

Amendment C269 – Consideration of Submissions – Assessment Criteria used to consider submissions that included detailed requests for changes using track changes (rewritten) versions of the exhibited policies

Approximately 29 submissions (stretching over 500 + pages) received by Council for Amendment C269 included track changes (rewritten) version of the exhibited policies. These submissions essentially rewrote the relevant policy, attaching the submitter’s preferred version.

Officers considered each of these submissions in detail, including the alternative versions of exhibited Amendment documentation provided by each submitter. Given the number of submissions which provided alternative versions of policies and the extensive nature of changes sought, officers prepared ‘Assessment Criteria’ to help assess whether to recommend ACCEPTING a change (Assessment Criteria 1 – 4) or recommend NO CHANGE (Assessment Criteria A – H).

Assessment Criteria:

- Recommended Position – ACCEPT

Criteria	Description
1. Errors and corrections	Includes: Corrections, fixing up formatting or minor drafting errors. <i>Example: spelling and grammatical errors, incorrect Clause references.</i>
2. Language improvements	Includes: Changes to wording to improve the drafting of statements without changing the intent. <i>Example: Reference to ‘greenhouse gas contributions’ is recommended to change to ‘greenhouse gas emissions’</i>
3. Additional content of benefit	Includes: Additional information that is strategically justified by the existing Planning Scheme or exhibited Amendment C269yara. <i>Examples:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarifying that the types of trees to be promoted in open spaces and along roads and railways are ‘indigenous’ trees rather than simply ‘trees’. - Adding ‘verandah’ to the list of elements to be respected, under the heading ‘New development, alterations or additions’ of proposed Clause 15.03-1L Heritage.
4. Points of clarification	Includes: In response to some of the issues raised in submissions, additional points of clarification to help to clarify the intent of a statement or policy. <i>Example: Qualifying that in supporting development that creates habitats for biodiversity with a balance of native</i>

	<i>and non-native species- that the preference is for native over non-native.</i>
--	---

- **Recommended Position – NO CHANGE**

Criteria	Description
a) Duplication (Included elsewhere in the Yarra Planning Scheme)	<p>Includes: Matters already dealt with through other sections of the Planning Scheme.</p> <p><i>Example: Request to define what housing diversity means in two different areas of the planning scheme.</i></p>
b) Inconsistent with Practitioner’s Guide or Planning Policy Framework Formatting / Structure	<p>Includes: Changes that do not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy.</p> <p><i>Example: Request to cross reference so that proposed Clause 13.03-1L Flood Management refers to the Special Building Overlay.</i></p>
c) ‘Like for like’ changes	<p>Includes: Changes that do not add value or have the same intent as the exhibited policy provision, and officers consider the exhibited wording should be preferred to the wording put forward by the submitter.</p> <p><i>Example: Request to change Clause 15.1-2L Building design, sub-heading Service equipment’ reference from: ‘limited visibility from the public realm’ to: ‘limited visibility from outside the site’.</i></p>
d) Inconsistent terminology / changes intent / too specific / misinterpretation	<p>Includes: Changes that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create inconsistencies in terminology in other areas of the planning scheme <p><i>Example: Request to change reference of ‘biodiversity’ to ‘local biodiversity’.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the intent of the statement or the policy <p><i>Example: Request to remove strategies entirely or reclassify them as policy guidelines.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are too specific and are not considered to be necessary

	<p><i>Example: Requests to add, rename or reorder headings in the policy.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or the policy. <p><i>Example: Submission that states that the adopted Spatial Economic and Employment Strategy should be reinforced by the new Yarra Planning Scheme - when Amendment C269 is based on the strategic directions in the SEES and proposes to include this document as a Background Document in the planning scheme</i></p>
e) Content that is a policy neutral translation	<p>Includes: changes to an existing policy in the Yarra Planning Scheme that is not proposed to be amended by Amendment C269yara.</p> <p><i>Example: Requests to change proposed Clause 15.03-1L World Heritage Environs Area. The proposed policy is a direct translation of the existing policy.</i></p>
f) Would require re-exhibition of amendment	<p>Includes: Changes that would likely require further consideration by Council and require that Amendment C269yara be re-exhibited because the change is substantial.</p> <p><i>Example: Requests to add additional landmarks to proposed Clause 15.01-2L Landmarks</i></p>
g) Additional work is underway / future work proposed	<p>Includes: Changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work.</p> <p><i>Example: Requests for additional standards and triggers under Clause 15.02-1L Environmentally Sustainable Design, when Council is separately progressing work that will compliment/strengthen its ESD policy.</i></p>
h) Outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and/or insufficient strategic evidence to support the change	<p>Includes: Changes that are otherwise outside the scope of Amendment C269 or that lack strategic justification to be included.</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Require the electric supply authority and the telecom companies to progressively relocate their caballing underground.</i>

The table below identifies the submissions that were assessed using the Assessment Criteria. These submissions were identified as appropriate for consideration by using this Assessment Criteria because they included lengthy or completely revised versions of the exhibited planning scheme policies. The table below also identifies the relevant criteria that officers applied in reviewing the submission. A number of changes proposed in submissions were not accepted as they were considered to be included elsewhere in the Planning Scheme or were considered to be a misinterpretation of the intent of the proposed policy. Additionally, changes were not accepted if they were considered to be outside the role of the Planning Scheme. For example, changes that relate to management or operational matters.

The clauses affected by the 'Accepted criteria' are set out in the preferred version of the local planning policies included as a separate attachment to this Council report.

