



Special Meeting of Council Agenda

to be held on Thursday 26 November 2015 at 7.00pm
Fitzroy Town Hall

Disability - Access and Inclusion to Committee and Council Meetings:

Facilities/services provided at the Richmond and Fitzroy Town Halls:

- Entrance ramps and lifts (off Moor Street at Fitzroy, entry foyer at Richmond)
- Hearing loop (Richmond only), the receiver accessory may be accessed by request to either the Chairperson or the Governance Officer at the commencement of the meeting, proposed resolutions are displayed on large screen and Auslan interpreting (*by arrangement, tel. 9205 5110*)
- Electronic sound system amplifies Councillors' debate
- Interpreting assistance (*by arrangement, tel. 9205 5110*)
- Disability accessible toilet facilities

www.yarracity.vic.gov.au

Order of business

- 1. Statement of recognition of Wurundjeri Land**
- 2. Attendance, apologies and requests for leave of absence**
- 3. Declarations of conflict of interest (Councillors and staff)**
- 4. Council business reports**

1. Statement of Recognition of Wurundjeri Land

“Welcome to the City of Yarra.”

“Yarra City Council acknowledges the Wurundjeri as the Traditional Owners of this country, pays tribute to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in Yarra and gives respect to the Elders past and present.”

2. Attendance, apologies and requests for leave of absence

Anticipated attendees:

Councillors

- Cr Roberto Colanzi (Mayor)
- Cr Geoff Barbour
- Cr Misha Coleman
- Cr Jackie Fristacky
- Cr Sam Gaylard
- Cr Simon Huggins
- Cr Stephen Jolly
- Cr Amanda Stone
- Cr Phillip Vlahogiannis

Council officers

- Vijaya Vaidyanath (Chief Executive Officer)
- Ivan Gilbert (Group Manager – CEO’s Office)
- Andrew Day (Director - Corporate, Business and Finance)
- Chris Leivers (Director - Community Wellbeing)
- Bruce Phillips (Director - Planning and Place Making)
- Guy Wilson-Browne (Director – City Works and Assets)
- Mel Nikou (Governance Officer)

3. Declarations of conflict of interest (Councillors and staff)

4. Council business reports

Item		Page	Rec. Page	Report Presenter
4.1	AMCOR Consultation and Submissions to Revised Development Plan	5	16	Bruce Phillips – Director Planning and Place Making

Public submissions procedure

The public submission period is an opportunity to provide information to Council, not to ask questions or engage in debate.

When the chairperson invites verbal submissions from the gallery, members of the public who wish to participate are to:

- (a) state their name clearly for the record;
- (b) direct their submission to the chairperson;
- (c) speak for a maximum of five minutes;
- (d) confine their remarks to the matter under consideration;
- (e) refrain from repeating information already provided by previous submitters; and
- (f) remain silent following their submission unless called upon by the chairperson to make further comment.

4.1 AMCOR Consultation and Submissions to Revised Development Plan

Executive Summary

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with an overview and summary of the submissions made in response to the exhibited (revised) draft Development Plan for the Amcor site and associated background reports.

Key Issues

A revised draft Development Plan for the Amcor site in Alphington has undergone a second phase of community consultation, in response to the feedback received in submissions from the first phase of consultation in March 2015.

Approximately 85 submissions have been received from the community and referral authorities in the latest phase of community consultation. Many of the same key issues of concern to the community, referral authorities and neighbouring municipalities have been raised, with traffic, building height and built form, the Yarra River and a number of other issues being raised.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications arising from this report on the submissions made in response to the draft development proposal for the Amcor site.

PROPOSAL

That the report outlining the key issues raised in submissions be noted by Council.

4.1 AMCOR Consultation and Submissions to Revised Development Plan

Trim Record Number: D15/131941

Responsible Officer: Coordinator Strategic Planning

Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to provide Council with an overview and summary of the submissions made in response to the exhibited (revised) draft Development Plan for the Amcor site and associated background reports.

Background

2. The Development Plan Overlay (DPO) that applies to the Amcor site requires that before redevelopment of the site can occur (with the exception of demolition and other specific minor works) a development plan must be approved by Council.
3. It is also noted that consolidation and subdivision of lots can occur prior to the approval of a Development Plan if it is judged that approval would not prejudice the Development Plan.
4. The Development Plan must respond to the requirements set out in the DPO Schedule 11.
5. At its meeting on 16 December 2014, Council resolved to undertake community consultation in early 2015 on a draft Development Plan, and endorsed a consultation strategy to support the exhibition process.
6. A draft Development Plan was submitted in February 2015, which proposed a mixed use development on the Amcor site, comprising substantial residential and commercial components, and this formed the basis for the initial phase of community consultation.
7. Both the draft Development Plan and revised Development Plan are comprised of the following set of documents:
 - (a) Vision;
 - (b) Planning Report;
 - (c) Site Master Plan;
 - (d) Design Guidelines;
 - (e) Heritage Conservation Management & Interpretation;
 - (f) Landscape Concept Plan;
 - (g) Economic Assessment Report;
 - (h) Housing Diversity Report;
 - (i) Community Infrastructure Report;
 - (j) Ecologically Sustainable Design Strategy;
 - (k) Site Remediation Strategy;
 - (l) Traffic Management Plan;
 - (m) Integrated Transport Plan;
 - (n) Acoustic Report;
 - (o) Services and Engineering Infrastructure Report;
 - (p) Development Staging; and

(q) Community Engagement Strategy.

8. The feedback from community submissions, as well as from referral authorities, overwhelmingly suggested that there were a number of issues that needed to be addressed before the Development Plan could be approved by Council.
9. Since the previous consultation in March, the development proponents have considered advice from Council officers, state agencies and adjoining councils and feedback from the community, and have incorporated changes to the draft Development Plan that responds to the matters raised in the submissions.
10. Subsequently, the development proponents lodged a revised draft Development Plan in late August 2015 that needs to be considered under the provisions of the DPO11 Schedule.

Consultation

11. An initial phase of consultation was undertaken earlier this year (in March 2015) and over 280 submissions were received in total, generally expressing dissatisfaction with the draft Development Plan on a number of key issues.
12. The following outlines the submissions received against various topics. It is important to note that no officer assessment or analysis exists in this report that will be contained in a separate report to Council in December.
13. Feedback was also sought from a range of referral authorities, including Melbourne Water, VicRoads, Parks Victoria and Public Transport Victoria (PTV), and the three neighbouring municipalities (Banyule, Darebin and Boroondara Councils).
14. The current consultation period, which commenced on 5 October and concluded on 4 November 2015, consisted of the following forms of notification and communication:
 - (a) notification of property owners and occupiers by direct mail;
 - (b) community information and drop-in sessions;
 - (c) information on Council's web site; and
 - (d) the draft Development Plan materials being available on the developer's web site.
15. A wide catchment area including all of Alphington and parts of Fairfield (in the City of Darebin) in close proximity to the site were notified by direct mail-out and a letter box drop, that included a fact sheet with details of the consultation and where to view the documents online and make submissions. In total, approximately 4,800 households were notified by mail and letter box drop.
16. An information session was held on 21 October 2015 at Fitzroy Town Hall, and was attended by more than 60 members of the community. Council officers outlined the planning requirements and approval process. The proponents and their consultants presented information and answered questions from those in attendance.
17. Council's web site provided information about the overall project and consultation, and a link to the consultation material which the development proponents provided externally.

Overview of Submissions and Key Issues

18. The submissions summary is provided as **Attachment 1** to this report. The attachment summarises the key concerns of each submitter, and highlights those key concerns by shading the issues categories in the table columns. Yellow shading indicates concern or objection to how that issue is addressed in the Plan and green shading indicates general support for the Plan's approach.
19. Approximately 85 submissions have been received from the community and referral authorities in the latest phase of community consultation.
20. There was acknowledgement and recognition in some of the submissions that some positive changes have been made to the draft Development Plan. However, a number of the key concerns remain and were expressed through submissions in this recent phase of consultation.

