

**Draft Carlisle Street Activity centre Structure Plan and Urban Design Framework
Analysis of Written Submissions**

Attachment 5

Submission Number / Interest - Trader - Resident - Property Owner	Position - Support - Partial Support / Specific Comment - Issue Specific Objection - Objection	Comments in support / consistent with Structure Plan and / or UDF	Comments raising objection to elements of Structure Plan and / or UDF	General comments / suggestions in relation to Activity Centre but beyond level of detail / scope of Structure Plan** **May be referred to other processes	Specific changes requested to Structure Plan / UDF Officer Comment on key objections / changes
1 Resident	Qualified support (Specific Concerns)	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressed support for the upgrade of Balaclava Station. Supports the plan to reduce vehicle speed in Woodstock St and surrounds. 	<p>Balaclava Walk Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst supporting the station upgrade, the submission expresses concern regarding potential overdevelopment of the station car park and loss of car parking. 	<p>Car Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cites shortage of resident parking in Rosamond Street and requests all Boundaries for the Structure Plan and UDF should be clarified. day parking be restricted. 	<p><u>Officer Comment:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The UDF has assessed and defined the appropriate future built form on this site taking into account the streetscape of Marlborough Street and amenity objectives for adjoining residential sites. A further opportunity will exist to comment on any detailed design proposal for the site at the planning permit stage. Identifying residential development opportunities within the activity centre balances reduced development objectives for established residential areas. Car parking is proposed to be relocated to the north side of Carlisle Street where it is in greater demand.

2 Resident	Support	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission expresses support for the intent and general policy direction of the Structure Plan. Submission expresses support for Balaclava Station upgrade, including creation of a plaza / public space and seating. 		<p>Various</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop space above the St Kilda Library. Residential areas up to Hotham Street need improving - affected by litter and poor plantings. 	
3 Resident	Not specified Support assumed as comments consistent with Structure Plan	<p>Improved access for persons with reduced mobility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission requests improved accessibility around area for motorised mobility devices, prams and walking frames, especially along Woodstock Street. Footpath trading should not limit / reduce mobility. 			
4: Resident (Immediate area)	Not Specified Support assumed as comments consistent with Structure Plan	<p>Lighting of laneways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission requests more lighting in the laneways around Carlisle St. 			
5 Resident	Issue Specific Objection		<p>Retail (Supermarket / Car Park) Renewal Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission expresses concern that a five storey development on the Coles site would be out of character with the vibrant, multi-cultural and 'quaintness' of Carlisle Street. Suggests 3 storey limit. 1-2 storey facades on street will maintain openness. Cites the development at 128-140 Chapel St as an example of excessive height. Does not support 3 storey residential development along the north side of Alfred Street. This is only necessary of excessive height is allowed on the car park site. 		<p><u>Specific Change Requested:</u> Submission suggests three storeys would be more appropriate maximum height on the supermarket / Car Park sites, with a 1-2 storey street wall.</p> <p><u>Officer Comment:</u> Request is not supported:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> UDF has assessed and defined appropriate future built form on this site taking into account streetscape / amenity objectives. Identifying development opportunities within the activity centre will enable retail / residential growth and take pressure off established residential areas. Three level development is already occurring in Alfred Street and creates an appropriate interface with the activity centre.

6 Resident (?)	Support	Balaclava Walk Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission implies overall support for the Balaclava Walk Project - to make area under rail bridge a 'focal point'. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission makes specific suggestions for the area around the station including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area under rail bridge to become a 'pedestrian haven' Preserve its heritage. 'Sound and light show' activated by approaching tram. Provision of rubbish bins 	
7 Resident	Support	General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission expresses that the upgrades around Carlisle Street 'look great'. 		Resident Car Parking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission comments on lack of parking around the Chapel Street Mixed Use Area and that new development will add to this. Requests resident parking areas & issue of permits. (Note: as a recent development this site is not entitled to Resident Parking Permits). 	
8 Resident	Qualified Support (Some Concerns)	General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission expresses support for the intent and general policy directions of the Structure Plan and in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrading of Cole / Safeway / Car parks Keeping smaller shops on Carlisle with larger stores to the rear More Shops, apartments and parking (suggests a DDS). Development around the station - apartments / shops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tavern on Red-Rooster site should be allowed to go ahead (VCAT has determined to refuse the permit application for a Tavern) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council should encourage / support repainting of Heritage Facades. 	<u>Specific Change Requested:</u> There should be a community square fronting Nelson Street. <u>Officer Comment:</u> No change to the Structure Plan is recommended. General enhancement /traffic calming of Nelson Street is already proposed by the Structure Plan as an important link to / from the station. Greater priority should be given to the creation of a public space in Camden Street between the two supermarket operations.

