

# Standing Advisory Committee Recommendations and Officer Response

The following tables provide the officer response to:

- Table 1: Committee Recommendations 1-15
- Table 2: Changes to Clause 11.03-1L recommended by the Standing Advisory Committee in Appendix E of the Report
- Table 3: Changes to DDO41 to DDO50 recommended by the Standing Advisory Committee in Appendix F of the Report

**Table 1: Officer response to Committee Recommendations 1-15**

Committee Rec #	Change recommended by Committee	Officer Response
1	Amend Clause 21.11 to no longer list the three reference documents relevant to draft Yarra Planning Scheme Amendment C291yara.	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>Yarra reference / background documents are currently listed in Clause 21.11 of the Yarra Planning Scheme. Clause 21.11 will be deleted as part of the approval of Amendment C269yara – Rewrite of Local Policies.</p> <p>The Committee’s recommendation is supported. The reference documents would be included in Clause 72.08 (Background documents). Amendment documentation and Clause 21.11 will be updated to reflect this change.</p> <p>See response to Recommendations 4(a) and 5.</p>
2	Amend Clause 21.12 and translate the content of Clause 21.12 into a new Clause 11.03-1L, as shown in Appendix E.	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support with changes</b></p> <p>A requirement within the letter of consent from the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning to prepare and exhibit Amendment C291yara was to prepare translation of Clause 21.12 Local Areas into the new Planning Policy format. This translation would sit under the new Clause 11.03-1L Activity Centres.</p> <p>The proposed policy included in Clause 11.03-1L is a condensed version of the proposed policy at Clause 21.12 with the context and vision removed and the preferred character statements converted into policy statements. These changes were made to reflect the new format for Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The translated Clause 11.03-1L was considered by Council on 21 December 2021 and forwarded to the Committee as part of the amendment documentation.</p> <p>The version of Clause 11.03-1L recommended by the Committee is generally consistent with Council’s preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021 with only minor changes as outlined below and in Table 2 of this attachment. After the conclusion of the hearing, the Committee requested Council officers provided an</p>

Committee Rec #	Change recommended by Committee	Officer Response
		updated version of the Clause 11.03-1L to all parties. The updated version corrected typographical errors and made language changes to reflect adopted Amendment C269yara.
3	Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedules 41, 42, 44, 48, 49 and 50 to include Interface J to land south of Bridge Road or Victoria Street.	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>The change is consistent with Council’s preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021.</p> <p>The change was in response to resident submissions which raised concern regarding proposed rear interface controls. They submitted the rear interface controls did not adequately protect the amenity of residents south of the commercial strips.</p> <p>Officers considered there was a need to provide greater protection for residential amenity in these locations given the east-west configuration of Bridge Road and Victoria Streets. Proposed changes would reduce overshadowing impacts, provide more certainty on the extent of overshadowing and reduce visual bulk.</p> <p>A modified version of rear interface requirements (Interface J) was proposed to apply in these locations. The modified residential interface would continue the 45 degree angle above the rear wall instead of capping it at 10 metres.</p> <p>The Committee supported Council’s application of Interface J across the two centres.</p>
4(a)	Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedules 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49 and 50, as shown in Appendix F, to no longer list the three reference documents relevant to draft Yarra Planning Scheme Amendment C291yara	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>The change is consistent with Council’s preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021.</p> <p>In the preferred version of the amendment, reference documents were deleted to comply with Ministerial Direction on ‘Form and Content’.</p> <p>Officers support Recommendation 1 which would relocate the reference / background documents to Clause 72.08. See also Recommendation 5.</p>
4(b) and (c)	<p>Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedules 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49 and 50, as shown in Appendix F, to:</p> <p>delete after the words ‘the proposal will achieve each of the following’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>excellence for environmentally sustainable design</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support with changes</b></p> <p>Officers do not support the deletion of the BESS project score criterion. The requirement is required in DDO41-50 to help mitigate the environmental impacts of intensified development. It aligns with Councils strategic objectives in the Council Plan and Amendment C269yara in terms of environmental outcomes. Officers consider there is a strong correlation between BESS requirement and built form. Refer also to the Council report.</p> <p>Officers do not support the deletion of the private and communal open space criterion. The requirement is required in DDO41-50 to help mitigate the demand for open space, increased dwelling sizes and the amenity impacts of intensified development. It aligns with the Council plan and Amendment C269yara in terms of creating high standards of on-site amenity. Officers consider there is a strong correlation between the private and communal open space requirement and built form and amenity. Refer also to the Council report.</p>