21. The key issues and concerns that were highlighted can be broadly summarised outlined below:
- (a) traffic congestion and transport infrastructure;
 - (b) duplication or realignment options for Chandler Highway
 - (c) the proposed dwelling yield and density;
 - (d) open space, public spaces and amenity;
 - (e) site layout, interfaces and the design and scale of buildings;
 - (f) the provision of community infrastructure;
 - (g) the Yarra River corridor interface; and
 - (h) activity centre and commercial/retail component.

Traffic Congestion and Transport Infrastructure

22. The submissions highlight that this is still a key issue and one which isn't adequately addressed by the revised Development Plan, according to the views expressed in many of the recent submissions. The scale of the development has not changed apart from a reduction in the overall retail floor-space on the site.
23. The Amcor site is located at the south-east intersection of the Chandler Highway and Heidelberg Road, with the Yarra River at its southern boundary. The arterial road network in this location experiences significant traffic congestion at different times. Concern that the scale of development proposed would worsen existing traffic congestion remains a common issue raised by submitters.
24. The issue of traffic congestion is related to the current traffic levels on Heidelberg Road and Chandler Highway and the potential for an increase in traffic volumes resulting from the scale of the proposed development, which would see a significant increase in population as well as workers on the Amcor site.

Chandler Highway

25. The need for the duplication of the Chandler Highway Bridge is a significant issue for many local residents, and a number of submissions consider that the bridge duplication project is needed to improve the overall traffic conditions within the local arterial road network.
26. Submissions highlight that the Amcor Development Plan has been created in isolation from the duplication of the Chandler Highway, which has only just begun consultation on a number of options to increase the capacity of the road. Many submitters express the view that the Development Plan should have considered the widening of the Chandler Highway as part of the overall proposal.
27. A number of submissions make comments about the potential alignment and widening of the Chandler Highway. VicRoads have put forward options for the road widening and bridge duplication either an east or west alignment and either four or six lanes. It is clear from the submissions that many local residents prefer an eastern alignment that potentially includes part of the Amcor site.
28. Submissions that are in opposition to a realignment on the western side are mostly from residents of West Alphington including a submission from the West Alphington Residents Incorporated (WARI) that outlines a number of concerns about the overall development of the site and also that the development plan should be considered in conjunction with the plans for the Chandler Highway.

Parking Provision

29. On-site parking remains a concern for many local residents who feel that the provision of parking is inadequate.

30. Submissions provided a mix of opinions about parking provision with some suggesting that there should be more parking to accommodate cars that will otherwise be parked in side-streets throughout the area. Other submissions suggested that the provision of car parking, as proposed, will encourage car ownership and car use.
31. Adequate provision of parking on the site was seen by many as a necessity to provide for the new population and ensure that parking issues are contained on the site, rather than affecting the existing local parking conditions.

Proposed Dwelling Yield and Density

32. Despite changes made to the Development Plan the issues relating to the proposed number and diversity of dwellings on the site remains a key issue of concern as the plan has not changed in that regard.
33. The revised Development Plan proposes approximately 2,500 dwellings on the site, which could accommodate approximately 4,800 people in predominantly one (39%) and two (49%) bedroom apartments. A small proportion of three (9%) and four (3%) bedroom dwellings are also proposed.
34. The vast majority of submissions expressed concerns relating to the scale and intensity of the proposed Amcor development, and the resulting dwelling and population density on the site. There was also concern regarding the potential impacts of such a high level of additional population on the local community and surrounding infrastructure.
35. Submissions expressed concern that the potential increase in population would effectively double the size of the population of Alphington and that there was a lack of planning for new infrastructure to cope with this change, as well as a lack of coordination between Council and various state government agencies.

Housing Diversity and Affordability

36. As with the previous phase of consultation, many submissions commented on the lack of housing diversity being proposed on the site with a high concentration of one and two bedroom apartments.
37. The issue of affordable housing was also raised, and many submitters felt that there was not enough affordable housing on the site at 5% of dwellings. The concept of affordable housing was questioned with regard to the provision and concentration of one and two bedroom apartments. The amount of affordable housing was also regarded as an oversupply in some submissions.
38. Affordable housing for families was an issue of concern as the high concentration of one and two bedroom apartments was seen as not providing for a wide demographic profile.

Open Space, Public Spaces and Amenity on Site

39. There have been changes to the Development Plan to address feedback from previous submissions about the lack of open space on the site.
40. Submissions from the previous phase of consultation expressed the view that the open spaces identified on the site were inappropriate and insufficient. For example, the river banks were included in the allocation of public open space and most of the open space on the site was in the form of linear paths.
41. During the recent phase of consultation there has been some acknowledgement of the changes made but there are still submissions expressing the view that there isn't enough open space on the site or that the type of open space, or public space, is inappropriate.
42. Submissions from a number of individuals as well as sporting clubs request that sporting facilities be constructed on the site to cater for the new population's needs.

Site Layout, Interfaces and the Design and Scale of Buildings;

43. In this phase of consultation, building heights remains a key issue of concern for many local residents and the wider community who feel in particular that the fourteen storeys proposed at the corner of Heidelberg Road and Chandler Highway is excessive and out of character with the area.
44. There was also concern expressed about heights at different interfaces on the site, those being along the Chandler Highway and along Park Avenue.

Heritage Buildings

45. Many submissions continue to express the view that the 1954 Boiler House is not worthy of heritage protection and want it removed when the site is redeveloped. The view was also expressed that this building was being kept to justify, or set a precedent, for the height of future buildings.

Yarra River Corridor

46. Submissions were made that relate to the sensitivity of the Yarra River corridor and how the Development Plan considers interfaces with the river corridor. The submission from Melbourne Water outlines the same specific requirements in terms of set-backs from the river bank (crest line) and the risks posed by flooding for areas along and within the river banks to public access paths.
47. More generally, submitters say that development close to the river corridor poses the threat of disturbance to the ecology of the river corridor and the submission from the Yarra River Keepers specifically outlines threats to ecology and highlights the development plan does not include a report on the ecological impact the development could have.

Commercial and Retail Provision

48. There is acknowledgement that the retail component has been reduced in size but many submissions express the view that it is still too large. There are also questions about the composition of the retail mix which remains unclear.
49. Neighbouring municipalities and a number of community submissions highlight the concern that the size of the commercial component on the site is still too large, even though it has been reduced.

Submissions from Neighbouring Municipalities

Banyule City Council

50. During the initial phase of consultation, Banyule City Council expressed concerns relating to a number of issues. In particular, Banyule identified the following concerns:
 - (a) the economic impact of the retail/commercial component of the development on neighbouring activity centre (in particular Ivanhoe) is a primary concern for Banyule. The other related concern is that Economic Assessment fails to identify Ivanhoe, a Major Activity Centre, in its analysis but includes Ivanhoe East which is a smaller Neighbourhood Activity Centre; and
 - (b) Banyule highlights that the proposed 2,500 dwellings and 31,000m² of commercial/retail floor space would have a profound impact on the road network. The submission questions the traffic analysis and modelling provided in the Traffic Management Plan, and the suggestion that the increase in traffic would be off-set by changes in travel behaviour.
51. In their submission, Banyule Council acknowledges and supports the fact that there has been a reduction in retail floor space, but highlights that the mix of retail remains unclear and ultimately, expresses the view that it is still too large.

52. Banyule Council agrees that the widening of the Chandler Highway Bridge should be considered as part of the Alphington Paper Mill Development Plan project and the State Government's proposed grade separation of the railway crossing at Grange Road needs to also be considered, as it is a government commitment.
53. In terms of sustainable travel, Banyule Council expresses the view that further attention can be made for the provision of safe, designated pedestrian and cycling links to the Alphington and Fairfield railway stations. Furthermore, Banyule supports the developer's commitment to offsite upgrades including a shared path on Heidelberg Road and the provision of bicycle parking at Alphington Train Station.
54. In terms of community infrastructure and open space, Banyule expresses the view that 2,500 dwellings will have an impact on existing facilities in the area and that further provision needs to be planned for adequately.
55. Banyule City Council 'in-principle' supports development of the Amcor site. However as a neighbouring municipality, the Council still has some reservations about various issues which are further detailed in their submission.