<p>9 Resident</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission supports the intent and general policy direction of the Structure Plan and states that it is 'comprehensive and well developed'. • Supports improvements to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supermarket area - Look and amenity of civic / community precinct. - Non-vehicular accessibility including station. - Promotion of night time uses - Increased urban art - Ensure all streets are well lit\ - Use public housing to add to diversity and culture 		<p>Various</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission make a range of general suggestions which are aimed at improving the presentation / function of the centre: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve presentation of Chapel St as an entry to centre - More bike parking - Clean up / name laneways - WSUD and water tanks - Celebrate Jewish culture Requests - Extension of Green-light Project to St Kilda Road 	
<p>10: Property Owner (Commercial)/ Resident</p>	<p>Issue Specific Objection</p>	<p>Priority is Carlisle Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submission states that the highest priority for Carlisle St should be to 'preserve and promote the Carlisle Strip' and to maintain its cosmopolitan flavour / range of household goods and personal services. 	<p>Retail (Supermarket / Car Park) Renewal Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes 'Retail Renewal Project' on the basis that it would shift the focus away from Carlisle Street: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Carlisle St is unique, bohemian, gritty and has a character of its own; a detached retail hub will detract from its appeal. - The RRP will 'inevitably draw customers away from 'the strip' and 'deprive it of its energy and vitality'. - Trade will be threatened by the RRP - Disruption from construction will seriously interfere with trade in Carlisle Street 		<p><u>Officer Comment:</u> The Retail Renewal Project is a key element of the Structure Plan which would deliver opportunities for retail and residential growth necessary to respond to projected demand for these uses.</p> <p>The Structure Plan (reflected in Design Concepts for this Project) emphasises the need to integrate any development on the Supermarket / Car Park Sites with the Carlisle Street Strip. Key aspects include; enhanced laneways / arcades connecting to the shops fronting Carlisle Street; improved permeability of the retail core, recreating 'active edges' to Carlisle, Camden and Nelson Streets; and a new public space focused on Camden Street.</p> <p>An improved retail offer, in particular through enhanced supermarket facilities, is critical to the long term viability of Carlisle Street.</p>

11 Trader	Issue Specific Objection		Retail (Supermarket / Car Park) Renewal Project - access issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission objects to the proposed development on the grounds that it will adversely affect business / result in loss of trade at the time of construction and beyond. • Business dependant upon passing trader / access from car park. 		Officer Comment: The Concept Plans for the Retail Renewal Project include reference to maintaining vehicle access along the laneway. To further clarify this point, it is recommended that the following be included in the description of 'Opportunity 2 Retail Renewal Project': <i>"Ensure appropriate access / loading is maintained for retail premises fronting Carlisle Street".</i> A key element of the Retail Renewal Concept is to integrate any new development with Carlisle Street through renewed laneways and arcades.
12 Property Owner	Issue Specific Objection		Proposed Heritage Controls <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to the proposed Heritage Overlay covering residential property at 336 Carlisle St. • Submission states that the property is not of sufficient significance to warrant inclusion and is 'ideal for future redevelopment to a higher density in accordance with Melbourne 2030. • Submission disputes findings of the Heritage Alliance. States property is not significant, representative or substantially intact. Submission states there are enough examples of inter war bungalows with heritage protection. Submission notes that the Structure Plan identifies the site as part of an 'Entry Point' to the Activity Centre, and thus a HO could 'severely restrict' urban design enhancements at the 'Entry Point'. • Submission argues that the intent of Melbourne 2030 Policy 1.3: A more compact city, supports higher density development on a this site, particularly given its proximity to an AC. 		Specific Change Requested: Deletion of 336 Carlisle Street from the proposed Heritage Overlay. Officer Comment: Request is supported following a further review of heritage significance and consideration of the need for a balance between heritage controls and providing development opportunities within the activity centre (Refer Att. 6 for detail).

