

Attachment 18 – Informal Consultation - Feedback Summaries

No.	Format	Summary of submission
1	Email	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits that DDOs are pointless as existing heritage controls are not enforced. Efforts would be better spent on improving governance.</p>
2	Email	<p><u>Amenity:</u> Recommends requirements for acoustic controls included in DDOs to future-proof for different uses, including live music.</p>
3	Email	<p>Concerns including:</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Proposed heights over 6 storeys in traditionally one or two-storey areas</p> <p><u>Amenity:</u> Poor quality residential apartments with poor internal amenity.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Inappropriate street setbacks (too small).</p> <p><u>Other:</u> History of developers failing to meet the desired DDO requirements and being granted approval by Council. Planning Application process is difficult for laypersons to engage in.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Heritage buildings should be better protected.</p>
4	Email	<p><u>Other:</u> Believes Council disregards feedback received. Collingwood requires street scraping and other works and improvements (such as those done in Fitzroy).</p>
5	Email	<p><u>Building Height:</u> General support for overlays as outlined. Proposes maximum height limits for all buildings, with nothing over 8 storeys</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Housing commission flats should be painted. External maintenance for all buildings over four storeys should be mandatory.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> All buildings should provide one car parking space with electric charging facilities for every four residents.</p> <p><u>Traffic increase/congestion:</u> Would like areas that allow <u>only</u> pedestrians developed (concerned about bicycles and electric vehicles sharing footpaths and roads).</p>

6	Email	<p><u>Public Open Space:</u> Collingwood needs more public open spaces.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Large developments are blocking sunlight and creating wind tunnels along public streets.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> New buildings should have a low carbon footprint. Submits that with new higher density houses there needs to be more EV charging facilities.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> High-rises will turn Collingwood into a bleak area.</p>
7	Email	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Seeking less intensification of DDO areas (does not like the density of Brunswick end of Lygon and Nicholson Streets). Maximum building heights between 6 or 8 storeys preferred.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Existing local amenities have limited capacity to absorb additional population (i.e. public transport).</p>
8	Email	<p><u>Amenity:</u> High-rise buildings overshadow footpaths and create wind tunnelling.</p> <p><u>Landscaping (public):</u> Lack of street trees. Street trees soften the built environment and cool streets in summer.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Would prefer new buildings setback from the street and landscaping provided in the front setback.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Maximum building heights should be 3 - 4 storeys (7-8 storeys too high).</p> <p><u>Public Open Space:</u> Large developments should contribute more public open space and provide wider footpaths along street boundaries.</p>
9	Email	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits the limit for the owned property is too low (proposed four storeys). Notes that the wider area of Gore Street/Kerr Street has 7 storey limit. Submits their property (395-397 Gore Street) should have a higher maximum height limit (around 7 storeys). Submits that higher maximum build height would be consistent with properties throughout Gore and Kerr Streets and surrounds. Submits that the supporting reasons: appropriate setbacks above level 3 should be enough to maintain streetscape (in line with heritage neighbouring properties).</p>

		Notes that the subject site is a non-residential, non-heritage building and therefore could be developed more intensely. Notes other commercial properties in the area have higher maximum building limits.
10	Email	<u>Other:</u> Supports the proposal of the City of Yarra to introduce built form and design requirements in the areas of Fitzroy and Collingwood.
11	Email	<u>Heritage:</u> Submits that the proposed DDOs place unnecessary development pressure on the heritage overlays. Submits that the DDOs should be revised - Maximum height in DDOs should respond to the Statements of Significance of each Heritage Overlay area. Recommends IS and C heritage should experience no development pressure. Recommends proposed heights should match the existing contributory building heights (typically 2-storeys). Submits that if there is increased development pressure through allowing taller buildings the contributory fabric will be removed and be in direct conflict with the HOs. Notes that there are existing contributory buildings that have principal roof depths greater than 8 metres. Notes that the current demolition policy references significant elements buildings without a specific SoS could have elements demolished. Submits that the term 'street wall' contributes to facadism - history is lost. Notes that HO333 includes more than just the facade elements as significant - notes that this is also included in other HO areas (Gertrude and Brunswick). Recommends attention be paid to the heritage of the following site: - 94-96 Smith Street, Collingwood - 86 Smith Street, Collingwood
12	Email	<u>Building Height:</u> Supports further development in the area. Does not support development over 6 storeys. Submits that there should be adequate spacing between high buildings. Submits that there are negatives to taller buildings: - Ugly massing of built form - Visual impact - Overshadowing - Overlooking into private open space - Excess noise - Excessive traffic - Impact on heritage and character <u>Usability of new development for commercial uses:</u> Submits that the retail tenancies on the ground floor of taller developments are too large for local businesses - Supportive of smaller tenancies.
13	Email	<u>Building Height:</u> Does not support the proposed building heights surrounding 366-368 George Street, Fitzroy. Submits that there is an error allowing a 6-storey building (southwest corner of George and Argyle) within proximity to the 1-3 storey area. Submits that there is an error allowing an 8-storey building at 369 George Street. Notes that the building stands out and is located between two 2-storey buildings.

		<p>Submits that the area is low-rise not mid-rise. Submits that there is not a suitable transition to the low-scale residential area.</p> <p><u>Traffic increase/congestion:</u> Submits that there aren't sufficient parking facilities and street frontage for bin collection.</p>
14	Email	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Does not support the proposed changes - go too far. Does not support further growth in the area. Submits that the Gasworks site will provide enough new dwellings and that there doesn't need to be more (notes 1200 new apartments).</p> <p><u>Issues from construction activities:</u> Submits there is already a new apartment complex being built near the corner of Smith Street and Alexandra Parade - Been going for months. Concern about the builders breaking guidelines - starting construction before 0730. Concern that it will worsen over summer as there are more daylight hours. Submits that there should be consideration of the needs of the local residents' wellbeing. Notes the number of shift workers and residents working from home in the area that would be impacted by increased development in the area. Recommends that construction shouldn't start from 0800 or 0830. Recommends that it is not unreasonable to extend that to 0900 on Saturday. Submits that there needs to be more consideration to local amenities - Recommends that services such as Fitzroy Pool cannot accommodate the additional density.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Recommends that a portion of money from new developments should go into facilities such as pools and gyms.</p>
15	Email	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Notes that the area currently is lower (14m) and the proposed height is 20.8m. Concern with the proposal to allow 2 storeys taller than the existing.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Notes the unique street views, pubs and shops - neighbourhood character. Notes the significance of the area.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Recommends mandatory controls (heights and setbacks) to be the current existing heights of the area. Recommends mandatory controls apply to public properties (including the State Government)</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Recommends that no DPO apply - Reference to the Brotherhood redevelopment Does not support 12-storeys (36m) at the Brotherhood site - notes that there is currently a 2-storey character in the area.</p>
16	Email	<p><i>Refer to summary of Submission 13.</i></p>

17	Email	<p><u>Building Height/Heritage:</u> Submits that the building heights proposed are too high - Will dominate the area. Submits that the heights will not achieve the DDO objectives. Recommends 3 or 4-storey maximum building height. Recommends that 6-10-storeys along Smith Street wouldn't protect the heritage streetscape. Recommends controls along Smith Street on the east side between Derby and mason Street be aligned with the controls on the same side between Peel and Derby (DDO30). Recommends reducing the height for the east end of Alexandra Parade - Recommends height is reduced to a maximum of 4 storeys. Submits that 7-storeys is too tall for properties adjoining William Murray Woolworks. Submits that it is important to retain heritage fabric beyond the facades. Recommends including - <i>service equipment above heritage sites should not be visible from the street.</i> Submits that a list of exceptions for exceeding the building height has been rejected in other DDOs. Recommends that preferred heights should not be exceeded by more than one storey (or similar metric). Recommends more consideration for (submits height should be 3 or 4 storeys): - Murray Woolworks - The Gasometer Hotel - The Fox Hotel Recommends 46 Alexandra Parade be assessed for heritage protection. Submits that the overall height of DDO39 (12-storeys) is too high. Recommends 3 or 4 storeys on Victoria Parade.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Recommends there needs to be a Landmarks Policy developed to provide appropriate context to the DDO heights. Recommends better protections to views of the Shot Tower, St. Johns Church, Croatian Church and Collingwood Town Hall. Submits that the population projections are inaccurate. Submits that employment can be better sustained in building lower buildings and refurbishing existing ones. Recommends new extensions behind heritage facades need to be lower to be visually recessive - a reference to the example of Queens Parade. Recommends a visually recessive approach be taken to the rear of new developments (heritage and residential areas). Recommends the maps be updated to include a scale that represents the depth of the setback.</p> <p><u>Street wall:</u> Recommends that 'match' be replaced with 'not exceed' in regard to infill development. Submits that a consistent street wall isn't appropriate everywhere - Notes Alexandra Parade. Recommends reference to the objectives referring to a consistent street wall be changed or removed. Recommends an objective be included - Strongly encourage a new setback from the street on the larger blocks of non-heritage sites on the Alexandra Parade to promote pedestrian amenities and allow landscaping. Recommends include - <i>In locations on Alexandra Parade where heritage is not a constraint, ground level setbacks (and above) to enhance the public realm and provide landscaping are strongly encouraged.</i> Submits that the street wall heights on Smith Street are too high.</p>
----	-------	---

		<p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Recommends overshadowing be considered at the winter solstice, not the equinox. Submits that 6-storeys will overshadow Otter Street.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Recommends mandatory setback of 10 metres for Smith Street shops. Recommends mandatory setback of 10 metres for Victoria Parade.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary heights:</u> Supports mandatory controls in most situations. Recommends that 'should' meaning preferred control be defined. Recommends mandatory street wall height controls on DDO39.</p> <p><u>Usability of new development for commercial uses:</u> Recommends that to maintain viable shops good shop width and depth need to be maintained. Recommends inclusion of the following objective - <i>Ensure shop front widths, depths and delivery access are not reduced to the extent they become commercially unviable.</i></p>
18	Email	<p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Concern that buildings allowed in DDO29 will overlook DDO40. Concern that there aren't provisions to not block current residents - Questions if this would be addressed in planning permits. Submits that if Brunswick Street becomes a bunch of apartments it will lose all character and soul. Concern that DDO40 does not consider overlooking enough - Questions about what provisions are in place. Supportive of development in the area. Concern that the view of Fitzroy from their balcony will be ruined by future development.</p>
19	Email	<p><u>Other:</u> Recommends Council request an extension of the existing interim controls. Recommends Council undertake further community consultation prior to a Planning Panel Hearing. Notes similarities between Queens Parade and the streets in this Amendment. Notes the resolution/recommendation of C269yara to undertake further activity centre planning for areas not covered by a DDO. Notes the status of many of the streets as "coolest streets in the world". Recommends Council rectify the number of heritage and zoning anomalies identified in the background reports. Recommends a peer review of the project. Recommends incorporating the findings of C231yara and C269yara.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Recommends upper-level setbacks behind heritage buildings be a minimum of 10 metres or the depth of the principal roof form.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits concern that the DDOs conflict with the HOs. Recommends Council undertake studies on the traditional and contemporary Aboriginal heritage of the city and note Fitzroy.</p>

		<p><u>Usability of new development for commercial uses:</u> Concern about the commercial viability of the area (night time economy, shopping, visitation and tourism). Notes the strategies that flag the area for economic growth.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Concern that height is based on plot size (depth) - not enough consideration for neighbourhood character.</p>
20	Email	<p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Submits that the upper-level setback requirement (for a depth of 6 metres from the Smith Street boundary) should not be applied to all properties along Smith Street, due to the differences in lot/land depth. Submits that properties with a shorter depth (such as your property at 347-349 Smith Street) should have a lesser upper-level setback requirement (you suggested a depth of 3 metres from the Smith Street boundary).</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Excessive alterations to Smith Street could be detrimental to the area; Smith Street is a vibrant shopping strip, which should be preserved.</p> <p><u>Traffic increase/congestion:</u> The section of Smith Street between Gertrude Street and Johnston Street is the busiest section of Smith Street. Areas of Smith Street to the north and south of this section are quieter and less productive.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> Car parking is in high demand along Smith Street, and all future developments should be required to provide adequate car parking within their property to reduce pressure for existing on-street car parking.</p>
21	Email	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Concern about the heritage area- Notes that it should be protected from destruction by development.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Notes the result from Queens Parade Amendment. Supports the same result as Queens Parade Precinct 4 (4-storeys).</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Notes that it's important for shopping strips and small businesses.</p>
22	Email	<p><u>Heritage / Upper-level setbacks:</u> Concern about the character and appeal of the main Fitzroy streets - Submits that they will be lost if minimum upper-level setbacks are not 10 metres. Notes that Fitzroy is a retreat from the planning of other nearby Councils. Submits that Fitzroy is the cultural heartbeat of Victoria. Submits that heritage is important to residents and those who visit - Priceless and invaluable.</p>
23	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
24	Email	<p>Strongly objects to DDO29.</p> <p><u>Neighbourhood Character/Heritage</u> Submits that the developments on Brunswick Street from Rose Street to Alexandra Parade must be kept at a level that fits with the streetscape thereby</p>

		<p>preserving the look, feel and heritage of the area. Provides evidence that 388 - 390 Brunswick Street, stands out like a sore thumb on Brunswick Street. It does not fit with the landscape and absolutely detracts for the look and feel of the area and the laneway behind the development.</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Concerned that allowing developments of 4 to 6 storeys on this section of Brunswick Street would seriously damage the unique reputation of Brunswick Street as not only a tourist attraction but one of the coolest streets in the world.</p> <p><u>Laneways</u> Submits that new development/s will damage the unique laneways and their appeal.</p> <p><u>Upper-Level Setback</u> Doesn't support the minimal setback 6m-8m above old shop fronts and submits that setbacks must be at least 10m-12m.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Submits that developments must be stepped to ensure sunlight to the low-rise residential properties.</p> <p><u>Request to rezone</u> The submitter mentions that the property is zoned as MUZ but it is clearly residential and is the only block off Brunswick Street classified this way and requests a rezoning to residential.</p>
25	Email	<p>Feedback regarding the proposed DDO36. Concerned with the proposed DDO36 overlay will completely destroy the appeal this area now has and create a high rise congested and visually abhorrent locality.</p> <p><u>Neighbourhood Character</u> Concerned with neighbourhood character and new buildings will be a very tall, narrow standalone building in our street which is visually unattractive and totally out of character among all the other buildings which are low rise.</p> <p><u>Building height</u> Recommends the building height to be 1-3 storeys rather than 6-9 storeys.</p> <p><u>Lack of Parking</u> Concerned that most of these new buildings have very limited car parking facilities which creates congestion with street parking.</p> <p><u>Amenity</u> Submits that the new developments' street frontage is limited and often have their bins located on the street, which is smelly, unattractive and a hazard for pedestrians. Concerned that the new development looks directly into neighbouring balconies and will take away personal privacy and light which is totally unacceptable.</p>
26	Email	<p><u>Commercial viability of the Centre:</u> Supports the business strip between Gore and George relies on all the frontages being maintained as commercial businesses as this brings foot traffic and supportive customers to all businesses. Also submits that historic shopping strips support the role of small, independent retailers (as opposed to big-box stores) and still allow for economic viability of small scale businesses in affordable and modest sized tenancies.</p>

		<p><u>Ground floor setback</u> Suggests that all development should be set back to protect the businesses.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Concerned that loss of sunshine and character would occur with high rise development above current levels.</p> <p><u>Protect streetscape:</u> Supports to protect the facades and the broader streetscapes.</p> <p><u>First Nation/Aboriginal heritage:</u> Submits that Gertrude Street has significance to First Nations people and work by Yarra on Aboriginal heritage should be included in this amendment.</p> <p><u>Building Heights:</u> Concerned that proposed building heights appear to mainly reflect residential yield, with little consideration for the context of the sites, for neighbourhood character and for commercial viability.</p>
27	Email	<p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary:</u> Requests that the word “should” remain in place as per Yarra Planning Scheme 22/10/2021 C288yara and that the word “must” be removed from the proposed DDO40 document. By retaining the word “should”, all parties involved in any future development will have flexibility and discretion to achieve the best development outcomes considering the various situations that may arise. Suggests deleting “A permit cannot be granted under this Design and Development Overlay to vary a requirement expressed with the term ‘must’”.</p>
28	Email	<p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Requests that the word “should” remain in place as per Yarra Planning Scheme 22/10/2021 C288yara and that the word “must” be removed from the proposed DDO40 document. By retaining the word “should”, all parties involved in any future development will have flexibility and discretion to achieve the best development outcomes considering the various situations that may arise. Suggests deleting “A permit cannot be granted under this Design and Development Overlay to vary a requirement expressed with the term ‘must’”.</p>
29	Email	<p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Requests that the word “should” remain in place as per Yarra Planning Scheme 22/10/2021 C288yara and that the word “must” be removed from the proposed DDO40 document. By retaining the word “should”, all parties involved in any future development will have flexibility and discretion to achieve the best development outcomes considering the various situations that may arise. Suggests deleting “A permit cannot be granted under this Design and Development Overlay to vary a requirement expressed with the term ‘must’”.</p>
30	Email	<p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Requests that the word “should” remain in place as per Yarra Planning Scheme 22/10/2021 C288yara and that the word “must” be removed from the proposed DDO40 document. By retaining the word “should”, all parties involved in any future development will have flexibility and discretion to achieve the best development outcomes considering the various situations that may arise. Suggests deleting “A permit cannot be granted under this Design and Development Overlay to vary a requirement expressed with the term ‘must’”.</p>
31	Email	<p>The submitter is supportive of the interim DDO39 becoming a permanent control.</p> <p><u>Building height:</u> Supports a higher preferred maximum height limit in the order of 14 storeys / 46.4 metres for the parcels of land between Cromwell and Islington Streets</p>

		<p>(assuming that heights in metres are calculated as having a 4.8-metre-high ground floor, with 3.2-metre-high floors above) and adds that increased preferred maximum height should be considered as part of any exhibited permanent DDO39.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Does not support the protection of the Victoria Parade central median at 12pm on 22 September overshadowing. Mentions that protecting it through overshadowing controls is unnecessary and excessive.</p> <p><u>Further consultation</u> Welcomes the opportunity to discuss the feedback further with Council should it be considered helpful, and otherwise looks forward to the formal public consultation process.</p>
32	Email	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Recommends changes to the DDOs - Note the changes are made to the website summaries.</p> <p>Area DDO36 (Fitzroy East and Johnston St North):</p> <p>1) Front wall of new buildings <u>will be kept to 2-3 storeys and heritage fronts retained</u> (consistent with DDO40-Fitzroy West, DDO37-Smith St North & South, DDO30-Smith St Shops). [change from 'mainly 3-4 storeys']</p> <p>2) Maximum building height <u>will be</u> - Johnston St: <u>3-5 storeys, 3 around small heritage shops</u> (consistent with DDO30-Smith St Shops, DDO35-Johnston St South) [change from 'should be 6-8 storeys'] - Back streets: <u>3-5 storeys (exception for a few pre-existing sites)</u> (consistent with DDO40-Fitzroy West) [change from 'should be 3-7 storeys']</p> <p>3) Taller parts of new buildings (setback) <u>>2-3 storeys will be 8+ metres pushed back regardless of heritage</u> from Johnston St and Back streets (10+ metres from Argyle St) (consistent with DDO37-Smith St North & South, DDO30-Smith St Shops) [change from 'setback >3-4 storeys... should be 6+ metres, Johnston St and back streets']</p> <p>Areas DDO37 (Smith St) and DDO30 (Smith St Shops):</p> <p>1) Front wall of new buildings <u>will be kept to 2 storeys</u> [change from '2-3 storeys'; essential to maintain existing eastern light into apartment/residential buildings of DDO36 (i.e., along Gore St)]</p> <p>2) Maximum building height <u>will be 2 storeys</u> on Smith St (West and East) and <u>3-5 storeys on back streets</u> (i.e., the west side of Smith St's northern end) (exception for a few pre-existing sites) [change from '6-10, 4-7, 3-8'; essential to maintain existing eastern light into apartment/residential buildings of DDO36 (i.e., along Gore St)]</p> <p>3) Taller parts of new buildings (setback) <u>will be 8+ metres pushed back regardless of heritage</u> [change from '6+ metres']</p>
33	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
34	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
35	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
36	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>

37	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
38	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
39	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
40	Email	<p>The submitter is supportive of the City of Yarra’s work to provide certainty to Residents and Developers in shaping the future of the suburb. Supports the height limits and setbacks contained in DDO34 with the following three suggestions that we consider will assist City of Yarra meet the stated objective at 1 “.....ensuring the overall scale and form of the new development provides a suitable transition to low scale residential areas and protects these properties from an unreasonable loss of amenity through visual bulk, overlooking and overshadowing.”</p> <p><u>Brotherhood of St Laurence (BSL)</u> Concerned at the efforts of the Brotherhood of St Laurence (BSL) to bypass the Councils Planning Framework by means of an application for a Development Plan Overlay made directly to the State Planning Minister. Concerned that the DPO proposes building to a height of 12 storeys with unknown setbacks. This far exceeds the maximum height limits of 20.8 metres contained in the current interim DDO34 and proposed permanent DDO34.</p> <p><u>Upper Level Front and Side Set Back Requirements</u> Suggests that the upper levels above a side street wall should be set back by a minimum of 6 (SIX) metres in place of the 3m in the current draft. This makes the setback consistent with a primary frontage street wall which is 6 metres. The reasoning is that side streets are generally narrow. A larger set back of 6 metres for upper levels rather than the 3 currently proposed will help increase light to the person/trees at street level and reduce the visual bulk of developments from that side street.</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Suggests that the exceptions to height limits listed at the 2nd paragraph and its six bullet points be removed (Height criteria?). Suggests removing the exceptions at the 4th paragraph and its three bullet points. (Services?)</p> <p><u>Landscaping</u> Requests to retain the landscaping and improve around the BSL site.</p>
41	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
42	Email	<p>Feedback on Design and Development Overlay Schedule 30 – Smith Street Shops</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> As a home owner that has a private residential property on Gore Street, that runs through to Little Smith Street, any height restrictions should be significantly reduced at the rear of Little Smith Street as this would have a detrimental impact on my property – both visually and financially. no more than three storeys in height on the back of any property in Smith Street that runs through to Little Smith Street; with any building height not exceeding five storeys.</p> <p><u>Neighbourhood Character</u> Whilst I appreciate the growing demand for more density living, the City of Yarra needs to start taking more consideration into our heritage; the foundations and the unique streetscapes we currently have within this area.</p>

		<p><u>Lack of Infrastructure</u> Further to this we currently do not have the infrastructure to accommodate such visually bulk building and accommodation within the Smith Street/Little Smith Street area.</p> <p><u>Parking</u> Any proposed amendments should ensure car spaces are available for both occupants and visitors to alleviate the pressure on parking within the surrounding streets. With proposed changes would see an increase in the number of residents; resulting in an increase in residents and their visitors seeking out places to park.</p> <p><u>Amenity / Overlooking</u> Apartments /office with West facing windows should have 100% opaque glass to reduce occupants looking directly in Gore Street properties. Balconies facing west from Little Smith Street should not be an option as this would enable occupants to look directly into habitable spaces</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Little to no consideration has been shown for the Significant Heritage overlay in Little Smith and Gore Street. The Little Smith Street side of any proposed development in Smith Street should also be subject to a heritage overlay. Heritage Reports need to ensure they address HO334 entirely.</p> <p><u>Traffic increase</u> Any increase in building size and structure would see an increase in traffic I see significant pressures on the current infrastructure that is also struggling to keep up with existing multi-dwelling development.</p>
43	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
44	Email	<p><u>Other</u> Completely positive feedback on the amendment and confident that we will pay attention to the views of the residents who own property or live in the area</p>
45	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
46	Email	<p><u>Building Design</u> Concerned about rapid change destroying the areas beauty and character</p> <p><u>Amenity (General)</u> Concerned about building with windows overlooking backyards.</p> <p><u>Building height</u> Concerned that even with street setbacks, buildings are overwhelming activity centres with their heights</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary</u> Would like to see more 3 storey buildings (max 5 storeys) distributed over the whole area sensitively</p>
47	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
48	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
49	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
50	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>

51	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
52	Email	<p><i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i></p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Concerns with future development of the neighbourhood. Submits that tall and inappropriate buildings impact greatly to the detriment of all concerned.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that the unique historic and aesthetic nature of the former industrial/residential suburbs deserve to be preserved for future generations and those living there.</p>
53	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
54	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
55	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
56	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
57	Email	<p><u>Building height</u> Overall concerns about height and setback of buildings on major streets (Brunswick, Smith and Gertrude Streets)</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> General amenity concerns about buildings that are too high including reduced light in neighbourhood</p> <p><u>Building design</u> Would like to see good architecture implemented but concerned that there is no control over this</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks</u> Would like to see a minimum 10m upper level setbacks in each DDO</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary</u> Would like to see mandatory controls used for upper level setbacks to side streets for each DDO</p>
58	Email	<p><u>Building Height</u> Is under impression that proposal is completely removing existing height limits in each DDO. Would like to see existing height limits retained?</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Wants mandatory rather than preferred controls.</p> <p><u>Amenity (General)</u> Concerned that area will end up like Langridge with ugly tower blocks, minimal setbacks and overshadowing Does not want to see wind tunnels created in area</p>

		<p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Would like to see a mandatory minimum of 10m upper-level setbacks Would like to see mandatory upper-level setbacks to side streets in each DDO too.</p>
59	Email	<p><i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i></p>
60	Email	<p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Would like to see minimum upper level setback of 10m for all development to protect street scapes</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Would like to see protection and preservation of intact heritage buildings all along Gertrude Street Wants preservation of historical corners on Gertrude referring to George St, Gore St & Napier St</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Wants current heights on Gertrude to remain the same to maintain neighbourhood character</p> <p><u>Street / neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving</u> Does not want to see shopping strips becoming buildings / accommodation Would like to see development in commercial and mixed-use zones in the streets behind shopping strips</p> <p><u>Other</u> Discusses how Gertrude and surrounds are an important creative hub of Melbourne/Victoria and the heritage shops foster electric, creative and diverse energy. Emphasis on the importance that shopping strips have on the economy too, alluding to how they would like to see this all maintained in new DDOs</p>
61	Email	<p><i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i></p>
62	Email	<p><u>Building height</u> Argues that beautiful, sustainable and resilient main streets have no more than 6 storeys in building height</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Believes taller buildings are far more energy demanding due to increased air con and elevator requirements - doesn't want to see this happen with this area. Does not want to see loss of sunlight through new developments. Suggests applying Better Apartment Design Standards to avoid this. Believes overlooking has become too prominent as a development issue. Believes that it actually encourages better relationships between neighbours and would like to see more of it.</p> <p><u>Building design</u> Provides list of building design elements that are present in the area and they would like to see more of: Classic and traditional forms, natural materials & textures (less steel & glass), quality materials which lasts centuries, human scale (community, familiarity), harmony (things agree with each other), fine-grain mixed use, ten minute rule (pedestrians rule, kids play)</p> <p><u>Street / neighbourhood / Public amenity needs improving</u> Would like to see more ground-floor retail implemented to create characteristic to the area and maximise public realm frontage</p>
63	Email	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Recommends a reduction in the height of the buildings to 3-4 storeys for both of these two blocks (other than the heritage building that is currently there</p>

		<p>between George and Gore Street) which should remain at its current height. Recommends along Cecil Street have a mandatory maximum height of the back of the building of 8m. Submits this will make it consistent with our area and help protect the character of our streets.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary provisions:</u> Recommends changing all preferred provisions to mandatory provisions.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Recommends increasing the setback at the rear of Alexandra Parade (along Cecil Street) to 10m above two storeys to reduce shadowing and privacy concerns. Recommends increasing the setback for the 1-2 storeys above Cecil Street to at least 8 metres (mandatory).</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits a seven-storey building with six-storeys on Cecil Street with a setback of 3 metres over 16metres will cause a significant reduction to the amount of natural light given these buildings are directly north of their block. Submits that taller development will decrease their privacy and way of life. Notes the number of children that play in the yards of the area.</p> <p><u>Traffic increase/congestion:</u> Submits that further development will make commuting through Fitzroy impossible. Submits that Fitzroy cannot manage the traffic as it currently is.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> Submits that further development will impact on the parking in Fitzroy. Submits that visitors to new apartment buildings will fill all the non-permit zones and there are not enough permit parks.</p>
64	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
65	Email	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Recommends a reduction in the height of the buildings to the north, north-west, and west of me to 3-4 storeys - to protect privacy and natural light Recommends a reduction in the height of the buildings across the road from me fronting Kerr Street to 11.2metres - to preserve the neighbourhood.</p> <p><u>Street wall:</u> Recommends the whole street line has a height consistent with the two terrace houses.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary provisions:</u> Recommends changing all preferred provisions to mandatory provisions.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Recommends increasing the setback to 10 metres (mandatory) if buildings need to be higher in the rear. Recommends adding setbacks on northern blocks in the DDO of a minimum of 8-10 metres - to ensure privacy and natural light. Recommends setbacks be taken from buildings and not just the street. Recommends increasing the setback on Kerr and George Streets to 10 metres (mandatory).</p>

		<p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits the proposed heights will be detrimental to privacy and natural light - impact on mental health and well-being.</p> <p><u>Traffic increase/congestion:</u> Submits that further development will make commuting through Fitzroy impossible. Submits that Fitzroy cannot manage the traffic as it currently is.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> Submits that further development will impact on the parking in Fitzroy. Submits that visitors to new apartment buildings will fill all the non-permit zones and there are not enough permit parks. Submits that increasing the driveways would be dangerous to pedestrians.</p>
66	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
67	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 63.</i>
68	Email	<p><u>Heritage</u> Believes that the importance of heritage needs to take precedence over the need to provide housing for population growth.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary</u> Raises general concerns about the sheer amount of objections they have had to lodge and amount of VCAT hearings that they have had to partake in due to inappropriate development. Believes that this is a cause of a lack of mandatory controls regarding building heights and setbacks in DDOs. Would like to see mandatory controls applied to building heights and setbacks - suggests heights to be stated in metres as opposed to storeys for clarity.</p> <p><u>Amenity (General)</u> Concerns about overlooking - commercial zones backing onto laneways and residential zones. Does not agree with measure of only requiring screening up to a distance of 9m. Wants to see this change.</p> <p><u>Street / Neighbourhood / Public amenity needs improving</u> Would like to see greening of laneways to provide attractive elevation.</p> <p><u>Building Design</u> Wants to see any design of major developments be required to be assessed by a design panel.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Believes that planning outcomes should be more focused on improving the built environment rather than continuing to degrade the quality of community through new development that attempts to reduce negative impacts Would like to see development contributions be required to be identified and used to improve local amenity. Believes sunlight needs to be preserved a lot more than it currently is.</p>
69	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
70	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 63.</i>
71	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>