Committee Rec #	Change recommended by Committee	Officer Response
	<p><i>measured as a minimum BESS project score of 70%</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>provision of end-of-trip facilities, including secure bicycle parking, locker and shower facilities and change rooms in excess of the requirements of Clause 52.34</i></li> </ul> <p>delete the words: <i>where a proposal includes dwellings, it also achieves each of the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>housing for diverse households types, including people with disability, older persons, and families, through the inclusion of varying dwelling sizes and configurations</i></li> <li>• <i>accessibility provision objective that exceeds the minimum standards in Clauses 55.07 and/or 58 as relevant</i></li> <li>• <i>communal and/or private open space provision that exceeds the minimum standards in Clauses 55.07 and/or 58, as relevant.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Officers support the deletion of the criteria in relation to end of trip facilities and bike parking, diverse housing types and accessibility.</p> <p>The clause should read as follows:</p> <p><i>A permit should only be granted to construct a building or construct or carry out works, which exceeds the preferred building height shown in the Height and Interface Plan 1 of this schedule where all the following requirements are met to the satisfaction of the responsible authority:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>the building elements permitted by the proposed variation satisfies the general design objectives in Clause 1.0 of this schedule and the relevant design requirements specified in this schedule; and</i></li> <li>▪ <i>the proposal will achieve each of the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>greater building separation than the minimum requirement in this schedule;</i></li> <li>– <i>excellence for environmentally sustainable design measured as a minimum BESS project score of 70%;</i></li> <li>– <i>no additional overshadowing or overlooking of residentially zoned properties, beyond that which would be generated by a proposal that complies with the preferred building height; and</i></li> <li>– <del><i>provision of end-of-trip facilities, including secure bicycle parking, locker and shower facilities and change rooms in excess of the requirements of Clause 52.34.</i></del></li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ <i>where the proposal includes dwellings, it also achieves each of the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <del><i>housing for diverse households types; including people with disability, older persons, and families, through the inclusion of varying dwelling sizes and configurations;</i></del></li> <li>– <del><i>accessibility provision that achieves the standards in Clauses 55.07 and 58.05 (as relevant);</i></del></li> <li>– <i>communal open space provision that exceeds the minimum standards in Clauses 55.07 and 58.03; and/or secluded private open space provision that exceeds the minimum standards in Clauses 55.07 and 58.05.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Committee Rec #	Change recommended by Committee	Officer Response
5	<p>Reference the following documents in Clause 72.08 (Background documents):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Bridge Road &amp; Victoria Street Activity Centres - Review of Interim Built Form Controls – Analysis and Recommendations (MGS Architects and Urban Circus, April 2021)</li> <li>b) Built Form Review: Bridge Road – Heritage Analysis and Recommendations (GJM Heritage, April 2021)</li> <li>c) Built Form Review: Victoria Street – Heritage Analysis and Recommendations (GJM Heritage, April 2021)</li> <li>d) Traffic Engineering Assessment, Victoria Street and Bridge Road Activity Centres, Richmond (Traffix Group, April 2021).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>See response to Recommendation 1.</p>
6	<p>Amend Clause 11.03-1L and Design and Development Schedules 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49 and 50, to make drafting changes shown in Appendices E and F which improves their clarity and operation.</p>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support with changes</b></p> <p>See Tables 2 and 3 for responses to the drafting changes proposed by the Committee in Appendix E and F of the Committee Report.</p>
7(a)	<p>Amend the Design and Development Overlay Schedule 41, as shown in Appendix F1, to: include a definition of building height as shown in Appendix E.</p>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>At the hearing, a submitter made submissions around building heights affected by the views to the Pelaco Sign. Council noted at the hearing that heights along the southern side of Bridge Road between Punt Road and Rotherwood Street are largely, though not exclusively driven by the protection of views to the Pelaco sign from Wellington Parade.</p>