<p>13 Not specified (Trader?) / Resident (St Kilda)</p>	<p>Partial Support / Specific Concerns</p>	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> States many aspects of the draft have merit in protecting the existing character of the centre. Supports the establishment of a Traders Association. Supports retail development to the rear of shops fronting Carlisle Street to provide an improved presentation to the Coles car park. 	<p>Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern over limited consultation / insufficient notice for Structure Plan. (Note: Referenced only Notice in Paper and Press release). <p>Less development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expresses a desire for more green space and less increase in development / density. <p>Retail (Supermarket / Car Park) Renewal Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not support redevelopment plans for Coles / Safeway. Is concerned of the effects upon traders during and after construction. Expresses concern with traffic management Camden & Nelson St's (in association with proposed Supermarket redevelopment) - streets can't cope with additional traffic. Improving pedestrian access should not be at the expense of cars. People need to be able to drive to the centre. 	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not 'believe the 2030 strategy will serve Balaclava and the community'. Supports 'footpath trading' for its village feel / activity. Requests information about the number of existing dwellings per hectare in a 400m zone surrounding the Activity Centre and for the number of proposed dwellings in the 'new residential development of both the Safeway and Coles car parks. 	<p><u>Officer Comment:</u></p> <p>The consultation process associated with the draft Structure Plan / UDF was extensive - extending well beyond notices / articles in local papers (refer Att. 4).</p> <p>Activity Centres such as Carlisle Street will continue to face pressures for increased development / intensity. Providing for well managed and well designed new development within the activity centre can achieve enhanced streetscapes and public spaces, whilst providing an improved retail offer and new housing opportunities.</p> <p>Detailed traffic management plans will be required at the design / permit phase of any large development and will be required to ensure additional traffic is accommodated in a safe and efficient manner.</p> <p>Whilst improving pedestrian access within the activity centre is a core direction of the Structure Plan, access to the centre by car will not be restricted but rather slowed. Reduced vehicle speeds and priority for pedestrian movement is an increasing feature of vital, successful activity centres.</p>
---	--	---	--	--	---

<p>14 Property owners - Commercial (multiple owners)</p>	<p>Issue Specific Objection</p>		<p>Proposed Heritage Controls</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to the proposed Heritage Overlay covering residential properties at 322-330 Carlisle St. • The buildings are later in period than those generally identified as being of significance to the existing HO7 precinct. It is noted that earlier studies by Port Phillip excluded these buildings based on their later date'. • The building do not 'relate as strongly as they might to the heritage buildings further to the west do', • The break in pattern and form created by the BP site separates the building from the main heritage sections of Carlisle Street. • The opposite side of the street is not included within a HO - any future development could 'substantially alter the context of these buildings'. • The heritage assessment is insufficient: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The buildings have been altered, lost detail, are not significant and do not warrant a HO • Overlay would impose impost and be detrimental to use and enjoyment • Overlay would impose unjustifiable costs 		<p><u>Specific Change Requested:</u> Deletion of 322-330 Carlisle Street from the proposed Heritage Overlay and recognition of opportunities for the redevelopment of sites.</p> <p><u>Officer Comment:</u> Request is supported following a further review of heritage significance and consideration of the need for a balance between heritage controls and providing development opportunities within the activity centre (Refer Att. 6 for detail).</p>
<p>15 Property Owner - Commercial (via planning consultant)</p>	<p>Partial Support / Specific Concerns</p>	<p>Land Use Direction - Office</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission supports land use direction for subject site (as commercial / office capacity site) 	<p>Increase Proposed Height Limit -141 Chapel Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission on behalf of the property owners of raises objection to the maximum preferred building height limit of 3 storeys. Considered to 'underestimate the development potential' and nor 'adequately cater for the floor space capacity of the site' and 'has not adequately considered the built form potential of the site' given surrounding context. • Heritage Overlay should not be regarded as a constraint. • Site should be recognised as having potential to create a 'gateway'. 		<p><u>Specific Change Requested:</u> Submission requests a review of the built form assessment and an increase to the preferred maximum height to 4-5 storeys.</p> <p><u>Officer Comment:</u> Request is supported following a further review of the built form context and opportunities for the site and adjacent properties. (Refer Att. 6 for detail).</p>

