

Amendment C220 Submissions

Submission No.	TRIM No.	Name	Stakeholder	Email	Precinct	Property Address (if relevant)	Submission Summary	Submission Position	Discussion	Recommended Change(s)
1	D17/194667	Saul Siritzky	Urbis	ssiritzky@urbis.com.au	Sub-Precinct 2D	378-380 Johnston Street, Abbotsford.	<p>Key Issue: Remove Mandatory Provisions</p> <p>The submission is supportive of the proposed rezoning of the land from the Commercial 2 Zone (C2Z) to the Commercial 1 Zone (C1Z) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will increase land use and development opportunities for both the site and broader Johnston Street area; • Current zoning is too restrictive; and • Rezoning the area will facilitate the rejuvenation and revitalisation of the area [as envisaged by the Johnston Street Local Area Plan (JSLAP)]. <p>Requests flexibility within the controls by removing mandatory requirements.</p>	Supportive with changes	<p>Mandatory provisions have been applied in locations where sensitive interfaces exist and/or where the character of the heritage streetscape is sought to be preserved and development that exceeds the requirements is considered to compromise either the character of the streetscape and/or the amenity of adjacent low-scale residential properties.</p> <p>The Johnston Street Local Area Plan (JSLAP) sets a preferred height limit of 6-7 storeys for Precinct 2. The site conditions have been further assessed through the more recent supporting document which identifies this section of Johnston Street as sub-precinct 2D.</p> <p>In Sub-precinct 2D a mandatory upper limit of 9 storeys is considered necessary to protect the amenity (in terms of visual impacts and outlook) of properties to the north.</p> <p>The recent trend has been for approvals of 6-8 storeys. Development above 9 storeys has a significant impact on the Johnston Street streetscape and amenity impacts (visual impacts) to low-scale residential properties to the north.</p> <p>The conditional authorisation for the amendment provides Council with the option of establishing an upper (mandatory) height limit which has been applied to manage amenity impacts for properties to the north (and south) of this section of Johnston Street.</p>	No recommended change.
2	D17/196382	Andrew Clarke	Matrix Planning	aclarke@matrixplanning.com.au	Sub-Precinct 1A (140A Johnston Street) 1B (95-97 Sackville Street)	140A Johnston Street, Collingwood and 95-97 Sackville Street, Collingwood	<p>Key Issue: Requiring commercial activity above ground floor in new buildings</p> <p>The submission is supportive of the Amendment based on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategically supported by the adopted JSLAP; • Change in zoning from C2Z to C1Z will provide greater choice of land use outcomes, including residential activity in area close to services and public transport. • Built form controls in DDO15 are reasonable and not complex. <p>The submission recommends that the Amendment is changed to <u>only</u> discourage residential uses at the ground floor of Johnston Street as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restricting residential development at first floor along Johnston Street is commercially unviable and threatens to constrain the increase in activity sought by the Amendment. • Sackville Street does not exhibit the same level of commercial character, through traffic and availability of public transport as Johnson Street. • Sackville Street is not a preferred location for retail or commercial activities and such activities are potentially likely to affect residential amenity. 	Supportive with changes	<p>Sackville Street currently accommodates low-scale commercial activity and the JSLAP envisions the area (Precinct 1) accommodating a more diverse mix of activities but also retaining an employment/commercial focus.</p> <p>The DDO requires new development to be <u>designed to accommodate</u> commercial activity at the lowest two levels of a building, as a discretionary requirement. Through the DDO and local policy, the amendment aims to encourage commercial use and development for the lower levels (ground and first floor) of new development and this is considered appropriate in a Commercial 1 Zone. It is not a mandatory requirement but should be a consideration for future permit applications under the proposed provisions.</p> <p>Council has engaged SGS Economics and Planning to undertake research to produce the (Draft) Yarra Spatial Economic and Employment Strategy (SEES). The report provides a comprehensive overview of the economic environment in which the City of Yarra sits within the broader metropolitan context of Melbourne. The SEES highlights the important role that commercial land plays in an evolving economy. Whilst the amendment facilitates a rezoning element to facilitate residential growth, the amendment also seeks to retain and expand on commercial opportunities.</p> <p>The research shows that there is increasing demand for office space within the inner city, beyond the CBD. Collingwood and Cremorne are emerging as two of Yarra's most important employment/commercial areas with a number of recently approved office applications in both areas, and there is a need to facilitate a diversity of office spaces for future demand.</p>	Minor change to wording within DDO noting that this applies to building design and <u>not</u> to land use.

Submission No.	TRIM No.	Name	Stakeholder	Email	Precinct	Property Address (if relevant)	Submission Summary	Submission Position	Discussion	Recommended Change(s)
3	D17/195309	Janet Taylor	Collingwood Historical Society	janettaylor@iinet.net.au	Sub-Precinct 1AA	Collingwood Arts Precinct – 35 Johnston Street, Collingwood	<p>Key Issues: Preservation of heritage character/fabric; building heights</p> <p>The submission supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Built form requirements, which will control development within the important heritage streetscape. Inclusion of heritage places in the HO between Hoddle St and the railway line. <p>The submission recommends that DDO15 is altered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define mid-rise as “5 to 7 storeys” and not “5 to 12 storeys,” as none of the building heights requirements extend to 12 storeys. The majority of places are a preferred maximum height of 6 or 7 storeys. Vary the setback from heritage buildings to 8m, as per the previous iteration of the DDO15. Include 23-33 Johnston St as part of 1A (not 1AA,) as per the original DDO15. The increase in from 23m to 28m not only affects the heritage streetscape (HO 324), but also overshadows the public open space of the Contemporary Arts Precinct. 	Supportive with Changes	<p>The term “mid-rise” is an urban design term that has been used to distinguish the envisaged scale of development from the ‘low rise’ scale of adjoining heritage and traditional residential neighbourhoods (1 to 3 storeys) and from the ‘high rise’ (12+ storeys) typical of the CBD. It refers <u>generally</u> to the overall scale of development for the area affected by the amendment. The height range is intended to provide an indication of what “mid-rise” means and does not mean that all development should automatically go up to the maximum height within that range. The proposed DDO specifies the heights that are appropriate in specific locations based on site context and hence, the identification of the various sub-precincts for the area based on site conditions/context.</p> <p>The previous DDO that was submitted for authorisation in May 2016, proposed a mandatory 8m setback for Individually significant buildings. Council received a conditional authorisation in March 2017 that required a comprehensive review of the proposed DDO and a scaling back of the mandatory provisions was required to comply with the authorisation. The adopted JSLAP specifies a 6m setback (for heritage buildings generally) and subsequent heritage advice confirms that this is an appropriate setback.</p> <p>In March this year, Amendment C237 was approved by the Minister for Planning, introducing an interim DDO to Johnston Street and redefining the height controls over 23-33 Johnston Street by making the maximum height mandatory and introducing a new Design Objective that identifies 35 Johnston Street as a state significant site.</p>	Change the height range to reflect the overall range of heights (5-10 storeys) proposed by the DDO.