Committee Rec #	Change recommended by Committee	Officer Response
		<p>The building heights proposed in DDO41 were supported through survey and modelling information provided at the Hearing. The modelling illustrated that the height limit to protect views did not require a development to follow the topography of the land. A horizontal height could also retain views to the Pelaco Sign. The Committee has recommended a specific building height definition for these properties.</p> <p>Officers support the specific definition for these properties. It will ensure that development is not unnecessarily restricted while protecting views to the Pelaco Sign. Rear interface controls will also temper impacts of new development to residential properties at the rear.</p> <p>A reference to even numbers has been added by officers to clarify that this definition applies only to the southern side of the street. A notation has also been added to Plan 1 to refer to the specific building height definition for these properties.</p> <p>The building height definition should read as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i><b>Building Height</b> has the same meaning as defined in the definitions at clause 73.01 except in relation to the numbers 2-70 Bridge Road, Richmond (even numbers between Punt Road and Rotherwood Street) where building height is measured for the purposes of this control as the vertical distance from natural ground at the centre of the Bridge Road frontage of the site to the roof or parapet at that point.</i></p>
7(b)	Amend the Design and Development Overlay Schedule 41, as shown in Appendix F1, to:  change the mandatory maximum building height across the rear of 146 and 148 Bridge Road, Richmond	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>The properties at 146 and 148 Bridge Road are located on the southern side of Bridge Road, east of Lennox Street. These properties are atypical due to their extensive depth.</p> <p>Interim DDO21 applies a mandatory 21m height to the entire length of these properties.</p> <p>Council's exhibited version of DDO41 reduced the height to 18m mandatory on the basis of preserving the prominence of the heritage streetscape.</p> <p>The landowners submitted the height at the rear should be a mandatory 21m height rather than 18m. They submitted that the depth of the properties could accommodate a 21m height without having a visual impact on the Bridge Road heritage streetscape.</p> <p>Modelling was provided by the submitter at the hearing showing a proposed planning application with a 21m height at the rear. This included a substantial upper level setback to the heritage building.</p> <p>Council's heritage and urban design experts at the hearing acknowledged higher built form (21m) would not have a significant impact on the heritage streetscape, public realm or views to the Pelaco Sign.</p> <p>Officers are satisfied that a 21m height at the rear would not undermine the integrity of the heritage streetscape, public realm or views to the Pelaco sign. Officers consider 146 and 148 Bridge Road an exception due to their atypical depth. A mandatory control would ensure that a taller development is not proposed.</p>

Committee Rec #	Change recommended by Committee	Officer Response
7(c)	Amend the Design and Development Overlay Schedule 41, as shown in Appendix F1, to: clarify mapping of Interface J near 242 Bridge Road, Richmond	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>At the hearing, a landowner submitted that the map in DDO41 Plan 1 <i>Height and Interface Plan</i> made it difficult to identify whether 242 Bridge Road was affected by Interface J.</p> <p>Council officers provided an amended map to clarify the application of Interface J in the Post hearing – Part C version of the Amendment.</p> <p>Officers support this recommendation. This change is reflected in the attached versions of DDO41.</p>
7(d)	Amend the Design and Development Overlay Schedule 41, as shown in Appendix F1, to: clarify overshadowing provisions.	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>At the hearing, a submitter commented the first provision under overshadowing requirements should be clarified to read:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>A permit must not be granted to construct a building or construct or carry out works that would <u>cast additional overshadowing any</u> of the following spaces between 10am and 2pm at 22nd September:</i></p> <p>Officers supported this minor amendment at the Hearing as it further refines the requirement. As per recommendation 6, officers have applied this change to other DDOs.</p>
8	Amend the Design and Development Overlay Schedules 41, 42 and 43 to show the correct location and associated view cone of St Ignatius Church.	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>It came to the attention of Council through the hearing that the location of the St Ignatius Church landmark symbol within DDO41, DDO42 and DDO43 was placed slightly west of the location of the Church's tower belfry and spire.</p> <p>The purpose of locating the landmarks and viewlines on the maps is to provide guidance to applicants, the community and Council in determining whether an application may impact identified view lines.</p> <p>While care has been taken with the location of the landmark symbol and the mapping, they do not provide the same level of detail as would a survey.</p> <p>Officers support the relocation of the landmark symbol as it would further improve the accuracy of the DDO.</p> <p>Officers also support the subsequent amendments to view lines and view cones</p>
9	Review Design and Development Overlay Schedules 41, 42, 43 and 50 to ensure they accurately map landmarks and associated view cones.	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>See the response to Recommendation 8.</p>
10	Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedule 43 to change the mandatory maximum building	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>At the hearing, the Committee was presented with a range of built form options from the landowner of 393-395 Bridge Road. They argued a discretionary height could achieve the built form objectives of DDO44.</p>