Darebin City Council

56. Darebin Council have re-submitted previous comments made on the draft Development Plan and provided further comments on the revised version.
57. In their previous submission, the City of Darebin identified a number of deficiencies in the material provided by the developer, and the level of compliance the draft Development Plan has with DPO. These concerns generally related to the adequacy of the management of traffic impacts on the local area, support for active transport, street level and street wall interfaces at Heidelberg Road and Chandler Highway, and the scale of the proposed retail and commercial component.
58. The City of Darebin also identified significant concerns around the traffic impacts of the proposal on the existing road network, and questioned the adequacy of analysis around these impacts, and prioritisation of active and sustainable transport modes in the precinct design to address the needs of the precinct.
59. Darebin Council wish to reiterate the requests made in their original submission:
 - (a) *continuance of the transport regional working group throughout the approvals and construction process of this major project and the forthcoming Chandler Highway upgrade;*
 - (b) *a joint project with the City of Yarra (and potentially the Metropolitan Planning Authority) to develop a holistic strategic plan for the Heidelberg Road strategic corridor which covers land use and development, and transport tasks, role and priorities; and*
 - (c) *continued involvement in discussions around the planning and delivery of community infrastructure in the precinct, in particular the provision of the integrated community hub and primary school campus facilities.*

Boroondara City Council

60. Boroondara City Council has reiterated the points made in their previous submission about the impact that a potential increase in demand would have on their existing community services and infrastructure in Kew and other nearby areas south of the Amcor site.
61. Boroondara puts forward the view that the developer should provide a financial contribution towards improvements to existing and potentially new community services and infrastructure in the City of Boroondara.
62. They consider that traffic volumes and flows within the City of Boroondara would be impacted by the proposed development on the Amcor site, and the traffic modelling, Integrated Transport Plan and Green Travel Plan submitted do not provide adequate information and detail to address these issues.

63. Generally, Boroondara consider that the concerns raised previously have not been adequately addressed.

Referral Authorities

Melbourne Water

64. Melbourne Water is responsible for regional drainage, floodplain and waterway management, and for contributing to the protection and improvement of waterway health across greater Melbourne.
65. In response to the revised Development Plan, Melbourne Water's primary concerns have not changed from their previous submission in which they specify that because of the flood risks that exist along the banks of the Yarra River corridor, an overall setback of 50m which includes the width of the river bank (30m) plus a buffer zone of 20m, is required.
66. They state that:
- (a) *the entire River Park Zone will be subject to flooding from the 100 year ARI storm event and the majority of the River Park Zone does not meet Melbourne Water's floodway safety criteria;*
 - (b) *the proposed linear shared path proposed within the River Park Zone is subject to extreme flood risk and must be located on top of the embankment or outside of the 100 year floodplain. As per Melbourne Water's Shared Pathways Guidelines, pathways should be located above the 1 in 10 year ARI flood levels. If this cannot be achieved, a review of flood risk and hazards will need to be undertaken to improve safety for the community;*
 - (c) *the proposed 30 metre setback zone within the 'River Park Zone' must be retained solely for waterway health and vegetation improvement. This zone is encumbered space characterised by a steep escarpment and a significant floodplain, making it inadequately suited as a public open space zone; and*
 - (d) *Melbourne Water's position is that a 50 metre wide waterway corridor in this reach of the waterway must be adhered to, together with an appropriate interface between the development and the waterway (i.e. 30 metre core riparian zone + 20 metre setback or vegetated buffer).*

VicRoads

67. VicRoads have provided a submission that outlines a number of outstanding issues in the revised Development Plan.
68. VicRoads note that no land has been set aside in the revised Development Plan for potential land acquisition in relation to the widening of the Chandler Highway, stating that this is not in accordance with the requirements of DPO11 which refers to "additional land for road widening".
69. VicRoads have accepted the updated traffic modelling provided by the developer which allows for an upgrade of the Chandler Highway with three lanes in each direction. VicRoads highlight that land will still be required from the western edge of the site (parcels 1- 5 on SP23379) either by agreement or by compulsory acquisition. VicRoads state this should be shown on the revised Development Plan at this stage.
70. VicRoads have identified the left slip lane from Heidelberg Road onto Chandler Highway as a potential conflict point and should Council require that this be removed, then this would be supported by VicRoads.
71. They also comment on the staging of infrastructure, noting that there is no indication or mention of the Chandler Highway upgrade which is a committed State Government project expected to be completed by the end of 2018. Details of the timing of the upgrade at the intersection of Heidelberg Road and Chandler Highway are outlined in their submission and they express the view that these works should be coordinated to minimise disruption to the community.

72. VicRoads state that the shared user path south of Heidelberg Road appears to have not been addressed in the revised Traffic Management Plan and Integrated Transport Plan. The shared path must be planned to allow it to form part of the road reserve and not encumbered by private buildings. They also request that there be an additional pedestrian operated signal installation located on Heidelberg Road between Parkview Road and Yarralea Street.
73. VicRoads requests amending the Heritage Overlay maps that affect the Amcor site and would potentially require VicRoads to apply for planning permits to carry out future road works.
74. VicRoads also outline a number of other issues in their submission relating to the following:
 - (a) acoustic treatments;
 - (b) the Public Acquisition Overlay on the north side of Heidelberg Road is intended to be retained by VicRoads;
 - (c) the location of a proposed school on the Amcor site and ensuring that parking arrangements do not cause conflict with traffic on Heidelberg Road or Chandler Highway; and
 - (d) access within Latrobe Avenue signalised intersection.

Parks Victoria (DELWP)

75. Parks Victoria have reviewed the revised Development Plan and state that their previous submission has been responded to satisfactorily and that they have no further comments to make at this stage.

PTV (Public transport Victoria)

76. PTV has provided a submission that reiterates comments received earlier in the year. Their submission provides comments relating to the following issues:
 - (a) in relation to bus stops, any relocation is to be at the cost of the developer and PTV supports measures that would increase bus patronage;
 - (b) there are a number of measures that are needed to encourage walking and cycling to and from the nearby stations at Fairfield and Alphington; and
 - (c) the railway reserve north of Heidelberg Road is still required for public transport purposes and not available currently for any proposed walking or cycling paths in the direction of Fairfield Station.

Submissions from Community Groups

APMAG (Alphington Paper Mill Action Group)

77. APMAG support, in principle, the vision outlined in Schedule 11 to the Development Plan Overlay and has provided Council with a detailed submission outlining their concerns with the revised Development Plan, which are outlined under the following headings:
 - (a) Design Guidelines;
 - (b) Heritage;
 - (c) Open Space/Landscape;
 - (d) Economic Assessment;
 - (e) Housing – Quality, Diversity, Affordability;
 - (f) Ecologically Sustainable Development (ESD);
 - (g) Traffic Management and Integrated transport Plan (ITP);
 - (h) Riverfront; and
 - (i) Community Infrastructure.

78. The detailed recommendations are outlined in APMAG's submission which provides a comprehensive assessment of the revised Development Plan.

