

Submission ID	Date Received	Submitter Name	Organisation	Stakeholder Type	Summary of Submission
SUB-001	28-Jul	Debra Shields	NA	Public	Opposes citing loss of neighbourhood character and privacy, increased traffic and parking pressure, inadequate sewer and drainage infrastructure, greater flooding risk, and reduced tree canopy leading to higher urban heat impacts. Requests amendment be refused.
SUB-002	30-Jul	Renata Blanch	NA	Public	Suggests flood and storm surge areas are likely to be areas where infill could make the most difference to housing supply and diversity. Ambiguity in explanatory document and unclear is provisions prohibit subdivision altogether, or only subdivision on affected portion of lot, does not support prohibition instead consent authority should retain discretion for flooding and storm surge areas
SUB-003	30-Jul	Shane Phillips	NA	Public	Supports proposal as it will optimise exisating infrastructure, improve housing supply and affordability, support multi generational living and aging in place and retains equitable property rights because landowners retain the ability to choose whether they will utilise the provisions
SUB-004	31-Jul	Dilip A Nellikatt	NA	Public	The amendment will increase available and affordable housing options and will create opportunities for residents and contractors who remain loyal to Alice Springs. Hopefully additional housing will help meet demand from mining activity in coming months
SUB-005	5-Aug	Robin Knox	NA	Public	Supports subdivision only if canopy, permeability and site coverage limits are introduced.
SUB-006	10-Aug	Owen Kelly	NA	Public	Include locational specific provisions for Alice Springs for the following: minimum permeable area, deep soil, tree retention, landscaping, stormwater, fencing, CPTED, orientation, strategic framework consideration
SUB-007	10/08/026	Brooke Best	NA	Public	Neighbourhood character will be affected, fundamental change to Zone LR, cumulative amenity impacts are the main concern not just individual proposals, infrastructure capacity should be established first, amenity impacts including traffic, loss of greenery, privacy. Suggests there are other ways to increase housing supply rather than a blanket approach, new housing should be located in select areas with good access to services.
SUB-008	10-Aug	Shaun Best	NA	Public	Neighbourhood character will be affected, fundamental change to Zone LR, cumulative amenity impacts are the main concern not just individual proposals, infrastructure capacity should be established first, amenity impacts including traffic, loss of greenery, privacy. Suggests there are other ways to increase housing supply rather than a blanket approach, new housing should be located in select areas with good access to services.
SUB-009	11-Aug	Emma Smith	NA	Public	Supports infill generally but opposes current proposal due to inadequate controls, canopy loss and infrastructure risks.
SUB-010	11-Aug	Raymond Hall	NA	Public	Argues proposal reduces liveability, impacts privacy and airflow, and should focus density near corridors and centres instead.
SUB-011	10-Aug	Max Bowden	NA	Public	Argues proposal sacrifices lifestyle, environment and green space while failing to address housing system issues.
SUB-012	9-Aug	Anthony Kerr	NA	Public	Significantly change the nature of the unique area of Brinkin
SUB-013	11-Aug	Judith Durnford	NA	Public	Raises concerns about overcrowding, traffic, air-conditioning dependence, habitat loss and infrastructure impacts.
SUB-014	11-Aug	Brad Cunningham	Cunnington Rosse Town Pl	Public	Supports objectives but requests formal infrastructure pre-lodgement process and clarification of planning provisions.
SUB-015	12-Aug	David Ronald	NA	Public	Supports proposal and suggests allowing smaller lots and easier rezoning.
SUB-016	13-Aug	Krystine Paice-Brown	NA	Public	Object to the proposal because of structural risks to existing properties, inadequate road access, destruction of high value native flora and wildlife, failure to account for Native Title Rights and sacred site protection
SUB-017	13-Aug	Sara Martin	NA	Public	Concerned about climate impacts, greenery loss, infrastructure strain and lifestyle impacts.
