



# **Special Meeting of Council Minutes**

**held on Thursday 21 May 2020 at 7.01pm  
via TEAMS**

**[www.yarracity.vic.gov.au](http://www.yarracity.vic.gov.au)**

## 1. Acknowledgement of Country

*“Yarra City Council acknowledges the Wurundjeri Woi Wurrung people as the Traditional Owners and true sovereigns of the land now known as Yarra.*

*We acknowledge their creator spirit Bunjil, their ancestors and their Elders.*

*We acknowledge the strength and resilience of the Wurundjeri Woi Wurrung, who have never ceded sovereignty and retain their strong connections to family, clan and country despite the impacts of European invasion.*

*We also acknowledge the significant contributions made by other Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to life in Yarra.*

*We pay our respects to Elders from all nations here today—and to their Elders past, present and future.”*

## 2. Attendance, apologies and requests for leave of absence

### Attendance

#### Councillors

- Cr Danae Bosler (Mayor)
- Cr Misha Coleman (Deputy Mayor)
- Cr Mi-Lin Chen Yi Mei
- Cr Jackie Fristacky
- Cr Stephen Jolly
- Cr Daniel Nguyen
- Cr Bridgid O’Brien
- Cr James Searle
- Cr Amanda Stone

#### Council officers

- Vijaya Vaidyanath (Chief Executive Officer)
- Ivan Gilbert (Group Manager Chief Executive’s Office)
- Bruce Phillips (Director Planning and Place Making)
- Mary Osman (Manager Statutory Planning)
- Rhys Thomas (Senior Governance Advisor)
- Mel Nikou (Governance Officer)

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

Nil

#### **4. Council business reports**

<b>Item</b>		<b>Page</b>	<b>Res. Page</b>
4.1	PLN17/0618 - 27-45 Best Street, 102-114 Scotchmer Street and Council owned rights of way 2087 and 2088 Fitzroy North	4	74

#### **5. Urgent business**

<b>Item</b>		<b>Page</b>	<b>Res. Page</b>
5.1	Urgent Business - Closure of Centrelink Abbotsford Service Centre	75	75
5.2	Urgent Business - Closure of the Abbotsford Centrelink Centre	76	77

---

**4.1 PLN17/0618 - 27-45 Best Street, 102-114 Scotchmer Street and Council owned rights of way 2087 and 2088 Fitzroy North**


---

Reference: D20/72747

Authoriser: Manager Statutory Planning

**RECOMMENDATION**

That having considered all objections and relevant planning policies, Council resolves to issue a Notice of Decision to Grant a Planning Permit PLN17/0618 for the Partial demolition for the use and development of the land for the construction of a mixed use building (inclusive of dwelling use), sale of packaged liquor (associated with the bottle shop) and a reduction in car parking requirement at 27 – 45 Best Street and 102 – 114 Scotchmer Street, North Fitzroy subject to the following conditions:

1. Before the development commences, amended plans to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the plans will be endorsed and will then form part of this permit. The plans must be drawn to scale with dimensions and three copies must be provided. The plans must be generally in accordance with the decision plans (plans prepared by Jackson Clements Burrows Architects and received by Council on 24 May 2019) but modified to:

- (a) Include all detail pertaining to the basement car parking areas and dwellings / apartments and townhouses as detailed in the “Without Prejudice” plans received by Council on 15 January 2020, and emailed sections received by Council on 05 March 2020.

But further modified to show:

- (b) The deletion of the third floor from the tower element facing Best Street and a consequent reduction in the overall building height (i.e. a maximum of six storeys);
- (c) The communal open space area shrunken to meet the minimum area required by Clause 58.03-2 (Communal Open Space objective - Standard D7) of the Yarra Planning Scheme as a result of the condition above;
- (d) The south-west corner of the ancillary office at the first floor of the building facing Best Street setback 3m from the western boundary, to allow for the provision of windows and screened in accordance with the provision at Condition 1(g);
- (e) The lobby to the west of the lift facing Egremont Street widened to 2.1m;
- (f) The deletion of the sign at the north-east corner facing Best Street;
- (g) All separation distances / dimensions between upper floor west and south-facing balconies and terraces of apartments including habitable room windows to either be shown with a minimum 9m separation distance annotated from the secluded private open spaces of surrounding existing dwellings / or habitable room windows or screened in accordance with the standard at Clause 55.04-6 (Overlooking objective) of the Scheme;
- (h) All storage volumes associated with the dwellings to be shown clearly on the plans in accordance with Clause 58.05-4 (storage objective) of the Yarra Planning Scheme;
- (i) Provision of EV charging points for vehicles in the basement car park;
- (j) All street trees identified;
- (k) Where relevant, any requirements of plans / information endorsed under conditions of this permit, the Acoustic report (Condition 15), the Sustainable Management Plan report (condition 20), the Waste Management Plan (condition 22), the Wind Impact

Statement (Condition 25) Landscaping Plan (Condition 27), and the Green Travel Plan (condition 42); and

- (l) An updated schedule of all external materials and finishes (including materials samples, colours and coloured elevations/perspectives). The schedule must show the materials, colour, finish and application methods (where relevant) of all external walls, roof, fascias, window frames, glazing types, cladding, doors and fences, including any materials that make a positive contributions to the building's energy performance. Timber is not to be used where this is exposed to weathering.
2. The development as shown on the endorsed plans must not be altered (unless the Yarra Planning Scheme specifies that a permit is not required) without the prior written consent of the Responsible Authority.
3. Any damage to road(s) and footpath(s) or other Council infrastructure as a result of the development must be reinstated to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

#### **Discontinuance of laneway**

4. **This permit does not come into effect until all areas of the public laneway that the development is to be developed on are formally discontinued under the provisions of the *Local Government Act 1989*; and formally privately owned and associated with instruments of title forming the address of this planning permit.**

#### **New Laneway**

5. Before the building is occupied, or by such later date as approved in writing by the Responsible Authority, the new laneway formation must be constructed at no cost to the Responsible Authority and to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

#### **Environmental Audit**

6. Before the construction of the development authorised by this permit commences, an assessment of the land to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. The assessment must be prepared by an environmental professional with suitable qualifications to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and must include:
  - (a) a description of previous land uses and activities on the land;
  - (b) an assessment of the level, nature and distribution of any contamination within, or in close proximity to, the land;
  - (c) details of any provisions, recommendations and requirements (including but not limited to, clean up, construction, ongoing maintenance or monitoring) required to effectively address and manage any contamination within the land; and
  - (d) recommendations as to whether the land is suitable for the use for which the land is proposed to be developed and whether an Environmental Auditor should be appointed under section 53S of the Environment Protection Act 1970 (EP Act) to undertake an Environmental Audit in accordance with the provisions of the EP Act.
7. If the assessment required by condition 6 does not result in a recommendation that an Environmental Auditor be appointed under section 53S of the EP Act to undertake an Environmental Audit in accordance with the provisions of the EP Act, all provisions, recommendations and requirements of the assessment must be implemented and complied with to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
8. If the assessment required by condition 6 results in a recommendation that an Environmental Auditor be appointed under section 53S of the EP Act to undertake an Environmental Audit in accordance with the provisions of the EP Act, before the construction of the development

authorised by this permit commences, the Environmental Auditor appointed under section 53S of the EP Act must undertake an Environmental Audit in accordance with the provisions of the EP Act and issue:

- (a) a Certificate of Environmental Audit for the land in accordance with section 53Y of the EP Act (Certificate); or
- (b) a Statement of Environmental Audit for the land in accordance with section 53Z of the EP Act (Statement),

and the Certificate or Statement must be provided to the Responsible Authority.

9. If, pursuant to condition 6, a Statement is issued:

- (a) the development authorised by this permit must not be undertaken unless the Statement clearly states that the land is suitable for the sensitive use for which the land is being developed;
- (b) the development authorised by this permit must not be undertaken until compliance is achieved with the terms and conditions that the Statement states must be complied with before the development commences (**pre-commencement conditions**);
- (c) before the construction of the development authorised by this permit commences, a letter prepared by the Environmental Auditor appointed under section 53S of the EP Act which states that the pre-commencement conditions have been complied with must be submitted to the responsible authority; and
- (d) if any term or condition of the Statement requires any ongoing maintenance or monitoring, the owner of the land (or another person in anticipation of becoming the owner of the land) must enter into an agreement with the Responsible Authority pursuant to [section 173](#) of the [Planning and Environment Act 1987](#) (**Agreement**). The Agreement must:
  - (i) provide for the undertaking of the ongoing maintenance and monitoring as required by the Statement; and
  - (ii) be executed before the sensitive use for which the land is being developed commences; and
  - (iii) the owner of the land, or other person in anticipation of becoming the owner, must pay all costs and expenses (including legal expenses) of, and incidental to, the Agreement (including those incurred by the Responsible Authority).

#### Sale of Packaged Liquor (Bottle Shop)

- 10. The sale of liquor as shown on the endorsed plans must not be altered (unless the Yarra Planning Scheme specifies that a permit is not required) without the prior written consent of the Responsible Authority.
- 11. Except with the prior written consent of the Responsible Authority, the use of the land for the sale of liquor may only occur between 7.00am – 11:00pm, seven days a week.
- 12. The amenity of the area must not be detrimentally affected by the use, including through:
  - (a) the transport of materials, goods or commodities to or from land;
  - (b) the appearance of any buildings, works or materials;
  - (c) the emission of noise, artificial light, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, vapour, steam, soot, ash, dust, waste water, waste products, grit or oil, or
  - (d) the presence of vermin.to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

13. Except with the prior written consent of the Responsible Authority, delivery and collection of goods to and from the land may only occur between 7am and 10pm on any day.

#### Façade Strategy and Materials and Finishes Plan

14. In conjunction with the submission of development plans under Condition 1, a Façade Strategy and Materials and Finishes Plan to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and be approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the Façade Strategy and Materials and Finishes Plan will be endorsed and will then form part of this permit. This must detail:
  - (a) Detailed drawings demonstrating the retention of walls of heritage buildings to scale of 1:20 or 1:50 illustrating typical podium details, entries and doors, and utilities and typical facade details for all heritage buildings;
  - (b) The existing facades of all heritage buildings including roof and return walls as shown in the decision plans received by Council 24 May 2019, including sections to show the thickness of architectural elements and information about how the façade(s) will be maintained, including any vegetation;
  - (c) The proposed reconstruction, restoration or works of existing façades, and return walls, with notations clearly outlining any changes from existing conditions or use of new materials with regard to heritage buildings;
  - (d) section drawings to demonstrate façade systems, including fixing details and joints between materials or changes in form; and
  - (e) a sample board and coloured drawings outlining colours, materials and finishes of every façade portion. Timber is not to be used where this is exposed to weathering.

#### Acoustic Report

15. Concurrent with the plans required by Condition 1, an amended Acoustic Report to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the amended Acoustic Report will be endorsed and will form part of this permit. The amended Acoustic Report must be generally in accordance with the Acoustic Report prepared by AECOM and dated 12 December 2018, but updated to include / demonstrate (or otherwise agreed to by the Responsible Authority):
  - (a) Details in relation to the sensitive receivers of some of the commercial properties to the north of Scotchmer Street;
  - (b) Facade details conducted at the façade of the building to determine compliance with the State Environmental Protection Policy (Control of Noise from Commerce, Industry and Trade) No. N-1 (SEPP N-1) with regard to background noise levels between the supermarket and dwellings;
  - (c) Compliance with SEPP N-1 relating to delivery truck noise;
  - (d) The loudest hours of the day and night periods to not exceed targets of 45 dBA Leq, 1 hour in the living rooms and 40 dBA Leq, 1 hour in bedrooms between 10pm and 7am;
  - (e) Full façade specifications for windows and lightweight non-vision elements;
  - (f) Rw ratings for any loading dock or car park entrance gates that require acoustic performance;
  - (g) Acoustic ratings and recommended construction for building elements required to control noise from the loading dock, supermarket (including BOH), café and the like; and

- (h) Sufficient information for any vibration isolation required on the project to ensure that the building / developer can make appropriate height and structural allowances for the necessary works.
- 16. Within 3 months of the full occupation of the building, a supplementary Acoustic Report to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be prepared by a suitably qualified acoustic engineer that confirms that all measures endorsed as part of the Acoustic Report required at Condition 5 have been implemented. The acoustic report must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the Acoustic Report will be endorsed and will form part of this permit.
- 17. The provisions, recommendations and requirements of the endorsed Acoustic Report(s) must be implemented and complied with to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
- 18. The development must comply at all times with the State Environment Protection Policy — Control of Noise from Commerce, Industry and Trade (SEPP N-1).
- 19. The development must comply at all times with the State Environment Protection Policy — Control of Music Noise from Public Premises (SEPP N-2).

#### Sustainable Management Plan (SMP)

- 20. Concurrent with the plans required by Condition 1, an amended SMP to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the amended SMP will be endorsed and will form part of this permit.  
The amended SMP must be generally in accordance with the SMP prepared by GIW Environmental Solutions and dated 19 December 2018, but updated to demonstrate / include the following information:
  - (a) A minimum of 4 additional apartments modelled for daylight at varying locations in the building including Apartment 5.07 (or 4.07 as a result of the deletion of one level);
  - (b) JV3 model or equivalent to demonstrate how the 10% improvement will be achieved;
  - (c) Details as to all methods of the servicing of the HVAC for the retail component;
  - (d) Details of all methods of irrigation and maintenance of vegetation;
  - (e) A statement demonstrating how the design contributes to reduction in urban heat;
  - (f) Recycled content in concrete;
  - (g) Include pipes, cabling, flooring that do not contain PVC or meeting best practice guidelines for PVC;
  - (h) Additional EV charging stations;
  - (i) Provision of organics collections service rather than food digester;
  - (h) An accredited head contractor; and
  - (i) Written confirmation that an Environmental Management Plan will be developed by the building contractor to monitor and control activities undertaken during construction.
- 21. The provisions, recommendations and requirements of the endorsed Sustainable Management Plan must be implemented and complied with to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

### Waste Management Plan

22. Concurrent with the plans required by Condition 1, an amended waste management plan to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the amended waste management plan will be endorsed and will form part of this permit. The amended waste management plan must be generally in accordance with the waste management plan prepared by Leigh Design and dated 19 December 2018, but modified to include:
  - (a) Reference to a part five and part six storey building; and
  - (b) Reference to organic waste collection.
23. The provisions, recommendations and requirements of the endorsed Waste Management Plan must be implemented and complied with to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
24. The collection of waste from the site must be by private collection, unless with the prior written consent of the Responsible Authority.

### Wind Impact Statement

25. Concurrent with the plans required by Condition 1, an amended Wind Impact Statement to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the amended Wind Impact Statement will be endorsed and will form part of this permit. The amended Wind Impact Statement must be generally in accordance with the Wind Impact Statement prepared by Vipac Engineers and Scientists and dated 19 December 2018, but modified to include:
  - (c) Reference to a part five and part six storey building.
26. The provisions, recommendations and requirements of the endorsed Wind Assessment Report must be implemented and complied with to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

### Landscaping Plan

27. Concurrent with the plans required by Condition 1, an amended Landscape Plan to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the amended Landscape Plan will be endorsed and will form part of this permit. The amended Landscape Plan must be generally in accordance with the Landscape Plan prepared by Eckersley Garden Architecture and received by Council 06 March 2019, but modified to include:
  - (a) A plant schedule with botanical name, common name, mature height, and spread, installation size, planting spacing's, locations and quantities;
  - (b) A legend containing key features and materials;
  - (c) Proposed levels including top of walls;
  - (d) Details of any raised planter beds including height, width and materials;
  - (e) Information on irrigation and drainage systems;
  - (f) Notes on the maintenance schedule, tasks and maintenance period including all maintenance measures associated with green walls; and
  - (g) The following specific details for the vegetable garden / green walls / design:
    - (i) The type of mulch layer proposed (something that won't blow away);
    - (ii) Growing media – suitable for roof top gardens;
    - (iii) Filter media;
    - (iv) Irrigation method / stormwater inlet;

- (v) Drainage system; and
  - (vi) Root barrier / water proofing layer.
28. Before the building is occupied, or by such later date as approved in writing by the Responsible Authority, the landscaping works shown on the endorsed Landscape Plan must be carried out and completed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. The landscaping shown on the endorsed Landscape Plan must be maintained by:
- (a) implementing and complying with the provisions, recommendations and requirements of the endorsed Landscape Plan;
  - (b) not using the areas set aside on the endorsed Landscape Plan for landscaping for any other purpose; and
  - (c) replacing any dead, diseased, dying or damaged plants,
- to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

### Tree Management Plan

29. Before the development commences, a Tree Management Plan to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be prepared by a suitably qualified Arborist and must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved the Tree Management Plan will be endorsed and will form part of this permit. The Tree Management Plan must make recommendations for:
- (a) the protection of trees adjacent and opposite to the development site along Best, Scotchmer and Egremont Streets:
    - (i) pre-construction;
    - (ii) during construction; and
    - (iii) post construction
  - (b) the provision of any barriers;
  - (c) any pruning necessary; and
  - (d) watering and maintenance regimes,
- to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
30. The provisions, recommendations and requirements of the endorsed Tree Management Plan must be complied with and implemented to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

### Street Tree(s)

31. Before the development commences, the permit holder must provide an Asset Protection Bond to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority for the surrounding street trees adjacent and opposite to the subject site along Best, Scotchmer and Egremont Streets. The security bond:
- (a) must be provided in a manner, and on terms, to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority;
  - (b) may be held by the Responsible Authority until the works are completed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority; and
  - (c) in accordance with the requirements of this permit; or
  - (d) otherwise to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

Public Realm Plan(s) / Works / Road Infrastructure

32. Prior to the demolition of any building(s) or by such later date as is approved by the Responsible Authority, a Public Realm Works plan must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the plan will be endorsed and will then form part of the permit. The Public Realm Works plan must show the works associated with all pedestrian footpaths, vehicle and bicycle spaces, crossings, roads, drainage, infrastructure works and connections and also associated landscaping (external to the building / development site, and include a tree management plan with regard to the protection of surrounding existing trees), including works associated with the new laneway as agreed to with the Responsible Authority and ensure an integrated urban design outcome is achieved with the surrounding context.
33. Before the building is occupied, or by such later date as approved in writing by the Responsible Authority, any redundant vehicular crossing must be demolished and re-instated as standard footpath and kerb and channel:
  - (a) at the permit holder's cost; and
  - (b) to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
34. Before the building is occupied, or by such later date as approved in writing by the Responsible Authority, all building works and connections for underground utility services outside the building's frontage must be constructed:
  - (a) at the permit holder's cost; and
  - (b) to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
35. Before the building is occupied, or by such later date as approved in writing by the Responsible Authority, all public infrastructure, including re-sheeting of the footpath for the entire width / length of the property must be pursued:
  - (a) at the permit holder's cost; and
  - (b) to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
36. Before the building is occupied, or by such later date as approved in writing by the Responsible Authority the relocation of any service poles, structures or pits necessary to facilitate the development must be undertaken:
  - (a) at the permit holder's cost; and
  - (b) to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

Car parking

37. Before the building is occupied, or by such later date as approved in writing by the Responsible Authority, the area set aside on the endorsed plans for the car parking spaces, access lanes, driveways and associated works must be:
  - (a) constructed and available for use in accordance with the endorsed plans;
  - (b) formed to such levels and drained so that they can be used in accordance with the endorsed plans;
  - (c) treated with an all-weather seal or some other durable surface; and
  - (d) line-marked or provided with some adequate means of showing the car parking spaces;

to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

38. Except with the prior written consent of the Responsible Authority, no less than 126 car spaces must be provided on the site at all times for staff and hotel guests.

#### Transport for Victoria's Condition 39

39. The permit holder must take all reasonable steps to ensure that disruption to tram operation along St Georges Road is kept to a minimum during the construction of the development. Foreseen disruptions to tram operations during construction and mitigation measures must be communicated to Yarra Trams and the Department of Transport (DoT) eight (8) weeks prior. The permit holder must notify DoT by either calling 1800 800 007 or email [customerservice@ptv.vic.gov.au](mailto:customerservice@ptv.vic.gov.au).

#### Loading on Site

40. The loading and unloading of vehicles and the delivery of goods to and from the land must be conducted entirely within the land to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

#### Bicycle parking

41. Except with the prior written consent of the Responsible Authority, no less than 138 bicycle spaces must be provided on the site at all times.

#### Green Travel Plan

42. Concurrent with the Condition 1 plans, a Green Travel Plan to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the Green Travel plan will be endorsed and will form part of this permit. The Green Travel Plan must provide details in relation to the following:
- (a) the promotion of various public transport smartphone apps such as the Public Transport Victoria app and/or train or tram tracker;
  - (b) a description of the location in the context of alternative modes of transport;
  - (c) employee welcome packs (e.g. provision of Myki/transport ticketing);
  - (d) the provision of real time passenger information displays for nearby stops within each lobby;
  - (e) sustainable transport goals linked to measurable targets, performance indicators and monitoring timeframes;
  - (f) a designated 'manager' or 'champion' responsible for coordination and implementation;
  - (g) details of bicycle parking and bicycle routes;
  - (h) details of GTP funding and management responsibilities;
  - (i) the types of bicycle storage devices proposed to be used for employee and visitor spaces (i.e. hanging or floor mounted spaces);
  - (j) the types of lockers proposed within the change-room facilities, with at least 50% of lockers providing hanging storage space;
  - (k) security arrangements to access the employee bicycle storage spaces;
  - (l) signage and wayfinding information for bicycle facilities and pedestrians pursuant to Australian Standard AS2890.3;
  - (m) reference to a minimum 40A single phase electrical sub circuit should be installed to the car park areas for 'EV readiness'; and
  - (n) provisions for the Green Travel Plan to be updated not less than every 5 years.

43. The provisions, recommendations and requirements of the endorsed Green Travel Plan must be implemented and complied with to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

Lighting

44. Before the building is occupied, or by such later date as approved in writing by the Responsible Authority, external lighting capable of illuminating access to the pedestrian and vehicular entrances and internal laneway must be provided on the subject site. Lighting must be:

- (a) located;
- (b) directed;
- (c) shielded; and
- (d) of limited intensity

to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

General

45. Finished floor levels shown on the endorsed plans must not be altered or modified without the prior written consent of the Responsible Authority.
46. As part of the ongoing progress and development of the site, Jackson Clements Burrows Architects, or an architectural firm to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be engaged to:
- (a) oversee design and construction of the development; and
  - (b) ensure the design quality and appearance of the development is realised as shown in the endorsed plans or otherwise to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
47. Before the building is occupied, any wall located on a boundary facing public property must be treated with a graffiti proof finish to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
48. Before the building is occupied, or by such later date as approved in writing by the Responsible Authority, all new on-boundary walls must be cleaned and finished to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
49. All buildings and works must be maintained in good order and appearance to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
50. Before the development is occupied, or by such later date as approved in writing by the Responsible Authority, all screening and other measures to prevent overlooking as shown on the endorsed plans must be installed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. Once installed the screening and other measures must be maintained to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
51. All pipes, fixtures, fittings and vents servicing any building on the land must be concealed in service ducts or otherwise hidden from view to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
52. The amenity of the area must not be detrimentally affected by the use or development, including through:
- (a) the transport of materials, goods or commodities to or from land;
  - (b) the appearance of any buildings, works or materials;
  - (c) the emission of noise, artificial light, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, vapour, steam, soot, ash, dust, waste water, waste products, grit or oil, or
  - (d) the presence of vermin.

to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

### Construction Management

53. Before the use and development commences, a Construction Management Plan to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the plan will be endorsed and will form part of this permit. The plan must provide for:
- (a) a pre-conditions survey (dilapidation report) of the land and all adjacent Council roads frontages and nearby road infrastructure;
  - (b) works necessary to protect road and other infrastructure;
  - (c) remediation of any damage to road and other infrastructure;
  - (d) containment of dust, dirt and mud within the land and method and frequency of clean up procedures to prevent the accumulation of dust, dirt and mud outside the land,
  - (e) facilities for vehicle washing, which must be located on the land;
  - (f) the location of loading zones, site sheds, materials, cranes and crane/hoisting zones, gantries and any other construction related items or equipment to be located in any street;
  - (g) site security;
  - (h) management of any environmental hazards including, but not limited to,:
    - (i) contaminated soil;
    - (ii) materials and waste;
    - (iii) dust;
    - (iv) stormwater contamination from run-off and wash-waters;
    - (v) sediment from the land on roads;
    - (vi) washing of concrete trucks and other vehicles and machinery; and
    - (vii) spillage from refuelling cranes and other vehicles and machinery;
  - (i) the construction program;
  - (j) preferred arrangements for trucks delivering to the land, including delivery and unloading points and expected duration and frequency;
  - (k) parking facilities for construction workers;
  - (l) measures to ensure that all work on the land will be carried out in accordance with the Construction Management Plan;
  - (m) an outline of requests to occupy public footpaths or roads, or anticipated disruptions to local services;
  - (n) an emergency contact that is available for 24 hours per day for residents and the Responsible Authority in the event of relevant queries or problems experienced;
  - (o) the provision of a traffic management plan to comply with provisions of AS 1742.3-2002 Manual of uniform traffic control devices - Part 3: Traffic control devices for works on roads;
  - (p) a Noise and Vibration Management Plan showing methods to minimise noise and vibration impacts on nearby properties and to demonstrate compliance with Noise Control Guideline 12 for Construction (Publication 1254) as issued by the Environment Protection Authority in October 2008. The Noise and Vibration Management Plan must be prepared to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

In preparing the Noise and Vibration Management Plan, consideration must be given to:

- (i) using lower noise work practice and equipment;
  - (ii) the suitability of the land for the use of an electric crane;
  - (iii) silencing all mechanical plant by the best practical means using current technology;
  - (iv) fitting pneumatic tools with an effective silencer;
  - (v) other relevant considerations; and
- (q) any site-specific requirements.

During the construction:

- (r) any stormwater discharged into the stormwater drainage system must be in compliance with Environment Protection Authority guidelines;
- (s) stormwater drainage system protection measures must be installed as required to ensure that no solid waste, sediment, sand, soil, clay or stones from the land enters the stormwater drainage system;
- (t) vehicle borne material must not accumulate on the roads abutting the land;
- (u) the cleaning of machinery and equipment must take place on the land and not on adjacent footpaths or roads; and
- (v) all litter (including items such as cement bags, food packaging and plastic strapping) must be disposed of responsibly.

#### Construction Times

54. Except with the prior written consent of the Responsible Authority, demolition or construction works must not be carried out:
- (a) Monday-Friday (excluding public holidays) before 7 am or after 6 pm;
  - (b) Saturdays and public holidays (other than ANZAC Day, Christmas Day and Good Friday) before 9 am or after 3 pm; or
  - (c) Sundays, ANZAC Day, Christmas Day and Good Friday at any time.

#### Time expiry

55. This permit will expire if:

- (a) The development is not commenced within two years of the date of this permit;
- (b) The development is not completed within four years of the date of this permit; and
- (c) The dwelling use and sale of liquor is not commenced within five years of the date of this permit.

56. The Responsible Authority may extend the periods referred to if a request is made in writing before the permit expires or within six months afterwards for commencement or within twelve months afterwards for completion.

Notes:

A building permit maybe required before development is commenced. Please contact Council's Building Services on 9205 5095 to confirm.

A vehicle crossing permit is required for the construction of the vehicle crossing(s). Please contact Council's Construction Management Branch on 9205 5585 for further information.

Provision must be made for drainage of the site to a legal point of discharge. Please contact Council's Building Services on 9205 5585 for further information.