4	D17/190333	Ilias Gouletsas	Land owner	ilias@gouletsas.com	Sub-Precinct 2A	272 Johnston Street, Abbotsford	<p>Key Issue: New Heritage Overlay</p> <p>The submission states that 272 Johnston St is the one of the owner’s main sources of income (rental income) and strongly opposes the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will devalue the property, as its use will be limited. Owner will gain nothing in return for the place’s inclusion in HO. Buildings in the HO precinct are dilapidated and the owners should be encouraged to extend, renovate or demolish and rebuild without needing to seek a planning permit. Facades of the buildings have no consistency / theme and are nothing special and as such, they should not be preserved. 	Objection	<p>The objection is noted and heritage issues will be resolved through the Panel process.</p> <p>The heritage qualities have been assessed by Context (heritage consultants) and found to comprise a number of contributory buildings that warrant the application of a precinct overlay, in addition to the recently applied overlays to individually significant buildings in this section of Johnston Street.</p> <p>The background report (Heritage Gap Study: Review of Johnston Street East, May 2016) by Context assesses the buildings between Hoddle Street and the railway bridge and supports the proposed Heritage Overlay.</p> <p>In response to one of the points, in accordance with the provisions of Clause 43.01 and Clause 22.02, property owners are allowed (and encouraged) to extend, renovate, refurbish heritage buildings and would be able to redevelop their property in accordance with the proposed DDO and current heritage policies.</p>	No recommended change other than re-classifying 270 Johnston Street to “Not Contributory” as it has been demolished in the absence of an HO and an older permit application that has allowed demolition.
5	D17/191799	Kate O’Neill	Grange Development Consulting	kate.oneill@grangedevelopment.com	Sub-Precinct 2D	400 Johnston Street, Abbotsford	<p>Key Issue: Requirements to exceed the preferred maximum height</p> <p>The submission is supportive of the proposed rezoning of the 400 Johnston St and adjoining land to C1Z and generally supports the introduction of the DDO to facilitate appropriate built form outcomes.</p> <p>The submission considers that the specific design requirements in DDO15 are too rigid as it necessitates that <i>all</i> the requirements be achieved to exceed preferred maximum high limit. The submission also considers that the design requirements do not allow a proponent to put forward an alternative solution for achieving net community benefit.</p> <p>The submission recommends a sixth design requirement: <i>“Or other design features or elements that deliver a net community benefit”</i></p>	Supportive with Changes	<p>The requirements have been assessed and are considered reasonable to achieve in total.</p> <p>The wording put forward in the submission is something that should be achieved in any permit application put forward to Council where the development requires a balance of competing objectives – e.g. enabling increased development and achieving preferred urban character. The wording does not preclude a proponent putting forward alternative solutions if they are in addition to those elements listed in the DDO.</p>	No recommended change.

Submission No.	TRIM No.	Name	Stakeholder	Email	Precinct	Property Address (if relevant)	Submission Summary	Submission Position	Discussion	Recommended Change(s)
							<i>benefit to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.”</i>			
6	D17/197272	Mark Naughton	Planning & Property Partners	naughton@pppartners.com.au	1AA	23-33 Johnston Street, Collingwood	<p>Key Issues: Objects to mandatory and preferred building heights</p> <p>The submission objects to C220 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council has not prepared C220 in compliance with the Minister for Planning’s conditional authorisation (dated 8 March 2017), insofar as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Exhibited C220 includes mandatory controls applying to sub-precinct 1AA; ○ There are no exceptional circumstances justifying the use of mandatory controls in sub-precinct 1AA; ○ Mandatory controls have not been demonstrated by Council to be “absolutely necessary” to prevent unacceptable built form outcomes in sub-precinct 1AA. • The preferred maximum height a sub-precinct 1AA does not go far enough in implementing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policy settings for Activity Centres in the State Planning Policy Framework; ○ Plan Melbourne 2017-2050; ○ Policy intent of DDO15, which allows for up to 12 storeys of building height; and ○ Strategic statements in the JSLAP. 	Objection	<p>The conditional authorisation letter suggests that there is an opportunity for Council to explore an upper limit to the preferred heights.</p> <p>It is not a “policy intent” of DDO15 to encourage development of twelve storeys throughout the centre. The DDO sets out a height range (mid-rise), and further specifies the appropriate heights for each sub-precinct, supported by the JSLAP, Appendix B and more recent analysis.</p> <p>Mandatory street wall heights and setbacks have been applied to heritage areas to ensure that the heritage streetscape is maintained as a prominent feature in the streetscape and to ensure that heritage buildings maintain their three dimensional form and are not overwhelmed by new upper level development. Mandatory street wall heights and setbacks also ensure that the preferred character of a prominent street wall with recessive upper levels is achieved.</p> <p>After exhibition of the Amendment, Amendment C237 was gazetted in February, 2018. The interim DDO was modified by the Minister and applied a mandatory height limit to the site, on the basis that it is neighbouring a state significant site and to protect the site at 35 Johnston Street from overshadowing and other impacts from any future development at 23-33 Johnston Street.</p>	See changes related to Submission 20 and the adoption of changes made via Amendment C237.
