

## Draft Amendment C273yara

### Summary of individual submissions and responses

The following table provides a summary of the individual submissions received to Amendment C273yara.

To comply with the requirements of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 and Privacy and Data Protection Act 2014 (PDP Act) Council has removed all personal information regarding a submitter (including their name) from the table below because this table will be published online as part of the Council report. Submitters can contact a strategic planning officer to find out their particular submission number if necessary.

This document corresponds to Attachment 1 “**Response to key issues raised in submissions**” as in the C273yara Council Meeting report.

#### Individual Responses:

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
1	Resident – Precinct 3B – Yarralea Street	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes proposed building heights in all precincts.</li> <li>Proposed building heights will impact the character of Fairfield and Alphington given the heights do not coincide with existing development in this area.</li> <li>Existing development/approved development permits within the Yarra Bend area (APM) shouldn’t dictate development within the DDO precincts.</li> <li>Suggests reducing the heights to a maximum of 14m throughout all precincts.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the inclusion of the HO451 and HO455 overlays and the deletion of the HO362 overlay.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 5 – <i>Heritage</i> response.</li> </ul>
2	Resident – All Precincts – Yarralea Street	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the proposed maximum building heights given the residential context surrounding the precincts.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul>
3	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed height will encourage residential buildings of up to nine storeys directly adjacent to existing single storey residential dwellings.</li> <li>The proposed building heights will impact the existing fabric/amenity of Fairfield.</li> <li>Concerns that the proposed height and density of new residential developments along this transport corridor will result in a decreased quality of life for residents.</li> </ul> <p><u>Construction Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development and construction impacts public access to the green space along the Yarra River</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The heritage elements of the APM site were disregarded during construction. Concerns that this could happen as a result of this amendment.</li> </ul> <p><u>Zoning</u></p>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Construction Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 5 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 5 – <i>Heritage</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Zoning</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 9 – <i>Land Use and Zoning</i> response.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that removing commercial zoning within these precincts will result in high rise residential dwellings. An increase in residents will impact negatively on existing infrastructure.</li> </ul>	
4	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed building heights will encourage development impacting on gardens and wildlife.</li> <li>Based on the orientation and topography of the sites (sloping sites), the proposed building heights will cause overshadowing to the residential dwellings directly to the south of the precincts.</li> <li>Suggest a maximum of three storeys across all precincts.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing/Solar Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on the orientation and topography of the sites (sloping sites), the proposed building heights will cause overshadowing to the residential dwellings directly to the south of the precincts.</li> </ul> <p><u>Stormwater</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development on the Amcor site has damaged the Yarra riverbanks, affecting storm runoff, with developers not accounting for residents’ actual transportation habits. Concerns this amendment will further impact stormwater runoff.</li> </ul> <p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests building low rise three- to four bedroom apartments, instead of one-two bedroom high rise at an attempt to encourage families to the area.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing/Solar Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Stormwater</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 10 – <i>Impacts on Climate Change</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul>
5	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to building heights of up to 20 metres in Precinct 2.</li> <li>Concerns that the proposed heights would allow for development that would breach privacy, create noise issues and will result to the adjoining properties feeling “hemmed in”.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing/Solar Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that the preferred building heights would detriment access to natural sunlight in property backyards and will impact negatively on solar panel efficiency.</li> <li>Building heights will cause overshadowing which will impact the well-being of residents and restrict activities such as working in the garden, exercise, drying clothes and growing vegetables.</li> <li>Overshadowing caused by preferred building heights will be of detriment to wildlife.</li> </ul> <p><u>Climate</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that the amendment does not consider the need to reduce emissions and climate action, given the solar panels on residential properties will be impacted by preferred building heights.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of up to 20m would harm the areas streetscape, in particular Fairfield Parkland.</li> </ul> <p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestions to focus on growth and additional housing near railway lines and other places which do not impact on existing streetscape and the well-being of a neighbourhood.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing/Solar Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Climate</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 10 – <i>Impacts on Climate Change</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul>
6	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that the preferred building height of 20m in Precinct 2 do not coincide with the existing built form and character of this area (max height of 12m in Precinct 2, Grandview Hotel).</li> <li>There is inconsistent methods applied to methodology of determining appropriate heights in each precinct – Precinct 2 = 20m while Precinct 3B = 17.6m.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Climate</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 10 – <i>Climate Change</i> response.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
		<p><u>Climate</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that the amendment does not consider the need to reduce emissions. Increasing height of built form denies sunlight access to solar panels of residential properties adjacent to these sites.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amendment does not address the increase in business activity infrastructure needs such as parking and traffic access, amid ongoing issues caused by new bike lanes and parking loss.</li> </ul> <p><u>Neighbourhood Character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing the built form of commercial building in Precinct 2 and 3B, with some as close as 20m from heritage overlays (HO328), will profoundly transform the area's character and heritage value.</li> <li>Heritage and residential areas in Fairfield and Alphington should not be isolated amidst commercial development.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If buffer zones are not possible due to geographic proximity, proposed development/built form provisions should be scaled down to more appropriate measures.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> <li>The DDO requires a landscape setback of the rear of Commercial Development in Precinct 2 and 3B.</li> </ul>
7	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns around the preferred maximum building heights between Panther Place and Chandler Highway (Precinct 2), emphasising its historic and leafy character.</li> <li>Opposes overdevelopment, specifically mentioning opposition to the more recent proposal at the Porta site.</li> <li>Suggestions to limiting building heights to 4-6 storeys or less instead of 6-8 storeys as proposed.</li> </ul> <p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter reiterates the significance of the area, in particular the housing south of Heidelberg Road, with properties along Park Crescent which are notable for its architectural diversity and connection to the Yarra River.</li> <li>Highlights the historical and cultural importance of the area, referencing Yarra Bend's past as a National Park and the significance to the Wurundjeri people.</li> <li>Submitter provides a link to a blog, which contains research about artist houses along the Yarra, suggesting the council to view and understand the history of these houses and their connections to famous artists.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 5 – <i>Heritage</i> response.</li> </ul>
8	Resident – Precinct 3A – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the built form provisions proposed for Precinct 3A, specifically preferred maximum building heights.</li> <li>Concerns about the impact the preferred building heights will have on properties to the south of Precinct 3A.</li> <li>Specifically concerned about the potential of a 7-8 storey building to be constructed to the west of the HOME building.</li> <li>Anticipated negative impacts of the preferred building heights include reduced sunlight, potential financial consequences, and aesthetic concerns.</li> <li>Suggests that a 4-storey building height limit would be more appropriate, in line with the current building located on Precinct 3A.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