72	Email	<p><u>Street / Neighbourhood / Public amenity needs improving</u> Argues that the Mixed Use area in Fitzroy West (particularly along Rose St) is heavily residential with families and they would like to see this taken into consideration through planning provisions. Does not agree with describing Leicester St, Rose St and Fitzroy St as "areas of transition" as these are substantially residential streets.</p> <p><u>Useability of new development for commercial uses</u> Concerns about the uses that are provisioned for building construction at 35 Rose St and a new hotel at the corner of Rose & Fitzroy Street. Worried that the intention is to install a rooftop bar which will play music late at night and lead to neighbourhood nuisances to the heavily residential area.</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Doesn't like that their property is included in Fitzroy West Precinct as their street (Garryowen Lane) is a neighbourhood with relatively few storeys - would like to see this stay the same way - no more than 4 storeys</p>
73	Email	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Recommends a reduction in the height of the buildings to 3-4 storeys for blocks at the north end of Brunswick Street (Leicester Street north to Alexandra Pde) - to protect the character and make it consistent with the rest of the street. Recommends 8m maximum along the laneways at the back of buildings.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary provisions:</u> Recommends changing all preferred provisions to mandatory provisions.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Recommends increasing the setback to 10 metres at the front of Brunswick Street - to maintain the character. Recommends a setback of 8 metres along the laneways at the back of buildings (for 1-2 storeys).</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits the proposed heights will be detrimental to privacy and natural light - impact on mental health and well-being. Notes the number of children that play in their homes and yards.</p> <p><u>Traffic increase/congestion:</u> Submits that further development will make commuting through Fitzroy impossible. Submits that Fitzroy cannot manage the traffic as it currently is. Submits that increasing growth/traffic will be dangerous for kids that play in the street and go between houses.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> Submits that further development will impact on the parking in Fitzroy. Submits that visitors to new apartment buildings will fill all the non-permit zones and there are not enough permit parks. Submits that increasing the driveways would be dangerous to pedestrians.</p>
74	Email	<p><i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i></p>
75	Email	<p><u>Building Height</u> Strongly concerned about proposed height limits of 17.6 to 27.2m on Smith Street being excessive when it comes to the transition between her property on Little Smith Street and Smith Street.</p>

		<p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Would like to see greater setbacks required for developments along Little Smith Street</p> <p><u>Building Design</u> Would like to see developments activate pleasant facades on Little Smith Street to improve safety and to allow passive surveillance in the street instead of treating it as a rear service lane. Concerned that it is perceived more as a laneway for rubbish to be dump and for toilet use.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Would like to see more suitable controls on Little Smith Street.</p>
76	Email	<p><u>Building Height</u> Resident in DDO37 concerned about building heights proposed for the north end of Smith St Believes that 10 storey high buildings will have detrimental effects to adjoining single storey properties behind proposed developments. Believes 8 storeys should be maximum</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks</u> Would like to see controls in place to make sure that each storey is set back further from the one below to protect privacy of residents</p>
77	Email	<p><i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i></p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Notes that they are appalled that the City of Yarra is allowing the avarice of developers to destroy the neighbourhood. Submits that each development is bigger than the last - Does not support this becoming the 'new normal'. Submits that the larger/recent developments are being used as examples of 'pre-existing'.</p>
78	Email	<p><i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i></p> <p><u>Amenity Loss</u> Concerned with overshadowing and overlooking Concerned with noise pollution (from apartment occupants)</p> <p><u>Car Parking</u> Concerned with lack of on-street parking, and new development creating additional demand for carparking</p> <p><u>Other</u> New apartment buildings should have fibre optic cable (NBN) to each apartment to reduce impact of electromagnetic radiation exposure.</p>
79	Email	<p><i>Refer to summary of Submission 75.</i></p>
80	Email	<p><u>Other:</u> Concerned that proposed maximum street wall height and building height will conflict with existing planning permit (PLN20/0470). Requests DDO30 have maximum building height and street wall height amended for this property, to align with planning permit. As planning permit was approved prior to gazettal of permanent DDO30; the requirements of DDO30 will not impact this planning permit.</p>
81	Email	<p><i>Refer to summary of Submissions 32.</i></p>

		<p><u>Amenity impacts</u> Concerned about impacts of building heights on adjoining properties, including overshadowing impacts. Concerned about loss of privacy/overlooking from future apartment buildings</p> <p><u>Traffic impacts/congestion</u> Concerned about increased traffic congestion and also risky driver behaviour Concerned about pedestrian safety along footpaths due to new driveways being created.</p> <p><u>Car parking</u> Concerned about loss of on-street parking due to new driveways being created.</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> Reduction in the height of the buildings along Rose Street (either side of George Street) and along George Street (south of Rose Street) to 3-4 storeys. Reduction in the height of the buildings along Kerr Street (between Gore and Napier Streets) to 11.2mtrs. Increase the [upper level] set back on these houses to 10 metres (mandatory) if they need to be higher at the back.</p> <p><u>Setbacks</u> Add a setback on blocks along south side of Rose Street of at least 8-10 metres to ensure our privacy and no overshadowing. This set back should be from houses, not just the front of the street and the laneway. Increase the setback on the frontage of Kerr Street and George Street from 6mtrs to 10mtrs and make this mandatory.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary provisions:</u> Recommends heights and setbacks as outlined are implemented as mandatory provisions.</p>
82	Email	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that Fitzroy is largely consistent with 19th-century buildings - generally 2-storeys high. Submits that shopping strips are historically and aesthetically integral to the suburbs as a whole. Submits that Fitzroy is the oldest suburb in Melbourne and contains some of the earliest buildings in the state - Notes the number of 1850s bluestone buildings.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Does not support 6-8-storeys along Brunswick, Gertrude and Smith Street - Submits that this will separate the residential area from the shops and visually change the suburb. Recommends preserving the present height of buildings (approx. 2-3-storeys).</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Notes the high number of tourists the area gets. Submits that the beauty, consistency and age of the streetscape and buildings are what draws tourists - Submits that if this changes the tourists won't come. Submits a comparison of Paris - Notes that in Paris there is increased density in new outer suburbs not in the city - Does not support increased density. Submits that even if the density is increased not everyone can afford Fitzroy. Notes that many people are working from home since COVID - Less needs to be located close to the CBD for work.</p>

83	Email	<p>Four storey building height along Gertrude Street will ruin retail and heritage streetscape due to overshadowing and additional demand for car parking. Recent development in the area has altered the streetscape forever and will not be recovered.</p> <p><u>Setbacks</u> Upper levels along Gertrude Street should be setback 10m (from main street and side streets) Lack of setback in recent developments results in lack of privacy for apartment occupants.</p>
84	Email	<p>Recent development along Rose Street (DDO40) has led to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of sun on the street 2. Wind tunnel effects 3. Traffic congestion, particularly from trucks and waste collection vehicles (not just from construction phases) 4. The above has made the street quite unpleasant to be in <p>Hence, my feedback is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 6-8 storeys in this area of Rose Street (corner with Spring St in particular) is too high 2. Given recent approvals were made in the absence of controls, the 6-8 storeys should not be used as a benchmark 3. Heights should be lowered to approx. 4 storeys as that would likely be a better balance
85	Email	<p><u>Setbacks</u> Requests a minimum upper level setback of 10m for all development Current Heritage Overlay setback requirements will conflict with proposed DDO31 setback requirements.</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> The feel and ambiance of Gertrude Street and Fitzroy in general is important and this means no high-rise developments. Heritage buildings along Gertrude Street (especially shops) must be protected and preserved. Gertrude Street supports small, independent retailers; small scale businesses are economically viable in heritage, modest-sized tenancies. Gertrude Street intersections with George, Gore and Napier Streets should be preserved. Include area/s of Aboriginal heritage along Gertrude Street in the Heritage Overlay.</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Current heights along Gertrude Street form neighbourhood character; should not be changed. Blue sky should be visible above heritage buildings</p> <p><u>Other</u> Maintain rear lane access for commercial buildings Residential developments should not be located along shopping strips (Gertrude Street)</p>
86	Email	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Concern that the proposal does not respect the heritage of neighbourhoods. Notes that there are suburbs with less historic significance. Submits that filling Fitzroy and Collingwood with more apartment buildings is not keeping the character of the area.</p>
87	Email	<p><i>Refer to summary of Submission 73.</i></p>

88	Email	<p><u>Heritage</u> Improve definitions of “heritage” within Fitzroy and Collingwood as faster, denser than other suburbs and “neighbourhood character” within Fitzroy and Collingwood as traditional architecture styles and building forms. Allow Haussmann style buildings to be constructed in Activity Centres Allow incremental development Request beautiful buildings (and refuse ugly buildings)</p>
89	Email	<p><u>Building heights</u> Narrow context of Smith Street means proposed maximum building heights between Langridge/Gertrude Streets and Webb Street (17.6m – 24m) will overwhelm Little Smith heritage streetscape and backyards to Gore Street properties.</p> <p><u>Rear interface</u> Development on commercial land abutting residential land should adopt a more modest scale and intensity at the interface.</p>
90	Email	<p><u>Overlooking</u> Proposed maximum building heights will allow overlooking to the rear of Gore Street properties Overlooking will cause devaluation of property</p> <p><u>Rear interface</u> Objects to “short laneway setbacks” and building heights, where these DDO requirements would create conflict with other requirements in the planning scheme (i.e. overlooking standard)</p>
91	Email	<p><i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i></p>
92	Email	<p><u>Consultation process:</u> Addresses within DDO30 did not receive notification (9,11,13,15,17 Hodgson St). <i>NB: Nos . 7, 9, 11 and 13 Hodgson Street were sent owner and occupier letters. Nos. 15 and 17 Hodgson St were not on mailing lists due to mapping error. This has now been corrected for future mailouts).</i></p> <p><u>Building height</u> Proposed maximum building height of 10 storeys at No. 243-255 Smith St is excessive and will cause overshadowing to properties along south side of Hodgson Street. Requests lowest building height possible on this site to eliminate overshadowing to properties along south side of Hodgson Street. Maximum height limits of 7 storeys should be applied across all new apartment blocks.</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Fitzroy heritage must be protected and preserved.</p> <p><u>Car parking</u> All new apartment blocks must be provided with sufficient on-site car, bike and motorbike parking for residents and visitors. Collingwood and Fitzroy areas are over-crowded with visitors.</p> <p><u>Noise</u> Noise caused by:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction noise during development • Vehicle access/garage roller doors • Entry door intercoms/speakers • People entering/existing premises • Garbage and recycling disposal/collection <p>causes poor mental health and is a nuisance to residents.</p>
93	Email	<p>Generally supportive of the proposal/controls. Concerned that tall buildings will negatively impact liveability and amenity of the area (particularly in relation to wind effects).</p>
94	Email	<p><u>Building height:</u> Impacted by DDO038, DDO036 and DDO029 - central Fitzroy, bordered by Nicholson St, Alexandra Pde, Smith St and Johnston St. Understands the need for development and supports to a reasonable height – does not support the desire to put 5-8 storey buildings all over this block. Notes a lot of heritage buildings in their area of concern. Apart from the iconic MacPherson Robertson Chocolate factory buildings and a few Council have already allowed – there are no taller buildings. Would ruin the ‘heritage rich vibrant and bustling community’ with ‘oversized buildings casting shadow, ruining privacy, increasing traffic congestion and ‘creating wind tunnels’. Tall buildings should remain where there are already tall buildings such as the factory fronting Alexandra Pde (between George and Gore Streets). Requests no building other than those already built exceed 4 storeys across all the proposed DDOs including Smith Street, the block of Alexandra Pde, Brunswick St, Johnston St and Nicholson St and south of Central Fitzroy.</p> <p><u>Heritage buildings:</u> Heritage buildings should remain and converted preserving as much of the exterior and interior as possible. No development that is high or blocks architectural and historic features or extensions directly behind or attached to the existing building.</p> <p><u>Amenity (General):</u> Comments about the impacts of 6-7 storeys in these two blocks on heritage cottages – especially in terms of amenity particularly light, privacy and the overlooking of backyards. Concerned about quality of life.</p> <p><u>DDO38:</u> Would like to seek the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduction in the height of the buildings to 3-4 storeys for both blocks (other than the heritage building that is currently there between George and Gore Street) which should remain at its current height. Makes it consistent with our area and help protect the character of our streets. - Change the language from ‘should’ to must not exceed these levels.

- Increase the set back at the rear of Alexandra Parade (along Cecil Street) to 8-10m above two storeys to reduce shadowing and privacy concerns.
- Along Cecil Street have a mandatory maximum height of the back of the building of 8m.

Brunswick Street – Building height:

Iconic street and world renown.

Notes heritage buildings e.g. the Mill on the corner of Westgarth and Brunswick Street.

Apartments on top of these buildings will substantially change their character. Notes tall buildings in Collins Street as an example.

Apply sensible height limits of 3-4 storeys for the entire street.

Development of 6-8 storeys here is WAY too high.

Residential interfaces:

Proposed heights will remove the afternoon light from all the buildings to the east, in particular those along Cecil Street and Westgarth St who will have shading from both blocks in the afternoons.

Proposed setbacks result in a wall that is a lot higher than what is currently there. After a minimal setback of 4.5m, the building can continue to rise, removing the privacy and light to all these buildings.

Notes laneway is incredibly narrow and development fronting it will cause wind impacts.

Role of laneways for traffic:

Presence of a heritage street wall along Westgarth, Brunswick and Cecil Street will prevent major changes to these heritage structures - means any entrance to the building will need to be served by the laneway.

This laneway is the front door to four townhouses. Used by some businesses on Brunswick Street.

Creating a driveway here to service a six-storey apartment will have severe impacts on the health and safety of the business owners and most

Estimates increased traffic from new apartments - 5-8 times the level of traffic down this street.

Impacts on health and safety of residents and businesses.

Increased danger to those using Westgarth and Cecil Street as pedestrians.

Traffic/congestion issues:

Concerned about traffic on surrounding streets such as Westgarth and Cecil Street and also Rose Street.

Potentially a huge increase in traffic that will materially impact the safety and use of these streets.

Concerned about increase in driveways / crossover and impacts on cyclist and pedestrian safety.

Notes impacts on the Napier St bike lane and recent incidents. Signs are not the answer - reducing traffic is.

Congestion on Brunswick Street will also result from the number of cars turning.

Traffic reports focus on Alexandra Pde - which is ALREADY highly congested and cannot take more traffic. Doesn't look at other streets.

Notes comments on good public transport in the area – but this relies on smooth traffic flows e.g. trams on Smith Street and buses down Alexandra Parade.

		<p><u>Parking:</u> Concerned about the impact on parking. Not enough permit parking areas to service the houses – often has to park a few blocks away. Removing parking for additional driveways and increasing the number of people is going to further exacerbate the problem. Visitor parking will also be an issue.</p> <p><u>DDO29:</u> Would like to seek the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduction in the height of the buildings to 3-4 storeys for ALL of Brunswick St not just the area between Johnston and Rose. This will make the street consistent and help protect its character. - Change the language from ‘should’ to must not exceed these levels. - Increase the set back at the front of Brunswick Street to 10m to ensure the character of the street is maintained for all of these blocks. - Along the laneways have a mandatory maximum height of the back of the building of 8m. - Increase the setback for the 1-2 storeys above this to at least 8-10 metres (mandatory). <p><u>DDO36:</u> Would like to seek the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduction in the height of the buildings in both of these blocks to 3-4 storeys. - Change the language in these height restrictions from ‘should be’ to must be no higher than these levels. - Add a setback on blocks to the north of my house and my neighbours of at least 8-10 metres to ensure our privacy and no overshadowing. This set back should be from our houses, not just the front of the street and the laneway. - Increase the setback on the frontage of Kerr Street and George Street from 6mtrs to 10mtrs to maintain the streetscapes (and make this mandatory). <p>Notes a number of heritage houses located in the blocks bordered by Rose Steet, Gore Street, Argyle Street and George Street. They are directly south of 6 and 8 storeys high development with minimal setbacks. Residents will lose all-natural light and privacy if these changes go ahead.</p>
95	Email	Refer to summary of Submission 94.
96	Email	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Major concern is the proposal does not give sufficient consideration to Yarra as an exceptional heritage place. Fitzroy and Collingwood heritage shops should be left intact. Does not support leaving the façade of a heritage building (or infill) at street level. Domination of the new building – stepped up and away from, or cantilevered over the façade. Distracts from and destroy the fine -grained heritage fabric as evidenced by so many places in Yarra already. (e.g. Aquila building Brunswick St, or development of the east side of Smith St south) Custodians of a very special place - in danger of destroying</p>

Other – other neighbourhood centres:

Unclear why St Georges Rd and Nicholson St. Fitzroy North have been left out of plans for DDO overlays –only two neighbourhood centres without proposed built form controls which makes them particularly vulnerable to inappropriate over-development.

Consultation:

Thanks Council for the opportunity to comment on the proposed DDO's in Collingwood and Richmond precincts.

Survey was difficult - demanded a black and white response to a nuanced set of proposals which have the potential to destroy the very qualities that attract people to Yarra.

Concerned that only those impacted by change to their immediate environment should be heard.

Yarra residents do not confine themselves to their neighbourhoods – they enjoy them all, just as visitors do.

Neighbourhood character and growth:

Should consider what attracts people to the area.

An option of appropriate sustainable and historically sensitive development was missing in the survey.

Not opposed to development – asks if we can provide for population increases without destroying the charm of shopping strips or impinging on low-rise residential areas?

Not necessary to build over shopping strips.

Questions how many new residents could be housed in 5 storey dwellings throughout Collingwood and Fitzroy without building over shops in shopping strips.

Viability of commercial:

Must retain the viability of an internationally renowned eclectic mix of shops and buildings where visitors as well as locals flock to cafes, pubs, music venues, galleries and specialty shops etc.

Shopkeepers could be assured of certainty and viability.

Other – need for nuanced approach:

Same formulaic response to each activity centre is inappropriate.

Smith St buildings/shops, south of Johnston St, are very different from Brunswick St. Gertrude St with the overlay of indigenous history and culture is particularly significant.

Built form must reflect the fine grained characteristics of each distinct neighbourhood.

Building heights:

Limit buildings to a mid-rise of five storeys which could create an attractive built form through industrial areas, set back from shopping strips.

Residents could be in touch with the green environment (tree tops as a minimum) as well as community.

Apartments in the former industrial area of Clifton Hill which illustrate an attractive uniformity of height. Not built over shopping strips.

MacRobertson building in Gore St, Fitzroy is an example of appropriate and attractive built form.

Amenity (general):

		<p>Increased heights contribute to wind tunnels which are not pedestrian or resident friendly. Apparent when walking from Smith St west down Rose St.</p> <p><u>Sustainability:</u> The preservation of heritage buildings in shopping strips (and not just facades) is sustainably sound. Knocking down /rebuild approach contributes to greenhouse gases. Demolition process is unsustainable environmentally</p>
97	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 63.</i>
98	Email	<p><u>Gertrude Street:</u> Seen changes in Gertrude Street and in east of Smith Street in Collingwood and Abbotsford. Gertrude Street is a most important amenity, not only for the residents of Gertrude Street, but for people who live east of Smith Street. Notes significant increase in foot traffic, particularly in the morning and the evening as city workers go to and from work. Increasing community feel with increasing number of coffee shops and cafes seven days a week. People of all ages, but young people especially love to be in Gertrude Street.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> East/west orientation of Gertrude which, together with the low building heights on the northern side ensure virtually all day the whole year round (with allowances for winter of course) full of light. Contrasts with Smith Street and its tall buildings. Has led to gloomy canyons. Maintaining the amenity of Gertrude Street should an important objective.</p> <p><u>Building height:</u> Extreme caution should be exercised in approving any height above the mostly two storeys on the northern side of Gertrude.</p>
99	Email	<p><i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i></p> <p><u>Building height:</u> Concerned about 6-8 storeys along major roads and up to 7 storeys in back streets. Impacts on light and atmosphere of the suburb. Acknowledges the need for more housing but supports height reductions. Current proposals are excessive.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Concerned about heights and impacts of tall buildings on heritage residences. Loss of light.</p>
100	Email	<p><u>Consultation:</u> Member of the Heritage Advisory Committee. Advised of the pre-exhibition consultation. Discussed options around making a submission. Busy time for members. Some members have made individual submissions. Complex amendment with many different DDOs. Identified issues raised in the past with other historic strip shopping centres and which appear to apply here to a greater or lesser extent.</p>

		<p>Dot points were put to the 12 voting member of the committee. Position was adopted by majority vote – 8 in agreement. None disagreed. 3 did not respond and on gave qualified support. Will be discussed a further meeting.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upper level setbacks are inadequate. The setback for new development above the heritage street wall is 6 or 8 metres. The assumption is that heritage fabric will only be retained within this setback. This reduction of buildings to shallow remnants is tokenistic facadism, which is to be avoided at all costs. The minimum setback should be 10 metres or the principal roof form, whichever is the greater. <p><u>Building heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New development in heritage streets should not be visible from the opposite side of the street. This will mean limits of 3-4 storeys rather than 6-7 storeys as proposed for some heritage streets. <p><u>Retention of individually significant buildings:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individually significant buildings should remain intact. DDOs for individually significant buildings should closely follow their built form so as not to encourage redevelopment. <p><u>Mandatory controls:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All height controls should be mandatory. Preferred height controls are known to be exploited and should therefore be avoided.
101	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 63.</i>
102	Email	<p><u>DDO29, 31, 32, 33, 34 – Building heights:</u> In general supports setbacks and height limits outlined in these interim DDOs. Caveat is that height limits need to be stated as absolutes with NO exceptions.</p> <p><u>Building heights – overall:</u> No buildings above 8 storeys are necessary or should be permitted in any of the Yarra precincts except for the widest boulevards such as Victoria Parade and the lower part of Nicholson St.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> No exceptions to upper storey setbacks should be permitted.</p> <p><u>Landscaping and trees:</u> All existing mature street trees should be protected.</p>
103	Email	<p><u>Building height:</u> Lives in Gore Street in HO334. Proposal does not respond to the strategic and contextual nuance of the heritage overlay. 24m is too tall and will overwhelm Little Smith Street, the heritage streetscape of Little Smith St and Gore St, and 1, 2 and 3 storey height of neighbouring buildings. Objected to a previous planning application PNL 15/0634 (2 December 2017). Suggested a ‘Transition Zone’ between the residential and commercial zones - between Smith Street and Gore Street.</p>

		<p>This would clarify the constraints on development in the commercial zone and may prevent applications ending up at VCAT. Commonly accepted planning principle that development at the edge of activity centres achieve an appropriate transition scale, intensity and massing. Requires residents abutting commercial zoned land to accept some reduction of amenity typical to the area and, likewise, development on the commercial land to achieve a more modest intensity and scale at this interface.</p> <p>Proposed DDO does not seem to consider this principle.</p> <p>Refers to the sketch attached to their objection - from the property boundary, a vertical line 8m high, then a 45 degree line.</p>
104	Email	<p><u>Building height:</u> Strongly oppose the new proposed heights planning schedules for Fitzroy. Concerned from a business perspective.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Fitzroy and its sunshine is what creates the atmosphere along with the hustling cafe and bar scene. To block out natural light will heavily impact business for those looking for afternoon food/drink in the sun. It will only create CBD feels which is a dark and depressing place. Keep Fitzroy open and able to see the sky for the sake of continued great bustling business and for the sake of good mental health of the patrons and employees of Fitzroy.</p>
105	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 73.</i>
106	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 63.</i>
107	Email	<p><u>DDO36 – Fitzroy east and Johnston Street north - Building heights</u> 409-429 Gore Street (at the south-west corner of the Gore/Rose Street intersection) should;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have a maximum street wall height of 9m (or 2 storeys) along the entire length of Gore Street and Rose Street - Have a maximum building height of 20.8m (or 6 storeys) <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Excessive building heights (and street wall heights) create wind tunnel impacts. The potential impact of building heights on wind effects should be considered. Excessive building heights (and street wall heights) reduce sunlight access to existing buildings, which can create issues regarding mould and damp. The potential impact of building heights on sunlight access should be considered. Existing (heritage) buildings which utilise bluestone foundations are particularly susceptible to mould and damp, and sunlight access is very important right to the foundations of these buildings.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> The overshadowing requirements which include protecting sunlight upon (opposite) footpaths should be mandatory requirements for all new developments.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Excessive development has resulted in a loss of heritage elements in the past, due to the permit amendment and permit extension process (small changes over time to the permit can result in the importance of those elements being forgotten). Heritage aspects of these buildings should be protected throughout the permit and construction process.</p>
108	Email	<p><u>Street, neighbourhood, public amenity needs improving</u> Supports development but wants it to complement the character and improve area</p>

		<p><u>Overshadowing of public streets/space</u> Worried about 12 storey apartments on streets like Johnston that create gloomy canyons.</p> <p><u>Useability of new development for commercial uses</u> Does not want buildings on top of shopping strips to interfere with their function. Submits that small shops/cafes are what provide areas with vibrancy and character and doesn't want to see this taken over by bigger department stores /chains. Concerned that rent may become too expensive for small shops if over-investment by developers occur.</p>
109	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 73.</i>
110	Email	<p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Wants to see a minimum 10m upper-level setback from the street for new development on top of shops.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary</u> Wants to see mandatory upper-level setbacks to side streets for each DDO Wants mandatory heigh limits across the area so shopping streets don't become canyons.</p> <p><u>Street, neighbourhood, public amenity needs improving</u> Insists that development does not crowd the unique street culture created by independent retailers</p>
111	Email	<p><u>Building Height</u> Strongly objects multi-level high developments due to loss of the quiet community feel that already exists Does not want to see greed of developers turn areas into a busy metropolis</p>
112	Email	<p><u>Heritage</u> Wants to see heritage shop buildings protected. Argues that this is what gives the Fitzroy /Collingwood shopping strips their special character and the reason people choose to live here Suggests that in order to protect these heritage strips, high-rise blocks of apartments and department stores should not be encouraged</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Does not believe that 6 Storey developments should be allowed on Brunswick Street</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary</u> Would like to see Mandatory limits in places so that shopping streets don't become canyons. Wants to see mandatory upper-level setbacks to side streets</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Submits that there should be minimum 10m upper-level setback from streets for shop top developments</p>
113	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
114	Email	<p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Wants to see a minimum 10m upper-level setback for new shop top developments</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Wants Mandatory upper-level setbacks to side streets for each DDO Wants mandatory height limits across area in general</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Would like to see careful consideration of existing heritage in building redevelopment and new building proposals, paying attention to building materials that would be applicable to heritage settings and maintaining character throughout streetscapes Wants to see DDOs provide advice on how to preserve and enhance the significance of a landmark where proposed developments are along view lines to the landmark</p> <p><u>Street/Neighbourhood/Public Amenity needs improving</u> Where there is redevelopment, they would like to see consideration of streetscapes in front of proposed developments such as seating, bicycle hoops, posts, bollards and rubbish bin enclosures. Would like to see this in not just stainless steel but galvanised steel or cast iron to improve public realm</p> <p><u>Useability of new development for commercial uses</u> Does not believe that DDOs of streets like Brunswick, Smith and Gertrude should allow for new private residential developments at all. Would like to see DDOs encourage new developments to include offices at 1st and 2nd floors above shops Would like to see commercial residential being built above shops as opposed to private residential to accommodate for shop owners and the lack of commercial residential accommodation in Yarra.</p> <p><u>Amenity (General)</u> Suggests that DDOs should include instructions to minimise the size and visual impact of infrastructure required by new development: fire equipment, gas meters, water meters and electrical switchboards Submits that commercial residential accommodation should have fire rated floor coverings, blinds/furniture and acoustic treatments to external walls to contain noise from streets.</p> <p><u>Parking issues</u> Wants to see car park entrances located on laneways for new developments if required.</p> <p><u>Traffic increase/congestion</u> Wants to see traffic analysis undertaken and design that will minimise traffic impacts of new developments</p>
115	Email	<p><u>Heritage</u> Completely against tampering with buildings that have stood for than a century Wants to see historic buildings protected</p>
116	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
117	Email	<p><u>Building Height</u> Wants development to be restricted to 3 storeys.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Wants heritage shops to have a minimum setback of 10m to retain viable business area</p>

		<p><u>Amenity (General)</u> Wants to see suitable rear setbacks to avoid buildings overshadowing neighbours and laneways</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Wants to see heritage protected generally.</p>
118	Email	<p><u>Building Height</u> Height is too great for all strips in DDO and doesn't want to see shopping strips ruined because of heights Submits that high rise buildings push up rent and consequently pushes out independent retailers</p> <p><u>Street / Neighbourhood / Public Amenity needs improving</u> Does not want to see unique street culture overcrowded by residential development Particularly concerned about potential development of Alexandra PDE. Does not want the grand tree lined boulevards to become concrete canyons and ruin its rich history.</p> <p><u>Traffic increase / congestion</u> Concerned about excess traffic arising if development was to go ahead on Alexandra Parade</p> <p><u>Landscaping (Public)</u> Would like to see more trees implemented as they are beneficial to the community in many ways</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Wants to see mandatory height limits in areas so shopping strips don't become canyons of concrete</p>
119	Email	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that the building heights proposed on Brunswick Street, Smith Street and Gertrude Street will threaten and ruin the heritage.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Recommends 3-storey mandatory heights - If development is essential. Recommend these three streets remain untouched. Recommends 5-6-storeys on Alexandra Parade (mandatory). Submits that the heights on Johnston Street are too high.</p> <p><u>Street/neighbourhood/public amenity:</u> Notes the walkability and commercial nature of these streets.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Support mandatory heights. Does not support preferred heights. Submits that it will be less costly at VCAT.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Recommends a minimum 10-metre upper-level setback.</p>

		<p>Recommends upper-level setbacks for side streets in all DDOs. Submits that these upper-level setbacks contribute to making streetscapes that are visually appealing - add to the pedestrians' walking experience.</p>
120	Email	<p>Amenity (general): Concern with light penetration and wind tunnels - should be a higher priority.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that shopping precincts (Brunswick, Gertrude and Smith Streets) should retain heritage and character</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Recommends 3 storeys at street level and no more than 4-5 storeys.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Recommends 10-metre setback.</p> <p><u>Public Open Space:</u> Submits that taller developments must provide substantial creative areas of public open space - not retail/commercial.</p>
121	Email	<p><u>Building Height / Upper-level setbacks:</u> Submits that the preferred heights are too high - particularly Brunswick, Gertrude and Smith Streets. Recommends setbacks be increased.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Notes the tourism that the area/heritage brings. Notes that housing stock is necessary - but development should not impact on the heritage. Submits that Aboriginal heritage needs to be considered and recognised.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls. Does not support preferred controls - Gives developers too much to pull.</p>
122	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 73.</i>
123	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 32.</i>
124	Email	<i>Refer to summary of Submission 73.</i>
125	Email	<p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Recommends removal of the mandatory requirements at 47 & 49 Chapel Street, Fitzroy. Submits that there is no heritage to the building. Notes the proximity away from the sensitive interface of Johnston Street. Notes that the property is on the boundary of a GRZ1 area. Submits that the properties on the GRZ1 side do not have sensitive interfaces with the property. Submits that allow flexibility with the height of the property would prove beneficial for future development.</p>

126	Email	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that the heritage streetscape and neighbourhood character are what draw people to the area. Submits that Brunswick, Gertrude and Smith are of national importance. Notes the high level of heritage overlays in the area. Submits that the proposed DDOs are part of the problem for heritage in the area. Submits that the heritage area shouldn't be incremental change. Submits that the controls will create fascism. Submits that DDOs must promote heritage controls. Concern about the erosion of cultural identity.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Submits that older buildings are more affordable than new buildings. Submits that older buildings can accommodate cheaper rentals, start-ups and marginal activities. Submits that Yarra is already meeting the housing needs. Submits that Yarra has enough developable land to meet population projections. Submits that the proportion of small dwellings and apartments is already higher than required. Submits that significant residential development is detrimental to the economic function of activity centres. Submits that more development won't aid in local spending. Submits that the area cannot accommodate affordable housing based on the cost of the land.</p> <p><u>Building height:</u> Submits that service equipment must be included in the total building height.</p> <p><u>Traffic increase/congestion:</u> Submits that access to the sky and overshadowing should be considered at other times. Submits that the street impacts, laneways and amenities of nearby residential areas are adversely affected.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls - essential. Does not support Council officers having delegation to approve discretionary controls</p>
127	Email	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Recommends planning tools that encourage the retention of the current heritage buildings - Submits that they are essential to the character and why people visit. Recommends retaining heritage corners (George, Gore, Napier and Little Napier). Recommends recognition of Aboriginal heritage in this Amendment. Submits that the approach focuses on the facades of buildings.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Recommends retaining 3-storeys.</p>

		<p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Recommends a minimum mandatory 10-metre upper-level setback.</p> <p><u>Car parking:</u> Concerns that if businesses lose access to the rear of their properties they lose access to deliveries, staff parking and general access.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Questions why a DDO is even needed for Gertrude Street - Submits that a DDO should be to reinforce the heritage overlay. Concern about the impact and purpose of a DDO. The submitter includes a breakdown of Instagram engagement - that supports their above submission.</p>
128	Email	<p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Concern about noise impacts from commercial activity - needs to be considered. Submits that existing resident of the area experience adverse noise impacts from commercial dwellings. Submits that commercial businesses do not properly manage their bins - negative impact on residents.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> Recommends more parking in new residential developments. Submits existing properties should be given on-street parking permits.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Recommends that more consideration should be given to the existing night-time venues' impact on residential developments. Submits that there are currently antisocial impacts on the existing residents. Significance concerns around the cost and requirements of converting from gas to electricity.</p>
129	Email	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Does not support 5-storeys in DDO29 (where the property is located). Recommends 2-storeys - to preserve the heritage of the block in DDO29.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits that anything higher than 2-storeys will add to the negative impact on amenities (noise, traffic, population). Concern that increases in population will add to the increased deliveries/waste management issues.</p>
130	Survey	No feedback provided for any questions.
131	Survey	Positive changes: Lots of new and exciting restaurants and shops Concerned about increased development which makes the streets busy and messy
132	Survey	Positive changes: Lots of good food places to try Concerned about gentrification <u>Overshadowing</u> Overshadowing to footpath requirement should be measured through the year/for longer hours.
133	Survey	No feedback provided for any questions.

