

APPENDIX B



Submission Summary Table for Planning Scheme Amendments C122 and C127

Submissions to Amendment C122

Submission Number	Amendment Code	Date of Submission	Suburb	Submission summary	Response
C122: 1	C122	13/11/2013	Northcote	Opposition; greedy developers overcrowd spaces; 8m wall on boundary is not acceptable; no height indication on rest of site; there should be an easement on the north for services (improve sewerage) or landscaping	<i>Reject</i> and Refer to Panel. Density of dwellings is partially guided by building codes; it is an 8m height restriction within the first 5m of a common boundary and setbacks are guided by the zone/Clause 55; height restriction on the remainder of development sites is 4 storeys.
C122: 2	C122	11/12/2013	Northcote	General support with request to change; questioning the RGZ in this a little more remote location; need for diversity in housing stock is recognised to achieve equitable metropolitan environment; it is understood the DPO tries to mitigate impacts that can come with the RGZ; DPO12 should be maintained and strengthened to incl. a mandatory setback from a common boundary of 198 Beavers Rd for any future dwelling to 7m with max of 2 storey height at that point; welcoming rezoning of 196 Beavers Rd, but want to retain right of passage over school ground	Partially not a planning matter. <i>Reject</i> and Refer to Panel. Right of passage over school ground exists due to the school tolerating this access, not Council; this rezoning is purely a correction; requirement of 7 metre mandatory setback to common boundary and general 2 storey height restriction is seen as too onerous and would likely prevent development and therefore clean-up works as required.
C122: 3	C122	12/12/2013	Northcote	General support with request to change; questioning the RGZ in this a little more remote location; need for diversity in housing stock is recognised to achieve equitable metropolitan environment; it is understood the	Partially not a planning matter. <i>Reject</i> and Refer to Panel. Right of passage over school ground

Submission Summary Table for Planning Scheme Amendments C122 and C127



				DPO tries to mitigate impacts that can come with the RGZ; DPO12 should be maintained and strengthened to incl. a mandatory setback from a common boundary of 198 Beavers Rd for any future dwelling to 7m with max of 2 storey height at that point; welcoming rezoning of 196 Beavers Rd, but want to retain right of passage over school ground	exists due to the school tolerating this access, not Council, this rezoning is purely a correction; requirement of 7 metre mandatory setback to common boundary and general 2 storey height restriction is seen as too onerous and would likely prevent development and therefore clean-up works as required.
C122:4	C122	12/12/2013	Northcote	General support with request to change; questioning the RGZ in this a little more remote location; need for diversity in housing stock is recognised to achieve equitable metropolitan environment; it is understood the DPO tries to mitigate impacts that can come with the RGZ; DPO12 should be maintained and strengthened to incl. a mandatory setback from a common boundary of 198 Beavers Rd for any future dwelling to 7m with max of 2 storey height at that point; welcoming rezoning of 196 Beavers Rd, but want to retain right of passage over school ground	Partially not a planning matter. <i>Reject</i> and Refer to Panel. Right of passage over school ground exists due to the school tolerating this access, not Council, this rezoning is purely a correction; requirement of 7 metre mandatory setback to common boundary and general 2 storey height restriction is seen as too onerous and would likely prevent development and therefore clean-up works as required.