9	Resident – Precinct 3A – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the built form provisions proposed for Precinct 3A, specifically preferred maximum building heights.</li> <li>• Concerns about the impact the preferred building heights will have on properties to the south of Precinct 3A.</li> <li>• Specifically concerned about the potential of a 7-8 storey building to be constructed to the west of the HOME building.</li> <li>• Anticipated negative impacts of the preferred building heights include reduced sunlight, potential financial consequences, and aesthetic concerns.</li> <li>• Suggests that a 4-storey building height limit would be more appropriate, in line with the current building located on Precinct 3A.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul>
10	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes proposed building heights in Precinct 2.</li> <li>• Concern with the proposed 20m heights proposed.</li> <li>• Suggest height remain at 8m.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that increased height will have significant impact on amenity (particularly sunlight).</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern regarding reduction of sunlight to indoor and outdoor spaces if heights are actualised.</li> <li>• Submits there will be an estimated ¾ reduction of PV production resulting from overshadowing due to 20m height.</li> <li>• Submits that a building of 20m height would overshadowing the rear of home 9 months of the year.</li> <li>• Concern that lack of sunlight would impact quality of life.</li> <li>• Submits that the proposed 20m height would impact on the ability to grow native seedlings for habitat restoration due to overshadowing.</li> <li>• Submits that overshadowing will have impact on their chickens health and wellbeing.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul>
11	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes proposed building heights in Precinct 2.</li> <li>• Concern with the proposed 20m heights proposed.</li> <li>• Submits that increased height will have significant impact on amenity (particularly sunlight).</li> <li>• Suggest height remain at 8m.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern regarding reduction of sunlight to indoor and outdoor spaces if heights are actualised.</li> <li>• Submits there will be an estimated ¾ reduction of PV production resulting from overshadowing.</li> <li>• Submits that a building of 20m height would overshadowing the rear of home 9 months of the year.</li> <li>• Concern that lack of sunlight would impact quality of life.</li> <li>• Submits that proposed 20m height would impact on the ability to generate renewable energy – overshadow of solar power panels.</li> <li>• Submits that the proposed 20m height would impact on the ability to grow native seedlings for habitat restoration due to overshadowing.</li> <li>• Submits that overshadowing will have a negative impact on native animals and pets within the area.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
12	Resident – All Precincts – Alphington Street	<p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the application of heritage overlays at 700 and 734 Heidelberg Road Alphington and 760 to 764 Heidelberg Road Alphington.</li> <li>Does not support the proposed permanent DDO18.</li> <li>Does not support the proposed 20m. Deviation from the neighbourhood character.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that Heidelberg Road is already congested and increase in housing will impact this.</li> <li>Concern that there is already inadequate parking – visitors can rarely find parks during the day.</li> </ul> <p><u>Public Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits the proposed plans should include improvements for public transport for higher density areas.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that overshadowing is bad for the environment and people living in it.</li> <li>Concern about the impact on open spaces – particularly the oval behind Porta site.</li> <li>Submits that overshadowing will change the environment for plants, animals and people.</li> <li>Submits that solar panels along Park Crescent and Station Street will lose access to sunlight.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 5 – <i>Heritage</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Public Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul>
13	Resident – Precinct 2 – Alphington Street	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposed 20m on the south side of Heidelberg Road – deviation from the neighbourhood character.</li> <li>Concern regarding the impact of the proposed heights of buildings on existing dwelling south of the DDO area.</li> </ul> <p><u>Public Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits the proposed plans should include improvements for public transport for higher density areas.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that solar panels in Alphington and Fairfield will lose access to sunlight.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Public Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul>
14	Resident – Precinct 3A – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes proposed heights in Precinct 3A.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern regarding impact of traffic noise in the area.</li> <li>Concern the building height will create an echo effect in the area.</li> <li>Submits that Chandler Highway is already very congested and is concerned with additional traffic.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul>
15	Resident – Precinct 3A – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the proposed height in Precinct 3A.</li> <li>Suggests that the maximum height should be 17.6m.</li> </ul> <p><u>Views</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that future development should not obstruct the view around the corner.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the local roads will not be able to accommodate increased traffic.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Views</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 11 – <i>Property Values and Views</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
16	Resident – Precinct 2 – Alphington Street	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposed to building heights of 20m – not keeping with neighbourhood character.</li> </ul> <p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits Council should be tempering the need / usefulness of housing (apartments) supply with the local environment.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul>
17	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposed to the proposed 20m building height in Precinct 2.</li> <li>Submits that height limits should be retained at 8m.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the building heights will overshadow gardens and will impact on previously planted trees.</li> <li>Submits that solar panels on north facing roofs of houses will not receive sufficient sunlight – notes this will be worse for neighbours on the north side of the street.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul>
18	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes proposed building heights in Precinct 2.</li> <li>Concern with the proposed 20m heights proposed.</li> <li>Suggest height remain at 8m.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that increased height will have significant impact on amenity (particularly sunlight).</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern regarding reduction of sunlight to indoor and outdoor spaces if heights are actualised.</li> <li>Submits there will be an estimated ¾ reduction of PV production resulting from overshadowing due to 20m height.</li> <li>Submits that a building of 20m height would overshadowing the rear of home 6 months of the year.</li> <li>Concern that lack of sunlight would impact quality of life.</li> <li></li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul>
19	Resident – All Precincts – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the concept of regulating building heights and promoting development along southern section of Heidelberg Road.</li> <li>Does not object to the proposed controls in Precinct 1 – parkland area will not impact on residents.</li> <li>Objects to proposed controls in Precinct 2 – submits that 20m is excessive and will lead to overshadowing, loss of privacy and deprivation of sunlight.</li> <li>Submits that building heights in Precinct 2 should be 11.2m.</li> <li>Strongly objects to proposed controls in precinct 3A – submits that 27.2 metres is excessive and will lead to overshadowing of dwellings to the north and south of Heidelberg Road in addition to those across Chandler Highway.</li> <li>Submits that building heights in Precinct 3A will should be 11.2m.</li> <li>Objects to proposed controls in Precinct 3B – submits that 17.6 is excessive and will lead to overshadowing, loss of privacy and deprivation of sunlight.</li> <li>Submits that building heights in Precinct 3B will should be 11.2m.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Property Value</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 11 – <i>Property Values and Views</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Views</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 11 – <i>Property Values and Views</i> response.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that building height will lead to loss of privacy and deprivation of sunlight for houses.</li> </ul> <p><u>Property Value</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that tall buildings next to residential areas is not appropriate and will reduce property values in the precinct.</li> </ul> <p><u>Views</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits the heights will deprive residents of views.</li> </ul>	
20	Resident – Precinct 3A – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>Property Values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that the proposed heights in Precinct 3A will negatively affect apartment/home value at 626 Heidelberg Road.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Property Value</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 11 – <i>Property Values and Views</i> response.</li> </ul>