Only roof runoff, surface water and clean groundwater seepage from above the water table can be discharged into Council drains.

Council will not permit clean groundwater from below the groundwater table to be discharged into Council's drainage system. Basements that extend into the groundwater table must be waterproofed/tanked.

Areas must be provided inside the property line and adjacent to the footpath to accommodate pits and meters. No private pits, valves or meters on Council property will be accepted.

**All future employees or residents within the development approved under this permit will not be permitted to obtain employee or resident visitor parking permits.**

Any services poles, structures or pits that interfere with the proposal must be adjusted, removed or relocated at the Permit Holder's expense after seeking approval from the relevant authority.

The Permit Holder/developer is responsible for the management and protection of their building from groundwater.

No parking restriction signs or line-marked on-street parking bays are to be removed, adjusted, changed or relocated without approval or authorisation from Council's Parking Management unit and Construction Management branch.

Any on-street parking reinstated as a result of development works must be approved by Council's Parking Management unit.

The removal of any kerbside parking sensors and any reinstatement of parking sensors will require the Permit Holder to pay Council the cost of each parking sensor taken out from the kerb/footpath.

The developer needs to ensure that the building has adequate clearances from overhead power cables, transformers, substations or any other electrical assets where applicable. Energy Safe Victoria has published an information brochure, Building design near powerlines, which can be obtained from their website:

<http://www.esv.vic.gov.au/About-ESV/Reports-and-publications/Brochures-stickers-and-DVDs>

These premises will be required to comply with the Food Act 1984. The use must not commence until registration, or other approval, has been granted by Council's Health Protection Unit.

*Councillor Nguyen arrived to the meeting at 7.23pm*

*A number of submissions were lodged ahead of the meeting by members of the public, and were provided to all Councillor ahead of the meeting. The Mayor tabled the submissions and asked that they be included in the minutes of the meeting.*

Submissions

Name	Submission
Hazel Porter Fitzroy North	<p>In these uncertain times it is more important than ever to be mindful of how the built environment influences the wellbeing of all people; residents and visitors alike. The evolution of development in Fitzroy North effects how we live together as a community and we need local developments that are appropriate and future focussed. As an architect I am passionate about the design and delivery of successful spaces and places that have positive and lasting impacts on all aspects of daily life. The built environment has direct and measurable impact upon living standards; community connections; economic and business health; environmental and micro-climate diversity; social cohesion; inclusion and our sense of belonging. Best Street deserves an appropriate development that appreciates what is located next door, comprehends what is across the road, acknowledges what is down the street, and responds appropriately. An appropriate development is successful because it has qualities that resonate with all of us, regardless of taste or style. These are quantifiable qualities that consider humans first and foremost. Unfortunately, the Piedimontes proposal does not demonstrate these qualities enough. Piedimontes is not presenting as a 'good neighbour' and we will all suffer for it, now and into the future. The overall bulk and scale has not been revised to make any significant difference to the development proposal, in fact in part, it has been increased. The proposal is still too big, inappropriate and unacceptable. The development proposal compromises amenity for everyone, impacting significantly on the neighbourhood and it's future viability</p>
Chela Niall Fitzroy North	<p>Please do not approve this. Seven storeys is out of proportion with the surrounding area. This is a prime site for apartments but the current proposal is too big and will dominate the village (or prove the thin edge of the wedge for attempts to build other over scale buildings and risk turning our lovely local shops into a replica of the terribly overcrowded, overshadowed intersections along Brunswick Road which are now deeply unpleasant places both aesthetically and experientially. Further, the quality of the proposed apartments is poor with a number of key failures even to meet the low bar of the better apartment design guidelines (ESD, minimum space requirements). There is absolutely no excuse for poor design on a site such as this which is effectively a blank slate: it is a product of greed and laziness and should not be rewarded with a permit.</p>
Olivia Hamilton North Fitzroy	<p>I believe 7 levels is inconsistent with the surrounding neighbourhood. I also think the quality of the designs I have seen so far are substandard and will not age well - similar to developments on Lygon St where the overall character is devalued by cheap and shoddy and oversized buildings. I support Council's recent decision on Queens Parade as this site is also a Neighbourhood Activity Centre, or maximum of 4 levels in line with McGauran's independent report commissioned by Yarra Council.</p>
Ann Robinson Fitzroy	<p>I object to the proposed size of the building. It is totally out of keeping with the atmosphere of the surrounding area and it would dominate and overpower other buildings and result in a loss of sense of harmony and community which are important factors in the village atmosphere of north Fitzroy.</p>
Joanna Lawrence Fitzroy North	<p>I do not believe this area has the appropriate amenities to accommodate a dwelling of this size. Particular issues with transport, schools, parking, community spaces - all of which are already at capacity. At the moment, we often struggle to park our family car on the nearby streets, and the park is so full there is little room for children to kick balls freely. Trams are packed. The school already has kids in classrooms that are inadequate for the number of children and need to use the park for play space. I have serious concerns about bringing such a large number of people into an area</p>

	that is already at capacity. If this goes ahead it needs to be accompanied by a council plan to improve on street parking for residents (more permit only areas), plan for more community spaces (?where) and more public transport
Steven Theunissen Fitzroy North	Please reject the piedimontes development proposal as it will destroy North Fitzroy village. The scale of the proposed development is far too large for its surroundings, it will destroy the village feel of the area as well as its heritage value. This project needs to be scaled down dramatically and cannot extend itself over public laneways. As councillors, your role is to protect local areas from developments such as this one. This development has no place in a small village such as North Fitzroy village.
Rens Tuit Fitzroy North	Concerns: Scale of the development & Urban environment quality The development remains too large. A structure under 5 stories would be less impactful, respectful to its surroundings, key for a desirable urban environment. Ask councillors to reconsider their decision, request development is reduced in scale to something sympathetic with its environment. The development sets a terrible precedent for future developments in the area, it will be impossible to argue against them if this development moves forward. Urge councillors to consider the follow-on implications of approving a development at this scale. The development at its current scale will restrict sunlight, introduce noise, and reduce privacy to a number of dwellings in the vicinity, reducing their liveability and appeal, and therefore their value – reducing the height/footprint will reduce this impact to a tolerable level. Strongly suggest councillors to better consider the immediate loss of quality in the immediate environment. Communal spaces are key, a large communal outdoor space (rooftop) is a feature detrimental to the surrounding environment (noise) and very unnecessary with having Edinburgh Gardens is a 2-minute walk away, and it can readily cope with an increase in visitors. Request councillors do not approve any rooftop space. The concluding remarks of the McGauran Report appear to have been ignored. As proposed, this building is detrimental to the charm of Fitzroy North. Fitzroy North Library is built to a scale that is considerate of the environment. Suggest councillors to consider this is a sensible benchmark for developments in this area.
Garry Morris Fitzroy North	First Thank you for hearing my objection. Fitzroy North is and has been a beautiful quiet suburb. My objections to this project are. The increased traffic It will bring. The increased congestion of people it will bring. The Planned height Is not in keeping with the heritage atmosphere of the area. More rented apartments, not needed in the area. The overall planned building is against a large portion of the local community. I am not against the total planned building but please reduce the height.
Daniel Capper North Fitzroy	I am happy for Piedimonte's to be updated, however, my concerns are around the proposed exterior design as we saw in a previous council meeting. I'd like a design that respects the area and reflects the heritage of North Fitzroy. I'm also concerned that the building will eradicate a lot of the local independent stores, which will cancel out retail diversity in the area. Lastly, I would want to ensure that the mix of apartments in the building would not be a majority of one-bedroom apartments, as car spaces are not required to be provided for one-bedroom apartments, and parking in the area is already difficult as is.
Rachel Polivka North Fitzroy	I think that an update to Piedimonte's can be a positive thing, however, I do have concerns that the building would squash a lot of the small independent retailers in the neighbouring buildings (or that will need to be knocked down for works to commence). I love North Fitzroy Village for its local charm; it's very much a place where you get to know the owners and workers of the stores, and I frequent these shops, such as Best St Store, the chemist and Billy Van Ice Cream, because I want to support my local businesses. If I wanted cheaper items I would shop at another suburb. I believe a lot of North Fitzroy residents think this way; quality and substance over cheap and nasty. My other concern regards parking. It is already difficult to find parking in the area; I live walking distance from Piedimonte's. Though I have a residential parking permit, I sometimes need to park a few blocks from home (a minor inconvenience, perhaps, but I would certainly not want this to be exacerbated). From what I saw of previous plans, there would be a lot of one-bedroom apartments, which would not legally require a car space. I fully support an updated building that ensures parking for both residents and shoppers was contained. I'd also like to reiterate the idea of timed parking so commuters couldn't park there in order to catch the tram into the city. Finally, I would like the exterior to be respectfully designed.

Alix Jackson North Fitzroy	This build will be a blight on an otherwise, untouched piece of inner city history. There is no need, no demand and no want from the local community for this build to be developed. It is unnecessary, will permanently cast shadow on all the shops on the other side of the street and destroy any privacy that anyone has in the surrounding blocks. As an community we have supported Piedmonte's, in return he is destroying our beautiful little community. This will not add value to any of the surrounding properties. This is the wrong decision to let this go through.
Graeme and Margaret Merrick Fitzroy North	We wish to object to the Piedimonte proposal on the following grounds: The proposal is inappropriate in our Heritage area. In particular, the proposed height will impose excessively and detract from the Village streetscape. There is no precedent in the area for a 7 level building. This increased height would significantly reduce skyscape in the adjoining streets and extended shading will darken the surrounding area. Finally the proposal would exacerbate the already congested street traffic and parking facility.
Carol Bate North Fitzroy	The proposed development is not in keeping with the heritage and village scale of the area. A building of more than 7 stories will have a negative impact on amenity and not align with the surrounding architecture. I have lived in North Fitzroy for more than 30 years and believe such a development does not fit with the suburbs character, culture or amenity that residents value in this fantastic locale. Council needs to listen to residents views and respectfully consider these views in not endorsing the proposed development.
Maria Nguyen Fitzroy North	I am expressing my concerns regarding the development of a 7+ level building at the Piedimonte's Supermarket site, which is likely to cause the following impacts: traffic congestion, out of character, obstructing views, and creating shadows or glare. The intersection of Best/ Scotchmer Street is already a high-traffic area, with a huge potential for vehicle/ pedestrian/ cyclist interaction, and this will be further exacerbated by the new development. Further, the proposed development will likely not 'fit in' with the aesthetic of the Fitzroy North neighbourhood and its character, as well as reducing the appearance of open space within the area.
Brett McDowall North Fitzroy	We reside [in] Fergie St, North Fitzroy and have unrestricted panoramic views back towards Melbourne CBD. My wife and I are concerned that these views are going to be significantly blocked should the Piedimonte's Development proposal be allowed to extent too high to 6 or 7+ levels. We are also concerned as to what will be seen on the rooftop of this new development and would like clarity as to what will be exposed and can be seen from 3/4 levels high (i.e. not just street level). Whilst we are not opposed to Urban Property Development (the Fitzroy Library being an excellent example) we do believe that North Fitzroy has a special "village" type vibe that should be maintained and we would like to see the Council representing our interests to maintain what we moved into the area for and what we believe this area represents by agreeing to a fair and reasonable Development that does not compromise our Community. An example of poor development that can now be seen close to us is at the corners of Lygon St and Brunswick Road, which sadly has now significantly affected the vibe and feel of the area. I would ask to please consider our resident opinions and let's not lose the integrity of our area.
Anita Xhafer Fitzroy North	I object to the overdevelopment proposal for the Piedimontes site. I think apart from the fact that it will be a total eyesore, I think it will change the very character of the neighbourhood that the developers are trying to cash in on. This sequence of events has happened in many areas of Melbourne where developers have had a free for all building ugly multi-story units for the sake of a fast buck ! Not only do the Piedimonte people want to build a multi storey monstrosity that will be a blight on the skyline, they want to have a bottle shop open from the early morning to late at night. The bottle shop combined with what will surely be a complex of airbnb's (given that these units will be mostly tiny and inappropriate for families) will turn the area into a big party time town. Then watch the crime rate go up as well. My big fear is that the very fabric of this community that has a unique village feel will be ruined forever - all just to make a few people even richer. Personally I think that idea is totally outrageous and unfair on the people and small businesses that have made this area so desirable in the first place. It's time to make a stand against unbridled and ugly developments that are becoming a blight on the Melbourne landscape.

Mervyn Collins Fitzroy North	I am utterly at a loss to understand how, to quote the Special Council meeting agenda pre-lockdown: 'the proposal (for Piedimonte's development) is considered to comply with the referred planning policy and should be supported' - albeit with some minor changes to the original design. Barely one of the key issues outlined in the agenda have been met or dealt with satisfactorily. In brief, there is at Point (a): no strategic justification for the project; (b) the area certainly does not need a 7 am to 11 pm liquor outlet - there is already a pub with drive-through bottle shop and a wine shop within 100 yards; (c) the 'built form and design' add nothing to the streetscape and go a fair way towards destroying it! And so on through points (d) to (j). The final point, (j) refers to 'objector concerns'. These have been voiced verbally at overflowing information evenings and submitted in writing - over 600 of them! And councillors can rest assured, if 600 took the trouble to write, then thousands more support their tenor. This groundswell of local opinion cannot and must not be ignored by Council - we are the people you represent. North Fitzroy is unique - an area to protect and be proud of. Let this Council not be complicit in destroying its uniqueness for the benefit of a rapacious supermarket owner. This is neither 'progress' nor beneficial to locals. Council must, in all conscience, vote against the redevelopment of the Piedimonte store
Kate Chester Fitzroy North	I object to the height of the building, this should only be three level - same as Queens Road development approval recently. There are many issues with increased congestion including dangerous pedestrian crossing around this area and a bottle shop with late opening hours potentially creating loitering.
Kathy Connolly Fitzroy North	I would like to oppose the height of the proposed Piedmont's development way too high for the area.
Amber Anderson Fitzroy North	I object to the development of Piedimontes. The height alone will detract from the village, feel, obstruct sunlight and unnecessarily build up an area appreciated for its heritage buildings unnecessarily. It will also put a huge burden on already strained traffic and parking infrastructure in the area for existing residents. The development has a reduced parking requirement, but will bring many new residents to the area without adequate facilities for their cars, visitors. Transport in the area is already incredibly crowded and the addition of this apartment block will make this pressure and congestion much worse.
Vena Bucholtz Fitzroy North	As a resident and home owner in Fitzroy North I wish to register my deep and sincere opposition to the proposed development of Piedimonte's supermarket. It is far too high and completely unsympathetic to our surrounding village. At most the redevelopment should be four stories and should not include commandeering of the public lane way. I want to support the supermarket but I also want to support the other local businesses who would be overshadowed by this frankly ugly and excessive proposed development . Please do not allow North Fitzroy to be ruined.
James Bate North Fitzroy	Do not allow this project to go ahead, it is not in keeping with the look of the area, the increased traffic is not suitable for the space and the community does not want it. Please, when doing your job as council, do what is right and represent the community. The community is overwhelmingly against this!
Elizabeth Attard Nth Fitzroy	Having lived in Barkly Street Nth Fitzroy for 35 years I am very unhappy with the plans submitted for the overdevelopment of the Piedimonte supermarket. The proposed 7 levels (or 6 approved by the planning dept) is much too high for our area and will destroy the relaxed lay back area which will result in a huge increase of people and activity here - the hustle bustle will be overwhelming and will rip apart any semblance of a community as we will be overrun with people and traffic. A building of such a great height will cause much overshadowing on the buildings across from it and the grass area in front. I strongly urge you to please reject this plan as it is far too high for this area and our community and is an unacceptable attempt for over development simply for the Piedimonte owners to line their pockets with the maximum amount of money. Please do not allow this greed to wreck our community. Three levels should be the maximum height.
Jeffrey Scott Fitzroy North	I have these concerns re this application.1. Height and Massing. Visually too high and too big and sets a poor precedent for future developments.2. Overshadowing of surrounding areas because to the height and bulk 3.Will make worse the existing traffic and parking problems 4. Will result in a detrimental change to the character

	and heritage value of the area. My view is that the Council should approve a 4 level development in line with the McGauran independent report commissioned by Yarra Council.
Anitra Rechner Fitzroy North	I object to a seven storey development at Piedimonte's. The village is heritage and a place for community. Seven stories is out of context and will destroy the ambience and character of the village. I understand the need for development and support a 3-4 storey development. I would also encourage council to ensure the development is future proof - well-designed with proper sound proofing and energy efficiency standards. Our climate is warming and we need to make sure our investments today will stand the test of time. We also need to make sure we are creating places people want to live and not future slums.
Markus Helsing Fitzroy North	I'm making this submission as the closest neighbour of Piedimonte's, we're living in ... Egremont Street, as well as an ardent defender and lover of the unbelievably beautiful current character, atmosphere, people and general vibe of the Fitzroy North Village. Overall - NO consideration by Piedimonte's in every aspect of this project Major Concerns are (besides many others): - Overall Bulk - strongly support FINRAG proposal of no more than 3 levels or max the McGauran report of max 4 levels. The current, second plans, are no better than the first lot as it has absolutely no consideration for the character of Fitzroy North Village and will set a very bad and dangerous precedent that slowly turns Fitzroy North into the 'trainwreck' that Richmond seems to be now. Also, it appears to be totally out of kilter with the Yarra Council Housing Strategy giving the Fitzroy North Village and area a 'incremental change area' rating - again not conducive to more than 3-4 levels. - Overshadowing - the current plans try to tell us all that a change from 2 1/2-3 levels to 7 levels has basically no major impact on overshadowing - this is absolute bullocks and plain wrong as well as insulting to any mature adult. We have solar panels currently and had plans to double them to become nearly energy-self-sufficient but were forced to halt that project due to the extreme uncertainty thrown at us by the selfish Piedimonte's project - again zero consideration.
Lisa Byrne North Fitzroy	There are three considerations which are the basis of the objection I submitted for this proposal: 1. Public Transport 2. Local Area Parking Facilities 3. Construction Height Public Transport There is a dependency on an uplift in Public Transport amenities given the reduced car parking within the proposed site. What is the appetite and commitment from Yarra Trams to increase the level of services of #11 Trams? These tram services are already crowded in peak times without the increase in expected demand from this development. The proposal documents a variation of the development requesting 126 car parks in place of the 326 statutory allowance for car parks Local Area Parking Facilities There needs to be permit parking introduced with alignment to a property rather than a generic 32 section for all surrounding areas which is policed. The patrons and residents of the proposed development site may well utilise this parking and existing residents lose access to existing street parking Construction Height The proposal is seeking a building of 7 stories. While there is no doubt that there is a need for an increased ability of the inner city to accommodate the growing Melbourne population, 7 stories is outside of and at significant odds of all surrounding buildings. An example of a multi storey construction with excellent form and style is the recent construction of North Fitzroy Library which is 4 stories ( <a href="http://www.buxtonconstruction.com.au/project/north-fitzroy-library/">http://www.buxtonconstruction.com.au/project/north-fitzroy-library/</a> )
Ann Shenfield North Fitzroy	I object to the Council Planning team's approval for the development of Piedimonte's supermarket in its latest iteration. I'm concerned about the bulk and height of the building, which still doesn't fit with the low-rise amenity of the area. I am dissatisfied that the Council Planning Department has ignored the independent urban design report that it commissioned, by Robert McGauran, which states: "The current form is almost twice the scale of recent other developments ...in the village ... is excessive bulk, scale and impact, becoming dominant in an area where the collection of village buildings is at the core of its charm" (pg. 8). Personally I walk and shop in this area a great deal and am seeking to protect it from becoming another soulless overdevelopment like those in Lygon St, East Brunswick. As elected Councillors, I hope that you take a stand to represent the community who are feeling very dissatisfied about this development.
Madeleine Yewers	Big concerns over parking in surrounding streets and the precedent this sets for all

Fitzroy	surrounding buildings on St George's Rd, changing the nature, history and community of the suburb
Glenn Morrison North Fitzroy	I am not against development. I am, however, objecting to the proposed Piedimontes development which is out of context in our North Fitzroy village and will destroy our unique Neighbourhood Activity Centre thus setting a dangerous precedent for future developments. The Piedimontes development should be only 3 stories high and be consistent with Council decision taken with respect to the Clifton Hill village development. The North Fitzroy library should be used as the benchmark for scale and tone of development in our village. The proposed development will amplify resident's existing stress with respect to traffic volume, rat running, parking and safety problems which already negatively impact the liveability of our residential neighbourhood. The recent Scotchmer precinct LAPM study clearly identified "The predominant concerns raised in the precinct were rat-running and truck traffic on local streets, pedestrian and bike rider safety, and new development". Of the 26 major issues raised by the community in the LAPM, all but two related to traffic volume/rat running/speed/truck volume/safety. The facts and data speak volumes about the problems. Brunswick St North is a clear example of existing traffic problems in a nearby residential street. As a long term resident I implore upon City of Yarra Councillors to vote against this development in its current form as it will negatively impact upon traffic volumes, rat running, safety and parking issues and detract from the current liveability of our neighbourhood. It also clearly does not fit with existing Council strategies related to Walking, Bike, Travel and Environment.
Jon Graham North Fitzroy	I urge the council to refuse Piedimontes' application to build a 7 storey building in the North Fitzroy Village. This development would dominate the village and is on a scale that is entirely incompatible with other recent developments in the immediate area. It would also be in marked contrast to the heritage character of the neighbourhood which is largely of one and two storey period buildings. Furthermore, it would be entirely inconsistent with the recent decision by council regarding the heritage shops in Queens parade and with the independent advice supplied to council by Professor McGauran. My other important concerns are significant overshadowing of properties in the east of Egremont street. no public housing included in the project. substantial reduction in the retail diversity of the village. If this project is agreed to in its current form the village will be substantially changed in ways that will never be able to be reversed, it is a crucial decision for the future of the area.
Bibi Gerner North Fitzroy	<p>1. I like the small scale character and 'village' vibe of the area which is essentially low rise. The proposed new development is out of character with the surroundings. Its height and bulk is excessive for an area characterised by small single or double story Victorian shop fronts.</p> <p>2. The library successfully strikes a balance between adding something new and of interest to the village precinct while maintaining the scale. The scale of the proposed development belongs elsewhere.</p> <p>3. I appreciate that a development including a residential component may be appropriate in the village, and have social benefits, but any new building must be appropriate in height and bulk, with setbacks that will break up the bulk of the building.</p> <p>4. Objective 17 and Strategies 17.1 and 17.2 of Clause 21.05 of the Yarra Planning Scheme are particularly relevant and outline parameters that must be applied to the assessment of this proposal.</p> <p>5. The proposal would not satisfy this strategy, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed levels (plus rooftop structures) exceed 5-6 stories. The proposed height is excessive having regard to the surroundings, including Council's new library building, which should be taken as the maximum height that is appropriate in the village.</li> <li>- The upper level setbacks are not significant.</li> <li>- The proposed architectural design would be a jarring element in the village and is not an example of excellence.</li> <li>- The scale and bulk of the building would detract rather than make a positive contribution to the public domain.</li> </ul>
Ann Taket Fitzroy North	I submit that the recommendation to allow development of six levels is not a residential use that can be considered complementary to the role and scale of the commercial centre (CO report para 142, page 36 of the agenda). it is far too large and dense. I note that the recommendation in the CO report is contrary to the advice to Council from urban design expert - Professor Robert McGauran (attachment 29) North Fitzroy Village should be protected from unsympathetic and inappropriate development so it can continue to serve its community as the heart of

	<p>the "20-minute neighbourhood" envisaged by state planning policy. The revised plans are deficient for a number of reasons: The height and massing is excessive for a neighbourhood heritage village, and out of scale with the current or preferred future neighbourhood character. The extent of shadowing created by the development The loss of independent retail spaces with their local businesses, including the chemist, this last representing the loss of an essential service within the village. The development includes a three level car-park, resulting in greatly increased vehicle traffic in a sensitive pedestrian and cycle thoroughfare. No affordable housing is envisaged within the plans. In summary, I consider that the application should only be approved subject to removal of the top 3 storeys, bringing it down to 4 storeys.</p>
Jenny Vaughan Fitzroy North	<p>I am a long-term resident of North Fitzroy and customer of Piedimontes. I acknowledge the need for all areas of Melbourne to respond to population increase, and accept the need for, and value of change. However, change can be a positive or negative contribution. The so-called 'progress' of the 1960's and 1970's led to the decimation of huge slabs of our beautiful city. Progress was all. Thoughtful consideration of how to sustain the unique character of each area was minimal. We are now facing similar challenges. North Fitzroy has largely retained its special character. Innovative, high quality design and building at a scale consistent with the neighbourhood can improve neighbourhood character. Consider the North Fitzroy library, which was built in a form and scale that adds to the neighbourhood. Please ensure local developments, and in particular this development almost opposite the library, share the vision shown for the library. To use Professor McGauran's words, this development would be "the dominant form and character of an area where the composite collection of village buildings is what lies at the core of its charm and collective contribution". An additional concern is the failure to include any affordable housing.</p>
Claire Phillips Fitzroy North	<p>I write to express my dismay that the proposed Piedmonte site development remains as inappropriate for the site as it was when first submitted and rejected by council in 2017. As a lay person, I cannot interpret the subtleties of the planning drawings in order to pick out particular details of concern. In essence this does not matter, as it is not specific details that concern me and my family. Rather it is the truly gigantic scale of the building, its impact on surrounding residents, the loss of the variety of small businesses that bring people to the area and the general insensitivity to the values of the Fitzroy North area. My family and I are strongly opposed to the modified submission and encourage the council to continue to work with the developers in a constructive manner with a view to reducing the overall scale. A very large building here will remove amenity, not enhance it for current and future residents alike.</p>
Max Affleck Northcote	<p>I strongly believe the development should be limited to 11metres (3-4 stories) in line with the recent decisions regarding the Queen's parade developments. Fitzroy Village is a village, just like Nicholson Village, Rathdowne Village, etc. 7 stories will impact this feel, reducing the appeal, and liveability of the village. It will also drastically affect nearby houses who will have sightlines ruined, whole properties shaded and overshadowed by a high-rise. Keep the development to 11 metres for fairness and to ensure the value of Fitzroy village.</p>
Carol Harvey Fitzroy North	<p>I am a Yarra resident living on Scotchmer Street. The current Piedmonte's proposal is still too high. I support 3 levels only, consistent with Council's recent decision on Queens Parade, as this Piedmonte's site is also a Neighbourhood Activity Centre. The design is too bulky and should have more setbacks that are physically and visually less imposing and intrusive. Taken together, these two features (excessive height and bulk) will result in this structure dominating all surrounding buildings. Linked with this, the overall design is not sympathetic to the village feel of this locale. This village feel is a valued part of the appeal and amenity of the area from my point of view as a resident on Scotchmer Street who regularly walks and shops in this area. The design is quite ordinary and uninspired – quite the opposite of the library which really shows how a reasonably large building in this locale can be sympathetically designed to enhance, rather than detract from, the local built environment. Finally, this proposal is not in keeping with some of the surrounding heritage and older properties and will therefore lead to a degradation of the physical amenity of our local neighbourhood.</p>
Sandra Scott	<p>I think it is too big and will have a bad visual impact in the area. It is important to</p>