Committee Rec #	Change recommended by Committee	Officer Response
	<p>height for 393-395 Bridge Road, Richmond to a discretionary height provision.</p>	<p>Council’s urban design expert also suggested a discretionary height could achieve the built form objectives sought from the DDO, however he strongly supported an 18m height.</p> <p>Typically, in a heritage context, mandatory controls have been applied where the Heritage Overlay (HO) applies. Precinct 3 does not have the HO applied consistently along Bridge Road and 393-395 Bridge is not covered by the HO.</p> <p>While the Committee recommended a 18m discretionary height, they supported Council’s application of mandatory controls to the street wall and upper level setback on Bridge Road. They considered proposed mandatory street wall height and upper-level setback provisions are necessary to ensure that new development along Bridge Road does not overwhelm the heritage streetscape.</p> <p>The Committee acknowledged that 393-395 Bridge Road is a larger site. In the context of mandatory street wall and upper-level setback provisions, the Committee accepted that allowing discretion for building height at 393-395 Bridge Road would not compromise objectives for Precinct 3.</p> <p>The Committee did not support the landowners proposed discretionary 24m height for the site but supported Council’s preferred height of 18m.</p> <p>Officers accept the Committee’s position that with the application of mandatory street wall and upper-level setback provisions along Bridge Road and other requirements set out in the DDO, a discretionary 18m height would not compromise objectives for Precinct 3 which seek to maintain its heritage and civic character and views to significant landmarks.</p>
11(a)	<p>Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedule 44, as shown in the Appendix F2, to:</p> <p>apply landscape setbacks of 1.3 metres to the southwest and 3 metres to the south boundary at 198-242 Burnley Street, Richmond</p>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>During exhibition, submissions were received which requested that landscape setbacks be applied to the southern portion of 198-242 Burnley Road in accordance with the approved planning permit PLN17/0370.</p> <p>Officers supported this proposal noting these changes would improve reduce overshadowing from a potential development to the north. The landscape setbacks were adopted in Council’s preferred version of the amendment, considered by Council on 21 December 2021.</p> <p>The Committee supports these setbacks proposed by Council and noted that, combined with the change to the residential interface provisions, the landscape setbacks will improve potential amenity outcomes as compared to the exhibited DDO44.</p>
11(b)	<p>Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedule 44, as shown in the Appendix F2, to:</p>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>During exhibition, submissions commented the existing permits for 198 -242 Burnley Street allowed vehicular access to Burnley Street. The exhibited amendment identified this frontage as ‘access not preferred’.</p>

Committee Rec #	Change recommended by Committee	Officer Response
	include in the Legend to Plan 2 (Access and movement): <i>'Burnley Street access may be considered depending on size of car park and discussions with the Department of Transport'</i>	<p>After consulting with Council's traffic engineers, Council included an annotation in DDO44 indicating access to Burnley Street may be considered depending on the size of carpark and support from the Department of Transport in its preferred version of DDO44 adopted by Council on 21 December 2021.</p> <p>At the hearing this position was supported by Council's traffic expert, who supported this change noting:</p> <p><i>This part precinct includes a number of large sites that front both Burnley Street and Neptune Street. Given the scale of development possible on these sites, direct access to Burnley Street may be preferable for traffic management reasons and impact on local streets. Allowing vehicle access to Burnley Street would be consistent with previous development approvals for these sites which had primary vehicle access to Burnley Street. Unlike Bridge Road, Victoria Street and Church Street, Burnley Street does not have any trams or buses that operate in this area. For the above reasons, I am satisfied with the variation of allowing direct vehicle access to Burnley Street in this specific location to be considered differently to other arterial roads within the Bridge Road Activity Centre.</i></p> <p>Officers support the change to DDO44 as the Committee's recommendations align with Council's preferred position and Council's expert witness.</p>
11(c)	<p>Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedule 44, as shown in the Appendix F2, to:</p> <p>revise wording under Vehicular Access Requirements to discourage access from Bridge Road and require Department of Transport approval for any access from an arterial road</p>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>In response to submissions, Council in December 2021 adopted a requirement which clarifies the role of the main streets in the two centres and limits vehicular access off those roads.</p> <p>The rationale for directing access away from main roads (Bridge Road and Victoria Street) was to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- maintain Bridge Road and Victoria Street as pedestrian orientated shopping destinations.</li> <li>- ensure the efficiency and safety of main roads controlled by the Department of Transport, largely by minimising vehicle access on roads they manage, particularly where tram lines exist.</li> </ul> <p>This change was supported by Council's traffic expert.</p> <p>Officers support the change to DDO44 as the Committee's recommendations align with Council's preferred position and Council's expert witness.</p>
11(d)	<p>Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedule 44, as shown in the Appendix F2, to:</p> <p>remove the potential pedestrian link from 566 Bridge Road, Richmond.</p>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>The change is consistent with Council's preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021.</p> <p>Officers received submissions to remove the pedestrian link. In response to submissions, officers concluded:</p> <p><i>Given that the link would have provided access to private property, it is recommended that the proposed pedestrian link for the site be removed.</i></p>