SAFCA

79. SAFCA have provided a submission in response to the revised Development Plan and in addition to their previous submission from earlier in the year. In summary, their submission makes the following comments:
- (a) *inadequate consideration has been given to the impacts on the surrounding area of what (we) consider overcrowding on the site;*
 - (b) *insufficient provision for car parking will mean crowding of nearby residential streets and reduced amenity to existing residents;*
 - (c) *the impact of greatly increased traffic in Heidelberg Rd and the Chandler Hwy has been greatly under-estimated;*
 - (d) *the plan identifies certain community infrastructure needs but fails substantially on two issues (relating to the provision of a community space on site);*
 - (e) *there is no worthwhile plan for re-development of the Yarra River riparian zone into an effective river park that well serves the community; and*
 - (f) *we consider the retention of the whole of the brick walls facing Heidelberg Rd is unnecessary from a heritage perspective and inconsistent with a new major development creating a quality urban landscape.*

WARI (West Alphington residents Incorporated)

80. As stated previously in this report the WARI group outline a number of concerns in relation to the revised Development Plan. One of their key concerns is the future alignment of the Chandler Highway and in particular they request that any new bridge across the Yarra River be located to the east of the current bridge.
81. WARI also express concern about the proposed heights in the Development Plan, particularly in relation to Chandler Highway, with which West Alphington has a direct interface. They also raise the issue of the retention of the 1954 Boiler House which like other submitters they would rather see removed.
82. More generally, WARI comment on the scale of the proposal, the number and composition of dwellings and other impacts the development could potentially have on the area.

PTUA (Public transport Users Group)

83. The PTUA submission expresses a number of concerns and makes commentary about the potential for enhancing public transport infrastructure and services that would benefit both the Amcor development and the wider community, as a means of reducing car dominated transport.
84. The PTUA expresses that the Amcor development itself could be a more transit oriented development than is currently proposed by enhancing the existing networks within the area, including prioritising buses on Heidelberg Road, and increasing the frequency of both buses and trains.

Alphington Community Centre (ACC)

85. The Alphington Community Centre provides a comprehensive submission outlining a range of issues including their requirements for land for a community centre and kindergarten, built form and urban design issues, access and movement around the site and encouraging walking through good urban design that addresses walkability.
86. The ACC express that they support the redevelopment of the Amcor site and are keen to ensure that a new community centre is clearly identified on the site and state that a dedicated space should be at least 1,500m² on a site of at least 3,000m².

Alphington Bowls Club

87. The Alphington Park Sports Clubs Incorporated have outlined a number of suggestions and/or requests for both new sporting facilities and upgrades to existing facilities as part of the Development Plan process and future development of the Amcor site.

Financial Implications

88. There are no financial implications arising from outlining the submissions made in response to the draft development proposal for the Amcor site.

Economic Implications

89. No economic implications at this point in time. This report simply outlines the submissions received.

Sustainability Implications

90. No sustainability implications at this point in time. This report simply outlines the submissions received.

Social Implications

91. No social implications at this point in time. This report simply outlines the submissions received.

Human Rights Implications

92. There are no known human rights implications.

Communications with CALD Communities Implications

93. Data from the 2011 Census indicates that 94% of the Alphington/Fairfield population are proficient English speakers. According to Census data, other than English, Italian and Greek are the other most commonly spoken languages at home in this area.
94. The following methods were used during the exhibition of the draft Development Plan to communicate to non-English speaking residents:
- (a) translation panel in resident newsletter inviting readers to find out more information about the project in six languages (Cantonese, Greek, Italian, Mandarin, Spanish, Vietnamese);
 - (b) newsletter to residents included advice to non-English speakers to contact Council to request an interpreter at the community information session or 'drop-in' sessions; and
 - (c) Yarra News story was translated in four languages (Chinese, Greek, Italian, and Vietnamese) in the print version and syndicated in four languages (Vietnamese, Turkish, Greek and Arabic) for broadcast media.

Council Plan, Strategy and Policy Implications

95. The Amcor site is identified as a Strategic Redevelopment Site in the Yarra Planning Scheme.
96. As one of the largest urban infill sites in Melbourne, it is also identified as an Urban Renewal Area within the Central Subregion of Plan Melbourne.
97. The Amcor redevelopment is identified as a major project in the Council Plan and affects a number of the Strategic Objectives, including; Celebrating Yarra's Uniqueness; Supporting Yarra's Community; Making Yarra More Liveable and; Ensuring a Sustainable Yarra.

Legal Implications

98. Consideration of submissions has to be in accordance with the provisions of the Yarra Planning Scheme and *Planning Environment Act 1987*.

Conclusion

99. Council will be receiving an officer report in December 2015 assessing and analysing the proposed Development Plan. That report will provide the recommendations to Council.

100. During the second phase of consultation, the volume of submissions has been less than earlier in 2015. However, submissions from the community, referral authorities and neighbouring municipalities express a similar set of concerns as with the previous version of the draft Development Plan, which many feel has undergone minimal changes.
101. Overall, many submissions raise concerns about the scale and density of the proposed development within the Development Plan and the building heights near the corner of Heidelberg Road and Chandler Highway.
102. Concerns are still expressed about the proposed dwelling density and composition of dwellings in terms of the number of one, two and three bedroom dwellings remaining the same.
103. The feedback received in many respects reaffirms the previous key issues and concerns by the community which in broad terms are as follows:
 - (a) concern over the scale of the development in terms of the height of buildings, the number of dwellings and the potential impact to the local area resulting from a population of approximately 5,000 new residents on the site;
 - (b) the potential traffic impacts which would result from the activity of residents and workers on the site and the generation of traffic;
 - (c) inadequacy of the traffic modelling and assumptions about future traffic volumes and travel behaviour;
 - (d) the relationship of the Development Plan with the Chandler Highway project which would potentially impact the site, and should be integrated into the Development Plan.
 - (e) the inadequate provision of parking on the site, although some submitters consider it would encourage car dependency through too much parking provision and the lack of attention to sustainable transport options;
 - (f) related to the above, the lack of provision or planning to integrate walking networks, cycling routes and connectivity with either existing or new public transport services, both on and off the site;
 - (g) acknowledgement that the configuration of open space on the site has been changed to include new public spaces, but that there should be more green space on the site and potentially sporting grounds; and
 - (h) there still isn't enough of a commitment to providing new, or improving existing, community facilities on the site or in the area.
104. Officer assessment and analysis of the revised Development Plan will be presented to Council in December 2015.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council notes the report summarising submissions received in relation to the revised Development Plan received in late August 2015 and placed on public inspection for 28 days from the 5 October to 4 November 2015.

CONTACT OFFICER: David Walmsley
TITLE: Manager City Strategy
TEL: 9205 5350

Attachments

- 1 Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

AMCOR SUBMISSIONS SUMMARY TABLE – NOVEMBER 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering
1	D15/130832	Restates points raised in previous exhibition phase: 1. Insufficient Public Space, Green Space and Recreational Space; 2. Lack of bike infrastructure; 3. Lack of community infrastructure. Acknowledges that the developers have made small concessions in some areas. But fundamentally they need to provide more than housing and commercial shops and buildings. Other comments: proposed public spaces are to small;																											
2	D15/130839	Submission states: The Papermill developers must be fans of the ABC's 'Utopia'. if you use the words 'Precinct', 'Artisan' (what artisan?) and 'Heritage' enough then mean little undersized flats can sound pretty groovy.																											
3	D15/130834	The APM site should have the bridge built on that (east) side rather than where there are existing homes. The noise associated with a 6 lane highway is likely be untenable for residents, who will find it difficult to sell. There will also be significant loss of amenity. In addition, with a development of this size, improving public transport will be essential.																											
4	D15/130838	Submission asks two questions: 1. Is there any plan to decouple car parking from the cost of dwellings? 2. Will there be a separated bicycle facility linking the development to the Alphington Train Station?																											
5	D15/133115	Insufficient car spaces provided. The issues around movement of traffic have still not been addressed. In short the whole development has TOO MANY flats/units . . . it is simply too big. Asks how are people going to get from A to B in an area where traffic is often at a standstill and the trains are packed.																											
6	D15/139335	Submitter states: Impressed to read in the Alpha Partners/Glenvill update, circulated to residents, that the developers have apparently listened to the community. Delighted to note potential space to host a farmers market on the Artisan Park, as this would provide local opportunity for local residents to connect and source their food directly from Victorian Growers and food producers, consistent with the community focus they claim to be striving for. Submitter would like the opportunity to make a submission to establish a regular market on the Alphington Paper Mill site as soon as possible, so this community enterprise is embedded in the planning stage and not overlooked or forgotten once other plans and commitments have been made.																											
7	D15/139339	Concerned that the Development Plan for the site lacks sufficient provisions to control the over-use of maximum height and minimum setback for the portion of the development along Parkview St which faces Alphington Park and the																											