Fitzroy North	keep our heritage of North Fitzroy. This is why we have bought into the area, why residents spend thousands renovating and up keeping their heritage homes. We should keep the village community that we have, it is what attracts people to the area and we will lose this by building larges structures. I know it is also important to move forward and this is why I would recommend that the building be 4 levels in line with McGauran's report commissioned by Yarra Council. I am a resident of 40 years and love the area and the visual impact is important to me.
Jeremy Welton Fitzroy North	The amended submission is still far in excess of an appropriate level of development for the Fitzroy North Village. A seven and even five story tower far exceeds permitted height limits, and is completely out of character for Fitzroy North. When considering it will sit adjacent to 120+ year old, two story heritage listed terrace houses, the proposal is even more inappropriate for the 19th century feel of the area. A development of this size is far in excess of nearby buildings and will a precedent for future developers to exploit in order to further erode the community feel of Fitzroy North. The number of dwellings, and increase in vehicles travelling on Scotchmer street will place undue strain on a neighbourhood street that is already busy and currently dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. The shortfall of 205 carparks out of total of 331 required by law will place extreme pressure on the existing number of carparks in the area, and should not be approved. The closure of the Laneway is unacceptable, and will adversely affect residents, particularly on Egremont St. The development should be rejected due to exceeding height limits, failing to adhere to heritage overlays, inappropriate levels of development in a predominantly residential area, adverse impact on vehicle traffic, adverse impact on the demand for on-street parking due to not providing enough car parking, and the reliance on a lane way closure. All of these are unacceptable in their own right, and combined, the application is overwhelmingly inappropriate.
Anastasios Tsatas Mount Waverley	I object to scale and size of this development as the owner of 16-18 Egremont St. We have concerns about the lane way closure along with this big ugly and overdeveloped mass that is being proposed. There is already inadequate parking in the area and the council ignores the residents' concerns. I would like to speak at the meeting to express my views. Shame on Council encouraging this type of development. Should council agree to close the lane way at Scotchmer St, they need to block it off from both Egremont St and Tranmere St. I am sick of complaining about the damage to our fence and light pole at the rear of 16 Egremont St. You have a responsibility to the ratepayers to stop sucking money from us and siding with ambitious developers.
Ross Martyn Fitzroy North	I object to the project for the following reasons. The height of the development ( Queens parade has a height limit of 3 levels ) is too high for the area. Increased traffic congestion from shoppers , residents and their visitors, then we need the area to become permit only car parking. The laneway should not be sold or closed off. Having the loading dock close to the car park entrance is dangerous. Having reversing trucks and cars entering and exiting the car park is asking for an accident to happen.
Sue Peirce Fitzroy Nth	I strongly urge the Council to refuse the permit in its current form. The size of the development compared with the other buildings in the locality will dominate rather than enhance. The current mix of small shops and supermarket will be further be lost. Most of the customers access this shopping centre as pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users- this contributes to the essence of 'village' as the competition with cars is minimal. The scale essentially retains the pre-car dominance elements. I hope the Council follows the advice of the McNamara report which identifies the factors important for me to ensure I remain a customer in this precinct.
Nicolas Barnard Fitzroy North	A building of this size is out of character with the area. The lack of affordable housing in the development is unacceptable, as are the three storeys of car parking, generating traffic that the surrounding roads are not equipped to take and creating risk in an area with heavy pedestrian, pram and bicycle use. The threat to local independent retail, including the pharmacy, is a concern. This development will irrevocably change the character of Fitzroy North village to its detriment. Please do not approve at this scale.
John Howarth	While the removal of one floor and the additional setback has improved the design

Fitzroy North	from a bulk and height, the design is still too overpowering and unsympathetic to the surroundings particularly at the Best St and Scotchmer St corner. The additional traffic and the removal of 205 car parking spaces (which are required under the Scheme) will result in unacceptable levels of traffic and too much pressure on local parking areas.
Martyn Brogan Fitzroy North	My concerns relate to three matters of PLN17/0618, two of which would be under consideration at the Council meeting on May 21st. My first concern relates to the proportions of the planned building. Six stories above ground level (originally seven) is disproportionately high for this area. No other buildings in this locale are of this height, nor of this scale. The planned building would destroy the relatively consistent skyline views and levels of this area. My second concern relates to the small number of planned car parking spaces for the expected increased number of shoppers, let alone the increased number of residents, visitors and other users of the building. Car parking spaces are at a premium at this supermarket even during these times of social distancing, isolation and 'staying at home' policies. More car parking for shoppers, residents, visitors and other users would need to be provided to avoid traffic chaos in this already busy area. My third concern relates to the proposed closure of the laneway between Scotchmer St and Tranmere St. My understanding is that this matter will be dealt with by Council at a later date. I look forward to expressing my concerns about this matter at that stage.
Dena Kahan North Fitzroy	The proposal is still too big and that it should be reduced to a maximum of 4 levels in line with McGauran's independent report, commissioned by the Council. The number of vehicles entering and exiting the building will cause extreme traffic delays on the busy through road of Scotchmer street. This will also interfere with the very busy pedestrian route of Scotchmer street, which is already impacted by deliveries to Piedimonte. It will particularly impact on elderly and disabled pedestrians. Visitors to the apartments will exacerbate the parking issues in the surrounding streets, where residents often have difficulty parking near their own homes. The height of the building will damage the heritage qualities of the area and create a dangerous precedent for more inappropriate development. It will overshadow existing residents, reducing the amenity of light and sunlight to solar systems. The development is just too big and not fit for this neighbourhood or this site.
Gwyneth Hill Fitzroy North	Firstly, the proposed development is too high. It is out of keeping with the surroundings and will change the character of the area. At present it is a village and we residents wish to maintain that character. Look at the recent Library building opposite Piedimonte's: it is of a height that matches the surroundings and maintains the ambience. Further, the increased vehicle numbers consequent upon such a large development will have a detrimental effect on the area. Secondly, part of the proposal involves closing over a public laneway. I object to the removal of any laneway and insist that all should be maintained as public space.
Susan Shedda Fitzroy North	The shops in this area hold a special place in Fitzroy North. Their character is determined by their low rise nature and the availability of many local traders. This development is not in keeping with the neighbourhood. As a resident of Fitzroy North of a decade now I treasure and value the conversations I have with other locals in these local shops. The proposed changes would fundamentally change the suburb and impact upon heritage of this neighbourhood.
Julian Silverman Fitzroy North	The development proposal for Piedimontes is inappropriate for the following reasons: *it will destroy local amenity, including heritage character and overlay *it is inconsistent with local height limits as indicated by McGauran's independent report *the traffic in and out of the two level car park will disrupt pedestrian traffic, cyclists and through traffic on Scotchmer street, which is already congested *overshadowing of local residents * visitors to the apartments will take up limited local parking for local residents who do not have onsite parking
john Dench North Fitzroy	My business on Scotchmer St may benefit from additional residences nearby. Bluntly, it may bring some new customers. However, I believe I will also lose a significant number of existing customers who shop in the village for the heritage and community feel of this precinct. North Fitzroy is special. Development on this most significant neighbourhood site should enhance the precinct, similar to the St Georges Rd library or the residences behind on Best St. They enhance the area. The

	<p>proposed development advances Piedmonte's and provides more rateable properties, but the cost will be paid by the community with inappropriate development permanently scarring the village, irrevocably diminishing amenity for locals and visitors. The consensus from my customers (locals and a significant number of non-locals who regularly visit my café and other traders) believe the existing plans are still transformative; the buildings have too much bulk for the streetscape. The number of floors needs to be reduced to safeguard the amenity of the neighbourhood and retain the village feel. In addition, these plans ought to be rejected for the shortfall of parking spaces: 331 required, 38% offered and no provision of car parks for unit visitors. Street parking in the area will be messy for small traders who will most certainly suffer yet another downturn along with life being made more uncomfortable for existing locals battling to access street car parks. Sometimes inappropriate street and building redevelopments can strip the essence of what gives local character and heart to neighbourhoods.</p>
<p>Robyn and Lucien Zalcman Nth Fitzroy</p>	<p>We oppose this application. The development is still too large in height and bulk. It is out of keeping with the surrounding streetscape. 7 shops will be lost ,it lacks retail diversity and takes away the feeling of a local village. No affordable housing is included . It will require the extensive demolition of a significant historical building.</p>
<p>Michael Oxer Fitzroy North</p>	<p>The presently existing triangulated precinct is a rare happenstance of old roadway layouts and allotment configurations. This has made possible a cluster of small scale and low profile buildings mainly for commercial purposes, tightly surrounded by residential uses, served by a major tram route, and with adjunct benefits of a primary school, library/community facilities, and next to one of Yarra's major parkland open spaces. This cluster of amenities and its social structures significance is critically dependant on the integrity of the physical built forms now in place. A major and out-of-scale new structure within the triangle would have a destructive impact on what now functions as a high value community and city asset. Make the wrong move now, and what is valued there could well never recover. Short term, given the size of the proposed building, this precinct would be deeply disrupted by a major construction process. The loss of the shopping services provided by the Piedimonte facility would cut down trade to other businesses and re-route many of the regular activities of the general public. Once done, such changes cannot be reversed and positive adaptations can never be assured. Having a stable physical environment into the next decade can of itself be a social and community benefit of deep and abiding significance.</p>
<p>Leigh Prendergast Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I would be deeply disappointed if this development is allowed to be built higher than three storeys (including any roof top gardens). As a close neighbour to Piedmontes, this development will have an impact on me due to the increased noise levels from the residents of the building (especially when they will be using their balconies or rooftop garden areas) and the increased vehicle traffic and the resultant congestion. It will also drastically impact the Heritage feel of this neighbourhood activity centre. It is such a beautiful streetscape with so much history and any development needs to be sympathetic to protecting and maintaining this feel. The proposed plan is excessive in its height and bulk and will negatively impact on the charming village and surrounding streets. I do support the need for more housing, especially in inner city suburban areas that are close to essential and required services. I would hope that this development provides for those needing housing support. When making your decision, please consider the long term impacts that your decision will have on this neighbourhood, as well as for future development in and around this area. We must protect these Heritage villages because once they have been developed, we will not get them back!</p>
<p>Lou Baxter Fitzroy North</p>	<p>Through objection-numbers and high meeting attendances, the community informed you how strongly they oppose this development. Many, enduring covid19, assume councillors remember the strong community opposition to the destruction of their local area but I am reminding you how the community hasn't changed its mind – opposition's still large and deeply felt. Without reiterating the reasons stated in earlier formal objections (built form, traffic, heritage issues etc.) please consider: Yarra's population density is extremely high – over double many other municipalities in Greater Melbourne. Exercising during lockdown in our open space areas displayed how crowded they were (social distancing was often difficult or impossible). Excessive development within the inner suburbs is destroying their entire character.</p>

	<p>Developments are only considered one at a time. Not enough deliberation is given to the overall effects of constantly adding excessively massive developments to an area as a whole (and 'affordable housing' is a meaningless PR phrase!). Moreover former plans include a public laneway - this shouldn't be granted to an unwanted development (yet many doubt council will 'do the right thing'). Local government exists so residents have a say over what happens to their neighbourhoods. Elected councillors are supposed to listen to residents but the inner suburbs risk becoming slums again, because of the continual decisions made to benefit developers not residents. I remind you of your responsibilities to allow citizens to maintain trust in governance and its processes a trust already lost by many. Please do your duty with honour and integrity.</p>
Vicky Westwood Fitzroy North	<p>I honestly believe that a 7 storey + building will ruin our beautiful heritage village . It will also be a terrible unfair Looming ugly overshadowing Building especially to the residents that live in Egremont St and there homes will drop in value. North Fitzroy Village is beautiful and unique please don't let it be spoilt!!</p>
Kathy Nidis Fitzroy north	<p>On behalf of the staff at Super Tasty Rooster, opposite Piedimontes store, and after constantly hearing customers views and objections to the approval of a 7 level extension of the building, we would also like to disapprove of the 7 levels, and we all agree that a maximum of 3 levels would be more appropriate and accepted by us and as I believe the neighbourhood living and working around this area.</p>
John Archer Fitzroy North	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed development of the Piedimonte supermarket and multiple surrounding heritage properties into a six story (plus plant rooms) apartment block. The proposal is totally out of scale with existing buildings, and would diminish the value and amenity of nearby properties. The new apartments would dramatically increase congestion, in an increasingly congested neighbourhood. In the recent ABC advertorial on the future of the Piedimonte supermarket, it was suggested that the motivation for the proposed development was to make it more financially attractive to the next generation of Piedimontes. If Piedimonte's need is to make their supermarket even more profitable, they could instead utilise their existing roof space to create a solar farm, thus greatly reducing or even eliminating their electricity bill. They could also sell their surrounding heritage properties to people more sympathetic to the special nature of the North Fitzroy village.</p>
Louis Roller Fitzroy North	<p>Respectfully wish to object to the Piedimonte's development as recommended by The Council Officer's report which recommends the development be approved at 6 storeys The recommendation of approval in the officer's report is subject to the removal of one floor - bringing the proposal down to 6 storeys (equivalent to 8 residential storeys). This is contrary to the advice to Council from one of the state's most eminent urban design expert - Professor Robert McGauran - who said: "The scales remained in my view grossly excessive for a compact village abutting as it does so directly with surrounding neighbourhood residential zone areas and sitting within a heritage zone. In this context new development as we have seen has been more modest in its ambition with 3 &amp; 4 level predominating. The main issues as we see them: The height and massing is excessive for a neighbourhood heritage village, and out of scale with the current or preferred future neighbourhood character. The loss of independent retail spaces with their local businesses, including the pharmacy (the pharmacy cannot be owned by Piedimontes). The proposed building will shadow the village park from early afternoon. The development includes a three level car-park, dumping more vehicle traffic into a sensitive pedestrian and cycle thoroughfare. No affordable housing. Loss of heritage We do support 3 levels consistent with Council's recent decision on Queens Parade (Queens Parade Amendment C231)</p>
Ernesto Arriagada Fitzroy North	<p>We definitely need greater residential density in inner Melbourne to accommodate a growing population, but this proposed development is too big for the North Fitzroy Village. The lower section of the resubmitted plans are more architecturally appealing and sensitive, however the overall impact is still too big for its location in this village of one and two storey homes, plus a small number of 3-4 storey buildings. The benchmark that should be referenced is the North Fitzroy Library. Its mass, design, materials and heritage sensitivity are what we should aspire to in the City of Yarra. This development needs to be less overbearing than proposed: No higher than 3-4 storeys the height of the North Fitzroy Library or Pinnacle Hotel No</p>

	overshadowing or loss of open "air space" to the surrounding streets, open public spaces, and residential and commercial neighbours. The laneway cannot be ceded to this development. In addition: on-premises parking must accommodate all resident and visitor parking. Council must not issue any resident or visitor on-street parking permits for this building. Adjoining streets' resident permit parking must be allocated to each specific property address and not to a generic "Area 32". Short-term on-street parking must be charged at market rates for non-permit residents or visitors and parking restrictions strictly enforced so that residents of this development don't take neighbours' parking. Services of number 11 and 96 trams must be increased to account for the additional load on public transport.
Heather Reva Sharp Fitzroy North	The proposed development is in the middle of a heritage overlay area. Scotchmer Street is a Local Collector street, but operates as an arterial road, already carrying 8,000vpd. As such it distributes traffic throughout North Fitzroy. Whatever happens on Scotchmer Street will be felt on adjoining streets: Best, Egremont, Birkenhead, Brunswick Street North, and Rae Street. In fact it will affect the whole of North Fitzroy, a unique heritage area. It is impossible to imagine the congestion 66 units would create at what is already a congested intersection -Scotchmer Street and St Georges Road. With regard to parking - Piedimonte has provided no parking spaces since the supermarket was open in 1951, and has expanded considerably over the years. Local surrounding streets are currently at saturation point with regard to parking. There is no available parking spaces. It is absurd to consider that there will be availability for any more parking. In fact, if you go out, on your return, your parking space has been taken by someone who does not have a permit, as it is the only available parking space. The statutory requirement is to provide 237 parks for shoppers. Piedimonte intends to provide 48. We need a study, a parking availability study.
David Chalmers Fitzroy North	The proposed development of the Piedimonte's supermarket site is unacceptable. The development: does not comply with the existing heritage guidelines, is too large in scale and will destroy the heritage character of the North Fitzroy Village and Brunswick St. provides poor amenity for the residents of the development and the wider North Fitzroy community and will set a benchmark example that will lead to further destruction of the character of Brunswick St/St Georges Rd and of the suburb. The council has a clear opportunity to provide leadership here. It must work to provide the best outcome for the Fitzroy community as a whole.
Susan Mahar Fitzroy North	I walk past oversized apartment blocks every day and wish we demanded more of developers. I wish we demanded they meet stringent environmental measures with appropriate orientation, green space and airflows. I wish we demanded a genuine mix of social housing. And I wish developers would respect our unique heritage precincts. The COVID-19 crisis has heightened awareness of our need for tranquil liveable spaces both indoors and outdoors, as well as a need to focus on community support. Another soulless oversized development with a minimum of outdoor space in the midst of a low rise neighbourhood village has no chance of building on community values of connection. It will add nothing. It is an assault on neighbourhood values as well as heritage. I hope councillors have had the chance to familiarize themselves with the current Scotchmer St delivery point for Piedimontes where shops, pedestrians, bike riders and through traffic are unbelievably impacted by delivery trucks as they circle surrounding streets or sit waiting, often on the wrong side of the road, and always blocking traffic. Scotchmer St is a narrow, two-way thoroughfare totally unsuited to trucking access. An expansion of the supermarket, as well as a three level underground carpark opening onto Scotchmer St, will increase the number of trucks, vans and customer and resident vehicles using this same narrow thoroughfare. This is not the place for a development of this size. I urge councillors to reject this proposal.
Janet Nicholds Fitzroy North	I ask council to reject the proposed development. This poorly designed development threatens the liveability of the area in many ways. The proposed building is not in keeping with neighbourhood character. Its height and bulk is overwhelming in an area where the biggest existing buildings are 4 stories, including plant. There is a wide variety of architecture with many interesting buildings including the recently constructed modern library in this eclectic area. The proposed development is not high quality and does not compliment or enhance the character of the neighbourhood. Car entry and exit arrangements for residents and supermarket

	<p>customers are inadequate and will exacerbate the already unacceptable traffic and pedestrian holdups on Scotchmer St caused by supermarket deliveries. Traffic on Scotchmer St will be disrupted by excessive numbers of vehicles leaving and entering the development because of the very large numbers of apartments planned. Fewer better quality residences would lessen this and be in keeping with neighbourhood character. Many people currently access the supermarket by bicycle and as bicycle riding is popular in North Fitzroy residents of the development are also likely to be bike riders. The proposal does not provide the short and long term bicycle storage with suitable street access needed by shoppers and residents of the proposed apartments. In summary the lack of quality in architecture, the inappropriate height and bulk of the proposed building and its negative impact on the character and amenity of the area mean the amended proposal should be rejected.</p>
Diana Carroll Fitzroy North	<p>Social distancing should not limit democracy. Unlimited words and 5 minutes speech (about 650 words) has now been reduced to 250 words! In short, I urge the Councillors to not accept the Officer's erroneous report. The proposed 7 storey development will kill the North Fitzroy village that we have loved for decades. The proposed development is too large, too bulky and is not in keeping with the existing neighbourhood character. The North Fitzroy village deserves the same protections as Queens Parade. I urge you to refuse this proposal.</p>
Linda Woo Fitzroy North	<p>I urge Councillors to refuse this proposal. The Officer's recommendation of 24 metres is far too high! This will have the effect of "killing" the North Fitzroy village. The proposed development is simply too large and too bulky and is not respectful of the existing neighbourhood. The North Fitzroy village deserves the same protections as Queens Parade. I urge you to refuse this proposal.</p>
David Nicholds Fitzroy North	<p>I am a resident of Fitzroy North with a particular interest in place-making and retaining the general character of the shopping precinct in which Piedimonte's supermarket is located. This development proposal will have a significant impact on the precinct due to its size, style and the traffic issues it will generate. The Local Area Place Making study for Scotchmer-North Fitzroy, which was conducted from early 2018, consistently identified traffic issues around Piedimonte's as a significant problem, notably the difficulty for pedestrians on Scotchmer St due to the volume of delivery vehicles accessing the lane and particular issues in Scotchmer St related to the Piedimonte's owned semi-trailer. This large, heavy vehicle uses Park St and Birkenhead St for access to the area so that it can drive on to the east bound lane of Scotchmer St and then back in to the lane behind the supermarket. The proposal does not address this issue, perhaps by banning the use of semi-trailers in the precinct, and proposes multi-level underground car parks which will generate significant traffic volumes across the busy Scotchmer St footpath. Reduction of the scale of the development through reducing the number of levels and increasing the size of the remaining apartments would reduce this problem. The scale of the development, even as recommended by officers, and the design treatment is out of keeping with the surrounding buildings and it seems likely that traffic and pedestrian safety issues will be worse than present. I urge councillors to reject the proposal.</p>
Bojana Tester North Fitzroy	<p>I object on the following issues with this proposed development: The height and massing is excessive for a neighbourhood heritage village, and out of scale with the current or preferred future neighbourhood character. The loss of independent retail spaces with their local businesses, including the chemist. The proposed building will shadow the village park from early afternoon. The development includes a three level car-park, dumping more vehicle traffic into a sensitive pedestrian and cycle thoroughfare. No affordable housing.</p>
Fred Purcell Fitzroy North	<p>It is astonishing how little effort the developer has done to address the well-known truck unloading issues, reflecting a lack of consultation and naivety of community concern. They sadly believe the solution to the problems is to acquire the lane, enabling Piedimonte's to at least claim that unloading is performed on their property. The plans have one truck every 40 minutes dangerously reversing from the opposite side of the road, holding up traffic during peak hours and risking pedestrians. As McGauren says "Despite the proposed site amalgamation, loading, storage... remain confused and disjointed." The proximity of the loading bay to the heritage facade on the west ensures that trucks need to reverse from the opposite side of Scotchmer Street. If the laneway was retained and developers located the unloading facility to its</p>

	<p>east, trucks could reverse into the loading bay from the south (same) side of Scotchmer street. The lane would offer an extra 3.1m to sweep around whilst minimising the blindspots for pedestrians. It would allow residents to reclaim their lane and support City of Yarra planning scheme objectives to protect laneway heritage. The developers do not explore this option as they want to maximise their supermarket floorspace by taking public land under the misrepresentation of solving the truck issues. Council's decision will define the truck traffic legacy of Fitzroy North for the next 30 years. Please don't be responsible for the next 30 years of unsafe practices and community frustration and have this historic problem is addressed.</p>
Robbie Leslie Thornbury	<p>I spend a lot of my time shopping, catching up friends for meals &amp; using community spaces in this village &amp; its surrounds. I feel the proposed plan has sucked the life , culture &amp; community feel that I know &amp; love. It doesn't include any space for other local businesses. It's such an eye sore and is way too high for the space in the village. This huge building looks over the neighbourhood and doesn't blend into the heritage of this beautiful area of Nth Fitzroy. With housing affordability out of reach I don't see any social housing in this development which is incredible in these times. There hasn't been feedback taken on from the community from the meetings that were had with Piedmont's. Please do not let this beautiful rare village be overtaken by this eyesore . Lower the height and make sure the design is sympathetic to its surroundings &amp; neighbourhood dwellings.</p>
Jill Ingram North Fitzroy	<p>The development is too big and will shade park opposite. Will destroy our neighbourhood village. Will attract more traffic to the area</p>
Richard Cade Fitzroy North	<p>Thank you for the opportunity of commenting put simply the proposed complex is far too bulky and too high for a village; it would dwarf all the surrounding small residences in the neighbourhood and thus is totally out of character</p>
Claire Weigall Fitzroy North	<p>The developers have proposed to redirect a public laneway into Egremont Street. The motivations of offering a 6metre wide laneway, twice that of all other lanes, must be questioned. Their justification to allow for vehicle passing is pathetic, and the adverse impacts will be significant. By allocating 6m to a thoroughfare, the developer will pull down an extra 3m of a heritage facade, and further reduce the depth on the already shallow ground level retail shops, further hurting Scotchmer street activation. A 6metre laneway will also not have the same heritage character of the laneway that they seek to acquire and given the history of Piedimontes using public laneways for unloading, it should be assumed that they will one day use the extra width for trucks unloading. I would also like to raise my concern with the plans to acquire a public laneway and replace it with their loading bay. There are no clear reasons as to why the developers can't use only their own land for the development. The advantages of keeping the public laneway are significant, and includes as the McGuaren report identifies, some separation to avoid the bulk massing impact of the development. It also supports the City of Yarra planning scheme to protect laneways and promote their use. As a community resident, the laneways are symbolic of the neighbourhood character and heritage. The council must not approve plans that endorses the handing over of public land without thoroughly reviewing the necessity of it.</p>
Kate Silvagni Carlton North	<p>My main objection with the proposed development is the change it will bring to North Fitzroy Village. As a former resident of Nth Fitzroy for a period of 16 years, and a frequent shopper, the attraction of the village lies in its small scale charm. The heritage feel of North Fitzroy Village would be lost with Piedimonte's proposed large scale development. It would also set a precedence for further erosion of the village charm and appeal. As our elected councillors I urge you to listen to the electorate and act accordingly. The loss of the heritage feel of the Village is irreplaceable.</p>
Cas Stingel Clifton Hill	<p>I support the community objection to the Piedemonte redevelopment. The proposed plan height is not aesthetically in keeping with the corresponding area of heritage shops and houses. There are simply far too many building projects already completed and being currently undertaken relating to inner suburban Melbourne, adding to the already saturated and over population of such a beautiful area</p>
Ohnmar John Fitzroy North	<p>I wish to register my objections to the Piedmontes Redevelopment Plan. The Plan's proposed height, as well as Council's recommendation of 24 metres, are both egregiously excessive in the context of a high value heritage neighbourhood activity</p>

	<p>centre within a residential area. At these heights, the building will shadow the village park from early afternoon, not to mention create a significant visual disruption uncharacteristic of a heritage area. Furthermore, the scale of the development threatens the viability of the independent retailers in the village that comprise its unique character and will result in the loss of others, including a long-standing essential service, namely the chemist. Finally, the three-level carpark will result in increased vehicular traffic in an already congested area that is also used by many pedestrians and cyclists. The nature of the proposed development is inconsistent with (i) the principles of the City of Yarra's Housing Strategy, which includes increasing the supply of affordable housing and well-designed internal and outdoor communal spaces in new development and (l) the principles of the City of Yarra's Strategic Transport Statement of promoting sustainable transport. I urge Council to reject the application.</p>
Penelope Stray Fitzroy	<p>This development is too big for the surrounding scale. It will open the floodgates for other big buildings as we all know will happen. It should be no higher than the existing height in the immediate street scape, match the height of the converted factory development of some years ago across the street near the library. It will overshadow and overlook its neighbours. Don't wreck this charming village, enhance it with tasteful development that doesn't overwhelm the existing integrity that is the gem of North Fitzroy.</p>
Frances Wheelahan Fitzroy north	<p>The height and massing is excessive for a neighbourhood heritage village, and out of scale with the current or preferred future neighbourhood character.</p>
Lily Chalmers Fitzroy North	<p>The current proposal for the redevelopment of Piedemonte's should not be supported by Yarra Council for the following reasons: - The development is large is too big. It is more than double the height of heritage buildings in the area. This will greatly diminish the heritage character of the neighbour, and surrounding buildings. - The heritage character of the neighbourhood will be affected by the facadeism of the development, which sees nothing but the front wall of historically significant building maintained. - There will be a loss in the amenity of the area. The North Fitzroy village is an important asset to the suburb as it contains not only a supermarket, but a variety of local business including a chemist, gift stores and an ice-cream shop. A number of these services will be lost in this redevelopment, to the loss of the local community who rely on them.</p>
Peter Enright North Melbourne	<p>The proposed development is just too big. It dwarfs current housing in the area and will pave the way for other inappropriately large developments which will destroy the unique heritage character of this lovely suburb.</p>
Robert Niall Fitzroy North	<p>Quite simply, the Piedimonte redevelopment is too tall. Not slightly too tall, but massively too tall. It is totally inconsistent with its surroundings. Additionally, it will inevitably set a precedent that every subsequent development in the immediate area will feel obliged to exceed. It should be cut back to no more than two-thirds of its presently proposed height. Please deny permission to this monstrosity.</p>
Lucille Wirtz Bourdel Fitzroy	<p>I am very unhappy about this proposed development for the following reasons: - The height and massing is excessive for a neighbourhood heritage village, and out of scale with the current or preferred future neighbourhood character. - The loss of independent retail spaces with their local businesses, including the chemist. - The proposed building will shadow the village park from early afternoon. - The development includes a three level car-park, dumping more vehicle traffic into a sensitive pedestrian and cycle thoroughfare. - No affordable housing.</p>
Rista Doherty North Fitzroy	<p>The proposed development is totally out of keeping with the building height in the area. It will impose itself on the landscape rather than offering a creative, low-key, architecturally aesthetic building. Change is inevitable but this is not the route to take. This wilful imposition on North Fitzroy comes from a greedy company/owner who objected to Barkly Square, Brunswick, being built because it would adversely affect its business in North Fitzroy! Why is it that businesses always seem to win over the community? Why should this development go ahead when so many residents have objected to it. Where is the democracy in that?</p>
Annette Tepper	<p>The Piedemonte's proposed development is still too big. It will dominate the very</p>

