

Development Plan for former CSIRO site

Community Engagement Report



18 October 2021

Bayside City Council
Corporate Centre
76 Royal Avenue
SANDRINGHAM VIC 3191

T (03) 9899 4444
F (03) 9598 4474

www.bayside.vic.gov.au



Contents

Overview	4
Key findings from the consultation	4
Next steps	5
1 Background	6
1.1 The proposed Development Plan	6
2 Definitions and scope.....	8
2.1 Negotiables and non-negotiables.....	8
2.2 Glossary	8
3 Consultation process.....	9
3.1 Consultation purpose	9
3.2 Communications approach.....	9
3.3 Consultation methodology	9
3.3.1 Consultation phase	10
4 Participant profile	11
4.1 Key demographics	11
4.2 Connection to the site	11
4.3 Participation and limitations.....	12
5 Consultation findings.....	13
5.1 Support for Development Plan	13
5.1.1 Overall support.....	13
5.2 Support by Development Plan aspects	14
5.2.1 Support by population groups.....	16
5.3 Feedback on aspects of Development Plan	18
5.3.1 Scale, form, layout and interface	19
5.3.2 Mix of uses, dwelling types, amenity and affordable housing.....	20
5.3.3 Design of open space and landscaping	21
5.3.4 Integration with surrounding area	22
5.3.5 Location and components of community facilities.....	23
5.3.6 Access, movement, traffic management and parking layout	23
5.3.7 Staging and management of construction.....	25
5.4 Out of scope feedback.....	25
5.4.1 Development of a residential precinct	25
5.4.2 Establishment and management of conservation area.....	26
5.4.3 Vegetation removal	26
5.4.4 Development Plan Overlay	27

6	Appendix.....	28
6.1	Engagement plan evaluation	28
6.2	Engagement Plan Overview	30
6.3	Online survey	33
6.4	Submissions received	34

Overview

The purpose of this consultation was to seek feedback on the proposed Development Plan for the former CSIRO site to inform Bayside City Council's assessment of the proposed Development Plan.

Bayside City Council is the authority responsible for approving the proposed Development Plan.

In total, 821 individual participants provided written feedback between 16 August – 19 September 2021 via:

- Online survey, including open comment form hosted on Bayside City Council's Have Your Say website (647 participants)
- Upload of written statement through Have Your Say website (65 participants)
- Email of written statement to Bayside City Council (95 participants)
- Post or hand delivery to Bayside City Council's offices (14 participants).

Some participants made multiple submissions through different or the same channel(s). Council officers sought clarification from the participant as to which response they wanted considered to ensure, whenever possible, that only one submission per person was included in the consultation.

Key findings from the consultation

- **71.4% of participants strongly oppose and 13.1% somewhat oppose the Development Plan:** the most opposed aspects of the Development Plan were the scale, form, layout of buildings and interface with adjoining properties (76.3% strongly oppose and 12.1% somewhat oppose); access movement, traffic management, and parking layout (78.3% strongly oppose and 8.6% somewhat oppose); and integration with the surrounding area (62.3% strongly oppose and 11.1% somewhat oppose).
- **The most supported aspects of the Development Plan are the open space provision, affordable housing facilitation and the community facility provision:** between a quarter and a third of participants strongly support or somewhat support these aspects of the Development Plan. Participants were excited about the possibilities for new public open space, and ensuring that the mix of facilities was right for the Highett community.
- **Traffic impacts and inappropriate building heights most concerned participants:** concerns about the impacts of increased traffic on already congested Highett streets was the most commented theme (66.6% of participants), following by the inappropriateness of the 7-storey maximum height proposed (59.8% of participants).
- **Adjacent landowners and residents, and the broader Highett community oppose the Development Plan at very similar levels:** these two groups strongly oppose the Development Plan at 74.2% and 75% respectively. Adjacent residents and landowners were more strongly opposed to traffic and access management, integration with the surrounding area, and the construction timing than the broader community. This is not surprising, as these aspects will have a greater impact on adjacent residents and landowners.

Consultation feedback suggests that the following changes would make the Development Plan more agreeable to many participants:

- Lowering the building heights and decreasing number of dwellings
- Increasing setbacks from existing properties to decrease overshadowing and overlooking of private property
- Further consideration given to how the traffic, road safety and parking impacts will be managed and mitigated
- Increasing the amount of public open space provided
- Providing more detail on the open space and facilities provision, and how construction impacts will be managed to mitigate impacts on the community.

Next steps

Bayside City Council will consider consultation feedback and whether or not to approve the proposed Development Plan, subject to the amendments outlined on this page, at its meeting on 26 October 2021.

In accordance with the statutory processes outlined in the Bayside Planning Scheme, once a Development Plan is approved, no additional community engagement will occur for future planning permit processes for this site.

1 Background

This document provides a summary of community feedback received during a statutory consultation conducted by Bayside City Council between 16 August – 19 September 2021 on the proposal for a new residential precinct at the former Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) site at 37 Graham Road and 32 Middleton Road in Highett.

Planning controls at the site require the landowner to prepare a Development Plan that sets out conditions for land uses and the new built form.

The Development Plan proposes approximately 1,048 dwellings in a range of building types from two to seven storeys, and features conservation land, public open space and community facilities including a public library and maternal and child health centre, as well as retail space.

Under current planning provisions, Council is responsible for assessing and approving the Development Plan. Community feedback will be used to assist Council in its assessment of the proposed Development Plan.

1.1 The proposed Development Plan

Key elements of the proposed Development Plan include:

- Approximately 1048 dwellings in a range of building types from two to seven storeys
- 3ha of nature conservation land
- 1ha of public open space
- Internal roads and pathways
- A public library and maternal and child health centre to be operated by Bayside City Council
- Minor retail facility.