Committee Rec #	Change recommended by Committee	Officer Response
12(a)	<p>Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedules 46 and 48, as shown for Design and Development Overlay Schedule 48 in Appendix F3, to:</p> <p>(a) revise the preferred upper-level setback from the property boundary along Little Hoddle Street (Interface I) to 6.5 metres, plus an additional 3 metres at the uppermost level for development over 30 metres on the western side of Little Hoddle Street</p>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>The change is consistent with Council’s preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021.</p> <p>The change was in response to resident submissions concerned that the proposed building heights and setbacks (Interface I) in the exhibited amendment were not adequate to protect the amenity of residents along Little Hoddle Street.</p> <p>Upper level setbacks from the property boundaries on the eastern and western sides of Little Hoddle Street were increased from 4.5m from the centreline of the laneway to 6.5 metres from the property boundary. (An additional 3 metre setback would apply to the upper most level of properties to the west.)</p> <p>The intent of this change was to increase sunlight to Little Hoddle Street between 11am-1pm at the Equinox. Little Hoddle Street has a unique character including a number of creative industries, cafes and residences at street level. It has also been identified as a potential shared zone where pedestrians and vehicles would share the space.</p> <p>Council’s urban design expert submitted that a 6.5 metre setback will retain the human scale of Little Hoddle Street, secure the distinction between the street wall and upper levels and reduce the potential for overshadowing.</p> <p>The Committee agreed with Council’s expert that the extra quantum of development that could be delivered with a building that overshadowed Little Hoddle Street for the entire day is not so great as to trade off the solar access that ought to be achieved, even if only for 1 hour between 12 and 1pm.</p>
13(a)	<p>Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedule 48, as shown in Appendix F3, to:</p> <p>delete specific property addresses in the ‘preferred requirements’ column of the minimum side/rear wall setback for Interface I.</p>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>Officers support the deletion of the specific property addresses in the ‘preferred requirements’ column of the minimum side/rear wall setback for Interface I.</p> <p><i>As Plan 1 Height and Interface Plan shows the setback on the map spatially, there is no need to list the addresses.</i></p> <p>The deletion of the addresses will protect against changes in property addresses in the future due to subdivision or consolidation of lots.</p>
13(b)	<p>Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedule 48, as shown in Appendix F3, to:</p> <p>revise the preferred upper-level setback (Interface D) along Hoddle Street south of Elizabeth Street to 3 metres, except within 5 metres of a</p>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support with changes</b></p> <p>Officers support the preferred upper-level setback (Interface D) along Hoddle Street south of Elizabeth Street to 3 metres.</p> <p>Officers do not support the insertion of <i>“except within 5 metres of a heritage property where an upper-level setback should be 6 metres”</i>. There are no properties affected by the Heritage Overlay along this section of Hoddle Street (between Elizabeth and York Streets).</p> <p>Officers support the preferred upper-level setback (Interface D) along Hoddle Street south of Elizabeth Street to 3 metres. This would replace the proposed 4.5m setback which was applied to provide a transition to the 6m upper</p>

Committee Rec #	Change recommended by Committee	Officer Response
	heritage property where an upper-level setback should be 6 metres	<p>level setback required for heritage buildings. Officers note there are no heritage buildings in this portion of Hoddle Street and Elizabeth Street.</p> <p>3m is consistent with the approach in interim DDO22.</p> <p>While a consistent approach along Hoddle Street is important, this part of Hoddle Street can accommodate a 3 metre upper-level setback without abruptly breaking any consistent built form – given a break in built form is created by the Elizabeth and York Street carriageways.</p>
13(c)	<p>Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedule 48, as shown in Appendix F3, to:</p> <p>revise the preferred upper-level setback along Elizabeth Street (Interface C) between Hoddle Street and Little Hoddle Street to 3 metres</p>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support with changes</b></p> <p>Officers support the proposed change to the preferred upper-level setback (Interface C) along Elizabeth Street between Hoddle and Little Hoddle Streets from 6 metres to 3 metres.</p> <p>3m is consistent with the approach in interim DDO22 and also reflects upper level setbacks of existing development on the south side of Elizabeth Street. The change only applies to one site.</p>
13(d)	<p>Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedule 48, as shown in Appendix F3, to:</p> <p>apply Interface C to the Regent Street boundary of 46-60 Regent Street</p>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>Council’s heritage expert recommended that Interface C should be applied to the Regent Street boundary of 46-50 Regent Street rather than Interface A. The change would apply a discretionary upper level setback rather than a mandatory and remove the 3m upper level setback for the top level.</p> <p>Council’s heritage expert supported changing Interface A to Interface C for the building on 46-50 Regent Street noting it <i>‘has a plain parapet building form compared with the northern part of the former Henry Walter’s Boot Factories buildings. It has also been over-painted and retains limited heritage significance’</i>. Council’s expert also noted that the building is internally subdivided and the likelihood of redevelopment is constrained. The Committee considers acceptable heritage outcomes can in these circumstances be achieved through performance based provisions.</p> <p>The Committee considers that the building to the south at 52-60 Regent Street should also be subject to Interface C. Interface A was applied to 52-60 Regent Street as it is included in the same property boundary as 46-50 Regent Street. Interface A has been applied to properties where the Heritage Overlay is applied. The building on 52-60 Regent Street is not subject to the Heritage Overlay and Interface C would be a more appropriate interface. The requirements in DDO48 would also ensure upper levels would match neighbouring heritage buildings for 6m.</p>
13(e)	Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedule 48, as shown in Appendix F3, to:	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>The Committee recommends amending Plan 2 – Access and Movement to correct an error identified by a submitter. The submitter requested a reduction in the extent of the <i>Potential Future Shared Zone</i> at the southern</p>