North Fitzroy	compact village of Fitzroy North and ruin the heritage aspects of the village. The loss of the heritage buildings on Scotchmer and Egremont Streets whilst retaining facades is not consistent with the heritage overlay of this area which surely must be to protect and preserve the old buildings and not have 'mock' buildings in their place. The development also will create total chaos around increased traffic on Scotchmer street with the propose access to the underground parking being there, which along with being ugly from a street view point of view it will also be very dangerous for the many pedestrians who use Scotchmer Street let alone the cars that will be pouring in and out of the place. Along similar lines the extension of the bottle shop hours from 7am seems quite irresponsible and unnecessary. There are plenty of hours in the day to purchase alcohol already. I urge you to reject this proposal as it in no way has addressed the concerns around heritage protection, adequate traffic management and pedestrian safety in this compact shopping village.
Sue Kokonis North Fitzroy	In comparison to the surrounding buildings, the proposed 6 storey building (equivalent to 8 residential storeys), is excessively large and out of character for this small heritage streetscape and will reduce sunlight over the village park. The plan will also reduce the diversity of small businesses which have formed the successful fabric of a thriving retail precinct and increase the traffic into the already heavily utilised surrounding streets and intersection. Allowing such a large development will undermine the liveability of the village precinct. I support development of a smaller scale development up to 3 storeys which would enable Piedimontes to develop while preserving the character of the precinct.
Melissa Marino Fitzroy North	I am asking you to please reject the proposed redevelopment of Pledemonte's in Best Street, North Fitzroy. I have lived in North Fitzroy all my life and the height of the proposed redevelopment is far too big and excessive for a neighbourhood heritage village. It will change the character of the neighbourhood and overwhelm the surrounding heritage buildings, ruining the unique charm of the village. A three or four storey development is far more appropriate. I am also concerned about the loss of independent space and local businesses including the pharmacist who is familiar with locals and provides an invaluable personal service to residents. The proposed three level car park is also deeply concerning to me, causing increased traffic, and increased risk to cyclists and pedestrians who populate the area and who contribute to its village-like feel. There is also no provision for affordable housing, which has been a proud feature of North Fitzroy for decades and which I believe should be part of every proposed development as an essential community asset. Finally, we have always prided ourselves that North Fitzroy is like a country town in the middle of the city. It's what makes it such a desirable and wonderful place to live and I am deeply concerned that if the development goes ahead as proposed, it will ruin the charm and character of the neighbourhood forever.
William Toppin Fitzroy North	Why do Councils keep ignore the wishes of the local residents? Scale and size are completely inappropriate for a small urban shopping centre. Why is development seen as necessarily good and resistance to change "bad?" We live here - most of you don't. We need to protect our independent businesses, especially now. Scotchmer/St Georges can be very difficult at times - don't make it worse for those of us who live around here.
Paul Lewis Fitzroy North	I am a long term resident of North Fitzroy having grown up here and now having rented in the area for a many years. I have been shopping at Piedemonte's Supermarket my whole life. It's not a stretch to say that despite its vital community function the building itself is an eye-sore and represents a poor urban design outcome for one of Yarra's most charming NACs. From a planning perspective, the project has clear merits, specifically: - Providing housing density in an area well serviced by transport, access to local services, employment opportunities and public open space. - Providing a better resolved urban design outcome to activate the streetscape. While the proposal is certainly a more intense built form proposition than what is currently present, the stepping down from the corner, fine grained materiality, and generally attractive architecture make it in appropriate fit. Council's officers clearly support the proposal (albeit with a level removed) indicating that it conforms with Council's carefully considered and consulted on policy and built form guidance for the location. It would be extremely disappointing for the Councillors to therefore reject the proposal based on pressure from a vocal segment of the community. It is critical for Council to stay the course and support the provision of

	well-designed and diverse housing options to allow those (like myself) who wish to buy and continue living in the area to do so.
Diane Morgan Fitzroy North	The reports attached to the agenda are comprehensive, and in principle, I agree with the recommendations of the independent consultants report. However, keeping it brief. I strongly object to the current proposal given it still shows disregard for the feedback already provided by the community. Most importantly:- Neighbourhood character - the design is inconsistent with neighbourhood character - it will significantly change the character of the village - we don't need a large supermarket in this village - it will set a precedent for the rest of the village Commercial diversity - it will decrease the commercial diversity currently in the village - it is the ONLY thriving shopping precinct in North Fitzroy - why destroy this!! - the impact of the construction period alone will impact commercial and residential living. it is just too big Traffic volumes and car parking - we constantly hear Yarra's principles around reducing car traffic and increasing public transport; cycling and pedestrian traffic - this proposal is totally inconsistent with that principle - the streets surrounding the village are begging for relief from traffic now. Why are we even discussing adding to this pressure and creating a 'car haven' in an underground carpark.
Ursula Groves North Fitzroy	This corner still has a real village feel with heritage qualities which is welcoming to all. With a building on the enormous scale envisaged in this submission, this atmosphere will be totally destroyed, making it just like many other recently altered corners in the area. There is an opportunity to retain, for future generations, a unique piece of Melbourne's long history on this site with a development on a much more modest scale than what is proposed. As a local resident I fear the lack of amenity that will result from this development, reducing this corner from a 'lively village' to a drive-in take away type outlet like so many others. I am strongly opposed to a development of this type on this site.
Angela Perry North Fitzroy	These closures, in particular the median strips at Holden and Miller will be blockers for the community at large including local residents and mums. The measures will favour only a few streets and limited residents. It will push traffic onto the main junctions on St Georges Road and Nicholson street and with the major works on Nicholson street already creating blockages, this is a growing issue which will undoubtedly worsen with the Brunswick Village apartments being occupied. Both the apartment block and the reduction in the Nicholson street lanes have been decisions at council. This decision should take into account those other factors and the impact that this will have to the traffic in this area. The situation is already being policed by the timing restrictions and this additional measure is disproportionate to the problem. It also sets a poor precedent that a few streets can pressure for closures, if this were to happen across the area it would cause gridlock on certain streets at certain times. The amount of traffic on the streets that are asking for closures is comparative or lower than that in other areas, such as Miller Street and May street which have large flows at school times, there is no justification for a specific median strip on these roads.
Susie May North Fitzroy	As a North Fitzroy resident for 29 years I would like to oppose the current plan for Piedimontes on the following grounds: 1) The proposed 6 storeys will dramatically change the existing village atmosphere in terms of scale and architectural design, both of which will destroy the current harmony between buildings existing in this heritage zone. A development of this sort should be undertaken by architects with a proven track record of creating buildings in the North Fitzroy area that combine innovation and style whilst simultaneously evoking a sensitivity to the heritage environment. The North Fitzroy Library is a perfect example. 2) It would appear that since the outbreak of Covid-19 residents are making more use of their local shops, a trend that will continue in the uncertain times ahead. We cannot afford to lose the local shops that will close as a result of the proposed development. 3) It is irresponsible as we experience the effects of climate change to allow a 3 level car park which will generate more traffic and emissions in an already increasingly crowded area. 4) More dense housing developments cannot occur without increasing amounts of green space. Edinburgh Gardens is already struggling to cope with the hundreds of people who visit the park at week-ends and public holidays. This not only shows the importance of creating more parkland but also represents a health hazard as social distancing becomes part of everyday life.

<p>Marianne Van Leeuwen Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I have lived in Fitzroy North and shopped at Piedimontes for almost 40 years. I wish to reiterate my earlier objection and urge Councillors to reject this application. I acknowledge that the new plans are an improvement in that they do address some of the concerns raised by Council and residents such as waste collection, commercial deliveries, outdoor space and apartment design. However the plans before Council have not addressed the predominant concerns of most residents which relate to height. The height and massing is excessive and out of scale for a small neighbourhood heritage village.....one loved by all residents. A building of 5 and 7 storeys (actually the equivalent of 9 residential storeys) will dominate that part of St Georges Rd/Scotchmer Street and overwhelm the beautiful Library/Hub building. Piedimontes and the Library/Hub are the two pillars of this village and should balance each other. If seven stories are approved, they may set a precedent for the three adjacent corners and result in an intersection resembling Lygon St/Brunswick Road, destroying the village character. I also object to the loss of a number of independent shops including the chemist and the lack of affordable housing. I urge you to listen to the community and reject this application.</p>
<p>Tracy Poynton Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I ask that Council refuse the redevelopment proposal for the St George's Road Piedimontes site. The height and bulk of the proposed building is vastly out of scale with the rest of the shopping village and undermines past efforts to sensitively develop sites such as the Bargoonga Nganjin library site. The consequent overshadowing of the St Georges Road precinct and neighbouring properties to the north west were the redevelopment to be permitted is also a serious concern. As a former resident of Egremont St I am well aware how limited daylight will be for residents who properties abut the Piedimontes site if the development goes ahead. Increased traffic flows are also worrying. Overall, I believe that too much is being asked of the site with too little attention to the impact on residents and the long term consequences of such a redevelopment.</p>
<p>Michael Gronow Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I live at [a property in] Bennett Street North Fitzroy, which is a few blocks away, and regularly shop at Piedemonte's and the surrounding shops in Best Street, St Georges Road, Scotchmer Street and surrounding area. I support the proposed development. I believe it is important to create more affordable housing in inner Melbourne. This development is on an appropriate site near the intersection of two main roads, in a commercial area and close to public transport (tram and bus). I don't think it is appropriate for local residents once they have purchased their own homes in inner suburbs like North Fitzroy selfishly to block developments that will permit others to live in the area at an affordable price. Things might be different if the immediate surrounding area were wholly residential but that is not the case. The proposed development is not too high for the immediate surrounding area, and will not disadvantage adjacent local residents in detached or semidetached housing, because there are none. If affordable medium density and multi-level housing development is not permitted on main roads near public transport and shops and restaurants, where is it to be permitted? Having more residents in the immediate area will assist the development of interesting and desirable shops, bars, cafes and restaurants in the North Fitzroy Village area by providing more patrons to support these local businesses.</p>
<p>Annette Oppenheim Fitzroy North</p>	<p>Piedimonte's proposal will destroy the village atmosphere by taking away much of the area's charm and neighbourhood character. It is a gross overdevelopment of the site and its height &amp; bulk will cause actual and visual overshadowing of the nearby heritage areas. The subsuming of other business sites in the plan will take away community services. If the development requires a three storey car park then this is at odds with what is integral to the needs of an area which contains more human scale buildings. If this plan was approved then this would become a precedent for the other future developments at the intersection which would result in a high-rise wasteland devoid of any charm or convenience. Professor McGauran's advice should be taken up by the council and a development of 3 to 4 levels would be more in keeping with the local area. As a Fitzroy North homeowner I am opposed to this current plan and ask that the Council reject it and require a submission of a plan that is more in keeping with its location.</p>
<p>Prue Gill North Carlton</p>	<p>The Piedimontes plan is an example of the very sort of urban architecture we should be moving away from. It is too high, too big, without the charm we could see in a</p>

	<p>more sensitive development. The character of this corner of North Fitzroy is dictated by the beautiful new library and the Victorian building a former hotel on the northern edge. Each building is angled and looks inwards to a rather intimate space. The Piedimontes plan makes no reference to the character or heritage of the old Fitzroy north buildings, it interrupts the space between the two lovely buildings in an aggressive way, dominating the open space and taking from the sense of village which has developed in recent years in this precinct. And why a carpark when we want to encourage public transport, cycle or travel by foot. Yarra council has given permit to some travesties of apartment blocks, take those on the corner of Reid and Nicholson St for example. This is a building the council should be ashamed of. I urge you not to make another mistake with Piedimontes. I have shopped there since 1970 when I moved into North Fitzroy. I will not darken their door if the development goes ahead as currently planned.</p>
Andrew White Fitzroy north	<p>Fitzroy and Fitzroy north are special places because of their lack of such tall buildings. Don't turn us into Moreland city council / Brunswick for short term financial gain.</p>
Angela Munro Carlton North	<p>I wish to endorse verbatim the critique of eminent architect, Professor Rob McGauran, on the proposed development, notably its excessive bulk and height (even as recommended by officers), with inevitable domino effect in threatening adjacent commercial, heritage protected stock. YCC is to be commended for the imaginative design of the nearby N Fitzroy Library complementing the community-focused retail precinct itself threatened by multiple loss of small shops in the development. The over-provision of car parking is at odds with excellent public transport and the post pandemic consensus in favour of enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access, consistent with government commitment to 10 minute walking from home to shops. The proposal represents an outdated model of retail development and urban design and should be rejected.</p>
Debbie Hay Fitzroy North	<p>The planned proposal for the Piedimontes apartments are too big, too huge, too tall and too massive. A scaled down version of 3 - 4 storeys would be in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and setting in a heritage area. We do not want our streets full of ten plus story apartments. The building will be too dominant losing the charm of living in North Fitzroy. It will overshadow the village park. We are all looking for the northern light and warmth in winter and it will be gone with a huge building overpowering this community area. There will be no affordable housing offered to those in need to support the underprivileged people living in our community. In England it is a prerequisite to every development that a certain no of apartments are available for those needing low cost housing. We need to support this way of living and change our laws and be up to date with mixed community living. Please reconsider the height of this building to 3 - 4 stories and listen to how the community would like to see the street scape in our future.</p>
Margaret Goding Fitzroy North	<p>As a local resident, I have been a regular customer at Piedimontes for the last 40 years, and have much appreciated the friendly service, variety of products and usual ease of parking outside. While accepting appropriate development of the Piedimontes site, I have been shocked to see the proposal for a massive and monolithic 7 storey building, totally out of keeping with the surrounding streetscape of North Fitzroy Village. Losing retail businesses, particularly the Pharmacy, adjacent to the current building, reduces neighbourhood amenity. Three storeys of car-parking will increase congestion in St.Georges Road. I do recognise the need to increase residential density in Fitzroy North, however an additional 66 apartments with no affordable housing is unacceptable. I urge councillors to reject this application.</p>
Geoff Poynter Fitzroy North	<p>The proposal is excessive. I have lived in Fitzroy North for 35 years and shopped weekly at Piedimontes, had my medical prescriptions dealt with by Evan and Betty Zapis's Pharmacy and regularly had coffee and/or lunch at Piccantes. The existing collection of buildings have a community feel to them and seem to me to be appropriate for the busy intersection. Whilst I understand the need for inner-Melbourne to increase its number of residences and I have no objection to a development of the Piedimontes site, I strongly endorse the advice to Council by Professor Robert McGauran and urge Council to re-consider its rejection of that advice by the Council officers.</p>

<p>Marion Marshall Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I am a business owner in Scotchmer Street and a home owner in Rae Street since 1991. Customers from my previous business of 22 years comment that on leaving my studio they can walk to bakeries, cafes, organic produce a chemist and supermarket without needing to access large car parks where shopping trolleys dent their cars and parking is only below ground. From my studio's large windows onto Scotchmer Street. I hold my breath as large produce trucks navigate the roundabout in front of me taking 3 tries to turn successfully, whilst families walk to the shops. As a house owner who had lived in an outer suburb I've embraced being part of a community, the school fetes, the fundraising and the belief we live in a very special village. I celebrated Clifton Hills 3 story height restriction and when I stand across the road from Piedmonte supermarket catching a view of the Library seeing how it enhances our village. I am terrified that a 7story development will ruin our sense of self. Throwing shadows on cafes whose outdoor space we treasure. Overwhelming our Victorian houses whose owners who were NOT given permission to impose new modern facades on the street scape by the same council which is now considering doing so in a prime location.</p>
<p>Linda Young Fitzroy North</p>	<p>It's just too big! I'm very alarmed not only by the massive bulk of this proposal, but by the implicit approval for much taller buildings whose development will inevitably follow. Yes, I understand that lots more people would like to enjoy life in Yarra's suburbs. But let's introduce them via 3 &amp; 4-storey developments that will not dominate, shade, and monopolise trade, on Brunswick Rd. And let's ensure that a solid percentage of affordable housing is included in every development.</p>
<p>Gail Thornthwaite Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I strongly object to the proposed Piedimonte's redevelopment within North Fitzroy Village. It would destroy the village's neighbourhood character and be out of keeping with the heritage precinct. I am also concerned that such a mammoth redevelopment would open the door to similar excessive structures on the other three corners of St. Georges Road and Scotchmer Street. I would not wish to see the demise of some local businesses, particularly the chemist, which the proposal would entail. The existing small businesses contribute significantly to the local character of the precinct. Apart from aesthetics, I am concerned about the impact which the large car park within the development would have on local traffic. Why is it necessary to provide car parking spaces when there is a tram route in St. Georges Road, another five minutes' away in Nicholson Street, and a bus route in Scotchmer Street/St. Georges Road? Surely everything should be done to discourage more vehicle traffic, especially in an area which carries so much pedestrian and cycle traffic. The proposed redevelopment would be more appropriate to built form on a major arterial road or as part of a shopping centre. North Fitzroy Village is just that - a village. I would not want to see it subsumed by over-development.</p>
<p>Andrew Millis North Fitzroy</p>	<p>The main issues as I see them: 1. The height and massing is excessive for a neighbourhood heritage village, and out of scale with the current or preferred future neighbourhood character. 2. The loss of independent retail spaces with their local businesses, including the chemist. 3. The proposed building will shadow the village park from early afternoon. 4. The development includes a three level car-park, dumping more vehicle traffic into a sensitive pedestrian and cycle thoroughfare.</p>
<p>Emily D'Cruz Fitzroy North</p>	<p>We live in North Fitzroy and use the North Fitzroy village including shopping at Piedimonte's each week. We do not support the revised plans of a part five, part seven storey (plus three basement levels and a roof terrace) mixed use building on the site of Piedimonte's. We find it still too big and bulky for the area and we are concerned that it doesn't address customer parking adequately.</p>
<p>Clare Morton North Fitzroy</p>	<p>As advised by the leading design expert Professor McGauren, the proposed development is grossly excessive. The scale of the development is out of scale with the neighbouring residential area, it is out of kilter with the heritage nature of the area and will completely dominate the lovely village atmosphere that us locals love. The development will also cast significant shadow including over the village park. I use the adjoining shops and walk through the area on a daily basis often meeting friends for coffee in the adjoining coffee shops. It will therefore detrimentally affect my quality of life.</p>
<p>George Douros Fitzroy North</p>	<p>The current proposal is not in keeping with the local environment - it is too large. 3-4 stories are far more fitting and will keep the village feel. No village has a 6 story,</p>

	block-sized behemoths shading them like a mountain. While the owner will be richer with it at that size, we will be poorer.
Melinda Barker North Fitzroy	I wish to lodge my objection to the Piedimonte's development. I have been a resident of north Fitzroy for 18 years and have significant concern for the impact this development will have on the North Fitzroy village. The proposed development is too large and the design will dominate and overshadow the village, compromising the neighbourhood character. I also have concerns with the loss of heritage and am saddened by the loss of small businesses that my family has supported for many years. My biggest concern is the increase in traffic and the likely congestion at the Scotchmer St intersection that is already overwhelmed at peak times. This will occur in parallel to a steady increase in traffic that has been occurring in the area over the past 5 years, with some small residential streets experiencing over 3000 cars daily. Finally, the lack of car parking will impact negatively on the already limited street parking in the surrounding streets.
Elizabeth Sime Fitzroy North	As a resident of Fitzroy North for 36 years, I strongly oppose the proposed Piedimonte's development. It is too high, too bulky. The village is already choked with traffic at peak times - the proposed development will bring many more vehicles in, making the area unliveable for pedestrians and cyclists, families, children, and dogs. The huge development will crowd out the small local businesses - the ones we locals rely on every day. It will block out the sky, and the sun. I have no objection to a 3 or even 4 story extension, so long as it is proportionate and adds to the beauty and character of the neighbourhood. I'd suggest larger apartments too - not shoe boxes for investors to rent. Please don't allow greed to ruin a neighbourhood. I have always trusted council to act for the greater social good. Fitzroy North is a wonderfully diverse, character filled precinct. Don't wreck that.
Deborah Astling Fitzroy North	The design of the proposed supermarket is not suitable for the size of the area and character of the village.
Pauline Drayton Fitzroy North	The height and massing is excessive for a neighbourhood heritage village, and out of scale with the current or preferred future neighbourhood character. The loss of independent retail spaces with their local businesses, including the chemist. Piedimonte's, over the years have swallowed up so many small businesses and have already adversely changed the character of the shopping centre. The proposed building will shadow the village park from early afternoon and more. The development includes a three level car-park, dumping more vehicle traffic into a sensitive pedestrian and cycle thoroughfare. Has this been really thought through? Imagine the disruption to those who live nearby, older residents who need to walk safely, the added noise and pollution. No affordable housing. What happened to the lane?
Barry Coley North Fitzroy	It was with considerable alarm that I learned that Yarra Council's Planning Team has recommended approving the Piedimonte's redevelopment with only minor changes that do not address community concerns about height and massing, heritage loss, inconsistency with neighbourhood character, exacerbation of traffic problems, and loss of commercial diversity. As a resident in Best St, I will be directly affected by the practical problems created by the increase in car, truck, and pedestrian traffic the massive increase in the size of this building entails. The Best St- Scotchmer St corner is already very busy and, at times dangerously clogged -- this 'development' will make it unusable for cars, cyclists and pedestrians. I find it hard to believe that such a decision could be reached -- did the Planning team actually visit the site and use their imaginations? This is an ugly construction that will bring only negative effects. Aside from the aesthetic, practical (and ultimately, economic) disadvantages that this decision entails, such an inappropriate scheme, if approved, looks like a deal stitched up between Business and Council, with local opinion excluded. That is not democracy.
Allison Kenwood Clifton Hill	I strongly oppose this development. The design is not in keeping with the area and will take away from the village feel. It is way too big and will overshadow and dominate an otherwise wonderful part of North Fitzroy. The loss of local and small traders is also worth noting as our community has always focused on buying and supporting small and local businesses. This development will destroy the sense of community and village feel of north Fitzroy that cannot be replicated.

Carla Alderuccio Fitzroy North	I have rented in North Fitzroy for several years and my parents own a house here, I also intend to buy in the area one day. My partner and I shop at Piedemonte's and in the North Fitzroy Village several times a week and catch the number 11 and tram every day. We very much consider the neighbourhood 'home'. The current Peidemonte's building is an eyesore and I welcome the owners rebuilding this local landmark to be more in keeping with the surrounding area and to provide much needed medium density housing in this inner city where we have ample access to high quality resources such as public transport, a library, parks and schools. I don't think the myriad lifestyle benefits offered by the North Fitzroy area should be reserved for the fortunate few and I personally welcome this new development. The latest design is also significantly superior to some other developments that have been allowed to be built in the area, such as the monstrosity on the corner of Nicholson and Reid Streets. I would much prefer more considered designs such as what Peidemontes have put forward (after a much needed second iteration).
Susan Penhall Fitzroy North	I respectfully wish to reiterate the gist of my email sent to Councillors on 21/3/2020, regarding my growing sense of outrage, apropos the potential loss of the North Fitzroy Pharmacy. Present plans for development of Piedimonte's site do not appear to take into account the ruination of a perfectly viable and essential adjoining small business. The lives of the proprietors ... are at present in limbo, before any actual physical demolition, excavation and rebuilding take place. There is also, by now huge perplexity over the Pharmacy's future amongst the Zapris's customers; all are local, many being your rate payers. The intended siting of the replacement Chemist shop is not in the least helpful, nor easily accessible. A street frontage is generally regarded as absolutely necessary for such an indispensable enterprise. An added insult is that the proposition as planned, will turn the heart of our so-called Village into Yarra's very own Clochemerle. I leave others more knowledgeable to comment on the actual structure of the proposed edifice. Please refresh your collective memory of the gamut of points raised in my original email; this is an extremely sensitive issue. I ask that you to regard it as such.
Alice Mooney Fitzroy North	The community of Fitzroy North, day in and day out help to maintain this area. We shop here, eat here, walk, garden and participate. While I understand that developments happen and change is inevitable, those whom have invested their time and love into this community and its surroundings will very quickly see it deteriorate from the increase in population, pollution, overcrowding and opposing social priorities. They as well as myself, fear being pushed out of the place we have called and created our home. We should be developing all that we can to keep our community here long term and to take care of one another. Giving way to the increased height of living will see further high-rise developments taint the charm of this historical area and so, create a loss of interest in its heritage listed homes as they fade into the shadows. Unfortunately, if this development goes ahead, yet again more generations of lower socio-economic groups will be forced further away from our city while gentrification dissolves culture and community.
Catherine Harper Fitzroy North	The Fitzroy North village is a compact village in a heritage zone. To maintain the heritage zone any new development must be consistent in size and architecture. The Piedemotes application is an excessive height and size for the village and the surrounding neighbourhood residential zone areas and is inconsistent with the heritage zone. Should this go ahead it will set a precedent for the area which will destroy its historical and cultural value.
Susan Martin North Fitzroy	I accept that planning in the inner suburbs should be towards increased housing density. However, any development should be mindful of the existing character and heritage streetscapes of the area. The proposed Piedimontes development shows excessive height and bulk. It would project far above the existing heritage facades and would dominate and change the character of the North Fitzroy Village in St Georges Road. If implemented the development would set an undesirable precedent for height of buildings in the area. A height of 3 storeys along the street frontages, increasing to 4 storeys in the middle of the development would, in my opinion, be acceptable.
Liz Conor North Fitzroy	This development will spoil the village/hamlet feel of North Fitzroy. It is too high and will set a precedent for the other corners. Instead of being a vibrant hub central to the village, we'll end up with a soulless dead corner like that of Nicholson and Holden.