134	Survey	<p>Positive changes: There are more cycle lanes. Concerned about increasing house prices. New developments do not adhere to the architectural style of the area, and do not seem to bring house prices down anyway.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Growth along Alexandra Parade should balance preserving atmosphere of the neighbourhood (i.e. no high rise buildings) and also providing affordable housing. Additional growth should be located in the 'outer parts of' Fitzroy and Collingwood.</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Heritage areas are important and should be preserved. Modern architecture is utilitarian and ugly. New development should take care to look nice/beautiful. If it were more beautiful and more care was taken to make the buildings look nice, my view would change</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Strongly opposed to preferred/discretionary maximum building heights in non-heritage areas; "not good for creating a community and neighbourhood feel".</p> <p><u>Internal Amenity</u> All bedrooms should have windows All apartments should have windows on two or more sides Apartments should be designed for good internal amenity, not for investors profits.</p>
135	Survey	No feedback provided for any questions.
136	Survey	<p><u>Positives</u> Nice cafes and restaurants</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Concerned about oversupply of apartments</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> The DDOs should not allow higher development (approx. 7-9 storeys) in areas with less heritage buildings. Higher buildings create dark neighbourhoods. The DDOs should allow lower developments (approx. 3 to 6 storeys) in areas with more heritage buildings and where close to traditional, low houses and backyards. It will reduce crowding.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Generally support preferred/discretionary maximum building heights in non-heritage areas; "if it suits, why not?" The DDOs should introduce mandatory minimum heights in sensitive heritage areas. It will reduce crowding.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Overshadowing to footpaths should be restricted; it makes Collingwood dark.</p>
137	Survey	<p><u>Positives:</u> Better nightlife and restaurants No concerns.</p>

138	Survey	<p>Positive changes: more people out and about in the sunshine Concerned about large apartment blocks on Smith St and use of different cladding materials (look terrible).</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> The DDOs should not allow higher development (approx. 7-9 storeys) in areas with less heritage buildings. Lower building heights create a lively suburb and prevent overshadowing.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks</u> Higher levels must be set back from traditional, low houses and backyards. No setbacks create overshadowing and overlooking problems.</p>
139	Survey	<p>Positive changes: Collingwood is opening new coffee shops and cafes. Has no concerns about new development in Fitzroy and Collingwood. New houses should not encroach upon the footpaths.</p>
140	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Wants to see heritage preserved</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on the nightlife including pubs and bars in area Specific to DDO39 - Wants to ensure there is support services available for low income population already in the area when development goes ahead</p>
141	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Wants to ensure that DDOs focus on having the style of developments match surrounding structures</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on more youth moving into area and more nightlife Concerns about drug problems increasing in the area</p>
142	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Would like to see new buildings respect the old style of the area</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on expansion happening Concerns about noise in general in area</p>
143	Survey	<p><u>Other</u> Concerned about the number of homeless and housing commission in the area</p>
144	Survey	<p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on the up and coming nature of the area, available to all ages and feeling secure.</p>
145	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Would like to see DDOs focus on more design in general</p>

		<p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on Yarra becoming more community based Concerned about the lack of respect for cyclists</p>
146	Survey	<p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on cleaner streets and more spaces to park Concerns about the area getting a little more dangerous to be in</p>
147	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Concerns about loss of heritage buildings and over-modernisation making suburbs less visually and culturally appealing</p> <p><u>Building Design</u> Concerns about quality of new housing being poor thus leading to streets and suburbs looking worse</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Concerns about developers' ability to bend rules through non-mandatory controls</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on more availability of amenities to match growth Concerns about the term 'less heritage sensitivity' and what constitutes this Concerns about squeezing numbers of people into smaller spaces</p>
148	Survey	<p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on new hospitality locations like bars and restaurants</p>
149	Survey	No specific comments made on this survey submission
150	Survey	<p><u>Building height</u> Doesn't want charm of shopping areas to be overtaken by big apartment buildings</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Generally supportive of setbacks and proposed controls</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on the vibe of area e.g. Music scene</p>
151	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Would like to see less apartment buildings being built too close to heritage properties</p> <p><u>Building Design</u> Would like to see building designs reflect other buildings in the area.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Happy to see that area has changed from a run down and dirty spot to a clean and modern area</p>

		<p><u>Growth no longer needed at this level</u> Afraid that there are too many apartment complexes being built too quickly</p>
152	Survey	<p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on the better roads and nicer parks within the area over time</p>
153	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Not supportive of new development that doesn't fit in with older architecture Not supportive of building designs implemented through the area already Suggests the use of brick on exterior when it comes to building designs</p> <p><u>Growth no longer needed at this level</u> Believes that there is already significant development that has occurred and doesn't want to see more</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Not supportive of 6 storeys in height as this is still double the height of the tallest heritage buildings</p> <p><u>Landscaping</u> Would like to see more greenery in the area - heritage gardens etc.</p>
154	Survey	<p><u>Parking issues</u> Would like to see more car parks for new apartment buildings</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback given on the new apartments giving more people a chance to live in the area</p>
155	Survey	<p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback given surrounding the increase in support that is given for small businesses. More money being spent in the area, less business closure and bringing the suburb back to life Positive support for growth as the area is highlight accessible for people and increases employment opportunities</p>
156	Survey	<p><u>Other</u> Enjoys the good food and retail in the area Does not support the lack of affordable housing within the area Concerned about loss of character when new high rise buildings are being constructed within the area</p>
157	Survey	<p><u>Overshadowing</u> Supportive of having overshadowing controls in place so that there is more sun over lunch time</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on the liveliness of some streets in area Makes comment on rental costs skyrocketing in the area and how this will push people out In support of growth in area generally as commuting from suburbs is becoming hard to afford.</p>

158	Survey	<u>Heritage</u> Does not specifically support the proposal of high rise buildings in areas with less heritage buildings.
159	Survey	<u>Building Height</u> Not fussed by high - rise development when these are located on busy main roads <u>Heritage</u> Doesn't believe development should be allowed in lower scales around heritage buildings as this will depreciate value of properties and make the area look cheap. <u>Other</u> Raises general concerns about drug relate issues with local injecting room
160	Survey	<u>Other:</u> Notes the culture, shops and places to dine. Submits that some places feel unsafe.
161	Survey	<u>Other:</u> Notes the nightlife, cafes, food culture and street art of the precinct.
162	Survey	<u>Other:</u> Notes the amount of cafes - range of choices. Notes the rising cost of living.
163	Survey	<u>Other:</u> Notes the wide range of bars and restaurants. Submits that the streets should keep a cohesive coherent street design.
164	Survey	<u>Public Open Space:</u> Submits that there needs to be more green spaces. <u>Other:</u> Submits that recent development has maintained the aesthetic despite the apartment developments.
165	Survey	<u>Other:</u> Notes the new developments in the area. Submits that the new developments are slow to progress.
166	Survey	<u>Other:</u> Notes the new supermarkets.
167	Survey	<u>Other:</u> Notes that there is a lot to do within the community. Submits that the area isn't affordable. Questions what would suit the community and people already living there.

168	Survey	<u>Other:</u> Notes the new restaurants and parks in the area.
169	Survey	<i>No comments given.</i>
170	Survey	Positive changes: less crime and more safety and cafes which bring more traffic Has concerns about traffic congestion and lack of parking
171	Survey	Positive changes: more buildings, offices, jobs in these areas. Green areas (park, trees, etc.) have improved. Has concerns about criminal issues like drug, homeless, night safety (especially the area near market, tram/train station) Planning should balance green space, economic benefits and the traditional heritage image of Melbourne. Skyscrapers will make Melbourne just like lots of other cities in the world. <u>Building heights</u> The DDOs should allow lower developments (approx. 3 to 6 storeys) in areas with more heritage buildings and where close to traditional, low houses and backyards. This will have economic benefits. <u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Generally do not support preferred/discretionary maximum building heights in non-heritage areas; creates precedence for buildings of increasing heights. The DDOs should introduce mandatory maximum heights in sensitive heritage areas. Change should be minimised in these areas and high standards enforced.
172	Survey	Positive changes: Fitzroy and Collingwood have become safer, and excellent restaurant and cafe variety Has no concerns about new development in these areas; "I like the way it is progressing". New development should avoid clusters of large buildings, and new buildings should be more visually appealing with the incorporation of nature.
173	Survey	No feedback provided for any questions.
174	Survey	Positive changes: Growth and livelihood in the neighbourhood, more restaurants and shops. Has concerns about gentrification, more apartments. Does not support additional growth in Alexandra Parade due to concerns about loss of heritage ("tradition"). DDOs should not be applied to these areas; these areas should be left as they are ("leave them be")
175	Survey	Positive changes: More commercial small businesses operating post covid. Increase in apartments. Has concerns about poorly built apartments, which do not comply with neighbourhood character. New buildings must fit in with the look of the neighbourhood.
176	Survey	Positive changes: Better restaurant/cafes Has no concerns about new development within Fitzroy and Collingwood.
177	Survey	Positive changes: New parks Has concerns about new development in relation to waste management.

178	Survey	<p>Positive changes: Great new developments have improved the nightlife in the area. Has concerns about gentrification due to high rent prices. New development should maintain the neighbourhood character and avoid architecture that does not “fit in”.</p>
179	Survey	<p>Positive changes: Great places to eat and shop Has no concerns about new development in Fitzroy and Collingwood. Heritage building fronts should be retained when possible. DDO31 – maintain Gertrude Street character, including high number of independent stores. It has a “homey village feeling”.</p>
180	Survey	<p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on new bike paths Concerned about the cost of housing / renting</p>
181	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Wants to ensure that high rise doesn't destroy the look and feel of the area <u>Other</u> Positive feedback on hospitality in the area (food and drink) bringing people to the area</p>
182	Survey	<p><u>Growth no longer needed at this level</u> Concerned that older houses in good condition are being demolished for new when there is no reason <u>Other</u> Positive feedback on the dining options in the area</p>
183	Survey	<p><u>Landscape</u> Would like to see DDOs focus more on greenery in the front of buildings <u>Heritage</u> Submits their support for heritage preservation <u>Other</u> Positive feedback on sense of community being built through new restaurants and bars</p>
184	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Doesn't want to see streets cluttered with tall complexes <u>Other</u> Positive feedback on new glass and green waste bins implemented Positive feedback on Fitzroy North Library Submits positive support to growth in DDOs stating that it would improve diversity and night life. Concerns about constant work on train lines?</p>

185	Survey	<p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on new pedestrian crossings on roads Concerned about increase of dirt and rubbish in area</p>
186	Survey	<p><u>Street / Neighbourhood / Public amenity needs improving</u> Fast growth taking away community vibes and green space as well as pricing locals out</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on bounce back post covid and more people wanting to move back into inner suburbs as such</p>
187	Survey	<p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on more parking, living options and bars/restaurants/entertainment</p>
188	Survey	<p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on more retail and visitors in area Concerned about drug use problems in area</p>
189	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Suggests avoiding heritage listings to avoid running into issues however not necessarily against development on heritage significant sites</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Submits positive support around the need for higher building heights to manage population growth</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Submits that overlooking can be solved with higher windows but understands that people will look regardless (if they want to look)</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Submits that they would like to see more overshadowing in place through development as skin cancer is a big issue</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on slow gentrification of area with smith street becoming a more lively scene Concerns about drug use problems in area</p>
190	Survey	<p><u>Traffic increase / congestion</u> Wants to see DDOs ensure that development is not adding to further traffic congestion</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on the new bars, restaurants and shops available within the area Submits that there is an increase in cheaper and boxier apartments in the area, changing it. Wants to see DDOs ensure that development is keeping with character of the area</p>
191	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Unsupportive of the number of high rise apartment blocks seen within the area Does not want to see streets that are already high in quality (example given: Gertrude St) developed any further</p>

		<p><u>Heritage</u> Wants to see heritage retained Believes that residents that own homes in areas with less heritage significance are adversely affected by proposed larger developments</p> <p><u>Amenity (General)</u> Does not want to see areas become a wind tunnel like the CBD Emphasises importance of sunlight</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on pedestrian crossings within the area</p>
192	Survey	<p><u>Growth no longer needed at this level</u> Raises concerns about rapid development / overdevelopment occurring. Gives example from outside DDOs with rumoured redevelopment of Piedimonte's Supermarket.</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Not supportive of development in heritage areas unless architecture keeps to the character of the area.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on emphasis that has been placed on recycling Positive feedback on increased green spaces and local facilities like libraries</p>
193	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Would like to see lower building heights even in areas with less heritage buildings so that views aren't impeded. Would like to see lower building heights in general to match the general street scape of areas</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Would like to see heritage buildings kept in mind through DDOs and when developing / redeveloping.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on more cafes and restaurants in the area Submits that there is more interests in this area which means higher demand for affordable housing and therefore, the pushing out of prices ?</p>
194	Survey	<p><u>Street / Neighbourhood / Public Amenity needs improving</u> Would like to see more built in community services and shared public spaces.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on new bike lanes in area Concerns about gentrification - displacing low income communities who have been able to live here for years</p>
195	Survey	<p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on the many parks within area Positive feedback on the public transport connections to the area Positive feedback on roads constantly being maintained and improved</p>

196	Survey	No comments made / no concerns
197	Survey	No comments made / no concerns
198	Survey	<p><u>Usability of new development for commercial uses</u> Concerned about old buildings being knocked down and small businesses that have been there forced to close Would like to see DDOs focus on maintaining accessibility for small businesses</p> <p><u>Traffic increase/congestion</u> Worried about congestion in areas in general</p> <p><u>Amenity (General)</u> Doesn't want to see an increase in noise and decrease of privacy with new development taking place</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on the amount of new restaurants, shops and apartment buildings Would like to see a focus on roads/transport alongside the increase of developments</p>
199	Survey	<p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on the safe bike lines on Wellington Street No comments made / no concerns</p>
200	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Supportive of allowing alcohol at Edinburgh Gardens during certain times. Submits that the area is becoming more gentrified.</p>
201	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits support for the female crossing signs.</p>
202	Survey	<i>No comments given.</i>
203	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes that the community has its own subculture, great hospitality venues, green spaces and funky apartments.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory heights - should be enforced.</p>
204	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes the new buildings in the precinct.</p>
205	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes the good architectural design adding to the character of the suburb. Notes the new bars and restaurants. Does not support the 'cookie cutter' buildings Does not support the chain restaurants.</p>

206	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes the increased inner city population and the corresponding increase in services, retail, and dining. Concerns regarding gentrification, lack of low-cost housing solutions, and apartment buildings overshadowing neighbouring residences. Recommends apartment developments be kept predominantly away from residential areas. Recommends the overshadowing controls be taken from March not September.</p> <p><u>Heritage/Building Height:</u> Submits that taller development should be allowed in low heritage areas - only if they do not impact neighbouring residences. Recommends that lower development should be limited to 3-storeys - 6-storeys is too tall. Not concerned with heritage impact - more concerned about the impact on neighbouring properties. Recommends 9-storeys it too tall for Gore Street - Particularly 180 & 250 Gore Street and the rear of Woolworths supermarket.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls - if they are not too tall.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setback:</u> Recommends the setbacks should be taken from ground level.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Recommends new developments be required to provide ample natural light, infrastructure for electric vehicle charging and respect neighbouring properties.</p>
207	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits that the type of development proposed is not sustainable and in conflict with goals of sustainability - notes the need for more open space and the tensions with newer buildings.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that heritage buildings are still suitable and should be retained.</p>
208	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Supportive of the adaptive reuse of larger ex-factory/warehouses.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Does not support the high-density developments (reference to the Aldi building, Dan Murphey's and the west end of Bridge Road). Submits that service equipment should not be visible from the street. Submits that heights and setbacks need to be consistent with the new development and blend with neighbourhood character.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Submits support for growth along Hoddle Street. Does not support growth on the key commercial strips. Submits that Plan Melbourne does not support risking commercial growth for housing growth.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls - infill should not be visible above the heritage. Submits that mandatory controls give property owners assurance of what can occur around their property.</p>

		<p>Submits that preferred heights are treated as a starting point to keep going - Problems with appeals in VCAT. Questions how much over a preferred height will be approved - Varies with VCAT members.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setback:</u> Recommends 8m upper-level setback over 6m upper-level setbacks -- Especially on heritage sites.</p>
209	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes the good outcome of Collingwood Yards - provides space for artists. Notes a number of good and bad examples within the area. Submits encouragement for developers to build high ceilings and well-designed apartments. Submits every room should have a window to the outside. Submits that at least one window in an apartment that is not facing south.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Notes the number of apartments being built in the past 5 years - Too many. Recommends that developments not on Alexandra Parade and Victoria Parade should be no more than 4-storeys (and no more than 30 dwellings). Recommends 2-3-storeys on George Street near Johnston Street.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Recommends that mandatory controls should address number of dwellings - max 20-30 dwellings.</p>
210	Survey	<p><u>Building heights</u> Most activity centres should have maximum 3 storey building height. Wider streets (like Victoria Parade and Alexandra Parade) are suitable for maximum 6 storey building height. 7-9 storeys in areas with less heritage buildings is too high. Requests 6-7 storeys in these areas. 6 storeys in areas with more heritage buildings is too high. Requests 3 storeys in these areas.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks</u> Upper level setbacks should be 10 metres.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary controls</u> Supports mandatory controls (specifically heights) due to VCAT costs for Council and developers' ability to exceed heights through VCAT.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing controls</u> Footpaths should retain sunlight. Walking in the sunlight is a normal 'right'.</p>
211	Survey	<p>Concerned about recently constructed buildings with insufficient set back and excessive bulk and height. Opposed to any additional growth/development in DDO areas. Council should encourage community consultation.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Opposed to excessive height limits.</p>

		<p><u>Upper level setbacks</u> Agrees with upper level setbacks (caveat; <i>survey fails to deal with the wider problem of excessive bulk and height</i>)</p>
212	Survey	<p>Concerned about high and inappropriate developments. Development should respect heritage, not demean it. Disagrees with additional growth in DDO areas because these are well-preserved heritage streetscapes. Additional growth (i.e. 8-10 storeys) should be directed toward industrial areas in Collingwood South.</p> <p><u>Building height</u> 7-9 storeys is too high for areas with less heritage buildings. 4-5 storeys should be the maximum building height in these areas. 6 storeys is too high for areas with more heritage buildings. 3 storeys should be the maximum building height in these areas.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs preferred controls</u> Mandatory maximum heights are essential for providing certainty to neighbouring properties. Preferred maximum height are appropriate for areas of no heritage sensitivity. (All heritage properties should be surrounded by mandatory height controls on neighbouring properties).</p> <p><u>Rear setbacks</u> Rear walls should be setback 4m from the laneway/rear boundary, and then rise at 45 degrees. 8m rear wall height on boundary is excessive.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Opposite footpaths should not be overshadowed between 9am and 3pm from September to March.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks</u> Higher levels of new development should be set back by 10 metres from the main streets (i.e. Brunswick, Smith, Johnston and Gertrude streets), and progressively set back further at higher levels.</p>
213	Survey	TBC
214	Survey	<p>Supportive of mid-rise apartment buildings with commercial tenancy on ground floor to activate street frontage.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Wider footpaths are needed (especially for prams, wheelchairs etc) Footpath and cycle path safety should take precedence over new garage entrances.</p> <p><u>Building height</u> 6 storeys should be the maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings. Higher buildings cause excessive shading in winter.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Preferred heights could be exceeded if the conditions also consider the internal amenity needs of the building (i.e. private open space), ESD (in construction phase and ongoing energy use) and affordable housing.</p>
215	Survey	<p>Supportive of 3 storey, well designed new development (complimentary to Yarra heritage). Concerned with heritage facadism, excessive height (and excessive bulk as a result). Poorly designed buildings (no architectural merit). Overdevelopment is destroying Yarra; DDO areas are at risk of losing heritage charm. Industrial past of Yarra is being lost to poorly designed new development.</p>

		<p><u>Building heights</u> 7-9 storeys is too high for maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings. Maximum building heights in these areas should be contained to the existing heritage building height. 6 storeys is too high for maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings. Maximum building heights in these areas should be 3 storeys. Excessive building heights results in overshadowing, noise, increased traffic and higher parking demand. Maximum 3 storey height limits in Gertrude, Smith, Johnston and Brunswick Streets.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Preferred height controls are too flexible/open to abuse. All DDOs should have set, maximum height limits.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks</u> Setbacks are a poor alternative to mandatory building height controls in addressing excess bulk, overlooking and overshadowing.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Overshadowing should be prevented by DDOs for longer time periods. E.g., 10am - 4pm and from September to April.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Heritage shops need good width, depth and rear delivery access. DDOs are urgently required for small, local activity centres - E.g., Berry and Ramsden Street LAC and Spensley Street LAC in Clifton Hill.</p>
216	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Wind tunnel effect of tall buildings and loss of heritage streetscapes</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be 2-3 storeys with “very occasional” instances of maximum 5 storeys. Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 3 storeys. All DDO areas should have maximum heights of 2 or 3 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Strongly support maximum height limits. Preferred controls are flouted by developers. No supported.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Overshadowing should be prevented by DDOs for longer time periods “most of the day”.</p>
217	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Excessive building heights and poor design. Lack of on-street visitor parking.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be less than 9 storeys.</p>

		<p>Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 3-4 storeys. All DDO areas should have maximum heights of 2 or 3 storeys.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Overshadowing should be prevented by DDOs for longer time periods “most of the day”.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Strongly support maximum height limits. Preferred controls are flouted by developers. No supported.</p> <p><u>Upper Level setbacks</u> Should be greater than 6-8 metres.</p>
218	Survey	No feedback provided for any longform questions.
219	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Increased density creates additional car traffic. Wants to see more green spaces. Excess building height is resulting in dark streets/lack of sunlight. Low building heights are part of Fitzroy and Collingwood character.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 3-4 storeys.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Overshadowing should be prevented by DDOs all year round.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Strongly support maximum height limits. Preferred controls are flouted by developers. No supported.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Building heights measured on sloped streets should be taken from the lowest level. Further development on Hodgson Street will exacerbate wind tunnel effects.</p>
220	Survey	<p><u>Upper-level setback</u> Concerned about upper-level setbacks causing damage to facades in area</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Believes heights are too great in area</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Wants to see mandatory height limits in place</p>

		<p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Submits that plant rooms and roof mounted equipment are unsightly leading to bad facadism</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Submits that DDO areas can absorb some development but doesn't want to see heritage significant sites redeveloped Would like to see DDOs address aboriginal cultural and built form heritage more</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on the use of brickwork in walls Believes street setbacks are insufficient</p>
221	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Positive feedback on most buildings being relatively contained in height Concerns about some buildings being too heigh in general Requests a 5 storey maximum height with at least 10 metres setback from street</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Worries about building heights creating overshadowing to private spaces like homes Concerns about building heights reducing privacy in current homes with overlooking and noise</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Would like to see mandatory maximum controls in place</p>
222	Survey	<p><u>Footpath widening</u> Would like to see footpath widening on main roads (Smith, Brunswick, Johnston Streets) so users feel safer.</p> <p><u>Street/neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving</u> Believes that Smith, Brunswick and Johnston Streets have an unfriendly nature to them.</p> <p><u>Building Design</u> Agrees with development in heritage significant areas as long as they are tasteful in design - including use of brick masonry and wood.</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Supportive of DDOs and not fussed on height limits so long heritage facades are maintained and built to ensure the character of the area</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on area starting to feel more like a community Positive feedback on warehouse conversions off Smith Street - have made former industrial areas into areas you want to visit, live and work in Positive feedback on Oxford, Peel and Cambridge Street - they feel safe and alive now. Concerned about lack of transport connectivity such as full time bus lanes or trams to connect communities Would like to see more medium density development to match the existing character in the area - but understands that high rise development could fit in too.</p>
223	Survey	No specific comments made on this survey submission
224	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Worries about the impact of height changes in the area.</p>

		<p><u>Heritage</u> Submits that Fitzroy in particular has very high heritage value and this should be protected</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Strongly opposing any high density development / increasing height limits due to all sorts of impacts regarding amenity and heritage Submits that overlooking remains a significant issue in development</p> <p><u>Other</u> Submits that survey is designed in a biased way to support proposals and ruin heritage. Some positive feedback on setbacks in the area and mansard roofs in building design</p>
225	Survey	<i>No additional comments provided.</i>
226	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Concerned new apartment developments in Fitzroy East and Johnston Street North are too high - Would like to see heights restricted to 3-6 Storeys here max. Would like to see big apartments along Alexandra or Vic Parade as opposed to anywhere else in DDOs due to their capacity to handle development</p> <p><u>Growth no longer needed at this level</u> Smith Street - has enough development and bigger buildings should not be of focus - shop frontages should</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Submits that heritage significant areas should not have any developments above 4 storeys going up Wants to see heritage frontages retained should there be development</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Would like to see more firm controls in place so that developers cannot find loopholes to developing new buildings</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on businesses coming back to operation along Brunswick / Johnston Street. Positive feedback on the conversion of Rose Street into a shared pedestrian space Opposes development on Gertrude St due to its unique and beautiful nature.</p>
227	Survey	<p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Lives on Gore Street and concerned about losing natural sunlight. Also concerned about being overlooked by apartments on Smith Street</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Argues 6 Storeys is too high in areas with high heritage value</p> <p><u>Street / neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving</u> Would like to see DDOs focus on adding more greenery and openness to the areas, using south side of Wellington St (Vic PDE end) as a failed example with its lack of greenery through development.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback given on more foot traffic in previously quiet areas, especially at night Generally positive support in development, especially when centric to empty / industrial areas</p>

228	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Positive feedback on sites in area being a great mix of new modern design and heritage look / appeal</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Submits that some new construction in the area is too high in general Concerned that building heights are taking away the feel for the old heritage of the area and driving people away.</p>
229	Survey	<p><u>Growth no longer needed</u> Concerned about area having too many office buildings in general when there is an oversupply in CBD Does not want to see development occur on Gertrude due to its charm</p> <p><u>Street / neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving</u> Concerns about there not being enough greenspace for growing population in Collingwood</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Argues that anything above 10 Storeys in building height starts to feel oppressive and is concerned about this</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Okay with mid-size buildings development as long as they limit impacts generally and have public amenities attached / considered Concerned about large buildings being proposed on laneways - privacy concerns and existing residents having to worry about windows being blocked</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on mid-size apartment complexes integrated in pre-existing mixed zone areas (i.e. Collingwood between Wellington and Hoddle; Johnston and Victoria) Concerns about proposed development of Honda Dealership on Hoddle that would be 23 Storeys?</p>
230	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Believes developers are taking advantage and adding extra storeys and rooftops</p> <p><u>Amenity (General)</u> Angry that we do not enforce the rules proposed through DDOs with overlooking Concerned that developers focus is on destroying existing communities with apartments that have no fresh air in bedrooms and bathrooms Concerns about overlooking being disregarded in new builds</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Concerned about imposition created between 10-2pm equinox in months of July etc.</p> <p><u>Building Design</u> Would like to see more greenery imposed in building designed as buildings are lacking appeal</p> <p><u>Other</u> Concerns that the consultation process is flawed and residents have not been informed with enough time to reply Frustrated / angry with changes occurring and expensive rates which is driving out a community. Angry with councils' lack of care in development and not keeping to proposals.</p>

231	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Concerns about what has been proposed - especially with 8 Storeys above Woolworths car park Does not want to see high rise development Specific to DDO37 (Smith St North and South) - does not want to see any high rise buildings in this street at all due to the existing character that should not be ruined</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Believes high rise development takes away character from existing historical areas</p>
232	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Would like to see no higher than 3 storeys when it comes to building heights</p> <p><u>Footpath</u> Concerns about footpath safety - suggest changing cement paths to sparkly asphalt.</p> <p><u>Parking Issues</u> Would like to see DDOs consider better parking facilities</p> <p><u>Street / Neighbourhood / Public Amenity needs improving</u> Specific to DDO29 - wants to see whole street knocked down and repainted for better character</p> <p><u>Other</u> Submits issues they have on filthy area that exists - wants to see this changed and updated into something nicer Submits issues they have with graffiti in area Submits issues they have with health and safety surrounding areas occupied by drug users and sex workers. Specific to DDO34 - wants cybercrimes to be looked into in this area?</p>
233	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Submits positive comments on how they see feedback taken on board for certain large proposals that are knocked back as they do not fit into neighbourhood Concerns about size of new development - does not want more than 4 storeys max in height across DDOs- Supportive of developments but does not welcome anything above this max suggested Submits that higher development takes away character of area, regardless of DDO location.</p> <p><u>Amenity (General)</u> Submits that higher development blocks sunshine, causes wind tunnels and towers over neighbouring buildings</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Wants to see controls enforced and developers not able to overrule through VCAT or seek exemptions.</p> <p><u>Landscape</u> Would like to see more new developments include green areas / trees to aid streetscape.</p>

234	Survey	<p><u>Amenity (General)</u> Submits that high rise overhangs smith and other streets in area - creating wind tunnels and blocking sun</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Suggests 4 storeys as appropriate development height - provided it is not destroying streetscape and culture. Believes all heights of buildings should be controlled on a case by case basis when it comes to specific DDO Specific to DDO30- Smith St Shops - Does not want to see up to 8 stores in height enabled here as it will damage already existing community vibe created in area as well as have general amenity impacts</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Wants the September Equinox to be extended to 5pm to get more sunshine through the day</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on Smith Street vibe post COVID promoting diversity.</p>
235	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Submits that development over 3 storeys is leading to degrading of the streetscape and environment Believes that development of higher building in both residential streets and main streets (Gertrude, Smith and Brunswick) is also leading to unsustainable population in DDO areas</p> <p><u>Upper-level setback</u> Believes that setbacks aren't really working in practice as bulk of buildings are still overlooking neighbouring properties and showing prominently on street scape</p> <p><u>Growth no longer needed at this level</u> Strongly unsupportive of development in all DDOs despite showing sympathy for the need for development - does not want to see this happen at a high rise scale at all.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Believes mandatory heights are a good approach but wary that this will not be followed through Finds the preferred maximum wording outrageous and not realistic as this won't be followed through</p> <p><u>Other</u> Some positive feedback given on Manfax Store on Gertrude as good example of development that is sympathetic to streetscape and local environment but the list stops there.</p>
236	Survey	<p><u>Landscaping</u> Positive feedback on the implementation and upgrading of green areas</p> <p><u>Traffic</u> Submits that traffic arrangements are chaos in area making it dangerous for all users. Too much congestion.</p> <p><u>Usability of new development for commercial uses</u> Submits that there is a massive loss of long term businesses unable to compete with bigger retailers</p>