<p>16 Property Owners</p>	<p>Issue Specific Objection</p>		<p>Proposed Heritage Controls</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to the proposed Heritage Overlay covering residential properties at 332-336 Carlisle St. • Submission states that review undertaken by Heritage Alliance 'provides insufficient evidence for including the property within a Heritage Overlay' and that the property is not 'in any way significant or representative'. • Submission advocates that the properties are 'uniquely located' at an 'entry point' to the activity centre and are thus prime locations for a mixed use development. 		<p><u>Specific Change Requested:</u> Deletion of 332-336 Carlisle Street from the proposed Heritage Overlay and recognition of opportunities for mixed use redevelopment of sites.</p> <p><u>Officer Comment:</u> Request is supported in part. Deletion of proposed Heritage Overlay is recommended following a further review of heritage significance and the need for a balance between heritage controls and providing development opportunities within the activity centre (Refer Att. 6 for detail).</p> <p>The subject sites are currently zoned residential. A rezoning to facilitate 'mixed use' is not supported as this would further elongate the activity centre and detract from objectives to create a compact retail core.</p> <p>A range of discretionary uses eg medical centre could be sought at ground level subject to permit.</p>
<p>17 Department of Planning and Community Development**</p> <p>Revised Submission following detailed discussions.</p>	<p>Qualified Support (Some Concerns)</p>	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expresses support for Structure Plan / UDF conditional upon the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Vision' to acknowledge the substantial change expected within the activity centre. - Further explanation of the Categories of Change. - Clarifying the boundaries for and the relationship between for the Structure Plan and UDF. - Recognise William Street as a 'Future Investigation' opportunity. - Preparation of a summary version of the Plan - Deletion of the proposed Heritage Overlay on Carlisle Street. 			<p><u>Officer Comment:</u></p> <p>Conditional support from DPCD provides a positive basis to move forward to implementing the Structure Plan / UDF, including the preparation of a Planning Scheme Amendment.</p> <p>The changes / clarifications requested by the Department are considered reasonable and are reflected Attachment 6 as recommended changes to the draft documents.</p>