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
12	<p>Criteria 3 - See preferred version of Clause 15.03-1L Heritage.</p>	<p>Criteria A: Comments were not accepted as they were matters included elsewhere in the Scheme. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submission seeks the inclusion of the following from the existing clause 22.02-5.3 in the planning scheme. <p><i>Encourage the reconstruction of original or contributory elements where they have been removed. These elements include, but are not limited to, chimneys, fences, verandahs, roofs and roof elements, wall openings and fitting (including windows and doors), shopfronts and other architectural details and features.</i></p> <p>This further text is considered unnecessary duplication as restoration and reconstruction is adequately encouraged under both the State heritage policy at Clause 15.03-1S and the wording proposed under Restoration and reconstruction (local heritage policy, Clause 15.03-1L).</p> <p>Criteria D: Comments were not accepted as they were too specific</p>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>and are not considered to be necessary. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submission seeks the inclusion of additional text relating to the reconstruction of street fences. <p>The additional wording is not considered necessary as policy currently exists within Clause 15.03-1S or is proposed under Restoration and reconstruction (Clause 15.03-1L) to encourage the accurate reconstruction of heritage places, including associated fences and gates, where their original form is known</p>
16	Criteria 3 – See preferred version of Clause 15.02-1L Environmentally sustainable development.	<i>N/A – all changes were accepted</i>
18	Criteria 1; and Criteria 3 – See preferred version of Clause 11.03-1L Activity centres.	<p>Criteria B Comments were not accepted as they do not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submission seeks to replace the term '<i>flood resistance measures</i>' in the objective with '<i>apply the Special Building Overlay</i>' to show how the strategies will be implemented. <p>The Practitioner's Guide to Victorian Planning Schemes seeks to avoid cross references to other sections of the scheme. In addition, the flood management policy does not solely relate to properties covered by the Special Building Overlay.</p> <p>Criteria D: Comments were not accepted as they misinterpreted the</p>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>policy. Refer to Criteria B as an example.</p> <p>Criteria E: Comments were not accepted as it relates to a neutral translation of existing policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submission seeks to change clause 13.07-1L Licensed Premises so that the section on Noise is cross referenced with the new patron noise standards in the Interfaces and Amenity policy above. <p>Criteria F: Comments were not accepted as is new content that would require re-exhibition of amendment. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In relation to clause 12.03-1L River Corridors the submission strongly supports the winter solstice as the test for avoiding additional overshadowing and would support the extension of the hours to 10.00am to 3.00pm. <p>The overshadowing provision for the Yarra River is in DDO1 and refers to the winter solstice. Inclusion in the policy which relates to Darebin and Merri Creeks as well would be new content that is considered to require re-exhibition.</p>
171	Criteria 2; and Criteria 3 – see preferred version of Clauses 02.03 Strategic directions and 15.03-1L Heritage.	<p>Criteria D: Changes were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 02.01 Context, the submission inserts <i>“with over 70% of Yarra’s properties covered by a heritage overlay”</i>. <i>This is considered as too specific and is not</i>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p><i>considered to be necessary. It is therefore not accepted.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 02.03 Strategic directions under <i>Activity centres</i>, the submission changes the statement “<i>Activity centres are a focus of growth in Yarra with the addition of mid-rise commercial development and apartments</i>” by inserting “<i>unlikely to continue to be</i>”. This changes the intent of the statement and is therefore not accepted. - In Clause 02.03 Strategic directions, under <i>Built environment and heritage</i>, the submission changes “<i>preserving and enhancing</i>” to “<i>protecting</i>”. This creates inconsistencies in terminology in other areas of the planning scheme and is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria E: Changes were not accepted as it relates to a neutral translation of existing policy. For an example see criteria G below.</p> <p>Criteria G: Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 15.03-1L World Heritage Environs Area, the submitter has proposed a number of changes. Any changes to this Clause are outside the scope of this Amendment as it is a policy neutral translation from existing Clause 22.14 Development Guidelines for Heritage Places in the World

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>Heritage Environs Area. Additional work is also currently being undertaken to update this policy and will be the subject of a separate amendment process.</p> <p>Criteria H: Comments were not accepted as they are outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and/or there is insufficient strategic evidence to support the change. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 15.03-1L Heritage, the submission rearranges the order of sub headings under the Clause. There is insufficient strategic evidence to support this change and therefore it is not accepted.
231	<i>No changes accepted.</i>	<p>Criteria A: Comments were not accepted as they were matters already included. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submission seeks reference to parapet lines in clause 15.03-1L Heritage. <p>The matter is already addressed in 15.03-1L Heritage under <i>New development, alterations or additions</i> which requires the respect of <i>Pattern, proportion and spacing of elements on an elevation; and Street wall.</i></p> <p>Criteria D: Comments were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 16.01-2L Location of residential development the submission does not <i>support mixed use development in incremental</i>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p><i>change area within activity centres.</i> This is considered to change the intent of the Housing Strategy and is therefore not accepted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 15.03-1L Heritage under <i>demolition</i>, the submission recommends changing ‘<i>avoid</i>’ to ‘<i>not support</i>’ or ‘<i>prevent</i>’. This is considered as too specific and is not considered necessary. It is therefore not accepted. - In Clause 15.01-1L Urban Design under <i>laneways</i>, the submission recommends that the proposed policy provides clarification on what is reasonable and unreasonable overlooking. This is a misunderstanding of the intent of the policy as the terminology provides discretion depending on the context of individual applications. The change is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria E: Comments were not accepted as it relates to a neutral translation of existing policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the proposed Clause 19.03-3L Water Sensitive urban design the submitter recommends to restrict the site coverage of blocks. This Clause is a policy neutral translation of the existing policy and therefore the recommendation has not been accepted. <p>Criteria H: Comments were not accepted as they are outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and/or there is insufficient strategic</p>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>evidence to support the change. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the proposed Clause 15.01-2L Building design under Policy Guidelines, the submitter recommends including a reference to new development potentially overshadowing existing solar panels on adjoining properties. This is outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and there is insufficient strategic evidence to support the recommendation. <p>Criteria G: Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the proposed Clause 15.01-2L Building Design, the submitter recommends adding clear limitations on the height of development for activity centres with specific reference to Rathdowne Activity Centre. Built form controls for a number of activity centres are subject to work that is currently underway. This recommendation is therefore not accepted.
234	<p>Criteria 3 - See preferred version of Clauses 02.02 Vision and 15.03-1L Heritage.</p>	<p>Criteria A: Changes were not accepted as they were matters included elsewhere in the Scheme. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.03-1L Heritage under Restoration and reconstruction, the submission seeks the inclusion of the following from the existing clause 22.02-5.3 in the planning scheme.