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering
		Alphington Bowls Club. Alphington Park is the prime recreation area for the neighbourhood, and the bowls club is also a critical community focal point.																											
8	D15/141276	Melbourne Water is responsible for regional drainage, floodplain and waterway management, and for contributing to the protection and improvement of waterway health across greater Melbourne. In response to the revised Development Plan, Melbourne Water's primary concerns have not changed from their previous submission in which they specify that because of the flood risks that exist along the banks of the Yarra River corridor, an overall setback of 50m which includes the width of the river bank (30m) plus a buffer zone of 20m, is required.																											
9	D15/142190	Submitter is deeply concerned by the lack of recognition of the broader impact on the community of this development. Population size will be doubled and concerned about the lack of planning for infrastructure within Development Plan. The new plans remain vague and unclear. There is little in the way of definitive commitment to environmental quality, the provision of social housing, or community needs. Much of the plan remains a vision without clear detail, such as the primary school. There is already pressure on Alphington Primary. Submission urges Council to reject these plans and demand revisions that adequately address community concerns.																											
10	D15/142194	The planned density does not match the surrounding areas. Believes that the developer has strategically listed the brick building on Heidelberg road and Chandler Highway, as well as the pump house due to the height of the buildings. There is little to no significance in the construction of the buildings. Disagrees with the heights of the buildings and the density of the development.																											
11	D15/142492	The Alphington Community Centre supports the development of APM the site and is keen to ensure the community centre is clearly identified on the site. The ACC feels that a number of issues raised in their previous submission have not been addressed and provide a list of revision they would like to see in the Development Plan: A dedicated space to accommodate a 1,500m2 community centre combining kindergarten and community spaces. 3,000m2 of land to accommodate the building and landscaping. Development Plan should identify a link between a community centre and state school facility.																											

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering	
12	D15/142653	Submission highlights that the current population of both Alphington and Fairfield is approximately the same as the projected population of the Amcor site and it should be treated as a new suburb with the necessary infrastructure planned for. Better coordination by state government agencies is also needed. Points to the Chandler Highway which is a separate project. Submission suggests that the Minister for Planning should be the responsible authority and this might produce a better outcome for the site with better coordination of the relevant government agencies. Objects to the height limits outlined in the development plan and believes that they are excessive. The submission highlights the positive aspects of the plan which are ESD and the primary school on site.																												
13	D15/142601	This submission is a combined submission from several different sporting clubs in Alphington (Soccer, Netball, Cricket) and refers to previous submission in which a number of requests are made for new and updated sporting facilities to cope with the increased demand that will be generated by the new population. These were: 1. A four court, mixed use indoor stadium built in the new development site (ideally adjacent to existing sports facilities) 2. New oval for junior sports created in lower Alphington Park 3. Refurbishment of the bowls club as the community / sports hub 4. Realign the main Alphington oval to incorporate 2 soccer pitches 5. Increase capacity of the soccer / cricket clubrooms 6. Plan infrastructure for organised, casual, passive and active users The submission expresses some gratitude to Council and the developer for providing more information but expresses general disappointment stating that not much has changed in the revised plan.																												

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering		
17	D15/144823	Thanks Council for their October 21 motion rejecting VicRoads proposed 6 lane widening of the Chandler Highway bridge on the west side for its flawed traffic plan and the adverse impact it will have on local residents. The duplication of the Chandler Highway Bridge and the development of the former Amcor site are inextricably linked and 2000 local residents want plans for the Bridge and funding finalised before approval is given for the development. Local residents universally view the Boiler House on the former Amcor site as an asbestos ridden eyesore that must be removed.																													
18	D15/144824	BUILDING HEIGHTS: The four 14-storey buildings on the northern eastern corner of the site (corner of Heidelberg Rd and Chandler Highway) are inconsistent with the built form in the surrounding area (generally 2 story houses). The existing AMCOR buildings along Heidelberg Road rise to 8 storeys and this is a reasonable limit in terms of maximising the site density. Location of traffic lights seems illogical at proposed location. TRAFFIC: Traffic leaving the site should be able to head south on Chandler Highway (or enter the site from Chandler Highway heading south from Heidelberg Rd). Northbound traffic (or east/west) could exit at the proposed signalised intersection on Heidelberg Road. Northbound traffic along Chandler Highway wanting to enter the site could turn right into Heidelberg Road, then right into the site.																													
19	D15/144827	TRAFFIC IMPACT: The provision of 6 lanes on Chandler Hwy and minimal treatment at Heidelberg Road is completely out of balance. The existing crossing is carrying 44,000vpd. A 4 lane Yarra River crossing would have a capacity of more than 67,500vpd assuming 25% green time is given to the Kew Boulevard signals. A 6 lane crossing would have a capacity of more than 100,000vpd using the same assumption. The responsible authorities have not released sufficient detail to do an accurate assessment of the capacity of Chandler Hwy at Heidelberg Road. BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE: The most important infrastructure for the new residents and the residents of the surrounding areas is the NEBC which will provide an attractive alternative for the 4800 new residents with activity destinations to the west and to the inner city areas to enable them to choose a safe sustainable transport mode for their trip. Of equal importance is the completion of the connection of the Darebin Trail to the Yarra Trail. VicRoads proposal for a shared path located on the eastern side of Chandler Highway as specified in its favoured plan for the Chandler Hwy bridge is sound.																													
20	D15/144829	My major concern is the traffic flow on Chandler Highway - the bridge is too small for the current traffic. Bridge needs upgrading sooner rather than later.																													

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering		
25	D15/144841	States that Alphington is not your typical suburb and is more suburban than other parts of City of Yarra. Public transport needs to be addressed and its needs to be accessible for the entire development. Concerned about houses on Parkview Road and proposed building heights on opposite side of street. Pleasing that the developers have offered to fund the construction of two multipurpose courts off their site. Asks that council commits to providing them within Alphington and not at the loss of existing sporting facilities. Safety issues with dropping off children and older residents in these busy areas. Afterhours access to community facilities and the lack provision of outdoor play area or outdoor community areas are also a concern.																													
26	D15/144842	Objects to current Amcor proposal: Firstly, there appears to be no provision for additional public transport. Secondly, there are too many additional residents for a small suburb like Alphington with inadequate infrastructure. Lastly, it is unclear as to what community facilities will be built.																													
27	D15/144845	Submission raises a series of questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are you addressing the enormous impact of traffic in and around this area? It is already congested and blocked at all times of the day. There is only a couple of ways to cross the Chandler Highway. What is happening with the proposed bridge widening? Why is this going ahead on the residence side and will it require acquisition of residential property? • Why is the boiler house remaining? Who has declared it a structure of significance? • How much open space is planned under this development? • What community facilities (not retail) will be involved? • What is the public transport plan to compliment this development? Expresses overall disappointment and dissatisfaction with proposal.																													
28	D15/144847	Considers the development to be too large in scale in terms of built/urban form and population increase. Will require additional transportation services and planning. Increased facility for Public transport planning is absent. Most importantly, the plan makes no provision for the expansion of the Chandler Highway bridge and leading road on the paper mill side.																													
29	D15/144850	Feels that the Chandler highway should be built on the eastern side of current bridge and road. The proposal to extend on the western side is not supported by the vast majority of the public because it is both unfair and illogical.																													