7	D17/200394	Timothy Neilson	Land owner	timdneilson@bigpond.com	Sub-Precinct 2E	54 Stafford Street, Abbotsford	<p>Key Issues: Objects to excessive building heights and the potential for inappropriate development</p> <p>Submission objects to C220 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the south side of Johnston Street were developed to the heights, and with the setbacks, proposed, 54 Stafford St and other properties on the north side of Stafford St would be permanently in shadow for weeks in the depths of winter. • It is not reasonable to exercise planning powers to compel residents to live in darkness for weeks on end at the coldest and darkest time of the year. <p>Submission also notes that that 54 Stafford St is in a HO and effectively cannot be developed above two storeys.</p>	Objection	<p>The ResCode standards in the Planning Scheme for overshadowing of private open space are measured at the equinox (22 September) only and not winter. The building height and rear interface requirements have been developed with regard to minimising overshadowing of private open space at the equinox.</p> <p>A key objective of the DDO is to “to ensure that the overall scale and form of new buildings is mid-rise (5 to 10 storeys) and provides a suitable transition to low scale residential areas, protecting surrounding residential properties from unreasonable loss of amenity through visual bulk, overlooking and overshadowing”. The extent to which the proposed development meets this objective will inform the approval of a planning permit.</p> <p>The proposed DDO sets stricter parameters where height limits are currently not specified in the Yarra Planning Scheme, as well as applying rear interface requirements to reduce visual bulk and overshadowing.</p> <p>In the absence of height limits along Johnston Street, and being within a Commercial 1 Zone there is currently the potential for larger scale proposals to be received by Council and the DDO will more effectively manage development proposals and outcomes.</p>	No recommended change
8	D17/200661	Catherine Hales, Patrick Guinness and Brendan Hales	Land owners	cathy.hales@iinet.net.au brendan.hales@gmail.com patrick.guinness@anu.edu.au	Sub-Precinct 2A	248 Johnston Street, Abbotsford	<p>Key Issues: Heritage concerns (issues not covered in amendment)</p> <p>The submission supports the intent of the Amendment to preserve the Victorian and Edwardian era heritage of Johnston Street.</p> <p>The submission recommends the following changes to the Amendment, to ensure that the structural integrity of the heritage buildings is maintained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the preferred maximum building height for Sub-Precinct 2A [21m (with basement car parking)]; and • Update the Amendment to prevent disturbance of sub-soils in Sub-Precinct 2A, possibly making alternative options available for the provisions of car parking to minimise the potential for disruptive 	Supportive with changes	<p>The amendment and DDO do not require that proposals provide basement car parking. The impact of any proposed car parking on the heritage place would be considered against the provisions of the Heritage Overlay and Clause 22.02. Entries from Johnston Street are strongly discouraged and would generally be unachievable for heritage frontages.</p> <p>Fortunately, the properties have rear access from a laneway and new development can consider alternative options for the provision of car parking such as reduced parking rates or car stackers, in accordance with the provisions of the planning scheme.</p>	No recommended change

Submission No.	TRIM No.	Name	Stakeholder	Email	Precinct	Property Address (if relevant)	Submission Summary	Submission Position	Discussion	Recommended Change(s)
							excavation works. The submission also requests that, if the above unachievable, Council should not apply the HO to Sub-Precinct 2A.			
9	D17/200735	Kon Koulouris	Resident	konkoulouris@hotmail.com	Sub-Precinct 2F	329, 329A Johnson Street Abbotsford, 37 Hunter Street Abbotsford and 236 Nicholson Street Abbotsford	<p>Key Issues: Design requirements within DDO specific to 329 Johnston Street</p> <p>The Submission seeks clarification on the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How C220 is to apply to any corner or island sites. For example, how will C220 apply to the property at 329, 329A Johnson Street Abbotsford (zoned Commercial Zone 2) together with 37 Hunter Street Abbotsford and 236 Nicholson Street Abbotsford (zoned Residential 2)? Why is C220 silent as to what the height wall should be in Nicholson Street and Hunter Streets? Is it proposed that the ratio of 1:1 be applied to the height of the street wall façade in these streets with upper levels to be set back at an angle of 45 degrees? If Hunter Street is 9 meters wide will C220 mandate that the maximum street wall façade facing Hunter Street be 9 meters so as to safeguard against an unreasonable sense of enclosure? Will C220 strictly apply to commercially zoned portion of the proposed development and not to the portion of the development zoned residential? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i.e. would a developer be forced to taper the building from its highest point to 8 metres on the boundary between the former car yard and the properties that it has acquired at 37 Hunter Street Abbotsford and 236 Nicholson Street Abbotsford? 	Neutral	<p>The submission poses a number of design-related questions in terms of how the DDO would affect this site (which has a current planning permit).</p> <p>The key issues raised relate to street-wall for corner sites and the application of 45 degree envelope. The questions posed are answered below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> C220 applies to this site as it would to any other site whereby the 45 degree envelope applies to the frontage of Johnston Street. Although the site is irregular in shape, the street-wall requirement and setback requirements still apply. The DDO is not being applied to residentially zoned land. The exhibited DDO specifies a street-wall height generally applicable along side streets, consistent with those along Johnston Street A 1:1 ratio has not been applied in terms of either street-wall or overall height. As above. The DDO only applies to land either currently, or proposed to be rezoned to, Commercial 1 Zone. The amendment (particularly the DDO) applies to the area as indicated by the exhibited maps. There is no scope to apply the controls beyond the area to which it is proposed to apply. The provisions of the General Residential Zone (Schedule 2) apply to the properties to the south. 	Provide more specific guidelines in the proposed DDO for corner sites.
10	D17/201613	Paul Kniest	Resident	pknjest@nteu.org.au	All Precincts	n/a	<p>Key Issues: General concerns about application of planning scheme provisions – not specifically related to proposed provisions</p> <p>The submission generally supports the Amendment, including the use of the 45 degree setback envelope contained in DDO15, as the existing planning framework for Johnston Street is overly convoluted.</p> <p>The submission states that Council should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop user friendly resources to help developers and resident appreciate the critical parameters of the planning framework. Provide a page summary outlining some of the critical aspects of the planning envelope that applies to different sites. Strongly support and uphold the new planning controls, once approved as Council has history of disregarding its own policies and plans at VCAT. 	Supportive	<p>Supportive with changes but not to the amendment but administrative suggestions to enforce the new planning control.</p> <p>Council's stat planning department are obliged to apply the provisions of the DDO to all permit applications, once the amendment is approved (in the form that it is approved).</p>	No recommended change.