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p data-bbox="1002 264 1393 667"><i>“Encourage the reconstruction of original or contributory elements where they have been removed. These elements include, but are not limited to, chimneys, fences, verandahs, roofs and roof elements, wall openings and fitting (including windows and doors), shopfronts and other architectural details and features.”</i></p> <p data-bbox="1002 701 1393 1070">This further text is considered unnecessary duplication as restoration and reconstruction is adequately encouraged under both the State heritage policy at Clause 15.03-1S and the wording proposed under Restoration and reconstruction (local heritage policy, Clause 15.03-1L).</p> <p data-bbox="906 1104 1393 1373">Criteria D: Changes were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul data-bbox="954 1406 1393 1977" style="list-style-type: none"> - In the proposed Clause 02.03 Strategic Directions under <i>Support and strengthen the vibrancy and local identity of Yarra’s network of activity centres</i>, the submitter inserts a fourth statement <i>“Encourage all new development to provide shade and weather protection over the footpath at the street frontages by way of canopies or verandahs”</i>. This change is considered as too specific and is not considered necessary. It is therefore not accepted.

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the third paragraph of the proposed Clause 12.03-1L Yarra River, Darebin and Merri Creek corridors, the submitter inserts the words “<i>shaded areas</i>” after the words “<i>open spaces</i>”. This is a misunderstanding of the intent of the policy. The change is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria F: Changes were not accepted as it includes new content that would require re-exhibition of amendment. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the proposed Clause 15.01-2L Landmarks, the submitter requests to add additional landmarks. This proposed Clause is would require re-exhibition of the Amendment and is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria G: Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.02-1L Environmentally sustainable development under <i>Energy Performance</i>, proposes several changes regarding window glazing. As council is separately progressing work that will compliment / strengthen its ESD policy, these changes are not accepted. <p>Criteria H: Comments were not accepted as they are outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and/or there is insufficient strategic evidence to support the change. For example:</p>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 15.03-1L Heritage, the submitter adds the heading "<i>Public realm heritage infrastructure</i>". There insufficient strategic evidence to support this change and therefore it is not accepted.
240	<p>Criteria 3 - See preferred version of Clause 11.03-1L Activity centres.</p>	<p>Criteria A: Comments were not accepted as they were matters already included elsewhere in the Scheme. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 11.03-1L Activity Centres, the submitter adds the statement "<i>Support development that recognises the importance of the North Fitzroy Village as a focus for the local community offering a diverse mix of shopping, business and community services, leisure and residential opportunities</i>". This is considered as an unnecessary duplication as proposed Clause 11.03-1L Activity Centres under <i>Strategies and St Georges Road, North Fitzroy</i> encourage and support a mix of uses which provide the day to day needs of the local community. Therefore the change is not accepted. <p>Criteria D: Comments were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 11.03-1L Activity Centres under <i>St Georges Road</i>, the submitter adds the statement "<i>support low rise development where it respects the heritage character of the centre</i>". This

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>changes the intent of the policy which is to direct mid-rise towards Neighbourhood Activity Centres. The change is therefore not accepted.</p> <p>Criteria G: Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 11.03-1L Activity Centres under Nicholson Street, North Fitzroy, the submitter suggests including <i>“Support development that recognises the importance of the Nicholson St shopping strip as a focus for the local community offering a diverse mix of shopping, business and community services, leisure and residential opportunities”</i> as in Queens Parade NAC wording. Queens Parade NAC wording has been created through DDO work and built form controls. Including similar wording for Nicholson Street would need to be considered through future work. <p>Criteria H: Comments were not accepted as they are outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and/or there is insufficient strategic evidence to support the change. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 12.03-1L Yarra River, Darebin and Merri Creek, the submitter recommends adding <i>“To identify areas significant to part indigenous communities to recognise the past and educate Yarra residents and visitors”</i>. There is insufficient strategic evidence to support

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		this change to the proposed policy and is therefore not accepted.
252	Criteria 3 - See preferred version of Clause 11.03-1L Activity centres.	Note: submission is the same as above. Refer to comments under submission 240. Criteria A; Criteria D; Criteria G; and Criteria H.
260	Criteria 1; Criteria 3; and Criteria 4 – see preferred version of Clauses 12.01-1L Biodiversity, 12.03-1L Yarra River, Darebin and Merri Creek Corridors, 19.02-6L Public open space contributions and 72.08 Background documents.	Criteria B: Comments were not accepted as they do not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clauses 12.01-1L Biodiversity and 12.03-1L Yarra River, Darebin and Merri Creek corridors, the submission seeks to include a section on Policy documents. Criteria D: Comments were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 12.03-1L Yarra River, Darebin and Merri Creek corridors under Strategies, the submitter adds <i>“and creates new views where possible”</i> after <i>“Maintains sightlines”</i>. This is considered as too specific and is not considered necessary. It is therefore not accepted. - In proposed Clause 12.03-1L Yarra River, Darebin and Merri Creek corridors under Objective, the submitter adds the word <i>“the”</i> in front of <i>“Darebin and Merri Creek corridors”</i>. This change creates inconsistencies in