Three hectares (30,000m²) encompassing the Highett Grassy Woodland will be set aside for conservation to encourage regeneration of indigenous species and natural habitat. An additional one hectare (10,000m²) of open space has been set aside for public recreation purposes.

The setting aside of land for open space and conservation is a condition of the site's sale between the Australian Government and developer and is the result of long-standing advocacy by Council and the community.

Figure 1 Site layout in Proposed Development Plan



2 Definitions and scope

2.1 Negotiables and non-negotiables

Community consultation was undertaken on the following aspects of the proposed plan:

- The scale, form, layout of buildings and the interface with adjoining properties
- Mix of uses, dwelling types, internal amenity, and provision of affordable housing
- Design of open space and landscaping/planting
- Integration with surrounding area
- Location and components of community facilities
- Access movement, traffic management, and parking layout
- Staging and management of construction.

There are some aspects of the redevelopment process for the site that cannot be influenced. These include:

- The site will be developed in some form because it has been given Residential Growth Zoning and Development Plan Overlay under a previous planning scheme amendment. The site will be redeveloped as a residential precinct under these existing controls.
- Restricted access to the conservation area will continue. This part of the site remains contaminated, as the extensive vegetation limited remediation activities. No further remediation would occur, as it would require removal of native vegetation that would compromise the conservation values of the area.
- Previous vegetation removal. This occurred prior to the current landowner when the site was commonwealth land, and Council was not the responsible authority at the time.
- Requirements for the Development Plan are set out in DPO2. The provisions contained in this planning control have already been gazetted and are therefore established policy. The proposal must comply with these requirements.

These negotiables and non-negotiables have guided the way we analyse feedback received.

2.2 Glossary

Item	Definition
DPO	Development Plan Overlay

3 Consultation process

3.1 Consultation purpose

The consultation process was open to all members of the Bayside community. Community engagement was designed to provide nearby residents, businesses and landowners, as well as the broader community, with the opportunity to have their say on the proposed Development Plan and future use and development of the site.

3.2 Communications approach

To ensure residents who may be impacted by the proposed Development Plan were informed of the consultation period, Council communicated this consultation to the Highett and broader community via:

- Letter sent by registered or addressed mail (7,130)
- Large signage at key points near the site (5)
- Direct email to Have Your Say members (3,532)
- Council website news stories (4) and weekly e-newsletter (8,590)
- Social media (5 posts >20,000 reach)
- *Let's Talk Bayside* printed magazine (41,000 copies)

3.3 Consultation methodology

Bayside City Council, as the responsible authority for assessing the proposed Development Plan, is required to give notice of the application pursuant to Clause 52 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*. Clause 52 requires Council to give notice to owners and occupiers of adjoining land and to any other person if Council considers they may experience material detriment in the event the Development Plan is approved. Clause 52 requires notice to be given by placing a sign on site, publishing a notice in a local newspaper or by letter.

Bayside City Council will consider all submissions received during the consultation period (16 August – 19 September 2021) prior to deciding whether to approve the proposed Development Plan. Community feedback will be considered alongside technical reports and consultation with State Government, according to the statutory processes outlined in the Bayside Planning Scheme.

The proposed Development Plan was open for community consultation between 16 August – 19 September 2021.



The Developer's consultation

The landowner and Development Plan applicant, Sunkin Property Group, held two webinars during the consultation period on 1 September and 7 September 2021. Council did not have any involvement in the developer's webinars beyond presenting

information at the end of each webinar about the Council's role as the responsible statutory authority and facilitating the pre-submission of questions for Webinar 2. These webinars, and any other engagement activities undertaken by the developer, are entirely separate to Council's statutory consultation process.

3.3.1 Consultation phase

The tools and techniques selected for this project were informed by the project content, stakeholders and type of feedback sought. Refer to the Engagement Plan overview in the Appendix for further detail. The program was delivered digitally, due to COVID-19 restrictions preventing face-to-face sessions. Consultation was open for a five-week period in consideration of COVID-related impacts.

The following engagement activities were undertaken:

- Project information, online survey and written statement upload form through Have Your Say, including opportunity to ask questions
- One-to-one bookable meetings (via phone or video due to COVID-19 restrictions)
- Printed survey and consultation materials available on request.

During the consultation period, community and stakeholders could make a submission or comment via the following methods:

Table 1 Consultation methods and participant numbers by method

Details	Method
16 August to 19 September 2021*	Online using a web form on Bayside Have Your Say (647 participants)**
821 participants in total*	Upload of a written statement to Bayside Have Your Say (65 participants)**
6,392 unique visitors to project webpage	Email of a written statement to planningstrategy@bayside.vic.gov.au (95 participants)
	Submission post addressed to Statutory Planning, CSIRO Development Plan, Bayside City Council, PO Box 27 Sandringham 3091 (14 participants)

Note that this table references the number of unique participants, not the number of submissions, as some participants made multiple submissions.

*Council received some written submissions following the close of consultation and accepted all properly constituted submissions received before 15 October 2021. These submissions are included within this report.

**In addition to the completion of a 'free text' submission with their feedback, those participants who submitted via Have Your Say were also asked to complete a qualitative survey asking them to rate their level of support for the Development Plan and provide some demographic data. A total of 718 participants completed this qualitative survey.

Council officers also responded to participants' comments via the following methods:

- Meetings with Strategic Planner (19)
- Ask a question - 47 contributions (refer to the Appendix for a summary of the main themes)
- Project hotline
- Email

Anonymous submissions could not be accepted as this is a statutory consultation process. There were 33 submissions that were not properly constituted submissions as they provided either no name, contact details or both. One submission per person could be accepted. When people sent in multiple submissions, Council officers contacted the participant to confirm which submission they wanted included in the analysis and reporting process.

