

## Attachment 3 – Precinct-wide issues raised in submissions Amendment C231 – Queens Parade

The following outlines the key precinct-wide issues outlined in submissions.

Precinct-wide issue	Main issues raised
<p><b>Importance of the centre to the local community</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A large number of submitters highlighted they had lived in the area for some years and felt a very strong connection to the Queens Parade shopping strip.</li> <li>• Many submissions explained that the centre was important to them as a place for daily shopping, meeting friends and a place to take visitors.</li> <li>• They appreciate and value the historic charm of the centre and Queens Parade boulevard. Its existing scale and character is part of that charm.</li> <li>• Submissions also highlighted that Queens Parade performs an important social function.</li> <li>• Some expressed concerns that as more people move in it will negatively affect community connection and the village feel.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Heritage - Importance of maintaining the heritage fabric</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An overarching theme was the importance of maintaining the prominence of the existing heritage fabric and the need to ensure that new development does not overwhelm the existing buildings and heritage streetscapes.</li> <li>• Many submissions noted the need to maintain the view of heritage parapets with clear sky behind them. A number highlighted the Statement of Significance for Queens Parade where the parapets are identified as an important element of buildings.</li> <li>• Strong concerns were expressed about the potential impacts of development up to 6 storeys with a 6 metre setback proposed for the main shopping strip (Precinct 4).</li> <li>• Many expressed the view that if a 6 storey development were permitted the heritage character and significance of Queens Parade would be lost forever.</li> <li>• A small number of submissions questioned proposed changes to heritage gradings or identified additional buildings/places for inclusion in a Heritage Overlay.</li> <li>• Other submissions were concerned that the proposed controls did not achieve the heritage objectives in the DDO or the Heritage Policy in the Yarra Planning Scheme (eg the DDO encourages demolition of heritage buildings).</li> <li>• Other submissions commented that the whole of Queens Parade must be considered a heritage place – not just individual buildings.</li> <li>• Many noted the same Heritage Overlay applies to shops and dwellings. Their view was Council applies stringent heritage controls in the residential areas. The amendment fails to apply the same high heritage standards should be applied to the shops in Queens Parade.</li> </ul>

Precinct-wide issue	Main issues raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A small number of submissions expressed concerns that heritage on Queens Parade was considered more important than adjoining residential amenity.</li> <li>• Other issues raised included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– A call for a peer review of the GJM Heritage Report</li> <li>– Internal controls on some buildings</li> <li>– Recognition of the importance of heritage features eg chimneys</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Urban consolidation / accommodating growth</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some submissions acknowledged a need for a degree of change to accommodate Melbourne’s growth.</li> <li>• Some also noted that the centre is a neighbourhood activity centre and not a major activity centre. They questioned whether development elsewhere on Queens Parade - the Gasworks, 26-56 Queens Parade and in Precinct 5 (behind McDonalds) meant that Queens Parade was already accommodating growth. They argued that allowing tall development in the historic retail precinct for a relatively small gain in additional housing was unnecessary.</li> <li>• There was some concern about the capacity of nearby open space, local roads, schools and public transport to cope with future development pressures.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Height of new development</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a strong message that taller buildings are not supported in the centre.</li> <li>• A number of submissions commented on the adverse impacts of recently constructed taller developments (eg Clifton Views, 217-241 Queens Parade in Precinct 5).</li> <li>• The proposed maximum height of 6 storeys in Precinct 4 – the Activity Centre Precinct attracted the most submissions. Almost all submitters to the amendment did not support 6 storeys in this Precinct. Only one submitter explicitly supported the proposed height.</li> <li>• Concerns were expressed about the 1:1 visibility test. Submitters said that it resulted in new development that dominated the street. [Noting the 1:1 ratio only applies to Precinct 5 in the DDO but informed building heights in other precincts such as Precinct 4.]</li> <li>• A range of alternative heights for this precinct were suggested in submissions, including retaining the current two storey scale, three, four or five storeys.</li> <li>• In Precinct 5, a range of other heights were proposed up to a maximum of 14 storeys. However strong concerns were expressed about the impacts of height on its prominent moderne heritage buildings eg Clifton Motors, former UK Hotel.</li> <li>• In Precinct 2, a submitter said the height limit should be 8 storeys instead of 28 metres. The recent approval of a building of 34.8 metres demonstrates this height can be accommodated.</li> <li>• In other precincts, some of the proposed heights were supported, however many lower heights were suggested.</li> </ul>

