only way to address the current and future open space provision needs, offers alternatives such as development contributions plans, section 173 agreements, 'capital works and or capital works redistribution, increased rates, Special Rates and Charge, sale of Council land and reinvestment, and other funding sources such as Government grants.</p> <p>4. Suggests that the new Clause 22.15 has not been justified and may be superfluous, with no justification provided in the C148 Explanatory Report, and repeats requirements already in Clause 53.01.</p>	<p>1. Disagree. See responses 2 and 3 to SUB 3.</p> <p>2. Disagree. See response 1 to SUB6</p> <p>3. Agree in part, in addition to seeking public open space contributions, Council may also seek additional funding opportunities to provide and enhance open space.</p> <p>4. Disagree. Clause 22.15 provides the strategic justification for the application of the 10% flat contribution rate. It also provides the additional details the method of collection for contributions, including any exemptions from the full application of Clause 53.01.</p>	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB43	Resident near Talbot Quarry	OAKLEIGH SOUTH	Object	See SUB16 (points 1-6) Also comments on Council's role in development, protecting residents and the health impacts of a lack of green space.	See response to SUB16	No Change Refer to Panel
SUB44	Resident near Talbot Quarry	OAKLEIGH SOUTH	Object	See SUB16 (points 1-6) Also comments on other issues related to contamination of former Quarry site.	See response to SUB16	No Change Refer to Panel