4 Participant profile

4.1 Key demographics

Table 2 compares the population of Highett with all consultation participants. Highett has been selected as the comparison population due to the majority of participants (75.1%) identifying as a Highett resident and the proposed development being located in Highett.

Table 2 Highett population compared to participants in the consultation

	Demographic	Highett 2016 Census	Participants (% [number])
Gender	Male	46.9%	41.7% [298]
	Female	53.1%	52.1% [372]
	Non-binary	-	0% [0]
	Undisclosed	-	6.2% [44]
Age	Under 18	24.5%	0% [0]
	18-24	6.6%	2.2% [16]
	25-34	11.6%	12.9% [92]
	35-44	17%	25.4% [181]
	45-54	16%	29.1% [207]
	55-64	10%	16.3% [116]
	65-74	7.1%	9.8% [70]
	75-84	3.9%	1.4% [10]
	85+	3%	0.1% [1]
	Undisclosed	-	2.5% [18]
ATSI	ATSI	0%	0.9% [5]
	Not ATSI	100%	92.6% [490]
	Undisclosed	-	6.2% [44]


Source: Bayside City Council profile.id Community Profile, and Bayside City Council Have Your Say online qualitative survey submissions (718). Participant demographic data does not include those people who only submitted via email or hard copy (103), as demographic questions were only asked to those participants who submitted via Have Your Say.

4.2 Connection to the site

Participants were asked about their connection to the site – the results are shown in Figure 2. The most common response was a Highett resident, with 75.1% of

participants choosing this category. The second most common category was resident adjacent to the site, with 23.9% of participants. Note that participants were able to select multiple responses to this question.

Figure 2 Participants' relationship to the site



Source: 718 surveys via Bayside City Council Have Your Say, of which 635 responded to this question. Does not include participants who only submitted via email or hard copy (103), as demographic questions were only asked to those participants who submitted via Have Your Say.

4.3 Participation and limitations

Based on the participant data as compared to the Highett population, it is noted that:

- The 35-44, 45-54 and 55-64 year old age groups are notably over-represented among participants
- Younger and older participants are under-represented
- Males are underrepresented.

Therefore, it is noted the submissions received may not be representative of views in the broader community.

5 Consultation findings


The following section summarises the level of support for and key themes from written community feedback on the proposed Development Plan. Where there was more than one mention of a topic or item, the number of mentions has been specified in brackets.

5.1 Support for Development Plan

5.1.1 Overall support

Figure 3 shows the overall level of support for the Development Plan on a Likert scale. The most common answer was 'strongly oppose', with 71.4% of participants selecting this level of support. Just under 5% of participants said they strongly supported the Development Plan.

Figure 3 Overall level of support for the Development Plan



Source: 718 qualitative surveys Bayside City Council Have Your Say, of which 705 responded to this question. Does not include those people who only submitted via email or hard copy (103), as level of support on a Likert scale was only asked to those participants who submitted via Have Your Say.

The reasons some participants gave for their level of support for the Development Plan are indicated through these quotes:

- *'The scale of the project is too large for the Highett community to accept... it and will negatively impact on the basic needs of the Highett community.'*
- *'The development grossly contradicts the proposal put forward originally. It does not meet the current structure plan.'*
- *'I am extremely concerned about this proposal as it stands because it is inappropriate on so many levels. I am all for growth if it's within an infrastructure that can support it but the number of dwellings for this site far outnumbers the original proposal.'*
- *'We need to increase the housing stock across the country, including in Highett. Otherwise, my generation and the one after will never be able to afford a house or live near where they work.'*

- *'I support this development and think it will bring a great atmosphere to the area and really improve Highett.'*
- *'I think this is really good urban planning. Sustainable housing with retail, plenty of outdoor space and sustainable transport options all nearby. I would say that not everyone would need a car space due to the existing transport infrastructure.'*

5.2 Support by Development Plan aspects

Participants indicated their level of support on a Likert scale for eight different aspects of the Development Plan:

- The scale, form, layout of buildings and interface with adjoining properties
- Mix of uses, dwelling types and internal amenity
- Facilitation of affordable housing
- Design of open space and landscaping / planting
- Integration with surrounding area
- Location and components of community facilities
- Access movement, traffic management, and parking layout
- Staging and management of construction.

The participants' data is shown in Figure 4 on the following page.

The most highly supported aspects of the Development Plan are:

1. Design of open space and landscaping / planting: 37.9% of participants either strongly support or somewhat support this aspect of the Development plan.
2. Facilitation of affordable housing: 24.8% of participants either strongly support or somewhat support this aspect of the Development plan.¹
3. Location and components of community facilities: 24.7% of participants either strongly support or somewhat support this aspect of the Development plan.


The least supported aspects of the Development Plan are:

1. The scale, form, layout of buildings and interface with adjoining properties: 88.4% of participants either strongly oppose or somewhat oppose this aspect of the Development plan.
2. Access movement, traffic management, and parking layout: 86.9% of participants either strongly oppose or somewhat oppose this aspect of the Development plan.
3. Integration with surrounding area: 73.4% of participants either strongly oppose or somewhat oppose this aspect of the Development plan.

A breakdown of the themes that participants discussed on each of the Development Plan aspects is provided in the section 5.3, which gives some context to the levels of support indicated on the Likert scale.

¹ Some participants may have misunderstood the mechanism for the facilitation of affordable housing proposed in the Development Plan. Some participants supported more affordable and social housing facilitation. However, other participants expressed their direct opposition to facilitating affordable and social housing in Highett, for a variety of views. For instance - believing it would impact safety in the neighborhood, or that it would lower property values.

Figure 4 Level of support for aspects of the Development Plan



Source: 718 qualitative surveys Bayside City Council Have Your Say, of which 705 responded to this question. Does not include those people who only submitted via email or hard copy (103), as level of support on a Likert scale was only asked to those participants who submitted via Have Your Say.