Precinct-wide issue	Main issues raised
<p><b>Setbacks</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The need for greater upper level setbacks was also raised as an important issue.</li> <li>• Submitters identified the need to maintain the prominence of the existing buildings and reduce the visibility of new additions.</li> <li>• They were concerned the 6 metre upper level setback would lead to facadism and not maintain enough heritage fabric. They were also concerned that the heritage would be overwhelmed by the new building behind.</li> <li>• Alternative setbacks of 8, 10 and 12 metres were proposed.</li> <li>• Setbacks on land in the Commercial 2 Zone (C2Z) were also raised. The amendment proposes Res Code B17 setbacks but a land owner argues that B17 setbacks are only suited in a residential context where Res Code applies (ie up to 4 storeys) and are totally inappropriate in a C2Z context as commercial floor heights are higher than residential floor heights.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Interface with residential development / amenity concerns</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong concerns were expressed about the negative impact of taller development on the low scale and well-established residential areas and dwellings to the side/rear.</li> <li>• Submitter concerns included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– loss of privacy through overlooking</li> <li>– overshadowing of private open space, living areas and solar panels</li> <li>– impacts of building bulk</li> <li>– wind tunnel effect in laneways.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A number submitted that the proposed setbacks in the amendment were not adequate to protect the amenity of residents which abutted the commercial strip. They consider Res Code Standard B17 – side and rear setbacks offers a better alternative.</li> <li>• One submitter commented on disparities in consultant reports where setbacks on lanes were measured from.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Impacts on the public realm</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitters were also concerned about impacts on the public realm through loss of heritage, increased overshadowing, wind and building bulk of an inappropriate scale.</li> <li>• Concerns about loss of views of the centre from residential properties, streets (eg McKean Street) or Rushall Station were also raised. The effects of recently constructed buildings in Precinct 5 on views was commented upon.</li> <li>• One submitter supported the building separation controls as they will allow for greater visual variety in the streetscape.</li> <li>• A number of submitters considered the amendment should consider building quality and materials. Comments were made about building finishes and materials particularly in Precinct 5.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Variations to heights and setbacks recommended by Council consultants / drafting of controls</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A few submitters identified differences between the exhibited heights and strategic work for the centre produced over the past two years.</li> <li>• These differences mainly related to Precinct 4 and included:</li> </ul>

Precinct-wide issue	Main issues raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Initial consultant work from February 2017 to support the interim controls for the western end of Queens Parade recommended 4 storeys (with an 8 metre upper level setback) for the rest of the centre.</li> <li>- Updated consultant work from December 2017 for the entire centre (to support the permanent controls) recommended 5 storeys and a 6 metre upper level setback in the final draft.</li> <li>- The exhibited amendment recommended 6 storeys and 6 metre upper level setback.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additionally some submitters noted that on 22 November 2016 Council resolved to request the Minister for Planning introduce interim controls to historic shopping streets which included a maximum height limit of 11.5 metres and a 10 metre upper level setback.</li> <li>• Some submitters were concerned that the drafting of the permanent controls differed from the drafting of interim DDO16. They want to see the drafting identical to the interim controls as it has been tested at VCAT.</li> </ul>
<b>Mandatory versus discretionary controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A large number of the submitters strongly supported mandatory controls – as they provided certainty to residents and developers, rather than discretionary controls which end up in endless debate at VCAT.</li> <li>• A number commented that they wished to see more mandatory height, setback and other built form controls.</li> <li>• Mandatory controls were supported across all precincts.</li> </ul>
<b>Laneways</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A large number of submissions commented that development of a scale proposed by the amendment would overwhelm the lanes which are an important part of the heritage fabric of the area. (See also interface issues.)</li> <li>• They considered that additional development would create a lot of extra traffic in narrow laneways which do not have the capacity to accommodate it.</li> <li>• Residents want to retain lanes for pedestrians and active transport (walking and cycling).</li> <li>• Four submissions commented that laneway widths did not meet emergency services access requirements (specifically MFB guidelines).</li> <li>• One submission said that new developments in Queens Parade will introduce parking stackers requiring the widening of the laneways.</li> </ul>
<b>Parking / traffic</b> (see laneways also)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many submitters commented on the impacts of traffic that will be generated from the new development. Some commented that despite Council’s encouragement of the use of active transport, people would still use cars.</li> <li>• Diverse views were aired about on-site parking in new developments. Some commented that full parking provision in developments should be mandatory, while another submitted that no parking should be provided.</li> </ul>