21	Resident – All Precincts – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partially supports the proposed planning changes in draft Amendment C273yara.</li> </ul> <p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significantly concerned with the current proposal. Heights are considerably out of proportion with the landscape of Alphington and the eco-centric values of the community.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposed to additional traffic and parking once dwellings are established.</li> </ul> <p><u>On-Street Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently there are difficulties in the number of allocated parking within the area. The amendment will accentuate this problem.</li> </ul> <p><u>Public Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current public transport system does not meet the needs of residents.</li> <li>Bus services run to minimal timetables.</li> <li>Note they have spoken with the relevant agencies and there are no proposed changes of service.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the proposed heritage overlays.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity and Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Zone 1 (Precinct 1 in DDO) is surrounded by parkland and having tall buildings on the site will not impact resident’s views or overshadow residential areas.</li> <li>Heights in Precinct 3A will overshadow, deprived of sunlight and privacy for homes alongside and even across the Chandler Highway. This will allow people to look across the road into homes.</li> <li>Heights in Precinct 3A will cause sizeable loss of privacy and critical reduction in sunlight.</li> <li>The development of Precinct 3A would increase construction and noise pollution to surrounding residents.</li> <li>Heights in Precinct 3B will cause loss of privacy and sunlight to dwellings south of Heidelberg Road.</li> <li>Objects to a high rise corridor along Heidelberg Road similar to that of Box Hill and Doncaster.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the proposed heights in Zone 2 (Precinct 2 in DDO), 20m is too high.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>On Street Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 5 – <i>Heritage</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing/Solar Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Property Values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 11 – <i>Property Values and Views</i> response.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct 2 heights will result in a loss of privacy, lack of sunlight, and properties along Heidelberg Road will be severely affected.</li> <li>Vigorously objects to the heights in Zone 3a (Precinct 3A in DDO), height of 27.2m is very excessive.</li> <li>Proposes a height of 11.2m for Precinct 3a.</li> <li>Objects to the height of 17.6m for Precinct 3b as the height is excessive and will have amenity impacts.</li> <li>Strongly objects to heights in Precinct 3B, 17.6m is unwarranted.</li> </ul> <p><u>Property Values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heights proposed in Precinct 3b will result in reduced property values in the precinct. No one in the neighbourhood will want to buy a property with no privacy or sunlight.</li> </ul>	
22	Resident – Precinct 3A – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposed to the proposed maximum building height of 27.2m.</li> <li>Notes that a recent proposal for a 6 storey building had been denied – submits future development would need to be below this height.</li> <li>Concern with the proposal given the large number of apartments at 626 Heidelberg Road.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing &amp; Views</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that the building height (27.2m) would negatively impact on view and access to sunlight and green spaces.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing/Solar Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Views</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 11 – <i>Property Values and Views</i> response.</li> </ul>
23	Resident – Precinct 3A – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposed to the proposed maximum building height of 27.2m.</li> <li>Notes that a recent proposal for a 6 storey building had been denied – submits future development would need to be below this height.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing &amp; Views</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that the building height (27.2m) would negatively impact on view and access to sunlight.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing/Solar Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Views</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 11 – <i>Property Values and Views</i> response.</li> </ul>
24	Resident – All Precincts – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that the area is already impacted by previous approvals yet to be completed.</li> <li>Submits that people need to be put before profit.</li> <li>Submits that there needs to be better understanding of the negative impacts of change.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that roads and local streets cannot accept more density challenges.</li> </ul>	<p><u>General:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul>
25	Resident – All Precincts – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moved to Alphington as it was a quaint, leafy, family-friendly suburb.</li> </ul> <p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More high rises will ruin the reasons for moving to Alphington.</li> <li>There are many apartments that haven't been sold in the Yarra Bend development (Alphington Papermills).</li> <li>Questions building more homes if they will be unoccupied.</li> </ul> <p><u>Public Transport</u></p>	<p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Public Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trains aren't frequent enough from Alphington station to hold any more residents. Trains that do stop are full.</li> <li>More high risers will exacerbate the problems with trains.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roads are packing during peak times, more "high risers" will exacerbate the problems.</li> <li>Not all residents want to ride a bike or can ride a bike. Bike lanes have made driving a huge issue.</li> </ul>	
26	Resident – All Precincts – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understands a need to develop the southern section of Heidelberg Road in Alphington, to reduce urban sprawl, though has objections to parts of the amendment.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposed heritage overlays.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity and Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Zone 1 (Precinct 1 in DDO) is surrounded by parkland and having tall buildings on the site will not impact resident's views or overshadow residential areas.</li> <li>Heights in Precinct 3A will overshadow, deprived of sunlight and privacy for homes alongside and even across the Chandler Highway. This will allow people to look across the road into homes.</li> <li>Heights in Precinct 3B will overshadow, deprived of sunlight and privacy for homes to the south of Heidelberg Road.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the proposed heights in Zone 2 (Precinct 2 in DDO), 20m is too high.</li> <li>Precinct 2 heights will result in a loss of privacy, lack of sunlight, and properties along Heidelberg Road will be severely affected.</li> <li>Main objection is to the heights in Zone 3a (Precinct 3A in DDO), height of 27.2m is very excessive.</li> <li>Proposes a height of 11.2m for Precinct 3a.</li> <li>Objects to the height of 17.6m for Precinct 3b as the height is excessive and will have amenity impacts.</li> </ul> <p><u>Views</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Precinct 3A heights will deprive residents of views that they paid a premium for.</li> </ul> <p><u>Property Values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heights proposed in Precinct 3b will result in reduced property values.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Public Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Views</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 11 – <i>Property Values and Views</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Property Values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 11 – <i>Property Values and Views</i> response.</li> </ul>
27	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the Draft Amendment C273yara Precinct 2.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Their northern boundary of their property is shared with the commercial properties on the south side of Heidelberg Road. Notes that there is a 8m brick wall on the north boundary.</li> <li>Notes that they do not get any sunlight on the rear until mid-September.</li> <li>Building height of 20 metres on this stretch of Heidelberg Road would have a deleterious effect on their own and neighbours' homes.</li> <li>Their small garden and living quarters would be permanently deprived of sunlight.</li> <li>Overshadowing would impact trees they are currently trying to grow.</li> <li>Solar panels on their home would be overshadowed and useless.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Overshadowing &amp; Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>On-Street Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
		<p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased density will result in the approval of higher rise apartments/office blocks/commercial establishments which will increase traffic along Park Crescent.</li> <li>Park Crescent is a relatively narrow thoroughfare and currently dealing with regular usage by commuters and commercial traffic.</li> </ul> <p><u>On-Street Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased density will result in the approval of higher rise apartments/office blocks/commercial establishments which will increase parking problems along Park Crescent.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes an 8-metre height limit.</li> </ul>	