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>terminology in other areas of the planning scheme and therefore is not accepted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 12.03-1L Yarra River, Darebin and Merri Creek corridors under <i>Strategies</i>, the submitter adds the word “<i>informal</i>” in front of “<i>recreation adjacent to waterways, including open space and walking cycling paths</i>”. This changes the intent of the statement and therefore is not accepted.
267	<p>Criteria 3 – see revised Clause 15.03-1L Heritage.</p>	<p>Criteria D: Comments were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.03-1L Heritage under <i>New development, alterations and additions</i>, the submitter inserts the statement “<i>Protecting and conserving the view of heritage places from laneways when the principal façade of the heritage place faces a laneway</i>”. This changes the intent of the proposed policy and is therefore not accepted.
289	<p>Criteria 1 Criteria 2 and; Criteria 3 – see preferred version Clauses 16.01-3L Housing diversity and 18.02-1L Sustainable Transport.</p>	<p>Criteria A: Comments were not accepted as they were matters already included elsewhere in the Scheme. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 15.01-1L Urban Design under <i>Development adjacent to a public open space</i>, the submitter suggests including reference to “<i>softening the building edges adjacent to the public open space to engage human interaction for e.g.</i>”

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p><i>built in seating, places to encourage people to stop and mingle</i>". This is already addressed in Clause 15.01-1L Urban Design under <i>Strategies – Public realm</i> and is therefore not accepted.</p> <p>Criteria B: Comments were not accepted as they do not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 16.01-4L Housing affordability, the submitter recommends using stronger wording than "support" and "consider as relevant". This recommendation does not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy which is that... <p>Criteria C: Changes were not accepted as they do not add value, have the same intent as the exhibited policy provision, and officers consider the exhibited wording should be preferred to the wording put forward by the submitter. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 16.01-4L Housing affordability, the submitter suggests a rewrite of the following statement. <p><i>"Provide well designed affordable housing within new development that is integrated with the remainder of the development."</i> to the following: <i>"Provide well designed affordable housing within new development integrated into the remainder of the development"</i>.</p>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>Criteria D: Comments were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 18.02-1L Sustainable transport under <i>Strategies</i>, the submitter suggests moving public transport above cycling so that it is a higher priority. This changes the intent of the policy and is therefore not accepted. - In proposed Clause 19.03-5L Waste under the strategy “<i>Ensure that waste and recycling facilities are located to enable ease of use by occupants and access for transport</i>”, the submitter suggests that the proposed policy should “<i>recommend facility has adequate lighting for users</i>”. This is considered as too specific and is not considered necessary. It is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria G: Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.01-2L Building design under <i>Carparking, loading facilities and outbuildings</i>, the submitter recommends the policy includes bicycle parking rates. This would require more work and is therefore not accepted.

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>Criteria H: Comments were not accepted as they are outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and/or there is insufficient strategic evidence to support the change. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the proposed Clause 15.01-2L Building Design under <i>Landscaping</i>, the submitter suggests inserting a statement which acknowledges certain plants should be selected that are able to cope with a hotter and drier climate due to climate change. This is outside the scope of the Planning Scheme as the PPF cannot manage this change. The change is therefore not accepted.
293	Criteria 1 – See preferred version of Clause 15.03-1L Heritage.	<p>Criteria A: Changes were not accepted as they were matters included elsewhere in the Scheme. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.03-1L Heritage under <i>New development and alterations</i>, the submitter requires clarification on what is meant by ‘respecting’ existing contributing elements. This is already addressed in Clause 15.03-1L Heritage and is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria B: Comments were not accepted as they do not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.03-1L Heritage under <i>Painting and surface treatments</i>, the submitter requests that new works within HOs should be deliberately designed and finished to be recessive and subordinate in the HO. This