Precinct-wide issue	Main issues raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitters commented that on-street parking was already difficult, particularly in adjoining side streets and on Queens Parade itself. Additional development would only worsen the problem. In the case of traders, reduced parking availability would probably drive customers away rather than attracting them.</li> <li>• A number of submitters also commented on resident parking permits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– There was concern that parking permits will become necessary for those that don't currently need them.</li> <li>– Others were concerned that Council would change its current parking policies and issue residents of future developments with permits.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Several submissions argued that the amendment and its background report should include consideration of broader transport issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Capacity of public transport, noting current public transport services are close to maximum capacity</li> <li>– Congestion and the capacity of roads</li> <li>– Promotion of alternate modes such as improving bike infrastructure or share cars.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Additionally one submitter commented that developments should be required to state their impact on public transport, parking and vehicle access to parking.</li> </ul>
<b>Net community benefit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A few submissions raised the issue of 'net community benefit'.</li> <li>• Their view was that the amendment should benefit the whole community, rather than just developers.</li> <li>• The protection of heritage to ensure the beauty of Queens Parade could be enjoyed by future generations should be a key community benefit.</li> </ul>
<b>Consultation</b> (including community involvement in neighbourhood planning)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some submissions questioned the process and expressed concern that the community had not been involved in preparing built form recommendations. Some requested a more collaborative planning process.</li> <li>• A number specifically referred to <i>Plan Melbourne</i> (Policy 5.1.2) which highlights the need for local communities 'to lead the planning of' neighbourhood activity centres.</li> <li>• A small number of submissions were critical of the exhibition process. Comments included that there was inadequate notification and insufficient time to consider the material and make a submission. The material presented was difficult to understand. There was also a feeling that a town hall style meeting was a better way of hearing from people, rather than the one on one information sessions with Council officers.</li> </ul>
<b>Zoning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Five submitters commented on the proposed rezoning of land on the corner of Smith Street and Queens Parade (from the Commercial 2 Zone</li> </ul>

Precinct-wide issue	Main issues raised
	<p>which prohibits residential development to the Commercial 1 Zone which allows for residential development):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two submissions objected to the proposed rezoning and expressed concerns about future development opportunities it would open up.</li> <li>- Another said that retaining C2Z land for industrial and commercial uses 'maintain Yarra as a place where people can live, work and play in a 20 minute city'.</li> <li>- Two submitters supported the rezoning if it allowed additional housing, one of these submitters supported more housing on 15-33 Queens Parade.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three submissions (including one from the property owner) requested a rezoning of 245 Gold Street from C1Z to GRZ or NRZ as recommended by the GJM Heritage report. [NB – This rezoning is not proposed as part of the amendment.]</li> </ul>
<p><b>Other issues raised</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some submissions suggested the amendment should more strongly support environmentally sustainable development and Council's Sustainability Guidelines.</li> <li>• One submitter expressed concern about increased storm water run-off generated by more development.</li> <li>• Others mentioned the need for social and affordable housing and housing diversity. The issue of social isolation created by high-rise developments was also raised.</li> <li>• One submission commented that the study area should be expanded to include land in Commercial 1 and Public Use Zones at Rushall Crescent, Brennan Street and McKean Street.</li> <li>• A small number of submissions suggested that future development could have a negative impact on the centre through disruption during building works, including adversely affecting local traders.</li> <li>• Additionally a handful of submitters commented the amendment would reduce land values.</li> </ul>