28	Resident – All Precincts – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amendment will impact the residents of their building and residential homes in the area.</li> </ul> <p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understands a need to development the southern section of Heidelberg Road in Alphington, to reduce urban sprawl.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposed heritage overlays.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing &amp; Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Zone 1 (Precinct 1 in DDO) is surrounded by parkland and having tall buildings on the site will not impact resident’s views or overshadow residential areas.</li> <li>Heights in Precinct 3A will overshadow, deprived of sunlight and privacy for homes alongside and even across the Chandler Highway. This will allow people to look across the road into homes.</li> <li>Heights in Precinct 3B will overshadow, deprived of sunlight and privacy for homes to the south of Heidelberg Road.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the proposed heights in Zone 2 (Precinct 2 in DDO), 20m is too high.</li> <li>Precinct 2 heights will result a loss of privacy, lack of sunlight, and properties along Heidelberg Road will be severely affected.</li> <li>Main objection is to the heights in Zone 3A (Precinct 3A in DDO), height of 27.2m is very excessive.</li> <li>Proposes a height of 11.2m for Precinct 3A.</li> <li>Objects to the height of 17.6m for Precinct 3b as the height is excessive and will have amenity impacts.</li> </ul> <p><u>Views</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Precinct 3A heights will deprive residents of views which they paid a premium for.</li> </ul> <p><u>Property Values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heights proposed in Precinct 3B will result in reduced property values.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 5 – <i>Heritage</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing &amp; Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Views</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 11 – <i>Property Values and Views</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Property Values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 11 – <i>Property Values and Views</i> response.</li> </ul>
29	Resident – Precinct 3A – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the amendment, in particular to site in Precinct 3A.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A large, tall building at Precinct 3A will introduce significant shadowing over all surrounding properties.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, parking and public transport</i></li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
		<p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A large, tall building at Precinct 3A will cause traffic congestion as workers vehicles enter and leave an already congested, difficult intersection at Chandler Highway &amp; Heidelberg road.</li> <li>It will make traffic congestion and delays even worse.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More traffic will add to exhaust and noise emissions which are terrible at the intersection of Chandler Highway and Heidelberg Road.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul>
30	On behalf of a land owner in Precinct 1 – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2.2.10 contains conflicting vehicle access requirements. One discourages collocating access points, while another specifically encourages it along Heidelberg Road, leading to inconsistency.</li> </ul> <p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expresses concerns about the potential negative impact on housing delivery, including affordable housing, due to these controls.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Separation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that the third design requirement in Section 2.3.1 which calls for a “strong” separation from the chimney is unclear and confusing. Suggests it should be revised for better clarity regarding the intended separation.</li> </ul> <p><u>Drafting of Planning Controls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests that the amendment lacks a sound justification for the use of mandatory controls.</li> <li>Concerns around the use of mandatory controls for building heights, setbacks and ground floor setbacks, suggesting that these controls should be discretionary to allow for contextual design.</li> <li>Suggests deleting the first objective of DDO18 since it wrongly mentions “design requirements” as an objective. Design requirements are meant to support objectives, not be objectives themselves.</li> <li>Suggest Section 2.2.8 (Front setback requirements) uses differed language compared to the rest of DDO18, where “street setback requirements” is consistently used. It is recommended that 2.2.8 should align with the same terminology.</li> <li>Suggests Section 2.2.9 (Other design requirements) redundantly restates the content of the Urban Design Guidelines of Victoria and design elements of the PPF and LPPF.</li> <li>Concerns that the decision guidelines in Section 6.0 are unclear and may not be very helpful for decision-makers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Point 3 is irrelevant because there are no heritage buildings on corners within amendment.</li> <li>Point 8’s goal to “increase a sense of openness” doesn’t align with DDO18’s design requirements, which anticipate more intensive development likely reducing openness.</li> <li>Point 10 contradicts DDO18 as it aims to “avoid overshadowing” while DDO18 allows for appropriate increase in overshadowing in both private and public areas.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to the introduction of mandatory building height, which the submitter finds unjustified and overly restrictive and should be made preferred controls.</li> <li>Opposes the preferred maximum building height of 24m given the site’s attributes and suggests an increase, especially for the northeast corner.</li> <li>Suggests increasing the preferred building height for the site in Precinct 1 to reflect the site’s opportunities and capacity.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, parking and public transport</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Separation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 3 – <i>Building Setbacks and Separation</i> response and Section 12 – <i>Drafting of the DDO.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Drafting of Planning Controls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 12 – <i>Drafting of the DDO</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Strategic Justification</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amendment was informed by a background reports in built form and heritage, traffic and recent planning scheme amendments and VCAT decisions. This work underpins Amendment C273 and DDO18 and provides the strategic justification for the amendment.</li> <li>The application of a permanent DDO will provide greater certainty for all stakeholders regarding the scale and form of new development within the Precincts.</li> <li>Officers understand while the Porta site is currently identified as a Strategic Redevelopment Site (SRS) in the Scheme, Amendment C269yara no longer uses the term SRS.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on the residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Setback Controls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 3 – <i>Building Setbacks and Separation</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 5 – <i>Heritage</i> response.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that the 2.6m height limit in Section 2.2.3 of DDO18 is insufficient for accommodating a lift to a rooftop communal open space with equitable access. Suggest that it should be raised to 3.6m.</li> </ul> <p><u>Strategic Justification</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They point out that the Amendment lacks an assessment of its broader implication on strategic planning policy outcomes.</li> <li>Concerns that the built form controls have been implemented in a piecemeal manner without proper analysis of their impact on accommodating growth.</li> <li>The amendments focus on built form, heritage and landscape considerations does not consider strategic planning costs, especially in areas identified as Strategic Redevelopment Sites (SRS).</li> <li>Suggests the need for a more facilitative approach to change and development on SRS sites.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2.2.5 of DDO18 lacks actual daylight requirements and may need to be updated to specify “sunlight” or “daylight” or possibly removed altogether.</li> </ul> <p><u>Setback Controls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to the introduction of mandatory setback controls, which the submitter finds unjustified and overly restrictive.</li> <li>Suggests removing mandatory setback requirements, with these to be shown as preferred requirements.</li> <li>Suggests the 45-degree upper level containment rule should apply to residential interfaces only, as indicated in Figure 1.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests the views to the Porta Chimney from the south are not essential from a heritage perspective and questions the urban design and character justification for retaining southern views to the chimney.</li> <li>Suggests that the southern view lines to the chimney should be deleted from the DDO.</li> <li>Concerns that Section 2.2.2 upper level setback requirements for heritage buildings are unclear and imprecise, potential causing confusion about how they apply to future proposals.</li> </ul>	