		<p><u>Heritage</u> Stresses that heritage buildings are being endangered Believes that there are more heritage significant buildings outside of heritage overlays that should be of focus Does not want to see laneways compromised due to more development on main roads.</p> <p><u>Building Design</u> Believes architecture if completely out of context in new developments</p> <p><u>Amenity (General)</u> Believes there is overdevelopment in DDO areas causing issues such as loss of sunlight and wind tunnels. Submits that area is not being kept to scale and building heights are leading to unnecessary amenity issues.</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Believes mandatory heights proposed are too high.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on return of collective celebration of arts and culture Positive feedback on support given to libraries and access to resources Positive feedback on more toilets in Edinburgh Gardens Positive feedback on the easier access to more supermarkets and chemists</p>
237	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Believes that development in the area has butchered the existing heritage - one of the main reasons why people visit the area in the first place</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Believes height restrictions should be kept at the levels they currently are in areas with buildings constructed before 1920.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Argues that DDOs should always be able to be scrutinised by the public & have a right to be taken to VCAT</p>
238	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Positive feedback on the current protection of building heights in Collingwood Against any development above 3 Storeys height due to increased congestion</p> <p><u>Landscaping</u> Positive feedback on the planting of new trees on streets</p> <p><u>Amenity (General)</u> Concerns about the current controls around frosted glass required on balconies to prevent overlooking.</p> <p><u>Traffic Increase/Congestion</u> Concerns about congestion through new development - roads / transport</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Believes developers should not be able to exceed set maximum heights</p>

239	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Believes that Melbourne's character is not being displayed well in approved buildings Suggests DDOs include better architectural designs to preserve character</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Submits that buildings approved seem to be too high.</p>
240	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Concerned about 'facadism' - important heritage buildings that are left with a façade and a 9 storey building on top.</p> <p><u>Building height AND Building design</u> The height of buildings should be reduced. Concerned about aesthetic of multistorey buildings on top of existing buildings.</p> <p>Concerned about turning the streets of Fitzroy and Collingwood into multiple high rise buildings - losing the fabric of what made the area attractive to live in.</p>
241	Survey	<p><u>Positives</u> Fantastic that developers in the area have had to keep building heights under the new proposal.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Concerned that infrastructure won't withstand the increase in development. Will directly impact quality of life. Strongly opposes this proposal.</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Proposal will detract from historical precinct, impact quality of life and drastically change landscape. It changes the fabric of the area and what makes it a fantastic place to live.</p> <p><u>Building height</u> Density and volume of the building will be overwhelming.</p>
242	Survey	<p><u>Positives</u> Agrees/ supports the need for sustainable development in the area, including medium density housing.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Density of development in Fitzroy and Collingwood is unrealistic. Infrastructure in the area is insufficient.</p> <p><u>Building height AND Overshadowing</u> Development which dominates and creates over-shadowing is unreasonable/detrimental to the quality and character of the area. Concerned about the height and massing of buildings that are being permitted. Issue with development along Smith and Brunswick Street is their north south alignment - creates overshadowing. Seven to nine storeys is too high. Three to four storeys should be the maximum. Concerned about the effect of placing disproportionate development next to low rise residential. Reducing heights in combination with setbacks is the answer.</p> <p><u>Other (discretionary controls)</u> Concerned that the Council is not resourced/skilled to ensure design outcomes respond to guidelines in a responsible way.</p>

243	Survey	<p><u>Positives</u> None - all of it taking away from Fitzroy's beautiful heritage.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> New developments have taken away what we love about the area, unique history and vibe.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> New developments have reduced available parking, taken away natural light, issues with noise/construction.</p>
244	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Believes modern style of buildings is detracting from the charm of suburbs and DDO areas</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Wants to see med-low rise buildings of focus that are appropriately set back Believes maximum heights should be capped at 3 Storeys</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Wants to see new development occur in line with heritage precedents in area Believes 3-6 Storey is too much in heritage protected areas as well as in general</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> General amenity issues raised with higher developments too - sunlight, noise and parking.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Wants to see Equinox pushed out to enable light for an additional hour during the day</p>
245	Survey	<p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Believes all changes in growth have led to wind tunnel creation</p> <p><u>Traffic increase / congestion</u> Believes all changes in growth have led to traffic increase around the area</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Submits that unique heritage character of area will be destroyed by overdevelopment</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Believes overshadowing controls do not help the fact that buildings are eyesores and impractical</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback given on small park on Langridge St</p>
246	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Believes new development is excessive in scale and do not fit well with the existing built area.</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Concerned about heritage properties being demolished for redevelopment</p>

		<p>Doesn't believe 7-9 Storeys in less heritage sensitive areas will be followed through with - believes this rule is pushed aside and higher developments are going ahead in these areas</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary</u> Concerned about developers' abilities to push controls in general and go over height limits etc</p> <p><u>Other</u> Concerned about general height controls and setbacks in the interim controls</p>
247	Survey	<p><u>Growth no longer needed at this level</u> Believes there is overdevelopment occurring and wants it to stop</p> <p><u>Issues from construction activities</u> Concerns about disruption to traffic and noise from construction - closed lanes, bike & pedestrian access etc.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerns about character being lost through new high-rise developments</p> <p><u>Building height</u> Submits support of development, just not developments that excessive in scale and eyesores to the area Submits that Kerr and George St areas are main residential and should not have 6-10 storeys allowed to be built there.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Would like to see September Equinox extended to other months so that there is less overshadowing in general</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on some multi-apartment blocks built in area</p>
248	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Concerns about oversized and overwhelming new development in area appearing Believes streets like Gertrude, Brunswick and Smith should be restricted to 4 levels above ground only. Would like to see DDOs only allow for low-rise developments</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Submits that buildings should be set back on all street sides, not just the one fronting the main road</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Wants to see heritage, character and history of suburbs protected generally through DDOs.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on some new buildings able to fit in with the character of Fitzroy/Collingwood - they are low density</p>
249	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Submits that streets like Johnston can handle higher developments but doesn't agree with other areas such as Town Hall and backblocks.</p>

		<p><u>Heritage</u> Believes that over-development is destroying the landscape / streetscapes - damaging heritage spaces etc.</p>
250	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Excess building height (over 5 storeys) along Victoria Pde and Smith St.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be less than 6 storeys. All DDO areas should have maximum heights of 5 storeys.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Wants to see more trees in Collingwood. Concerned with heat island effect.</p>
251	Survey	<p><u>Positive changes</u> Street based activity (on street dining). Improved building design (modern look) in Fitzroy and Collingwood.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be “preferred maximum of 5 storeys with maximum of 9 storeys if conditions are met”.</p>
252	Survey	<p><u>Positive changes</u> Good new mixed use developments in Fitzroy and Collingwood.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be 5-6 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Disagrees with mandatory maximum height limits.</p>
253	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Overdevelopment of sites on Smith, Gertrude and Johnson Streets. Overdevelopment is detrimental to streetscape and increase traffic volume, parking demand and demand for waste services (and other utilities).</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 3 storeys. 6 storeys will create wind tunnels and dark streets.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supports mandatory maximum height limits. Disagrees with preferred maximum height limits.</p> <p><u>Other</u> DDOs should not allow restrictions to be eased or lifted.</p>
254	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Small cafes and bars provide a sense of community.</p>

		<p><u>Concerns</u> Overdevelopment of sites on Fitzroy will result in loss of character and history. Loss of sunlight is detrimental to mental health.</p>
255	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Use of brickwork in new developments. Provision of low car, mixed dwellings to encourage families to stay in the area (3 bed dwellings with private open spaces).</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Housing affordability. Back streets (outside of DDO areas) should be developed as they are in a good location. Higher density development increases car use and parking demand.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Minimum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 6 storeys.</p>
256	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Slower traffic. Increased bike lanes.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Tall, ugly glass buildings detracting from heritage streetscape (i.e. Collingwood South and Johnston Street). Overdevelopment results in wind tunnels and loss of sunshine (i.e. near Rose and Kerr Streets, Fitzroy). Housing affordability. Increased housing cannot be accommodated in Fitzroy and Collingwood.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 2-3 storeys. No tall new buildings should be constructed on Brunswick Street.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supports mandatory maximum height limits. Disagrees with preferred controls.</p>
257	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Business growth. Tourist traffic.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Noise pollution resulting from new developments Loss of privacy as a result of new builds. Height of new developments not in keeping with character of Fitzroy.</p>

258	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Redevelopment of industrial heritage buildings (adds to aesthetic and increases foot traffic and boosts economy). Diverse demographic, sense of community.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Excessive development resulting in loss of character (to Collingwood, esp. Smith Street) Large residential builds should be located far back from Smith St and Brunswick St. New developments are not responsive to immediate surrounding neighbourhood (re: built form). Excessive residential development (surplus to requirements).</p>
259	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Shared space along Rose Street creates good community space.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Hotel on Rose Street is too large and rooftop bar will negatively impact the neighbourhood. Developers using the planning permit amendment process to alter the approvals.</p> <p><u>DDO40</u> Maximum building height of 8 storeys is excessive. Setback provisions do not alleviate impact of building heights.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be less than 7-9 storeys. Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be less than 6 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Disagrees with preferred controls.</p> <p><u>Rear setbacks</u> Proposed rear setback distances and angles are insufficient.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Overshadowing should be prevented for longer through the day.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks</u> 6-8 metres is insufficient setback from the street.</p>
260	Survey	<p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits that Collingwood is prone to wind tunnels and the footpaths are shadowed by taller buildings. Does not want Fitzroy to lose its amenity like Collingwood has. Submits that apartments have been designed with limited light, poor airflow and poor workplans.</p> <p><u>Building height:</u> Submits the hotel under construction on Rose Street to too tall - proposed rooftop bar will have negative impacts on the residents in the area. Submits that area around Rose Street (DDO40) cannot support tall buildings - residential area and 8 storeys is too tall.</p>

		<p>Submits that the area is residential (lower scale) and not former industrial. Submits 6 storeys is too tall for Gertrude Street.</p> <p><u>Upper-level Setback:</u> Submits that setback provisions are insufficient.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Concerned that all controls are not mandatory. Submits that the term 'preferred' is useless.</p>
261	Survey	<p><u>Building Design:</u> Notes there are interesting architectural options.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Submits that there is too much development. Submits that development should have biophilic requirements and a mandatory 7-star green rating.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits that development is too tall - overshadowing and not enough light or trees. Should be human scale and improve greenery and open space.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Building heights shouldn't be over 6 storeys - human scale as it can be accessed without lifts and keeps with the surroundings.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Submits that height should be enforced everywhere.</p>
262	Survey	<p><u>Building Design:</u> Submits that there has been excellent quality design in some recent development (notes 231 & 239 Napier Street and 250 Gore Street). Submits that poor quality designed building need repairs soon after being built.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Concern about the loss of original brick textures and spaces (notes 250 Gore Street and 200 Johnston Street theatre). Submits that the excellence needs to be kept intact. Notes the Victorian cityscapes and sky. Submits that height should be 3-storeys around important heritage streets. Submit Gertrude Street should be better protected. Submits that parts of Smith Street should be singled out for preservation. Submits that control should address specific areas and not across multiple streets.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that 7 storeys should be avoided - inhuman to the environment.</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Submits that height should be mandatory. Does not support preferred controls - taken advantage of</p>
263	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes the benefit of abandoned sites being reused for housing. Submits there has been poor consultation with residents regarding the amenity changes from increasingly taller developments. Submits that priority needs to be given to the environmental impact of development.</p> <p><u>Building height:</u> Submits that the building heights are taller than the surroundings.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits overshadowing of adjacent properties is negatively impacting solar access (PV panels and light). Concern with the impact of noise on nearby properties from construction. Submits the character of the neighbourhood is lost due to poor architecture. Submits there is a lack of appropriate building design for a climate change.</p> <p><u>Public open space:</u> Submits there is a lack of public open space/green space.</p> <p><u>Parking:</u> Concern around the impact of lack of parking.</p> <p><u>Traffic issues:</u> Concern with the lack of passive pedestrian transport options.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Submits that height should be mandatory. Does not support preferred controls - taken advantage of.</p>
264	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits there has not been a positive change in the area in relation to new development and growth. Submits that Fitzroy and Collingwood are an urban oasis and the number of large developments has been minimal. Concerns with the Aldi building - submits it's a bad example and how not to build. Concern that the area will look like the Docklands.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that Peel and Wellington Street developments are too tall. Submits that building over 3 storeys imposes on people's privacy.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that people live in Fitzroy and Collingwood because of the unique community and old buildings and character - submits this needs to be maintained.</p>

		<p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits that overly tall buildings create wind tunnels along main roads. Submits new development block views of the city.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Submits that height should be mandatory - if the heights are reduced.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Submits that setbacks below 8m would create wind tunnelling and block light.</p>
265	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes the benefit of housing affordability in the area. Concern about the loss of 'vibe' in the suburbs. Submits concern that this may be a pointless exercise. Concern about what power Council will have if everything ends up at VCAT</p> <p><u>Building design:</u> Submits that some new developments have good designs.</p> <p><u>Building height:</u> Submits buildings are too tall. Submits that 7 - 9 storeys is driven by developer greed and not responding to the area. Submits that 7 - 9 storeys is unnecessary. Submits that the difference in 3 and 6 storeys is large - should be limited to 3 and 4 storeys.</p> <p><u>Parking:</u> Submits that parking is near impossible to find near residences. Concerns with the type of car that is parked in the area - Submits that they don't live in the area.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits there has been a loss in community amenities.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Concern that mandatory heights are pointless unless detailed and understood. Does not support preferred controls - concerned that developers will push for more.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Concern that 4 hours for overshadowing isn't long enough.</p>
266	Survey	<p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits that new development has brought vibrancy to the neighbourhood - Need to ensure new developments consider the long-term impact on amenity. Submits that multiple taller developments next to each other create dark zones and wind tunnels. Concern about the impact on privacy, natural light and investment in amenities for existing residents.</p>

		<p><u>Building Height:</u> Concern with the maximum heights on Smith, Johnston and Brunswick - impact on heritage homes. Does not support the height proposed in DDO36 - submits that 5 storeys would be more appropriate on back streets. Does not support the height proposed in DDO37 - Already seeing an impact on Kerr Street.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory heights - depending on the maximum height.</p>
267	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits there have been little positive changes in the area recently.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits that approved development detracts from residents' amenity. Concern that current controls are destroying the amenity. Concern that controls do not go far enough for those adjoining development - interface needs to be more sensitive.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Concern that the overshadowing requirements are not strict enough - needs to be longer than 4 hours.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Submits that upper-level setbacks are not large enough.</p> <p><u>Parking:</u> Concern regarding the development of car parking. Concern about the pressure of on-street parking.</p> <p><u>Building height:</u> Concerns with the increasing height of some large developments. Submits these developments are too dense.</p> <p><u>Front Setbacks:</u> Concerns with developments being built up to site boundaries.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Concern that without mandatory controls development will just continue to push.</p>
268	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits that there have not been many positive changes in the area recently. Concern with the amount of graffiti. Submits there has been a lack of regard from Council and officers for creating a mentally healthy vibrant arts community. Concern that planning does not have enough regard for the mental health impacts of development on the community.</p>

		<p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that brutalist architecture does not have enough regard for heritage buildings or places. Concern with the overdevelopment of heritage buildings.</p> <p><u>Building height:</u> Submits that the heights proposed are too tall.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Overshadowing should be eliminated - submits it is unhealthy. Submits that 4 hours is not long enough for overshadowing - Recommends 8am - 4pm.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Submits that the setbacks need to be increased.</p>
269	Survey	<p><u>Economic Development:</u> Submits that more businesses need to be open along shopping streets.</p> <p><u>Active Transport:</u> Submits that more pedestrians in pedestrian-friendly areas such as Rose Street.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Concern that the market will be filled with too many low-quality apartments.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that high-rise development out of areas with character cottages and heritage buildings.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that 6 - 7 storeys is too tall and shouldn't be allowed.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls. Does not support preferred controls - Developers will take advantage.</p> <p><u>Public realm:</u> Submits that requirements should ensure public amenities.</p>
270	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Believes that building heights are too excessive currently Does not believe new building heights should be allowed to exceed existing buildings in sensitive areas Wants to see strict height controls imposed to avoid destroying character of area</p> <p><u>Traffic</u> Submits that there is a human and traffic congestion increase</p>

		<p><u>Amenity (General)</u> Concerned that development is cause wind tunnel effects in many streets and blocking sunlight too Believes that views to areas such as the Dandenongs have been blocked due to high-rise development</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Believes no amount of setbacks will be able to address excessive building heights and their damage to the area</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Concerned that developers still get their desired end result due to controls being too relaxed</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Not fond of favouring less heritage centric areas for more development - industrial character of areas require as much protection as do the historical public buildings on the register - does not want to see this ruined.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Believes that overshadowing is downplayed through development and character of streetscape is thus changed</p>
271	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Believes buildings are designed with no architectural merit Concerned about environmental damage created through use of concrete in buildings (CO2 emissions)</p> <p><u>Amenity (General)</u> Concerned about wind tunnels / dust created by high-rise developments Concerns about high-rise development cause overlooking and privacy issues in general through all areas</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Concerned that increasing heights will lead to greedy developers who want money and don't care for community Supports developments up to 6 floors but that is pushing it even - no more than 4 floors requested. No more than 3 storeys requested in areas with heritage significance Specific to DDO40 - retain two storey heights along Nicholson. Increase heights gradually to 6 Storeys around Fitzroy and Kerr. Drop to two floors on Brunswick St Specific to DDO29 & 30 - Doesn't want to see Brunswick & Smith Street overdeveloped and have night life ruined.</p> <p><u>Upper-level Setbacks</u> Believes setbacks are getting smaller leading to overshadowing</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Wants to see mandatory height limits only to reduce developer greed and VCAT cases.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Believes September equinox hours are too generous and doesn't allow enough sunshine for residents</p>
272	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Some developments have eliminated heritage aspects experienced in area - North end of smith e.g. provided</p>

		<p>Would like to see more street front retail activation Does not want to see above heritage shop fronts developed, even if setbacks are in place.</p> <p><u>Street / Neighbourhood / Public amenity needs improving</u> Wants to see development focused on side streets / in-fill behind main roads Believes Gertrude should have no development due to its vibrant and cultural street</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Believes developers push over set height limits and doesn't want to see this burden occur again.</p> <p><u>Usability of new development for commercial uses</u> Believes setting 6-8 metres away from main roads for development will likely lead to shortening of available retail floor space for street shop fronts and impact the viability of retail businesses such as restaurants</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on some development that has been able to protect streetscape whilst increasing residential supply - e.g. Stanley Street (north side between Smith and Wellington Streets).</p>
273	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Positive feedback on some appearances of new buildings keeping with the area and its heritage value</p> <p><u>Upper-level Setbacks</u> Positive feedback on some setbacks on new developments Would like to see 8m setbacks as a minimum & work on a case by case from there based on width of streets</p> <p><u>Amenity (General)</u> Okay with developments on major roads but would like more emphasis on side streets of these developments so that there is a reduction of overshadowing on residents and noise too.</p> <p><u>Traffic increase/ congestion</u> Concerned about congestion caused by large developments on main roads</p> <p><u>Issues from construction activities</u> Concerns about impacts of construction over long periods of time for residents (noise etc)</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Supportive of development in industrial pockets so long they are not excessive scale and impact residents Does not want to see 7-9 storeys in industrial areas as this won't keep in with general heritage of DDO areas. In heritage areas - wants to see only 2-4 storeys as anything else is out of keeping with heritage protection.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Concerned that developers can go higher than preferred maximums and would like to see mandatory maximums in place instead.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on some access to new supermarkets in Fitzroy - North of Johnston</p>

274	Survey	<p><u>Street / Neighbourhood / Public Amenity needs improving</u> Believes many redevelopments are large and do not fit into the landscape and intrude natural environments Believes over scaled development alters the character of the neighbourhood in negative ways</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Believes 7-9 storeys are too heigh - even in heritage areas.</p> <p><u>Amenity (General)</u> Submits that tall buildings overlook and overshadow existing properties in DDOs, regardless of heritage or not</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Does not want it to be preferred maximum and rather mandatory instead. Does not want to see development exceed mandatory heigh requirements at all.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Believes that the type of terminology used in DDOs gives no confidence that they will be adhered too (Such as the words " should" when discussing building heights) Positive feedback on some former industrial areas that have benefited from redevelopment</p>
275	Survey	<p><u>Building heights:</u> New buildings are already too high. The proposed changes will allow them to be even higher. Will help rich developers to the detriment of current residents. Large buildings are more appropriate on major thoroughfares than in small streets. The backstreets of Fitzroy have immense character. Don't ruin them. 1 to 2 storeys for heritage buildings not 6.</p>
276	Survey	<p><u>Traffic:</u> Huge traffic increase. Streets being used as rat runs. Cars speeding to beat the traffic.</p> <p><u>Construction:</u> Constant construction, trucks, and noise is quite debilitating during the day.</p> <p><u>Parks and open space:</u> The parks are getting more and more full. The bins in the parks are always overflowing. Queues to cross at pedestrian lights (especially the Alexandra Parade lights near the pool) means that it's even more difficult to get across that road.</p> <p><u>Building heights / heritage:</u> Proposed in the Smith/Brunswick area are far too high. Already the area is feeling boxed in and lacking in light & amenities. This is a suburban area. The developments that add one or two storeys to the existing are ok and in character. 7-9 storeys in areas with less heritage sensitivities is far too high. (Notes DDO36 as an area of concern – heights are too high.) The developments that have added to the neighbourhood are the ones that only add one story to the warehouses/factories, and the apartments also seem</p>

		<p>more liveable. Supports height on Alexandra Pde - concerned about heights in the backstreets of the suburban areas e.g. Kerr/George. 6 storeys is still far too high for heritage areas. Limiting to 3 storeys is essential. Maybe 4 storeys with significant setbacks.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Setbacks are essential. Support larger setbacks to retain street scape, light, and a neighbourhood. Again. NOT ENOUGH. Is that enough for our trees to continue to thrive and keep the temperature down in the streets? What about late afternoon sun in a cafe? These joys are why people come here, why people live here. The backstreet cafes and pubs will all either disappear or be forced to close outdoor drinking with these new DDO's, and the rooftop gardens for those that have them will all be overshadowed.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> Set buildings further back.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Restrict roof areas and setbacks turning that area into a roof top bar like the new hotel on Rose Street.</p> <p><u>Commercial viability:</u> The character of the area needs studios and artists and backstreet locals' bars and cafes. Make development smart and create the Fitzroy that will thrive and continue to be an arts and culture hub. These behemoths are not that. In DDO36 - Fitzroy east and Johnston Street north - studios, warehouses, independent shops are under threat. Important part of our community and why people live here.</p> <p><u>Open space:</u> Provision of open space for new residents. Where do people live outside their apartments? Smith Street reserve has high usage – what happens with more people and dogs. Where will these new residents go? Build more parks in some of these lots. Make space for kids to play and dogs to run and people to kick a ball. Edinburgh Gardens and Atherton gardens can't support this many more people. Need open space, sunshine, and to be able to see the sky.</p>
277	Survey	<p><u>Building design / character:</u> The quality of buildings and impact on narrow streets is detrimental to the character to Fitzroy. Collingwood is destroyed. One architect's assessment - there were only about six developments of merit in Collingwood. The developers would be the only ones who would think there have been positive changes - to their bank balances.</p> <p><u>DDO29 & DDO40:</u> DDO29 and DDO40 are a potential disaster for Fitzroy. What attracts people to Fitzroy is going to be destroyed. The buildings heights of 6 - 8 storeys are far too high.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Support mandated limits - if the heights are appropriate.</p>
278	Survey	<p><u>DDO36 Fitzroy East and Johnston St North:</u> Front wall of new buildings must be kept to 2 - 3 storeys and heritage fronts retained. Consistent with DDO40, DDO37 and DDO30.</p>

		<p>Maximum building height should be 3 - 5 storeys with 3 storeys on heritage sites. Consistent with DDO30 and DDO35. The back streets 3 - 5 storeys consistent with DD040. Taller parts on new buildings [setback] greater than 2 - 3 storeys will be 8+ metres pushed back regardless of heritage from Johnston St and back streets [10+ metres from Argyle St consistent with DDO37 Smith St North and South, DDO30 Smith St Shops</p> <p><u>DDO37 Smith St and DDO30 Smith St Shops:</u> Front wall of building kept to 2 storeys. Maximum building height of 2 storeys on Smith St [west & east] and 3 - 5 storeys on back streets except for a few pre-existing sites. Taller parts on new buildings will be 8+ metres pushed back regardless of heritage.</p>
279	Survey	<p><u>Building heights:</u> Supports higher density living in the right place. Concerned with heights around Smith Street, Gertrude Street and Brunswick Street in particular - inside Fitzroy and Collingwood. Maintaining a town or village feel for these three acclaimed streets is critically important to the submitter. Height near Alexandra Pde, Johnston, Nicholson or Hoddle Streets is ok.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Supports 3-4 or 5 storeys max in heritage areas. Protect historical feel in Smith, Gertrude and Brunswick Streets.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Supports mandatory heights in heritage areas - provided these maximums are low e.g. 3 storeys.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Protection of footpaths from 10am to 2pm isn't acceptable around any of the 3 key historical axis of Smith (North/South axis), Brunswick (N/S axis) or Gertrude. Morning sun and afternoon/evening sun or light (east/west) is critical - need to access morning or afternoon/evening sun or light. Shouldn't be impacted further by overshadowing at any time.</p>
280	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Positive feedback on keeping some of the new buildings to around 6 levels, retaining liveability Concerns about height of some other new buildings over 6 storeys that are not keeping in check with neighbourhood Believes buildings should be a maximum of 6 storeys</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Would like to see mandatory as opposed to preferred terms used</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on some new developments that have maintained integrity, bringing character and aesthetic to area Positive feedback on the mix of residential, retail and small businesses in the area Does not agree with the characterisation of some of the areas as 'former industrial'</p>

281	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Would like to see absolute height limits specified to each area to avoid excessive height development Believes development in all DDOs should be restricted to a height limit of 5 Storeys</p>
282	Survey	<p><i>No additional comments provided.</i></p>
283	Survey	<p><u>Traffic increase/congestion</u> Believes there is too much traffic in area</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Wants to see a maximum of 3 storey height</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on amenities and vibrant street culture Is over development affecting the old charm of the area</p>
284	Survey	<p><u>Traffic increase / congestion</u> Concerns about increase in traffic flow through small streets</p> <p><u>Issues from construction activity</u> Concerns about construction activity effects through new developments / poor quality leading to frequent repairs required</p> <p><u>Building Design</u> Concerns about the loss of Fitzroy aesthetic and culture through development Concerns about building design lacking vibrancy or uniqueness to area</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerns about higher apartment blocks leading to wind tunnels and sunlight issues</p> <p><u>Parking issues</u> Concerned about more development leading to parking and accessibility issues</p> <p><u>Building height</u> Believes heights should be limited to 4 storeys in heritage areas Believes heights need to be lower even in less heritage significant areas - max 5-6 storeys Specific to DDO36 - wants 5 storey developments in this area, especially due to their property only being 1 Storey</p> <p><u>Other</u> Some positive feedback on infrastructure being built alongside growth - childcare, supermarkets and school upgrade Concerns about rubbish accumulation on front yard of property on Argyle St if short stay apartments were to appear Concerns about lack of low income or affordable housing in area</p>
285	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Concerns about too many large multi-storey apartment buildings increasing pressure on other infrastructure (i.e. roads, transport) Would like to see a maximum of 3 storey heights - 7-9 is too high</p>

		<p><u>Street / Neighbourhood / Public amenity needs improving</u> Concerns about not enough green spaces in area Concerned that appeal and charm of area may be lost through development and this should be priority</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Believes buildings over 3 storeys create wind tunnels, changes landscape, creates overshadowing for other residents Specific to DDO30 - concerned about buildings over 3 storeys going up on Smith Street due to all of their property windows facing the street. Concerned privacy will be neglected and reduced light too.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Concerns developers can overlook preferred maximum heights - would rather mandatory</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Would like overshadowing to be thought about outside of the hours and days of September Equinox</p> <p><u>Traffic increase / congestion</u> Would like to see consideration given on traffic on roads and public transport due to development</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on mixture of buildings in area adding to diversity of area</p>
286	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Submits that Fitzroy requires respect for its heritage buildings</p> <p><u>Issues from construction activity</u> Concerns about development construction traffic, noise and disturbance on residential side streets</p> <p><u>Upper-level setback</u> Wants to see a 10m minimum upper-level setback</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Believes Multi-storey buildings are incompatible with the low-rise character of area Specific to DDO39 - Is against suggested 12 Storeys on Victoria PDE. Harms residential heritage side streets. Specific to DDO31- Wants to see minimum 10 metre setback and 4 Storey limit</p>
287	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Concerns over some large plan developments created that were inappropriate to the area, harming the charm of the area. Submits that developments could be good in some areas if sympathetic in style and architecture</p> <p><u>Issues from construction activities</u> Concerns that developers and professionals have no concept of the day to day / hour to hour impacts that construction can have on residential areas as well as to the broader scope.</p> <p><u>Street / neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving</u> Submits that developments could be good in some areas if green space is included too</p>

		<p><u>Building Height</u> Does not believe that large buildings can support the area in any way within the DDOs.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on appreciation given to local input in matters. Positive feedback on appreciating the importance of preserving the unique qualities of the area Submits that professional studies that accompany development proposals seem to leave out the psychological impact buildings have when they are larger - even when set back.</p>
288	Survey	<p><u>Overshadowing</u> Concerns about overshadowing generally</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Concerns about destruction of heritage in general</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Wants to see 3 storey heights maximum</p> <p><u>Other</u> Believes street setbacks for buildings should be further than stated in controls</p>
289	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Concerns about too many higher rise developments that do not reflect character of the area</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Concerned that 7-9 storey developments would overshadow / destruct views of existing low rise buildings Believes overshadowing at any time of the day or year is not acceptable - does not support 10am-2pm</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on some developments that reflect the character of the area well Does not support development at all in Industrial areas - should be preserved due to uniqueness Believes buildings should have street setbacks of at least 10m</p>
290	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Increased green spaces.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Number and excessive height of recent developments. Loss of character and heritage due to excessive height.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> High rise buildings are inappropriate. Height limits should be "set according to what exists". Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be in accordance with the existing building heights in these areas. Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be in accordance with the existing building heights in these areas.</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls (if the height limits are lowered to reflect the current building heights in each area). Not supportive of preferred controls due to VCAT appeals process.</p>
291	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Increased green spaces and community spaces. Collingwood arts precinct is more inviting.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Number and excessive height of recent developments. Loss of character and heritage due to excessive height. Large developments create traffic issue, especially in laneways. Local groups must protect heritage themselves (self-funded). Overdevelopment results in loss of sunlight.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should protect the character and safety of these areas. Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be three storeys or less.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls (if the height limits are lowered). Not supportive of preferred controls due to VCAT appeals process.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Overshadowing should be prevented for longer through the day.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks</u> 6-8 metres is insufficient setback from the front street.</p> <p><u>DDO31</u> Gertrude Street has a unique heritage character that must be protected from overdevelopment. Loss of heritage, heritage views and sunlight will ruin the culture.</p>
292	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Number and excessive size of recent developments. During construction, these developments disrupt neighbourhoods (construction workers occupying on-street parking, blocked roads, noise).</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should consider the heritage buildings in the block/s behind. Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 2 - 3 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls (if the height limits are lowered). Not supportive of preferred controls due to VCAT appeals process.</p>