5.2.1 Support by population groups

Participants have been separated into three groupings to consider level of support for the development plan among different sections of the community:

- Landowners and residents adjacent to the site
- Highett residents and business owners
- Visitors and 'other'² connection type.

Figure 5 shows the level of support by the participants' connection to the site.

Figure 5 Level of support by connection to the site



Source: 718 qualitative surveys on Bayside City Council Have Your Say, of which 635 responded to the question about their connection to the site. Does not include those people who only submitted via email or hard copy (103), as level of support on a Likert scale was only asked to those participants who submitted via Have Your Say.

Breaking down the overall level of support by type of connection to the site shows that:

- Highett residents and business owners strongly oppose the development plan at very similar levels to adjacent landowners and residents (75.0% and 74.2% respectively).
- Visitors and others have the highest levels of support for the development plan (5.8% strongly support and 13.2% somewhat support). However, just under 20% of participants selected visitor or other as how they were connected to the area.

Support for the eight different aspects of the development plan by the participant's connection to the site is shown in Table 3. For each aspect, the highest percentage

² 'Other' connection type was self-reported as: residents in other Bayside or surrounding suburbs; and people who visit the area for shopping, work or recreational reasons.

of strong opposition is highlighted in red, and the highest percentage of strong support is highlighted in green. Table 3 shows that:

- Highett residents and business owners strongly oppose the scale, form, layout of buildings and interface with adjoining properties; and the mix of uses, dwelling types and internal amenity at slightly higher levels than adjacent landowners and residents.
- Adjacent landowners and residents show the highest levels of strong opposition to the integration with the surrounding area; the access movement, traffic management, and parking layout; and the staging and management of construction. This is expected as these aspects will affect adjacent residents and landowners to a higher degree than the wider community.
- Visitors and others strongly support the affordable housing facilitation to the highest degree (17.4%), while adjacent residents and landowners strongly oppose it to the highest degree (28.5%).
- The facilitation of affordable housing; the design of open space and landscaping / planting; and the staging and management of construction all have close to a third of all participants reporting they are 'neutral' on the aspect. These are the least polarising aspects of the Development Plan.

Table 3 Support levels across aspects of the development plan by the respondent's connection to the site

	Adjacent landowners and residents	Highett residents and business owners	Visitors and 'other' connection
Number of participants ³	215	485	124
The scale, form, layout of buildings and interface with adjoining properties (%)			
Strongly oppose	78.47%	80.79%	57.85%
Somewhat oppose	12.92%	10.23%	18.18%
Neutral	2.87%	2.30%	5.79%
Somewhat support	4.31%	3.76%	7.44%
Strongly support	1.44%	2.92%	10.74%
Mix of uses, dwelling types and internal amenity (%)			
Strongly oppose	53.88%	57.89%	36.67%
Somewhat oppose	17.96%	13.68%	25.83%
Neutral	13.11%	12.84%	14.17%
Somewhat support	8.74%	9.26%	12.50%
Strongly support	6.31%	6.32%	10.83%
Facilitation of affordable housing (%)			
Strongly oppose	28.50%	24.84%	26.45%
Somewhat oppose	12.08%	12.42%	13.22%
Neutral	39.13%	38.53%	24.79%
Somewhat support	11.11%	15.58%	18.18%
Strongly support	9.18%	8.63%	17.36%
Design of open space and landscaping / planting (%)			
Strongly oppose	16.75%	18.13%	18.18%
Somewhat oppose	13.88%	14.79%	14.05%

³ Participants could select multiple connections to the site. In this table, those participants categorised as 'adjacent landowners and residents' have selected either adjacent landowner OR adjacent resident, or both options. The number of participants represents the number of *unique* participants in the grouping. Therefore, some participants would be counted across more than one of the three groupings.

	Adjacent landowners and residents	Highbett residents and business owners	Visitors and 'other' connection
Neutral	36.36%	30.63%	24.79%
Somewhat support	15.79%	17.29%	20.66%
Strongly support	17.22%	19.17%	22.31%
Integration with surrounding area (%)			
Strongly oppose	69.71%	67.02%	40.17%
Somewhat oppose	11.54%	9.24%	17.09%
Neutral	6.73%	7.77%	15.38%
Somewhat support	6.25%	8.61%	11.97%
Strongly support	5.77%	7.35%	15.38%
Location and components of community facilities (%)			
Strongly oppose	43.69%	43.97%	30.83%
Somewhat oppose	12.62%	13.95%	10.00%
Neutral	20.87%	19.66%	26.67%
Somewhat support	14.56%	14.38%	17.50%
Strongly support	8.25%	8.03%	15.00%
Access movement, traffic management, and parking layout (%)			
Strongly oppose	86.47%	81.84%	59.17%
Somewhat oppose	5.31%	7.10%	15.83%
Neutral	2.90%	3.55%	9.17%
Somewhat support	1.45%	2.30%	8.33%
Strongly support	3.86%	5.22%	7.50%
Staging and management of construction (%)			
Strongly oppose	42.03%	35.85%	35.00%
Somewhat oppose	12.56%	11.95%	13.33%
Neutral	37.68%	44.44%	38.33%
Somewhat support	3.86%	4.19%	7.50%
Strongly support	3.86%	3.56%	5.83%

Source: 718 qualitative surveys received via Bayside City Council Have Your Say, of which 635 responded to the question about their connection to the site.

5.3 Feedback on aspects of Development Plan

This section summarises the feedback received by written submission and through the web form provided on the Bayside City Council Have Your Say on the eight main negotiable aspects of the Development Plan. The findings in this section are informed by 174 written statements (uploaded via Have Your Say or received by email or post) and 647 online surveys received (a total of 821 submissions).