Submission Summary Table for Planning Scheme Amendments C122 and C127



Submissions to Amendments C122 and C127

Submission Number	Amendment Code	Date of Submission	Suburb	Submission summary	Response
C122/C127: 1	C122, C127	25/11/2013	Northcote	Opposition: there already is traffic congestion, the area would get too busy	Investigate possible changes to address concerns. <i>Accept in Part</i> and Refer to Panel. The DPO12 requests for a DP to show parking location, expected traffic generation and its management; actual car parking rates would be considered under Clause 52.06. Should investigate inclusion of requirements for a Traffic Management Plan.
C122/C127: 2	C122, C127	28/11/2013	Northcote	Of support	<i>Accepted</i>
C122/C127: 3	C122, C127	10/12/2013	Northcote	General support with request to change; contingent on the maintenance of safe public access via school site; allow for future provision of bridge; no development on escarpment and application of an ESO	Partially not a planning matter. <i>Accept in Part</i> and Refer to Panel. ESO is already applicable for entire area; PUZ is correction only and access is allowed by school, not Council; the amendments refer to development of private land and not public.
C122/C127: 4	C122,C127	12/12/2013	Northcote	Opposition; upsurge in traffic for local streets, lack of detail/car parking not shown; hours of operation in a C1Z unknown; drainage via laneway not addressed (already flooded in heavy rainfalls; extent of laneway	Investigate possible changes to address concerns. <i>Accept in Part</i> and Refer to Panel.

Submission Summary Table for Planning Scheme Amendments C122 and C127



				usage unknown (do not utilise it for waste collection due to noise increase); concern over privacy if higher structures allowed/overlooking; concern over reduced solar access also for solar energy generation	The DPO12 requests for a DP to show parking location, expected traffic generation and its management; parking rates would be considered under 52.06; noise form uses would depend on each future use, but will be subject to min. standards from EPA guidelines; a Development Plan would outline specifics about laneway interfaces and how it may be utilised (but waste collection via laneway is seen as unlikely); concerns such as overlooking & overshadowing etc. would be addressed via specific development assessments
C122/C127: 5	C122, C127	13/12/2013	Northcote	General support with request to change; comments on allowing separate DPs north of Beavers Rd; building height in RGZ should not be worded mandatorily; wording of second dot point under 198 and 200 Beavers Rd confusing, rather include requirement to provide a landscape buffer; prescription of natural materials towards the Creek is too detailed and should be part of a later assessment; point on complementarity and connectivity between built form of C122 and C127 too detailed	Investigate possible changes to address concerns. <i>Accept in Part</i> and Refer to Panel. DPO requirements allow for DP separately between north and south, two land owners at north can co-ordinate, create a DP and then develop at different stages; landscape buffer requirements can be added, but screening of fence probably should stay to protect existing Golf Course operation;

Submission Summary Table for Planning Scheme Amendments C122 and C127



					material requirements should also remain to ensure a considerate outcome at this unique interface; requesting a relationship in the built form between the areas is not too detailed, one would set the tone depending on which one starts first
C122/C127: 6	C122,C127	13/12/2013	Northcote	General support with request to change; requesting inclusion of requirements as per letter (how access arrangement will influence PT infrastructure)	<i>Accepted</i>
C122/C127: 7	C122,C127	13/12/2013		General support with request to change C127; support of the focus on the Merri to improve current conditions through requirements as Clause 3 of the DPO12; PAO should be included in C127 which would also be in line with other Council strategies; land on creek below escarpment should be in PCRZ	<i>Reject and Refer to Panel.</i> PAO unlikely due to potential for contamination; Council's Environment Unit and Bushland Management are exploring ways to formally ensure management of weeds on the creek bank by Council for the long term.
C122/C127: 8	C122,C127	17/12/2013	Melbourne	General support with request to change; use of RGZ questioned due to creek proximity - suggested to look at Moreland's Housing Strategy (NRZ); new development should be set back by 12m from top of escarpment where no shared pathway is anticipated, Moreland allows for 50m of a waterway corridor; requirement of a geotechnical report to ensure future works will not cause erosion or unstableness of escarpment in the future; use setback as per Development Guidelines for Merri Creek 2004;	Investigate possible changes to address concerns. <i>Accept in Part and Refer to Panel.</i> Past development has been allowed according to the relevant development guidelines already. No intrusion in this space is being allowed. The restriction of 2 storey