11	D17/201627	Ashley Pirovich	Pirovich Developments	as@pirovich.com	Sub-Precinct 2F	329 Johnston Street, Abbotsford 236 Nicholson Street, Abbotsford 37 Hunter Street, Abbotsford	<p>Key Issues: Site specific request to rezone/consolidate other properties into C1Z; Objects to Sub-precinct allocation and 45 degree requirement</p> <p>The submission is supportive of the rezoning of No. 329 Johnston St to the C1Z and also seeks for 236 Nicholson St and 37 Hunter St to be rezoned from General Residential Zone (GRZ) to C1Z for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the above sites are within single ownership. If rezoned, the whole landholding can efficiently redeveloped (appropriate to the role and function of the activity centre) and will become available for a wide range of uses in accordance with provisions of the zone. <p>The submission also recommends the following changes to the specific design requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend phrase "<i>the proposal will achieve each of the following</i>" to 	Supportive with changes	<p>The amendment is not proposing to rezone the properties currently within the GRZ and until this time, Council has not received a request to do so. A permit application has been assessed and approved under the current zoning.</p> <p>The Commercial 1 Zone generally applies to the land fronting Johnston Street which has an established commercial role. The purpose of rezoning sites from the Commercial 2 Zone, and sites that are General Residential Zone fronting Johnston Street, is to enable an appropriate mix of commercial and upper levels of residential, as well as an appropriate scale of development to a Neighbourhood Centre like Johnston Street. This is not appropriate in the established low-scale residential areas which the JSLAP aims to protect.</p> <p>The 45 degree envelope provides a specific (measurable)</p>	No recommended change.

Submission No.	TRIM No.	Name	Stakeholder	Email	Precinct	Property Address (if relevant)	Submission Summary	Submission Position	Discussion	Recommended Change(s)
							<p>read, "the proposal can achieve specific benefits, such as".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete the fourth dot point as "minimal" is not a quantifiable measure of amenity impacts and will cause confusion. <p>The submission objects to the inclusion of the site at 329 Johnston St in Sub-Precinct 2F and the application of mandatory requirements, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landholding is one of the largest in the Johnston Street area, which provides a unique redevelopment opportunity. Landholding can accommodate larger heights and smaller setbacks without affecting residential amenity or compromising the character of any of the streetscapes. Landholding does not abut sensitive interfaces. JSLAP 2015 nominates a preferred height of 6-7 storeys or 23 metres for this part of Johnston Street while DDO15 nominates a mandatory height of 21 metres. <p>The submission also objects to the 45 degree setback envelope as prescribed in DDO15 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amenity impacts can be managed without the need to conform to a 45 degree angle measurement. Blanket approach to all designs, and does not allow for design variation for individual site circumstances and interfaces. Upper level 45 degree setback envelope is a departure from JSLAP 2015. 		<p>requirement that implements what the JSLAP refers to in terms of "transition" to lower scale residential properties (sensitive interfaces) as well as achieving visual recessiveness for upper levels along the main streetscape.</p> <p>The 45 degree setback is not considered a departure from the JSLAP as it builds on the following built form objectives found within the JSLAP and further illustrated in Appendix B of the JSLAP (pages 19-21):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid overshadowing the southern footpath between 10am and 2pm at the equinox. Upper levels should be setback appropriately and be visually recessive in the streetscape. Taller building should minimise off site impacts and be recessive in design in respect to the street wall façade. Design of new higher development should be recessive and compliment the heritage fabric. Heritage facades should dominate streetscape views. Provide a scale transition where new development is adjacent to fine grained residential areas. 	
12	D17/203286	Gillian Menegas	VicRoads	Gillian.Menegas@roads.vic.gov.au	All Precincts	n/a	<p>Key Issue: Inclusion of a VicRoads road in mapping</p> <p>The submission objects to the Amendment, as it requires VicRoads to apply for planning permits to undertake routine works and maintenance to the road reserve of Johnston Street.</p> <p>VicRoads recommends the following changes to the Amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alter the alignment of HO and DD15 so that they no longer applied to the arterial road reserve width of the exception of the Railway Bridge which has identified heritage significance; and / or Modify the provisions, overlay or schedules to provide planning permit exemptions to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> crossovers roadworks other than traffic signals or signs; bicycle paths and trails; and maintenance, which changes the appearance of the heritage place or use different materials to the existing conditions. 	Objection	The submission from VicRoads is noted and maps will be amended to exclude road reserve.	Change Zone and HO maps to exclude road reserve.
13	D17/203349	Kellie Burns	SJB Planning	kburns@sjbplanning.com.au	N/a	436-438 Johnston Street, Abbotsford	<p>Key Issues: Rezoning Request</p> <p>The submission seeks to include 436-438 Johnston St in the proposed rezoning from C2Z to C1Z for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 436-438 Johnston Street's major frontage presentation is to Johnston Street; Site has been redeveloped for the purposes of an office building therefore its economic vitality of the activity centre is assured without needing the limitations of the C2Z to control land use; All properties within Trenerry Crescent have, or are in the process of being rezoned to the C1Z. Maintaining the eastern properties within the C2Z, is not reflective of the evolution of the Johnston Street area, nor of the Council's strategic planning for this centre, which is otherwise providing for the rezoning of all other surrounding commercial land to the Commercial 1 Zone. 	Supportive with changes	<p>Council has engaged SGS Economics and Planning to undertake research to produce the (Draft) Yarra Spatial Economic and Employment Strategy (SEES). The report provides a comprehensive overview of the economic environment in which the City of Yarra sits within the broader metropolitan context of Melbourne. The SEES highlights the important role that commercial land plays in an evolving economy. Whilst the amendment facilitates a rezoning element to facilitate residential growth, the amendment also seeks to retain and expand on commercial opportunities.</p> <p>Whilst the majority of properties are being rezoned to the Commercial 1 Zone, there are two large sites at the eastern end of Johnston Street that operate successfully under the Commercial 2 Zone and it is the intention that it remains that way. The SEES recommends that the sites remain within the Commercial 2 Zone.</p> <p>The properties at the eastern end of Johnston Street are not included in Amendment C220. The property in question is currently an office building, recently constructed (2008-10). Rezoning is not required at this point in time.</p>	No recommended change.
14	D17/203354	Malcolm Jack and	Land owners	mcjack@bigpond.	Sub-Precinct 2D	424 Johnston Street,	<p>Key Issues: Objects to building heights (generally); requests a different sub-precinct (2C)</p>	Supportive with	The majority of properties in Sub-Precinct 2D have the same characteristics and do not share the same circumstances as 2C	No recommended change.