31	On behalf of a land owner in Precinct 3B – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlights that the approved development on this site does not comply with these mandatory controls and significantly deviates from them.</li> </ul> <p><u>Drafting of Planning Controls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the design requirements outlined in Clause 2.2.9.</li> <li>Points out an inconsistency between the objective of creating a ‘new low-rise character’ in Precinct 3B and the existing mid to higher-rise commercial conditions along Heidelberg Road.</li> <li>Cites planning policies such as Clause 11 of Yarra Planning Scheme and Plan Melbourne 2050 encourage consolidation, redevelopment and intensification of existing urban areas.</li> <li>Combined effect of ‘fine grain’ and ‘low rise’ requirements in areas with larger sites will hinder urban densification and the growth of the activity centre.</li> </ul> <p><u>Mandatory Controls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The mandatory built form controls are overly restrictive and will stifle growth.</li> </ul>	<p><u>General &amp; VCAT Decision</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategic background work and DDO18 did consider approved permits for context and guide expert views. It does not use them as an absolute basis to draft controls. Officers and expert advice have considered the recent VCAT cases in the preparation of C273yara, including the one mentioned in the submission.</li> <li>The heights for Precinct 3B in the DDO are proposed as preferred. Additional criteria are provided for proposals that exceed the preferred maximum height – See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> <li>The DDO proposed different built form outcomes for different precincts based on comprehensive expert evidence which has taken a corridor approach. The preferred character in Precinct 3B is a low-rise character. It is common for development to be approved in the absence of built form</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are inflexible planning tools that hinder the delivery of design solutions and may affect economic viability for developers.</li> <li>• Submits that given the current housing crisis and limited undeveloped land within the urban growth boundary, making efficient use of strategically located infill land is crucial.</li> <li>• Suggests a combination of performance based and discretionary planning tools to be used instead of mandatory controls.</li> <li>• Provides an example of the use of performance-based assessment tools in the City of Merri-bek which prioritises street amenity, solar access, view lines and spatial separation in a discretionary context.</li> <li>• Supports the discretionary controls set out in the DDO for building separation, amenity and solar access.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rear Interface Controls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raises concerns about the clarity of the proposed wording regarding the 45-degree angle requirement, especially in determining the point from which the angle should be measured.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While welcoming the discretionary nature for the building height on this site, it is noted that 17.6m is significantly lower than the approved developments height of 26.97m.</li> <li>• Questions why a site with an existing 8-storey approval is proposed to be reduced to 5 storeys, expressing concerns about this inconsistency</li> <li>• Advocates for height controls to align with evolving planning conditions and allow for greater density.</li> </ul> <p><u>VCAT Decision</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VCAT’s decision during the draft amendment process expressed concerns about the proposed lower and mandatory height limits in the interim controls (Amendment C272yara)</li> <li>• VCAT found the subject site could support taller building form on Heidelberg Road but needed to transition to smaller scale towards the east.</li> <li>• The decision of this development will contribute positively to the public realm, prioritise pedestrians and had a modulated building form which wouldn’t be possible under interim/permanent controls.</li> </ul>	<p>controls. Decisions are made based on the scheme requirements as they apply on the day. Planning controls prepared after may vary from some approved permits as a result of the availability of information.</p> <p><u>Drafting of Planning Controls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 12 – <i>Drafting of the DDO</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Mandatory Controls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 7 – <i>Mandatory Controls</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rear Interface Controls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on the residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul>
32	On behalf of land owner in Precinct 3B – Heidelberg Road	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes the land impacted by the amendment as currently developed with single storey commercial building on Heidelberg Road, telecommunications tower at the rear and a vehicle crossover.</li> <li>• The land is proposed to be included in Precinct 3B.</li> <li>• Supports the concept of introducing a DDO to provide guidance on the built form for the land.</li> <li>• Concerned that the proposed DDO is unduly restrictive and is an underdevelopment of the site.</li> </ul> <p><u>Utilities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeks confirmation that the DDO will not unduly impinge upon the existing telecommunications tower or any future necessary upgrades to that tower.</li> <li>• Notes that the tenant maintaining the tower want to ensure they are given direct notice of applications for development on adjoining properties. They would be happy to discuss this further with Council including the possibility of amending Schedule to Clause 66.06 as appropriate.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommends an increase in the preferred maximum building height within Precinct 3B.</li> <li>• There is an urgent need for additional housing in Alphington and the area has excellent access to transport and services.</li> <li>• Recommends a preferred maximum height of 20m to be consistent with the Hodyl Report.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights and Utilities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clause 62.02-1 identifies buildings and works that are exempt from any requirement. This includes buildings and works for a telecommunications facility exempt from a permit under clause 52.19-1. Clause 52.19-1 outlines a list of telecommunication buildings and works that do not require a permit.</li> <li>• As long as any proposal falls under that list the requirements set out under Schedule 18 to the Design and Development Overlay would not apply.</li> <li>• It is understood that telecommunication tower located in Precinct 3B is classified as a low impact facility under Telecommunications (Low-impact Facilities) Determination 2018 (Cth), which is included on that list.</li> </ul> <p><u>Strategic Justification</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council does not consider the background documents that informed the amendment outdated.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flexibility should be provided to building height in relation to telecommunication towers.</li> <li>The DDO allows for exceedances of building height requirements for service equipment and structures. The existing telecommunications tower is of a significant height.</li> <li>Notes the essential service the tower provides to the surrounding community.</li> <li>Recommends that the DDO include a specific exemption for telecommunication towers within the height limits and allow such facilities to be appropriately managed under clause 52.19 of the Planning Scheme.</li> </ul> <p><u>Strategic Justification</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many of the strategies that form the basis of the DDO are significantly outdated. In particular the Yarra Housing Strategy 2018 and the Urban Design Strategy 2011.</li> <li>The Hodyl Report considered these when it was prepared in 2019.</li> <li>Does not support the objective the area should be a moderate growth as per the Yarra Housing Strategy.</li> </ul> <p><u>Upper-Level Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support a 6m upper level setback and there is no proper basis for 6m.</li> <li>Recommends a 3m upper level setback.</li> <li>The Hodyl Report acknowledges there are challenges in designing developments on the narrow, long blocks on Heidelberg Road. More appropriate for sites to be front loaded where possible in response to the sensitive interface of the Neighbourhood Residential Zones to the rear and the robust nature of the Heidelberg Road.</li> <li>A 3m setback will better achieve this balance while still ensuring the upper storey is appropriately recessed from Heidelberg Road.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rear Interface</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the 45 degree setback envelope. This is unduly restrictive and does not provide sufficient flexibility for alternate design solutions.</li> <li>The varied size of properties within Precinct 3B calls for a flexible approach.</li> <li>Prescriptive requirements will reduce opportunities for design solutions.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Separation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature of properties in Precinct 3B will not be able to meet building separation requirements without consolidation of lots.</li> <li>If fine grain nature of Heidelberg Road is to be retained, building separation requirements should be removed from narrow lots.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommends deleting the provision for infill development adjoining a heritage building to match the parapet height for 6m.</li> <li>Does not support heritage buildings dictating the height of adjoining development.</li> <li>This is a prescriptive requirement without a clear heritage basis.</li> <li>A preferred outcome to flexibility of design in relation to the height of a building adjacent to a heritage is recommended.</li> </ul> <p><u>Public Acquisition Overlay</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amendment should test and consider the impact of the PAO on properties.</li> <li>The PAO is acknowledged in the Amendment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is reasonable to plan for growth as per Council's adopted Housing Strategy and Spatial Economic and Employment Strategy.</li> <li>Given the current policy direction remains unchanged, the background documents and that land use and development needs to be undertaken with a long-term view, it is not considered the directions of draft Amendment C273yara needs to be changed.</li> </ul> <p><u>Upper-Level Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 3 – <i>Building Setbacks and Separation</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rear Interface</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Separation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 3 – <i>Building Setbacks and Separation</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 5 – <i>Heritage</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Public Acquisition Overlay</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Public Acquisition Overlay was applied for long-term transport planning reasons in case any road widening is required in the future.</li> <li>The Department of Planning and Transport have not provided more specific comments what the PAO would be used for or when.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PAO may influence redevelopment of affected properties. It has the potential to dramatically affect the future redevelopment of properties and for the Precinct to achieve many of its desired outcomes in terms of amenity.</li> <li>Requests that Council liaise with the Department of Transport and Planning to confirm its intentions in respect of the PAO and how applications for development within it will be managed.</li> </ul>	