<p>18 Commercial Property Owner</p>	<p>Issue Specific Objection</p>		<p>William St Precinct - Residential future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land at 60-62 Nightingale St (within the Williams St Precinct) is no longer suitable for industrial uses. 		<p><u>Specific Change Requested:</u> William St and in particular 60-62 Nightingale St be rezoned for residential use.</p> <p><u>Officer Comment:</u> Request supported in part. The future land use directions for William Street should be determined in the medium term. Industrial zoning to be retained in the short term to 'preserve' future potential for the mixed use / residential renewal of the precinct.</p>
<p>19 Resident</p>	<p>Partial Support / Specific Concerns</p>	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports broad directions but implies plan does not go far enough. Supports raised crossing along Carlisle Street. Supports establishment of a Traders group Submission agrees that the retail diversity is adequate, but is slowly diminishing, also recognises the need for a bookshop etc. Submission indicates 'in principle' support for Woodstock style development in air space above 'at grade' car parks. Supports shop top housing - but must be well done. 	<p>Various</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expresses concern that the Structure Plan will not improve the 'structure and functionality of the centre', will 'not preserve the centre's present ambience' and that council is 'reluctant to spend money to improve its less than adequate infrastructure and currently very tired physical appearance'. The Structure Plan should include a detailed parking analysis or a needs assessment. There is insufficient long term / medium term car parking. Does not support placing car parking above or below ground level due to issues relating access, utility and the 'health of the centre'. Detailed centre floor space analysis' to be undertaken so that 'success in measuring future changes and preserving/improving local retail mix. Will assist the council in persuading VCAT and State Gov. instrumentalities of the merits of restricting 'fast food outlets'(chain stores). Submits that retail demand projections in the Structure Plan are excessive. Plan does not 'identify opportunities and actions to improve the functioning of the 	<p>Various</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priorities for the Structure Plan should be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving access by all mode but particularly cyclist and pedestrians. Improving centre function - car parking / toilets. Making the centre pleasant to be in - public spaces. Developing action plans / directing Council expenditure. Footpath trading bylaws need to be reviewed-displays should be removed immediately as they impede access along footpaths. Requests more seating throughout Activity Centre. Requests updated paving. Seeks improvement of pedestrian crossings. Seeks a review of long term and daily parking with the activity centre. Submission calls for 'strategic priority' in the establishment of a traders association. Submission sketches/proposes alternate 'retail renewal concept' for Safeway site and Alfred St. Suggest an urban design framework for consistent street furniture to create a sense of place. 	<p><u>Officer Comment:</u> The Structure Plan recommends a range of initiatives that will enhance the functioning of the centre - including new and improved public spaces, redesigned residential / commercial interfaces, a compact walkable retail core, enhanced walkability throughout the centre and continuous 'active' edges.</p> <p>The Structure Plan establishes clear principles in relation to car parking provision - maintain existing supply / new development to be self sufficient in parking. A detailed Traffic and Parking Plan would be required as part of the assessment of any large development proposal.</p> <p>The Structure Plan references detailed retail demand projections undertaken as part of the City of Port Phillip Activity Centres Strategy.</p> <p>Planning Schemes are unable to control retail mix. The Structure Plan recommends that Footpath Trading be used as a means of influencing mix through limiting footpath dining within the retail core where highest levels of pedestrian movement will be impacted.</p> <p>The Structure Plan provides clear direction that entertainment based uses should serve the local community rather than see Carlisle Street become regional</p>

			<p>centre', specifically, 'nothing in the plan to create a town centre'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Submission is generally not supportive of retail renewal concepts - considers they are not needed• A 'stronger statement in the plan is needed to prevent Carlisle St from becoming another tourist or entertainment destination.		<p>destination. A recent VCAT decision on a large scale Tavern within the activity centre acknowledged this policy direction.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	---

