

#	TRIM	Suburb	Summary comments	General	Development Plan	Building Heights / scale	UD/Design Guidelines	Yarra River	Landscape/Open Space	Env Sustainability	ESD	Heritage	Housing # /type / diversity	Population/ Density	Affordable housing	Town Centre	Commercial & Retail	Economic impact	Comm facilities/Infrastructure	Schools	Traffic	Chandler Highway	Parking	Public Transport	Pedestrian facilities	Bicycle facilities / safety	Remediation/contamination	Construction	Dev staging	Service/engineering
1	D15/23719	Alphington	The submission highlights (and criticises Council for missing) the opportunity to upgrade the Chandler Highway																		Y	Y								
2	D15/23728	Alphington	Concerned about the effect of increased traffic on Chandler Highway																		Y	Y								
3	D15/23731		Critical of consultation and availability of information on Council web site, as well as having to register personal information in order to view documents	Y																										
4	D15/23748		Enquiry relating to the provision of a supermarket stating that the area needs one.														Y	Y									Y	Y		
5	D15/23749	Melbourne	Duplication of Chandler Highway Bridge - Questions why it is not mentioned																		Y	Y								
6	D15/23753		Submission raises a number of questions about the provision of affordable housing. States that 5% is low compared to the national average and that a description of what "affordable housing" means would be appropriate. Other options for affordable housing could be explored such as taking a 5% value contribution and developing affordable housing elsewhere.		Y		Y						Y		Y															
7	D15/24107	Balwyn	Raises the issue of the number of cars that will be introduced to the area by new residents and the traffic impacts this will have on an already heavily congested area.																		Y		Y	Y						
8	D15/24139	Abbotsford	Objects to the current Development Plan based on 3 key issues: 1. Inadequate bike path integration; 2. The lack of public parkland; and 3. The junior campus vision		Y				Y										Y											
9	D15/24751	Heidelberg	Very concerned that traffic management measures are too vague given the potential increase in traffic volumes due to new residents and businesses on the site. The area is already extremely congested, particularly at peak times.																		Y			Y						
10	D15/26740	Ivanhoe	Pleased that site is being redeveloped but concerned about the local road network (Chandler Highway) and the site being developed prior to any road network improvements.		Y		Y														Y									
11	D15/26741	Alphington	Expresses three main concerns with the proposal: Firstly, the number of dwellings consisting of one and two bedroom apartments; secondly, the 14 storey height of the landmark building which should be scaled back; and thirdly, there are transport projects that need to be undertaken in conjunction with the project - Chandler Highway upgrade/duplication and grade separation of the train crossing on Grange Rd.		Y	Y	Y						Y								Y			Y						
12	D15/26744	Rosanna	Submission relates to traffic conditions as a road user and states that congestion is already a problem that needs to be addressed as part of the proposal																		Y									
13	D15/26748	Alphington	Raises two objections to the proposal: the proposed development is too dense and will cause significant traffic problems in addition to those that already exist.										Y								Y									
14	D15/26750	Kew	Believes that developers will overdevelop the site and that traffic conditions need to be addressed before any development commences, particularly the Chandler Highway bridge		Y								Y								Y									
15	D15/26751	Alphington	Longstanding resident who has witnessed the steady increase in traffic and congestion to the present day where traffic volumes are currently extreme. The proposed development with 2,500 dwellings plus commercial activity will add to the traffic issues experienced in the area significantly.																		Y			Y						
16	D15/26752		Submission talks about the over-supply of one and two bedroom apartments and the need for more family oriented dwellings both on the site and in inner Melbourne. Highlights that developers do this to maximise their profit margins. "The City of Yarra is all about building communities".		Y								Y																	
17	D15/26753	Fairfield	Submission asks question about council/state/federal funding to address the Chandler Highway bridge duplication issue.	Y																	Y			Y						
18	D15/26755	Fitzroy	Opposes the idea of duplicating the Chandler Highway because of the negative impact it will have on the Yarra Bend Park and future residents on the AMCOR site. Believes that the development should have a sustainable transport focus and discourage car use. Suggests some alternatives to the bridge duplication: The historic rail bridge, a relic of the Outer Circle Railway, should best be utilised within this new development as both or either of the following: a new LRT or heavy rail transport corridor for an orbital alignment linking Fairfield Stn to the proposed Monash Stn / pedestrian and cycle way. There still exists the land for such a rail corridor and its protection should be met before the commencement of any developments at the Amcor site. The Chandler Hwy bridge should be retained as an example of 19th century industrial engineering, while potentially serving 21st century transport needs. The Chandler Hwy for road transport could be diverted via a short tunnel beneath the Yarra River linking Heidelberg Rd better still traffic can be diverted via Burke Rd.					Y	Y	Y	Y										Y		Y	Y	Y	Y				

























