		<p><u>Overshadowing</u> Overshadowing should be prevented throughout the year (i.e. winter).</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks</u> 6-8 metres is insufficient setback from the front street.</p>
293	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> The tallest new developments have been confined to commercial areas.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Impact of excavation on neighbouring dwellings/buildings (including cracked wall, ceiling and cornices). Wind tunnels. Creaking “singing” tall buildings in high winds Lack of community housing. Poor internal amenity in new units. Large developments will increase traffic and car parking demand.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Agrees that maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be 7-9 storeys. Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should consider the impacts on adjacent housing.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Supportive of preferred controls on a “case-by-case” basis.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Overshadowing to footpaths requirement is “too restricted”.</p>
294	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Increasing height of buildings in the area and impacts on traffic.</p>
295	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> New art shops and cafes on Smith St.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Proposed development of 10 storeys would overshadow submitters house and block northern light.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be lower. Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be lower</p>
296	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> High quality design and workmanship (result in plans which reflect the finished build)</p>

		<p>Densification of the neighbourhoods creates a more liveable inner-city experience. Quality architecture is contributing to the built form in a positive way.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Poor quality façade materials Lack of social/affordable housing (proposed minimum 20% of all new builds over 1000sqm to social housing) Poor standards for vehicle entry/exit points in new developments, especially loading docks for large vehicles.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 3-5 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Unsupportive of preferred controls due to developer interpretation.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Inhibit use of poor quality materials.</p> <p><u>DDO34</u> Should be a low-rise area. Increase green space.</p>
297	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> New Aldi building provides good off-street parking. Would like to see more arcades or walkways between new buildings to allow pedestrian traffic and visibility through to other areas.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Too many tall buildings blocking sunlight and views. Poor design of buildings not sympathetic to heritage character.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 4-5 storeys. Maximum building height in DDO40 should be 4 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Unsupportive of preferred controls.</p>
298	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Some low-rise new buildings are ok with setbacks.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls (if heights are low). Unsupportive of preferred controls.</p>

299	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> High rise apartment buildings Development will attract tourists.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Housing affordability New apartments create noise (from occupants on balconies) and destroy privacy to existing backyards.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be lower (3-6 storeys blocks views). Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be lower (7-9 storeys blocks views).</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls.</p> <p><u>DDO38 and DDO39</u> Very noisy.</p> <p><u>DDO33</u> Overcrowded ("like sardines")</p>
300	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Positive feedback on some of the consideration made to heritage Positive feedback on consideration of visual separation of old and new facades Concerns with lack of heritage retained when developing buildings, even when promised more during proposal?</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Concerns with overwhelming setbacks on top of heritage façade buildings Concerns about lack of input from objectors when it comes to proposals going over height limits</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Would like to see preferred controls changed to 'under special circumstances'</p> <p><u>Other</u> Concerns about developers going over controls limits and seeking VCAT approval. Wants clarity with DDOs that setbacks are including balconies in wording.</p>
301	Survey	<p><u>Issues from construction activity</u> Concerns about dust from development picking up in area Concerns about road closures / inconveniences in area due to development</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Does not support developments of more than 6 Storeys in any DDO area Does not want to see more than 3 Storeys in heritage significant areas</p>

		<p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerns about sunshine, breeze and sky that is lost through higher developments</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Would only support mandatory height controls in all DDOs Wants to see minimum mandatory set back controls established for any buildings over 2 Storeys high.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setback</u> Wants to see mandatory 10m upper-level setbacks from 3 Storeys and above in developments</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Would like to see percentages used for overshadowing instead of time blocks. 10% for warmer months and 15% for colder months</p> <p><u>Other</u> Concerns about issues with accessing services such as public transport, parking, doctors, restaurants. Concerns about not enough infrastructure to support the level of development</p>
302	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Positive feedback on some of the consideration made to heritage Positive feedback on consideration of visual separation of old and new facades Concerns with lack of heritage retained when developing buildings, even when promised more during proposal?</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Concerns with overwhelming setbacks on top of heritage façade buildings Concerns about lack of input from objectors when it comes to proposals going over height limits</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Would like to see preferred controls changed to 'under special circumstances'</p> <p><u>Other</u> Concerns about developers going over controls limits and seeking VCAT approval. Wants clarity with DDOs that setbacks are including balconies in wording.</p>
303	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Positive feedback on historic overlay on residential streets and attention to development that is sensitive of streetscape</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Concerns about developer's potential to build at inappropriate heights and building mass due to these permeant DDOs Fine with 2-4 Storey developments with good setbacks but believes 6 Storeys is too high for DDOs</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Does not believe overshadowing should occur through the majority of the day</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on caring and community minded council.</p>

304	Survey	<p><u>Street / Neighbourhood / Public Amenity needs improving</u> Concerns that the area is overdeveloped and has high density Concerns about the change from family communities to overshadowing imposing blocks that destroy heritage</p>
305	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> General concerns about heights - should be low-rise rather than high-rise Submits that only major roads are capable of carrying additional heights in new developments</p> <p><u>Building Design</u> General concerns about design - very ugly buildings General concerns about quality of developments - poor materials making developments look like public housing</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerns that they will soon be living in ugly wind tunnels due to development</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Disagrees with heritage preservation only consisting of keeping heritage facades and then building on top of this. Suggests 3-6 Storeys in areas with less heritage significance and 1-3 Storeys in areas with heritage significance</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Concerns that with no mandatory maximum heights, it gives developers free reign</p>
306	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Concerns that new developments do not pay respect to their historic site context, consequently destroying the neighbourhoods</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Concerned about the flow on effect of high developments in the area that lead to even higher developments in future, ruining the areas significance</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Would like to see mandatory controls in place so that developers do not abuse the system</p>
307	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Positive feedback on some designs of new buildings Argues that too many newer developments are boxy and ugly, taking up too much space and with small uninhabitable apartments.</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Submits there needs to be a balance of density, with apartments mixed with low level housing and green spaces and other facilities Submits that 7-9 storeys is too high and would rather support 4-5 Storey developments Would like to see a maximum of 3 Storeys in heritage sensitive areas</p> <p><u>Landscaping</u> Wants to see more greenery included in development (vegetable gardens on rooftops, trees and greenery at street front level etc)</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Would like to see overshadowing timing extended within September Equinox</p>

		<p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerns about privacy through overlooking when new developments are built - would like to see DDOs cover this more</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on arrival of new businesses Positive feedback on some small - medium height apartment buildings replacing worn-down warehouse sites Expresses a lot of anger surrounding lack of community consultation notice and a vague survey created. Concerned about lack of details on heights and setbacks in individual DDOs within survey - believes it is a blanket, all-in approach.</p>
308	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Positive feedback on some designs of new buildings Argues that too many newer developments are boxy and ugly, taking up too much space and with small uninhabitable apartments.</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Submits there needs to be a balance of density, with apartments mixed with low level housing and green spaces and other facilities Submits that 7-9 storeys is too high and would rather support 4-5 storey developments Would like to see a maximum of 3 storeys in heritage sensitive areas</p> <p><u>Landscaping</u> Wants to see more greenery included in development (vegetable gardens on rooftops, trees and greenery at street front level etc)</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Would like to see overshadowing timing extended within September Equinox</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerns about privacy through overlooking when new developments are built - would like to see DDOs cover this more</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on arrival of new businesses Positive feedback on some small - medium height apartment buildings replacing worn-down warehouse sites Expresses a lot of anger surrounding lack of community consultation notice and a vague survey created. Concerned about lack of details on heights and setbacks in individual DDOs within survey - believes it is a blanket, all-in approach.</p>
309	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Submits that Yarra is approving too many inappropriate developments that are jammed-in together, cheap and badly designed</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Wants to see mandatory heights lowered in general for DDOs</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Wants to see set (mandatory) controls in place so that areas are protected</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Does not believe there should be overshadowing at all</p>

		<p><u>Growth no longer needed at this level</u> Specific to DDO29 - Does not want to see buildings developed on Brunswick Street</p> <p><u>Other</u> Concerned about lack of infrastructure being built alongside new developments Concerned about Yarra's active erosion of the character of areas like Fitz and Collingwood Does not want to see back street pubs being sold off and developed as these add value to the community Would like to see more service provision of focus in DDOs (parking, garbage, street cleaning)?</p>
310	Survey	<p><u>Other - Brotherhood of St Laurence:</u> Brotherhood of St Laurence plans to build a 12 storey building near the corner of Gertrude and Brunswick Street. Went directly to the State Government for approval to skip the planning scheme approval and public review. Not acceptable.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Doesn't agree with height in heritage areas but supports mandatory heights.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Make them mandatory to preserve the character of Fitzroy and Collingwood - too unique and special to lose. Building heights should be mandatory to ensure consistency. Makes the city look like a well thought through space. Preferred building heights are negotiable and lead to a random appearance.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Should not overshadow any existing buildings.</p> <p><u>DDO34:</u> Oppose this proposal for Brotherhood of St Laurence - around the corner of Brunswick and Gertrude Street. Suggested building height of 20.8m is not acceptable - completely out of place for this area where most buildings are 2 or 3 storey max. Keep the unique character as is.</p> <p><u>Landscaping:</u> More trees in public spaces have been planted and outdoor spaces for restaurants have been created.</p>
311	Survey	<p><u>Building heights:</u> New apartment and office buildings are substantially higher than adjacent dwellings. Impacts on light and creates wind tunnels. Proposed heights of 6 to 8 storeys with minimal setbacks at rear are detrimental to single and double storeys houses and units. 4 storeys maximum i.e. no higher than twice the residential areas. Irrespective of whether area is heritage or has minimal heritage sensitivity.</p> <p><u>Residential interfaces:</u> Maximum boundary heights of 2 storeys and 4 storeys overall Setbacks at both front and rear to ensure sunlight can access buildings.</p> <p><u>DDO29:</u> Height restrictions should be 2 storeys at front or rear boundary with a significant setback. 4 storeys max height.</p>

312	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Supports more people accessing transport and services that inner city living offers. Neighbourhoods are more vibrant with more people.</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> A blanket approach in this area will produce negative outcomes for existing residents of existing buildings which have been approved rely on light coming into the interior of the buildings, such as 416 Gore St. A more localised approach should be taken to reduce negative impacts on the amenity of residents in existing buildings. Not just traditional low houses that rely on access to light and privacy, existing multi-residential buildings rely on light into internal spaces.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Mandatory heights would give a clear direction to developers. Must be set with the aim of protecting the amenity of residents in existing buildings.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Increased density must not come at the cost of loss of basic amenity, such as light, noise levels and solar access, for existing residents. Protect light to internal spaces – relied on by residents e.g. 416 Gore St – not just footpaths.</p> <p><u>DDO30:</u> Keep the front wall of new buildings to 2 storeys to maintain existing eastern light into apartment / residential buildings of DDO36. Maximum building height - 2 storeys on Smith St (West and East) and 3-5 storeys on back streets to maintain existing eastern light into apartment/residential buildings of DDO36. Taller parts of new buildings should be set back 8 metres regardless of heritage.</p>
313	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Supports Collingwood yards and identification of an arts precinct</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> The maximum heights and density for each respective area are too high. Concerned large apartment blocks are taking light. Large apartment blocks feel imposing and sterile - diminish liveability. Does not support higher densities in the previously industrial areas. Supports creative medium density with shared public spaces. 7 -9 storeys is too high - particularly in areas where there is very limited public open space. Approach of 3-6 storeys should be across the board rather than just in heritage <u>areas</u></p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Mandatory heights should be across the board - the entire area should be considered sensitive. Does not support preferred heights / criteria – gives the developers to much control.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> Apply 6-8m not just for heritage buildings.</p>

		<p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Should not overshadow from sunrise to sundown. Living in darkness in the morning and afternoon is acceptable??</p> <p><u>Amenity:</u> Retain space and light.</p>
314	Survey	<p><u>Commercial offer:</u> Supports better shopping, such as Aldi opening.</p> <p><u>Character:</u> Too much high density housing which is impacting the streetscape and general look of the streets. The buildings are out of keeping with the streetscape. The buildings are too close to the street and there is no green space around them.</p> <p><u>Parking:</u> Increase in parking issues.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Increase in rubbish.</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> Proposal for 6-8 storeys is too tall. Will have a negative impact on the heritage scape of the Yarra area.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> 6 storeys is still too tall as it is intrusive.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Supports mandatory heights depending on what the height is.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> Does not take into account how many storeys the buildings are.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Concerned overshadowing could still occur outside of these hours.</p>
315	Survey	<p><u>Building heights:</u> Very tall buildings do not sit comfortably in this area. Buildings in Langridge Street and Wellington Street and other areas of Collingwood are too high. Many are ugly with no apparent architectural input. Buildings are very dense with small balconies. Some of the proposed developments in Fitzroy, particularly the new hotel proposed for Rose Street, appear to be of reasonable height. The residential buildings in Smith Street (the old Cococabana nightclub) are great design but the residents behind in Gore Street face overlooking and overshadowing.</p> <p><u>Building design:</u> Designs should blend better in the historic area of Fitzroy and Collingwood. Not too high and not utterly boring as some developments appear.</p>

		<p><u>Heritage buildings:</u> Supports lower developments in heritage area but must be an excellent and creative design.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Support for mandatory - depends on the design.</p>
316	Survey	<p><u>Traffic</u> Concerned about traffic - did not elaborate.</p>
317	Survey	<p><u>Construction:</u> Lots of roadworks and construction all at once without considering impact to local community.</p> <p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> The area is vibrant and with more people and opportunities only makes it better. The streets are prime areas for housing and retail with great existing connection to transport and services. Supports mixed use - retail and housing.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Size and impact of heritage building should be considered not just number of them. Allow tall buildings with creative designs incorporating the history and/or setbacks rather than less.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> There should always be a review mechanism for exceptional cases or where the overlay boundary no longer fits with the area. Height criteria are a balanced approach.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> Setbacks should only be considered where the existing building is vital to the streetscape appearance and would be taller than surrounding properties, rather than being applied to everything. Would also like to see an exception for courtyards/outdoor areas so they are not as far from the street.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Overshadowing objections should be limited to public spaces like parks not buildings. Would like to see developers have different options to reduce overshadowing or overlooking. No point designing not to overshadow a brick wall. One small area of shadow shouldn't derail a whole project.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Controls should be reviewed every 5-10 years.</p>
318	Survey	<p><u>Building design:</u> Some nicely considered buildings e.g. former industrial buildings of Wellington St. 237 Napier St is also a good example. Many poor designs - the Coles development on Smith St and former Lyric Theatre site.</p>

		<p><u>Commercial offer:</u> Retain the diversity of shopping precincts</p> <p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Support development of formerly industrial areas, and near major roads - ideally suited to new development.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Concerns about protection of heritage shop fronts. Development in heritage precincts should be restricted - only approved if it does not alter the character and feel of the area. Setbacks should be significant. Heights limited as low as possible - maximum 3 storeys.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Concerned about natural light and creation of dark shadowy streets.</p>
319	Survey	<p><u>Open space:</u> The lack of green space and public amenities will become more highly used with more population.</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> Supports 6-8 storeys in Smith Street.</p> <p><u>Building design:</u> Heritage isn't the only key to keeping a street's charm. The frontages should be well designed.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> Upper story setbacks shouldn't remove the Victorian aesthetic.</p>
320	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes that there are not as many vacant shops on Brunswick Street. Notes that their house is in a residential zone and a mixed-use zone is across the road.</p> <p><u>Traffic issues/congestion:</u> Concern with the potential increase in car traffic. Notes that it's difficult to drive in the area and divers avoid Brunswick Street by driving around the side streets.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> Submits that parking is a problem.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Submits that upper-level setbacks should be bigger.</p>
321	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes the cafes and bars in Collingwood. Submits that the new shop fronts are not affordable - streets need to retain the feel. Recommends requiring verandas to protect from the sun and rain - need them because of climate change.</p>

		<p><u>Building design/Building height:</u> Submits that new taller buildings are ugly and too high - specifically Johnston Street (Aldi building) Submits that the buildings between Argyle Street (between George and Napier Street) are too tall. Recommends proper design panels - to oversee any development and ensure good design outcomes. Recommends development to be 5-6-storeys. Recommends buildings be no taller than 7-storeys.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Concern that the character of Smith, Brunswick and Gertrude Street will be ruined.</p> <p><u>Street wall:</u> Recommends only 2-3-storeys at street level.</p> <p><u>Usability of new development for commercial uses:</u> Concern about what the ground floor commercial opportunities will look like. Submits that the current shops need to be retained.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls - restrictions should be required throughout the area.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> Recommends there should be parking level restrictions - submits the area has sufficient public transport.</p>
322	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits support for the use of on-street parking for outdoor seating for venues. Does not want new building projects and new apartments on their residential street.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Concern that 8-storeys surrounding their property will impact on privacy, natural light, land value and congestion.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> Submits that there will be a loss of access to streets and parking.</p>
323	Survey	<p><u>Upper-level setback:</u> Notes that recent developments in Collingwood have had a minimum setback requirement - Submits make the area feel nicer. Concern that buildings won't have minimum setbacks. Submits that setbacks are important to maintaining existing character.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Notes that recent development in Collingwood has maintained the existing facades and makes good use of the existing fabric.</p> <p><u>Usability of new development for commercial uses:</u> Submits that maintaining a sense of place is tied to smaller shop fronts - locally owned. Concern about the loss of local business and the acquisition of existing stores by bigger businesses.</p>

		<p>Recommends that commercial spaces should be required to match with the surrounds - provide smaller shopfronts for independent businesses that match the existing character.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Submits that we need more housing - need to be done carefully.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Submits that there needs to be a mandatory limit - developers will push for more.</p>
324	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes a number of recent developments they support: Concern regarding the density south of Collingwood (near Victoria Parade) Concern with the lack of affordable housing. Recommends that 'street life' should be prioritised in the DDOs -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - solar access to streets - prioritising pedestrian and non-vehicular traffic - providing opportunities for diverse, active and mixed uses on ground floor - discouraging access to apartments via carparks only - minimising services (including fire) to active street frontages - providing affordable housing - public realm design (public and private land) <p><u>Heritage:</u> Concern around 'superficial facadism' - protecting the appearance at the expense of positive public realm outcomes.</p> <p><u>Building design:</u> Notes a number of recent 'poorly designed' developments. Supports growth with the condition that it is done well. Recommends focus on public realm design, active transport, ground level interface, usage of ground floor and high-quality dwellings - Opposed to focusing on setbacks, street wall and height.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Concern around the lack of public amenities as density rises. Submits that existing residents' amenities should be protected unambiguously.</p> <p><u>Open Space:</u> Submits that existing private open space must be protected.</p>
325	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Supportive of adaptive reuse and use of original frontages for development.</p>

		<p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that there have been too many taller developments in the area (above 5 storeys). Recommends that nothing higher than 5 storeys should be built in Fitzroy and Collingwood.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Submits that taller development should be kept away from the centres - hidden away in dull and less vibrant areas. Submits that profits from new building approvals should be invested wisely by Council.</p>
326	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits that planners are too focused on growth and will destroy the inner-North. Recommends there be no more development other than parks. Submits concern that Council has already made up their minds on controls. Submits concern that Council is contributing to the destruction of the planet.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Recommends a maximum building height of 2-storeys. Submits that there shouldn't be taller development - Not sustainable for the future.</p>
327	Survey	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that taller development in the area is inappropriate. Submits that taller development is not in character with the area - development will ruin the character. Recommends height limit below 6-storeys. Does not support taller building expansion.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits concern that taller development will threaten the privacy of people with backyards - access to sunlight will reduce.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls - provided they limit building to what existed 30 years ago. Does not support mandatory controls - Without a limit preferred is redundant.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits that overshadowing requirements should be taken for longer in the day.</p>
328	Survey	<p><u>Traffic increase / congestion:</u> Submits that traffic volume is a problem.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that height controls are inadequate. Submits the area is overdeveloped and overcrowded.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> Submits that parking overcrowding is a problem</p>

		<p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits that overlooking, overshadowing, loss of quiet enjoyment of property, and noise are problems. Submits that pressure on neighbourhood community centres (such as Cohealth) is a problem.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Submits that 10am - 2pm for overshadowing requirements is not enough.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that loss of neighbourhood character and heritage are problems.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Does not support preferred controls - Submits it's a weak work with no power and developers will exploit.</p>
329	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits the increased bike lanes are positives of the area.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that Brunswick Street is being impacted by multi-storey buildings and apartments.</p>
330	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> High density living results in lots of energy and activity. Yarra should prioritise active and public transport over cars.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Housing affordability New buildings should be high to encourage additional growth and thus sustainable living.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Generally supportive of increased building heights across the board.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Strongly supportive of preferred controls which allow discretionary planning.</p>
331	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Large, ugly new developments result in increased traffic. Loss of neighbourhood character.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Strongly supportive of mandatory controls.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Overshadowing to footpaths requirement should cover the whole year and outside the hours given.</p>
332	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Excessive height of new buildings. Anything over 4 storeys is too high (especially in relation to DDO38).</p>

		<p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 3-4 storeys. Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be lower (7-9 storeys visually intrusive, results in loss of privacy and sunlight).</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Strongly supportive of mandatory controls (at lower heights). Unsupportive of preferred controls.</p>
333	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Art murals.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> New glass and steel building facades. Brick would be preferred to align with neighbourhood character.</p>
334	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Large developments in heritage areas dwarf properties and block sunlight. Residents must self-fund to appeal against inappropriate development. Council sale of public laneway to developers. Increase in local traffic. Loss of heritage character and quality of life. Lack of trees. Lack of amenities (i.e. medical services).</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 3 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Strongly supportive of mandatory controls. Unsupportive of preferred controls.</p>
335	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Endless development More traffic Less parking Less sunshine / overshadowing More rubbish Higher drug use Less safety Pollution Wind tunnels Diminished property values</p>

		<p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be lower than 7-9 storeys. Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be lower than 3-6 storeys.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Overshadowing to footpaths requirement should cover the whole year and outside the hours given.</p>
336	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Road blocks due to construction works Lack of on-street parking Loss of sunlight due to building heights New buildings are too large, create wind tunnels.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be lower than 7-9 storeys. Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be lower than 3-6 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Unsupportive of preferred controls.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks</u> 6-8 metres is insufficient setback from the front street.</p>
337	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Redevelopment of industrial heritage buildings provides housing, small business space and also brings essential services.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Lack of green spaces Loss of culture/character. Loss of sunlight due to building heights New buildings are too large, create wind tunnels. Noise from garage doors.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be 4-6 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Unsupportive of preferred controls. Supportive of mandatory controls.</p> <p><u>Other</u> DDOs should also require external greenery and general beauty. DDOs should also require sustainable design against the elements.</p>

		<p><u>DDO30</u> Too many tall buildings at north end of Smith St will create wind tunnels.</p>
338	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Overcrowding as a result of increased density. Overcrowding results in increased noise, overcrowded trams, increased traffic and parking demand. Construction noise from new development.</p>
339	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> New development improves housing affordability.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Lack of development, too much focus on heritage.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Generally supportive of increased building heights across the board.</p>
340	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Positive feedback on some nicely designed buildings that have aesthetic appeal to add to the area</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Concerned that developments are just too big, especially when they sit on narrow streets Would like to see heights in keeping with existing heritage and not try to go above this. Would like to see 4-5 Storeys in height</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerned about big buildings creating wind tunnels</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Would like to see more sensitive and careful development which respects the character of the street and protects heritage on a broader scale</p> <p><u>Traffic increase / congestion</u> Concerned about how small streets will cope with hundreds of cars during rush hour - infrastructure needs to follow alongside development</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Would like to see mandatory controls in place or else developers will walk over them.</p>
341	Survey	<p><u>Traffic increase / congestion</u> Concerns about the increase of traffic in general</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerns about reduced light and privacy through development in general</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Submits that using a range to describe heights will only mean that developers will reach for the higher height (e.g. 3-6 storeys will always lead to 6)</p>

		<p><u>Other</u> Concerns about reduced environmental sustainability Concerns about reduced community health Wants to see the process for managing approvals and notifications for residents redesigned so there is more response time and more of a say from residents Submits that they have no faith in councils abilities to manage development appropriately Does not like phrasing around heritage - deeming people in less heritage sensitive based areas as less important and therefore the front of the effects of development</p>
342	Survey	<p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Some positive feedback on developments that are setback from roads as well as upper-level setbacks</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerns about overlooking and neighbours being shadowed due to bulky buildings</p> <p><u>Building Design</u> Concerned about lack of architectural merit going into building designs</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Supports development at levels where they have already occurred but not development that is just unexplained. Believes 6 Storey heights is too high</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Would be happy with development in heritage sensitive areas so long as facades are maintained</p> <p><u>Other</u> Would like to see development more on an individual bases and what impacts they will have within DDO areas (amenity, overshadowing, greenery etc).</p>
343	Survey	<p><u>Landscaping</u> Concerns about limited trees, vegetation, and other landscaping in the area</p> <p><u>Building Design</u> Supportive of development in other precincts as long as they are carefully designed which is visually appealing</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Would like to see higher development (10-20 storeys) in less heritage sensitive areas so less development is needed in those sensitive areas and they can be left for preservation and incremental infill</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Believes street setbacks should be more flexible and isn't against shorter street setbacks.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Doesn't believe overshadowing in public space is an issue and doesn't see why we need to protect footpaths etc</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on some former industrial areas becoming more alive</p>

		Expresses support for development around major transit corridors of Victoria Pde, Alexandra Pde and Johnston St. Expresses support for development in former industrial areas which already are eclectic in terms of building heights and design
344	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Submits that developments in area are horrendous - money drive, ugly, cheap design and cheap material</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Angry about the amount of developments that have gone ahead with overshadowing on local residents</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Not supportive of development unless it is realistic (no more than 5 Storeys)</p> <p><u>Other</u> Submits numerous times that council is money driven and only want development</p>
345	Survey	<p><u>Growth No longer needed at this level</u> Submits that Yarra already has a dense population and doesn't want to see growth happen here</p> <p><u>Building Design</u> Concerns that there are issues with infrastructure in apartment blocks that do not protect from flooding and cause drainage issues Argues that most high rise development does not fit into neighbourhood character with poor designs</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerns about noise, shading of morning sun and general amenity issues that come from developments - wind tunnels, dust etc</p> <p><u>Street / neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving</u> Would like to see more open space if higher development was to happen</p> <p><u>Parking issues</u> Concerned about parking problems from higher developments that would affect neighbours</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Would like to see mandatory height controls in place otherwise developers will abuse the system</p> <p><u>Other</u> Submits anger surrounding lack of rubbish disposal services available in Yarra for people living in apartments</p>
346	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Concerned about high rise buildings being developed in general Believes 6 Storeys is too high in heritage sensitive areas</p> <p><u>Traffic increase / congestion</u> Concerns about the increased problems surrounding congestion in area</p> <p><u>Parking issues</u> Concerns about the increased problems of parking in the area</p>

		<p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerned about overlooking problems in area</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Does not want to see mandatory limits becoming standard / normally accepted heights and preferred overridden.</p>
347	Survey	<p><u>Building height:</u> 7-9 storeys is enough for inner city. Notes has happened on the other side of town, the west side, and the monstrosities that have been built. There is overshadowing and no green space in buildings. Need to learn lessons after COVID - benefits of being home with space and green space at that , it increases wellbeing and does great things for mental health.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Overshadowing from the apartment towers in Melbourne near Southern Cross station has changed the whole dynamic of that end of town.</p> <p><u>Public and private open space:</u> Every person living in a committee has a right to green open space. Covid has shown how our surrounds are so important to our well-being. Maximise green space. Green space on balconies, in buildings is needed for every apartment. People need outdoor space.</p> <p><u>Parking:</u> Developments should factor in car parking. One space per apartment. Allows for visitors.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> Does not support proposed upper level setbacks if 7-9 storey buildings are possible. Do not allow setbacks for these developments there is still an environmental price for these communities.</p> <p><u>Sense of community:</u> Must consider community well-being – more important than heritage. Yarra City Council should assist in creating communities not revenue for developers. Developments should provide spaces to visit family friends and not be isolated. Should make developers consult with a range of urban designers and architects. No faith in developers who use architects to design the most revenue priced developments or Yarra City Council who overrules community protest and allow these buildings. Need to make sure these places are healthy living spaces that can stand the test of time, and not become slums of the future.</p>
348	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Does not want to see development occur above heritage buildings just because we are keeping the facades in check</p> <p><u>Other</u> Expresses disapproval of development in general - does not want to see Fitzroy lose its desirability due to awful developments</p>
349	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Concerns about buildings being too tall and close to roads</p>

		<p>Believes Brunswick Street could benefit from some development but small /low level developments - does not want to see anything happen on Smith and Gertrude Street</p> <p>Does not believe that there is a need for higher than 4-5 Storeys developments</p> <p>Would like to see 3-4 Storeys maximum in heritage sensitive areas</p> <p><u>Street / Neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving</u></p> <p>Concerns about development using up every bit of space available and not leaving room for parks, seating, trees or dog areas</p> <p>Concerns about beauty of the area changing due to its loss of diversity in people and culture which may be driven out by affordability issues</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <p>Would like to see overshadowing rules applied all year round</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <p>Positive feedback on more food and beverage available</p>
350	Survey	<p><u>Commercial offer:</u></p> <p>Supports new cafes and restaurants popping up in the side streets.</p> <p>-Too many hairdressers, optometrists, barbers, nail salons and women's fashion shops here.</p> <p><u>Accommodating growth:</u></p> <p>Understands Melbourne needs to house more people – but why in a dense area such as Collingwood and Fitzroy.</p> <p>Development done respectfully and well is ok.</p> <p>Buildings in the are too high and take light and air and reduce liveability.</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u></p> <p>7-9 storeys is too high. It should be maximum 4-5 storeys.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u></p> <p>3-4 storeys is enough. Does not support 6 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory heights</u></p> <p>Mandatory heights should apply to the whole area.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u></p> <p>One of the most liveable suburbs in Melbourne because there are still some connections to nature through trees, sky and sun.</p> <p>Should not be destroyed through high massive buildings.</p>
351	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u></p> <p>Prefer 3-5 storeys in South Fitzroy</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u></p> <p>Otherwise streets become like Grand Canyon</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u></p> <p>Already feeling overwhelmed by huge developments in Collingwood.</p>