	I've based myself around this lovely corner for 37 years. If it goes ahead we've decided to sell up and move. It won't be home anymore.
Grace Darken Fitzroy North	I am 28 years old and have lived in Fitzroy North for over four years (some of that time in an apartment) and I regularly shop in Piedemontes. I vehemently object to the plans proposed for the Piedemontes redevelopment. I strongly believe that anything more than two levels of apartments above the supermarket would be heavily impede on the abundant natural light on the streets below, it would also significantly impact the historical look and feel that the Fitzroy North shopping strip holds. I feel this proposed development is greedy in size and would irrevocably change the whole neighbourhood, I would be extremely saddened and unsupportive if this development was to go ahead with these proposed plans. Whilst I acknowledge that the neighbourhood will change and be developed over time it should be done so in a way that maintains the best visual and tangible aspects of the neighbourhood that we enjoy and love today. These plans are domineering and will ruin the entire feel of Fitzroy North.
Simon Evans Fitzroy North	I am a long term resident of North Fitzroy The Officers Report was drafted prior to Covid-19 outbreak and does not consider the changes that may be required in our planning system for the following reasons:- Consideration of density of dwellings - anecdotal evidence of Australia and New Zealand's low population densities being one reason for our success in mitigating Covid-19 The balancing of density and the provision for people to isolate and be socially distant Co-location of residential dwellings in high traffic retail areas - safe distance between entries. Residents won't want to be riding in lifts or touching shared surfaces as much, at least in the short term. This uncertainty will impact the on design of common area Small footprint living will be tested and means that many high-density interior layouts might not be ideal. We might need more private, enclosed spaces within dwellings Importance of medical services being readily available - this application removes the existing chemist from its current location with no certainty of its return. Supermarket layouts will need to be adjusted, to account for the safety of staff and customer I raise these issues, without knowing the answers, but suggest that Councillors should take a view, that the Precautionary Principle should be applied, to prevent long term harm, especially in this time of uncertainty The above, and noting my previous objections lodged, leads me to seek that the Councillors reject the Application for a Planning Permit.
Anne Horrigan-Dixon North Fitzroy	I object to this development -it will destroy the most successful village in Yarra. The N. Fitzroy Village is the vibrant heart for this community. It's been my shopping centre for 40 years. It has everything we need. Its charm is its low rise heritage shops and businesses which are always busy. The village is the meeting hub of the whole community enhanced by Bargoonga Nganjin. It's the centre of the 20 minute neighbourhood for N.Fitzroy community- walking, riding or public transport- so is essential for the future sustainability of this community. There is an expected large growth in population from developments in surrounding areas. It must retain the variety of heritage shops for the commercial viability of the future which will be lost in this development. The development removes many commercial properties destroying the future capacity of this shopping precinct-new shops being small. Piedemonte's Supermarket has been a greatly loved with is friendly staff but it is part of a vibrant mix of businesses. The development will overwhelm the neighbourhood as it is too high and too large - the introduction of a massive monolithic bulk in a heritage strip under the heritage overlay. This development is out of keeping with this heritage village which is in fine grained, low rise heritage neighbourhoods. It does not comply with Yarra Heritage policies- Lovell Chen Report. The proposal includes substantial demolition of a number of contributory heritage buildings, and individually significant heritage building. It doesn't respect the heritage of this area.
Simon Hobbs Fitzroy North	I strongly object to the Piedimonte's development as it currently stands, despite being supportive of the idea of Piedimontes development in general. I exhort the Council to listen to the voice of the Fitzroy north community in rejecting the current proposal. In particular, the primary grounds of my objection is that the development is too big, and too dominating, to be in keeping with the spirit of the neighbourhood. The impacts of increased foot and vehicle traffic, increased demands on parking (which have not been adequately addressed, even in the revised proposal), increased visual bulk and overshadowing - all will have a disproportionate and negative impact on the life of

	<p>local residents. Please, listen to the voice of the residents, and do not allow Piedimontes to damage the fabric of life in Fitzroy north via this inappropriate development. To do so would be an irreversible mistake.</p>
<p>Lee Ewing Fitzroy North</p>	<p>Piedimontes is the hub of our neighbourhood, it is where we walk to do our shopping and a much valued part of our local community. A development of 7 storeys with rooftop infrastructure further adding to the bulk on this site would completely dwarf the surrounding streetscape and destroy individually significant heritage buildings in an area within the current Heritage Overlay, hence not complying with Yarra's heritage policies. A height reduction should be mandatory. Removal of 7 shops is not retaining the retail diversity of shops we currently value within our 20 Minute Neighbourhood. It was concerning to learn that the consultant's report for City of Yarra from Anthemion Consultancies approving previous assessments had not included a site visit!</p>
<p>Glen McCallum (Protect Fitzroy North Inc.) Fitzroy North</p>	<p>Submission on PLN17-0618 (Piedimontes) planning application for Protect Fitzroy North Inc. Advocating for refusal due to reconfiguration required being unconditionable. Yarra engaged Professor Robert McGauran for urban design referrals throughout application's life. His findings were specific and detailed, including: - At a height equivalent to 9 residential storeys, the proposed height of 27+ metres is almost double the height of other buildings in the neighbourhood, plus the bulk and massing is at odds with neighbourhood character, therefore.. - Remove two storeys from the 'main' (east) building facing Best St, and .. - Delete central built form to create a "break" in the building better suiting the fine-grained heritage neighbourhood character and provide better daylight amenity to apartments. Recommendations ignored by the applicant and very partially addressed in the officers' report (single floor reduction and no mid-block "break" in that main building), in what was called a "compromise" position. It's not stated what this "compromise" relates to, or why a "compromise" is needed. Consider the nearby "Moonlight" VCAT case: - Much less sensitive location outside neighbourhood village - Not under heritage overlay - Tribunal stated near-doubling of height compared to highest neighbours was an unacceptable response - Reduced height from 40m to 30m. The McGauran changes - including the "break": - reflect Yarra's own strategic guidance in heritage NACs - would likely be endorsed by VCAT as the minimum acceptable planning outcome in this heritage neighbourhood. 250 word limit prevents covering other issues.</p>
<p>Mark Landy North Fitzroy</p>	<p>My wife, Julie Ahern, and I have been long-time residents of North Fitzroy. North Fitzroy Village is our local shopping strip. It is called a 'village' for good reason. What makes it attractive is its distinctive, low level streetscape with local shops that reflect the character of our community. Certainly Piedmontes is a part of the village, but the proposed redevelopment will forever ruin what continues to be a human-scale shopping strip. The development will dominate our heritage shopping centre and turn it into something more like a large-scale commercial precinct. In addition, we oppose the development for the following reasons: The height and massing is excessive for a neighbourhood heritage village, and out of scale with the current or preferred future neighbourhood character. The loss of independent retail spaces with their local businesses, including the chemist. The proposed building will shadow the village park from early afternoon. The development includes a three level car-park, dumping more vehicle traffic into a sensitive pedestrian and cycle thoroughfare. We urge the Council to reject this proposal.</p>
<p>Anna Middleton Fitzroy North</p>	<p>At 27m, the proposed development is manifestly excessive in bulk, scale and impact to the surrounding heritage and small-scale residential area. The proposal is more than double the height of the heritage buildings in the village, and twice the scale of other recent nearby developments. Existing local residential homes will be dwarfed in comparison. The proposed development is not consistent with the Council's own Heritage policies, nor is the balance of benefit in the community's favour. I would be supportive of a development of three (but not exceeding four) storeys in height, consistent with Council's recent decision on Queens Parade (another identified Neighbourhood Activity Centre of high heritage value) and the McGauran independent report. High value Heritage Neighbourhood Activity Centres are intrinsic to the culture and the history of Yarra and Melbourne. Plan Melbourne 2017-2050 makes this clear, and is supported by Council's recent Queen's Parade decision. Yarra's heritage neighbourhood areas are worthy of being protected for our</p>

	<p>community and our future, making mandatory height limits appropriate (such as that nominated for the heritage shops area of Clifton Hill). No evidence of apartment shortfall in Fitzroy North has been presented to justify a development of this scale in this culturally significant area. The hundreds of objectors to this project have been clear “ we are imploring our Council to preserve the heritage and the heart of our neighbourhood, which have not been protected by the Planning Officer recommendation.</p>
Denise Charman North Fitzroy	<p>The proposed development is excessive in both height and width. The neighbouring streets will be in shadow and some will not have the eastern sun. The number of apartments and insufficient parking will put undue pressure on an area that already has a paucity of parking. Developers argue that tenants (mostly) will not have cars but this is usually found to be a false premise. And these tenants have visitors. The area will become quite clogged. Also the proposal includes part of an important laneway. That laneway is important to neighbours and for the utilities and should not be given over to developers who are far too ambitious for this development. It is not in keeping with the neighbouring heights and the social and cultural aspects in the surrounding area. I cannot think of a more poorly conceived proposal that offends. The local streets are already prone to accidents with the corner of St George's Road and Scotchmer Street a real safety hazard for pedestrians, cyclists and cars. To accept a proposal that will increase substantially the movement in the area is foolhardy. I implore the committee and the council to rule in favour of community benefit and not developer ambition.</p>
Deb Keys Fitzroy North	<p>I am writing to express my concern regarding the Yarra Council Planning Team recommendation that Piedimonte's recent planning application be approved. The Planning Team's recommended reduction of one level will not address the numerous concerns raised by the community and the council commissioned reports supplied by Robert McGauran. While fully supportive of increased housing in the area, new developments should offer net community benefit. In my view, this development will have a significantly negative effect on the Fitzroy North village and the community. Most notably, as the third report City of Yarra commissioned from Robert McGauran stated 'The scales remain in my view grossly excessive for a compact village abutting as it does so directly with surrounding neighbourhood residential zone areas and sitting within a heritage zone'. City of Yarra's Framework for Urban Design in Yarra shows Piedimonte as part of a Neighbourhood Activity Centre with the design intent listed as 'Built form in scale with the neighbourhood'. In no way can this design be described as in scale with the neighbourhood. It looms over the nearby streets, dominating the fine grain residential neighbourhood. If Piedimonte's development goes ahead at six levels, we will be landed with an incongruous landmark building that dominates our compact village and fails to provide a net community benefit. Council recently and commendably voted for a mandatory 3-storey limit in Queens Parade, a shopping strip in the same heritage overlay. I urge you to reject the current proposal.</p>
Tracey Anderton North Fitzroy	<p>I urge the council to refuse this application. The proposed development is not in character with the local heritage area. There are no multiple storey buildings in our area, there are kept to major roads. Scotchmer St and Best St are local streets with high pedestrian use. The multi-storey development with loading bays, multilevel parking, apartments, cafe, bar/bottle shop, is not wanted by the community that live here. We love and live in a low density village - this will absolutely destroy our community! Piedemontes has not revised and reduced size of proposed development, and this is a cash grab for profit in a community that objects and does not want it. The streets cannot accommodate the trucks, traffic that this development would bring. This will destroy our village, and devastate the community.</p>
Narelle Stegehuis Nth Fitzroy	<p>I oppose building height and apartment ratio. Overcrowded spaces with poor ventilation and natural airflow. Airflow of building including air conditioning flows into communal space including that of retail spaces and food produce significant risk of infection to both residents and community "COVID-19 ... droplet transmission was prompted by air-conditioned ventilation" <a href="https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/7/20-0764_article#r2">https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/7/20-0764_article#r2</a>. No improvement in public infrastructure to accommodate density living including increased risk of infection while traveling on public transport, inadequate "green space" <a href="https://www.thefifthestate.com.au/articles/where-does-covid-19-leave-high-density-living/">https://www.thefifthestate.com.au/articles/where-does-covid-19-leave-high-density-living/</a> - increasing risk of public health concerns such as</p>

	<p>infection, isolation and transmission during infection and pandemics. Considerable long term risk to both residents, supermarket shoppers, retail traders and local community including aging and marginalized populations. Has council considered harm prevention models that require developers, Piedimontes, owners and businesses to take all reasonably practicable steps to minimise risks of harm to human health and the environment? Request health and community impact report to outline liability to increased exposure of risk to surrounding workforce with regards to health and safety.</p>
Elda Colagrande Fitzroy North	<p>Living directly opposite this development I call on the council to reject the application. Its height and mass will significantly diminish my quality of life and have a net negative benefit to the community. The very limited setbacks mean there are significant oversight risks of my property as well as sound and shadowing impacts (all my windows and doors front the development). The development's 9 levels and density is totally inconsistent with the adjoining area which maximum of 3 levels. Council is asked to reject the application as it does not comply with its own planning frameworks e.g. the precinct is zoned for 'incremental development' - a property 3 times higher than its neighbours is not increment. It is not consistent with the neighbourhood character with its monolithic dominance imposed on a precinct that council promotes as a 'village'. The loss of several independent businesses accessible from the street will be lost. The development promotes 'facadism' with only the outline of historic building features retained, and opaque impenetrable windows conveying a mockery of the area's heritage. The project assumes an inappropriate transfer of public assets for private commercial reasons and there is no inevitability about the proposed doubling of the supermarket. Increasing access to alcohol through extended is inconsistent with public health policies. Our community deserves better in this iconic site, a development that meets commercial interests and adds community benefit. This application fails that test. Reject it so an appropriate option can be developed in partnership with the community.</p>
Peter Hooper Fitzroy North	<p>We live near North Fitzroy Village because of its community spirit and charm. Over time, we lost our butcher, newsagent and fruiterer as Piedmontes became the dominant business in the Village. We tolerated morning disruption as huge trucks manoeuvred around tight Victorian streets and crossroads. We thought they were doing their best. North Fitzroy retained its appeal. Now we are faced with a huge six or seven story residential/shopping hub in this tight little village. There will be more and bigger trucks unloading taking over a public lane. Piedmontes should use their own site for the purpose. Public land in Best Street already forms its private carpark. Cars from multiple units will also jam the crossroad entering and exiting. Shoppers are unlikely to negotiate underground parking in the traffic nightmare that will ensue. Three or at the most four levels should be the limit here. Huge supermarkets are best built on large blocks in non-heritage zones where proper parking can be organised without impacting on residents. The East Brunswick Village on an old warehouse site of 3.8 hectares is a good example. Construction, noise and dust will continue for years other local businesses will fail. With a single decision tonight Yarra Council will decide on the extent of the damage this project will cause the historic North Fitzroy Village - a beloved local Community.</p>
Diane Morgan Fitzroy North	<p>The reports attached to the agenda are comprehensive, and in principle, I agree with the recommendations of the independent consultants report. However, keeping it brief. I strongly object to the current proposal given it still shows disregard for the feedback already provided by the community. Most importantly:- Neighbourhood character -the design is inconsistent with neighbourhood character -it will significantly change the character of the village -we don't need a large supermarket in this village -it will set a precedent for the rest of the village Commercial diversity - it will decrease the commercial diversity currently in the village -it is the ONLY thriving shopping precinct in North Fitzroy - why destroy this!! -the impact of the construction period alone will impact commercial and residential living. it is just too big Traffic volumes and car parking - we constantly hear Yarra's principles around reducing car traffic and increasing public transport; cycling and pedestrian traffic - this proposal is totally inconsistent with that principle - the streets surrounding the village are begging for relief from traffic now. why are we even discussing adding to this pressure and creating a 'car haven' in an underground carpark.</p>

Robert Follis Fitzroy North	Hello and thanks for the chance to input on Piedimonte's Supermarket Proposals a. The development is simply too large, too high and too dense b. It will destroy five vibrant local retailers including the vital North Fitzroy Pharmacy, over 30% of local independent retail. c. It breaks all agreed planning guidelines for the development of Fitzroy North Village d. It brings no benefit to anyone apart from the developers e. the aesthetic design is suitable for a Chadstone highway corner, not a compact inner-city village f. The apartments are mean, small and many have little natural light, sky slums in the making. Overall this is a disgusting, opportunistic bit of development, done with no regard for the locality and the residents, destroying retail diversity and a net negative benefit for Fitzroy North. No-one in 3068 wants this to go ahead, please reject it!
Juliana Hoop Fitzroy North	We object to the scale and size of the proposed Piedimonte Development - six or seven levels of apartments will swamp our historic village and its small Victorian-era streets and crossroads. 3 or 4 levels as recently recommended in reports would be more acceptable. Scotchmer/Pigdon Street - is a main East/West route through North Fitzroy, crossing Nicholson Street, St Georges Road and Queens Parade. This busy route is already compromised by the morning unloading of huge Piedmonte pantechincons into their small private loading zone plus their utilization of the public lane. Piedmontes now want this public lane rather than using their own site for unloading. They already enjoy Public Land in Best Street as their private car park. The traffic chaos during years of construction in this congested Village will destroy other businesses, rob us of the pleasure of using it and make it a nightmare for local ratepayers to visit for years to come. When completed, all the extra cars from the big residential development exiting onto Scotchmer Street will exacerbate the congestion problem. Other large new developments in the area like East Brunswick Village on 3.8 hectares nearby have been purpose built on cleared sites with large car parks. We live at the end of Best Street to easily access the Village. We will need to avoid the Village for years to avoid noise, congestion and confusion. Other shop keepers won't survive. Please make it smaller! What draws people to work and live in North Fitzroy will be destroyed.
Michele Sime Fitzroy North	The new development is not fitting with local design or community needs.
Peter Rankin Fitzroy North	My wife and I have lived approximately 100 m from the proposed development for the past 27 years. I wish to object to the application on the following grounds The number of residential units planed for the site is excessive and is likely to cause increased traffic problems in the surrounding area. The height of the proposed development is excessive and will detract from the "village" nature of the area. Any reduction in parking requirements for the supermarket will lead to increased traffic problems around the supermarket. There appears to be no attempt to include social housing or specialist disability accommodation in the project. The proposed development would be an ideal opportunity to provide housing in the community for people with disabilities. We have a son with disabilities and know how difficult it is for such people to get suitable housing in this area. Our son was forced to move outside the area he had grown up in, was familiar with, and where his family lived, because there was no suitable local accommodation. The proximity to public transport and services makes the location ideal for some SDA apartments. The current proposal with its six storey building will seriously detract from the village atmosphere of North Fitzroy. The surrounding area is predominately single or two storey. Six storeys is not a building on a village or human scale. While Piedimonte's own the buildings, the village "vibe" belongs to the residents and for their wellbeing, needs to be retained.
Michael Bogan Fitzroy	I continue to object to the latest proposal on the following grounds: 1. Excessive building height and visual bulk; 2. Overshadowing of adjoining properties; 3. Material heritage loss; 4. Traffic and car parking impacts; 5. Inconsistency with neighbourhood character; and 6. Loss of commercial diversity.
Therese Barrett Bathe Fitzroy	We live at [a property in] Egremont St Nth Fitzroy. We do not want trucks for delivery or wastes using our street to access the Piedimontes supermarket as these will occur at any hours ranging from 2 am onwards. Egremont street is a residential street and it is to remain that way. Public land our streets are not to be sold to Piedimontes supermarket as there is a lot of history to these Lane ways. Also the density of apartments is excessive for our neighbourhood. I ask that it be reduced by 4 stories

	please to fit in more with the current nature and surroundings. Please no trucks in Egremont St!
Annabel Hawkins Fitzroy North	<p>Objections to PLN17/0618 Fitzroy North Heritage, Aesthetics and Character The significant scale of both sections is at odds with the neighbourhood character which is largely one and two story dwellings and shops, and is inconsistent with the requirement by Heritage Overlays and planning policy. A more appropriate height would mirror the library nearby. The proposed built form above the existing heritage facades will dominate the streetscape. Sets a bad precedent for future developments in Fitzroy North, especially adjacent corners. Loss of diversity in retail especially small shops/businesses disappearing. I am particularly concerned about the loss of the local pharmacy given the recent pandemic and escalation in family violence and mental health issues. Traffic, Transport and Parking Increased traffic congestion with limited parking for customers and visitors which does not comply with statutory requirements. Residential Amenity The number of vehicle movements in Egremont Street, to service the expanded supermarket and residences will significantly increase. The development will result in overshadowing of many properties and will block the sunlight for some houses, gardens or solar panels. Post COVID19 Considerations Increased density in the and the increased possibility of the spread of the virus as a result of difficulties in maintaining social distancing. Increase in Family Violence Increase density and increased trading hours of the liquor department will result in an increase in the incidence of family violence.</p>
Richard Harmer Fitzroy North	<p>My family and I object strenuously to the outrageous Piedimonte development plan on a number of grounds, including: 1. The development negatively impacts North Fitzroy's Heritage, Aesthetics and Character and will compromise the future resale value of by heritage Edwardian home; 2. The development negatively impacts Traffic, Transport and Parking in and around the development making it difficult for the existing residents of the area to drive through, park or catch public transport in the vicinity of the already congested St Georges Road-Schotchmer Street precinct; 3. The development negatively impacts long-standing local businesses and other essential services currently available to local residences by reducing the diversity of small and boutique businesses in the precinct that not only results in a poorer range of services for local residents but also and compromising the financial livelihood of others who are also local to Fitzroy North; and 4. The development negatively impacts existing community infrastructure and services for current local residents of North Fitzroy resulting in an adverse flow-on impact on community amenities such as pre-schools, schools, public transport, park facilities. As long-standing residents to Fitzroy North (and the St Georges Road-Schotchmer Street precinct), we are dismayed by the 'overreaching' of the Piedimonte development plan in monopolising what is currently a diversity rich and community-oriented area of inner-city Melbourne, Moreover we are disgusted that the Council is even considering this obnoxious proposal. I hope common sense prevails.</p>
Michelle Edwards Fitzroy North	<p>I first moved to Fitzroy North from South Yarra in 1998, what attracted me most to this area was the heritage village feel and the open space. The Piedimonte's development design would be more at home in an area like South Yarra, where flashy high rise developments are common. My concern is that if this development goes ahead at the proposed height, it will stand out dramatically and cast a huge shadow over the heritage area of the village. It will also set a precedent in the shopping village for other developments of similar scale and height, forever changing the look and feel of the village. I will also be personally impacted as my workplace is a tiny office space above the Tin Pot Cafe on the opposite corner to Piedimonte's Supermarket. The proposed height of the development will block our sunlight from early afternoon, as well as being an imposing structure to look out at any time of the day. I sincerely hope that the council will consider the views of the local community, many of whom have lived and worked here for decades, and reject this proposal at its current height.</p>
Heather McDonald North Fitzroy	<p>City of Yarra should reject the Piedemonte's proposed development because: The scale of the development is excessive and will dominate the North Fitzroy Village. The proposal is contrary to Council's expert advice and opinion The development is in a heritage area and if approved will set a precedent for future developments in the North Fitzroy Village, particularly the corner sites. It will destroy the character and charm of North Fitzroy Village The two book ends to the village are the old North</p>

	<p>Fitzroy Post Office and the new Library Bargoonga Nganjin. The carefully considered design of the Library set out to complement the old Post Office building and a development such as Piedemonte's proposal would undermine the integrity of these two landmark buildings. There will be a loss of independent retailers in the village, in particular the Pharmacy. Car parking and traffic management remain an issue. We urge the City of Yarra Councillors to reject this proposal.</p>
<p>Louise Riseley Fitzroy North</p>	<p>As a long-term resident of Fitzroy North, I am very concerned about the significant negative impact that the proposed development of the Piedemonte's site will have on the heritage streetscape and liveability of the suburb. The height of the development is inappropriate, even the reduced six level development supported by the Council Planning Team. The surrounding neighbourhood is predominantly single and double storey heritage buildings. The development will loom over North Fitzroy Village and surrounding homes, totally destroying the quaint, heritage atmosphere of North Fitzroy Village. It also sets a dangerous precedent for future developments in the area. The proposal subsumes a large number of heritage buildings and shops on Scotchmer and Bests Streets which will also have a significant negative impact on the character of North Fitzroy Village. Any development at this site must preserve the precious heritage character of North Fitzroy village and the diversity of businesses. Any development must be kept to a maximum of four stories to minimise overshadowing and to protect the heritage streetscape and village atmosphere. I am also concerned that the number of apartments proposed, plus the size of the commercial premises will lead to increased traffic in the already congested Scotchmer Street. It is currently dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists to cross Scotchmer Street (e.g. at the corners of Best and Birkenhead streets) and this development, with its increased traffic flow, as well as the proposed carpark entrance on Scotchmer Street, will increase hazards for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
<p>Jos van Boheemen Fairfield</p>	<p>I object to the height of the building as this site is in a Neighbourhood Activity Centre, I want to see a maximum height of 3 stories.</p>
<p>Eril Jolly Carlton North</p>	<p>I respectfully urge Councillors to reject the Planning Team's proposal and recommendation re PLN17/0618 because of the range and magnitude of outstanding issues: Independent planning advice Could the Planning Team indicate why independent advice sought from Robert McGauran was decided against? McGauran suggested amendments to the proposal but did not oppose overall development. Ambiguity re height The proposed building height appears to be 7 levels above ground plus non-detailed amenities, really 9 levels. Does the 5 level recommendation include or exclude amenities? Safety As an elderly pedestrian I am concerned about current loading arrangements, including large vehicles reversing across Scotchmer Street, an arrangement still not properly addressed. Laneway The acquisition of the laneway is a separate matter, but also an integral part of the current proposal. Why are no alternatives presented in case Piedimonte's is unsuccessful in its laneway application? Neighbourhood character North Fitzroy and Carlton North are distinguished by low rise urban heritage buildings. People live close together in an area serviced by local businesses and civic facilities. Our neighbourhood character is not defined by Piedimonte's supermarket, although its customer base is drawn mainly from these districts. Council has worked hard to preserve this unique neighbourhood character and heritage through the Yarra Planning Scheme. Our community has appreciated and accepted restrictions placed on us all by way of residential planning regulations. Planning matters are difficult, but please, continue to consider all residents.</p>
<p>Susan Foley North Fitzroy</p>	<p>I'm really opposed to this development. I'm worried the development hasn't been designed with the aesthetic of the area (it looks awful, more like a mass retail shopping centre than a property for a village). It's also too big and I'm worried how it will negatively impact on the lovely community or village feel of the area, not to mention the retailers being directly impacted. These plans will see this shopping strip go from an energetic community shopping strip to a soulless, beige retail building. The contradiction here is that Piedi's is such a big part of the great village feeling and energy, why do they want to destroy this. I have no issue with them developing, but do it with soul, do it with the neighbourhood and it's people in mind. How can they design this so it benefits not destroys the community? The library across the road is a great example of this. Thank you for hearing my feedback.</p>