SUB-018	14-Aug	Angela Salamito	NA	Public	Concerned about living too close to neighbours, investors knocking down perfectly functioning buildings, impacts on the climate/urban heat and wildlife
SUB-019	15-Aug	Paul & Bec Clissold	NA	Public	Raise concerns about canopy loss, stormwater, traffic, privacy and neighbourhood amenity in Nightcliff.
SUB-020	17-Aug	Carolyn Wakeling	NA	Public	Concerned about increased traffic particularly giving existing traffic problems in nightcliff area
SUB-021	14-Aug	Lorraine Gameau	NA	Public	Concerned about traffic growth, reduced gardens and loss of tree canopy.
SUB-022	17-Aug	Beth Niemeier	NA	Public	Concerned about loss of trees, wildlife habitat, amenity and added pressure on ageing infrastructure in Nightcliff.
SUB-023	18-Aug	Sonja Pastor	NA	Public	Concerned about cumulative infrastructure impacts, urban heat, short-term rentals and insufficient place-based planning.
SUB-024	19-Aug	Dwayne Clifton	NA	Public	Objects due to impacts on lifestyle, mental wellbeing, family space, canopy, infrastructure and traffic.
SUB-025	19-Aug	Jaemie Page	NA	Public	Concerned about infrastructure, traffic, stormwater, tree loss and blanket planning approach.
SUB-026	19-Aug	Martin Jackson	NA	Public	Seeks stronger climate-resilient planning, tree retention, infrastructure analysis and more affordable housing measures.
SUB-027	19-Aug	Bryson Lashbrook	NA	Public	Seeks climate-resilient, place-based planning and stronger protection of canopy, deep soil and tropical design outcomes.
SUB-028	19-Aug	Traci Clifton	NA	Public	Objects due to impacts on lifestyle, mental wellbeing, family space, canopy, infrastructure and traffic.
SUB-029	19-Aug	Scott Reynolds	NA	Public	
SUB-030	19-Aug	Peter Stephenson & Cather	NA	Public	Support proposal but seek flexibility for lots minimally affected by storm surge overlay.

SUB-031	20-Aug Peter Roe	NA	Public	Concerned about infrastructure, traffic, schools, tree canopy and loss of established suburb character.
SUB-032	20-Aug Laurie Palfy	NA	Public	Opposes the change due to impacts on environment, climate and infrastructure demand
SUB-033	20-Aug Alisa Leibrick	NA	Public	Requests infrastructure analysis and evidence before broad Zone LR changes proceed.
SUB-034	20-Aug Amber Harford	NA	Public	Similar to Andrew Harford; raises infrastructure, traffic, tree canopy and neighbourhood character concerns.
SUB-035	20-Aug Babette Willis	NA	Public	Opposes reduced lot sizes, increased density and battle-axe provisions. Prefers targeted rezoning and infrastructure-led planning.
SUB-036	20-Aug Emily Banks	NA	Public	concerned about loss of Territory lifestyle
SUB-037	20-Aug Gayle Laidlaw	NA	Public	Concerned by infrastructure limits, blanket application, affordability assumptions and canopy loss.
SUB-038	20-Aug Belinda Townend	NA	Public	Raises concerns regarding infrastructure, traffic, parking, environmental impacts and loss of suburb character.
SUB-039	21-Aug Nick Oloughlin	NA	Public	Concerned about ageing infrastructure, urban heat, tree canopy loss and blanket Territory-wide approach. Supports place-based planning.
SUB-040	21-Aug Ryan Riedel	NA	Public	Supports density increases but seeks stronger private open space and landscaping requirements.
SUB-041	21-Aug Graham Kirby	NA	Public	Raises concerns over urban heat, habitat loss, infrastructure capacity and neighbourhood character.
SUB-042	21-Aug Kate Dixon	NA	Public	Objects due to ageing infrastructure, sewer/stormwater concerns, tree loss and urban heat impacts.
SUB-043	21-Aug Jane Agaaard	NA	Public	Concerned about water and sewer infrastructure, parking, congestion and loss of leafy suburb character.