		<p>Do not want heritage precinct of South Fitzroy to be encircled by overwhelming development along Gertrude, Smith and Brunswick streets – that overlook and block out the sky. Residents are subject to heritage limits - so should the developments but subject to sympathetic limits.</p> <p><u>Traffic:</u> Needs to also consider increased traffic load on tiny streets behind such developments as the car entry and egress is always on these streets. Difficult already to exit streets such as Little Smith Street as no keep clear on Gertrude Street. Sometimes takes multiple sets of light to get out.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Feels like sun gets to pavement for only minutes each day.</p>
352	Survey	<p><u>Public spaces:</u> Supports the creation of new green areas and non-car streets.</p> <p><u>Transport:</u> Supports introducing more bike infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Fitzroy and Collingwood are a beautiful environment which is increasingly in danger of being destroyed. If people want high-rise, they can live in Docklands.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> The beautiful old buildings that give character to the place are overwhelmed and actually look ugly juxtaposed against most of the new buildings. This height should be in the activity areas, not in the residential areas. New buildings should be set back from existing heritage buildings that they are being built over. Huge new developments spoil the presence of the heritage buildings.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Mandatory heights are important so that locals don't have to spend resources engaging with every development that seeks to exceed height limits. Preferred limits mean nothing to a developer.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> Doesn't agree with the high developments but does agree with setting back whatever is being built.</p> <p><u>Residential interface:</u> Does not like wedding cake shapes but will accept this is there nothing they can do to prevent excessive heights.</p> <p><u>DDO34:</u> The Fitzroy Town Hall is known for its beauty and heritage. Keeping greenery and low rise in the surrounding areas helps keep the Town Halls' profile.</p> <p><u>DDO37:</u> Beautiful heritage buildings are being overwhelmed.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Comments that some questions in the survey are confusing.</p>

353	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> It's not only about protecting heritage - it's about protecting Fitzroy's vibrant community and maintaining a high quality of life for residents. Part of Fitzroy's charm comes from the architecture, the way the light filters through the streets and paints the skies. Apartment buildings risk the loss of this character and uniqueness.</p> <p><u>Traffic:</u> It is impossible to park on regular evenings and sometimes during the day. Increased congestion will lead to a lower quality of life. It already feels dangerous to cycle on a lot of the local roads and this will only get worse with increasing congestion.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Proposed heights are better than allowing 9 storeys but will still have a major impact on the feel of the suburb.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Mandatory heights are supported but height limit is too high. Developers will exploit criteria for preferred heights.</p> <p><u>Residential interfaces:</u> Support the approach but there is still going to be an issue of overshadowing. Better not to allow such high buildings - changes the landscape of a street and an area even if it's not overshadowing,</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Does not support the proposal. The earlier and later parts of the day are where we experience the most beautiful light in the area. It is also when most people will be walking along the street to commute. There should really be no shadowing.</p>
354	Survey	<p><u>Traffic and parking:</u> Increased traffic. Negative impact on parking for residents. Increasingly unsafe streets for pedestrians. Too many blockages of footpaths. Too much priority given to bikes and cars, over pedestrians.</p> <p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Concerned about overpopulation of an already dense area ruining the amenity of the area. Fitzroy and Smith Street already have enough development. Same with Johnston Street and the area around the Fitzroy Town Hall.</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> No need for more buildings of 7-9 storeys. The Gasworks site will add a lot more.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Closeness of buildings means that overlooking is an issue s. Need to see sky and treetops and keep the airways clear.</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary heights:</u> The mandatory height must remain low.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> There must be stricter criteria - 4 hours of winter Sun doesn't seem fair.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Concerned about lack of accessible housing. Loss of neighbourhood connections.</p>
355	Survey	<p><u>Building height:</u> Concerned about corner Gore Street and Moor Street; towers in Smith Street especially near the corner with Alexandra Parade. Concerned about turning Fitzroy and Collingwood into St Kilda Road or Docklands.</p> <p><u>Materials</u> Concerned about poor building finishes e.g. concrete and glass finishes, or other others that are out of character. Good examples e.g. on the Charles St/Gore St corner that uses red brick and timber to alleviate the brutality of concrete and warehouse/industrial conversions in Oxford Street behind Smith Street, or the MacRobertson buildings north of Johnston Street between Brunswick and Smith Streets. Especially a concern for the development of heritage buildings.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Effects of tall buildings on the skyline. Visible for considerable distances.</p> <p><u>Residential interfaces:</u> Does not support the wedding cake approach – wrecks the character of the street. e.g. on the north end of Smith Street near the Gasometer Hotel).</p> <p><u>Character / accommodating growth:</u> Concerned that the character of Fitzroy and Collingwood will be destroyed. Highlights examples like the MacRobertson buildings, the Foy & Gibson buildings and the apartments on the corner of Charles and Gore Streets which do not wreck the neighbourhood. Supports conformity to current neighbourhood character.</p>
356	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Increase in multi residential developments is diminishing the low rise village atmosphere of Fitzroy and Collingwood. Heights do not consider overshadowing and general density of living within Fitzroy and Collingwood. Poor aesthetics of high rise developments - ugly, cheap construction to maximise profits.</p> <p><u>Parking and traffic:</u> Parking in your own street is now a battle.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Higher than 3 levels does not suit the village atmosphere of Fitzroy and Collingwood</p>

		<p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Any overshadowing is not acceptable. There should be no leeway. Agree that overshadowing is important – should not allow for development of greater than 3 storeys at street level.</p>
357	Survey	<p><u>Size of apartments:</u> New apartment building developments between Smith and Wellington look lovely on the outside but inside are tiny. Poor standard. One bedroom apartments should still have a living room that can fit a couch and a kitchen. Not a kitchen and bench seat with a wall mounted TV</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> Support developments of the same height as their surrounds e.g. replacing a five or six storey warehouse with an apartment building of the same height.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> New developments are taking away natural light of expensive existing dwellings. Loss of street appeal through new developments.</p> <p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Asked if Council is trying to turn the area into an unappealing cluster of apartments like Docklands?</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Supports three storeys but not six.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Does not support the preferred height criteria because they are not convinced developments won't be wave through and not follow due process</p>
358	Survey	<p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Lack of concern for pre-existing residents. Losing their sunlight, their peace and most of all their privacy by out-of-place monoliths.</p> <p><u>Parking:</u> Finding parking spots is a nightmare to find (even permit spots, especially as parking enforcement is seemingly non-existent and construction workers can park wherever they want without getting fined).</p> <p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Fitzroy and Collingwood are a beautiful environment which is increasingly in danger of being destroyed. If people want high-rise, they can live in Docklands. Overdevelopment is out of control and sucking the soul and vibe out of Fitzroy and Collingwood - making the suburbs overpopulated, congested, hostile and gentrified.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> More and more modern monoliths now tower over heritage listed houses.</p> <p><u>Building height:</u> Doesn't agree with the high developments but agrees with setting back whatever is being built. No new buildings over 6 storeys should apply everywhere.</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Mandatory controls are absolutely crucial. Shame hasn't already been put into action. Too many grey areas with preferred height criteria. People with more money will get away with more things. Have one flat rule for the suburbs.</p>
359	Survey	<p><u>Building heights:</u> Lower development between 4-6 storeys would be more reasonable - doesn't matter whether it is heritage or not. Height cuts out natural light to the neighbourhood and changes the whole feeling of the place. 3-4 storeys with lots of space between like the rows of apartment blocks on Drummond St North Carlton would be better. Without light and green space, the density of development makes the area like a business/industrial district and reduces its appeal, which in turn will reduce its value to businesses, consumers and locals.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Supports mandatory heights - as long as the maximum height is reasonable and adhered to Mandatory maximum heights would be more appropriate – create a consistent approach across all areas regardless of heritage sensitivity.</p> <p><u>Residential interfaces / upper level setbacks:</u> Setbacks for higher levels are appropriate, but the angle proposed is not sufficient to reduce overshadowing of the street and residential areas. Higher levels should be set further back</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Should protect the main part of the day i.e. 6 hours and apply all year round.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> The DDOs should consider proximity to other developments – not multi storey developments are not squashed right next to other developments. Drummond Street apartment blocks illustrate medium density housing that is spaced and allows light between the buildings.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Support development of the new school.</p>
360	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes the positives of new or enhanced recreational spaces.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Notes the positives of setbacks on new/elevated buildings in the activity centres.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Does not support increasing the number of taller developments - Notes Johnston Street. Does not support blanket 7-9 storeys for areas - Submits that areas are nuanced. Submits that 3-storeys is okay. Submits that 6-storeys is challenging to implement.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Notes the negatives in developments departing from the character of the area.</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls depending on the maximum values. Submits that using preferred controls will just result in inappropriate development applications.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Supports overshadowing requirements in principle. Submits that overshadowing is a big concern - multi-storey developments.</p>
361	Survey	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that taller development/height of new development is a concern. Submits that height are excessive and too tall above existing buildings. Notes the development at the Turney Site of Gertrude Street - Submits it is inappropriate in height. Notes the development at the Brotherhood site - Submits it is inappropriate in height. Recommends that development height should match the existing building.</p>
362	Survey	<p><u>Parking issues:</u> Submits that Council has been sensible about car parking for new developments. Submits that apartment developments haven't had a negative impact on street parking for existing residents.</p> <p><u>Public Open Space:</u> Submits that there is not enough green space to service the increased population. Recommends requirements that developers need to consider: - Biodiversity - Open green spaces within buildings Recommends Council investigate more pocket parks.</p> <p><u>Building Design:</u> Submits that recent developments have not been attractive.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Recommends medium density should be on major roads, not near low existing housing.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Recommends Council needs mandatory controls to give developers and residents certainty about height.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Recommends overshadowing requirements be taken from 8am-4pm.</p>
363	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes that the area looks good.</p>
364	Survey	<p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Submits concern about overshadowing.</p>

		<p>Submits that residents need sun in the morning, afternoon and winter. Submits that overshadowing of heritage houses needs to be avoided.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Submits that development above guidelines is inappropriate.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that the heights proposed are too tall.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> Submits that parking must be sufficient.</p> <p><u>Building Design:</u> Submits that no more cladding materials should be used.</p>
365	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that the overdevelopment of the area is detracting from the look, feel, spirit and heritage of the area.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Submits a number of concerns about the attractiveness of recent developments and that they look out of place. Recommends requirements to protect residents living along laneways.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Submits that development should not be seen from the other side of the road. Recommends 10-12 metre minimum setbacks.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls if the height limits are within reasons. Does not support preferred controls - developers will take advantage.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that building height on Brunswick Street (between Rose and Alexandra Parade) should be kept at the current level. Submits that development of 4-6-storeys in this area would ruin the area.</p>
366	Survey	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits concern for the heights proposed in DDO35-37 and DDO30. Submits that 8-storeys are too tall - will overwhelm the current buildings. Submits that 6-storeys is fine.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits disappointment at the loss of facades on Smith and Brunswick Street - not preserved. Questions why the old Fitzroy Nursery facade (394 Brunswick) was pulled down.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Submits that nobody wants to live in the shadow of tall buildings.</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Does not support preferred heights - Limit will be overstepped.</p> <p><u>Public Open Space:</u> Submits that open space and planting needs to be considered. Recommends there be visible planning and seating or small green spaces in front of buildings.</p>
367	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits that recent development is all mismatched. Recommends new development be considered from all angles and decisions agreed across the people in the area. Concern Council is creating a ghetto - People aren't wanting to go to the area anymore. Submits that there needs to be more engagement between architects, advisors and others to keep the area as they currently exist.</p>
368	Survey	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that any positive changes in the area are overshadowed by the heights of new developments. Submits concern with the building heights proposed - submits buildings should support financial pockets and not a growing community. Submits that 2-storeys is more than enough.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Submits that stock of existing empty houses needs to be taken before building more. Concern that Council does not know the area and the benefit of an outdoor walk as a human against taller buildings.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Recommends that mandatory controls be applied to all property as with heritage sites.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Submits there should be no overshadowing throughout the entire day.</p>
369	Survey	<p><u>Public Open Space:</u> Submits support for the Council implemented pocket parks.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that Wellington Street has become a chasm. Submits that 3-4-storeys is possibly okay - 6-10-storeys is not okay.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Concern Council is becoming a leader in facadism. Concern about the impact on landmarks.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Concern about the loss of amenity if the area changes too much.</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls - concern that often planning laws are overruled by other bodies. Submits that preferred controls are not strong enough.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Submits that lower buildings need setbacks - need to be larger to reduce impact on streetscape.</p>
370	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> New high school at gasworks site. Queens Parade height limits.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Excessive number of apartment towers in Collingwood South. Foundry redevelopment in Clifton Hill. Alexandra Pde should not be “turned into a concrete canyon”.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be lower than 7-9 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Unsupportive of preferred controls. Supportive of mandatory controls.</p> <p><u>DDO38</u> Mandatory height limit between Smith Street and Hoddle Street should be 3-4 storeys.</p> <p><u>DDO37</u> Trilby building at north end of Smith St should be demolished.</p>
371	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Local activity centres have been conserved.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Lack of clarity/certainty regarding new development rules. Lack of heritage preservation guidelines and setback guidelines.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 4 storeys (and additional setback requirements). Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be 6 storeys.</p>
372	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Well designed new buildings in Gertrude Street. Gertrude Street parklets/extra outdoor dining.</p>

		<p><u>Concerns</u> Excessive height of ACU development (and potential present this sets).</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be lower than 3-6 storeys.</p>
373	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> More housing (i.e. apartments)</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Small size of new apartments - should be larger. ESD for new developments. Increased hours to rooftop bars. Huge towers have a poor impact on the neighbouring houses.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 5 storeys. Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be 5 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Unsupportive of preferred controls. Supportive of mandatory controls.</p> <p><u>DDO40</u> Mandatory height limit for all small streets in this area should be 5 storeys. (Brunswick Street could be higher).</p>
374	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> New bike lanes Parklets/outdoor dining Public seating areas (i.e. Kerr and Brunswick St intersection)</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Large new developments with no green space, poor internal amenity/apartment size and create overshadowing. Housing affordability New developments do not consider heritage nature of Fitzroy. Development through Kerr, Rose and George Streets would ruin character of the neighbourhoods (and loss of privacy and sunlight).</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 4 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Unsupportive of preferred controls. Supportive of mandatory controls.</p>

		<p><u>Overshadowing</u> Overshadowing to footpaths requirement should cover the whole year.</p>
375	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> New developments result in larger range of shops.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Large new developments are too high, create canyon effect. Loss of heritage character. Unsupportive of further development/additional growth.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 3 storeys. Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be lower than 7-9 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Unsupportive of preferred controls. Supportive of mandatory controls.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Overshadowing to footpaths requirement should cover March – September.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks</u> Upper level setbacks should be greater than 8m.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Heritage buildings (esp. on street corners) to be retained. View lines to heritage landmarks should not be impacted (Shot tower, St John’s Church).</p>
376	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Restoration and refurbishment of historic buildings.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> High rise buildings near Gore Street. Loss of neighbourhood and heritage character due to new developments.</p> <p>Loss of “blue sky” over heritage buildings.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> No change to existing Gertrude St building heights.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks</u> Upper level setbacks should be 10m.</p>
377	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Heritage buildings being destroyed (with new developments above/behind).</p>

		<p>Loss of commercial space with residential buildings in activity centres. Conflict between DDO and heritage overlay (setbacks).</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> No increase to existing building heights in Gertrude Street.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks</u> Upper level setbacks should be 10m.</p>
378	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Excessive high rise developments. Additional growth should be located outside heritage overlay areas.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be lower than 3-6 storeys. Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be lower than 7-9 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Unsupportive of preferred controls.</p>
379	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Excessive high rise developments.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 2 storeys. Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should match existing building heights i.e. 2 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Unsupportive of preferred controls.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks</u> Setbacks should be tailored to each property, depending on heritage significance.</p>
380	Survey	<p><u>Traffic and parking:</u> Supports recent road management works and new bike lanes.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Concerned about tall new buildings overshadowing infrastructure and homes that are unique to Collingwood/Fitzroy.</p>
381	Survey	<p><u>Traffic and parking:</u> Notes easily accessible roads</p>

		<p><u>Heritage:</u> Impacts of towering of buildings cause the 'extinction' of Victorian period homes.</p>
382	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Notes old Victorian houses may be demolished. Everything will look new. No olden day sentiment</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Concerned about intrusions on privacy. Development needs to build slightly further away as may block views.</p>
383	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Area used to be a diverse, busy area with activity focussed on main streets and a bustling, friendly night life. Now it is overcrowded with young wealthy families. The history and unique culture of the area is being destroyed by high rise buildings, "family values" that belong in suburbia and overpopulation. Send people to the empty buildings in the CBD instead. There's enough empty shops and buildings in the area already.</p> <p><u>Heritage / building heights:</u> Don't build more and ruin the historic feel of the area. Should be no higher than 3 storeys</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> The area is unique, high-rises will turn it in to just another dark, concrete area with no light or life.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Development should not cause shadowing of surrounding residents or block views from other housing already there.</p> <p><u>Night time economy:</u> Must not negatively impact or take any issue with night life already present in the area.</p> <p><u>Views:</u> Must not block pre-existing views from other buildings.</p>
384	Survey	<p><u>Sustainability:</u> Developers should have to meet higher than the minimum sustainability standards</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> A maximum of 5-7 storeys, with step backs from the street and the inclusion of green space would give better quality of life for the residents and stop the already narrow streets becoming less open and welcoming.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Strongest possible measures are needed to counteract the needs of the developers to maximise profits at the expense of social responsibility. 'Preferred' maximum heights are the thin edge of the wedge. Developers exploit the 'weakness' of the guidelines approach.</p>

		<p><u>Communal open space:</u> Would like to see developers forced/encouraged to include some common property areas in housing developments to foster community and increase liveability.</p> <p><u>DDO40:</u> Rose Street is a sensitive area - while it is adjacent to the lively Brunswick Street, it is largely residential in nature. The 'cool' factor in Rose Street depends on a mix of residential amenity and "quirky and niche galleries, boutiques, markets, bars and cafes" surrounding the new development. The new residential developments must preserve the street's character and amenity. Concerned about the conversion of Grace café into a 'boardgame bar' with a capacity for 95 patrons and the construction of the 7 storey high Standard hotel with potential night noise and mess and overlooking concerns. Council has made praiseworthy attempts to improve this area, including a shared zone, road pavement art, new seating and planters and the ill-fated sculpture. Damage by skateboarders, destruction of the statue and tagging make this a challenge but urges Council to keep trying!</p>
385	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Supports the retention of the heritage and feel of Fitzroy/Collingwood by retaining original building facades. We need to remember that Fitzroy/Collingwood is a small area which is already densely populated.</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> Buildings which are not on major roads (such as Johnson, Smith and Brunswick Streets) should be kept to 3-5 storeys high. Anything more will make these small back streets an awful place to live and walk around.</p> <p><u>Parking:</u> New developments should be required to put in a level of public car parking - impossible for friends and family to visit because of the limited parking in the area.</p> <p><u>Other – housing mix:</u> Need a mix of people living in the area. The area around George, Napier, Kerr and Argyle Streets still provide houses for families and older people. Tall buildings will ruin the small community pockets. Keep the tall buildings (over 5 storeys) to Smith, Johnston, Brunswick, Alexandra Parade etc</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Developers are not going to care or consider preferred heights – sticking to set parameters is important. Mandatory height should be consistent with the buildings around it.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Need to consider impacts on existing apartment buildings (e.g. building of the same height will impact on privacy. Impacts on sightlines and views.</p> <p><u>Landscaping:</u> Need for more tree planting/street landscaping.</p>

386	Survey	<p><u>Impacts on streetscape:</u> Tall developments are creating a canyon effect - overshadowing the streets, dominating heritage fabric, blocking the skyline and destroying the open environment.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Surviving pockets of heritage properties make Fitzroy and Collingwood interesting. Encouraging growth sacrifices the old parts. The fact that there are only a few heritage buildings left in the area makes it especially important to preserve them. Notes there is a lot of difference between a 3-storey addition and a 6-storey addition. Would agree to a 3-storey development, but not 6 - inappropriate to the streetscape as well as a negative impact to traditional residences.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> A well-considered and accepted mandatory height would alleviate some future challenges and conflict in planning applications and time at VCAT. "Preferred maximum heights" is meaningless as developers simply use it as a bargaining tool. Each case is different depending on what is on the table for the proposal.</p> <p><u>Residential interfaces:</u> Does not support rear wall height that exceeds the height of the residential neighbour.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Notes impacts of overshadowing on tree planting to enhance the environment. Notes not all the streets are north-south oriented. East-west oriented streets would have other overshadowing issues.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> 6 to 8m setbacks will chop into the front main rooms of most of the heritage buildings. This will not retain enough of the heritage fabric as well as provide enough operating space. Brunswick, Smith or Gertrude Streets are not wide streets, the 6-8m setback will still mean the upper levels will be very visible and dominant from street level. The character of the streetscape is important. Proportion, material and colours should complement rather than contrast.</p> <p><u>Communal open space and balconies:</u> Placement of rooftop open spaces and balconies in new developments should not affect the privacy of neighbouring open spaces, by sight or sound.</p> <p><u>Night time economy:</u> Developments with public entertainment areas should be required to have sound proofing material and elements as standard, based on their proximity to residential areas.</p>
387	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Too many new and high buildings without an overall plan and community amenity.</p> <p><u>Car parking:</u> Lack of on-site car parking. Increased congestion.</p>

		<p><u>Building heights:</u> There are areas in the block which are residential and it is inappropriate to put more than 3 storeys 9 storeys is too high in non-heritage areas - creates shadows and wind tunnels. 6 storeys is too high in heritage areas. The east side of George Street between Kerr and Rose Street is residential and should not be 6-9 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Residents have no confidence in this process Preferred heights can always be overridden. No faith in such flexible legislation.</p> <p><u>DDO36:</u> Does not wish for development over 6 storeys</p>
388	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Supports the return of families and the renovation and addition to existing properties Increase in traffic, graffiti, noise and lack of open space. Notes the so called industrial areas have houses amongst them. Development that is too tall will destroy the area. The Max had lots of Council support - it now looks like an eastern block building Will overshadow existing buildings and turn the streets in to canyons like Docklands.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Who decides on the heritage value? The Regent Theatre was said to have no heritage value as was the Federal Coffee House.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Preferred height criteria are another back door for developers to argue about to maximise the area.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Means other ten hours a daylight is blocked. Overshadowing should no more than 2 hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> A minimum of 10 to 12m is more appropriate - related to height.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Materials used must be reusable or recycled and carbon neutral.</p> <p><u>Private and communal open space:</u> Building design should put residents first and their quality of life with real green space. Not individual balconies.</p>
389	Survey	<p><u>Other – arts precinct:</u> The redevelopment of Collingwood Arts Precinct is fantastic. The Gurner apartments looming over it is not great.</p> <p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> The amount of construction has been awful.</p>

We don't feel like this is our Fitzroy and Collingwood anymore - it has made existing residents want to leave the area. Yarra Council doesn't seem to care about the people that live here, only the developers that want to push us out. Could understand if housing was to be used for social housing. But only for developers and investors – not residents. Highlights the 7-storey Standard Hotel that is being built as an example of this.

Building heights:

Just because an area is not heritage doesn't mean a tower should be built there.

Amenity (general):

Opposed to development that affects existing residents' quiet enjoyment of their homes.

Consultation:

Feels like completing this survey is a futile exercise.

Council won't listen to residents. Developers will get their way.

Would prefer actions - where is Council's action on stopping, not enabling reckless development?

Other:

The 10kmh zone in Rose St is a good step in placemaking.

Banana artwork was a needlessly expensive choice - it was always going to be vandalised.

Amenities on the street has have been trashed by skateboarders which Council seems to have no interest in stopping.

Development in parks:

The new toilet block at Edinburgh Gardens is excellent.

Although where are the recycling bins? How can any Council, let alone a Greens-led one, justify taking them away?

Public transport:

What public transport infrastructure is being added to cater to an increase in population?

Building quality:

There is no oversight on the quality of buildings - both in design and construction. Apartments are being built for investors, not for the people that live in them.

Construction:

Daily construction noise in their residential area has greatly affected their mental health - feel trapped in their own home.

Heritage:

Turning Brunswick, Smith and Gertrude into apartments destroys the character of these amazing streets.

Even though setting back higher levels from the street may preserve heritage in one sense, the new buildings are almost invariably ugly and clash with the heritage building below.

Mandatory vs discretionary:

Agrees with mandatory height that are in line with heights before this rash of development began.

Council has already allowed for apartments and a hotel to be built beyond a reasonable height - the mandatory height needs to be lower than this.

		<p>Developers have been getting things approved that should never have been allowed. Needs to be more oversight and restriction on what developers can do, not less.</p> <p><u>Residential interfaces:</u> Tall developments should not be built so close to existing residents under any circumstances. Visual appearance of new developments – ‘eyesores’. Noise is a huge concern from new developments.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Winter is when we need sunlight the most, but also when the sun is lowest in the sky. The shadowing rules should be applied based on March-September.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> Despite setbacks you can still see the new building above the existing streetscape – contrast with the streetscape is jarring. For this idea to work, stronger rules or oversight are needed to make sure buildings complement the streetscape.</p>
390	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth / character:</u> Sympathetic development behind high-street shopping strips such as Smith, Gertrude, Johnston, Brunswick can be accommodated. Buildings must not dominate the heritage building in the high-streets or the skylines. The high streets of Gertrude, Smith, Brunswick Streets and areas around Town Halls etc must be protected and maintained - not destroyed. Development should be focused away from the high-street shopfronts.</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> Supports the mix of heights in Smith Street. Does not support creation of boxes all of the same height and in a row - will destroy the high-streets of City of Yarra. Heights on either side of heritage listed buildings such as the Collingwood Post Office in Smith Street needs to be lower. Heights of 20.8m (6 storeys) and 30.4m (9 storeys) in the heart of old Smith Street e.g. behind Woolworths’s façade are inappropriate. Height should be not more than the current facade, which is listed as individually significant. Does not support heights proposed for Gore Street - a beautiful heritage street. Inappropriate heights will destroy the high-streets and their surrounding streets and lanes.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Industrial buildings - Support of growth in industrial areas but not at the cost of destroying industrial heritage. Repurpose heritage factories – not demolish or leave facades. Heritage shops - Mandatory maximum height of development no more than 3 storeys (11.2m). Not possible to develop above them and retain heritage character. Any setbacks should be minimum of 10m. No facadism. Low-scale development on infill sites which need to respect the heritage building around them. Heritage shops attract people to the area.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Supports mandatory heights limits - a must to stop the destruction of heritage buildings.</p>

		<p>Same standards should apply to areas with heritage sensitivity. Preferred maximum height are challenged by the developer at VCAT. E.g. the Alphington site on Heidelberg Road and the Austral theatre. The vast majority of developers are wanting to make a profit, so anything that will curtail such a move, will be challenged at VCAT. Mandatory heights and mandatory setbacks will send a clear message to developers and mean less stress both financially and time wise for council and the residents of the City of Yarra.</p> <p><u>Residential interfaces / amenity:</u> B17 setbacks should apply. Was supported in Queens Parade – should the standard across City of Yarra. Rear private open spaces of the residential houses behind retail development must be protected.</p> <p><u>Impacts on public realm:</u> Concerned about higher heights on iconic Smith Street e.g. developments causing overshadowing and wind tunnels. This is not conducive to attracting people to the area.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> Higher levels should be set back by the main building (principal roof structure) or 10m, whichever is the greatest. Eight metres is not enough with deeper blocks - allows for the destruction of the heritage fabric of the building and facadism.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Suggests Council undertake further activity centre planning for those centres not covered by a DDO to ensure valued character is protected as incremental change occurs.</p>
391	Survey	<p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Concerned about buildings going up in front of 496 Fitzroy Street, Fitzroy that are higher than 2 storeys - will completely block sunshine into their apartment and impact privacy.</p> <p><u>Accommodating growth / character:</u> Heritage being preserved through people living in the old factories and built apartments in them. Part of unique charm of Fitzroy and the popularity of the area. Wrong to turn those areas now into a high rise apartment / hotel precinct.</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> 3 storeys in ALL areas of Fitzroy should be the planning rules. Had enough development.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Mandatory maximum 3 storey height should be introduced for ALL areas of Fitzroy not just heritage.</p>
392	Survey	<p><u>Sustainability:</u> Need higher environmental standards that are effective not tick box. Need more of each block dedicated to garden space to support cooler city temperatures.</p> <p><u>Public realm:</u> Concerned about shade and wind tunnels.</p>

		<p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerned about overshadowing.</p> <p><u>Character:</u> Sad to see so many ugly cheap badly designed developments already wrecking the special beauty of Brunswick and Smith streets.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Developers have too much power. Responsibility to residents not developers. Homelessness and access to housing issues that are not being resolved.</p>
393	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Empty shops due to greed of landlords.</p> <p><u>Traffic:</u> No consideration of the impact on traffic and the small community streets. Many being used as through roads due to congestion on the main streets (Brunswick, Johnston, Smith, Alexandra etc.). Traffic speeds of 50-60kms per hour through little streets like Westgarth and Napier. Bike accidents in their street. Trucks stuck on the roundabout.</p> <p><u>Lack of infrastructure:</u> Doesn't have the infrastructure to cope with the current community.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Concerned about the impacts of 8 storey buildings on heritage e.g. impacts of development on the MacPherson Robertson Chocolate Factories as well as small buildings such as corner of Kerr and George, period housing on one corner and the Marquis of Lorne.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerned about loss of daylight and impacts on small garden. Loss of privacy.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Need to protect winter sun.</p> <p><u>Consultation:</u> Worried comments will be ignored.</p>
394	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Yarra Council and the Victorian Government are using Fitzroy and Collingwood as dump zone for ugly developments. Too many large, concrete eyesores on Smith and Wellington Streets. Quiet streets, like the northern end of George and Gore Streets are losing sun, are subject to less street parking, and constant road closures due to construction. Proud history from the Wurundjeri Woi Wurrung, working class roots and artistic flare of Fitzroy are being destroyed in the name of 'development'. Fitzroy is not Manhattan.</p>

		<p><u>Heritage:</u> This part of Fitzroy is steeped in history and supports a strong community.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Worried what 'overshadowing' means to council. The community will have a different standard.</p>
395	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Appropriateness of heights depends on the setbacks and the quality of the design. More supportive of 3 and 4 storeys.</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> Supports higher heights depending on how it is done. Depends on the setbacks, the height and the quality of design. Some parts of Kerr and George Street would be spoiled by 7-9 storey buildings. Higher developments on Johnston St between Brunswick and Smith would be less objectionable. Topography is important to consider. Gertrude St, and the western side of Fitzroy are on higher ground – height of developments will have a greater effect (appear higher). Opposes 6 storey height in heritage areas on the higher ground locations. Less of a concern where land is lower.</p> <p><u>DDO31:</u> Protect from overdevelopment. Supports 3 storeys – not six to preserve what is special about this shopping strip.</p> <p><u>DDO39:</u> Supports higher developments here - will not shade housing. Victoria Parade is a very wide road.</p> <p><u>DDO35:</u> Does not support high developments here. Fitzroy Town Hall is quite special and the streets are lovely to walk around. Not the place to go higher than 3 storeys</p>
396	Survey	<p><u>Parking / construction:</u> Parking a nightmare during day hours. Visitors of the neighbourhood (i.e. mostly tradies) do not abide by parking limits / speed limits. Littering and driving over garden beds.</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> Concerns about maximum height on both main artery streets (e.g. Smith Street, Johnston St, Brunswick) and local streets. Impacts on sunlight to the public realm and wind. Will ruin what many people enjoy e.g. walking, cafes. Already sees the impacts of 5 and 6 storey buildings – seen on Kerr Street between Smith Street and Gore Street. Let alone 9 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Maximum mandatory height limits are a must.</p>
397	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Questions why Council wreck these traditional heritage terrace streets with any other sort of development.</p>