The 10 most commented themes from community feedback:

1. The streets surrounding the site are already too congested, so further development cannot be supported – 66.6% of participants (547 participants)
2. The building heights are too tall – 59.8% of participants (491 participants)
3. The density is too high – 50.6% of participants (415 participants)
4. There are too many dwellings – 36.5% of participants (300 participants)
5. Highbett Rd is already congested, so more traffic cannot be supported – 32.4% of participants (266 participants)
6. It is not keeping with the Highbett character – 30.9% of participants (254 participants)

7. There already is insufficient parking in the area, so further vehicles cannot be supported – 30.3% of participants (249 participants)
8. Middleton St is already congested, so more traffic cannot be supported – 28.4% of participants (233 participants)
9. Graham Rd is already congested, so more traffic cannot be supported – 26.8% of participants (220 participants)
10. Concern about road safety by increasing the number of vehicles in the area, with potential for car crashes and crashes involving pedestrians or cyclists – 18.8% of participants (154 participants).

5.3.1 Scale, form, layout and interface

Most participants were against a maximum height of 7 storeys and the current density proposed. Some recommended their own lower height limits, with the most common recommend maximum height being 4 storeys, followed by 6 storeys. Participants' most common concern was overshadowing of existing homes, the new public open space and conservation area. Table 4 summarises the feedback received on this aspect of the Development Plan.

Table 4 Feedback on scale, form, layout and interface with adjoining properties

Theme	Feedback	Number of participants	Typical comments
Building heights	Heights not appropriate	490	<i>Far too tall for the area</i>
	Heights appropriate	1	<i>Need further development like this</i>
Suggested maximum number of storeys	6 storeys or less	50	<i>Maximum number of storeys, with cascading lower storeys when closer to existing homes or public open space</i>
	5 storeys or less	33	
	4 storeys or less	52	
	3 storeys or less	22	
	2 storeys or less	16	
Density	Density too high	415	<i>Density not typical of Highett</i>
	OK with density proposed	3	<i>Support higher density living</i>
Interface	Overshadowing concerns	117	<i>Overshadowing neighbouring houses and new open space</i>
	Overlooking private space concerns	89	<i>Towers looking into neighbouring homes</i>
	Creating wind tunnels concerns	6	<i>Tall buildings will make the area very windy</i>
Design	More sustainability consideration (e.g., solar panels, water/waste recycling, passive heating/cooling)	35	<i>Sustainability has not been properly considered. The environmental impact needs to be managed.</i>
	Need to know proposed materiality of buildings	10	<i>Designs are indicative only – participants want to know what buildings will look like</i>

Some examples of participants' comments on this aspect of the Development Plan:

- *'I am supportive of the redevelopment plan, however I am not supportive of the provision of 1,048 dwellings and 7 storey buildings. I would support capping the height of buildings at 4 stories (consistent with the height of other developments along Highett Road).'*
- *'The green spaces proposed are at risk of being overshadowed by the sheer size and quantity of the towers. The abutting residents to the Development have their privacy at risk due to the sheer size of the structures as well as the shadowing the buildings create.'*
- *'(Needs) solar panels installed utilising the entire roof-space to minimise the carbon footprint of the development.'*

5.3.2 Mix of uses, dwelling types, amenity and affordable housing

Participants thought there were too many dwellings, which would add significantly to overpopulation of the area. Many thought the housing type mix was not appropriate for the demands in the area – that there was not demand for apartments, particularly due to the pandemic. Table 5 summarises the feedback received on this aspect of the Development Plan.

Table 5 Feedback on mix of uses, dwelling types, amenity, and affordable housing

Theme	Feedback	Number of participants	Typical comments
Supply of housing and other uses	Too many dwellings	300	<i>Will add too many people to the area, and make traffic more congested</i>
	More commercial uses	11	<i>New residents need shops and cafes</i>
Public / social housing	More public / social housing	10	<i>Need to support those on low incomes by providing housing</i>
	Less public / social housing	15	<i>Public housing brings undesirable people to the area, creates a public safety risk</i>
Affordable housing	More affordable housing	38	<i>The housing market is out of control, people need to be able to buy into Highett</i>
	Less affordable housing	9	<i>Affects surrounding property values</i>
Dwelling types	Less apartments	105	<i>There is not the demand for apartment-living post-COVID.</i>
	More family homes	55	<i>This is a family area; people want family homes</i>

	More townhouses	51	<i>Townhouses is a more appropriate housing type for the area</i>
--	-----------------	----	---

Some examples of participants' comments on this aspect of the Development Plan:

- *'The number of dwellings is concerning since the area is already very congested. I would support the development if the number of dwellings was reduced 75%.'*
- *'I do not wish for the area be used for public housing or affordable living. This devalues the suburb and area / schools for which we have paid top dollar for.'*
- *'I would strongly encourage an increase of 3 and 4 bedroom residences to encourage family units and aid in the minimisation of traffic.'*
- *'As a young renter in the area hoping to buy property it worries me how many apartment blocks are being built. Getting into the housing market is not easy but most buyers are not interested in small apartments that they can't live in long term.'*

5.3.3 Design of open space and landscaping

Participants were excited by the possibilities for new public open space, wanted the conservation area protected, a playground and walking and jogging trails. Many participants wanted the size of public open space increased, noting there was a lack of parks in Highett compared to other areas. Table 6 summarises the feedback received on this aspect of the Development Plan.