Committee Rec #	Change recommended by Committee	Officer Response
	correct Plan 2 (Access and movement plan) to terminate the southern end of Little Hoddle Street at the property boundary of 67-81 Hoddle Street and 84 Regent Street, Richmond.	end of Little Hoddle Street to ensure it applies to the laneway and not private property. This error was corrected in Plan 1 – Building heights and interfaces following the receipt of submissions but was not corrected in Plan 2.
14	Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedule 49, as shown in Appendix F4, to change the mandatory maximum height for 35-47 Lithgow Street, Abbotsford to a discretionary height provision.	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Do not support</b></p> <p>The proposed controls have been guided by PPN59 and PPN60 and mandatory controls have been applied where they can be strategically justified and are necessary to achieve acceptable heritage outcomes.</p> <p>Mandatory maximum heights were proposed where there are consistent heritage streetscapes and recommended to reduce the visual impact of new development and better respect the heritage significance of the heritage forms.</p> <p>Officers also note that the Committee at Page 22 of the Committee Report notes:</p> <p><i>The mandatory provisions have been applied in circumstances which are necessary to protect and manage:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the existing heritage qualities of the centres generally</i></li> <li>• <i>the heritage qualities of stand alone heritage buildings</i></li> <li>• <i>the protection of views to landmarks, namely the Pelaco sign, Richmond Town Hall, St Ignatius Church and Skipping Girl sign</i></li> <li>• <i>the protection of solar access to designated streets and areas.</i></li> </ul> <p>Council’s heritage expert recommended that:</p> <p><i>the highly visible tiled roof forms, industrial chimney and varied facades to Lithgow and Little Lithgow Street of the Former Cordial Factory are the features that the ‘Upper level requirements’ guidance is intended to inform. The intent of these requirements is not to be applied blindly but rather should consider the importance of these elements and the contribution they make to the identified values of the heritage place.</i></p> <p><i>It is my view that the proposed 15m (4-storey) mandatory height control proposed for this site within DDO49 and the upper-level setback from the Lithgow Street façade will ensure that the historic façade and roof form of the Former Cordial Factory remain prominent elements within the streetscape.</i></p>
15(a) and (b)	Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedule 50, as shown in Appendix F5, to apply discretionary rather than mandatory building height provisions on land on the	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Do not support</b></p> <p>The application of mandatory controls was guided by PPN59 and PPN60 and mandatory controls have been applied where they can be strategically justified and are necessary. Council applied mandatory maximum heights were proposed in some locations where development abuts sensitive residential interfaces.</p>

Committee Rec #	Change recommended by Committee	Officer Response
	<p>south side of Victoria Street between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Church and Lambert Streets, except for land subject to the Heritage Overlay</li> <li>b) McKay and Johnson Streets.</li> </ul>	<p>Council officers and Council's planning expert support mandatory heights in this location:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• as it is consistent with the principles applied elsewhere within Bridge Road and Victoria Street.</li> <li>• proposed building heights range from 18 to 21 metres (5/6 storeys) in this area represent a significant level of change in built form from the current one and two storey developments.</li> </ul>

**Table 2: Officer response to changes to Clause 11.03-1L recommended by the Standing Advisory Committee in Appendix E of the Report**

Local Policy Element	Change recommended by Standing Advisory Committee	Officer Response
<b>Bridge Road, Richmond</b>		
Whole activity centre	Limit direct vehicular access onto Bridge Road, Church Street and Burnley Street <a href="#">as specified in a DDO.</a>	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Inserted to improve clarity of policy.
Whole activity centre	Protect primary views defined in the clause 15.01-2L to the spire of St Ignatius Cathedral, clocktower of Richmond <a href="#">Town Hall</a> , and the Pelaco sign.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Corrects typographical error - 'Town Hall' capitalised.
Precinct 1 – Bridge Road West	Support Epworth Hospital by supporting associated health and allied services to locate near the hospital.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Corrects typographical error – full stop added.
Precinct 1 – Bridge Road West	Ensure mid rise development on the northern side of Precinct 1 respects the heritage fabric and the adjoining <del>low-scale</del> <a href="#">low-rise</a> residential neighbourhoods.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Amended to accord with version of clause 11.03-1L adopted as part of Amendment C269yara on 19 April 2022.
Precinct 3 – Bridge Road Central	Enhance the <a href="#">Richmond</a> Town Hall forecourt as a key public space providing a setting for the Town Hall and the former police station.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Minor clarification – 'Richmond' inserted to make it clear the reference to 'Town Hall' is the Richmond Town Hall.
Precinct 4 – Bridge Road East South	Maintain the prominence of the Former Flour Mill and Grain Store Complex (534-534A Bridge Road) on the south-east corner of Bridge Road and Type Street as a local landmark.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Corrects typographical error – bracket added.
<b>Victoria Street Abbotsford/Richmond</b>		
Whole activity centre	Manage licensed premises and the precinct's prominent night-time economy including the <a href="#">core entertainment</a> precinct west of Burnley Street.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Corrects typographical error – space inserted.
Whole activity centre	Limit direct vehicular access onto Victoria Street and Church Street <a href="#">as specified in a DDO.</a>	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Inserted for clarification
Whole activity centre	Facilitate new and improved pedestrian connections to the <del>DHHS housing sites</del> <a href="#">North Richmond Housing Estate.</a>	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b>