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>does not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy and therefore this change is not accepted.</p> <p>Criteria D: Comments were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.03-1L Heritage under <i>New Development and Alterations</i>, the submitter seeks to insert the words “as outlined in the <i>Burra Charter</i>” after “<i>Ensure the adaptation of heritage places is consistent with the principles of good conservation...</i>”. This change is too specific, it is also noted that the <i>Burra Charter</i> is listed as a Background document. The change is therefore not accepted.
302	<p>Criteria 1; Criteria 2; and Criteria 3. – See preferred version of Clauses 02-01 Context, 02.03 Strategic Directions and 19.02-6L Open Space.</p>	<p>Criteria C: Changes were not accepted as they do not add value, have the same intent as the exhibited policy provision, and officers consider the exhibited wording should be preferred to the wording put forward by the submitter. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 02.01 Context under <i>Location</i>, the submitter seeks to replace the word “<i>bound</i>” with “<i>bounded</i>”. <p>Criteria D: Comments were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent</p>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 02.01 Context under <i>Community and population growth</i>, the submitter seeks to include the wording “<i>and educational</i>” after the proposed policy’s wording “<i>The community is diverse in terms of ethnicity, language spoken, socio-economic...</i>”. This change is too specific and is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria E: Changes were not accepted as it relates to a neutral translation of existing policy. For an example see criteria G below.</p> <p>Criteria G; Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.03-1L World Heritage Environs Area, the submitter has proposed a number of changes. Any changes to this Clause are outside the scope of this Amendment as it is a policy neutral translation from existing Clause 22.14 Development Guidelines for Heritage Places in the World Heritage Environs Area. Additional work is also currently being undertaken to update this policy and will be the subject of a separate amendment process.
312	<i>No changes accepted.</i>	<p>Criteria A: Changes were not accepted as they were matters included elsewhere in the Scheme. For example:</p>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.02-1L Environmentally sustainable development, the submitter requires the emphasis of the environmental benefits of adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. This is considered as an unnecessary duplication as proposed Clause 15.03-1L Heritage addresses the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. The change is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria B: Comments were not accepted as they do not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.03-1L Heritage, the submitter requires the inclusion of definitions (e.g. individually significant, contributory, non-contributory). Including definitions does not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy and therefore the change is not accepted. <p>Criteria D: Comments were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 02.01 Context under <i>Built Environment and Heritage</i>, the submitter seeks to remove the wording of “above 14 storeys” after the proposed policy wording “<i>The existing scale of development within the municipality is mostly characterised by low to mid-rise buildings, with</i>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p><i>some taller buildings...". This changes the intent of the policy and is therefore not accepted.</i></p> <p>Criteria E: Changes were not accepted as it relates to a neutral translation of existing policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.01-2L Building design under <i>Site Coverage</i>, the submitter requires the site coverage of 80% to be reduced. This section of the proposed policy is a policy neutral translation from the existing Clause 22.10 Built Form and Design. This change is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria F: Changes were not accepted as it includes new content that would require re-exhibition of amendment. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the proposed Clause 15.01-2L Landmarks, the submitter requests to add additional landmarks. This proposed Clause is would require re-exhibition of the Amendment and is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria G: Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 15.03-1L World Heritage Environs Area, the submitter has proposed a number of changes. Any changes to this Clause are outside the scope of this Amendment as it is a policy neutral translation from existing Clause 22.14

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>Development Guidelines for Heritage Places in the World Heritage Environs Area. Additional work is also currently being undertaken to update this policy and will be the subject of a separate amendment process.</p> <p>Criteria H: Comments were not accepted as they are outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and/or there is insufficient strategic evidence to support the change. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 13.07-1L Caretakers houses, the submitter requires the former Victoria distillery and silos, 21 Northumberland St Collingwood to be rezoned to acknowledge the longstanding residences. This is outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and there is insufficient strategic evidence to support the change. It is therefore not accepted. - In relation to Clause 15.01-2L Landmarks, the submitter suggests that additional views to the Shot Tower should be protected. However, there is insufficient strategic evidence to support this change.
323	<p>Criteria 3 – See preferred version of Clause 15.01-1L Signs in a Heritage Overlay and Clause 19.03-5L Waste.</p>	<p>Criteria D: Comments were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 17.04-1L Tourism, arts and culture, the submitter seeks to change

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>the heading of the proposed Clause to “<i>Attracting tourists to Yarra</i>”. This changes the intent of the proposed policy and therefore is not accepted.</p> <p>Criteria E: Changes were not accepted as it relates to a neutral translation of existing policy. For an example see criteria G below.</p> <p>Criteria G; Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.03-1L World Heritage Environs Area, the submitter has proposed a number of changes. Any changes to this Clause are outside the scope of this Amendment as it is a policy neutral translation from existing Clause 22.14 Development Guidelines for Heritage Places in the World Heritage Environs Area. Additional work is also currently being undertaken to update this policy and will be the subject of a separate amendment process.
324	<p>Criteria 3 – See preferred version of Clause 17.01-1L Employment.</p>	<p>Criteria A: Changes were not accepted as they were matters included elsewhere in the Scheme. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.01-1L Urban design under <i>Laneways</i>, the submitter seeks to add an additional strategy which states “<i>Support development that retains and enhances public laneways</i>”. This is considered as an unnecessary duplication as proposed Clause 15.01-1L Urban

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>Design already covers this and therefore the change is not accepted.</p> <p>Criteria G: Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.01-2L Building Design, the submitter comments that mid-rise development should not be encouraged in “employment areas” including Cremorne without specific built form guidance (structure plan or a DDO). Future work built form work is being proposed in regards to the Cremorne area, therefore no change is accepted.
334	<p>Criteria 3 – See preferred version of Clause 15.03-1L Heritage and 15.01-1L Signs in a Heritage Overlay.</p>	<p>Criteria B: Comments were not accepted as they do not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.03-1L Heritage, the submitter requires the inclusion of definitions (e.g. individually significant, contributory, non-contributory). Including definitions does not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy and therefore the change is not accepted. <p>Criteria D: Comments were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 11.03-1L Activity centres, the submitter requires mid-rise development to be redirected outside of the historic cores of shopping strips. This changes the intent of the proposed policy and is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria E: Changes were not accepted as it relates to a neutral translation of existing policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.01-2L the submitter proposes that the maximum site coverage percentage should be reduced and minimum site coverage should be allocated to soft landscaping. This section relates to a neutral translation of existing Clause 22.10. <p>Criteria F: Changes were not accepted as it includes new content that would require re-exhibition of amendment. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submitter seeks Council to review the background document <i>Yarra Industrial Heritage Policy 15 October 2019</i> and to incorporate more of the recommendations from the document. This change would require re-exhibition of the Amendment and is therefore not accepted. - The submitter seeks to include additional landmarks in clause 15.01-2L Landmarks. This change would require re-exhibition of the Amendment and is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria G: Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope</p>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.02-1L Heritage under <i>Demolition</i>, the submitter suggests that stronger language be included to explicitly discourage demolition by neglect. This is outside the scope of the Amendment, but current/future work is through the State Government work plan. The change is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria H: Comments were not accepted as they are outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and/or there is insufficient strategic evidence to support the change. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 72.08 Background documents, the submitter seeks to include a plain-English guideline to support the proposed policy. This is outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and there is insufficient strategic evidence to support the guideline. The change is therefore not accepted. - In relation to landmarks policy and key views, the submitter rejects statements in the <i>Review and Development of the City of Yarra Landmarks Policy</i> that 'not all views should be considered as being of equal worth' which disregards incidental and long range views, and what it interprets as prioritising building heights over view lines to landmarks. There is insufficient support for the changes sought by the submitter in respect of