Table 6 Feedback on design of open space and landscape

Theme	Feedback	Number of participants	Typical comments
Management of landscape	Improve the conservation area	41	<i>Use appropriate native plants</i>
	More trees planted	22	<i>Revegetate the area, habitat for nature</i>
	Open space must not become private open space for new residents	20	<i>Must be controls to ensure open space remains public</i>
	Accessible for users of all abilities	9	<i>Facilities and paths should be accessible to people with disabilities</i>
	Developer to maintain open space	6	<i>Developer must ensure continued upkeep</i>
Outdoor facility provision	Playground	24	<i>Children need somewhere safe to go and play</i>
	Walking and jogging trails	22	<i>Create network of trails for walking and jogging, with lighting for safety</i>
	Dog park	13	<i>Off lead enclosed area for dogs</i>
	Outdoor fitness equipment	13	<i>Exercise equipment for people of varying</i>

Theme	Feedback	Number of participants	Typical comments
			<i>strength and fitness levels</i>
	Other outdoor facility	12	<i>Skate/BMX park, public pool, BBQ, sporting field, community garden</i>
Open space provision	More open space	131	<i>Highett is already short of open space, so more open space is highly needed</i>
	Like the open space provision	33	<i>Like that the Development Plan creates new place for the community</i>

Some examples of participants' comments on this aspect of the Development Plan:

- *'I love the open space/parkland and community facilities. Great for families and the community.'*
- *'I am an oldie, but I see a need to use some of that space for youngsters and teenagers. They desperately need a BMX track for fun, excitement, health and practising skill reasons and, of course, to get them away from their screens and outdoors.'*
- *'Erect a children's playground in the communal park... Easy accessibility / pathways for disabled individuals in and through the community park (wheelchair access).'*

5.3.4 Integration with surrounding area

Many participants felt that the development was not in line with the character of Highett or would change the 'village feel' by increasing the population. Table 7 summarises the feedback received on this aspect of the Development Plan.

Table 7 Feedback on integration with surrounding area

Theme	Feedback	Number of participants	Typical comments
Integration	Not in keeping with Highett character	254	<i>Village feel, low rise development is the norm, family area</i>
	Does not integrate with neighbouring streets	110	<i>The heights and density are at odds with adjacent houses</i>

Some examples of participants' comments on this aspect of the Development Plan:

- *'Having lived in Highett since 1996 we have been a part of the family community and seen many families grow in the neighbourhood. This development further degrades the communal "village" appeal that is making Highett one of the most sought-after suburbs to purchase in Melbourne.'*
- *'The residents of Highett did not buy property and choose to live in this neighbourhood (to be part of) a high-density, high-rise environment and this*

significant change in landscape is what is being forced upon the surrounding community.'

5.3.5 Location and components of community facilities

Some participants welcomed the provision of new facilities, like a library (33 participants), which they thought offered multi-use opportunities to the community. Childcare and schools were suggested by a number of participants. Table 8 summarises the feedback received on this aspect of the Development Plan.

Table 8 Feedback on community facilities

Theme	Feedback	Number of participants	Typical comments
Facility provision offering	Dislike the mix of facilities offered	43	<i>The mix and offering isn't right</i>
	Like the mix of facilities offered	25	<i>Will positively add to the community</i>
Library	Support a library on site	33	<i>Library could be used for other purposes like hosting community group events, co-working spaces</i>
	Do not need a library	14	<i>Already have Highett Library nearby</i>
Facilities to be considered	Childcare centre or school	69	<i>Schools and childcare at capacity, with more people in the area will need new facilities</i>
	More retail/hospitality spaces	46	<i>New residents will need shops, cafes</i>

Some examples of participants' comments on this aspect of the Development Plan:

- *'There is already a perfectly fine library in Sandringham and Hampton as well as a library in Highett Rd run by Kingston Council.'*
- *'Incorporation of a new Kindergarten and Primary School within the grounds or establishment of a new Kindergarten and Primary School (or expansion of existing local schools/Kindergartens) within reasonable proximity of the proposed Development sufficient to service the anticipated additional demands created by the development.'*
- *'Having the right community feel and spirit is important to us, especially as our daughter grows up. Having amenities that are community minded, spaces that safe and accessible to the Highett and Bayside communities is imperative. The Development fails to offer many additional amenities to the community and to the new residents.'*

5.3.6 Access, movement, traffic management and parking layout

The most commented theme throughout the consultation was that the streets in the area were already at capacity so more development in the area, which would bring more traffic, would further increase congestion.

Table 9 summarises the feedback received on this aspect of the Development Plan.

Table 9 Access, movement, traffic management and parking layout

Theme	Feedback	Number of participants	Typical comments
Traffic congestion and safety	Already traffic congestion in area so cannot support addition of more vehicles	547	<i>Peak hour is terrible, hard to turn out of local streets, more traffic would make streets unbearable</i>
	Already congested on Highett Rd	266	<i>These local streets are at capacity, cannot deal with managing all traffic heading to the new development</i>
	Already congested on Graham Rd	220	
	Already congested on Middleton St	233	
	Traffic congestion due to level crossing so cannot support more vehicles	142	<i>The lowered boom gates back up traffic in the area</i>
	Concern about road safety with more vehicles	154	<i>More vehicles will create greater road safety risk, with potential for crashes, including involving pedestrians and cyclists</i>
Parking	Already not enough parking in the area	249	<i>Challenging to find a park currently</i>
	All residents must have parking needs met on site	123	<i>Cannot have new residents taking spaces on local streets</i>
	More visitor parking on site	93	<i>All visitor parking needs must be met on site</i>
	1 parking spot (or less) per residence is not sufficient	57	<i>Not likely that new residents will rely on public transport</i>
Active transport	Improve pedestrian permeability	43	<i>Create more connections through the site from neighbouring streets</i>
	More cycling infrastructure (storage, paths, parking)	51	<i>Make the neighbouring streets and the site safe for cyclists, and provide end trip facilities</i>

Some examples of participants' comments on this aspect of the Development Plan:

- *'Traffic is going to be unbearable. It's already super hectic in Highett Village with buses, trains and cars.'*
- *'If you drive down Clonmult Avenue you will find huge numbers of kids on their scooters, bikes and roller blades going up and down the street, as well as kicking the footy, playing cricket and other games together. By adding a development of the scale proposed at the CSIRO site... I fear not only for the*

traffic, congestion and changing nature of the neighbourhood, but also the safety of the children that live in the area.'