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering	
37	D15/144888	Concerns relate to: - chandler hwy expansion not accounted for on Amcor site - lack of suitable infrastructure to support increase in population - plans do not appear to adequately address increase in traffic, public transport needs - height of proposed buildings is not in keeping with character of Alphington																												
38	D15/144890	Get on with a plan (any plan) which will relieve the ridiculous bottleneck that is called the Chandler Highway'																												
39	D15/144891	As an owner/ occupier living opposite the new Amcor development - greatly concerned about the plans for the site. - Building heights and density are unchanged and remain as guidelines rather than maximums and as much as 70% of the 2,500 dwellings could be 1 and 2 bedroom apartments. We are concerned about the increase of population in the area and are afraid the infrastructure, roads, schools, facilities and surrounding neighbourhood won't cope. - The retail and commercial space is far too large for the population- 30,000 square metres is not needed. - The boiler house remains and is an eyesore. - There is no mention of what community facilities will be provided, if any. - Public transport planning is absent, again, how transport needs be met with doubled population of Alphington? We need more bus routes and more train line parking spaces as it is.																												
40	D15/144893	Notes the changes to the provision of open spaces and think this a positive development, but still have many concerns. 1. Still as many as 2500 one and two bedroom apartments. Needs to be more diversity and more 3 bed units and a range of larger houses. 2. Community facilities not clear. 3. Public transport planning is not clear. North/ south public transport is poor and the bus to the city is unreliable and infrequent. 4. Retail and commercial space is too big. Will serve a wider non-local community. The local roads and facilities are not equipped to deal with a centre of this size. 5. Retaining the boiler house is ridiculous. It is ugly, unsafe and unnecessary. Only serves to justify height 6. No real changes to building heights and density which are guidelines rather than defined maximums. 7. Not integrated with the upgrade of Chandler Highway and the duplication of the Chandler Highway Bridge. Hope the road and bridge upgrade uses land from the Amcor site rather than the west side which would impact residents.																												

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering	
41	D15/144895	Feels that the development is too big and is typical of "greedy developers". Suggesting the bridge has to be located on the west side of the existing one due to the heritage boiler house is rubbish.																												
42	D15/144899	Concerned that the probability that this huge, Docklands style development that is totally at odds with its surroundings in Alphington is inevitable'. Concerns include: Traffic; - sceptical about traffic report for the developer which tries to minimise impacts, opposes traffic light intersection onto Chandler Highway because this stretch is too traffic signal dense already, ingress and egress from Coate and Rex Avenue will be badly impacted; Height; - the proposed heights are uncertain and could be exceeded; Retail and commercial; - While the retail is reduced why two supermarkets, reduce the commercial by adding community infrastructure; Heritage; - questions the need to preserve the boiler house building and potential implications for the alignment of the widening of the Chandler Highway; Community infrastructure; - the proposals are vague and insufficient. Open space changes are positive. Overall the proposals are an overdevelopment and a missed opportunity.																												
43	D15/144904	Concerns include: the scale and intensity of the proposals is extreme and not in the interests of local residents; the demands of new residents will put pressure on Alphington Park and the local school, there should be more open space within the Amcor development; dwelling types should be more diverse; building heights are high and uncertain; traffic impacts seem to be under-estimated and there should be an independent traffic assessment; the bridge should be widened to the east not the west; prefer a four rather than six lane upgrade; public transport should be upgraded and wider impacts on road networks assessed.																												
44	D15/144907	The proposals are 'currently high rise up to 16 storey's and a high density development very out of character for Alphington and Fairfield, virtually a city within a city and may house up to 5000 people almost doubling the local population'. Concerned that 'our parks and the river sidewalks will be over used and trampled'. 'People that own river frontage properties that allow people to walk through along the river bank have stated they will fence off their properties to prevent over use. Please reduce the scale of this development.'																												

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering
45	D15/144910	Concerned development will add thousands of households to the area before Chandler Highway issues are resolved. Council should wait until there are concrete plans formally approved about the highway before approving this development.																											
46	D15/144913	Concerned about the impact on traffic, particularly the Chandler Highway bridge and surrounds. Prefer to have the bridge built on the paper mill side and to leave the existing houses alone, as much as possible. Also concerned about the provision of schools, medical assistance, public transport and recreation (including space for off-lead dog walking) facilities for the increased population. The river needs to be kept clean and the native animals and natural vegetation impacted as little as, possible.																											
47	D15/144917	Refers to previous submission; concerns include: Masterplan, Building Heights, Urban Design - Design Guidelines, Yarra River, Landscape - open space, Environmental Sustainability, Ecological Sustainable Design (ESD), Heritage Housing - number or types of proposed dwellings, Affordable Housing, Economic Impact, Community Facilities, Traffic, Public Transport, Pedestrian Facilities, Bicycle Facilities Site Remediation - Contamination, Construction, Development Staging, Services - Engineering																											
48	D15/144920	Council and the developers have an opportunity to develop something spectacular - a showpiece for Melbourne on our beautiful Yarra close to the city... this is a far cry from what we are getting'. Concerns are: 1. Insufficient protection offered to the Yarra riverbank, 2. The height of the remaining building (boiler house?) in the south west corner. It is out of keeping with the surrounding areas, has no aesthetic appeal and should not be seen as a heritage building. 3. The remaining buildings on Heidelberg Rd are unsightly and can never be anything but ugly. 4. Far too many one and two bedrooms apartments. 5. Insufficient amenities provided - a library, primary school, day care, play grounds																											

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering		
49	D15/144922	Proposed development does not adequately address: - impact on existing residents and infrastructure such as parks etc. - additional traffic lights in Chandler Hwy will add to noise level to existing and new residents due to hill, stop/starts of through traffic. - density is not in keeping with neighbourhood character, more in keeping with inner city. - Chandler Hwy bridge needs to be located on mill side so traffic control can be properly designed. - in general, local existing residents comments and issues relating to road access, noise levels, over use of existing amenities are not a significant part of the City of Yarra criteria for planning approval. Lobbying of State Government to locate new bridge to mill side is an example of this.																													
50	D15/144924	<u>Chandler Widening</u> The plans do not take into account the Chandler widening proposed by VicRoads. This makes commenting on the proposals very difficult. The VicRoads concept plans do not accurately show where the 6 lane road will go. This makes it difficult for Council to make a proper assessment of the proposals. <u>Cycling and Public Transport</u> The development needs more walking, cycling, and public transport access and amenity for residents and future residents. <u>Sporting facilities and a pool</u> More sporting facilities like a sports hall for basketball, indoor athletics, soccer and other indoor sports. A pool would be desirable in the area. The closest pool at Northcote is about 5kms away in Victoria Street. <u>Parking.</u> The development needs sufficient parking areas for cars for residents and visitors. Suggests along the road (Chandler /Heidelberg Rd? not specified) would help set back residents from noise of the busy highway. <u>Bridge Across Chandler</u> to link development with residents. It would be good to have a bridge across the Chandler to the current residents' side of Alphington to allow resident access to the amenities proposed in the development. (Not clear what sort of bridge is proposed. The purpose seems to get pedestrians / bikes across the upgraded Chandler Highway.) <u>Trucks and Traffic</u> Large trucks and traffic now pass through the Chandler making it very noisy. Council needs to consider ways to mitigate traffic noise and other impacts <u>Grange Road Congestion</u> The 6 lane road will still feed into Grange Road, that has a train crossing. Need to consider traffic impacts on nearby road network and trains / public transport. <u>Number of apartments</u>																													

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering	
		Thousands of apartments will be slow to fill up if the Chandler widening is approved. People will not buy to live beside a 6 lane road. Council must not approve the Development plans until VicRoads have decided on the Chandler. <u>Birds and wildlife</u> Must respect the natural surroundings and provide a home for 'thousands' of birds and wildlife in the area (more trees and park area). The area should also respect the local Aboriginal heritage and spiritual connection with the land.																												
51	D15/144928	Very concerned that the Amcor site will be developed prior to the expansion of the Chandler Highway bridge. Currently, it is faster to travel twice the distance and cross via Bourke Rd to take my son to school than to cross via the Chandler Highway bridge. I do this trip FOUR times a day, and work as well. Problem will be increased if the demand for using this bridge increases with the Amcor development, if the bridge is not expanded first. May decide to move to the other side of the river and away from Ivanhoe /Alphington if the traffic worsens, because it will not be sustainable for our family.																												
52	D15145208	The proposed development will make huge demands on essential services, such as gas, water, sewerage and electricity. Solar power (panels and storage batteries) should be mandated to make this development as independent of the electricity grid as possible. "Heritage" listing for the ugly brick wall on Heidelberg Road, and the Boiler House, which we now understand to contain asbestos, should be challenged. Difficult to assess the true traffic impacts when the Chandler Highway issue remains unresolved.																												
53	D15/145209	Submission outlines that the provision of high density, inner city housing to off-set urban sprawl is typically one and two bedroom apartments which doesn't cater for all household types and therefore, pushes the demand for detached housing back out to the outer suburbs. This type of development appeals mainly to investors.																												