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>additional primary views to landmarks. Any change proposed is therefore not accepted.</p>
349	<p><i>No changes accepted.</i></p>	<p>Criteria A: Changes were not accepted as they were matters included elsewhere in the Scheme. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.01 Urban design under <i>Boulevards</i>, the submitter seeks to include the following: <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>“Maintains the heritage fabric and landscaped character comprising avenue trees and kerbing along Yarra’s historic boulevards – Hoddle Street, Victoria Parade, Alexandra Parade, and Queens Parade.”</i></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">This is considered as an unnecessary duplication as proposed Clause 15.03-2L Heritage already covers maintaining heritage fabric. The change is therefore not accepted.</p> <p>Criteria D: Comments were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 02.03 Strategic direction under <i>Climate change</i>, the submitter seeks to remove the following opening statement. <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>“Increased population in the inner city can bring sustainability benefits through more efficient use of existing infrastructure, more people</i></p>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p data-bbox="1002 230 1401 465"><i>being able to access existing services, local recreation and employment opportunities, increased use of sustainable transport modes and reduced sprawl on Melbourne’s fringe.”</i></p> <p data-bbox="1002 499 1401 566">This changes the intent and is therefore not accepted.</p> <p data-bbox="906 600 1401 734">Criteria E: Changes were not accepted as it relates to a neutral translation of existing policy. For an example see criteria G below.</p> <p data-bbox="906 768 1401 1003">Criteria G; Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p> <ul data-bbox="954 1037 1401 1608" style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.03-1L World Heritage Environs Area, the submitter has proposed a number of changes. Any changes to this Clause are outside the scope of this Amendment as it is a policy neutral translation from existing Clause 22.14 Development Guidelines for Heritage Places in the World Heritage Environs Area. Additional work is also currently being undertaken to update this policy and will be the subject of a separate amendment process. <p data-bbox="906 1641 1401 1843">Criteria H: Comments were not accepted as they are outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and/or there is insufficient strategic evidence to support the change. For example:</p> <ul data-bbox="954 1877 1401 2009" style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 02.03 Strategic direction under <i>Climate change</i>, the submitter requires planning

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		for power distribution and telecom companies to progressively relocate all cabling underground. This is outside the scope of the Amendment and therefore not accepted.
350	<i>No changes accepted.</i>	Note: Changes proposed by this submitter are largely the same as those requested by submitter 170. Refer to comments on submission 170 above.
352	<i>No changes accepted.</i>	<p>Criteria F: Changes were not accepted as it includes new content that would require re-exhibition of amendment. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submitter seeks to include additional landmarks in clause 15.01-2L Landmarks. This change would require re-exhibition of the Amendment and is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria H: Changes were not accepted in relation to landmarks as there is insufficient support for the changes sought by the submitter in respect of additional views to landmarks.</p>
363	Criteria 3 – See preferred version of Clause 11.03 Activity centres.	<p>Criteria A: Changes were not accepted as they were matters included elsewhere in the Scheme. For example:</p> <p>In proposed Clause 11.03-1L Activity Centres under <i>Strategies</i>, the submitter seeks to insert the words “and encourage restoration of verandahs and upper floors” after “Protect the heritage shop fronts and verandahs”. This is considered as an unnecessary duplication as proposed Clause 15.03-2L Heritage will covers this matter through other accepted track changes (submission No.12).</p>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>Criteria B: Comments were not accepted as they do not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.03-1L, the submitter seeks to include a clear and comprehensive set of definitions of technical terms. Including definitions in the Planning Scheme does not conform with DELWP requirements and therefore is not accepted. <p>Criteria D: Comments were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 11.03-1L Activity Centres under strategies, the submitter seeks to remove “<i>Neighbourhood Activity centres</i>” from the following strategy. “<i>Support high quality mid rise buildings in major and neighbourhood activity centres</i>”. This changes the intent of the proposed statement and is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria E: Changes were not accepted as it relates to a neutral translation of existing policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submitter seeks to include planning guidelines that revisit the percentage of permeable land to be retained on private and commercial properties. Site

