

Number of submissions	Submission comments
2 submissions	No comment/did not object: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melbourne Water • Minister for Environment
1 submission	Comments / did not object to the amendment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Protection Authority – noted that it is preferable for an Environmental Audit to be done before notice of a planning scheme amendment is given to enable the planning authority to satisfy itself that the land is suitable for the proposed use.
7 submissions from residents in Emmaline Street and Bird Avenue	Objected to the amendment or requests changes (including minor modifications) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for clarification of plans in the DDO • Not clear on weight of DDO • Concerned about impact on surrounding residences • DDO fails to protect residential amenity • Design of new buildings should be sympathetic to area • Prefer that the development remains within existing building envelopes and does not exceed two storeys on the currently vacant land • Prefer mix of one and two storey townhouses and not apartment blocks • Prefer 7 metre height limit • What is the maximum height if not 10m? • Balconies and windows to southern side would overlook • Overshadowing • Rooftop structures and architectural feature exceptions should not be allowed • Prefer low density development with open space and landscaping provisions • Should not have access to garages from laneway • Setbacks to Emmaline properties inadequate • Industrial trucks and factory are noisy and smelly – proposal needs to go further to include all of Gadd Street • Unsure of implications of EAO. <p>There were supportive comments in the submissions which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Happy with Residential zoning and apartments assuming quality design and conservation of important heritage elements • Prefer all industrial land to be rezoned to residential • Support limiting access to laneway to pedestrian and secondary vehicle access • Support retention of parts of the Tannery in the Heritage Overlay.

<p>1 submission from Ensign, the adjoining industrial laundry business.</p>	<p>Strongly objected to the amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendment would isolate Ensign site • Residential development in Gadd Street would have an adverse impact on Ensign's operations • Ensign's operations would have an impact on residents in Gadd Street – Ensign's traffic is restricted to Gadd Street which is currently all commercial • Ensign has long hours of operation (4.00 am to 6.30 pm) • The amendment not sufficiently underpinned by appropriate analysis • Questioned the appropriateness of the Residential 1 zoning – limited consideration has been given to Mixed use zone and Business 2 zone • The lack of a concurrent planing application makes it difficult to determine the impact of new residential development on Ensign's operation • Not opposed to the long term rezoning of the site.
<p>1 submission from owners of 47 Gadd Street whose industrial land forms part of the amendment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about rezoning from Industrial to Residential as it may limit potential future opportunities for site • Want to remain Industrial 3 zone and still be able to convert property for residential use.