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering	
57	D15/145219	Acknowledge that in the latest plan open spaces have been expanded. Concerned about: 1. the absence of habitat and suitable planting for birds and animals; and 2. for ecological continuity between the open spaces within and beside the development. Plan needs to show an active concern for the ecology: for example the planting of indigenous vegetation; continuous canopy of trees; and suitable undergrowth for birds and reptiles. This needs to include the street planting.																												
58	D15/145220	Expresses disappointment at revised development plan stating that the scale of the development is excessive in terms of built form and projected population. Concerned about the proposed heights in the development plan. To allow 1750 1 & 2 bedroom apartments in a development of 2500 would suggest that the council is developing a non-family friendly environment in a suburb predominantly occupied by families.																												
59	D15/145222	Concerned that plan does incorporate plans for Chandler Highway. Disputes heritage significance of 20th century boiler house. Believe that it is there just to set a precedent for building heights. Believes that density on site is too great (sardines). Current plan does not provide for public transport.																												
60	D15/145223	Thanks Council for opportunity to comment. Has concerns about changes to traffic exits and entrances to Coate Ave, Tower Ave Perry St and Yarraford Ave; the Chandler Bridge expansion and its impact on residents living to the west of the existing bridge; the retention of 1954 boiler house; and the lack of articulation and breaks in built form along Chandler resulting in bounce back of noise and pollution to residents on west of highway.																												
61	D15/145225	South Alphington & Fairfield Civic Association Inc. The submission provides the following comment about how the matters in our original submission (15 March 2015) have been addressed in the developer's amended plans: 1. 'Inadequate consideration has been given to the impacts on the surrounding area of what we consider overcrowding on the site' – the development densities proposed for the site are compared with other areas in Alphington, Collingwood and Templestowe. 2. 'Insufficient provision for car parking will mean crowding of nearby residential streets and reduced amenity to existing residents' – parking may not be sufficient and spill into nearby streets. 3. 'The impact of greatly increased traffic in Heidelberg Rd and the Chandler Hwy has been greatly under-estimated' – discusses potential need for road widening in Heidelberg Road and the implications of retaining heritage structures.																												

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering		
		<p>4. 'The plan identifies certain community infrastructure needs but fails substantially on two issues' – concerned that the small community facilities will be occupied by commercial uses such as medical and child care facilities. 'Commercial facilities'... 'should be housed elsewhere on site'.</p> <p>5. 'There is no worthwhile plan for re-development of the Yarra River riparian zone into an effective river park that serves the community'- expresses concern at the lack of a plan for these areas and problems with fill and trying to re-create a natural gradient to the River.</p> <p>6. 'We consider the retention of the whole of the brick walls facing Heidelberg Rd is unnecessary from a heritage perspective and inconsistent with a new major development creating a quality urban landscape' – suggests that the heritage values are a means by which to justify building height and minimal setbacks. The submission proposes removing some of the former Paper Mill structures along Heidelberg Road.</p>																													
62	D15/145226	Recent changes have made little difference to submitter's concerns about the Amcor site. Concerned about claims made in traffic management plan as well as the economic impact assessment. The submission calls for significant changes the development plan including resolving the situation with Chandler Highway in collaboration with VicRoads. The submission makes the following recommendations: two on-site indoor sports courts; removal of 1954 boiler house; renaming the development (not Alphington Park).																													
63	D15/145227	<p>The submission is comprehensive covering a range of issues. Welcomes the modifications to the planned open space, the opening of site lines to and from Alphington Park and the river, and the improvements for pedestrian and bicycle movement through the site. Outlines a number of concerns though with revised development plan. The status of the river front land, and assigning of responsibility for its maintenance, remains undecided.</p> <p>The reduction in the size of the proposed retail area is welcome, but the proposed area of 15,000 sq metres matches that of Ivanhoe and Kew, designated principal activity centres, not neighbourhood ones. It is considerably short of the 12,000 sq metres proposed by Darebin Council, concerned at its impact on the existing Fairfield shopping centre.</p> <p>The retention of Buildings 5 and 6, the allowances made for extra height on Heidelberg and Chandler Highway interfaces if justified, and the use of the "Urban wall" as an element of design, all serve to emphasise how little consideration is given to the northern part of this community, divided by a political decision.</p> <p>When questioned about the failure to provide for sports courts within the development, a spokesman for the developer stated that it was not the responsibility of the developer to make up for an existing "deficiency". Who,</p>																													

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/ infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering
		then, takes responsibility when the scale of the development exacerbates that deficiency? The Integrated Transport Plan aims for a ratio 55% car 45% active transport from the site. Its own summary outlines the measures needed to facilitate pedestrian/bike traffic to Alphington and Fairfield stations – developer contribution is limited to bike storage facilities at Alphington Station.																											
64	D15/145230	Concerned about the negative impacts from both the construction on the site and longer term impacts of the development. The additional noise will also have an impact on all neighbouring streets. Current residents in the area agree that such a large and densely populated development will have a negative effect on property values, traffic, noise and air pollution.																											
65	D15/145234	Wants the current road to pass through the AMCOR site and not the pre-existing housing in West Alphington. Does not agree to the installation of a traffic light on the roads for use of the people on the AMCOR estate to access the Chandler Highway.																											
66	D15/145239	States that there have been no significant changes to the development plan. The proposed 14 storey maximum height is excessive in a suburb where the current maximum height is four storeys. The proposed housing density and number of residents are excessive and will overwhelm public infrastructure in the area. The number of residents should be reduced substantially from the 5,000 currently proposed. Alphington Park interface should be lower. There should be a further reduction in the retail space. Assumptions in traffic management plan deeply flawed. No plans to incorporate chandler hwy. There is no provision in the plan for increased public transport, which will be essential with such a large increase in population. The developers defer to the state government on the building of a new school within the precinct. A new school is essential in a development of this size, as all schools in the area are currently at capacity.																											
67	D15/145241	Doesn't see the value in the boiler house being retained. Thinks that council has failed in its negotiations with VicRoads re Chandler Hwy.																											
68	D15/145242	Disappointed at lack of 3-D visualisation of Amcor site. Thinks that the proposal is out of scale with surrounding area. Believes that buildings along Chandler Highway should be much lower regardless of Boiler House.																											