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>coverage is included in proposed Clause 15.01-2L Building design and is a policy neutral translation from existing Clause 22.10 Built Form and Design Policy. The change is therefore not accepted.</p> <p>Criteria F: Changes were not accepted as it includes new content that would require re-exhibition of amendment. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submitter seeks to include additional landmarks in clause 15.01-2L Landmarks. This change would require re-exhibition of the Amendment and is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria G: Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submitter requests identification of North Fitzroy, Nicholson Street and Rathdowne Street with special status. This is outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but is the subject of proposed future work. <p>Criteria H: Comments were not accepted as they are outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and/or there is insufficient strategic evidence to support the change. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 11.03-1L Activity Centres under <i>Strategies</i>, the submitter seeks to insert "<i>Promote the local independent retail, commercial and personal services offerings and</i>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p><i>rejuvenation of the village</i>". This is outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and the change is therefore not accepted.</p>
364	<p>Criteria 3; and Criteria 4 – See preferred version of Clause 02.03 Strategic Directions.</p>	<p>Criteria A: Changes were not accepted as they were matters included elsewhere in the Scheme. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 02.01 Context under <i>Housing</i>, seeks to include the following <p><i>“Housing in the future will increasingly have to become multi-functional to allow for working at home and multi-functional to allow for extended families and share households. There also needs to be more housing that offers accessible, adaptable, affordable housing options to cater for Yarra’s diverse community, now and into the future, is a worthy focus for Yarra.”</i></p> <p>Housing diversity and household types is included in the proposed Clause 02.01 Context and 16.01-3L Housing diversity. The change is therefore not accepted.</p> <p>Criteria B: Comments were not accepted as they do not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 02.01 Context under <i>Economic development</i>, the submitter seeks to include the following after the last paragraph. <p><i>“In its Heritage Tourism Strategy and Action Plan 2020-2030, UNESCO notes:</i></p>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p data-bbox="1002 230 1374 465"><i>“Heritage is our legacy from the past what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations. Our cultural and natural heritage are both irreplaceable of life and inspiration”</i></p> <p data-bbox="1002 465 1374 633">This change does not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy and therefore it is not accepted.</p> <p data-bbox="906 667 1369 936">Criteria C: Changes were not accepted as they do not add value, have the same intent as the exhibited policy provision, and officers consider the exhibited wording should be preferred to the wording put forward by the submitter. For example:</p> <ul data-bbox="954 969 1390 1104" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="954 969 1390 1104">- In Clause 02.01 Context under <i>Built Environment and Heritage</i>, the submitter seeks to change the following <p data-bbox="1002 1137 1390 1406"><i>“Apartment living is becoming more common in Yarra, to a range of households - singles, couples, families and share households. It will become the predominant form of housing over the next 15 years”</i></p> <p data-bbox="1002 1440 1310 1473">to the below statement:</p> <p data-bbox="1002 1507 1390 1843"><i>“Apartment living has increased in Yarra, and now new apartment developments need to become more diverse to better suit large families and share households, if it is to become a predominant form of housing over the next 15 years.”</i></p> <p data-bbox="906 1877 1390 2011">Criteria D: Comments were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create</p>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Clause 02.03 Context under <i>Economic development</i>, the submitter seeks to include the following after the last sentence under <i>Employment land</i>. <p><i>“While these areas could provide opportunities for hotel developments, they will now be protected from private residential apartment buildings which generally adversely affect commercial or industrial work.”</i></p> <p>This change is too specific and is considered unnecessary and is therefore not accepted.</p> <p>Criteria E: Changes were not accepted as it relates to a neutral translation of existing policy. For an example see criteria G below.</p> <p>Criteria F: Changes were not accepted as it includes new content that would require re-exhibition of amendment. See Criteria G below.</p> <p>Criteria G: Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.03-1L World Heritage Environs Area, the submitter has proposed a number of changes. Any changes to this Clause are outside the scope of this Amendment as it is a policy neutral translation from existing Clause 22.14

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>Development Guidelines for Heritage Places in the World Heritage Environs Area. Additional work is also currently being undertaken to update this policy and will be the subject of a separate amendment process.</p> <p>Criteria H: Comments were not accepted as they are outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and/or there is insufficient strategic evidence to support the change. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 02.01 Context, the submitter seeks to include the following: <i>“Arrangements now need to be put in place that enable the community to participate in key decision making processes and that these become the norm rather than the exception.”</i> <p>This is outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and there is insufficient strategic evidence to support the change.</p>
372	<p>Criteria 1; and Criteria 3 – See preferred version of Clauses 11.03-1L Activity centres, 15.01-1L Urban Design and 19.02-6L Public open space contribution.</p>	<p>Criteria A: Changes were not accepted as they were matters included elsewhere in the Scheme. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 11.03-1L Activity Centres under <i>St George’s Road, North Fitzroy</i>, the submitter seeks to insert <i>“Support the development that contributes to attractive pedestrian links to the community facilities and Edinburgh Gardens”</i>. This is already included in the proposed Clause 11.03-1L Activity Centres as the fourth strategy.

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>Criteria D: Comments were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 16.01-2L Location of residential development, the submitter comments that that identification of “moderate change” for Queens Parade is at odds with C231. This comment changes the intent of the proposed policy which is to implement the Yarra Housing Strategy. Therefore, no change is accepted. <p>Criteria E: Changes were not accepted as it relates to a neutral translation of existing policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submitter proposes changes to site coverage percentages which is a policy neutral translation of provisions already in the Scheme. - The submitter also questions clause 19.02-6L2 in relation to reasonable sunlight access. This is a policy neutral translation of existing policy. <p>Criteria G: Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 02.02 Vision, seeks to strengthen the proposed statement on climate change through

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>inclusion of Yarra aiming to be carbon neutral. This change is outside the scope of this Amendment but is the subject of work that is currently underway.</p> <p>Criteria H: Comments were not accepted as they are outside the scope of the Planning Scheme and/or there is insufficient strategic evidence to support the change. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 16.01-4L Housing affordability, the submitter seeks to increase the proposed housing affordability from 10% to 20%. This change lacks strategic justification and is therefore not accepted.
379	<i>No changes accepted.</i>	Submitted track changes were included in no. 350. See submission no.350 for examples.
380	<i>No changes accepted.</i>	<p>Criteria D: Comments were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.01-1L Urban Design under <i>Boulevards</i>, the submitter seeks to remove “<i>Provide a scale that reflects the context of the boulevard</i>”. This changes the intent of the proposed policy on boulevards and therefore the change is not accepted. <p>Criteria G: Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 11.03-1L Activity Centres under <i>Smith Street, Fitzroy</i>, the submitter seeks to remove Victoria Parade. This change is not accepted as it is outside the scope of this Amendment but is the subject of current built form work for Smith Street (C288 Interim controls).
396	<p>Criteria 1; and Criteria 3 – See preferred version of Clauses 02.01 Context and 15.03-1L Heritage.</p>	<p>Criteria A: Changes were not accepted as they were matters included elsewhere in the Scheme. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.03-1L Heritage under <i>Strategies</i>, the submitter seeks to insert “<i>Ensure that conservation is guided by the statement of significance for the place</i>”. This statement is already covered through proposed Clause 15.03-1L Heritage. It is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria B: Changes were not accepted as they do not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submitter seeks to number all the Clauses within the individual proposed Clause. This change does not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy. The change is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria C: Changes were not accepted because they propose like for like changes. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submitter proposes strategies be included in activity centre policy covering matters that are contained within the SEES which is