<p>Peter Fullerton Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I object to the Piedimonte development for the following reasons: a. The development is simply too large, too high and too dense for the suburb. b. The North Fitzroy Village has a "small town" feel to it and this will be destroyed. b. It is out of character with the suburb's heritage overlay. c. It breaks all agreed planning guidelines for the development of Fitzroy North Village. d. It will bring excessive out-of-area car traffic, with attendant traffic volume and parking problems in surrounding residential streets.</p>
<p>Leonie D'Aprano Fitzroy North</p>	<p>As long time North Fitzroy residents my partner Max Ogden and I, frequently shop at Piedimonte, enjoy coffees, and shopping at other retail outlets in the precinct, we are strongly opposed to the proposed development, as far too large, and completely out of character with the surrounding buildings. With only one inadequate lane as access and egress to the proposed apartments, traffic will be chaotic and unsafe. There is no provision for affordable housing which we see as outrageous. We object to the loss of some retail outlets which ourselves and others frequently use, as a narrowing of the range of products available, and yet another case of a large supermarket squeezing out valuable small businesses. We strongly urge council to reject the current proposal, requesting Piedimonte to significantly revise it, or lay down strict guidelines to remedy the serious issues highlighted by ourselves, and the over 650 local citizens who have similarly objected.</p>
<p>Margaret Temelkovski Fitzroy North</p>	<p>As a City of Yarra rates payer and member of the community for the past 17 years, I wish to voice my objection to the plans submitted for the redevelopment of Piedimonte's. The development should be no more than 3 or 4 storeys. My objections are based on the following reasons - The height and massing is excessive for a neighbourhood heritage village, and out of scale with the current or preferred future neighbourhood character. The loss of independent retail spaces and the local businesses, including the chemist. The proposed building will shadow the village park from early afternoon. The development includes a three level car-park, dumping more vehicle traffic into a sensitive pedestrian and cycle thoroughfare. No affordable housing. Approving the development at even 24 metres, would create a dangerous precedence for development of the rest of the village. I don't want our local village to be engulfed by a "too big" development, which is out of character with the local neighbourhood.</p>
<p>Tim Mahar Fitzroy North</p>	<p>This Council is charged with the enormous responsibility of making decisions that will affect residents of inner Melbourne for generations to come. Poor development decisions can't be undone. We understand there is a need for increased residential development. In fact, we strongly support a significant increase in high quality social housing initiatives in inner suburbs. But the idea of plonking a huge mass structure, that is twice as high as anything else in this heritage listed area, is clearly not "complimentary to the surrounding area", as VCAT has suggest in similar cases. In addition, it is totally unnecessary. There are plenty of sites in inner Melbourne that are suitable for new medium rise residential developments that are not in such sensitive locations and that meet the anticipated needs for housing in the foreseeable future (see Spencer SGS) What developers need is clarity and certainty. The current approaches to planning clearly encourages ambit claims, endless negotiations, claim and counter claim over heights, traffic flow and amenity. They are clearly unsatisfactory and frustrating for all. Developers know that under these approaches, if they hang in long enough and appeal often enough, they will prevail. Consider what this part of North Fitzroy will look and feel like with a dozen (or 50?) such developments over the next 20 years. If this development proceeds, then this is our inevitable future.</p>
<p>Hilary Toppin Fitzroy North</p>	<p>If the COVID19 has shown us anything, it is that a local community is so very important. The local Fitzroy North community, centred around the shops in the St Georges Rd and Scotchmer St, values its small scale, the tenants of the shops in the Piedimonte's block who know and care about their customers, the current (barely) manageable traffic flow and parking, all of which are threatened by the proposed massive re-development. The height of the proposed development is not in keeping with the area, nor with the notion of a smallish local community. The new building will dominate and change the nature of the space. It is difficult to imagine how greatly increased traffic is to be managed. And the fate of the local shop tenants, and the residents of Egremont St is of great concern to me. I am not at all in favour of the</p>

	proposed re-development.
Rod Harris Fitzroy North	<p>Size &amp; Bulk Professor Robert McGauran, the leading urban planning expert engaged by the council, reviewed the latest plans (Attachment 29). His report included an extensive list of problems and concluded: "The current proposed 27m form is excessive in bulk, scale and offsite impact becoming the dominant form and character of an area where the composite collection of village buildings is what lies at the core of its charm and collective contribution." We support the professor's list of fixes required for the plans to meet City Of Yarra planning objectives including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Deleting from the main building facing the village: the 3rd &amp; 5th floor;</li> <li>* Deleting the 4th floor of the second building on Scotchmer Street; and</li> <li>* Inserting an East-West mid-block break in the main building facing the village.</li> </ul> <p>Housing Needs Plan Melbourne 2017-2050 makes clear, the recent Queens Parade Panel affirmed, and council agreed that high value heritage neighbourhood activity centres are intrinsic to Melbourne and Yarra's culture. They are worthy of the highest grade of protection therefore mandatory height limits are appropriate. Fewer apartments are needed because the Queens Parade Panel C231 concluded North Fitzroy already has more than enough capacity in the development pipeline to meet forecast demand for apartments sold at full market rates. Moreover, the proposal does not include any affordable housing and some should be included. Shadowing Also we request substantial reduction of shadows that would be wider and longer, especially on the grassed public open space in winter.</p>
Lucy Healey Fitzroy North	<p>I object to the current Piedimonte's redevelopment proposal. It will be the death of this neighbourhood shopping area because of its extreme scale, impact on surroundings and loss of current businesses. Its bulk and height will cast deep, cold shadows on surrounding residences and public areas, limiting plant choice and pleasure in the surroundings. In this covid-19 era, there will be increased competition between cars, trucks, cycles and pedestrians (and less inner-city use of public transport) and this large development will add to this pressure and increase the risk of harm to walkers and cyclists. There should be proportionate inclusion of affordable housing and provision made for electrification of cars in this and any other new developments. I would support a redeveloped Piedimonte site if it demonstrated energy efficiency, adherence to universal design principles, was a height of no more than the equivalent of a 4-storey building (with appropriate setback) and included some affordable housing.</p>
Name withheld Northcote	<p>I wish to confirm my objection to the proposed development. I think that the development poses a threat to the local character of this area. I live in the area and frequently shop in the area of North Fitzroy village. I think the development is a gross overdevelopment of the site. I am concerned that the development does not recognise or protect the local character. This is a local area with a special character that has been enhanced by the sensitive redevelopment of the excellent new library. I am concerned about the quality of the design response and the lack of protection of heritage buildings and their contribution to local character. I am concerned about the effect on a busy corner of so much increased traffic, parking, and noise. I oppose any acquisition of public land for the development and the building over and blocking off of public space. I think council should refuse to allow the proposed development.</p>
Fiona McGrath Fitzroy North	<p>I strongly object to the size of this development. It will be completely out of place in the area which has at most 4 stories. Please protect our area from this inappropriately large, dominating building. We have invested in a renovation of our home in North Fitzroy and this is not reflective of the community and village environment we are committed to. It is completely out of context for the area.</p>
Erin McAuley Fitzroy North	<p>Object to the development -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The development is simply too large, too high and too dense</li> <li>b. It will destroy five vibrant local retailers including the vital North Fitzroy Pharmacy, over 30% of local independent retail.</li> <li>c. It breaks all agreed planning guidelines for the development of Fitzroy North Village</li> <li>d. It brings no benefit to anyone apart from the developers</li> <li>e. the aesthetic design is suitable for a Chadstone highway corner, not a compact inner-city village</li> <li>f. The apartments are mean, small and many have little natural light, sky slums in the making.</li> </ul> <p>Overall this is a disgusting, opportunistic bit of development, done with no regard for the locality and the residents, destroying retail diversity and a net negative benefit for Fitzroy North. No-one in 3068 wants this to go ahead, please reject it!</p>

<p>John Owe Young Fitzroy North</p>	<p>Council recently and commendably voted for a mandatory 3-storey limit in Queens Parade, a shopping strip in the same heritage overlay City of Yarra Planning Team I am registering my objection to the Piedmonte development. The oversized development doesn't integrate with, or evolve from the existing heritage fine-grain fabric of North Fitzroy village. This bulk does not satisfy the City of Yarra's Framework for Urban Design requirement for, "built form in scale with the neighbourhood". The impact on the neighbourhood of the imposing, over-scale sight lines and bulk of the structure aren't reduced by merely cladding an oversized structure with "sympathetic" or heritage materials and finishes. It will always be too big. The architects of this design make a feature of paying homage to the original narrow shopfronts, but selectively ignore the height and scale of these same shops. This over-scale and inappropriate development is imposed-upon rather than being informed-by or welling-up from the existing heritage fine-grain fabric of North Fitzroy village. This development seems to be exactly what the City of Yarra's Framework for Urban Design that the, "built form in scale with the neighbourhood" is meant to prevent. I urge Councillors to reject this inappropriate proposal and to refer to the example of sympathetic development of the 3-level Library, as well as the mandatory 3-storey limit in Queens Parade that Council recently voted for. The North Fitzroy village shopping strip shares the same heritage overlay.</p>
<p>John Dwyer Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I live in the area and frequently shop in the Fitzroy North village. I wish to confirm my objection to the proposed development. The proposed development is a gross overdevelopment of the site. The development does not recognise or protect the local character of the Fitzroy North village This is a local area with a special character that has been enhanced by the sensitive redevelopment of the excellent new library. I am concerned about the poor quality of the design response and the lack of protection of heritage buildings and their contribution to local character. I am concerned about the effect on a busy corner of so much increased traffic, parking, and noise. I oppose any acquisition of public land for the development and the building over and blocking off of public space. I urge council to refuse a permit for the proposed development.</p>
<p>Maya Park Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I have lived in Fitzroy North around the corner from Piedimontes for 3 years now. The quaint heritage village feel of Fitzroy North is one of the aspects that attracted us to the area. I am not opposed to sympathetic development (the Bargoonga Nganjin Fitzroy North library is a great example of sympathetic development in the area), however I oppose the Piedimontes application in its current form for the following reasons. The height, bulk and impact of the proposed development is excessive for the area, and out of scale with the current neighbourhood character. Higher traffic movement from supermarket customers, residents of the development and commercial vehicles will impact the surrounding residential streets. We already have parking issues on our street due to visitors to the Fitzroy North village (the drop in cars parked in our street since the covid-19 restrictions have been in place has been noticeable). This higher traffic movement from commercial vehicles and rubbish trucks will also create significant noise pollution for Scotchmer and Egremont streets. The proposal creates a loss of independent retail spaces with their local businesses, including Muscrats and the chemist. The proposal does not resolve the safety issues with large semi-trailers backing from Scotchmer street into the supermarket for deliveries multiple times a day. I otherwise rely on my previous written objection.</p>
<p>Patrick Helsing Fitzroy North</p>	<p>The over-shadowing impacts from PLN17/0618 will be dominant on all sides of the project way beyond the tolerable. The development abuts largely intact heritage 1 and 2 storey residential neighbourhood and incremental change commercial neighbourhoods. Even while the plans only provide modelling from its own rooftop, not its neighbours, the South of the development will be completely over-shadowed for most of the day and the East from 2pm onwards. In addition, McGuaran report page 7, section 38 is scathing of major impacts for existing and future solar panel households and businesses. "Notably too, whilst the applicant seeks to enjoy substantial benefits arising from photovoltaic provision, the positioning of the building and heights.....effectively deny their immediate neighbours effective rooftop performance". The current plans and shadowing diagrams do not seem to include the additional structures, e.g. Air Conditioning units and Lift Towers, that are on top of the official area raising serious concerns to the accuracy of said diagrams. Secondly and very importantly, the proposal for Laneway acquisition directly impacts</p>

	<p>my living conditions and is detrimental to my enjoyment of current amenity. The Plans continue to name my self-contained bungalow as a shed, it is NOT. I live at the back of 36 Egremont, council approved 2007., The proposed laneway acquisition will mean that unacceptably, my bedroom will be only a wall away from a new so called "road" which is proposed to be 6 metres - double the usual lane width, without any reason given why this is necessary.</p>
Sam Kingston Fitzroy North	<p>The application should be rejected as it is contrary to planning principles and completely contrary to the heritage overlay of Fitzroy North village. In particular: The height, bulk and impact of the proposed development is excessive for the area, and out of scale with the current neighbourhood character. Higher traffic movement from supermarket customers, residents of the development and commercial vehicles will impact the surrounding residential streets. We already have parking issues on our street due to visitors to the Fitzroy North village. This higher traffic movement from commercial vehicles and rubbish trucks will also create significant noise pollution for Scotchmer and Egremont streets. The proposal creates a loss of independent retail spaces and parking for small local business. The proposal does not resolve the safety issues with large semi-trailers backing from Scotchmer street into the supermarket for deliveries multiple times a day. If the application is approved it would amount to pre-judging the outcome of the laneway resumption process in circumstances where residents have not been given the opportunity to object.</p>
Odette Corbett Fitzroy North	<p>I wish to reinforce and continue my original objection to the nature and scale of the proposed development at Piedimontes Nth Fitzroy with specific reference to the following detrimental social and environmental impacts on the safety and amenity of the Fitzroy North local community zone. 1. The proposal for expanded alcohol sales (scale of store and extended times of opening) are detrimental to the health and safety of the local community (including primary and high school children who frequent this area early morning and late afternoon). Nth Fitzroy Village already has 4 points of alcohol sales within 30 second- 1 minute walking distance of each other (Drive through bottle shop, pub, Scotchmer St and the supermarket). What sort of message are we trying to send with respect to alcohol consumption by this saturation? - The negative impact of increased traffic and parking demand on local streets has yet to be properly addressed (e.g. Brunswick St Nth rat run traffic impact) by this proposal. - Likewise the negative impact on local parking, traffic and noise posed by the proposed function centre has yet to be properly addressed. - The height of the building is not clear given that it appears that storeys with setbacks are not counted as building levels, yet will accommodate new activities and uses. Despite the length of time passed, the proposal remains inconsistent, with too many outstanding issues (social and infrastructure-wise) that have not yet to be carefully assessed. It is not ready for approval.</p>
Daniel Hutchins Fitzroy North	<p>As a resident of North Fitzroy, I have submitted a detailed list of concerns already. To summarise, the project must be considered as a whole including the proposed acquisition of a publically owned laneway despite the current process in place. The development is an assault on the character of the area - made possible by the huge wealth of one individual who has been acquiring property in the area for many years. This wealth has enabled one person to think they can build a giant complex in a quiet residential area with no care for heritage overlays nor public ownership. Would I be able to acquire the right-of-way out of the back of my own property or build to 7 stories? The development does not address concerns over my own street - Birkenhead Street - which already suffers traffic today from Piedemonte's and this will be increased due to the increase in size of the shop. Piedemonte's tactic of submitting a first round proposal which was known to be too big, followed by a slightly smaller submission does not mean the new submission is acceptable. This is a process of attrition and the few small changes made are not enough. Including external fittings it is still 7 stories! Council - as our elected representatives - please reject the proposal. We do not want this development. A development this size does not belong, and if allowed to go ahead will open the way for other developments ruining this suburb forever.</p>
Peter Hodder Fitzroy North	<p>The Fitzroy North village has a special character and heritage significance that must be protected. It is recognised that development of the Piedmonte supermarket to modernise and improve customer experience is welcomed, however the proposed development has far greater implications with the inclusion of a massive</p>

	<p>accommodation site. The modernisation of the supermarket will attract new people to the area which is fine provided the appropriate catering of inevitable car traffic, which has not been fully considered in the proposal. The accommodation aspect of the development is another story. 1 The number of apartments in the complex will place undue pressure to the village precinct with inevitable visitors cars and multi car tenants. 2 The look and feel of the Victorian heritage of the streetscape will be lost forever. 3 The height of the complex has been reduced in the redrawn plans from extremely massive to massive, it will still overshadow the area for blocks around changing the ambience of this unique piece of inner suburban Melbourne. 4 The commercial value of a new supermarket is restricted due to the increased traffic arising from over populating the precinct with accommodation. Even though objections on grounds of pure village protection and future heritage value have merit on its own, one wonders if the development is an excuse to build a massive accommodation complex under the banner of a supermarket redevelopment, rather than a supermarket development that benefits the community with accommodation to assist investment aligned to the character of the village.</p>
<p>Molly Hunter Fitzroy North</p>	<p>As a long term resident and rate payer of North Fitzroy I am asking council to reject the current building plans for the development of Piedemontes supermarket and 8 surrounding properties for the following reasons: 1. The proposed building plans at 27 metres are excessive in scale and pattern. They do not ensure that the heritage streetscape of the North Fitzroy village is preserved. 2. With the disappearance of small shops and businesses there will be a loss of diversity in retail and amenities. Of particular concern is the loss of our chemist, an important community asset. 3. The proposed design would set an unacceptable precedent for VCAT on what is acceptable built form for future developments in North Fitzroy, especially on the adjacent corners. 4. There is not great diversity in the proposed mix of apartments, very few above 2 bedrooms. There is no affordable housing offered. 5. Current parking is inadequate for residents, users of the supermarket and retailers. The proposal will put more pressure on already limited parking in the area.</p>
<p>Louise Poultney Fitzroy North</p>	<p>The main issues as I see them: The height and massing is excessive for a neighbourhood heritage village, and out of scale with the current or preferred future neighbourhood character. The loss of independent retail spaces with their local businesses, including the chemist. The proposed building will shadow the village park from early afternoon. The development includes a three level car-park, dumping more vehicle traffic into a sensitive pedestrian and cycle thoroughfare. The loss of the village feel to a historic part of the city, don't change the wonderful community that lives there. No affordable housing.</p>
<p>Melissa Scheele Nth Fitzroy</p>	<p>The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets</p>
<p>Maureen Cox Nth Fitzroy</p>	<p>The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets</p>

Jennifer Cox Brunswick	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Margaret cox Brunswick	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Lisa Cox Brunswick	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Ros McConville Fitzroy North	This development is in a heritage overlay. It is too big & inappropriate for both its 'incremental change' categorisation and the heritage context of the village, where the majority of buildings are contributory or individually significant and any non-heritage buildings sit quietly within the heritage streetscape and where modern developments (e.g. 3 storey library complex) are appropriately modest in scale and fine in grain. It FAILS all of the following Yarra planning scheme heritage requirements to: protect heritage skylines of heritage precincts, protect heritage buildings, streetscape and precincts from visual intrusion of built forms both within and from adjoining areas and reflect the scale of all adjoining buildings and ensure there is a harmonious transition to adjoining residential areas. Any planning decisions that council makes currently in our unprotected village should reflect Council's recent decisions (e.g. C231 Queens Parade) and its upcoming heritage protection intentions (e.g. Amendment C269). In addition to these concerns, I remain vehemently opposed to: any extension to the hours for the sale of alcohol (7am is outrageous), the reduction to the car parking requirements of the Scheme, the inadequate and dangerous loading bay configuration which will only exacerbate the existing traffic congestion and pedestrian safety issues, and the use of a public laneway for a private development. I ask that Councillors reject this proposal. " already with 50+ conditions it simply cannot be further conditioned sufficiently to effect the "transformation" required to make it sympathetic to its surrounds & compliant with heritage values.
Marie Scheele Red Hill ACT 2611	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples

	quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Deborah Scheele Carwoola NSW 2620	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Mark Ballard Carwoola NSW 2620	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Fleur Scheele Pearce ACT 2607	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Mark Kovacs Pearce ACT 2607	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Jennifer Scheele Pearce ACT 2607	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets

George Rais Pearce ACT 2607	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Leon Fay Nth Fitzroy 3068	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Kaspa Elston Yarraville	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Chris Scheele Wanniassa ACT 2093	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Gerry McLellan Wanniassa ACT 2903	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Andrew Scheele Wanniassa ACT 2903	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the

	surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Tim Scheele Wanniassa ACT 2903	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Laura Scheele Wanniassa ACT 2903	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Rebecca Scheele Wanniassa ACT 2903	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Brendan Scheele Wanniassa ACT 2903	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Emma Scheele Wanniassa ACT 2903	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with

	all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Emma Taylor Pearce ACT 2607	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Adam Smith Pearce ACT 2607	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Jane Begg North Fitzroy	The revised plans are better, but not better enough. The height is still excessive.
Eileen Taylor Pearce ACT 2607	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Henry Scheele St Ives NSW 2075	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Ric Begg North Fitzroy	The revised plans are an improvement on the originals. However the overall height is still excessive . The council officer's recommendations for a 6 storey limit should be supported. Regards, Ric Begg.
peter Scheele Torrens 2607	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated

	by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Stella Scheele Torrens 2607	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Dorothy Waterfield Yarraville	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Glenn Elston Yarraville	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Otis Elston Yarraville	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Arky Elston Yarraville	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets

Narelle Crux Fitzroy North	I object to the proposed development. While I support medium density housing in inner city areas I believe that this development it is too big for the site and its location. As proposed it will result in significant overshadowing of the local area, as well as increased traffic flows, including heavy vehicles and related noise. This will negatively impact amenity for local residents and destroy the community feel of the Fitzroy North shopping village area. The village will lose some other businesses, e.g. the pharmacy, unless they are able to find alternative premises. Higher traffic levels will increase safety risk for pedestrians and cyclists, including children from local schools. A development of more proportionate size, no more than four stories, and including appropriate setback is required. Some affordable housing in the residential complex should be mandatory, together with at least one car park space per apartment, to minimize traffic congestion in narrow local residential streets. Provision for charging of electric vehicles should be provided. Universal design should be mandatory for a majority of residential units, together with appropriately designed and located parking for residents (and also shoppers) with disabilities.
Natalie Lack Mornington	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Dean Hoare Queanbeyan, NSW	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Cass Battye Yarraville	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Elizabeth Lack Fitzroy North	I believe the plans that Piedimontes has before council should be rejected on the following grounds 1. the plans by Piedimontes are not intended for the betterment of the local residents. It is purely a development intended to increase the power, control and financial gain of the Piedimonte family. 2. the plans include taking ownership of the public thoroughfare at the rear of Piedimontes. This sets a dangerous precedent of developers believing they can gain ownership and control of public land 3. the plans are not in keeping with the vibe of the Fitzroy North Village which holds a special place in the hearts of the local community 4. once one development starts then surely others will follow and what is now a characterful village runs the serious risk of being turned into yet another soulless hub. 5. Basically the community have indicated by the objections and responses that they feel very strongly against this development. I believe the community's interests

	should not be ignored in the interests of businesses/organisations whose sole reason for development is the increase in wealth and control over the community's buying power. For these (and not doubt many other reasons that the objectors are putting forward) I believe the Council should reject the over-development of the Piedimonte's site
Pauline Underwood Toorak	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Allan Fay Lower Plenty	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Cecilia Cairns Carlton North	I am appalled by the submitted plan for the extension of Piedimontes Supermarket. it is too high, and too big. It is completely out of place, and will change for ever a charming and much loved precinct. More to the point it will remove that community, and turn a place of possibility (communal, social and visual) into a place where there is no longer that possibility. For the people who live within the area it would be totally unacceptable. Please stop this travesty from going ahead. Cecilia Cairns
Ruth Robles Pascoe Vale	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Luke McColl Pascoe Vale	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets
Marty Kilderry Pascoe Vale	The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over

	<p>everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets</p>
<p>Turde Kilderry Pascoe Vale</p>	<p>The development should not go ahead: Too large: Too much bulk: No heritage considerations: City skyline obstructed from other heritage buildings: Impedes and negatively impacts the heritage streetscape and view. Once gone never returns and loses appeal for the whole area. Greed should not be allowed to precede over everyone's amenity: Design is ugly and inappropriate; not sympathetic to the surrounds; impacts negatively on adjoining streets and properties removing peoples quiet enjoyment; overshadowing ; overlooking; noise and sound pollution generated by such high density properties Do not let it go ahead It is a terrible precedent for the area Too high To dense Just too big To much traffic congestion and too much pressure on public transport school and other amenities etc. Kids will be killed with all the extra traffic concentrated in an already busy intersections / streets</p>
<p>Carole Browne Fitzroy North</p>	<p>The visual impact of such a dominant bulk proposed in the Fitzroy North Village is completely at odds with the surrounding streetscape. Varying forms of architecture, especially the heritage buildings, are low-rise and they are what give the small Village such charm. Traffic congestion would increase immensely in and around Scotchmer Street. When apartment visitors and shoppers find the underground parking full, their cars would clog the adjacent streets. And residents/ratepayers in those streets would find parking close to their homes, already at a premium, nigh impossible. There is a friendly, community feeling in this open, low-rise area, but a structure such as that proposed, towering over the middle of the Village, would completely change that atmosphere and ruin its unique character. I respectfully request that you all unanimously refuse this development application as currently proposed. The damage it will do for Fitzroy North Village will be irrevocable.</p>
<p>Gareth Balston Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I would like to object to the proposed development on the following grounds: 1) The height and bulk of the proposed development will dominate the village centre and change its character. An important part of people having a sense of community is the feeling that the different buildings that form the heart of that community fit together in a coherent way. Having a seven storey building, with a height of 27 meters, would profoundly impact the heritage feel of the area and the sense of identity that people have as residents of North Fitzroy village. The proposed development is almost twice the height and bulk of other recent village developments. 2) There is no affordable housing provided in the current proposal. There are many social and economic benefits to affordable housing, many of which are noted in the City of Yarra's Social and Affordable Housing Strategy (2019), including the role such housing plays in promoting socially, culturally and economically diverse communities. 3) The village will lose character and diversity in its commercial life through the loss of independent businesses such as the chemist. 4) The village centre, the community park, will be under shadow in the afternoon due to the bulk and height of the proposed development. 5) The three storeys of parking space will increase the amount of traffic on local roads and increase hazards and risks for the local population.</p>
<p>Nicholas Hooper Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I live in Batman Street, Fitzroy North and wish to object to the size and height of the proposed Piedimonte Development. The Village near the proposed development has narrow streets and crossroads and a strong sense of Community. A huge Six or Seven Story residential development plus huge expansion of the Supermarket itself will swamp our Village. Three levels would be more in keeping with the character and amenity of North Fitzroy Village. Scotchmer Street is the main East/ West link through the Suburb providing access to Hoddle St, Alexandra Parade and to the west of the city. It is often hard to get across St George's Road, Queens's Parade and Nicholson Street now without more huge trucks unloading and unit residents getting in and out of an underground carpark. A Public Lane should not be taken over for the Development. The noise and disruption for many years of construction will impact severely on the ability of ratepayers to enjoy using their Village. We will lose more of the small shops that give the Village its atmosphere and amenity. It will</p>

	become Piedimonte Village.
Michael van Leeuwen Fitzroy North	The development is far too large for the village character of Fitzroy North. There has been no real concern about the community, just a grubby dash for cash.
Marigene Larew Fitzroy	I urge Council not to endorse the current application for redevelopment of Piedimontes. Reasons: 1. The scale is much too high and grandiose. It's a huge building that will dwarf and darken surrounding buildings and the wee park our use the existing store. The maximum height given these proportions should be three at most four, stories. 2. The Development is not in keeping with the unique and precious heritage area. 3. The Hundreds of car parks will mean an already bottle neck intersection is far worse. Due to the extra cars trams and buses will be delayed, pollution will increase and there will be added risk to bike riders. 4. There is not enough allocation for small shops like our valued chemist. 5. Also the development excludes affordable, social housing. Fitzroy and Fitzroy North take pride in their diverse population, not just a neighbourhood of well to do people who can pay sky high rents and huge apartment purchase price tags.
Carla Bozzetto Fitzroy North	As a long-term resident of North Fitzroy (30-plus years) I've always been proud of the village heritage, its sense of community, and diversity. I am worried about the increase in traffic that is likely to happen if the proposed development goes ahead, particularly around Egremont, Scotchmer, and Tranmere Street. The houses on Egremont Street will lose privacy and light due to the height and bulk of the development. I disagree with the proposal that the lane should be sold. This is public land and should remain so. My view is that the proposed building, which is almost twice the size of any recent developments in the area, would weaken the sense of local community, which is the heart and soul of North Fitzroy.
Chris Goodman Clifton Hill	The Piedimonte's Redevelopment recommendation brings the Yarra Planning Scheme into disrepute and will be seen as a signal to developers that they can disregard the planning scheme with impunity. The application "should be refused on urban design grounds" as they have not followed the advice to a) Remove the existing Third Floor of the eastern main building. b) Remove the existing Fifth Floor of the eastern main building Rob McGauran's recommendations in relation to urban design, neighbourhood character and planning weren't addressed either by the applicant or the officers, so now it is up to the residents to fight to protect the village.
Jan Anderson Fitzroy North	Strongly object to the height of 6 levels and the overall density that creates a significant overdevelopment of the proposed site. The proposed plan inc Planning Officer recommendations ignores the overwhelming objections from the community, ignores the key recommendations of the independent McGauran Urban Design Report and is inconsistent with the heritage overlay, Planning Policy requirements and the City of Yarra framework for Urban Design. The associated problems that will be created with the proposed monolithic development i.e.: overshadowing, line of sight, noise, significant increase in traffic, and parking requirements will impact negatively and destroy the ambiance of the neighbourhood. The impact of these issues will be felt significantly by local residents, like myself, who will lose all sense of the heritage, vitality and diversity of the area. We will be overshadowed by a gross monolith which will add next to nothing to the community. Please do not ignore all the feedback from residents and the community! Do not accept the overdevelopment of the proposed site! Reference the City of Yarra library development Develop with sympathy to the heritage value of Fitzroy North and consistent with the Council policies and commitment to creating and valuing diversity. Reference Council vote - C231 amendments for Queen's Pde notably for a mandatory 3-storey limit for most of the village to provide a better heritage and commercially viable outcome for the shopping village precinct these reasoning's apply equally to Fitzroy North Village.
Pamela McLure Fitzroy North	The new proposal for the development of the Piedmonte's site is still grossly excessive and totally inappropriate for our local community. The North Fitzroy Village is the focus and centre of a charming low rise heritage area where individuals and families live, work and shop.. The new development would dominate and destroy this atmosphere not to mention increasing road traffic in the area and over-shadowing surrounding streets in the afternoon when adults and children walk and gather