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering		
		4. The improved focus on the river frontage is welcome, but it is important to get this right; for the ambience of the entire river area.																													
71	D15/145247	Concerned that there is not a consistent, 'umbrella type' approach to this significant development, which will change the amenity of the local area. As a resident of View Street, very aware of the unique nature of this area, which has a limited number of exit roads, because of the freeway and river (barriers). It has an unusually large population of young people because of the two schools, a kindergarten and a day care centre, which means foot traffic and cars in this area increases significantly in the morning and afternoon. The proposed traffic management plan must consider road network and the increased traffic from new shops, residents and a second. The plans for the Chandler Highway and bridge cause doubt about a realistic and honest study of this issue. Too much PR or hyperbole than honest acknowledgment of the existing and future issues around traffic management. Enhancements in support of sustainable transport (bicycles/pedestrians) are positive. Bike paths and pedestrian walkways are great will this encourage people to cycle or walk? Will families be able to afford or interested in the new development? Concerned about the impact of works on the local fauna (sightings of wallabies/joeyes and platypus, including our bird population) along the waterways and embankments. What is the potential impact on Alphington Station in terms of passenger usage – it is already quite crowded at peak times and is a small station.																													
72	D15/145250	Public Transport Users Association. This submission follows an earlier submission, 2 April 2015, which highlighted significant deficiencies in public transport provision in the area and which would be accentuated by the proposed development on the paper mill site. In that submission the PTUA recommended the following public transport improvements to address the development: higher-frequency train services on the Hurstbridge line, including outside peak hours and on weekends; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seven-day-a-week services on the 350 route bus (La Trobe University to the CBD on Chandler Highway), with evening services at least on weekdays and no less than 10- minute frequencies during peak hours; • Seven-day-a-week services on the 546 route bus (Heidelberg to the CBD on Heidelberg Road), with evening services at least on weekdays and no less than 10 minute frequencies during peak hours; • A more direct route for the 609 route bus (Hawthorn railway station to Fairfield) with services seven days a week and 10 minute frequencies during peak hours; and an extension of route bus 624 from Harp Junction in Kew to Alphington Station via Earl Street and Chandler Highway to 																													

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering		
		<p>developer intends to meet market demand. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>Impact on Surrounding Street Scapes: The Development Plan is too internally focussed presenting dominant high and large walls to both Chandler Highway and Heidelberg Rd. It turns its back onto the surrounding streets of Alphington and Fairfield creating a ghetto development. A lower scale blending and breaking up of the perimeter buildings is needed. Chandler Hwy entrance and intersection: The proposed major entrance off the Chandler Highway is problematic because it needs traffic lights at the intersection which will interrupt traffic flow. The increased noise at this intersection due to the breaking and accelerating of cars would also impact residents decreasing the amenity of the area.</p>																													
75	D15/145264	Chandler Hwy widening and bridge alignment: Is concerned that plans have been developed WITHOUT provision for the rebuild of the Chandler Rd Bridge.																													
76	D15/145267	<p>This submission recommends that Yarra City Council should defer making any decision on the Revised Development Plan until there is a decision on the upgrade of Chandler Highway Bridge alignment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive Integrated Public Transport Plan for a rail link to and from the site be designed and funded by the State Government linking to the railway line at Fairfield. (Hurstbridge Line). • A comprehensive pedestrian and bicycle path designed along the Vic Track land to the North West corner of the site linking to Fairfield. • Review the Heritage Value of the Orange Brick Buildings along Heidelberg Road. Many believe these tall, ugly, obtrusive and unsightly buildings should be demolished and new, buildings of up to 2 to 3 storeys with large (3-5 metre) setbacks with space for pedestrian and cycling paths along Heidelberg Road be designed. Reconsider this aspect of the Development. • Yarra City Council liaise with Darebin City Council, the State Government, VicTrack , PTV, PTUA , Vic Roads and other affected parties on the above matters until a comprehensive Integrated Public Transport Plan is devised. • A Revised Development Plan should NOT proceed until this plan is developed. • The Park Precinct should be limited to 2 storey dwellings. • The 14 Storey building on the corner of Heidelberg Rd and Chandler Hwy should be deleted from the plan and a Transport Hub located in this area to cater for the extra 5,000. • The overall density (?) is reduced to 2,000 people. (Maximum). The time frame for Public Response to these plans extended because 4 weeks to absorb all that is involved is too short. 																													

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering	
82	D15/145390	Whilst there are some notable improvements especially to open space still concerned by: The significant increase in the size and density of the development since we first purchased and read Council's design principles, and even since the DPO was introduced; The inappropriate increase in size of the retail/commercial aspects; The retention of ugly buildings on the pretence of heritage – especially the imposing 1954 boiler house building, and the façade along Heidelberg Road. Lack of family housing and 88% one and two bedroom apartments; The failure of the developer to make provision for a bridge expansion on its land; The loss of opportunity to use more renewable energy especially in light of Council's zero carbon target by 2020.																												
83	D15/146148	Banyule Council acknowledges and supports the fact that there has been a reduction in retail floorspace but highlights that the mix of retail remains unclear and ultimately, expresses the view that it is still too large. Council agrees that the widening of the Chandler Highway Bridge should be considered as part of the Alphington Paper Mill Development Plan project and the Government's grade separation at Grange Road needs to also be considered as it is a government commitment. In terms of sustainable travel, Banyule Council expresses the view that further attention can be made for the provision of safe, designated pedestrian and cycling links to the Alphington and Fairfield railway stations. Furthermore, Banyule supports the developer's commitment to offsite upgrades including a shared path on Heidelberg Road and the provision of bicycle parking at Alphington Train Station. In terms of community infrastructure and open space, Banyule expresses the view that 2,500 dwellings will have an impact on existing facilities in the area and that further provision needs to be planned for adequately. Banyule City Council 'in-principle' supports development of the Amcor site. However as a neighbouring municipality, the Council still has some reservations about various issues which are further detailed in their submission.																												
84	D15/146838	Parks Victoria have reviewed the revised Development Plan and state that their previous submission has been responded to satisfactorily and that they have no further comments to make at this stage.																												
85	D15/147301	VicRoads have provided a submission that outlines a number of outstanding issues in the revised Development Plan. VicRoads note that no land has been set aside in the revised Development Plan for potential land acquisition in relation to the widening of the Chandler Highway, stating that this is not in accordance with the requirements of DPO11 which refers to "additional land for road widening". VicRoads have accepted the updated traffic modelling provided by the																												

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering	
		<p>developer which allows for an upgrade of the Chandler Highway with three lanes in each direction.</p> <p>VicRoads highlight that land will still be required from the western edge of the site (parcels 1- 5 on SP23379) either by agreement or by compulsory acquisition. VicRoads state that it is imperative that this be shown on the revised Development Plan at this stage.</p> <p>The remainder of issues are outlined in more detail within their submission.</p>																												
86	D15/149497	<p>Boroondara Council continue to express concerns about the impact of the development and future population on existing community facilities and infrastructure in Kew and other nearby areas south of the Amcor site in the municipality of Boroondara.</p> <p>Their previous submission outlined that they consider that a financial contribution towards existing and potential future community facilities would be appropriate.</p> <p>In their report they state: In general, the concerns raised in the previous response have not been totally addressed to the satisfaction of City of Boroondara officers. The Community Development Directorate stated that the development is likely to have an impact on a number of Council services and facilities including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Maternal and Child Health Services b. Kindergarten and Child Care Services c. Kew Library d. Kew Neighbourhood Learning Centre e. Community meeting spaces f. The Kew Recreation Centre. <p>The Traffic and Transport Department raised concerns with the impact that the development is likely to have on traffic volumes and flows within the City of Boroondara. These concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The traffic model used to demonstrate the development's impact on the surrounding road network provides a very limited perspective as to the impact that the development will have on the City of Boroondara. b. The Integrated Transport Plan is poor at best and provides little to no direction for active and sustainable transport modes. c. The Green Travel Plan initiatives provided are lacking in any sufficient thought and detail. 																												
87	D15/148306	VicTrack's response will be provided through PTV in their submission.																												

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015

#	TRIM	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	facilities/ infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering
88	D15/149995	PTV reiterate comments made in their previous submission earlier in the year in relation to the provision or relocation of bust stops to enable good access from the site. Any relocation of stops or new stops should be at the cost of the developer. Encouraging people to walk and cycle towards nearby train stations is dependent on the quality of pedestrian and cyclist connections.																											

Attachment 1 - Amcor Submissions Summary Final - November 2015