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>proposed to be incorporated into the Scheme.</p> <p>Criteria D: Changes were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.03-1L Heritage, the submitter seeks to include provisions to manage the height of fences. Referencing height is too specific and is considered unnecessary. The change is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria F: Changes were not accepted as it includes new content that would require re-exhibition of amendment. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submitter seeks to include additional landmarks in clause 15.01-2L Landmarks. This change would require re-exhibition of the Amendment and is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria G; Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submitter proposes changes to the Statement of Significance. This is outside the scope of this Amendment but is the subject of proposed future work. The changes are therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria H: Changes were not accepted as they are outside the scope of the Planning Scheme</p>

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>and/or there is insufficient strategic evidence to support the change. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submitter proposes a number of changes to the Heritage Database. This is outside the scope of the Amendment and is therefore not accepted. - The submitter appears to suggest that an additional view of the Shot Tower be protected. There is insufficient support for the changes sought by the submitter in respect of additional primary views to landmarks. Any change proposed is therefore not accepted.
403	<p>Criteria 1; Criteria 2; and Criteria 3 – See preferred version of Clauses 02-01 Context, 02.03 Strategic Directions and 19.02-6L Open Space.</p>	<p>Submitted track changes were included in no.302. See submission no.302 for examples.</p>
418	<p><i>No changes accepted.</i></p>	<p>Criteria C: Changes were not accepted as they do not add value, have the same intent as the exhibited policy provision, and officers consider the exhibited wording should be preferred to the wording put forward by the submitter. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the proposed Clause 15.01-1L Urban Design under <i>Laneways</i>, the submitter changes the strategy “<i>Provides a ground floor setback from the laneway, where the laneway is too narrow to provide safe access for vehicles and pedestrians.</i>” to the following: “<i>Where laneways are too narrow, provide safe access</i>”

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p data-bbox="1002 230 1374 365"><i>for vehicles and pedestrians including through ground floor setbacks from the laneway.”</i></p> <p data-bbox="906 398 1394 667">Criteria D: Changes were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul data-bbox="954 701 1394 1037" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="954 701 1394 1037">- In the proposed Clause 15.01-1L Urban Design under <i>Development adjacent to land in a Heritage Overlay</i>, the submitter seeks to remove first and fourth strategy. This changes the intent of the proposed policy and is therefore not accepted. <p data-bbox="906 1070 1394 1305">Criteria G; Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p> <ul data-bbox="954 1339 1394 1742" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="954 1339 1394 1742">- In the proposed Clause 15.01-2L Landmarks, the submitter requests that further clarity is provided around what level of ‘clear sky’ us considered ‘adequate’ between new development and the landmark. This change is outside the scope of the Amendment but is the subject of proposed future work.
420	Criteria 2 - See preferred version of Clause 15.01-1L Urban Design.	<p data-bbox="906 1778 1315 1912">Criteria A: Changes were not accepted as they were matters included elsewhere in the Scheme. For example:</p> <ul data-bbox="954 1946 1362 2009" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="954 1946 1362 2009">- The submitter states that in clause 15.01-2L Building

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>design, building form does not take into account a site context with emerging or varied preferred future character envisaged by the Scheme. This is generally defined in policy and current built form work. Therefore the change is not accepted.</p> <p>Criteria B: Changes were not accepted as they do not conform with DELWP requirements for drafting planning scheme policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submitter opposes the inclusion of 74.01 Schedule to application of zones and overlays. This schedule is a requirement of the Planning Policy Framework and the classifications are the standard agreed upon definitions across the planning schemes. No change is therefore accepted. <p>Criteria D: Changes were not accepted because they either change the intent of the statement or the policy, are too specific, create inconsistencies in terminology and/or are a misunderstanding of the intent of the statement or policy. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the proposed Clause 18.04-2L Car Parking under <i>Strategies</i>, the submitter requires clarification to confirm if the statement “<i>Support a reduction in the required number of car parking spaces...</i>” is intended to refer to Clause 52.34 or to increase bicycle requirements. No change is accepted as the policy is general and provides discretion depending on the context and any change to clarify would be too specific.

Submission No	Accepted Criteria	No Change Criteria
		<p>Criteria E: Changes were not accepted as it relates to a neutral translation of existing policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the proposed Clause 15.01-1L Urban Design under <i>Laneways</i>, the submitter seeks to change the wording “<i>avoids light spill</i>” to “<i>avoids unreasonable light spill</i>”. This section of the policy is a policy neutral translation from the existing Clause 22.07. The change is therefore not accepted. <p>Criteria G: Changes were not accepted because they included changes that are outside the scope of Amendment C269yara but are the subject of work that is currently underway or the subject of proposed future work. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In proposed Clause 15.02-1L Environmentally sustainable development under <i>Policy guidelines</i>, the submitter seeks to include the statement “<i>unless otherwise agreed by the Responsible Authority</i>”. As council is separately progressing work that will compliment / strengthen its ESD policy, these changes are not accepted.