Submission No.	TRIM No.	Name	Stakeholder	Email	Precinct	Property Address (if relevant)	Submission Summary	Submission Position	Discussion	Recommended Change(s)
		Carrolyn Jack		net.au ianjack3000@gmail.com ejack@taias.com		Abbotsford	<p>The submission is supportive of the proposed rezoning of 424 Johnston St to C1Z, as the rezoning will facilitate the best use of the site.</p> <p>The submission requests that the Amendment be changed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove requirements for building heights or setbacks for Sub-Precinct 2D and part of Sub-Precinct 2C on the north side of Johnston St, and that Table 1 be revised to reflect this. <p>Should Council not support the above, the submission requests that 422-430 Johnston St be removed from Sub-Precinct 2D and included in Sub-Precinct 2C. Sub-Precinct 2C and 424 Johnston Street, Abbotsford are sufficiently similar characteristics to warrant the height limits and setbacks being the same.</p>	changes	which has less sensitive interfaces to the north, and the properties on the south side are considerably deeper lots, with an approved permit at 247-259 Johnston Street.	
15	D17/204888	Brendon Pang	SJB Planning	bpang@sjbplanning.com.au	Sub - Precinct 1A (166-168 and 174-176 Street) Sub- Precinct 1B (121 Sackville Street)	166-168, 174-176 Johnston Street and 121 Sackville Street, Collingwood	<p>Key Issues: Mandatory Provisions (street-wall and setback)</p> <p>The submission supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning 166-168, 174-176 Johnston, and 121 Sackville Streets to Commercial 1 Zone, as it is consistent with the directions of State Planning Policy and Plan Melbourne 2017-2050. Discretionary building heights, street-wall heights, and minimum upper level setbacks of Precinct 1B. <p>The submission recommends removing the mandatory building and street wall heights and setback requirements of Precinct 1A to allow for contextual design opportunities, better responding to State and Local policy.</p>	Supportive with changes	<p>The mandatory provisions relating to Sub-precinct 1A relate to the required setback behind the heritage street-wall and the street-wall height for infill sites and are considered appropriate.</p> <p>The purpose of the mandatory street-wall height (11m) is to maintain the scale of development at the street edge to preserve the heritage character of the streetscape. This mandatory height is taller than any heritage parapet and it is preferred that new development matches the street-wall height of any neighbouring two storey parapet/façade, as well as being designed to blend into the streetscape.</p> <p>The mandatory 6m setback is also required to preserve the prominence of the heritage streetscape by pushing new development back from the street edge, reducing the visual impact of upper levels.</p> <p>State and local planning policies also seek to preserve the integrity of heritage place</p>	No recommended change.
16	D17/204665	Tony Wang	Urban Planning Mediation	urbanplanningmediation@hotmail.com	Sub - Precinct 1A	8-10 Johnston Street, Collingwood	<p>Key Issues: Rezoning Request</p> <p>The submission supports rezoning 8-10 Johnston St to C1Z and seeks for Council to also rezone sites to the rear (north) of the site, fronting Sackville Street, to C1Z for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no planning reason why the southern side of Sackville is not included as part of the proposed changes as the immediate interface to the north are non-sensitive commercial properties. There is also no strategic basis for splitting the block with an artificial mid-block. Current rezoning proposal does not encourage future consolidation of land for improved planning outcomes and more comprehensive developments options. 	Supportive with Changes	<p>Council has engaged SGS Economics and Planning to undertake research to produce the (Draft) Yarra Spatial Economic and Employment Strategy (SEES). The report provides a comprehensive overview of the economic environment in which the City of Yarra sits within the broader metropolitan context of Melbourne. The SEES highlights the important role that commercial land plays in an evolving economy. Whilst the amendment facilitates a rezoning element to facilitate residential growth, the amendment also seeks to retain and expand on commercial opportunities.</p> <p>The properties to the north, that have a frontage to Sackville Street, are a part of the broader "Easey Street Precinct" which is a viable commercial precinct and one which Council seeks to retain for future commercial activity..</p> <p>The Easey Street Precinct functions as a viable commercial precinct and the activities occurring along Johnston Street are considered separate to that activity. It is logical to retain as much of the economic component of this precinct as possible. The SEES recognises the importance of the Easey Street Precinct in providing commercially zoned land for future commercial activity.</p>	No recommended change.

Submission No.	TRIM No.	Name	Stakeholder	Email	Precinct	Property Address (if relevant)	Submission Summary	Submission Position	Discussion	Recommended Change(s)
17	D17/204666	Luke Chamberlain	Tract Consultants	LChamberlain@tract.net.au	Sub - Precinct 2A	.398 Johnston Street, Abbotsford	<p>Key Issues: Side setbacks; 45 degree requirement</p> <p>The Submission supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning 398 Johnston Street, Abbotsford from C2Z to C1Z, as it will encourage diverse mix use development. Preferred build height requirement of 7 storeys (24m) with a 9 storey (31m) mandatory limit on sites able to accommodate upper levels setbacks. <p>The Submission recommends that the Supporting Document (October 2017) is corrected to identify 398 Johnston Street, Abbotsford as having a frontage of 10m (not less than 10m).</p> <p>The submission does not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upper level side setbacks as it would render many sites in this precinct incapable of viable development above street wall. Application of the 45-degree setback envelope, particularly at the Johnston Street interface as it is not based on sound principles and is inflexible. The 45-degree setback envelope should be removed and replaced with broader performance-based objectives. 	Supportive with changes	<p>The (discretionary) upper level side setback requirement is triggered when a window to either a habitable or non-habitable room is proposed.</p> <p>Due to the north-south (narrow) orientation of the blocks in this sub-precinct, it is possible for apartments to have either a northern or southern outlook and due to the development potential of other sites, potentially undesirable to locate windows on side walls.</p> <p>The 45 degree requirement above the street wall reduces the impacts of taller development on the streetscape through visually recessive development and ensures that the street wall is a dominant feature of the streetscape as envisioned in the JSLAP. It also helps to achieve solar access to the southern footpath of Johnston Street,</p> <p>It is a sound and necessary requirement to achieve these outcomes that is supported by an urban design expert from Ethos Urban and is a requirement in other DDOs in Melbourne, and indeed overseas, to achieve good urban design and built form outcomes. As it is a discretionary requirement it is not considered to be inflexible.</p>	No recommended change.