	<p>especially after school hours. The development of the Fitzroy North Library is recent proof that modern attractive functional buildings can be developed which respect the surrounding heritage area and add to the vibrancy of the local community. I implore the Council not to approve this application but to listen to the views of your heritage consultant and to the hundreds of rate payers who live in this community.</p>
Samuel Bolton Fitzroy North	<p>My wife and I are resident in Fitzroy North and are concerned about the Piedimonte's planned development. The development falls within a heritage overlay and the following applies: "HO327 North Fitzroy Heritage Overlay Area (south of Holden St) is aesthetically and historically significant to the City of Yarra (National Estate Register [NER] Criteria E1, A4)". The heritage overlay "HO327" lists contributory elements as follows: "The Government planned section of Fitzroy North (south of Holden St) is significant:" - "For its low rise streetscapes of intact Victorian and Edwardian buildings one and two-storey terrace and villa housing" - "For its traditional Victorian-era residential character, evoked by the formal presentation of the decorated facade to the street with its small ornamental front garden, low front fence, pedestrian gateway and front path, with the functional necessities of delivering coal, removal of nightsoil and occasional stabling provided by the back lanes" - "For the rectilinear Victorian-era allotment plans and street layout with wide main streets, rear service lanes, all counter posed with circular parkland reserves, major angled streets and boulevards" We feel that this development is in violation of this heritage overlay as: 1) It is massive in size for a development compared to the rest of Fitzroy North and is unsympathetic to both the surroundings and character of the area. 2) It plans to build over an existing rear-service laneway (from Scotchmer St), again against character.</p>
Robyn Smith Fitzroy North	<p>I ask that Council rejects this application from Piedimonte's Supermarket to develop their site to a height of 27 metres. I believe that the proposed size, scale, and bulk of the development will have significant and negative impacts on the surrounding shops and homes of North Fitzroy Village. The development should be kept within the scale of the Village and surrounding heritage buildings. Similar to the recent decisions on Queen's Parade/Clifton Hill Village - a maximum of 3 levels (approx 11 metres) is much more appropriate and in keeping with the existing neighbourhood character. I am concerned also about the loss of diversity of local services (e.g.: Chemist) as the supermarket takes over existing retail spaces. Cars and parking will become a bigger challenge, with significant negative impacts on surrounding local streets. In short, the proposed development is just too big and will overpower and overshadow the rest of the North Fitzroy Village. As I understand it, there is no evidence of an apartment shortfall in the inner north that would justify setting aside the State and City of Yarra cultural, heritage and built form planning objectives in order to proceed with this development. In addition, the development contains no social or affordable housing - something that we should be expecting of developers in all inner city developments. A smaller and more sympathetic design that adopts Prof McGauran's recommended changes could be considered. However, the current Piedimonte's design should be rejected - it is just not appropriate for the area.</p>
Conrad Exton Fitzroy North	<p>Apart from the impact visually once the development is completed, I wish to strongly object to the noise, dust and traffic disruption during construction. Scotchmer St will need one lane closed, heavy truck and trailers will be transporting excavated material, noise and dust from rock hammers and piling rigs. Mud on the roads during winter, dangerous traffic for school children, cyclists and the elderly. This disruption will continue during construction, delivery of materials, heavy crane lifts and fleets of concrete trucks during pours. The builders will no doubt push to work weekends and include night work, all of the above totally unacceptable to the residents of Fitzroy North.</p>
Jacqueline Exton Fitzroy North	<p>Apart from the impact visually once the development is completed, I wish to strongly object to the noise, dust and traffic disruption during construction. Scotchmer St will need one lane closed, heavy truck and trailers will be transporting excavated material, noise and dust from rock hammers and piling rigs. Mud on the roads during winter, dangerous traffic for school children, cyclists and the elderly. This disruption will continue during construction, delivery of materials, heavy crane lifts and fleets of concrete trucks during pours. The builders will no doubt push to work weekends and include night work, all of the above totally unacceptable to the residents of Fitzroy</p>

	North.
Lindsay Hussey East Brunswick	<p>Although not residents of North Fitzroy we have been regular shoppers and cafe users there for over 25 years; this is where we chose to spend our money. We deliberately chose North Fitzroy because of the pleasant environment and the visual interest of the many heritage buildings. I am concerned that Piedimonte's proposal, particularly the size and height of the redevelopment, will have a detrimental effect on the environment. Six storeys is quite out of kilter with the surrounding two storey buildings. I don't object to apartments being built, higher density housing in the inner city is inevitable, but surely four stories in line with the McGauran Report is more reasonable? Approve this proposal as it stands and the very things that make North Fitzroy appealing and attract shoppers will be gone. I am also concerned that Piedimonte's proposal includes aspects contrary to the Council's own planning regulations. Its highly arrogant for a developer to expect these decisions, which have been made by the Council on behalf of the community, should be waived for their benefit and convenience. As we live between Nicholson St and St Georges Rd we often drive through North Fitzroy so I'm also concerned about Piedimonte's plans where they encroach on Scotchmer Street and impact on both safety and accessibility for drivers. Thank you for the opportunity to lodge an objection. I hope the Council understands that their decision will impact non-residents as well.</p>
Jeanti Exton North Fitzroy	<p>Apart from the impact visually once the development is completed, I wish to strongly object to the noise, dust and traffic disruption during construction. Scotchmer St will need one lane closed, heavy truck and trailers will be transporting excavated material, noise and dust from rock hammers and piling rigs. Mud on the roads during winter, dangerous traffic for school children, cyclists and the elderly. This disruption will continue during construction, delivery of materials, heavy crane lifts and fleets of concrete trucks during pours. The builders will no doubt push to work weekends and include night work, all of the above totally unacceptable to the residents of Fitzroy North.</p>
Carolyn Davy Fitzroy North	<p>I have previously made detailed formal objections to the application and amended application supported by photographs and also emailed councillors before the cancelled March 2020 special meeting. I trust Council has already taken account of all this material. In summary, it is inconceivable to me as a resident that Council would accept a proposal for a major new development in 2020 which involves semi-trailers backing across local roads to access a loading bay. That it is proposed there be less semi-trailers than currently and that the practice has been going on for years does not render it less dangerous or obstructive to local road users, (bike and car) and pedestrians. The road safety of many and enjoyment of their local neighbourhood should not be sacrificed for a commercial development which can do better and must be able to manage without semi-trailers. In addition, it is surprising that the congestion and road safety implications arising from so many streets, Best x 2, Birkenhead, &amp; Egremont streets and St Georges Road converging over such a short distance with a new car park, loading bay entrance and reversing semi-trailers is not disqualifying in itself. Does not Council have an obligation to ensure that planning decisions are not made which affect the road safety, character and enjoyment of the neighbourhood of so many for the commercial benefit of one party? Council should also be obliged to ensure that trucks, large and small do not monopolize the local streets as they do now.</p>
Artemisia Kousis Fitzroy North	<p>I consider that the height and massing of this development is excessive for a neighbourhood heritage village, and out of scale with the preferred neighbourhood character. The new library was restricted in height in order to sympathise with community views and better integrate into the village feel, I can't see why this development shouldn't. More importantly, the proposed building will shadow the village park from early afternoon. The development includes a three level carpark, directing more traffic into a sensitive pedestrian and cycle thoroughfare where many families with children shop, and many children from the high school frequent. The loss of independent retail spaces with their local businesses, including the local chemist will be a huge loss and will plonk a huge supermarket and booze shop right in the middle on the heart of Fitzroy North. This is where the tram passes on a daily basis and this development will set the tone of what the wider community sees as the</p>

	<p>Fitzroy North vibe. We need to ensure that new apartments are accommodated in a way that is sympathetic to the environment that people have enjoyed for decades and not create increased value for one business by detracting amenity from the local community and its regular visitors. Implications of the new world order (post COVID) on design, needs to also be considered. I am disappointed that the Council wasn't able to allow submissions through video conferencing when all public and private schools and workplaces were able to continue working remotely.</p>
<p>Michael Bullen Fitzroy North</p>	<p>Building B towers over all residential properties to the west. There are no buildings in any of the local Fitzroy North Village or residential area surrounding that even approaches this scale. The council commissioned Robert McGauran to provide independent view of the plans. He refers to a scale of building planned that doubles the size of existing buildings and a recommendation to delete the third and fifth levels of current plans. Specifically, he calls out the excessive height in Egremont Street and a recommendation to "delete the fourth floor of the North Western building" I understand that the sale and diversion of the laneway are subject to separate review and approval but I am concerned that plans reflect a 6-metre-wide laneway exiting to Egremont Street and directly opposite 33 and 35 Egremont. This appears unreasonably large for a diversion of existing laneway and suggests alternate use. On street parking is an issue today which is infrequently addressed by Yarra Council Inspectors making car parking for permitted residents difficult today. There is an increasing level of homeless making residence in nearby Edenborough Gardens, whilst I respect this is a community and social welfare issue, the fact that people are seen walking the streets with open containers of alcohol I do not understand why the need for a license to sell needs to cover from 7am to 11.00pm and this should be rejected. In general, I believe the plans are excessive and should be rejected by council.</p>
<p>Pieter Penhall Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I object because: 1. It ignores well established North Fitzroy planning and heritage requirements. 2. It ruins five characterful local buildings properties that are either Victorian housing stock or retail premises in good general condition, or that have specifically been identified as being of historic interest. 3. It will materially hurt local traders such as the Zapris Pharmacy that is critical for the local community. We have seen how the local Newsagency has been hollowed out by moving it onto the first floor of Piedimontes. This business model just does not work. 4. Opportunities for small retail and artists and makers, will be reduced by the loss of individual retail frontages, and direct competition to local businesses with more licensed premises and the increase in the Piedimontes bottle shop. 5. The residents of Egremont Street will have their quality of life seriously affected. Impacting darkness, dampness, health and safety, mental well-being, it will have a drastic effect on their lives. 6. Piedimontes have not provided any perspective views/renderings of the property before/after the building work, from Scotchmer Street directly across the street from the development, despite this being specifically requested previously. I consider this dishonest. A development should not be allowed on that tenuous basis. 7. It will cause extreme and unacceptable noise and traffic disruption over the building cycle for local residents. 8. It is extremely ill-advised in the current financial climate because a failed development with destroyed heritage buildings will be a blight on the landscape.</p>
<p>Anna Rotar North Fitzroy</p>	<p>North Fitzroy Village is a beautiful community space that is at risk of destruction should Piedimonte's be allowed to proceed with their planned development. The bulk and design of the project is at odds with the space and the 'village' feel. It will dwarf all surrounding terraces and buildings. It is not a complementary design in any way and will destroy our village. North Fitzroy is presently one of the most intact and original suburbs of Melbourne, hence its broad appeal. We accept that development is inevitable, however, this should be in a sympathetic manner that does not destroy local character. The proposed development would see the absorption of many of the shops, so diversity also disappears. Save our community and reject this proposed development.</p>
<p>Maria Liberogiannis North Fitzroy</p>	<p>We would like to express our discontent and disappointment regarding the latest development plans. It would be a planning catastrophe to see such a development proceed. Redevelopment can go ahead but not at the expense of altering the streetscape and heritage of our area. The ridiculous height and mixed commercial-residential use is shameful. The current plans do not respect the integrity and</p>

	<p>historical importance of one of the first suburbs of Melbourne. The existing infrastructure is already stressed with huge delivery trucks unloading in Scotchmer Street. This operation is time consuming and disruptive to traffic. Our narrow street was never designed to handle the volume and size of such vehicles. The laneway is used by the trucks to enter, park and unload. Our laneways are public thoroughfares that need to be accessed by all at any time of day. Squeezing more people into such housing is incomprehensible and a travesty. What we fail to comprehend is when Yarra Council built our new Library height restrictions were enforced and the result was a functional, sustainable and pleasing example of modern, eco-friendly architecture well suited to the area. Ratepayers are obligated to comply to strict regulations and require permits to carry out extensions to their homes often with many setbacks. It is not surprising when commercial interests are at take our Council allows such inappropriate, aesthetically ugly development to go ahead. It would be an eye-sore dominating the sky-line and setting a precedence for more unsuitable construction in the future. Profit and greed needs to end.</p>
<p>Christopher Pickings Fitzroy North</p>	<p>As a Fitzroy North resident and home owner of 5 years, the development of the area means a great deal to myself and my family. We plan to spend the next 2-3 decades living in our house and raising our children on Rae Street, between Scotchmer and Reid Streets. I am certainly not opposed to change and development in the area on particular sites, and see the Piedmontes site as one that does indeed require improvement. However, if the development goes ahead as proposed, I believe it will damage Fitzroy North village forever and will set a precedent for further development of this scale in an area predominately made up of 1 and 2 story heritage residential homes. The forced acquisition of public land blocking off the laneway at the rear of the site is also something I feel is unjust and damaging to residents of the area, particularly those living on the east side of Egremont Street. In my opinion, the building should be kept to a maximum of 5 stories and no public land/access should be affected by the development once complete.</p>
<p>Carlan Pickings Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I have been a Fitzroy North resident and home owner for 5 years now and the development of the area means a great deal to myself and my family. We plan to spend the next 20-30 years living here and raising our children on Rae Street, not far from Piedmontes. I understand the need for change and development in the area. This is normal and necessary in many cases. The Piedmontes site is not aesthetically pleasing, is not an efficient use of the land area and does indeed require improvement. However, if the development goes ahead as proposed, I believe it will negatively impact Fitzroy North village forever and will set a precedent for further development of this scale. The area is mainly comprised of 1-2 story residential homes with some older industrial buildings and the village hub is the junction of Scotchmer and St Georges Rd. The last thing it needs is a building of this scale dominating the skyline and setting up the next big development to go even higher. The forced acquisition of public land blocking off the laneway at the rear of the site is also something I feel is unjust and damaging to residents of the area, particularly those living on the east side of Egremont Street. In my opinion, the building should be kept to a maximum of 5 stories and no public land/access should be affected by the development once complete.</p>
<p>Hanna Schotten Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I have been part the North Fitzroy community for more than 25 years and greatly value the small village feel to the shopping strip with its relatively small shop fronts and low sky line. The proposed development is too high at 6 stories and bulky and would dominate the village and is not in proportion to existing size developments of a maximum of 3 stories on the street . It would negatively impact on my enjoyment, sense of community the character of our neighbourhood. The bulk and size of the proposed building would lead to significant shading of the surrounding streets with a loss of direct sunlight and sky view. The design is uninspiring and very unsympathetic. Given its dominant position the is a responsibility going forward to ensure a better design that is more in keeping with the thoughtfulness put into the design of the local library for instance The proposed building is completely out of scale with the size and style of the adjoining building and character in what is a relatively small shopping area The suggested number of dwellings is excessive increasing density will put increased pressure on the existing green space such as Edinburgh gardens which is already overcrowded. Taking out the need for an underground car park would reduce the number of dwelling being suggested to cover</p>

	the cost of building an underground car park, and reduce the disruption of such a major development I
Andrea Davy Fitzroy North	As per my previous submissions, I continue to strongly oppose the Piedemonte development on multiple grounds including: 1. the overall size and height of the development is not in keeping with the surrounding village and suburb of Fitzroy north. the bulk of the development - its height and mass is out of character with surrounding buildings 2.the proposed development does nothing to enhance the environment nor the residents who live here who value community development and respect for how we live here. 3. i do not support the proposal to take over a public laneway for private gain. 4. i do not support extension of a liquor license which increases our community's exposure to alcohol. 5. i do not support overshadowing - design needs modification (refer to point 1) 6. heritage loss - an essential aspect of our local neighbourhood which many other suburbs have sacrificed for development. this cannot be replaced! 7. traffic and car parking impacts including my own street which is already lined with piedemontes staff who overstay the 6 hr limit. number of parking bays within the development do not support number of residential properties 8. inconsistent with neighbourhood character - design and presentation 9. loss of commercial diversity and a threat to our social well-being
Hayden Oberin Fitzroy North	Firstly, as a 13+ year local on Tranmere St I'm very concerned that the Piedimonte's development would generate more traffic on both Tranmere and Egremont St. We already have a major problem with commuters taking illegal shortcuts (against signs and at high speed) through our quiet streets. Please ensure that no extra traffic or deliveries burden our single lane and one way streets. Secondly, I very much value our historic public laneways. Me and my daughter often walk our dogs on them and it would be a true shame if any were lost (photo proof over many years: <a href="https://photos.app.goo.gl/ybhEHAMoUztFgYGx2">https://photos.app.goo.gl/ybhEHAMoUztFgYGx2</a> ). Please ensure that no lanes are lost or closed as a result of this development because that can never be undone. Thirdly, while I totally understand development is inevitable (and generally good for local business etc.) I don't think the size or design is in keeping with the current local buildings and history of the area. I'm no expert but I do implore you to please listen to the local heritage experts and ensure this development doesn't destroy what makes the local shops so special (and successful). Dear council, you have ONE chance at this, and your decisions will ripple for years, if not for generations to come. If you would not accept this on your doorstep, please don't put it on mine. I beg you to ensure this is a positive for the locals, in all respects, as this can never be undone.
Kerry Merriman Fitzroy North	As a long-term land owner and resident of North Fitzroy I wish to again strongly object to the proposed redevelopment of Piedimontes' supermarket The planned redevelopment is entirely out of scale with surrounding streetscapes which comprise largely single or double-storey heritage listed residential dwellings and which give the area so much charm. The development will result in decreased amenity for local residents in terms of parking and traffic congestion in our already highly congested local shopping area. The local streets are not suitable for even more delivery trucks. Onsite parking in the development is inadequate for the number of residential premises planned. The proposed building is intrusive, architecturally unattractive and overshadows nearby housing and streets. Please keep our local shopping centre small in scale offering its wide range of boutique artisan shops. I have boycotted Piedimontes since hearing of their development plans and will continue to do so till these plans are quashed. Please hear the widespread public outcry and groundswell from residents and object to this unnecessary and unwanted oversized re-development.
Annette Helsing Fitzroy North	Fitzroy North Residents Action Group requests Councillors reject the proposal which is inconsistent with neighbourhood character (3 levels is the highest point in the neighbourhood), and Yarra's planning policy and housing strategy (area is an incremental growth area), creating a disproportionate monolith in a village; results in heritage losses - demolition of large sections of buildings that define the neighbourhood, creates facadism and reduces street activation, compromised village skylines scale and density - negatively impacts on community and individuals, effectively 9 levels, over 60 apartments, lack of 'variation' creates inappropriate overshadowing and lines of sight, and limits solar power functionality reduces commercial and arts diversity - 5 parcels of land and independent businesses that

	<p>are currently accessed from the street lost permanently precedent setting with the 3 adjoining corners set for similar redevelopments transfers public assets to private ownership for commercial purposes but no community benefit car parking and traffic impositions - only 38% of parking needs provisioned, exacerbates traffic volume with no traffic study in place; exacerbates unsafe loading operations inappropriate expanded access to alcohol - extending liquor shop hours from 7 am to 11 pm FNRAG remains committed to supporting developments that evolve at a pace and scale that is sustainable and respects all stakeholders. We believe it is possible for a redevelopment to be sympathetic with its environment, have a net community benefit and still meet commercial interests. Despite repeated offerings to engage with the applicant, we are saddened that these offers have not been taken up.</p>
<p>Ross Honeyman Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I object to current proposed redevelopment of Piedimonte's supermarket. It is a huge development and out of character with the village feel of the surrounding area. Its' excessive scale will result in undesirable shading of the fronting park. The park which provides vibrancy and a focus for the village will become cold and dreary. Inclusion of a three storey car park will bring excessive traffic to the area when a feature of the area is bike riding and walking. This is an opportunity to do something special which will not replicate many of the bland, un-imagitive and soulless developments and communities across Melbourne. I recently moved to the area attracted by the feel of area and, in particular, the village. I support redevelopment of the site but not at this scale.</p>
<p>Name withheld Fitzroy North</p>	<p>To the detriment of my fellow residents, I am in support the development of Piedimontes into a multi-storey dwelling. This grocery store is an iconic part of Fitzroy North and it desperately needs a facelift. My opinion is that if it's owners are willing to refresh their existing premises, I feel the community should be grateful for the investment. Piediamontes supermarket is a very well-used local resource which supports a community feel in the neighbourhood. Some residents are saying it's greedy and going too far, but when did we (civilization) ever get anywhere by remaining stagnant and unchanged? The changes should be embraced as long as they are in-keeping with the community and do not cause disruption. My only real concerns are around ensuring local traffic is not adversely affected by this development. I live off Egremont street, and want to be sure the traffic won't be funneled through the small streets as we already have enough traffic and I would hate to see it get worse.</p>
<p>Jayne Darby Fitzroy North</p>	<p>No precedent for 7 storeys in the immediate vicinity: overshadowing of Egremont &amp; Scotchmer. Minimal consideration of sustainability; Impact of 89 apartments- excessive noise levels, traffic, impact on parking in adjacent streets due to insufficient residents' parking. One entrance point for parking, together with trucks delivering to the loading bay will increase risks to pedestrians and cyclists, as well as increasing traffic congestion. Significant impact on local services: schools, preschools, medical clinics, as well as impact on infrastructures such as sewage, water, power, garbage and recycling collection, together with impact on public transport and traffic congestion. Appropriation of public laneway will have detrimental impact on residential amenity for residents of Egremont &amp; Tranmere Sts, together with other local residents, not only by detracting from the character of the local area but also by restricting access to existing residents and businesses. Creation of a new laneway in Egremont St for rubbish collection and service delivery for the development will result in unacceptable levels of noise, smells and light pollution. Design is overpowering &amp; neither sympathetic nor complementary to the surrounding buildings. High density development of 89 apartments over 7 storeys has no consideration for inclusion of low cost or social housing. Smaller number of higher quality apartments would be more appropriate and almost as lucrative. Piedimontes' supermarket has been a stalwart of the community, &amp; we have been regular customers for 31 years. This development demonstrates a total lack of consideration for those that have supported the business for so many years.</p>
<p>Joseph Chan Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I object for the following reasons: 1. Inappropriate Scale The scale of the proposed development is excessive. High-density design has been achieved to the detriment of liveability (natural light, indoor and outdoor space, communal areas). The proposal does not include any affordable housing. 2. Out of Character with the Local Area - The area predominately consists of one to three storey buildings. The proposed seven-storey building is vastly out of character with the area. The proposed design</p>

	<p>removes significant parts of heritage buildings and replaces them with a building that does not complement existing local architecture. 3. The increased commercial traffic to the loading dock presents a danger to pedestrians and cyclists as large delivery trucks reverse across Scotchmer Street. Already, on a weekly basis I witness delivery trucks unloading while blocking the footpath and forcing pedestrians to walk on the road. 4. Reduced Retail Diversity – Several smaller shops on Best Street will be eliminated. The inclusion of townhouses with the small format commercial on Scotchmer Street suggests the most likely use would be non-retail commercial. This will detract from the walkability of the area and make the district less desirable as a general shopping destination. 5. Closure of a Public Laneway - This would adversely impact all residents on the East side of Egremont Street and is against council policy to activate and create laneway connections.</p>
Rosalyn Jack Fitzroy North	<p>I feel that this development is unnecessary and unattractive. There's a new Coles a couple of minutes away on Nicholson St and many new apartment developments in the vicinity, we don't need more, especially in such a landmark spot.</p>
Julie Paul Fitzroy Nth	<p>I am opposed to the height and scale of the proposed development above Piedimonte's supermarket. The area is my local shopping area and I love the mix of small shops as well as Piedimonte's. However, with the proposed development, some of the small shops would disappear, being subsumed into a large, towering building that would dominate the skyline, the intersection and the local area. Please preserve the village feel of the area and the variety of shops and don't allow a huge tall building to be the start of large scale buildings/apartments on this corner.</p>
Anne Coveny North Fitzroy	<p>Please refuse this development to keep the village feel of North Fitzroy Village. With the (former) Post Office at one end and our beautiful new library at the other, still the most prominent buildings. The Yarra Housing Strategy says North Fitzroy village should only have incremental change, not high, not moderate, incremental. North Fitzroy village is in the same heritage overlay, in the same suburb as Queens Parade Village. The top planners in the state spent weeks deciding the heights along Queens Parade. What did the panel of planners say about heights in the Queens Parade village? They said 11m absolute maximum, where the shops are narrow, then 14m where the shops are wider. The officer has recommended 24m for Piedmontes. That is way higher than 14m. Why? The officer is relying on the council's heritage advisor's opinion. It is worth noting the same heritage adviser also said 16 storeys, (51m), was ok for 26-56 Queens Parade. The same 26-56 Queens Parade panel said should be no higher than 10 storeys, 30m. The adviser was 40% out for 26-56, so if she is 40% out on Piedmontes, 27m could be approved when a good heritage outcome is around 16m. Whatever height Piedmontes get, the other corners will want higher. Losing the village feel we love, and a bunch of lovely village shops, for a big new bottle shop is a really dud deal.</p>
Bruna Evans North Fitzroy	<p>I urge Councillors to reject the proposed plan for Piedimontes. The appeal of the North Fitzroy village is the diversity of shops with cafes, bakeries, a pharmacy and gift shops. The very popular Piedimontes, though no architectural gem, blends in, and doesn't detract from the charming heritage shops near to the neighbouring Victorian terraces. The latest development design overwhelms the village with its height and bulk, blocking sunlight from nearby houses and shops, and reducing the number of individual independent shops. The loss of the pharmacy would be felt by many. The outcome of the C231 Planning Panel for the Queens Parade shopping strip, a height limit of 3 storeys, must be echoed in the North Fitzroy village, for all the same reasons. At that Panel it was noted that North Fitzroy had enough apartment capacity in the development pipeline. Why destroy a much loved community gathering hub, if it is unnecessary? Robert McGauren's report correctly sums up the proposal's threat to the valuable heritage character of the village. His recommendations need to be listened to. If Councillors approve the proposal, dwellings nearby would eventually seek to develop with similar excessive bulk further destroying the loved low rise village atmosphere.</p>
Carmel D'Andrea Fitzroy North	<p>*The proposed building is totally inappropriate for the surrounding area. *It is too big, too high, not in keeping with the historical and characteristic buildings in the nearby streets. * The proposed building will over-shadow neighbouring properties and will block the sun to the little garden reserve in front of the supermarket. *The building will be an unwanted, imposing behemoth which will bring more traffic, noise and</p>