Local Policy Element	Change recommended by Standing Advisory Committee	Officer Response
		Updated to correct name – ‘DHHS housing sites’ amended to ‘North Richmond Housing Estate’.
Whole activity centre	Capitalise on future opportunities such as provision of open space and links to the Yarra <a href="#">River, provided</a> by commercial and industrial areas in Abbotsford, including the Carlton and United Brewery site.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Corrects typographical error – space inserted.
Precinct 1 – Victoria Street West	Retain the visual prominence of the Victoria Street Gateway at the intersection with <a href="#">Hoddle Street</a> .	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Corrects typographical error – space inserted.
Precinct 1 – Victoria Street West	Provide for lower midrise development for the remainder of the precinct that respects the heritage fabric and the adjoining <del>low-scale</del> <a href="#">low-rise</a> residential neighbourhoods.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Amended to accord with version of clause 11.03-1L adopted as part of Amendment C269yara on 19 April 2022.
Precinct 2 – Victoria Street Central	Provide for lower midrise development (3-6 storeys) in Precinct 2 that respects the heritage fabric and the adjoining <del>low-scale</del> <a href="#">low-rise</a> residential neighbourhoods.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Amended to accord with version of clause 11.03-1L adopted as part of Amendment C269yara on 19 April 2022.
Precinct 2 – Victoria Street Central	Support Victoria Street <del>Centre</del> <a href="#">Central</a> as the centre’s fine grain retail and dining precinct.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Corrects typographical error - replaced ‘Centre’ with ‘Central’.
Precinct 2 – Victoria Street Central	Provide for lower midrise development (3-6 storeys) in Precinct 2 that respects the heritage fabric and the adjoining <del>low-scale</del> <a href="#">low-rise</a> residential neighbourhoods.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Amended to accord with version of clause 11.03-1L adopted as part of Amendment C269yara on 19 April 2022.
Precinct 3 – North Richmond Station	Ensure new midrise development (5 -10 storeys) respects the pockets of heritage fabric and the adjoining <del>low-scale</del> <a href="#">low-rise</a> residential neighbourhoods.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Amended to accord with version of clause 11.03-1L adopted as part of Amendment C269yara on 19 April 2022.
Precinct 4 – Victoria Street East	Ensure new midrise development (5-7 storeys) respects the pockets of heritage fabric and the adjoining low scale low-rise residential neighbourhoods.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Amended to accord with version of clause 11.03-1L adopted as part of Amendment C269yara on 19 April 2022.
Precinct 4 – Victoria Street East	Facilitate new and improved pedestrian connections to Precinct 4 from the <del>DHHS housing sites</del> <a href="#">North Richmond Housing Estates</a> .	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Updated to correct name – ‘DHHS housing sites’ amended to ‘North Richmond Housing Estate’.

Local Policy Element	Change recommended by Standing Advisory Committee	Officer Response
Precinct 5 – Victoria Street East End	Provide for new midrise development (4-7 storeys) that respects the pockets of heritage fabric and the adjoining <del>low-scale</del> <u>low-rise</u> residential neighbourhoods in Precincts 5.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Amended to accord with version of clause 11.03-1L adopted as part of Amendment C269yara on 19 April 2022.
Precinct 5 – Victoria Street East	Support Victoria Street End as a diverse mixed-use precinct consisting <u>of</u> a range of retail, commercial and residential uses within new midrise developments of varying heights, widths and character.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Corrects typographical error – inserted the word ‘of’.