33	Darebin City Council – All Precincts – Gower Street	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes the preparation of Planning Scheme Amendment C373yara.</li> <li>Notes that the City of Darebin will not be making a submission.</li> </ul> <p><u>Drafting of Planning Controls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes the proposed policy is generally consistent with the draft Heidelberg Road Local Area Plan.</li> </ul>	No response required.
34	Resident – Precinct 2 – Station Street	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Park Crescent in Fairfield is the finest residential street in Fairfield and arguably the finest in the City of Yarra</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the finest mansions were demolished and replaced with multiunit developments, it retains many of the houses from the late Victorian era, some over 130 years old.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recent Developments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There have been several inappropriate and unsympathetic commercial buildings constructed on the north side of Heidelberg Road between Station Street and Panther Place.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of developments have been built to the north boundary of homes resulting in overshadowing of backyards and a considerable loss of amenity.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If proposed buildings proceed it will cause a catastrophic loss of natural light.</li> <li>Some properties will be totally overshadowed which will have impacts on plant growth, rooms will be perpetually dark and cold, paving will be mouldy and laundry will not dry.</li> <li>Solar panels will cease to function from overshadowing.</li> </ul> <p><u>Property Values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Properties will be significantly devalued by this proposed development.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommends that new buildings be staggered in height back towards Heidelberg Road.</li> <li>Recommends that building setback 3m from boundary with Park Crescent properties should only increase in height by no more than 3 metres for every 6 metres horizontally.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Setbacks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes no buildings allowed within 3 metres of north boundary on the rear of Park Crescent properties.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 5 – <i>Heritage</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Property Values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 11 – <i>Property Values and Views</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Setbacks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 3 – <i>Building Setbacks and Separation</i> response.</li> </ul>
35	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The building heights of 20m on the south side of Heidelberg Road represents a significant deviation from the built form and neighbourhood character of the area.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not appropriate to replace low buildings with buildings of 20m.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heidelberg Road is already very congested and will not deal with a large increase in housing or industrial properties.</li> </ul> <p><u>Public Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amendment does not contain plans for improving public transport.</li> <li>Increased public transport is paramount if the population is to increase further.</li> <li>On-street parking</li> <li>There is inadequate parking in the area. Visitors to Alphington Street can rarely find a car park.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overshadowing is bad for the environment and those who live in it.</li> <li>Concerned on the impact on open space, in particular behind the Porta site.</li> <li>Overshadowing will impact on plants, animals and people.</li> <li>Many properties on Park Crescent, Station Street and Arthur Street will have their solar panels shaded.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, access, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Public Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, access, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul>
36	Resident – Precinct 2 – Alphington Street	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests this is another attempt by developers to build apartments for a huge profit.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the building height of 20 metres.</li> <li>Suggests Council has previously encouraged other to build similar monoliths. Refers to the development on the corner of Heidelberg Road and Chandler Highway.</li> </ul> <p><u>Neighbourhood Character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To allow development of the south side of Heidelberg Road is out of character for the area.</li> <li>The area is predominately residential with some development.</li> </ul> <p><u>On-Street Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a lack of parking in the area and Council cannot accommodate further parking.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Car parking has been removed from Heidelberg Road for a bike which will cause more vehicles to use side streets.</li> </ul> <p><u>Utilities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pressure on services such as power and sewerage will be overloaded.</li> </ul> <p><u>Open Space</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity on parks and gardens will be stretched.</li> </ul>	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Neighbourhood Character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>On-Street Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, access, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, access, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Utilities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 8 – <i>Infrastructure and Utilities</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Open Space</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul>
37	Resident – Precinct 2 – Alphington Street	<p><u>Accommodating Growth and Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need for greater density of development in the inner suburban areas, but this should not come at the cost of resident amenity.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p>	<p><u>Accommodating Growth and Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION (Corresponds to Attachment 1)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The building heights of 20m on the south side of Heidelberg Road represents a significant deviation from the built form and neighbourhood character of the area.</li> <li>It is not appropriate to replace low buildings with buildings of 20m.</li> </ul> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should not be a continuation of new developments without an improvement of infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There needs to be a radical improvement to infrastructure in the region, traffic on Heidelberg Road and Station Street is a serious level of gridlock.</li> <li>Heidelberg Road is already very congested and will not deal with a large increase in housing or industrial properties.</li> </ul> <p><u>Public Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amendment does not contain plans for improving public transport.</li> <li>Increased public transport is paramount if the population is to increase further.</li> </ul> <p><u>On-Street Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is inadequate parking in the area. Visitors to Alphington Street can rarely find a car park.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overshadowing is bad for the environment and those who live in it.</li> <li>Concerned on the impact on open space, in particular behind the Porta site.</li> <li>Overshadowing will impact on plants, animals and people.</li> <li>Many properties on Park Crescent, Station Street and Arthur Street will have their solar panels shaded.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 8 – <i>Infrastructure and Utilities</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, access, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Public Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, access, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>On-Street Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, access, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul>