18	D17/204731	Jason Black	Insight Planning Consultants	admin@insightplanning.com.au	Sub-Precincts 1A and 1AA	40 Johnston Street, Collingwood & 35-37 Sackville Street, Collingwood	<p>Key Issues: Rezoning Request</p> <p>Submission is supportive of the intent of the JSLAP.</p> <p>The submission recommends the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the Precinct 1 boundary to include all of Sackville Street. Rezone Sackville Street to C1Z so that development in the area can be maximised. Amend the Supporting Document (October 2017) and DDO15 to remove all preferred and mandatory heights. Council undertake an assessment of ownership on all properties within Precinct 1. Include large landholdings in precincts that allow for more intensive redevelopment (such as Sub-Precinct 1AA). Amend Supporting Document (October 2017) and DDO15 to allow for alternate development scenarios where there are non-sensitive land uses opposite a site and where there is no heritage building located along Johnston Street. 	Supportive with changes	<p>Council has engaged SGS Economics and Planning to undertake research to produce the (Draft) Yarra Spatial Economic and Employment Strategy (SEES). The report provides a comprehensive overview of the economic environment in which the City of Yarra sits within the broader metropolitan context of Melbourne. The SEES highlights the important role that commercial land plays in an evolving economy. Whilst the amendment facilitates a rezoning element to facilitate residential growth, the amendment also seeks to retain and expand on commercial opportunities.</p> <p>The reference to the BILS (Business and Industrial Land Strategy) is worth considering in terms of the timing of the adoption of the BILS (2012) as the JSLAP was being drafted and the original intent of the JSLAP which primarily sought to create a plan that gave direction to how Johnston Street should evolve as an activity centre, once the designated areas of C2Z were rezoned to C1Z (which was previously Business 3 being rezoned to Business 1, with the zones having a different emphasis on retail activity and shops at that time).</p> <p>The rationale for the boundary between Precinct 1 and Precinct 5 within the JSLAP can be found at page 29 of the BILS, where it states:</p> <p><i>“The interface with CIB 2 precinct west of Wellington Street may involve conflicts between future housing and industry. The future zone/precinct boundary could be the property boundaries midway between Sackville and Johnston Streets rather than Sackville Street.”</i></p> <p>This logic was also expressed in the “Yarra Industrial and Business Land Strategy Review” (2004) which stated:</p> <p><i>Between Smith Street and Wellington Street a more extensive concentration of business uses exist to the north of Johnston Street, extending through to Keele Street. It is not the intention to introduce the opportunity for residential uses into this precinct.</i></p> <p><i>Accordingly between Smith Street and Wellington Street, any rezoning to Business 1 should only apply to properties fronting Johnston Street, and should not extend through to Sackville Street.</i></p>	No recommended change.

Submission No.	TRIM No.	Name	Stakeholder	Email	Precinct	Property Address (if relevant)	Submission Summary	Submission Position	Discussion	Recommended Change(s)
									<p>The JSLAP adopted this rationale/approach as the basis for the rezoning of Johnston Street in order to activate the activity centre whilst retaining the commercial precinct to the north.</p> <p>The Easey Street Precinct functions as a viable commercial precinct and the activities occurring along Johnston Street are considered separate to that activity. It is logical to retain as much of the economic component of this precinct as possible.</p> <p>The SEES recognises the importance of the Easey Street Precinct in providing commercially zoned land for future commercial activity.</p>	
19	D17/204737	Anthony De Luca	DPG	anthony@dpgcorp.com.au	Sub-Precinct 1AA	196-202 Johnston Street, Collingwood	<p>Key Issues: Mandatory provisions; 45 degree requirement</p> <p>The submission is generally supportive of the Amendment and rezoning 196-202 Johnston Street, Abbotsford to C1Z.</p> <p>The submission objects to the following aspects of the Amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of mandatory built form controls of any kind. Built form controls should provide design flexibility to ensure optimum development outcomes can be achieved. • Application of a 45 degree setback envelope for new developments on sites with a north south orientation, including 196-202 Johnston Street, Abbotsford as there is little strategic justification for the uses of this principle and it precludes site-specific innovative design. 	Supportive with changes	<p>Mandatory controls have been applied in circumstances where an unacceptable built form outcome could occur as a result of lesser setbacks or greater building height than the mandatory provision specifies. Protection of the heritage streetscape is one such circumstance.</p> <p>The 45 degree (discretionary) requirement above the street wall reduces the impacts of taller development on the streetscape through visually recessive development and ensures that the street wall is a dominant feature of the streetscape as envisioned in the JSLAP. It also helps to achieve solar access to the southern footpath of Johnston Street.</p> <p>It is a sound and necessary requirement to achieve these outcomes that is supported by an urban design expert from Ethos Urban and is a requirement in other DDOs in Melbourne, and indeed overseas, to achieve good urban design and built form outcomes. As it is a discretionary requirement it is not considered to be inflexible.</p>	No recommended change.
20	D17/204937	Ben Daly	Tract Consultants	BDaly@tract.net.au	Sub-Precinct 1AA	Collingwood Arts Precinct – 35 Johnston Street, Collingwood	<p>Key Issues: Seeks specific protection for 35 Johnston Street</p> <p>The submission is generally supportive of the Amendment and commends the Council’s initiative to apply built form controls to Johnston Street.</p> <p>The Submission recommends the followings change to the Amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend the Supporting Document (October 2017) to reflect the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Site is actually zoned to SUZ6 21 July 2017 not MUZ at noted on pg. 12. ○ SUZ6 can accommodate accommodation and as such is not a “non-sensitive commercial (or other) interface” (pg. 17). ○ Susceptibility of the site’s open space to be overshadowed. ○ Acknowledgment of 67-71 Johnston Street’s interface with the Collingwood Arts Precinct and its potential to overshadow the ‘shared zone’ access point into 35 Johnston Street, Collingwood. • Amend DDO15 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Expand the ‘Overshadowing and Solar Access’ section to include the following paragraph: <i>Development in Sub-Precinct Sub-Precincts 1AA and 1 should be designed to ensure no additional overshadowing of 35 Johnston Street measured from 10am to 2pm at the equinox (september22).</i> ○ Reconsider the heights proposed in DDO15 for Sub-Precinct 1A and 1AA as they apply to 67-71 Johnston Street and 23-33 Johnston Street respectively to protect the sites outdoor space from overshadowing. • Amend the Local Areas Policy to include the following edit (in bold): <i>“Foster and support education, arts and community based activities at 35 Johnston Street (Collingwood Arts Precinct)</i> 	Supportive with changes	<p>The submission requests changes to the amendment that specifically seek to protect outdoor areas on the CAP site from loss of amenity through overshadowing. The site was (as correctly pointed out) rezoned to the Special Use Zone through (GLSAC) process in 2017.</p> <p>Whilst the Special Use Zone makes reference to a Masterplan being created for the site, one hasn’t yet been created. Therefore, it is difficult to assess which parts of the site have importance in terms of outdoor areas and whether these areas have a need to be protected or not.</p> <p>Amendment C237 has brought in an interim control (DDO15) that applies a mandatory height limit for the site and includes new design objective within the DDO that addresses the concerns raise in the submission.</p>	<p>Modify background document to correct error on zone map (was taken from original work on JSLAP)</p> <p>Adopt the changes made via Amendment C237 by the Minister for Planning for 23-33 Johnston Street, recognising the state significant role of 35 Johnston Street.</p> <p><u>The changes brought in by Amendment C237 include:</u></p> <p>Application of a mandatory height limit to 23-33 Johnston Street; and an additional Design Objective recognising the state significance of the site and to protect the future use and operation of the site as an arts precinct.</p>

Submission No.	TRIM No.	Name	Stakeholder	Email	Precinct	Property Address (if relevant)	Submission Summary	Submission Position	Discussion	Recommended Change(s)
							<i>including through the protection of its outdoor space from any additional overshadowing."</i>			
21	D17/205020	Ken Cronin	Land Owner	k.s.cronin@gmail.com	All precincts	n/a	<p>Key Issues: Housing diversity</p> <p>The submission is generally supportive of the Amendment.</p> <p>The submission notes that the Amendment calls for mixed housing to suit a variety of needs but fails to set any specific guidelines. The submission recommends there be guidelines on the number of each bedroom type with an emphasis on dwellings that can support families living in the area.</p>	Supportive with changes	<p>The wording of the DDO requires that developments which exceed the preferred maximum building height provide for a diversity of housing, including families.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to specify (within the DDO or local policy at Clause 21.12) specific percentages or numbers of dwellings of specific sizes, or bedroom numbers. This is not current practice in Victoria and will require updating should housing needs change.</p>	No recommended change.