		<p>New builds impose themselves on the streetscape without any real consideration of streetscape, history or heritage. Concerned about impacts on shopping streets and residential areas.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> Keep heritage facades intact - look of the heritage streetscape must not change; i.e. the shops stay as is</p>
398	Survey	<p><u>Building design:</u> Smith St Woollies looks horrendous. Notes some poorly-activated "mixed-use" buildings e.g. Dan Murphy's – an anathema to the fine grain of the precinct.</p> <p><u>Commercial offer:</u> The commercial focus of the high streets must be maintained. Notes the death of retail on the north end of Smith St after the stillborn Structure Plan. Supports ingress of retail and other commercial into some of these side streets. Can't add people without adding more employment, retail and entertainment.</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> Context is everything - there is scope to put some buildings of 7-9 storeys in those areas with less heritage sensitivities. However, the amenity of the public realm must be preserved. A uniform height on the northern side of Johnston St of 9-10 storeys is too much - it will become a heavily shaded wind-tunnel if that is the result. Development of accommodation in the infill sites to the rear of the shopping high streets has been broadly positive (whereas "shop-top" development is much less so). Does not support tall development on shops.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Lower buildings developments should really only be on infill sites. Does not consider you can insert "shop-top" development without destroying the thing that makes those streets successful in the first place. Heritage shops are an attraction.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Mandatory heights were imposed in Queens Parade after much consideration by the Panel because it's the only thing that works. Concerned with preferred height criteria - the devil's in the detail. Poor record of enforcing the "conditions in exchange for extra height" e.g. Austral Theatre. If VCAT will not enforce these conditions then maybe mandatory heights are the preferable solution.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> Notes original stance by Council in Queens Parade Amendment C231 was 6m setbacks. Community and heritage experts pushed for 10m or the principal roof structure (whichever is the greater). Panel supported 8m. 8m simply isn't enough to take in the main front room of most shops or the principal roof form - invitation for facadism. In the case of Queens Parade the strict height limits mean that "shop-top" development won't happen in any case. Perhaps the same basic approach could be reused - 11m height limit on shorter/smaller sites and 14m on larger ones (kind of sending the "limited redevelopment possible" message - which is probably more realistic than the high street strip heights outlined thus far for most of these DDOs).</p>

		<p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Support approach as a worst-case fallback. Doesn't go far enough - The standard planner approach is to have higher heights on the north side of an east-west street because the shadows will fall on the roadway.</p> <p><u>Public realm:</u> Concerned about proposed 9-10 storey uniform heights proposed on the northern edge of Johnston St - a heavily pedestrianised street. It's a traffic sewer but that's an indictment on how we've treated the street. Increase plantings to improve the pedestrian realm (and for many other reasons). Questions how will we increase tree coverage if we make our streets into bleak dark wind-tunnels?</p> <p><u>Residential interfaces:</u> The "modified B17" setbacks were supported by the Panel for C231 - "gold standard" and should be strongly considered. The same situation applies here. Asks why only in Queens Parade? Most of the amenity of a heritage residential property is in the form of the rear private open space. Heritage Overlay constrains heritage properties. Reinforces importance of backyards.</p>
399	Survey	<p><u>Building heights:</u> Cites example of European cities that limit the heights of development e.g. Stockholm limited any new residential buildings to five storeys (or the width of the street) in 1874 to protect light and fresh air.</p> <p><u>Trees / greening:</u> Impacts of building shadows on Council's plan for an urban forest.</p> <p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Understands demographic pressures being placed on Melbourne and the rationale for accommodating growth around public transport and arterials. However, development needs to be sustainable. Concerned about anonymous high-rise towers that erode any sense of community and neighbourliness. Do medium-density well - townhouses rather than apartments, cap heights at 4 storeys, generous setbacks, mandate off-street parking and maintain character.</p>
400	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes the improvement in infrastructure. Concern regarding safety/racism/violence in the area.</p>
401	Survey	<i>No additional comments provided.</i>
402	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits there has not been great development in Fitzroy recently. Notes that plans for 131 Smith Street look appealing - Has not been built. Submits that Collingwood along Wellington Street, Dan Murphy's building and the Aldi building are bad changes.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Concern that taller developments overwhelm the heritage areas abutting.</p>

		<p>Submits that 6-storeys on Brunswick Street is too tall. Submits that 5-storeys on Gertrude Street is too tall.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Recommends IS buildings not be included in the controls at all - Should remain. Submits that the DDOs will destroy the fabric and streetscapes of Fitzroy. Concern the proposal encourages facadism and the reduction of heritage value.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Recommends mandatory controls be applied to all 12 DDOs.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Recommends a minimum upper-level setback of 10m.</p>
403	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits that the Aldi building and supermarket has been a positive impact on the area. Submits that recent development on the corner of Gore and Johnston Street is an eyesore - too tall. Questions why if there is additional growth why rates are rising and not decreasing.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Concern that the growth and size of taller development is too large.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that the heritage should remain.</p>
404	Survey	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Concern regarding taller buildings, higher density and noise. Submits heights should be around 3-6-storeys.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Concern with the overshadowing of taller buildings.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits that quiet residential areas are being impacted negatively by noise, hotels and loss of character.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Submits the residential area should be preserved.</p>
405	Survey	<p><u>Public Open Space:</u> Submits that the pocket parks and parklets have been a good initiative.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Concern that the heritage and character is being overdeveloped. Submits these areas should be preserved and remain low rise.</p>

		<p><u>Building Heights:</u> Submits that building height are too high.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls - there shouldn't be any alteration. Submits that preferred controls are too easy to alter.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Submits that setbacks need to be increased (in size and quantity). Submits that the minimum setbacks should be at least 8 metres.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Recommends overshadowing be taken from the winter solstice not the equinox.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Submits density is high enough. Submits streets need to be creative rather than for mor housing. Submits that laneways need to have 'active liveable green interfaces'. Submits developers need to contribute more in terms of greening the streets.</p>
406	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits that apartments have ruined and overwhelmed the area.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing/heritage:</u> Concern that taller developments will overshadow the heritage areas.</p>
407	Survey	<i>No additional comments provided.</i>
408	Survey	<i>No additional comments provided.</i>
409	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes the benefit of some developments including art and sympathetic to the surroundings.</p> <p><u>Building Heights:</u> Submits that too many permits for taller buildings have been granted.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> Submits that new buildings don't have enough car parks - bikes, trams and walking is good but everyone needs a car park.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Recommends that the suburbs should be considered as a whole entity to maintain the heritage integrity.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory heights - if the maximum heights reflect the height of surrounding buildings.</p>

		<p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Submits that there need to me more setbacks - everything stepped back and sides should be included.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Submits that the footpath should not be overshadowed in winter.</p>
410	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Use of red brick in new building facades Retaining heritage façades</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Excessive number of high apartment buildings which cause overshadowing, increased parking demand, and impact heritage character. Unsupportive of new buildings over 6 storeys.</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Believes new building heights in areas with more heritage buildings should have a maximum height of 4-5 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Supportive of controls to limit shadowing to footpaths</p> <p><u>Other</u> New developments should also be required to consider and include ESD.</p>
411	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> New trees in Johnston Street</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Excessive number of high apartment buildings which cause overshadowing and impact heritage character. Unequal development opportunity to develop smaller sites. Loss of heritage and culture</p>
412	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Increased provision of housing</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Construction works begin before 8am</p>
413	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Increased provision of housing</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Excessively high buildings cause dark street and wind tunnel effects</p>

		<p>Developers disregard Council guidelines (bypass to VCAT) Adverse impact on laneways</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Supportive of controls to limit shadowing to footpaths – believes they should be measured at winter solstice</p>
414	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Smaller (3 storey) apartment blocks</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Overshadowing from 8 storey buildings to single dwellings/private open space Overcrowding due to increased density</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Disagrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Disagrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings. Should be 3 storeys only.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Not supportive of preferred controls.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Supportive of controls to limit shadowing to footpaths – believes they should be protected from shadowing all hours of the day.</p>
415	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Lower speed limits on local roads Bicycle lanes Enjoys Edinburgh Gardens</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Loss of heritage character with new developments (including facadism) Preferred heights are insufficient; wants mandatory heights Poor internal amenity in new apartments Impact on local amenity from large new developments</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Disagrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Disagrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings.</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Not supportive of preferred controls.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks</u> Should be 10m.</p> <p><u>Other</u> New developments should also be required include ESD measures (mandatory).</p>
416	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Good use of external finish materials in recent developments New supermarkets</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Insufficient public transport and infrastructure to support increased density Lack of parks/green spaces Overlooking Poor design in new developments Increased noise Lack of car parking in new developments Increased traffic congestion Poor community consultation by Council</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Disagrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Disagrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings. Should be 3 storeys only.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Not supportive of preferred controls.</p>
417	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Low rise buildings with considered designs Taller developments spread out (not clustered)</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Graffiti Tall buildings block out the winter sun and natural light New developments would create further shadowing and congestion, canyon effect. Noise and nuisance from construction</p>

		<p><u>Building Heights</u> Disagrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Disagrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings. Should be lower.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Not supportive of preferred controls.</p>
418	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Poor architectural design Tall buildings block out the winter sun and natural light, create canyon effect. Overlooking Lack of car parking Lack of landscaping to the street Increased noise from new apartment balconies</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Disagrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Disagrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Not supportive of preferred controls.</p>
419	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Increased violence/racism/homelessness</p>
420	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Submits that heights are overbearing - anything over 4 storeys is no good</p> <p><u>Building Design</u> Concerns that many developments have no architectural merit - Aldi on Johnston Street given as an example</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Does not want to see development destroy heritage value and the ambience of well-established Brunswick, Gertrude and Smith Streets.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Argues that any development over 4 Storeys causes issues to do with sunlight loss, neighbourhood character loss etc</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Submits that degree of agreement on mandatory maximum heights depends on the nature and extent (i.e. - how many levels would be mandated at the maximum) Concerns about how proponents leverage higher development through personal dealings with council</p>

		<p><u>Overshadowing</u> Concerns that from personal experience - overshadowing is occurring outside of hours between 10am-2pm.</p> <p><u>Traffic increase/congestion</u> Concerns about increased congestion - especially motor vehicles</p>
421	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Positive feedback on how the area is good where it is height wise at the moment and nothing outrageous has happened yet. Does not want to see higher than 5 Storey developments - worried about noise, sunlight loss and privacy issues if this were to happen</p> <p><u>Parking issues</u> Specific concerns related to submitters property (496 Fitzroy St) surrounding parking issues from potential new developments nearby - wants to see new developments provide more parking so that they are not impacted</p>
422	Survey	<p><u>Landscaping</u> Would like to see DDOs focus on implementing more vertical gardens in area</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on cleaner streets in area Positive submission - understanding that development is needed to ease pressure on renting and housing prices</p>
423	Survey	<p><u>Overshadowing</u> Would like to see overshadowing rules acknowledge winter solstice as opposed to just Sept Equinox</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Concerns that heritage properties are being ignored in development Would like to see a sympathetic transition to traditional housing abutting or behind new developments on main roads. Heritage preservation</p> <p><u>Growth no longer needed</u> Believes there is ample development in industrial areas to increase housing density and there does not need to be even more</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Believes development should trend down in height as they progress north of Victoria Parade so they meld into the streetscape. Submits that recommended height limits are a starting point for developers, not an end point.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Would like to see mandatory maximum height limits and setbacks in place.</p> <p><u>Street / Neighbourhood / Public Amenity needs improving</u> Would like to see more green space activation - not just putting a rooftop garden in.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Concerns that developers begin with proposals that are already outside of recommended limits in height and setback Concerns about clauses that are allowing buildings of significant architectural merit to exceed height limits etc. Believes developments are not sympathetic to physical surroundings and do not improve the community</p>

		<p>Submits that all new developments should provide for solar panels that meet needs of buildings</p> <p>Believes that all car spaces should have the ability for charging of EVs in new developments in future.</p>
424	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Concerns about too many apartments with fewer height restrictions - disregarding neighbours and creating overshadowing issues Argues that lower height limits should apply to all of Yarra and DDOs in general</p> <p><u>Building Design</u> Concerns about design having little regard for aesthetics and longevity</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Not supportive of the term "sensitive" when describing heritage areas as this is vague Submits that just because there are fewer heritage buildings in certain areas, doesn't mean there should be fewer restrictions</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Wants to see mandatory maximum height limits and not preferred in area</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Believes any overshadowing is a safety issue as this impedes vision.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Some positive feedback on more greenspaces and tree planting in the area Believes a lot of the survey questions do not take into account street orientation and effects on properties / businesses in all directions</p>
425	Survey	<p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on area becoming greener, safer and more family friendly Submits concerns surrounding drug use in area Submits concerns surrounding lack of housing in area and housing affordability</p>
426	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Agrees with development in industrial areas as they are a perfect location for new quality and superior high rise buildings - uses Wellington and Langridge pocket of development as an example of the type of development they would like to see in old - run down industrial areas</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Believes heritage preservation can be achieved with a fuse of low and high density living in heritage sensitive areas that looks after heritage facade</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Generally agrees with overshadowing submitting that sunshine is good for streets</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on new large and attractive buildings in the area Concerns with bike lanes causing nuisance in the area</p>

427	Survey	<p><u>Street / neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving</u> Concerned that construction is negatively changing the face and character of the neighbourhood Argues that there are not enough green spaces in area</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerned that tall buildings are creating wind tunnels down streets and blocking out light Concerned about noise that derives from rooftop gardens created on developments</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Uneasy with mandatory maximum heights as they believe this would depend on height - concerned about overdevelopment that will occur if preferred limits.</p>
428	Survey	No specific comments made on this survey submission
429	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Wants to see better quality builds of focus in all DDO areas</p> <p><u>Other</u> Doesn't want to see area become like Docklands as Fitzroy is nicer than that. Positive feedback on new restaurants in area Does not want to see more cheap and worn-down apartments in the area anymore</p>
430	Survey	<p><u>Landscaping:</u> Notes the significant increase in tree plantings</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> New buildings are too high.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> New developments have insufficient setback of upper storeys.</p> <p><u>Parking:</u> Insufficient parking.</p>
431	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Destruction of heritage. Concerned about huge, towering apartment blocks e.g. developments in Wellington Street and Johnston Street. Loss of character and amenity and puts additional pressure on the area (transport, traffic, noise, etc). Hard to trust property developers or Council given the scale of destruction from large buildings. Therefore, does not support any new developments (or plans to increase growth).</p> <p><u>Building heights / heritage:</u> 6 storeys is too high for the heritage areas.</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Mandatory height restrictions were needed years ago. Support these completely. Retain mandatory height restrictions throughout instead of allowing more flexible, preferred maximum heights.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> Essential for keeping access to skies and sunlight open. 8.0m does not go far enough.</p> <p><u>Commercial offer:</u> More supermarkets have given locals more choice and options.</p>
432	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Concerned about the loss of history and heritage.</p>
433	Survey	No additional comments.
434	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Concerned about trust. Considered the work helpful.</p>
435	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Supports growth but it lacks architectural creativity - mostly because of systemic economic issues out of Council's control. Increases the population supports vitality. The property industry is developer led and this causes conflict over DDO issues as developers minimise cost to maximise profit. Increase the role of government in developing property. Council should make it clear to the State Government that increased building heights via a DDO will not lead to increased supply and affordability. Interest rates and other taxation regimes influence supply. There is no real connection between planning controls and accommodating growth. Does not support development facing onto Alexandra Parade or Victoria Parade.</p> <p><u>Building design:</u> Remove any requirements that mandate the use of red brick in facades. This is an ugly and unnecessary constraint on architects. Concerned about larger format retail like Dan Murphy's and Aldi with poor street interfaces e.g. 30m stretch of opaque glass. Address the street interface in the DDO.</p> <p><u>Heritage / building heights:</u> Heights of up 6 storeys are okay – but must negotiate good design outcomes</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Mandatory height limits everywhere - set clear limits and setbacks then leave it to architects. Preferred height criteria confuses residents. Is a poor approach for maintaining a good relationship with residents. Make clear height regulations. That extra storey will not actually influence overall housing supply and affordability in Yarra.</p>

		<p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> Building mass have too intense after the first setback in some buildings. Apply a receding setback (pyramid style) so each floor is set back from the one below.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Supports the approach but apply it to every property boundary across every precinct. Considers the size of industrial lot sizes are big enough to accommodate this approach and ensure development still feasible.</p>
436	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Have seen some changes which were necessary for the growing population. Nothing against the growth of the area.</p>
437	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Acknowledges that new buildings bring new people and businesses. <u>Heritage / building heights:</u> Does not support tall buildings in heritage areas - ruins the look and appeal of the streetscape.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Important to have sunlight in streets, brings in the appeal and pleasantness of the area.</p> <p><u>Other – impact on entertainment precincts</u> Concerned about supporting entertainment precincts and the impacts of residential buildings close by. Residential buildings should not be built so close to entertainment precincts. Complaints from residential buildings force entertainment venues to reduce hours or noise. Impacts on those businesses and the area.</p>
438	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Concerned that the Council has lost its focus - veered far from core business. No confidence in the ability to deliver any benefits for the community. Against Council's support of LBGQ.</p>
439	Survey	<p><u>Building heights:</u> Concerned heights of some projects are getting too tall.</p> <p><u>Building design:</u> Boring all-concrete/glass design should stay in the Docklands. Supports the use of non-concrete materials.</p> <p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Supports redevelopment of ugly buildings like the 'Turnley' building (Gertrude Street) – had no character and is on prime land. Highest and best use principle makes sense there. Does not support tall concrete buildings that dominate a low-rise residential heritage streetscape. Must be addressed on a case by case basis.</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Support mandatory heights if height is around 6 storeys. Considers every area should have a maximum. Once you let one huge one it, we're doomed, we'll just be the CBD.</p> <p><u>Upper level setbacks:</u> Comments that Jan Gehl gave us the phrase 'Human Scale' and this reminds us 'we are soft little creatures moving amongst hard, tall and sharp-edged buildings'. Feel over-whelmed when they are too tall, too close, too monotonous, too hard and too many. All design and planning should be considered in this light</p>
440	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits support for seeking community feedback - putting in time.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> Submits there is not enough parking.</p>
441	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits support for lower rooflines - can see the sky. Submits concern for the endangerment of natural greenspaces and pollution.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> Submits concern for the lack of parking.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits the importance of keeping the heritage looks.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits there shouldn't be anything above 3-storeys built.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls - Submits people will take advantage otherwise.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Submits that 6-8 metre upper-level setbacks is not enough.</p>
442	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits the recent bike lanes and parklets have been positive. Concern with hair flow within buildings. Concern with developments creating heat islands with clusters of new buildings.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits there has been a number of taller-multi-building developments that have had a negative impact on the area. Concern that height is determined by the lot size.</p>

		<p><u>Heritage:</u> Concern that taller-developments are creating a loss of sense of neighbourhood and heritage. Concern with the development of facadism. Submits that the current DDOs provide adequate protection for the character and heritage areas.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits there has been a loss of amenity for the residents. Submits residents can no longer see the sky</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary heights:</u> Supports mandatory controls - if the overshadowing and overlooking were minimal.</p>
443	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Supportive of the increased density of housing in the area - more people can enjoy the amenity of the area. Concern that Council rejects too many applications for denser housing. Does not support DDOs because they lower heights and insist on unnecessary setbacks.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that the requirements are too restrictive. Submits that the minimum heights allowed in the area should be 6-storeys. Submits that 3-storeys is too low.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Submits that the requirements are too restrictive. Submits that setbacks are unnecessary.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that there is no need to protect heritage from being dominated.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Does not support requirements to avoid overshadowing - Does not make the area any less than what it is.</p>
444	Survey	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Supportive of recent development below 4-storeys. Submits that recent developments have been too tall. Submits that the area is turning into a 'dark canyon'. Submits that 3-4-storeys with good design should remain.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory requirements - as long as they are not too tall. Submits that preferred isn't strong enough.</p> <p><u>Heritage/Upper-level setback:</u> Concern larger upper-level setbacks above heritage will lead to facadism.</p>

445	Survey	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that enabling more people to live in the area is good - Notes that new development needs to be kept within the area. Submits that 6-8-storeys cast a shadow on houses. Recommends new development be kept to 4-storeys.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Submits concern with the impact of overshadowing on backyards with taller development. Submits it's not just overshadowing but privacy to be considered. Submits that overshadowing should be considered in winter.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory requirements - as long as they are not too tall.</p>
446	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes the area has brought in some bigger supermarkets - assist in greater choice and walkability. Submits that more apartments means more younger people can afford the area.</p> <p><u>Building Height/Design/Heritage:</u> Submits that recent developments are ugly, cheap, too small and too tall. Submits that building height should match the heritage buildings around. Submits that heights shouldn't go higher than 3-4-storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls - should be enforced.</p>
447	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes the new infrastructure going up in different areas. Notes they were not aware of the lack of controls in the area.</p> <p><u>Building Heights:</u> Submits that building heights should remain at the same height.</p>
448	Survey	<p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Submits that winter sun is important.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Does not support the recent art/murals on buildings.</p>
449	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Notes that the refurbishing of warehouses/industrial properties and maintaining the heritage and culture of the area has been a positive.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that taller development in conected areas is having a negative impact.</p>

		<p><u>Other:</u> Does not support additional development in close proximity to existing buildings. Submits there has been negative impact on residents from construction.</p>
450	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Noise created during construction of new buildings.</p>
451	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Excessive amount of development. New buildings 10+ storeys are too high Further development in DDO areas will “destroy these neighbourhoods in pursuit of revenue”</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Disagrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Believes buildings should be maximum 5 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Not supportive of preferred controls.</p>
452	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Fitz-Coll are already overdeveloped New buildings do not provide car parking New development increases traffic congestion Public transport is insufficient due to high numbers of additional residents Tall new buildings will destroy heritage of these areas Council is not listening to residents and rate payers.</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Disagrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Not supportive of preferred controls.</p>
453	Survey	Generally supportive of additional growth across all DDO areas, and proposed DDO requirements
454	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> New businesses in the area</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Increased rate of crime.</p> <p>Generally supportive of additional growth across all DDO areas, and proposed DDO requirements</p>

455	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> New businesses in the area</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Increased rate of crime.</p> <p>Generally supportive of additional growth across all DDO areas, and proposed DDO requirements</p>
456	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> More job opportunities</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Nil</p>
457	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> New buildings at the south end of Wellington Street look amazing.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> New development should keep the heritage buildings as much as possible.</p> <p>Generally supportive of additional growth along main roads and boulevards, and proposed DDO requirements</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Agrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Disagrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings.</p>
458	Survey	Generally supportive of additional growth along main roads and boulevards, and proposed DDO requirements
459	Survey	Generally supportive of additional growth across all DDO areas, and proposed DDO requirements
460	Survey	<p><u>Overshadowing</u> Enjoys shade from buildings when it is hot so not fussed about overshadowing</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Would like to see lower buildings around houses with back yards so there are not privacy concerns</p>
461	Survey	<p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on pedestrian friendliness of the area</p>
462	Survey	<i>No additional comments provided.</i>
463	Survey	<i>No additional comments provided.</i>
464	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Wants to see denser development throughout the suburb so more people can come and live in the area Is more supportive of higher developments and wants to see higher maximums</p>

		<p>Believes that high density development should not have to be scrapped in this area so that wealthy single-family homes can be protected with guaranteed sunlight</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on housing that has led to an influx of diversity and activity in the area Would like to see more social housing in the area to preserve mix of socio-economic background in area Would like to see more done to discourage car-ownership</p>
465	Survey	<i>No additional comments provided.</i>
466	Survey	<i>No additional comments provided.</i>
467	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Believes we need to allow taller buildings in the DDOs so that apartment prices will lower and more people will be able to afford to live in the area Argues that DDOs are overly restrictive in heights and should be pushed higher</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Does not want to see heritage as an excuse to lock up streets from development anymore - believes we can find a way to preserve and develop at the same time</p> <p><u>Setbacks</u> Believes setbacks are ugly and wants to see street walls go 5-6 Storeys or more.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on all the new people in the area</p>
468	Survey	No specific comments made on this survey submission
469	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Would like to see a limiting on the amount of high rise developments to come in the future of DDO areas</p>
470	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Too much development. Leave things along and 'stick to reducing rates'.</p>
471	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth / character:</u> Does not support development in Gertrude Street, recognised as best street? Keep it the way it is with all its charm and leave the high rises out of it. Development is better away from heritage buildings and places. But considers it is so densely populated that we shouldn't develop these areas.</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> 6 storeys is too high in heritage areas. Require buildings to be less tall than 6 storeys.</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Support mandatory heights but it depends on what that height is.</p>
472	Survey	<p><i>No additional comments provided.</i></p>
473	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Keep building heights low with less people and cars - it is highly congested as it is.</p> <p><u>Building heights:</u> Supports less than 6 storeys for heritage buildings.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> Does not consider preferred heights work - must have strong guidelines with low heights.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Comments there would be no issues if development was at a lower level.</p>
474	Survey	<p><i>No additional comments provided.</i></p>
475	Survey	<p><u>Building heights:</u> Limitation on building heights</p>
476	Survey	<p><u>Positives:</u> Significant improvement in structures and transformations from houses with small backyards 'to points with significant ones'.</p>
477	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Increase in population growth and it will provide the critical mass of people and skills to build better infrastructure.</p>
478	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> There needs to be more work done to improve the area. Need to increase housing in heritage areas.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary:</u> There needs to tighter height controls. Height limits are necessary.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Supports proposed residential interfaces - the proposal should be less intrusive. Supports overshadowing controls.</p>
479	Survey	<p><u>Accommodating growth:</u> Supports the DDOs as great idea that will shape Collingwood and Fitzroy area to something that the locals and visitors can admire, while keeping the streets safe for everyone to enjoy.</p>
480	Survey	<p><i>No additional comments provided.</i></p>

481	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Supportive of the outdoor dining spaces, upkeep of parks and gardens and the maintenance of small local over chain stores.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Concerns with the increasing high-rise developments. Submits that taller development will change the aesthetic of the area and the culture.</p> <p><u>Usability of new development for commercial uses:</u> Submits concern that increasing rental costs are contributing to the number of vacant storefronts.</p>
482	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that new developments fitting with the neighbourhood and using brick and industrial facades has been positive.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits concern that taller apartments are spreading through Collingwood.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that elements of history should be preserved.</p>
483	Survey	<p><u>Building Heights:</u> Submits that building heights should be less than 8-storeys. Submits that taller buildings should be kept away from Smith Street.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls - provides certainty that they won't be exceeded.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Submits that the time period should be longer than 4 hours.</p>
484	Survey	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Supports building heights below 4-storeys. Submits that buildings should be kept at 'human scale'.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Submits that setbacks are crucial.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that new development need to respect and respond to the heritage over the area.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Concern with the number and scale of new developments. Appreciates Council being pro-active and engaging with the community.</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls. Does not support preferred control - End up in VCAT.</p>
485	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Supports closing the top of Otter Street for a park. Concern for the number of buildings being built. Concern the area is a constant construction height.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Concern with the height of newer developments.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> Submits there are not enough car parks in new developments.</p>
486	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Notes that mor housing has brought a younger population to the area.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that the area is losing the heritage facades. Submits that in order to protect the heritage buildings need to be lower.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> Submits that parking is becoming more difficult.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that taller buildings are casting shadows. Submits that 6-storeys feels too high.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls - preferred to not give certainty.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Recommends the outdoor retail also be considered for overshadowing.</p>
487	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Supports the new infill and regeneration of buildings.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits the heights proposed are too tall. Submits that the proposed heights will overwhelm the existing buildings.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Concerns with the destruction of existing largely Victorian style buildings.</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs. discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls - Preferred controls are exploited.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Submits that upper-level setbacks should be greater.</p>
488	Survey	<p><u>Landscaping:</u> Supports tree planting around streets.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Supports residential renovations that respect the heritage.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Does not support high developments (above 3 storeys) that create dark shadowy streets (specifically Langridge and Stanley) - submits they create cold wind tunnels (block out the sun).</p>
489	Survey	<p><u>Public Open Space:</u> Supports recent parklets - submits that they were good for businesses and made the area feel like on big community.</p>
490	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits that there has not been much positive new development in the area. Supports environmentally sensitive development (notes one good example on Roseneath Street). Submits that fighting inappropriate development has a large toll (cost, work, intelligence) and is often lost by the local community.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Recommends that controls respect and recognise the heritage, environmental and community values of connectedness, belonging, creativity, environmentalism and aestheticism.</p> <p><u>Building Height / Amenity (general):</u> Does not support 7-9-storeys - Creates wind tunnels that do not induce connectedness and belonging. Does not support 6-storeys in most areas.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls. Does not support preferred controls - "developers will exceed the advised height limit and VCAT will support".</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Submits that setbacks help but need to be considered alongside other important values.</p>
491	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Supports restoration of heritage frontages. Does not support modern builds that look cheap. Submits that Fitzroy and Collingwood are losing character.</p>

		<p><u>Building Height:</u> Does not support taller development - 6-storeys is too high.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Does not support preferred controls. Supports mandatory controls.</p>
492	Survey	<p><u>Street/neighbourhood/public amenity:</u> Submits that parks and footpaths have been a positive change in new developments. Does not support the recent development sprawl from ACU.</p>
493	Survey	<p><u>Street/neighbourhood/public amenity:</u> Supports the planting of trees on the streets of Collingwood. Recommends that more green space around new development should be provided - More pocket parks.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that the number and height of new development is overwhelming.</p> <p><u>Parking issues:</u> Submits that density, car parking reduction and restrictions is a problem.</p>
494	Survey	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Supports discussion regarding 'over development' and building heights.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that the area is at risk of too many new developments at the expense of heritage.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Does not support additional growth in the area. Submits that the area is already at its capacity.</p>
495	Survey	<p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that residential buildings are too high. Does not support development over 5-storeys.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits that taller buildings are overshadowing the street. Does not support overshadowing requirements only being taken from the middle of the day (10am-2pm).</p> <p><u>Issues with construction activities:</u> Recommends that buildings be built with better workmanship and builders held accountable.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Recommends that additional growth should be affordable housing.</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls. Does not support preferred controls.</p>
496	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Submits that new buildings and additions have been sympathetic to history. Supports reclaiming run-down and tired properties. Submits that there should be more consideration of neighbourhood character.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing (public space):</u> Does not support the overshadowing of recent developments on the streets.</p> <p><u>Landscaping:</u> Submits that there is a lack of trees and plants.</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Submits that building height is too high. Supports a general restriction on height.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory control. Does not support preferred controls.</p>
497	Survey	<p><u>Overshadowing (public/private):</u> Submits concern about overshadowing in the height limits of 7-8-storeys on Smith Street. Submits that overshadowing controls should go further than reducing overshadowing.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Supports medium density - Not mega structures. Recommends that only affordable/commission/social housing should be allowed for taller development. Supports limiting development to 5-storeys - Submits that this would accommodate growth. Does not support large-scale development.</p>
498	Survey	<p><u>Building Height / Setbacks:</u> Recommend 10m upper-level setbacks - 6-8-storeys is not enough. Recommends mandatory 3-4-storey height limit. Submits that the heights will not get a good design outcome and decrease the viability of the fine grain shops. Submits that 6-storeys is too high for most areas. Recommends that for preferred controls there is still a limit to how far they can be exceeded. Does not support 6-storeys around Otter Street mini park - will be shaded in winter.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls.</p>

		<p><u>Heritage:</u> Does not support increasing facadism.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing (public):</u> Does not support the overshadowing of taller buildings around Wellington Street - submits these developments have lost the view to Yorkshire Brewery. Supports control to limit overshadow of footpath at the equinox. Recommends that overshadowing should also be considered at the winter solstice.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Supports limited development happing in areas with good access to public transport. Does not support the proposed mid-rise heights.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Recommends the DDO maps include the proposed upper-level setbacks.</p> <p><u>Street wall:</u> Recommends that street wall should not exceed height of adjoining heritage parapets - shouldn't 'match'.</p> <p><u>Recommends:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removal of 'consistent street wall' from Alexandra Parade DDO. - Add objective to strongly encourage a new setback from the street on the larger blocks non-heritage sites on Alexandra Parade to promotes pedestrian amenity and allow landscaping. - Height of development around the Murray Wool works should be no higher than 4-storeys to protect view to the Shot Tower and so the heritage Wool works remains visually prominent. - Height of any developments take into account views to the Shot Tower and other landmarks. - Street wall height of 4-storeys on Smith Street corner is too high (DDO39). - Height is not a pedestrian friendly human scale and does not respect the Victorian heritage of the grand boulevard. - The overall height on the Smith Street corner (DDO39) of 10 metres, even set back 6 metres, is too high.
499	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Supports removal of 60/70s buildings.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Supports a more diverse population.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Does not support the number of recent apartment blocks - losing space, light and privacy. Does not support development 6-storeys and above.</p>
500	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Supports the individual nature and character of the areas. Concern that too much growth will transform the precinct into something it's not - another docklands.</p>

		<p><u>Building Design:</u> Submits that some developments look diverse and innovative - do not overwhelm or cut out of place.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Concern that parking is getting worse, loss of history and character, green space or balance.</p>
501	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Supports the build and design of new development. Generally supportive of the proposal.</p>
502	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Supports subdividing heritage buildings to provide apartments - works well when contemporary building additions are kept to a minimum or internal. Supports respecting the heritage of original buildings. Does not support recent development that does not respect the heritage or character of the property or surroundings. Concern that further development in the area will overwhelm the area and heritage. Supports growth in warehouse and high-rise areas of Collingwood.</p> <p><u>Building Design:</u> Recommends that natural building materials should be used - for example, cnr of Charles and Gore Streets.</p> <p><u>Traffic increase/congestion:</u> Submits that public transport should be provided to other parts of Melbourne.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Does not support growth in the residential areas of northern Collingwood and Fitzroy - developed enough. Does not support development 6-storeys and above - 3-storeys would be better with 5-storeys (if they are short levels).</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Does not support 'wedding cake' shaped setbacks.</p>
503	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Supports additional new homes and jobs created through growth (notes 1.6 million homes and 1.5 million jobs).</p>
504	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Concerns with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - apartments and density increasing. - traffic congestion. - reduction of car parking. - bike lanes added. - Unsustainable and oversized properties.