38	Resident – Precinct 2 – Rex Avenue	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building heights of 20m significantly deviates from the built form and character of the area.</li> <li>The heights will destroy the amenity of residents and owners living adjacent to apartments.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overshadowing is bad for the environment and those who live in it.</li> <li>Concerned on the impact on open space, in particular behind the Porta site.</li> <li>Overshadowing will impact on plants, animals and people.</li> <li>Many properties on Park Crescent, Station Street and Arthur Street will have their solar panels shaded.</li> </ul> <p><u>Wind</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that wind tunnels or wind impacts from increased height will have.</li> <li>The Housing Commission high rise on the other side of Heidelberg Road will have particular negative impact.</li> </ul> <p><u>Public Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amendment does not contain plans for improving public transport.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Wind</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Public Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, access, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, access, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased public transport is paramount if the population is to increase further.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heidelberg Road is already very congested and will not deal with a large increase in housing or industrial properties.</li> </ul>	
39	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formally objects to the proposed changes in the planning scheme in C273yara Precinct 2.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Height</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to the preferred maximum height of 20 metres. Notes a 20m height translates to a 5 storey apartment complex.</li> <li>Trebling the height in Precinct 2 will impact all residents and tenants that connect with Precinct 2.</li> <li>Questions what the proposed allowable building envelope/volume and setbacks for lots facing Heidelberg Road?</li> <li>Questions the rationale for varying 20m vs 16m height limit on the plan?</li> </ul> <p><u>Property Values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trebling the maximum height with Precinct 2 will lower the property values.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An increase in height from 8m to 20m will eliminate access to natural light in the rear of adjacent properties.</li> <li>An increase in height from 8m to 20m will reduce or obliterate the effectiveness of solar panels.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Property Values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 11 – <i>Property Values and Views</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul>
40	Resident – Precinct 2 – The Esplanade	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to Amendment in particular Precinct 2.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building heights of 20m will impact unreasonably on immediate dwellings.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buildings of 20m will decrease sunlight hours throughout the year.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extreme increase in traffic should be avoided.</li> <li>Traffic congestion impacts on residents should be considered.</li> </ul> <p><u>Porta Development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed Porta development should not proceed given its impact on the adjacent oval and its surrounds.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, access, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Porta Development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The previous application was refused by both Council and VCAT. There are currently no live applications for this site. The impact on surrounding areas is discussed within Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i>, Section 3 – <i>Building Setbacks and Separation</i> and Section 6 – <i>Traffic, access, parking and public transport</i>.</li> </ul>
41	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive of higher density development in close proximity to the city, amenities and transport but suggest changes.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Land Use</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 9 – <i>Land Use and Zoning</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION (Corresponds to Attachment 1)
		<p><u>Land Use</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area provides great amenity for residential development.</li> <li>Residential development is in more need than commercial.</li> <li>High density areas should focus on housing rather than commercial space.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>16m height more appropriate for Precinct 2 to protect amenity of dwellings to the south.</li> <li>Heights in Precinct 2 will have a lot of over shadowing issues.</li> </ul> <p><u>Darebin City Council</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It's important that this plan considers Darebin Council zoning what is happening on the northern side.</li> <li>Questions if Yarra knows what the Darebin City Council is planning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Darebin City Council</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft Heidelberg Road Local Area Plan and the Built Form Framework (Hodyl &amp; Co) have formed the strategic basis for the amendment and considered the broader strategic context of the area. This included the land use and zoning patterns on both sides of the street.</li> <li>Darebin City Council have been informed of proposed amendment and have been notified. It was noted that the amendment was generally consistent with the draft LAP.</li> <li>The Darebin City Council have progressed amendment C203dare which applies heritage controls along Heidelberg Road. The findings from the draft Heidelberg Road Corridor Local Area Plan and Built Form Framework community engagement were reported to Darebin Council at its Planning Committee meeting on April 11, 2022. Darebin Council resolved to note the findings and for officers to continue to undertake further strategic work on the broader project before moving into a scheme amendment phase.</li> </ul>
42	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposed to the proposed 20m building height in Precinct 2.</li> <li>Questions the rationale for the proposal varying from 20m vs 16m.</li> <li>Questions what the proposed allowable building envelope/volume and setbacks are for lots facing Heidelberg Road.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests that the existing height of 8m already casts significant shadows on houses.</li> <li>Submits that the increased height will limit / eliminate access to natural light in the rear of houses.</li> <li>Reduce the effectiveness of solar panels on houses.</li> </ul> <p><u>Car Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions the plan for car parking if development occurs in line with the proposed heights.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Car Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, access, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul>
43	Resident – Precinct 2 – Arthur Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
44	Resident – Precinct 2 – Arthur Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
45	Resident – Precinct 2 – Arthur Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
46	Resident – Precinct 2 – Arthur Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
47	Resident – Precinct 2 – Arthur Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
48	Resident – Precinct 2 – Station Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p>	See Response 42.  <u>Building Heights:</u>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed building heights will negatively impact privacy, block sunlight, and negatively impact amenity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul>
49	Resident – Precinct 2 – Station Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
50	Resident – Precinct 2 – Station Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
51	Resident – Precinct 2 – Station Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
52	Resident – Precinct 2 – Station Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul> <p><u>Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will negatively impact access to services.</li> </ul> <p><u>Neighbourhood Character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that the amendment will negatively impact the wellbeing of existing neighbourhood and community.</li> </ul>	<p>See Response 42.</p> <p><u>Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, access, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Neighbourhood Character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul>
53	Resident – Precinct 2 – Station Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul> <p><u>Solar Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will detriment properties access to natural light.</li> </ul> <p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will put pressure on amenities.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic and On-Street Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will impact traffic/parking.</li> </ul>	<p>See Response 42.</p> <p><u>Solar Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic and On-Street Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, access, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul>
54	Resident – Precinct 2 – Station Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <p>Will create an oppressive atmosphere.</p> <p>Submits that it will create privacy issues, loss of views and access to sunlight.</p>	<p>See Response 42.</p> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul>
55	Resident – Precinct 2 – Clarke Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
56	Resident – Precinct 2 – Slater Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
57	Resident – Precinct 2 – Murphy Grove	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
58	Resident – Precinct 2 – Heidelberg Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
59	Resident – Precinct 2 – Heidelberg Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
60	Resident – Precinct 2 – Heidelberg Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
61	Resident – Precinct 2 – Heidelberg Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
62	Resident – Precinct 2 – Yarraford Avenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