- *'The provision of 150 bike parking spaces is inadequate for such a large development.'*
- *'The disruption to the lives and mental health of those existing residents in regard to the potential traffic chaos, particularly in the small residential streets surrounding the development must be addressed.'*

5.3.7 Staging and management of construction

Some participants were concerned about the long construction program and how this would impact neighbourhood amenity. Table 10 summarises the feedback received on this aspect of the Development Plan.

Table 10 Feedback on construction

Theme	Feedback	Number of participants	Typical comments
Construction	Construction impact on neighbourhood amenity	116	<i>Concern for how long construction would take, impacting residents for a decade</i>
	Inform us about construction impacts	28	<i>More information required about nature of impacts and how will be mitigated</i>
	High quality construction needed	9	<i>Concern about 'shoddy' building practices</i>

An example of participants' comments on this aspect of the Development Plan:

- *'I am also displeased about the long development time frame of 10 years due to construction traffic, noise, dust, etc concerns as there is a local park to the east of the development and the major primary grocery shopping Woolworths right next door... I am also concerned the developer may be incentivised to drag the project on as they do not have to build the community spaces until the END of the project. I believe they should be held to a roadmap to build the community spaces within a reasonable time after commencement.'*

5.4 Out of scope feedback

This section summarises community feedback provided on matters that were out of scope of the consultation.

5.4.1 Development of a residential precinct

Table 11 summarises the feedback received on creating a residential precinct on the former CSIRO site.

Table 11 Feedback on creating a residential precinct

Theme	Feedback	Number of participants	Typical comments
Residential development	Support residential development in principle	71	<i>Generally support development if it's</i>

Theme	Feedback	Number of participants	Typical comments
			<i>appropriate, a lot of housing demand</i>
	Against residential development in principle	65	<i>Highett cannot cope with more development</i>
Highett's capacity to support development	Community infrastructure is at capacity	109	<i>Current infrastructure is at capacity, schools are full</i>
	Highett already overpopulated	53	<i>Cannot accommodate a significantly increased population</i>

5.4.2 Establishment and management of conservation area

Table 12 summarises the feedback received on management of the conservation area.

Table 12 Feedback on conservation area

Theme	Feedback	Number of participants	Typical comments
Access to conservation area	More access	13	<i>Belongs to the community</i>
	Support continued restricted access	4	<i>Protect flora and fauna</i>
Conservation	Support protecting the conservation area	46	<i>Important biodiverse area, needs to be protected</i>

5.4.3 Vegetation removal

Table 13 summarises the feedback received on vegetation removal that previously occurred on site.

Table 13 Feedback on vegetation removal

Theme	Feedback	Number of participants	Typical comments
Vegetation removal	Against the vegetation removal	5	<i>Disappointed by destruction of trees</i>
	Revegetation needed	2	<i>Replanting should be required</i>

5.4.4 Development Plan Overlay

Table 14 summarises the feedback received on the local planning controls.

Table 14 Feedback on planning controls

Theme	Feedback	Number of participants	Typical comments
Support for DPO	DPO is appropriate	30	<i>Agree with the intention of the site use</i>
	DPO is not appropriate	2	<i>Site should not be developed as per DPO, should create public park, expand conservation area</i>
Other planning controls	Does not comply with Highett Structure Plan 2018	90	<i>Building heights are much taller than structure plan stipulated</i>

6 Appendix

6.1 Engagement plan evaluation

Engagement Plan Overview

An 'Engagement Plan Overview' (Appendix 6.2) was published as a subpage on the Have Your Say website as part the consultation. The Engagement Overview page was viewed 215 times (168 visitors, 2.1%) during the consultation period with no comments or questions received.

Participant reach and representation

Targets set for the reach, representation and participation, based on similar projects, were all exceeded.

The engagement targets and the results achieved are summarised below:


- 1,500 visitors to the online engagement platform Have Your Say – target exceeded, 6,392 unique visits
- Representation from each identified stakeholder group – achieved
- 20% of visits last at least 1 active minute – exceeded, 38%
- 15% of visits where at least 2 actions are performed – exceeded, 27.5%
- 3% of visits where at least 1 contribution is made – exceeded, 7.1%
- All project deadlines were met and the engagement delivered within budget.

Participant satisfaction and experience

Survey participants were asked if they had the right information to participate, with 63.3% responding that the information was very (18.1%) or mostly (45.2%) easy to find and understand. A target of 75% was set, meaning the result was slightly below expectations.

Figure 6 shows participants feedback on whether they had the information they needed to provide feedback on the proposed Development Plan. The most common answer was that the information was 'mostly easy to understand'.

Figure 6 Feedback on information provision during consultation



The main additional feedback provided on what information was missing was:

- Community had to rely on the developer's information provision, rather than having 'objective' documents provided by a third party.
- A condensed, plain English version of the Development Plan could have made it easier for people to take in all the information.
- The documents had a marketing focus, rather than a focus on direct information provision.
- The transport modelling was regarded as being incomplete or inaccurate.
- Supporting studies were very technical and required an understanding of engineering or design to make sense of the information.
- Lack of detail on some matters, such as percentage of public and affordable housing, construction impacts.

Q&A tools

The Q&A forum received 47 questions, which were responded to within the stated timeframe. The questions, including the Frequently Asked Questions information, on this page were viewed 537 times by 256 individuals.