SUB-044	21-Aug Maxwell John Congdon	NA	Public	Objects to proposal given impacts on traffic and parking and concerns no contact with residents has been made on proposal
SUB-045	21-Aug IsraelTshepo Kgosiemang	NA	Public	Supports amendment as balanced housing reform that increases housing diversity while retaining assessment controls.
SUB-046	21-Aug Ian Redmond	NA	Public	Raises concerns about urban heat, wildlife loss, affordability outcomes and infrastructure capacity.
SUB-047	21-Aug Barbara Saunders	NA	Public	Supports housing objectives but opposes blanket flood-overlay prohibitions and seeks merit assessment pathway.
SUB-048	21-Aug Christine Cox	NA	Public	Raises concerns about infrastructure, canopy loss, urban heat and lack of suburb-specific assessments.
SUB-049	21-Aug Peter Morante	NA	Public	No explanation about why Zone LR outcomes have replaced 'predominantly' with 'generally' two storeys or less and no explanation why requirement for visual and acoustic privacy to be taken into account for subdivision has been removed
SUB-050	21-Aug Andrew Harford	NA	Public	Objects due to impacts on neighbourhood character, traffic, parking, tree canopy, water pressure and infrastructure capacity in Wulagi.
SUB-051	21-Aug Matthew McKenna	NA	Public	Concerned about impacts on heritage homes, traffic, schools, infrastructure, climate resilience and neighbourhood character.
SUB-052	21-Aug Samuel Swan	NA	Public	Potential to ruin Darwin suburbs, concerns with negative impacts on infrastructure, is a missed financial opportunity, concerned about increased heat in cities due to lack of trees
SUB-053	21-Aug Annie Lillis-Jones	NA	Public	Believes infill will reduce suburb character and overwhelm roads and infrastructure. Prefers greenfield development.
SUB-054	21-Aug Julie Lillis	NA	Public	Strongly opposes proposal, citing loss of suburb character, infrastructure pressure, canopy loss and reduced liveability.
SUB-055	21-Aug Inge Gardiner	NA	Public	Concerned about densification, traffic, heat island effects, infrastructure strain, loss of character and biodiversity. Calls for deferral.
SUB-056	21-Aug Nick Kirlaw	Plan: The Planning Action I Community group		Opposes Territory-wide approach; seeks precinct-based planning, infrastructure certification and stronger development controls.
SUB-057	21-Aug Margaret Clinch	NA	Public	Believes proposal will negatively affect residents and overload infrastructure.
SUB-058	21-Aug Trudy Campbell	Citizens party	Public	Questions infrastructure impacts, tree canopy protection, costs and actual housing benefits.
SUB-059	21-Aug Michael and Karen Schipp	NA	Public	Do not support changes and wish to retain Nightcliff character.
SUB-060	13-Aug Karen Relf	Australian Institute of Architects Industry		Supports intent but stresses design quality, climate responsiveness, infrastructure capacity and neighbourhood amenity.
SUB-061	19-Aug Marisa Fontes	Australian Institute of Landscape Architecture Industry		Supports housing objectives but calls for canopy, deep-soil, landscaping, stormwater and urban-heat controls.
SUB-062	21-Aug Rory McKay	Planning Institute of Australia Industry		Supports amendment and housing goals; recommends infrastructure assessments and implementation mechanisms.
SUB-063	21-Aug Ruth Palmer	Property Council NT	Industry	Strongly supports amendment, with refinements relating to infrastructure, battle-axe lots, hazard overlays and implementation guidance.
SUB-064	21-Aug Annie Taylor	NT Shelter	Industry	Supports amendment to increase housing supply and diversity; seeks explicit social and affordable housing outcomes, infrastructure planning, climate-responsive design and monitoring.
SUB-065	21-Aug Mary Watson	Local Government Association Industry		Supports infill in principle but seeks infrastructure audits, council consultation, cost-sharing arrangements and strategic planning.
SUB-066	21-Aug Engineers Australia Northern Territory Engineers Australia Northern Territory Industry			Supports infill reforms in principle but seeks infrastructure capacity planning, proportionate servicing assessments, tropical design controls, stormwater management and ongoing monitoring.