<p>20 Resident (Immediate area)</p>	<p>Qualified Support (Some Concerns)</p> <p>Note: Very Detailed submission generally supporting the strategic directions of the Structure Plan -Strategic Directions 1,3,4,5 & 7 and Activity Centre Precincts 1,4 & 7 and Strategic Option 1.</p> <p>Raised some concern over ability to achieve directions proposed.</p>	<p>Support for Strategic Directions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports intent to manage cafes / restaurants and protect core retailing (raises concerns over scope to achieve / conflict with night time activity). • Supports prevention of uses that will turn Carlisle St into an entertainment destination. • Supports directions to improve the 'retail offer' / range of personal services / place identity / independent traders. • Supports strategies to manage new development (but concerned that VCAT may override). • Supports access and movement strategies including pedestrian crossing at station / station upgrade. • Supports but questions if designated cycle lane can fit along Carlisle Street. • Agrees with recognition of heritage and special character as part of strategy to provide residential opportunities. "Council is to be congratulated for finally bringing Nightingale St into the Heritage Overlay" • Supports shop top dwellings and expresses support for Woodstock as successful use of such a policy. • Supports the intention to review council's footpath trading policy and the recognition of the importance of accessible streets / permeability for pedestrians through 'walk throughs' etc. • Supports the concept of integrating the eastern walkway into the Williams Street precinct by opening entrance into east/west connector streets. • Supports provision of additional social housing / a well designed redevelopment of the Marlborough St car park with 'housing that is appropriate to the streetscape'. • Supports improvements to station access / safety associated with the Balaclava Walk project and creation of public space. 	<p>Various</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not support higher density residential development on the western side of William St based on concerns that any increase in height and density may further decrease amenity and perceptions of safety in the walkway. • Car parking should be retained on the station car park with social housing built over (cites Woodstock as an example to follow) • Eastern side of Balaclava Station / rail line also need to be included on plans for upgrading. 	<p>Various</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission comments on the loss of retail diversity overtime and the increase in footpath clutter associated with cafes. • Public waiting areas could be improved - current seats cold / ugly. • Balaclava Walk project - desire for 'active edges' to walkway must not include serving windows / outdoor dining on walkway - need to keep walking routes free. • Suggests larger Post Office • Need to provide public toilets in association with the station upgrade. 	<p><u>Officer Comment:</u></p> <p>The Design Objectives for William Street (as for all parts of the activity centre) emphasise built form / land use outcomes which provide for the passive surveillance of the public realm and active ground level uses to enhance public safety.</p> <p>Relocation of the station car park to the north side of the activity centre (rather proposing development over the car park) is proposed on the basis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Placing car parking where it is in greatest demand. - The limited visibility of the subject site / potential for safety issues / likely inefficient use of site. - Improved amenity and reinstatement of a residential interface to Marlborough Street. <p>Whilst the Concept Plans for the upgrade of Balaclava Station are focused on the western side (and associated walkway and housing development), the eastern side of the station will be incorporated into the upgrade.</p>
---	---	---	---	---	--

21 Resident (Immediate area)	Partial Support / Specific Concerns	Alfred / Nelson Residential Interface <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports increase in height limits in Alfred, Nelson and Camden Streets 	Retail (Supermarket/Car Park) Renewal Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefer Coles car park to remain to provide sense of space and future scope for open space / public use. Build up around car park instead. Concerned that a covered or underground car park will create a 'dead zone' / & could attract illegal activities. Opposed to 'one way' streets and pedestrian malls 	Public Realm Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like to see the public realm further improved around the Town Hall forecourt and Carlisles St Interface. 	<u>Officer Comment:</u> The Retail Renewal Project is a key element of the Structure Plan which would deliver opportunities for retail and residential growth necessary to respond to projected demand for these uses. Scarce land resources in inner Melbourne requires a different future for large at grade car parks. Well designed new development will create quality urban streetscapes and public spaces. Relocating car parking underground is intended to 'reconnect' the activity centre with the adjoining residential area. This is a well established design principle for activity centres. Reducing the impact of cars and providing priority for pedestrian movement is an increasing feature of vital, successful activity centres.
22 Trader	Issue Specific Objection		Retail (Supermarket/Car Park) Renewal Project - impact on access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to the proposed redevelopment of the Coles car park due to likely impact on deliveries and access. 		<u>Officer Comment:</u> The Concept Plans for the Retail Renewal Project include reference to maintaining vehicle access along the laneway. To further clarify this point, it is recommended that the following be included in the description of 'Opportunity 2 Retail Renewal Project': <i>"Ensure appropriate access / loading is maintained for retail premises fronting Carlisle Street".</i>
23 Resident	Qualified Support (Some Concerns)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car Parking Comments that planning permits should not be issued for new dwellings without the requirement for on site car parking. 			
24 Vic Track	Issue Specific objection		Need for Retention of Railway Reserve <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed linear park / planting on railway reserve may affect railway operations or infrastructure. A 3rd or 4th track is required to meet needs. 		<u>Specific Change Requested:</u> That railway reserve (PUZ4) be excluded from consideration as linear /landscape link. <u>Officer Comment:</u> Request is supported. Delete rail reserve as one of the locations nominated in the Structure Plan where linear planting is to be improved. (Refer Att. 6 for detail).