	<p>rubbish to an already busy zone. *If allowed, It will set a precedent for development on small sites within the North Fitzroy village which will ruin the amenity forever.</p> <p>*The proposed building does not respect the history, character or the community of our suburb. *It does not fit in with , nor reference, the corner buildings of Old Post Office and Nth Fitzroy Library. * The building will destroy the village feel of the neighbourhood and will impact on the residents' lives in an extremely negative</p> <p>*There are already too many high, inappropriate, overly congested developments in this little suburb. This will be an addition to the blights on the landscape.</p>
<p>Max Bracegirdle Fitzroy North</p>	<p>This is a heritage village within a Heritage overlay and Yarra uses one of this village's buildings (namely the Victorian Heritage listed former North Fitzroy Post Office c1886-1887) on the front of its current Heritage Strategy Document and yet ironically, this village doesn't have appropriate heritage protection. And why has Yarra engaged Professor Robert McGauran for urban design referrals throughout this process, only to ignore his recommendations? Simply put, McGauran found the height of 27+ metres was almost double the height of other buildings in the neighbourhood, and therefore inappropriate for the heritage neighbourhood character. His recommendation was to remove two storeys from the 'main' building facing Best St and remove central built form to create a "break" in the building to be more in keeping with the fine-grained nature of the neighbourhood. The council officers' response to this advice is a reduction of one storey. Why? I draw councillors' attention to the recent nearby "Moonlight" VCAT case which stated near-doubling of height compared to highest neighbours was an unacceptable response and that was not in a heritage village covered by a heritage overlay. Why is it that residents in a heritage overlay can't even put visible solar panels on their rooftops, yet this massive development adjoining residential properties is immune? I ask councillors to refuse this proposal as it already has 50 plus conditions on it and would need as many more to make it acceptable. That is if they could actually be articulated clearly enough via this forum.</p>
<p>Sarah Jolly Fitzroy North</p>	<p>The proposed development fails significantly to meet the external building and land development controls described in the Heritage Overlay of the Yarra Planning Scheme concerning North Fitzroy Precinct. In support of my objection: 1) Heritage Overlay Clause 22.02-5.7 states that new developments: Be articulated and massed to correspond with the prevailing building form of the heritage place or contributory elements to the heritage place. Be visually recessive and not dominate the heritage place. 2) Lovell Chen's Heritage Impact Statement comments: 'The proposed new buildings are acknowledged to be of a scale which is not typically found in this section of the North Fitzroy Precinct'. (p32). This report also mentions the 'monolithic form of the upper level' (p33). 3) McGauran Report Conclusion 40 states: 'The current proposed 27m+ form is almost twice the scale of other recent developments within the village and is excessive in bulk, scale and offsite impact becoming the dominant form and character of an area where the composite collection of village buildings is what lies at the core of its charm and collective contribution.' 4) Of great concern to me as a professional designer, I note the 'Advertised Perspectives' are misleading. The 'Perspective View' suggests the eastern building will be approximately 6 storeys in height. Reality will be equivalent to 9 residential storeys (7 commercial storeys) (McGauran). The general public rely on these drawings for fair representation. Our beloved village, our respected councillors please vote to reject.</p>
<p>Chris Hallwright Fitzroy North</p>	<p>The proposed development of Piedimontes would irrevocably destroy the heritage character of Fitzroy North, through its utterly excessive height. Fitzroy and Fitzroy North were Melbourne's first suburbs. If heritage means anything at all to Yarra Councillors, then you must, please, reject this proposal.</p>
<p>James Peter Yewers Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I am a long term resident and rate payer of North Fitzroy I ask council to reject the current building plans for the development of Piedemontes supermarket and 8 surrounding properties 27 metres is excessive in scale and pattern and will destroy the heritage streetscape of the North Fitzroy village The proposed design would set an unacceptable precedent for VCAT on what is acceptable built form for future developments in North Fitzroy, especially on the adjacent corners. Current parking is inadequate for residents, users of the supermarket and retailers. The proposal will put more pressure on already limited parking in the area. The development will increase traffic volumes particularly in Scotchmer Street</p>

Jillian Hiscock Fitzroy North	I have responded previously, and will reiterate my high concerns about the design (too high, not in the style of the area), the impact on the amenity of that small shopping area and the loss of the diversity of the existing shops. In the increased density of the inner suburbs, we are losing what makes them community, to our detriment. Adding apartments increases traffic activity in an already busy corner. While cars are being discouraged for new apartment builds, with the assumption that people will be public transport users or cyclists, this is incorrect. If the first wave of residents do not have cars, the next wave of occupants will as they will be moving into a community that has been so changed by current developments that the values have changed. The family have the right to do what they want with their business, but having been an integral part of the community they helped to build, it would be a great tragedy if the development meant the loss of community.
Joanna Lawrence North Fitzroy	The planned development is too large for the local infrastructure and will have a negative impact on existing locals. The changes to traffic and lanes in particular will be significant to the local streets with negative impacts on Tranmere and Egremont St which are already used as short cuts to avoid the heavy traffic on St George Rd. Parking for local residents is already difficult. Trams are packed and often pass by without stopping at peak times. The local outdoor space, the park is often full with little room for children to play with balls. Some development of Piedmontes is welcome but the proposed build is far too big and will be a very unwelcome addition to this already crowded neighbourhood.
Ann Shenfield North Fitzroy	I'm writing to object to the Council Planning team's approval of the development of Piedimonte's supermarket in its latest iteration. I'm concerned about the bulk and height of the building, which still doesn't fit with the low-rise amenity of the area. I am dissatisfied that the Council Planning Department has ignored the independent urban design report that it commissioned, by Robert McGauran, which states: "The current form is almost twice the scale of recent other developments ...in the village ... is excessive bulk, scale and impact, becoming dominant in an area where the collection of village buildings is at the core of its charm" (pg. 8). Personally I walk and shop in this area a great deal and am seeking to protect it from becoming another soulless overdevelopment like those in Lygon St, East Brunswick. As elected Councillors I hope that you take a stand to represent the community who are feeling very dissatisfied about this development.
Jessica Gillespie Fitzroy north	As a local resident who frequently uses the north Fitzroy village I object to the development of Piedmontes supermarket and surrounding Schotchmer St for the following reasons: - it is too high - loss of retail diversity. The community feel of our local shops will be greatly impacted by the removal of so many valued retailers to be replaced by a single unnecessarily large supermarket. It's unsupportive of small local businesses. - the number and configuration of apartments will not foster long term residents with a commitment to our community. They are too small and have too many single or double bed units. I'm not opposed to apartments but for us to support higher density living any new apartments we build must be able to support more families. They need community space and facilities. The huge number of additional residents will be totally dependent on local facilities that are already overburdened e.g. Edinburgh gardens. - I don't believe development over the alleyway is ok. It is a bad precedent to set for other developments around alleyways And should be left as is. Please consider the impact this will have on our community at a time where we need more connectedness not more isolation. We need to support a diverse community and local small business.
Andrew Kenyon Fitzroy North	The current proposals have almost all the substantive failures of the earlier proposals. The height remains excessive, and is completely out of character with the neighbourhood of mostly one to two storey houses and shops. It would set a socially and community damaging precedent for future development in the rest of the area (particularly the adjacent corners). The height should be limited to the equivalent of 4 residential stories; there should be no reduction in car parking requirements; the traffic entry and exit from the parking looks highly problematic for those who use these streets already. The proposal still has excessive bulk--it is worse than the earlier plans in that regard. It would dominate the streetscape, harming the character and liveability of the suburb. Fitzroy North village should be developed in a sympathetic manner to sustain and enhance the valuable and diverse

	retail and community services available there. The loss of the chemist is a far greater harm to the village than adding to the supermarket. There is no provision for integration of affordable housing, even though this is needed in the neighbourhood. Nor does this appear to be an environmentally sustainable development. Both these elements run counter to Council policy focusing on fostering social justice and tackling the climate emergency.
Rachael Ford North Fitzroy	I have lived in the local North Fitzroy area since 1986 and have always supported Piedmontes and other local traders. This area has a real sense of community and heritage which I fear will be lost if this proposed construction goes ahead. It will also create a logistic nightmare with so many people and cars coming and going and noise levels will without a doubt rise. I fear the scale of this development will change the nature of living in North Fitzroy irrevocably. I ask you to please consider the views of the residents when making your decision. I am not opposed to development but believe it should be in keeping with the local area and lives of those who live there. The design is out of keeping with the local architecture..
Jenny Sinclair Fitzroy North	I would like council to reject this application based on its size, its noncompliance with planning guidelines and its negative effect on the North Fitzroy Village, and to ask the applicant to come back with a more moderate and sustainable proposal.
Peter Barrett Fitzroy North	I object to the current proposal on the following three (3) grounds: 1. Excessive visual bulk, and excessive height for this prominent site (3 levels would be more appropriate); 2. The visual bulk is out of character with the existing neighbourhood and retail precinct, particularly its heritage scale; 3. Amenity: I object to the loss of a public thoroughfare (the lane at the rear of the supermarket, which I understand will be acquired by the developer from Council).
Sarrah Coffey Fitzroy North	I strongly object to proposal, including: - excessive height and massing for neighbourhood heritage village - out of scale with current or preferred neighbourhood character (e.g. library and other shops etc.) - loss of independent retail spaces/local businesses - incl chemist - proposed building will shadow neighbourhood park from early afternoon - proposed car parking and vehicle traffic movements excessive
Joseph Piedimonte Fitzroy North	The Piedimonte family has operated a business from the existing site since 1958. Since that time, it has expanded its business and ownership to deliver an important service to the community of Fitzroy North. The commercial operations of a modern supermarket and food business have changed substantially over recent years, and the Piedimonte's Supermarket needs to be upgraded to reflect such changes in order to provide an ongoing service to the local community. The Piedimonte family undertook an original design with Peddle Thorpe Architects. That proposal received significant community backlash, as well as generating a wide range of concerns from Council's planning officers. In response, I have personally engaged with community members and local traders. We made a decision to go back to the drawing board and we employed award winning architects Jackson Clement Burrows and a new project team to undertake a redesign to specifically address matters raised by the community and Council Officers. The resulting development outcome achieves positive built form, public realm and amenity outcomes that has achieved support from Council's planning officers, who have recommended approval subject to conditions. The development will result in a much-needed upgrade of an important part of Fitzroy North's urban fabric that is a widely valued local community service, being the Piedimonte's supermarket, providing an \$80m investment and creating 240 jobs within the City of Yarra. We thank Council for its consideration of the application, and we look forward to Council's support for the proposal.
John Cheek Fitzroy North	too many small units. Does not add to community housing options for families who will stay in the area - taking public space to build, but not adding to public areas - no amenities for residents - obliterates small community shopping space - quite unattractive
Natasha Hunter Fitzroy North	I object to the Council Planning team's approval of the latest development of Piedimonte's. The bulk and height of the building still doesn't fit with the low-rise amenity of the area. I am dissatisfied that the Council Planning Department has ignored the independent urban design report that it commissioned, in which states: "The current form is almost twice the scale of recent other developments ...in the village ... is excessive bulk, scale and impact, becoming dominant in an area where

	<p>the collection of village buildings is at the core of its charm" (pg. 8). Personally I walk and shop in this area a great deal and am seeking to protect it from becoming another soulless overdevelopment like those in nearby suburbs. My husband and I bought in this suburb with a plan to the long-term and plan to raise our young family here. I truly hope this suburb and community remains the same vibrant, diverse area we love. As elected Councillors I implore you to take a stand to represent the community who are feeling very dissatisfied and extremely concerned about this development.</p>
Jared Hunter Fitzroy North	<p>I object to the Council Planning team's approval of the latest development of Piedimonte's. The bulk and height of the building still doesn't fit with the low-rise amenity of the area. I am dissatisfied that the Council Planning Department has ignored the independent urban design report that it commissioned, in which states: "The current form is almost twice the scale of recent other developments ...in the village ... is excessive bulk, scale and impact, becoming dominant in an area where the collection of village buildings is at the core of its charm" (pg. 8). Personally I walk and shop in this area a great deal and am seeking to protect it from becoming another soulless overdevelopment like those in nearby suburbs. My wife and I bought in this suburb with a plan to the long-term and plan to raise our young family here. I truly hope this suburb and community remains the same vibrant, diverse area we love. As elected Councillors I implore you to take a stand to represent the community who are feeling very dissatisfied and extremely concerned about this development.</p>
Patsy Yaksender North Fitzroy	<p>To All Councillors, As a 25+ year resident of North Fitzroy I implore you reject Council Officers recommendation to approve the Piedimonte Development. I implore you to be cognisant of the large volume of objections and the wishes of the local community and to vote accordingly to reject this proposal. I oppose the 27 metre height and the Council Officers recommendation of 24 metres. This is still too high. The height &amp; bulk of the building will forever change the visual amenity of the local community. It is excessive and out of scale with the character of the neighbourhood village. It will dominate the landscape, other village buildings and the local historic surrounds. This proposal will have detrimental effect on vehicle congestion in the neighbourhood with access to car parking so close to the St Georges Rd major intersection and traffic already "banking" significantly on Scotchmer St. The proposal will increase traffic hazards for pedestrians and cyclists. This proposal will have a Negative net benefit to the community. The scale of this development will reduce the diversity of our local businesses in the village. Local residents value small independent traders. We will lose valued independent clothing and gift shops and chemist. This development will reduce the live-ability and walk-ability of the village. Still too big &amp; bulky Once again I implore all Councillors to listen to the overwhelming view of local residents vote against this proposal that will forever change the character of our Village!</p>
Rose Nechwatal Thornbury	<p>Please I understand you may need to update the area but it needs to be in keeping with the heritage surrounds of the area. That shopping strip is adorable let's keep it that way.</p>
Kathryn Rae North Fitzroy	<p>This development is too big and bulky and will change the atmospherics of our special village feel suburb</p>
Julia McClelland Fitzroy North	<p>I object to the Council Planning team's approval of the latest development of Piedimonte's. The bulk and height of the building still doesn't fit with the low-rise amenity of the area. I am dissatisfied that the Council Planning Department has ignored the independent urban design report that it commissioned, which states: "The current form is almost twice the scale of recent other developments ...in the village ... is excessive bulk, scale and impact, becoming dominant in an area where the collection of village buildings is at the core of its charm" (pg. 8). As elected Councillors I implore you to take a stand to represent the community who are feeling very dissatisfied and extremely concerned about this development.</p>
Anne Mullins FITZROY NORTH	<p>I implore Council to reject these plans, and the recommendation of the officer's report to approve with some changes. As a long-standing resident of North Fitzroy (25 years+), I know my suburb and love it. I don't agree with the officer's conclusion that "the subject site is capable of adopting a building of this scale and yield". Perhaps in</p>

	<p>the abstract, but not for THIS site and for THIS village. 8 or 9 storey building heights should NOT be the new benchmark for North Fitzroy village, and I ask Councillors to reject this. At 27 metres, the proposed building is as tall as a 9 story block of flats this is not the scale that the area speaks to now nor should it in the future. Council's own urban design expert rejected the plans as "excessive in bulk, scale and offsite impact". The developer's heritage expert admitted "the proposal is not consistent with all aspects of Council's Heritage policies". Yarra's Planning Rules MUST apply to a heritage neighbourhood village. As the COVID-19 pandemic took over our lives, we kept close to our neighbourhood, walking endlessly around it, and discovering it anew. We took comfort from the quiet village atmosphere, with its low-rise heritage buildings. Please do not let this be taken away now.</p>
Lucy Rogers Fitzroy North	<p>I object to the Council Planning team's approval of the latest development of Piedmonte's. The bulk and height of the building is not in keeping with the low-rise profile of the area. I am frustrated that the Council Planning Department has ignored the independent urban design report that it commissioned, which states: "The current form is almost twice the scale of recent other developments ...in the village ... is excessive bulk, scale and impact, becoming dominant in an area where the collection of village buildings is at the core of its charm" (pg. 8). These local shops have a unique village feel much loved by locals like myself. If the local area becomes over developed and loses its special quality we will look to relocate as it will have lost its appeal for our young family. As elected Councillors I ask that you to take a stand to represent the community who are feeling unheard and extremely concerned about this development.</p>
Juliette Stead Fitzroy north	<p>I object to the latest plans for the Piedmonte's development. The size of the development is too big and out of place with the rest of the area. In addition, taking possession of the laneway is unacceptable and a terrible precedent to set for the area. People choose to live in this area for a very specific reason, and it stands out from other areas nearby. Allowing this type of development to take place against the wishes of almost the entire community would be at worst a lazy and financially motivated betrayal and at best a terribly misjudged decision. Other developments have enriched the area - such as the library. Let's focus on more positive additions rather than imposing, incongruous, damaging developments.</p>
Alison Cross Fitzroy North	<p>The proposal for PLN17/0618 at Piedmontes is too big. It completely visually dominates two major streets destroying historical facades and neighbourhood character. The building will overshadow, and overlook neighbouring properties. There is insufficient parking allowed for units, visitors to units, and the supermarket. There is insufficient parking bays for truck delivery. The new height limit may lead to a rash of new, high developments resulting in a "canyon" down St Georges Rd; much like Nicholson St. There will be loss of amenity. Small shops like the pharmacy will not be viable in proposed tiny footprints for new shops, and will probably close; many local elderly folk who do not drive rely on these services. A new licensed venue is inappropriate in this residential area, especially with homes directly above it.</p>
Julie Koch Fitzroy North	<p>I object to the Council Planning team's approval of the latest development of Piedmonte's. The bulk and height of the building still doesn't fit with the low-rise amenity of the area. I am dissatisfied that the Council Planning Department has ignored the independent urban design report that it commissioned, in which states: "The current form is almost twice the scale of recent other developments ...in the village ... is excessive bulk, scale and impact, becoming dominant in an area where the collection of village buildings is at the core of its charm" (pg. 8). Personally I walk and shop in this area a great deal and am seeking to protect it from becoming another overdevelopment like those in nearby suburbs. My husband and I moved to this suburb with a long-term and plan to raise our young family here. I truly hope this suburb and community remains the same vibrant, diverse area we love. As elected Councillors I implore you to take a stand to represent the community who are feeling very dissatisfied and extremely concerned about this development.</p>
Anthony Holden Fitzroy North	<p>I am a Fitzroy North resident and I object! The proposal to redevelop Piedimonte's in Fitzroy North village is too big and threatens to ruin the character of the village and its surrounds. While I accept that some sort of redevelopment is necessary, the proposed new development is obscenely large, and completely out of scale with the</p>

	<p>otherwise low-rise nature of the area. It will cast a literal and figurative shadow over the entire village area, and will mean the death of the existing vibrant Fitzroy North community, in favour of yet another monument to greed. The plans must be scaled back to save Fitzroy North village.</p>
<p>Emma Byrnes Fitzroy North</p>	<p>I strongly object to the proposed development in its current form. I believe the design is still too visually bulky, its height is excessive and will be out of character with the surrounding heritage village and I object to the developer acquiring a public laneway at the rear of the development. Yarra Council should not be selling off public spaces to developers!</p>
<p>David Collins North Fitzroy</p>	<p>I've been a loyal shopper at Piedimontes for the last 28 years, and have always appreciated the human scale and neighbourhood character of the supermarket and surroundings. I don't want to shop at a Coles/Woolies clone. Unfortunately the owners have misjudged the situation again. This revised Piedimonte's development proposal fails, like the earlier proposal, to respect the neighbourhood character in terms of scale and heritage aspect, or to offer anything other than unsightly bulk, increased congestion, and loss of utility and variety, to our local village. It continues to impact negatively on nearby residential streets. If approved it would inevitably bring to the area developers intent on replicating the monolithic building practices seen elsewhere. Please do not approve this development.</p>
<p>Lillie Wilson North Fitzroy</p>	<p>I object to the Council Planning team's approval of the latest development of Piedimonte's. The bulk and height of the building still doesn't fit with the low-rise amenity of the area. I am dissatisfied that the Council Planning Department has ignored the independent urban design report that it commissioned, in which states: "The current form is almost twice the scale of recent other developments ...in the village ... is excessive bulk, scale and impact, becoming dominant in an area where the collection of village buildings is at the core of its charm" (pg. 8). Personally I walk and shop in this area a great deal and am seeking to protect it from becoming another soulless overdevelopment like those in nearby suburbs. My husband and I bought in this suburb with a plan to the long-term and plan to raise our young family here. I truly hope this suburb and community remains the same vibrant, diverse area we love. As elected Councillors I implore you to take a stand to represent the community who are feeling very dissatisfied and extremely concerned about this development.</p>

## COUNCIL RESOLUTION

**Moved:** Councillor O'Brien

**Seconded:** Councillor Fristacky

## GROUNDS FOR REFUSAL

That having considered all objections and relevant planning policies, Council resolves to issue a Notice of Refusal to Grant a Permit PLN17/0618 for the Partial demolition for the use and development of the land for the construction of a mixed use building (inclusive of dwelling use), sale of packaged liquor (associated with the bottle shop) and a reduction in car parking requirement at 27 – 45 Best Street and 102 – 114 Scotchmer Street, North Fitzroy subject to the following conditions:

1. The extent of demolition is excessive and fails to satisfy the relevant provisions at 22.02 (Development Guidelines for Sites Subject to the Heritage Overlay) and 43.01 of the Yarra Planning Scheme.
2. The scale, height and architectural quality of the proposed development does not respond to the site context and fails to comply with the provisions at Clauses 15 (built Environment and Heritage), 22.02 (Development Guidelines for Sites Subject to the Heritage Overlay) and 43.01 of the Yarra Planning Scheme.
3. The scale of the development does not respond to the character of the North Fitzroy Village neighbourhood activity centre and therefore fails to comply with the relevant provisions at Clause 21.08-8 (North Fitzroy) of the Yarra Planning Scheme.
4. The proposed development does not provide an adequate level of equitable development opportunities and fails to provide a net community benefit in accordance with the objectives of Clause 17.01 of the Yarra Planning Scheme.

**CARRIED**

*Councillor Jolly left the meeting at 7.54pm*

*Councillor Jolly returned at 8.26pm*

## 5. Urgent Business

### 5.1 Urgent Business - Closure of Centrelink Abbotsford Service Centre

#### Background

On Tuesday 19 May, Minister Stuart Robert announced that the Centrelink Service Centre in Abbotsford, the only centre in Yarra, would close on 21<sup>st</sup> May, giving clients and employees less than 48 hours' notice.

This office will "merge" with the South Melbourne office requiring Yarra residents to travel to South Melbourne to access an office. The expectation is also that many clients will transfer their interactions with Centrelink to online.

Yarra has the highest concentration of public housing in the state. Ten percent of our residents live in public housing and need access to a Centrelink office. Many more Yarra residents need access to a Centrelink office for short and long term purposes, and thousands more still during the current crisis.

Yarra employees have been disproportionately hit by job losses with our economy dominated by the arts, entertainment, retail and hospitality sectors where job losses have been high and swift. The Abbotsford Centrelink Office is one of the busiest in the nation, used by thousands of clients.

Whilst there is a national trend of closing Centrelink Service Centres and encouraging clients to move online, there remains a need to retain a street front presence as a vital social service for people.

If Services Australia has had difficulty finding suitable accommodation in Yarra, support can be provided in finding that. Yarra is rich in office space and with many commercial developments in the pipeline. A lack of suitable space should not be an impediment to retaining a Centrelink Service Centre in any of Yarra's suburbs, all of which are in easy public transport reach of most of our citizens.

The landlord at 617 Victoria St Abbotsford has stated today that an offer to extend the lease to Services Australia has been made. There are reports that an extension of the lease has been confirmed for 3 months. Yarra's citizens need certainty and not confusion around the provision of the key services of Centrelink and Medicare and that certainty needs to be provided as soon as possible.

#### COUNCIL RESOLUTION

**Moved:** Councillor Stone

**Seconded:** Councillor Searle

1. That Council note the announcement by the Minister for Services, Stuart Robert, of the closing of the Abbotsford Centrelink Service Centre with 36 hours' notice, directing clients travel from Yarra to the South Melbourne office in future and a subsequent announcement today of a 3 month extension of this lease:
  - (a) write to Minister for Government Services, Stuart Robert MP, as a matter of urgency, urging him to ensure a Centrelink Service Centre remains in the City of Yarra, a municipality with the highest concentration of public housing in the state, and a high number of COVID-19 related employment losses in the arts, entertainment, hospitality and retail sectors;
  - (b) seek clarity from Services Australia about their need for long term accommodation in light of claims made today by the landlord at 617 Victoria St Abbotsford that an offer to renew the lease had been extended; and

- (c) direct officers to liaise with Services Australia over possible long term sites for a Centrelink Service Centre in Yarra, both temporary and long term, including but not confined to any suitable council-owned property.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

*Councillor Jolly left the meeting at 8.38pm*

*Councillor Jolly returned at 8.43pm*

*Councillor Jolly left at 8.43pm.*

## 5.2 Urgent Business – Closure of the Abbotsford Centrelink Centre

### **MOTION**

**Moved:** Councillor Nguyen

**Seconded:** Councillor Chen Yi Mei

1. That in the matter of the announced closing of the Abbotsford Centrelink Service Centre on 21 May 2020, Council:
  - (a) present an offer of negotiation to the Minister for Government Services, Stuart Robert MP of a lease of the Council's premises being:- the ground floor of 345 Bridge Road, Richmond, for the establishment of a Centrelink Service Centre;
  - (b) further resolve that such offer shall comprise the following:
    - (i) the requirement for Centrelink to take out a long term lease
    - (ii) that the lease would be available rent free for a period of up to 12 months;
    - (iii) a condition to ensure that Yarra residents have access to a localised physical Centrelink office during the negotiation and potential transition from the current Abbotsford premise;
    - (iv) be conditional that discussions of this presented offer of negotiation commence within 14 days from the date of the offer being made;
    - (v) the Council's formal confirmation of the above outlined offer in accordance with any requirements under the Local Government Act; and
    - (vi) the Mayor write to the Federal Opposition to seek a commitment to ensure a continued provision of a physical Centrelink Service in City of Yarra if elected.

### **AMENDMENT**

**Moved:** Councillor Fristacky

**Seconded:** Councillor Bosler

*The rewording of 1. (a); Present an offer of negotiation to the Minister for Government Services, Stuart Robert MP of a lease of City of Yarra premises, for the establishment of a Centrelink Service Centre in the vicinity of the current centre.*

*The deletion of clause 1. (b) (iv); be conditional that negotiation of this presented offer of negotiation commence within 14 days from the date of the offer being made.*

**CARRIED**

Councillor O'Brien abstained

After further debate, Councillor Nguyen decided to withdraw his motion.

*Councillor Nguyen left the meeting at 8.48pm.*

## **COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

**Moved:** Councillor Chen Yi Mei

**Seconded:** Councillor Fristacky

1. That in the matter of the announced closing of the Abbotsford Centrelink Service Centre on 21 May 2020, Council:
  - (a) present an offer of negotiation to the Minister for Government Services, Stuart Robert MP of a lease of City of Yarra premises, for the establishment of a Centrelink Service Centre in the vicinity of the current centre;
  - (b) further resolve that such offer shall comprise the following:
    - (i) the requirement for Centrelink to take out a long term lease
    - (ii) that the lease would be available rent free for a period of up to 12 months;
    - (iii) a condition to ensure that Yarra residents have access to a localised physical Centrelink office during the negotiation and potential transition from the current Abbotsford premise;
    - (iv) the Council's formal confirmation of the above outlined offer in accordance with any requirements under the Local Government Act; and
    - (v) the Mayor write to the Federal Opposition to seek a commitment to ensure a continued provision of a physical Centrelink Service in City of Yarra if elected.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Stone abstained

**Conclusion**

The meeting concluded at 8.56pm.

Confirmed Tuesday 2 June 2020

---

Mayor