22	D17/204417	Vu Nguyen	K7 Developments Pty Ltd	vnguyen@asiapacificlawyers.com.au	Sub -Precinct 2D	288 - 296 Johnston Street Collingwood	<p>Key Issues: Objects to mandatory building height and allocation into sub-precinct 2D; 45 degree requirement</p> <p>The submission objects to the Amendment stating that DDO15 provisions are based on a flawed interface analysis and lack strategic justification.</p> <p>The submission objects to the following aspects of the Amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of the 288 - 296 Johnston Street Collingwood from the Activity Node (as outlined in the JSLAP) and its relocation to Precinct 2D. Given the C1Z of the land to the north, and the proximity of the subject site to the Railway Station there is no strategic justification to remove the subject site from the Activity Node; Application of mandatory built form controls including the proposed mandatory maximum building height of 31 metres and the mandatory maximum street wall height of 18 metres; Upper level 45 degree setback envelope requirement; Absence of transitional provisions in draft DDO15 to protect current planning permit applications. <p>The submission also notes that a planning permit application to develop land at 288 - 296 Johnston Street Collingwood is currently being assessed by Council. The submission notes that it would not be fair to approve the DDO15 in its current form given the planning permit application was prepared in accordance with the existing provisions (with guidance provided by the adopted JSLAP) and the significant investment associated with the acquisition of 296 Johnston Street Collingwood.</p>	Objection	<p>The rationale for the departure from the JSLAP was based on how proponents would then interpret a height limit stated as 8-10 storeys, which was then interpreted as a preferred overall ten storey maximum height limit in the DDO. As evidenced by a more recent permit application for 288-296 Johnston Street for a 12 storey building, a preferred maximum height limit is usually interpreted by proponents as a starting point, rather than a height limit.</p> <p>It was considered that the site could be inserted into sub-precinct 2D because it shared similar characteristics with the rest of 2D and the site (which consist of two properties) has an existing permit for an 8 storey development. Upon review, and considering that the JSLAP identifies the two properties as within a distinct precinct referred to as "Victoria Park Station Activity Node", it is logical to include the sites in 2C as requested in the submission.</p> <p>Building height and amenity impacts are addressed through various requirements within the DDO. This includes the mandatory street wall height and preferred setbacks within a 45 degree envelope which will reduce the visual impact of upper levels as well as overshadowing impacts on the southern footpath.</p> <p>Transitional provisions were considered for the interim DDO (Amendment C237) but based on advice from DELWP as well as the delayed authorisation for Amendment C220, it was considered that built form controls were well overdue for Johnston Street. As the interim DDO15 has been approved it cannot be considered as part of Amendment C220.</p>	Place 288-296 Johnston Street into sub-precinct 2C as originally identified in the JSLAP
23	D17/203535	Mathew Furness	Message Consultants Australia	mathew@messageconsultants.com	Sub-Precincts 1A, 1AA and 1B.	220, 222 and 222A Johnston Street, 153-155 and 165 Sackville Street, Collingwood	<p>Key Issues: Site specific response required for the submitter's collection of properties forming a large site.</p> <p>The Submission supports The proposed rezoning of 220, 222 and 222A Johnston Street, 153-155 and 165 Sackville Street, Collingwood to the C1Z and the intent of DDO15.</p> <p>The submission recommends the following changes to DDO15 :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include whole landholding within a single sub-precinct rather than a mix of Sub-Precincts (1A, 1AA and 1B),to encourage/facilitate a coherent and comprehensive built form outcome for the area and avoid a compromised design response. Make the building height requirement for the landholding reflect the upper level of the 5-12 storey range referenced in the DDO15 design objectives, given the suitability of the landholding for a taller building. Remove mandatory street wall height, as it is preferable for there to be some flexibility to depart from a preferred street wall height where the site context, design response and land use requirements support this. Exempt the landholding from the 45-degree setback envelope requirement, at least as it relates to the Johnston Street frontage. 	supportive with changes	<p>It is acknowledged that the consolidation of a number of various sized parcels makes up a significant redevelopment opportunity for the corner of Johnston, Sackville and Hoddle Streets. For this reason, the site was appropriately designated as Sub-precinct 1AA with a preferred height limit of 8 storeys.</p> <p>However, future development of the site should be considered in the broader context of Johnston Street and how the street could develop over time and the preferred future character of the street that sees it retaining the prominence of the heritage streetscape, accommodating upper level development that is visually recessive in design.</p>	Place the identified parcels in the submission into Sub-precinct 1AA). Verify land ownership of all parcels as submission seems to incorrectly identify one parcel that is potentially owned by VicRoads.