The main themes to these questions were:

- Proposed building heights
- Facility and open space provision
- Affordable housing contributions and provision
- Traffic, parking and noise impacts
- Queries about whether the development would be a gated community
- The developer, Sunkin.

This report

This report has been prepared by an external consultant on behalf of Bayside City Council.

6.2 Engagement Plan Overview

Project objective

A Development Plan has been proposed for the former CSIRO site in Highett at 37 Graham Road and 32 Middleton Street in Highett. This process seeks to inform stakeholders and the community of the site's background and the relevant statutory processes, and to consult on the proposed Development Plan.

Project impacts

The proposal would create a new residential precinct with approximately 1,048 homes from 2-7 storeys.

The proposal would deliver the 3ha of conservation land and 1ha of public open space that Council secured as a condition of the site's sale.

According to the provisions of the Bayside Planning Scheme, if the plan is approved, future planning processes will not include opportunities for community feedback.

Further project impacts and considerations are addressed in the Frequently Asked Questions.

What information do we need from the community?

Council must consider community feedback on the various components of the proposed Development Plan before a decision can be made on whether to approve the proposed plan.

What can the community influence?

Council is seeking feedback on the following aspects of the proposed plan:

- The scale, form, layout of buildings and the interface with adjoining properties
- Mix of uses, dwelling types, internal amenity and provision of affordable housing
- Design of open space and landscaping/planting
- Integration with surrounding area
- Location and components of community facilities
- Access movement, traffic management, and parking layout
- Staging and management of construction.

What can't the community influence?

- The site will be developed because it has been given Residential Growth Zoning and Development Plan Overlay under a previous planning scheme amendment. The site will be redeveloped as a residential precinct under these existing controls.
- Restricted access to conservation area will continue. Council will develop a masterplan for the Highett Grassy Woodland in 2021/22.
- Previous vegetation removal occurred prior to the current landowner when the site was commonwealth land, and Council was not the responsible authority at the time.
- Requirements for the Development Plan are set out in DPO2. The provisions contained in this planning control have already been gazetted and are therefore established policy. The proposal must comply with these requirements.

Stakeholders and community

This stakeholder assessment is a generalised understanding of sections of the community that have a connection to the project or matter. This information is used to understand the types of tools and techniques that will achieve the strongest and most effective outcomes for engagement and communication.

Impact: What level of change the stakeholder / community segment may experience as a result of the project / matter

Interest: What level of interest has been expressed or is anticipated

Influence: Reference to the IAP2 Spectrum

Stakeholder / community	Impact	Interest	Influence
Directly abutting residents	H	H	Consult
Tenants of commercial precinct	H	H	Consult
Surrounding residents	M	H	Consult
Highbett and Cheltenham (Pennydale) residents	M	H	Consult
Resident and community groups, including traders and environmental groups	M	H	Consult
Councillors and Local MP's	L	M	Inform
Government Authorities	L	M	Involve

Selected tools and techniques

The tools and techniques selected for this project are informed by the project content, stakeholders and type of feedback sought. The impact of COVID-19 may restrict our ability for face-to-face communication, as well as slower distribution of printed mail.

Key tools for communicating the project:

- Project signage on-site
- Statutory notification letters (posted 16 August 2021)
- Council's website and Have Your Say engagement website
- Website news stories
- Social media
- Contact with Council staff via Have Your Say Q&A forum, project email to planningstrategy@bayside.vic.gov.au, phone to 9599 4441 and bookable meetings
- Printed project information available at Corporate Centre


Key methods for gathering feedback

Written submissions via a submission form or document upload on Council's Have Your Say project website or emailed to planningstrategy@bayside.vic.gov.au. Posted or hand-delivered hard copy written statement submissions to Council's Corporate Centre will also be accepted.

Feedback must be received via a written submission to be considered as part of the statutory process of assessing the proposed Development Plan.

Project timelines

Submissions will be accepted from 16 August – 19 September. Council will consider feedback in its assessment of the proposed plan, and will decide whether to approve the plan in late 2021.



Decision-making process

Council will consider all submissions received during the consultation period prior to deciding whether to approve the proposed Development Plan.

Community feedback will be considered alongside technical reports and consultation with State Government.

In accordance with the statutory processes outlined in the Bayside Planning Scheme, no additional community engagement will occur for future planning permit processes for this site.

More information

For enquiries related to this project, please contact Council's Strategic Planning department via email planningstrategy@bayside.vic.gov.au or phone 03 9599 4441.

6.3 Online survey

Your level of support for the proposed Development Plan

Please indicate your level of support for the following attributes of the proposed Development Plan for the former CSIRO site at 37 Graham Road and 32 Middleton Street, Highett.


	Strongly support	Somewhat support	Neutral	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose
The scale, form, layout of buildings and the interface with adjoining properties	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mix of uses, dwelling types and internal amenity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Facilitation of affordable housing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Design of open space and landscaping/planting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Integration with surrounding area	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Location and components of community facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Access movement, traffic management, and parking layout	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Staging and management of construction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall level of support for the proposed Development Plan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Your written statement

☐ My submission is in regard to the proposed Development Plan for this former CSIRO site at 37 Graham Road and 32 Middleton Street in Highett Required

Your submission must include your reasons for holding that view and how you would be affected by the proposed Development Plan. This information will be used by Council to consider your submission.

Please upload your written statement here. Required

 Choose file...

Allowed file types: pdf,doc,docx,txt,xls,xlsx,rtf,png,gif,jpg,jpeg Size limit: 5.00 MB

Terms of submission: Written submissions are not confidential and may be incorporated or summarised (including your first and last name only) into a community engagement report and/or the agenda and minutes of any Council or Committee meeting at which the matter is considered.

☐ I have read and agree to the terms of submission Required

6.4 Submissions received

All written submissions received from 16 August to 15 October 2021 are included at Attachment 1 with identifying details removed.