63	Resident – Precinct 2 – Yarraford Avenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
64	Resident – Precinct 2 – Yarraford Avenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
65	Resident – Precinct 2 – Station Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that only Precinct 3A has a mandatory height requirements, other areas are preferred heights, inviting unrestricted development.</li> </ul>	<p>See Response 42.</p> <p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul>
66	Resident – Precinct 2 – Station Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current development at Heidelberg Road and Chandler Highway dominates the landscape and is setting a risky example for future developers.</li> <li>Suggests a maximum building height of 12m for this PSA.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yarra Council needs to prioritise protection of solar access to facilitate energy generation.</li> <li>Overshadowing is a concern, tied to preserving sunlight and amenity for residents.</li> </ul>	<p>See Response 42.</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing/Solar Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul>
67	Resident – Precinct 2 – Austin Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
68	Resident – Precinct 2 – Austin Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
69	Resident – Precinct 2 – Austin Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
70	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
71	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
72	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
73	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
74	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
75	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further questions the rational for 20m preferred heights instead of the 8m current height.</li> <li>Questions not only what the proposed allowable building envelope/volume and setbacks are for lots facing Heidelberg Road, but also what are the present requirements?</li> </ul>	<p>See Response 42.</p> <p><u>Building Heights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
76	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
77	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
78	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
79	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
80	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
81	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
82	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
83	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
84	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
85	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
86	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
87	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
88	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
89	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
90	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
91	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
92	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
93	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
94	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
95	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
96	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
97	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
98	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
99	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
100	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
101	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
102	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
103	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
104	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
105	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
106	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
107	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
108	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
109	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
110	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
111	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Submission 42 for Summary.</li> </ul>	See Response 42.
112	Resident – Precinct 2 and Precinct 3B – Rathmines Street	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposed to the proposed 20m building height in Precinct 2 and Precinct 3B.</li> <li>Questions the rationale for the proposal varying from 20m vs 16m.</li> <li>Questions what the proposed allowable building envelope/volume and setbacks are for lots facing Heidelberg Road.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that the increased height will limit / eliminate access to natural light in the rear of houses.</li> <li>Reduce the effectiveness of solar panels on houses.</li> <li>Notes recent VCAT judgment in Brunswick that determined sunlight as a fundamental human right.</li> </ul> <p><u>Car Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions the plan for car parking if development occurs in line with the proposed heights.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Car Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, access, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul>
113	Melbourne Water – All Precincts – La Trobe Street	<p><u>Climate</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that the properties are not subject to flowing from the 1%AEP flows of the Melbourne Water Drainage System.</li> <li>Notes that these properties may be subject to flooding from Council Drainage System.</li> <li>Submits that Council should seek flood level information from the Council Drainage Team.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Climate</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 10 – <i>Impacts on Climate Change</i> response.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION Corresponds to Attachment 1)
114	Commercial Landowner – Precinct 2	<p><u>Setbacks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to the 3m mandatory setback on Heidelberg Road and Park Crescent.</li> <li>• Submits that where their property located is the widest part of Heidelberg Road.</li> <li>• Submits that a 3m setback would restrict future development.</li> <li>• Submits that if there is a setback then the property should be allowed to have a higher building height to accommodate its potential.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to the proposed building height of 20m.</li> <li>• Submits that the building height should be 27m.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes the impact of overshadowing at Park Crescent is potentially more of a concern than building heights to those living in Park Crescent and reducing the setback may impact on these properties. However, suggest that the setback of 2.4m should be the minimum.</li> </ul> <p><u>Property Value</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that proposed controls will detrimentally impact on the financial value of their property.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Setbacks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 3 – <i>Building Setbacks and Separation</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Property Value</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 11 – <i>Property Values and Views</i> response.</li> </ul>
115	Resident – Precinct 2 – Arthus Street	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Their house is a couple of blocks from Heidelberg Road where the amendment applies.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about the impact on the change of heights.</li> <li>• Recommends height limits of 16m.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned the impact the heights will have on their amenity and enjoyment of their house and garden.</li> <li>• Increased height will further limit or eliminate sunlight to their house, garden or street.</li> <li>• Concerned about the impact on increased commercial activity on the neighbourhood.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned height will impact their solar panels.</li> </ul> <p><u>On street parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned the impact from increased commercial activity on parking.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>On street parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 6 – <i>Traffic, access, parking and public transport</i> response.</li> </ul>
116	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area bound by Panther Place to Alphington Street is a unique cul-del-sac along the river; it’s a quiet neighbourhood where few houses get sold and remain in families for generations.</li> <li>• They have lived in the area for the past 17 years and chose to raise a family because it was quiet and you were not living on top of neighbours, surrounded by parks and trees.</li> <li>• Development of 20m would destroy this type of living.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes any heights taller than 16m along Precinct 2.</li> <li>• Is not supportive of heights of 20m.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings would overshadow and overlook their private space.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Accommodating Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 1 – <i>Accommodating Growth</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul>

SUB NO.	INTEREST	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION (Corresponds to Attachment 1)
117	Resident – Precinct 2 – Park Crescent	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Live behind properties in Precinct 2.</li> </ul> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about current provisions for overlooking and staggering of the building.</li> <li>• Recommends stronger boundaries around overlooking regarding balconies and windows.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend building height be reduced towards the back of development.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 4 – <i>Impacts on residential amenity</i> response.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Heights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 2 – <i>Building Heights</i> response.</li> </ul>