Submission Summary Table for Planning Scheme Amendments C122 and C127



				request of meeting certain objectives and to include for additional information on DP (e.g. contours, title boundaries, flood extent, existing vegetation survey, setback of proposed development from escarpment in accordance with Development Guidelines 2004, location and size of WSUD measurements, exact setback of shared pathway or internal road etc.); a DP must be referred to MW	height within 5m of the top of the escarpment is more stringent already. A shared pathway through the Merri Creek environs is not proposed. Investigate inclusion of additional guidelines regarding water quality and information to be shown on a DP.
C122/C127: 9	C122,C127	9/12/2013	Northcote	General support with request to change; generally welcome the changes; concerns are: car parking location and amount for existing uses and traffic management and flows on neighbouring streets due to increase in population unknown; how can use of private road be restricted to current users of buildings?; how will noise be addressed when changes occur? some streets should be considered to be changed to one way streets with development increasing	Investigate possible changes to address concerns. <i>Accept in Part</i> and Refer to Panel. Submission forwarded to Council's transport unit, consider the inclusion of more specific requirements regarding estimating and addressing car parking and traffic impacts and future requirements. Noise issues will be addressed through the building code as well as guidelines in the DPO12.
C122/C127: 10	C122, C127	19/12/2013	unknown	Request to change: linkage across the Merri is identified in both Moreland's and Darebin's Cycling Strategies; the lack of the link would force new residents on already busy roads; a link across the creek would increase safety and accessibility for both communities, encourage increase in usage of sustainable transport modes for school, residents, CERES.	<i>Reject</i> and Refer to Panel. Technically the investigation and construction of a bridge would take place on public land and is not a requirement for the development on private land as per DPO; The submission was

Submission Summary Table for Planning Scheme Amendments C122 and C127



					forwarded to the transport unit.
C122/C127: 11	C122, C127	19/01/2014	Northcote	Of support; changes are welcome to rejuvenate the area.	<i>Accepted</i>

Submission Summary Table for Planning Scheme Amendments C122 and C127



Submissions to Amendment C127

Submission Number	Amendment Code	Date of Submission	Suburb	Submission summary	Response
C127: 1	C127	12/12/2013	Northcote	General support with request to change; of support due to excellent access to infrastructure of the area, C12 fits with long term vision of owners; concerned regarding lack of staging provision within the DPO12 and with the height requirements along the Merri Creek and the prescription of natural materials along the creek; suggestion: allow for separate Development Plans being allowed, replace 'must' with 'should' re: the natural materials requirements along the creek; Q: would brick or colour bond be allowable?	Investigate possible changes to address concerns. <i>Accept in Part</i> and Refer to Panel. Material and colour requirements should remain in essence but changes may be needed; the heights along the creek corridor should remain to ensure minimal impact and visibility; a Development Plan can be general in nature and agreed on, despite splintered ownership of land, permits can then be issued based on the DP.
C127: 2	C127	13/12/2013		General support with request to change; concerns regarding management of private land along the Merri Creek - this is the last larger stretch of private owned creek frontage and acquisition would be in line with strategic direction of the scheme; requesting a PAO from top of escarpment to the Merri; the DPO12 to refer to the intent of land transfer or at least require frontage to be revegetated and managed	<i>Reject</i> and Refer to Panel. PAO application is unlikely due to potential for contamination; Council's Environment Unit and Bushland Management are exploring ways to formally ensure management of creek bank by Council for the long term.
C127:3	C127	30/01/2014	Northcote	Rezoning and changing of the area is supported; concerns about the blanket application of the EAO –	<i>Reject</i> and Refer to Panel.

Submission Summary Table for Planning Scheme Amendments C122 and C127



				<p>should be site specific; DPO12 should either be more flexible or be removed from the amendment</p>	<p>The application of the EAO over the entire area is based on the information available to Council at the moment. This being, that the entire area was likely a landfill site. As such, a site specific application of the EAO is not advised. Council does not have control over the drafting of the Victorian Planning Provisions, where the EAO wording and requirements have been drafted. Therefore Council should reject the submissions raising this issue. DPO12 allows flexibility as well as providing the required control to manage the change near sensitive environs.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--