274	D15/42648	Ivanhoe	<p><b>Banyule Council</b> acknowledges the suitability of the site for residential infill development but has some concerns relating to the following aspects of the development plan proposal: 1. Economic Impact - the proposal includes over 19,000sq.m of retail floorspace for a proposed neighbourhood activity centre. This includes one full line supermarket. Banyul CC is concerned that this is beyond what is outlined in the Development Plan Overlay and has no strategic support in either Plan Melbourne or the Yarra Planning Scheme. The scale of the proposed activity centre compares with Ivanhoe, Northcote and Heidelberg in terms of proposed floorspace. Banyule is most concerned about the impact on the Ivanhoe activity centre. Residents in the area currently travel to Northcote, Ivanhoe and Kew to access a full line supermarket and the new retail offering at AMCOR will potentially capture this trade in an out of centre development that will impact on those existing activity centres. It is highlighted that the Macroplan Report does not include Ivanhoe in its assessment of retail floorspace. A more detailed assessment would be appropriate to outline impacts on existing activity centres. 2. Transport and Traffic Impacts - The proposed 2,500 dwellings and 31,000m2 of commercial floorspace will have a significant impact on the surrounding road and transport networks. Banyule Council has serious concerns about the potential traffic and transport impacts and the adequacy of the accompanying traffic report and analysis. The development will generate an additional 18,000 vehicle movements per day and have a significant impact on Heidelberg Road and Chandler Hwy. There is concern about the Traffic Impact Assessment provided and Banyule Council disagrees with the premise that future increases in traffic will be off-set by changes in travel behaviour. The development is expected to have significant impacts on the public transport network. The integrated transport plan has little to say about the developments effect on the Heidelberg Rail line and Alphington Station. 3. Walking and Cycling Provision and Access - Heidelberg Rd is part of the Principal Bicycle Network and provides bicycle access east and west along Heidelberg Rd. The Integrated Transport Plan does not provide for on road bicycle facilities that encourage non-vehicular transport to and from the site. Provisions to support pedestrian access and walking to key destinations beyond the site should be incorporated more strongly into the plan. Further analysis of the traffic impacts and opportunities to mitigate these impacts should be undertaken. 4. Community Infrastructure and Open Space - A number of provisions are proposed for facilities including a school and community centre but nothing proposed to cater for formal and informal outdoor recreation. There will potentially be an overflow in terms of demand for recreational and sporting facilities as Alphington Park has limited capacity. The river corridor cannot be defined as a meaningful contribution to open space.</p>	Y	Y	Y	Y																						
275	D15/42584		<p><b>VicRoads</b> Submission: States that the future widening of the Chandler Highway to improve the efficiency of the road network is a state government initiative but with no timeframe stated as there is currently not a budget commitment. The Grange Rd rail crossing has been committed to but with no timeframe stated. An area of land on the subject site will be required and a future PAO will be implemented on the site. Discussions have occurred with the developer regarding compensation for acquisition of the required land. VicRoads makes critical commentary on the following points: Section 4.1.4 suggests that future traffic generated by the site will seek alternate routes and people will shift modes. VicRoads state that this assumption has no evidence to support this claim. The traffic management report does not identify whether the alternate routes have sufficient capacity to cope with the extra traffic. VicRoads accepts that there could be an acceptable level of increased traffic on the roads but does not support the modelling or assumptions used to support this. VicRoads suggests that if the modelling cannot support the suggested increases then the scale of the development may need to be reduced to ensure that increases in traffic are not reliant on duplication of the Chandler Hwy. VicRoads also expresses concerns about the impact of heritage overlays existing on the site which could impact future road works in association with Chandler Hwy. VicRoads also state the the Development Plan should acknowledge the potential future acquisition of part of the site on the western side for road widening. The left hand turn slip lane identified in one of the traffic plans appears to cut through an existing building. It needs to be clarified if the building will be retained or the lane modified in order to retain the building. The location of the proposed school raises the issue of pick-up and drop-off locations for parents/students and VicRoads states that Chandler Hwy would be an inappropriate place for this to occur. The shared path on the western side of Chandler Hwy should include way-finding signage to direct people (cyclists) to cross the bridge to connect with existing paths across the river.</p>																										