Submission No.	TRIM No.	Name	Stakeholder	Email	Precinct	Property Address (if relevant)	Submission Summary	Submission Position	Discussion	Recommended Change(s)
							Application of the 45-degree envelope to the landholding is likely to undermine the built form response to Hoddle Street and ignores the potential for a building to include upper level elements which 'hold the corner' at the Johnston Street and Hoddle Street intersection.			
24	D17/204504	Melissa and Tim Fitzgerald	Land Owners	mf.perrystreet@gmail.com	All Precincts	13 Perry Street in Collingwood	<p>Key Issues: Building heights; housing diversity</p> <p>The submission supports the height limitations proposed by the JSLAP, which will provide a good balance between the desirable developments of under-utilised sites.</p> <p>The submission notes that the western end of the Amendment sits at the top of a rise, making tall buildings in this location have an even greater actual height and therefore greater amenity impacts (including visual bulk and overshadowing), particularly for their down-hill side neighbours. The Submission recommends that topography should be considered when considering height limits within the precinct.</p> <p>The Submission also notes that what constitutes an acceptable amount of "housing for diverse household types" and "additional amenity impacts to residentially zoned properties" (as outlined in the specific design requirements of DDO15) is open to interpretation by developers.</p>	Supportive with changes	<p>New development that is located on the sloped part of Johnston Street towards Smith Street will appear more prominent from some viewpoints, notably to the east. The slope of the land north south is less significant and so the amenity impacts on neighbouring residential properties will be not be sufficiently greater that specific controls are required</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to specify (within the DDO or local policy at Clause 21.12) specific percentages or numbers of dwellings of specific sizes, or bedroom numbers. This is not current practice in Victoria and will require updating should housing needs change.</p>	No recommended change.
25	D17/204503	Daniel Stevens	Zero Nine Pty Ltd / land owner	daniel@zeronine.com.au	Sub-Precinct 1D	105-107 Johnston Street, Collingwood	<p>Key Issues: Objects to a number of requirements within DDO</p> <p>The submission objects to aspects of the amendment including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed 45 degree upper level setbacks, as it is not suitable in this context. Proposed "building separation", side wall setbacks of 4.5m, 3.0m and mid-point of laneways, as it is not suitable in this context. Proposed "overshadow and solar access" detailed requirements in relation to the Southern alignment of Johnston Street, as it is not suitable in this context. Proposed "building height and setbacks" as it is not a suitable requirement in this context. 	Objection	<p>The submission provides no reasons for the objections other than to say it is not suitable in this context. All of the requirements within the DDO are based on analysis of the context and conditions of Johnston Street, which has a variety of site conditions, strong heritage character (west of the rail bridge) and an east-west orientation/alignment with the potential for overshadowing of southern footpaths from new development on the northern side of the street.</p> <p>The 45 degree (discretionary) requirement above the street wall reduces the impacts of taller development on the streetscape through visually recessive development and ensures that the street wall is a dominant feature of the streetscape as envisioned in the JSLAP. It also helps to achieve solar access to the southern footpath of Johnston Street.</p> <p>The requirements for building separation are dependent on whether windows to habitable rooms are proposed on common boundaries and are also driven by the need for equitable development opportunities from site to site.</p> <p>Southern side footpaths are an important component of the public realm as solar access is received throughout the year (currently). Taller development will inevitably reduce the amount of solar access during winter months and restricting the amount of overshadowing to the September equinox is a common measure to reduce the overall impact of taller buildings.</p> <p>Maximum building heights and minimum setbacks have been based on rigorous analysis and are either discretionary or mandatory depending on the context of the sub-precinct and the presence of sensitive interfaces. The overall mid-rise character that is envisaged for Johnston Street is based on analysis of lot sizes, street-width, amenity impacts and past and present permit applications, including VCAT decisions.</p>	No recommended change.
26	D17/203671	Tanya Tescher	Land Owner	tanyatescher@gmail.com	Sub-Precinct 1A	116-120 Johnston Street, Collingwood	<p>Key Issues: Supporting</p> <p>The submission is supportive of the Amendment and commends Council for taking action to inject life into Johnston Street, which is underutilised given its proximity to the university and to the city.</p> <p>The submission notes that rezoning land from C2Z to C1Z and by virtue allowing residential development will help commercial uses in the street</p>	Supportive	n/a	n/a

Submission No.	TRIM No.	Name	Stakeholder	Email	Precinct	Property Address (if relevant)	Submission Summary	Submission Position	Discussion	Recommended Change(s)
							including, shops and restaurants and give a new feel to the area. It will allow the first floor areas above shops to be utilised to provide much-needed residences close to the CBD.			
27	D18/45509	Julia deVille	Land Owner		Not in a precinct	73 Harmsworth Street Collingwood	<p>Key Issues: Rezoning request</p> <p>Requests to be rezoned from the General Residential Zone to the Commercial 1 Zone</p>	Requesting a change	The property sits outside of the area subject to the amendment. The JSLAP seeks to protect the low-scale residential areas north and south of Johnston Street	No recommended change.
28	D18/51287	Chris Gersch	Resident	Chris.gersch@gmail.com		Stafford Street	<p>Key Issues: Scale of development / building heights</p> <p>Late submission from local resident.</p> <p>Expresses concern about the development trends and scale of development within the local area (along Johnston Street).</p> <p>Objects to the preferred and mandatory height limits within the DDO as the heights are an extreme change from the current scale of the area. The 18m street-wall height is too high. Supports having clear and mandatory height limits (at an appropriate scale).</p> <p>States that preferred limits should be the mandatory limit. Development above 4 storeys will still impact local residents.</p> <p>Concerned about overshadowing in the winter months and the impacts on residential properties.</p>		<p>The re-draft of the DDO from the original proposal has had strong regard to the conditional authorisation which discourages the use of mandatory controls unless considered necessary. The authorisation also specified that preferred heights should not be lowered. The heights are based on those found in the JSLAP being the basis for the amendment which is underpinned by a built form analysis (Appendix B).</p> <p>Within the amendment, building height and amenity impacts are addressed through various requirements within the DDO. This includes the mandatory street wall height and preferred setbacks within a 45 degree envelope which will reduce the visual impact of upper levels as well as overshadowing impacts on the southern footpath.</p> <p>Urban Design advice has recommended increasing the setback from the street-wall, east of the railway bridge, to 6m. This will assist in reducing the impact of upper levels beyond the street-wall height.</p>	Increase preferred setback to 6m for upper levels for sub-precincts east of railway line.