		<p>- Commercial areas are suffering. - Setbacks would make buildings inaccessible.</p> <p>Does not trust that feedback will be heard by Council - Submits that pre-consultation is to appease community and won't be listened to. Submits that revitalisation should occur elsewhere. Does not support additional density. Submits that further development of the area will increase the prices of apartments and office spaces. Submits that the existing infrastructure cannot accommodate the extra demand.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls on sensitive heritage areas.</p>
505	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Supports the 'gentrification' of the area.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing (public/private):</u> Does not support the overshadowing of buildings through recent developments.</p>
506	Survey	<p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Supports the new pedestrian crossing at Moor and Napier Streets. Supports urban drainage implementations - submits that more is needed. Supports public toilets - Submits that the toilets need to be kept in good condition and more is needed.</p> <p><u>Landscaping:</u> Supports tree planting - Submits that more is needed. Supports retention of native species. Submits that developments must consider the remaining wildlife.</p> <p><u>Traffic increase/congestion:</u> Supports cycling lanes directed to quiet streets - Notes Napier Street as an example. Supports reduction of traffic in backstreets.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Does not support vacant commercial spaces.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Does not support the scale and design of new apartment blocks. Wants to support growth - But likes things the way they are. Submits that high-rise apartments it's out of character to the area. Supports less than 4-storeys - To avoid destroying the vibe and culture of the area. Supports reuse of buildings over redevelopment - Notes that it is more sustainable and interesting. Does not support 6-storeys.</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements:</u> Supports mandatory controls - DDO should be capped at 4-storeys near heritage buildings. Does not support preferred controls.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing (public/private):</u> Submits that overshadowing should be measured from more than just 4 hours (10 am-2 pm).</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Supports setbacks of 6-8 metres.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Does not trust that feedback will be heard by Council - Submits that developers will always win out.</p>
507	Survey	<p><u>Other:</u> Submits that there have not been positive changes in recent developments. Concerns regarding 4 developments on Napier Street (between Town Hall and Exhibition Street). Concerns regarding upcoming development on the south-western corner of Napier and St David Streets (8-storeys proposed - is higher than what is outlined in DDO34). Submits that development should occur along main roads where possible. Submits that both sides of streets need to be considered when determining the number of storeys. Supports mandatory controls - will assist with VCAT cases.</p> <p><u>Heritage:</u> Notes that guidelines already allow tall buildings in areas with less heritage.</p> <p><u>Building Height:</u> Submits that 4-storeys is lower than most areas but still significantly higher than the 1-storey terraces along Napier Street. Recommends 2-3-storeys for the street front and 3-4-storeys for maximum height.</p>
508	Survey	"Test response"
509	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Excessive high rise developments no architectural excellence. "Inner Melbourne" is overdeveloped now. Lack of employment options in the area. New growth development should be planned "in the regions".</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be 3 storeys. Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be 3 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Unsupportive of preferred controls.</p>

510	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> New development footprints expand across entire lots of land (no space for gardens); resulting in increased heat island effect, overshadowing, overlooking and noise pollution. New development built “to the pavement” do not offer amenity to the public. Loss of heritage and character as a result of new development. Current level of services, green spaces, public transport cannot cope with increased population density.</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be less than 3-6 storeys. Maximum building height in areas with less heritage buildings should be less than 7-9 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Unsupportive of preferred controls.</p>
511	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Better bars and restaurants Good range of retail</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> New development high-rise behind heritage streetscape Wind tunnels, overshadowing, loss of sky view, increased traffic congestion and noise. Loss of quality of life in Fitzroy and Collingwood.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Unsupportive of preferred controls.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Overshadowing to footpath requirement should be measured between 8am and 6pm.</p>
512	Survey	<p>Test Response. No feedback.</p>
513	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> New residents of Fitzroy and Collingwood complaining about noise from live music venues. New buildings are not aesthetically pleasing. Introduce design requirements. Larger developments should only be located on arterial roads (Victoria Pde and Alexandra Pde).</p> <p><u>Building heights</u> Maximum building height in areas with more heritage buildings should be less than 3-4 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Unsupportive of preferred controls.</p>

514	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Good adaptive re-use of heritage buildings (i.e. Lume) and along Rose and Gore Streets.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Loss of heritage streetscapes (i.e. Dan Murphys building) Facadism does not preserve heritage.</p> <p>Generally unsupportive of additional growth through any DDO areas.</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Disagrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Believes buildings should be max. 5 storeys in these areas. Disagrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings. Believes buildings should be max. 3 storeys in these areas.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Not supportive of preferred controls.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Buildings should be oriented to avoid western sun and provide westerly aspect. Wants mandatory heights, heritage protections and ESD requirements.</p>
515	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> New development erodes amenity of public spaces (footpaths, public spaces) and do not contribute to public spaces (i.e. through street landscaping, furniture, lighting etc). Recent development along Johnston Street is already “too intense” i.e. 7 storeys Need more “sunny pocket parks”</p> <p>Generally unsupportive of additional growth through any DDO areas.</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Disagrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Believes buildings should be max. 4-5 storeys in these areas. Agrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings.</p> <p><u>DDO36</u> 6-9 storeys in this area is too high. Intensification without improvement to public realm results in loss of heritage and character of neighbourhood. New development contributes to high parking demand.</p> <p><u>DDO37</u> “Limit DDO to main street; do not encroach one or two blocks back into the neighbourhood”</p>
516	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Agrees with development through Fitz-Coll</p>

		<p><u>Concerns</u> New development along Gertrude Street would destroy the appeal. Cheaply built and poorly designed new developments destroy street appeal. “Fitzroy between Gertrude St and Johnston St and between Napier St and Gore St” should be protected from substantial development and building heights should be maintained as they are.</p> <p>Generally supportive of additional growth through main roads and boulevards (except Gertrude St).</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Agrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Disagrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Not supportive of preferred controls.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Supportive of controls to limit shadowing to footpaths – believes they should be protected from shadowing through winter also.</p>
517	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Higher density housing which will lead to more affordable housing Generally supportive of additional growth all DDO areas.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> “NIMBYism” is preventing higher density developments</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Agrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Disagrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings. Believes this should be higher.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Not supportive of mandatory controls. Supportive of preferred controls.</p> <p><u>Other</u> More bike lanes.</p>
518	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Medium density apartment buildings create good communities within the buildings. Collingwood Yards is a nice development – good open space</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Excessively large developments (too many, too high) block out sky and sunlight</p>

		<p>Limited open space in Yarra Concerned additional development in DDO areas will impact transport and infrastructure</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Disagrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Neutral re; preferred controls.</p> <p><u>Other</u> More contribution to public amenity should be required from developers.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Supportive of controls to limit shadowing to footpaths – believes they should be protected from shadowing through all hours.</p>
519	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Inclusion of arts in community Inclusive approach to community Idea that greening is essential</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Poorly designed buildings/poor architecture Lack of landscaping at each level of high rise buildings Council planning department are “truly overwhelmed” Imitation of heritage is discouraged by Council and hence new buildings are too modern</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Agrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Agrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Neutral re; preferred controls.</p> <p><u>DDO29</u> Brotherhood of St Laurence will destroy this area New development (Mileau) set to pull down heritage building Brunswick St should be protected; one of the most significant heritage streetscapes.</p>
520	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Rose St arts precinct Walking and cycling tracks</p>

		<p><u>Concerns</u> Height of new buildings is excessive and reduces sunlight on streets, and blocks views Heritage buildings need to be protected. Generally unsupportive of additional growth through any DDO area, except Alexandra Parade</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Agrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Agrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings.</p>
521	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Improvements to public parks</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Increased population in Fitz-Coll places high demand on public parks Height of new buildings destroys heritage values and overshadows existing buildings (also limits use of solar panels) Buildings on street boundaries create narrow footpaths and wind tunnel impacts. Generally unsupportive of any additional growth in any DDO area.</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Disagrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Disagrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings. Believes heights should be max. 3-4 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Not supportive of preferred controls.</p> <p><u>Other</u> More contribution to public amenity should be required from developers, including to public parks. Buildings should be setback from the footpath. Highest ESD requirements should apply to new buildings</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Supportive of controls to limit shadowing to footpaths – believes they should also be protected from shadowing through winter solstice.</p>
522	Survey	<p><u>Concerns</u> Increased population in Fitz-Coll places high demand on public parks, adds to traffic congestion, results in loss of community Height of new buildings destroys heritage values and overshadows existing buildings, causes overlooking and wind tunnel impacts. Lack of public parks Generally unsupportive of any additional growth in any DDO area.</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Disagrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Disagrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings. Believes heights should be max. 3 storeys.</p>

		<p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Not supportive of preferred controls.</p>
523	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> New businesses along Smith and Brunswick Streets Generally supportive of additional growth in DDO areas.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Increased height of recently approved buildings. Yarra turning into CBD.</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Disagrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Agrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Neutral re; preferred controls.</p>
524	Survey	<p><i>No additional comments provided.</i></p>
525	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Collingwood Yards “great addition to cultural landscape” Supports additional growth in DDO areas “within 5 storeys”</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> Objecting to planning applications “very disheartening”. No compromise with local residents (in single dwellings). Overshadowing caused by high rise buildings.</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Disagrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Believes buildings should be max. 5 storeys. Disagrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings. Believes buildings should be max. 5 storeys.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Not supportive of preferred controls.</p>
526	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Council recently refused proposal for high-rise building near me.</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> New primary school building blocks views of Aged care centre opposite Darling Gardens.</p>

		<p>New high school on Alexandra Parade is too big – blocking views. Generally unsupportive of additional growth through all DDO areas.</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Disagrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls.</p>
527	Survey	<p><u>Positive</u> Apartment buildings with upper levels setback</p> <p><u>Concerns</u> New Aldi building too high – sets precedent for new 10+ storey buildings Excessively high buildings around Collingwood brewery Lack of public parks</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u> Disagrees with 7-9 storey building heights in areas with less heritage buildings. Agrees with 3-6 storey building heights in areas with more heritage buildings.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Preferred Controls</u> Supportive of mandatory controls. Not supportive of preferred controls.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Highest ESD requirements (mandatory) should apply to new buildings. Car parking in new development should be limited (to reduce traffic congestion) and active transport encouraged</p>
528	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> No new buildings and not more than two storeys.</p>
529	Survey	<p><u>Landscaping - Public</u> Requests for more landscaping/vegetation.</p> <p><u>Neighbourhood character</u> Requests to preserve the existing building façade.</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Supports 6 storey buildings and building heights should be mandatory. Street / neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving Concerned that the development will deteriorate the great atmosphere of Smith Street, Brunswick Street and Johnston Street.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing of public space/streets</u> Concerned about overshadowing.</p>

		<p><u>Traffic increase/congestion</u> Concerned about traffic congestion.</p>
530	Survey	<p>Generally supportive of the proposal/controls.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerned that tall buildings will negatively impact liveability and amenity of the area. Concerned that the taller development creates negative wind impact on the cyclist and pedestrian and overshadowing of the surrounding area. Windows/screens should be required to prevent overlooking someone's existing personal space.</p> <p><u>Rear interface</u> Concern about the rear interface.</p> <p><u>Traffic/pedestrian improvement</u> Supports walking and cycling, suggests pedestrian linkages through large sites.</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Suggests the building height should be 6 storeys. Suggests tightening the control.</p>
531	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Suggests building height should be 5 storeys.</p> <p><u>Neighbourhood character</u> Concerned that over development is destroying the character of the area.</p>
532	Survey	<p><u>Traffic increase/congestion</u> Concerned about the traffic in the area.</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Suggests development impact should be assessed prior to allowing any development over two storeys.</p>
533	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Concerned about large developments next to small houses, particularly along narrow streets like Napier Street. Concerned that 9 storeys are too high, suggests 4-6 storeys and in areas of lower developments suggests 3-4 storeys.</p>
534	Survey	<p>Supports the proposal for a DDO. Usability of new development for commercial uses Wants more creative industries/commercial activities.</p> <p><u>Neighbourhood character</u> Concerned that Collingwood is losing its industrial/heritage feel. Suggests preserving Victoria Parade but allowing development along Alexander Parade.</p>

		<p><u>Building Height</u> Very concerned about the height and bulk of new buildings.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Suggests upper level setback should be 10m.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing of public/private space/streets</u> Concerned about overshadowing, suggest winter solstice for overshadowing control.</p> <p><u>Sustainability</u> Concerned that poor BESS score rated buildings are still allowed to be built.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements</u> Suggests that mandatory rules are essential to ensure better outcomes and reduce ratepayers' money being spent at VCAT defending good Council decisions.</p> <p><u>Waste</u> Concerned that too many bins now for street side collection.</p>
535	Survey	<p><u>Street / neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving</u> Suggests that new development of residential and commercial buildings will the improve the streetscape and bring more amenities into the area. Supports more bike friendly streets and greenery on streets. Raises questions that what requirements have been imposed on developers to help develop more amenities for the increased population density? Also would want to ensure amenities in the area are also developed in line with population density growth. Heritage (Better protection of heritage building) Supports preservation of heritage facades to maintain the character of the area whilst allowing for improvements that don't impact the view from the street.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing of private space</u> Concerned about overshadowing of surrounding buildings. Wants extended hours of sunlight.</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Suggests limiting height to 4 storeys maximum (mandatory) to maintain character of area.</p>
536	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Supports aesthetically pleasing multi-storey developments, not just concrete blocks.</p> <p><u>Parking issues and public transport</u> Submits that there is loss of parking or lack of parking and very little additional bike parking around new developments. No increase in public transport. Demands for adequate parking, access, bike and car share parking within the immediate area.</p> <p><u>Street / neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving</u> Submits that the pedestrian environment has exacerbated by ongoing on street cafe/restaurant outdoor seating. Minimal maintenance of pavements for pedestrians. Submits that the new developments is reducing the liveability of existing properties, gardening, pet comfort etc.</p>

		<p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Submits that there will be loss of light, privacy and increased noise from the new developments.</p>
537	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Submits that buildings are too high, building mass, poor design, poor integration or respect for current architecture.</p> <p><u>Lack of policy direction</u> Submits that it is unclear that what is being done with residential areas along Wellington Street/ Victoria Parade.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Submits that tall buildings are causing wind tunnels, overshadowed areas and do not contribute to the feel of the area. It becomes too dark and cold due to shadows and creates wind tunnels.</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Request to limit the new development to 3 storeys.</p>
538	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Complains about the high-rise buildings in the heritage suburbs. Building heights are too tall.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Concerned about overshadowing.</p>
539	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Suggests adopting building designs from modern European cities.</p> <p><u>Sustainability</u> Concerned about climate change, suggests stopping urban sprawl.</p> <p><u>Demand for housing /Lack of housing diversity</u> Supports more housing and higher density with 10 storeys and zero street setback.</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Suggests mandatory minimum of 8 storeys or more.</p>
540	Survey	<p><u>Demand for housing /Lack of housing diversity</u> Supports new homes to ensure a sustainable future for Yarra as new homes are more energy efficient and therefore have lower carbon footprint than older less efficient homes. Supports those new developments can improve the streetscape while providing more places for people to live close to transport and other amenities.</p> <p>Supports that planning schemes should allow significant development, also submits that design restrictions such as setbacks and concerns about overshadowing are an impediment to providing much needed new homes.</p> <p>Supports that allowing additional supply of homes is a critical factor in housing affordability and denying development will continue to lock young people out from purchasing their own home in desirable areas.</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Concerned that heritage protections and height restrictions will limit the development of new homes in Yarra.</p>

		<p>Submits that the heritage will restrict the development opportunity. The submitter does not believe that "sensitive heritage areas" (dilapidated old houses) are worth protecting.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements</u> Disagrees with mandatory maximum building heights as this will discourage the development of new homes.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Supports the design requirement that can be introduced to avoid overlooking, however, doesn't support protecting the footpaths from overshadowing.</p> <p><u>Street / neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving</u> Submits that the plan should promote rejuvenation of the streetscape rather than creating a museum of rundown old shopfronts.</p>
541	Survey	<p><u>Sustainability</u> Submits that redevelopment of previous factories has allowed increased residential population and increased social surveillance and community safety and mentions that developments appear to use greener building standards or pricing mechanisms to support housing affordability. Submits that the strategy must balance diversity of housing stock, good access to natural light and views. Mentions that the climate the environmental impacts of any new build are priority. Submits that developers remove nature strips and build right to the footpath, increasing urban heat effect and damaging the water table, sending polluted runoff directly to the waterways. Requests to reinvigorate areas no longer meeting their original use before impacting established residential areas. COVID-19 and need for hybrid working Mentions to consider Covid-19 impact and working from home situation as the likelihood that people will be spending more time at home.</p> <p><u>Neighbourhood Character</u> Mentions that the location remains appealing, suitable for people without cars, interesting and diverse.</p> <p><u>Demand for housing /Lack of housing diversity</u> Submits that residential styles cater to a narrow market (younger professionals) both pricing long term residents out of the area limiting their social contacts and preventing families from moving in.</p> <p><u>Issues from construction activities</u> Submits that construction periods are not planned collectively and residents experience noise pollution and blocked streets for months at a time.</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Opposes 6 storeys building height and will overshadow any 1-2 story houses making them less desirable for families, limiting their enjoyment of green and blue space and privacy. Submits that the City of Yarra must stand up for constituents and not provide wiggle room for developers - what is there to gain from letting them build up beyond the preferred maximum building height.</p> <p><u>Heritage – Aboriginal</u> Requests that definitions of heritage should also be broadened to understand Aboriginal understandings of “heritage” and not only focus on English style architecture of colonisers.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Supports the requirement for protecting the footpaths from overshadowing and avoid a concrete jungle.</p>

		<p><u>Street / neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving</u> Questions the outdoor space of the new developments. Demands for more green and blue space, more diversity for different household types, compliment with transport and parking solutions, better green design less concrete, safer footpaths including during construction.</p>
542	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Supports the limiting the development to a certain height. Study area/DDO area Submits that more areas on the map should be covered with the controls. Submits that new developments should be limited to 5-6 levels and the height should compared with the neighbouring houses. Submits that guidelines are needed for other streets which are currently targeted by developers.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Mentions that Oxford Street is now engulfed in large buildings and parts of Wellington Street are now in full darkness all day. Supports the requirement to allow sunlight on street. Submits that there is need for more extended of sunlight on the streets.</p>
543	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> New development not being sensitive towards heritage buildings Submits that the new developments are not heritage-friendly with their cladding materials and colour schemes, there seems to be too many black boxes. Concerned that the existing building facades on the corners of Johnston Street, Gore Street and Argyle Street will not be conserved when the proposed development begins.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Concerned about overshadowing and a bleak (lacking vegetation), looming appearance.</p> <p><u>Neighbourhood Character</u> Submits that recent high density, high-rise developments in Richmond and Abbotsford look and feel claustrophobic, damp and bleak and requests not to duplicate similar developments.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements</u> Requests for clarity and consistency for the requirements and not have any wriggle room that can be argued in arbitration.</p> <p><u>Sustainability</u> Mentions that sunlight has a major impact on mental health, environmental health and aesthetics. Requests to include 'green' requirements, such as roof gardens, EV charging facilities, renewable energy sources, passive heating/cooling and small open parkland spaces.</p>
544	Survey	<p><u>New bike lanes</u> Requests for more bike lanes and lower speed limits.</p> <p><u>Drainage improvements</u> Requests for storm water catchments or drainage improvements.</p>

		<p><u>Building Height</u> Submits that developers bypassing council regulations at VCAT and building at inappropriate heights.</p>
545	Survey	<p><u>Neighbourhood Character</u> Concerned that high rise developments around Collingwood will destroy Fitzroy streetscapes. Submits that the southern end of Smith Street is particularly unpleasant with tall apartment buildings up against each other.</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Submits that the new development should limit 6 storeys to avoid residential amenity impact. Concerned that developers will build as high as possible despite preferred maximums without an imperative to constrain height.</p>
546	Survey	<p><u>Street / neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving</u> Wants more street eating opportunities for cafe, particularly in Gertrude, the street has a good cafe vibe.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing</u> Submits that many hotels and apartments are being proposed and are very intrusive and block out sunlight. Submits that new development will block out daylight, views and someone is going to be negatively affected in at least one side.</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Concerned about the loss of some iconic older properties that added character along Wellington and parallel streets in Collingwood. It's the former industrial nature that people love about this area. Don't sanitise it. There may be a place for more development along Victoria parade and Alexandria parade because they are the borders that can cope with and shield the noise of traffic Recommends preserving the side streets and mentions that these are quiet havens and lovely to wander through.</p> <p><u>Neighbourhood Character</u> Submits that Kerr Street and George Street aren't suitable for high rise development.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary requirements</u> Concerned that the developers can propose offsets that don't consider the perception of people actually having to live with them.</p>
547	Survey	<p><u>Parking issues</u> Submits that roads being overtaken by bike paths and losing car parking.</p> <p><u>Neighbourhood Character / Building Height</u> Submits that the footprint of the Gurner Project in Johnson St, next to Collingwood Yards is excessive and does not look aligned with other buildings in the street. Against any further high rise new development.</p> <p><u>Street / neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving</u> Submits that the submitter would like to see more trees in the area.</p>
548	Survey	<p><u>Building height</u> Believes that while high-level developments is necessary, there needs to be better use of development on lower-levels so that street scape is not lacking</p>

		<p>livelihood and is consistent throughout neighbourhood. Recommends implementation of new parks, outdoor dining and bars, seating areas and shop activation.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Lack of sunshine through high-rise development within area.</p>
549	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Supports the quality of some newer builds and protection of heritage overlay and protection of original character - example give: CF Row Building (Napier Street)</p> <p><u>Street / Neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving</u> Believes that development should be centric to main roads (Hoddles, Johnston, Alexandra). Believes that overdevelopment should not occur in residential areas (block between Smith/Brunswick & Gertrude/Johnston) as this would impact the community and the aesthetic character.</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Does not agree with large variance in height numbers (example: 3-6 storeys) and would much rather it stay at the lower end being 3-4 storeys to protect suburbs such as Fitzroy</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Agrees with mandatory heights but only in the instances where they remain in line with street scape</p>
550	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Concerned about lack of effort put in to retain heritage and original designs with new developments</p> <p><u>Street / Neighbourhood / public amenity needs improving</u> Believes development should be limited to main roads and be restricted in suburban neighbourhoods</p> <p><u>Parking issues</u> Concerned generally about parking congestion for residents</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback on the greenery of neighbourhood and better access for pedestrians and cyclists that is present</p>
551	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Supportive of contemporary designs that are sympathetic to existing fabric. Supportive of how houses and streets are being progressively improved. Believes that design proposals have no architectural merit at all. Uses construction around “the tower” of Wellington and Gipps as an example of architectural destruction. Suggests that empathetic architecture could enhance areas (example given: green towers in European towns).</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Believes that buildings are too large and areas are becoming overdeveloped.</p> <p><u>Parking Issues</u> Concerned about inadequate parking – believes commercial need parking that isn’t too expensive.</p>

		<p><u>Overshadowing of public space/streets</u> Believes that large size of buildings creates issues with overshadowing Believes that overshadowing of footpaths opposite new development should occur between 8am-5pm as opposed to current September Equinox. Believes that this goes against the design to reduce energy costs and people would be needed to use lights after 2pm.</p> <p><u>Need for more public open space / parklets</u> Believes the river precincts should be open to community activities along with parks. Concerned about lack of open space – suggests addressing issues by requiring developers to provide space at the front of buildings during construction at their cost and not rate payers.</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> Believes that rather than implementing set heights for developments, this should be based on architectural merit and consistency of height across the council area. Thinks that unfettered heights have been allowed in other residential areas which is not right.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary</u> Does not believe in the exceeding of maximum heights and suggest that better design guidelines could alleviate this.</p> <p><u>Other</u> Concerned about animal waste on owners’ property that shouldn't be owner’s issue. Believes that distances that developments are built away from main streets should be greater than 6-8 metres Believes that there is an obsession with bikes that overrides the needs of pedestrians</p>
552	Survey	<p><u>Building height</u> Wants low-rise development only - against anything over 4-5 storeys. Specific to DD34 (Fitzroy Town Hall and back blocks): concerned about development along Napier Street impacting upon town hall visibility</p> <p><u>Parking issues</u> Concerned about parking as a general point for the whole area</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary</u> Against exceeding maximum heights even if they meet certain conditions</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerned about wind tunnels caused between apartment blocks</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Specific to DDO29 (Brunswick Street Shops): wants developers to upkeep heritage buildings in the area and improve shop frontage</p>
553	Survey	<p><u>Heritage</u> Concerned about lack of design empathy to historic buildings being replaced. Concerned about residential areas losing historic character due to development. Wants to see Yarra appoint an Architect to knock back building designs that are faceless and tasteless</p>

		<p><u>Building Height</u> Not impressed by height of buildings overpowering narrow streets and lanes (example given: apartment building above the Smith Street Coles)</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary</u> Believes that 2-3 storeys should be maximum for heritage buildings</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Concerns about higher buildings overshadowing houses and blocking sunlight (making solar panels useless) Believes there should be no windows overlooking existing properties</p> <p><u>Landscaping</u> Wants to see more focus on street scape activation and more greenery in front of buildings. Concerned about lack of setbacks from footpaths with limited grass verges</p> <p><u>Other</u> Concerned about the number of buildings in area in general (specific comments to Wellington St as well)</p>
554	Survey	<p><u>Building height</u> Positive feedback on high density housing that has been built and its role in aiding sustainable city development</p> <p><u>Need for more public open space / parklets</u> Concerned about lack of green and open space with new high-rise development</p> <p><u>Traffic increase/congestion</u> Concerns about development causing additional traffic congestion, pollution and danger of injury.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general)</u> Wants to make sure that higher developments do not deprive sunlight from residents.</p> <p><u>Parking issues</u> Believes that there should be low maximum limits on new car spaces provided through development. Would like to see only a small to no minority of residents have access to parking. Would like to see sustainability implemented in development - bike parking provision, insulation and draft-proofing and power efficiency.</p>
555	Survey	<p><u>Building Design</u> Positive feedback on façade treatment which softens street scape and pays homage to the area's industrial past Concerned on the other hand about some poorer examples of facadism Believes that many developments do not fit in with character of area Would like to see heritage more respected in the rebuild of demolished buildings design wise.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary</u> Would like to see a maximum of 9 storeys in the area</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Would like to see further upper level setbacks in buildings if bordering a lane with houses behind.</p>

556	Survey	<p><u>Overshadowing of public space/streets</u> Concerned about overshadowing as a general Would like to see a longer September Equinox implemented instead of 10am-2pm.</p> <p><u>Parking issues</u> Concerned about too many car parking spaces provided across neighbourhood</p> <p><u>Need for more public open space/parklets</u> Concerned that there is not enough green space</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs discretionary</u> Unhappy with developers going exceeding height limits when developing Uneasy with the term preferred when describing height limits as this does not provide residents clarity</p> <p><u>Building Design</u> Wants to see design improvements at ground levels as they believe it is ugly and unpleasant to walk around</p> <p><u>Other</u> Positive feedback received on new cafes, shops and offices away from main streets. Believes that driveways to access buildings are frequently dangerous for those not in cars.</p>
557	Survey	<p><u>Building Height</u> Unsupportive of high rise buildings in the area - would like to see more medium density development</p> <p><u>Traffic increase / congestion</u> Dislikes bike lanes on Wellington St as they make driving difficult for shopping trips. Would like to see large intersections between main roads widened so that traffic flows better Would like to see pedestrian friendly changes to the area regarding traffic and movement</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks</u> Would like to see better setbacks implemented</p> <p><u>Street/Neighbourhood/Public Amenity needs improving</u> Would like to see more garden spaces</p>
558	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Notes that some new developments appear to have been designed in respect of the heritage and character. Does not support future development impacting the neighbourhood's character. Submits that height should respect the heritage.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general) / Building Height:</u> Submits that Wellington Street between Victoria Parade and Langridge Street - down Langridge and Hoddle contain taller developments - impacting on amenity. The increased height is having a negative impact on amenities.</p>

		<p><u>Usability of new development for commercial use:</u> Recommends that commercial building development should not continue until 75% of the current supply is occupied. Supportive of the development of multi-use buildings (incorporating commercial and residential).</p> <p><u>Traffic increase/congestion:</u> Submits that increase development will have a negative impact on commuting.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing:</u> Recommends that the overshadowing should be taken during the cooler period of April - August.</p>
559	Survey	<p>Supports the recent emergence of green spaces and small recreational areas.</p> <p><u>Amenity (general):</u> Submits that there are too many taller developments creating a negative impact.</p> <p><u>Heritage / Building height:</u> Submits that taller development changes the look and feel of heritage areas.</p> <p>Recommends that buildings should be 3 storeys. Recommends that heritage should consider the rear of buildings and protect the rear of buildings.</p> <p><u>Mandatory vs Discretionary:</u> Supports mandatory controls - to protect heritage. Does not support preferred controls - will ruin the heritage.</p> <p><u>Upper-level setbacks:</u> Submits that setbacks should be bigger.</p>
560	Survey	<p><u>Heritage:</u> Supports development that respects the heritage frontages.</p> <p><u>Public Open Space:</u> Submits that there is not enough open space for the population - does not want an increase.</p> <p><u>Building height:</u> Submits that the lower the height the better.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Concern with the process and Council folding or being overruled by the Minister.</p>