**Table 3: Officer response to changes to DDO41 to DDO50 recommended by the Standing Advisory Committee in Appendix F of the Report**

DDO number	DDO Requirement	Change recommended by Standing Advisory Committee	Officer Response
DDO41 - DDO50	Building Heights Requirements	Less than 50 per cent of the roof area is occupied by the equipment /structures (other than solar panels <a href="#">and green roofs</a> );	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> The change is consistent with Council’s preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021. This minor amendment to the criteria for exceptions to building height (such as services) was made at the 21 December 2021 Council Meeting.
DDO41 - DDO50	Building Heights Requirements	The equipment and/or structures do not cause additional overshadowing of private open space to residential land, opposite footpaths, kerb outstands, <a href="#">or planting areas in the public realm etc</a> ; and	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> The change is consistent with Council’s preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021. This minor amendment to the criteria for exceptions to building height (such as services) was made at the 21 December 2021 Council Meeting.
DDO41 - DDO50	Upper Level Requirements	For heritage buildings, upper level setbacks behind the street wall should be provided in excess of the minimum upper level setback where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ it would facilitate the retention of a roof form and/or chimneys that are visible from the public realm, or a roof or any feature that the relevant statement of significance identifies as contributing to the significance of the heritage building or streetscape;</li> <li>▪ <a href="#">a lesser setback would not</a> <del>it would</del> maintain the perception of the three-dimensional form and depth of the building; and</li> <li>▪ a lesser setback would detract from the character of the streetscape when viewed directly or obliquely along the street.</li> </ul>	<b>Officer recommended change:</b> Clarifies intent by rewording the requirement. Clearer about the circumstances where a greater setback should be required.
DDO41 - DDO50	Overshadowing Requirement	A permit must not be granted to construct a building or construct or carry out works that would <a href="#">cast additional overshadowing any</a> of the following spaces between 10am and 2pm at 22 <sup>nd</sup> September:	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 7(d) for a response to this change.



DDO number	DDO Requirement	Change recommended by Standing Advisory Committee	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ any part of the southern footpath of Bridge Road, measured from the property boundary to the existing kerb.</li> </ul> <p><del>A permit should not be granted to construct a building or construct or carry out works that would any additional overshadowing overshadow any of the following spaces between 10am and 2pm at 22nd September, unless the overshadowing would not unreasonably prejudice the amenity of the public space, to the satisfaction of the responsible authority:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>▪ any part of the opposite footpath of Lennox Street and Church Street, measured from the property boundary to the existing kerb (including any opposite kerb outstands, seating and/or planting).</del></li> </ul> <p>A permit should not be granted to construct a building or construct or carry out works that would cause any additional overshadowing of the following spaces in <a href="#">Table 2</a>, between 10am and 2pm at 22nd September, unless the overshadowing would not unreasonably prejudice the amenity of the public space, to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.</p>	
DDO41 - DDO50	Design Quality Requirements	<a href="#">Ensure shopfront widths are not reduced to the extent they become commercially unviable.</a>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>The change is consistent with Council’s preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021.</p> <p>During the exhibition of C291yara, submissions raised concern that the economic viability of shops could be compromised due to development in Bridge Road and Victoria Street.</p> <p>In response to submissions, Council added this requirement to help to address the issue.</p>
DDO41 - DDO50	Design Quality Requirements	Development should avoid blank walls visible <del>permanently or temporarily</del> from the public realm.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b>

DDO number	DDO Requirement	Change recommended by Standing Advisory Committee	Officer Response
		<p><a href="#">Where a solid external wall is unavoidable, walls should be detailed and include articulation to provide an interesting appearance.</a></p>	<p>The change is consistent with Council's preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021.</p> <p>During the exhibition of C291yara, a submission raised concern with the wording of the requirement. Officers made amendments to the requirement in response:</p> <p>The terms '<i>permanently and temporarily</i>' were removed and wording was added to clarify the outcome sought i.e. all visible facades should be detailed and avoid blank walls.</p> <p>Officers also recommend the concept of articulation is included to clarify the intent of the requirement.</p>
DDO41 - DDO50	Design Quality Requirements	<p><a href="#">New development considers opportunities for lot consolidation to achieve high quality design and heritage outcomes.</a></p>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>The change is consistent with Council's preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021. This amendment was made as per Council's resolution 21 December 2021 item 1 d(iii).</p> <p><i>The Committee supports the proposed policy to consider opportunities for lot consolidation forming part of the Design Quality Requirements. The policy is not mandatory and the Committee does not agree that it will force fine grain heritage sites to redevelop (Page 57 of 187 of the Committee Report).</i></p>
DDO41- DDO50	Access and Movement Plan	<p>Update plans to remove access notations on side streets and laneways which are not main roads managed by the Department of Transport or identified 'Green Streets'.</p>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>The change is consistent with Council's preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021.</p> <p>Following the exhibition of Amendment C291yara, many submissions raised concern regarding the access provisions within the DDOs. In response, officers made amendments to the Access and Movement Plans and the Vehicle Access Requirements section of the DDO.</p> <p>The changes included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- refining the role of the 'Access and Movement Plan' to focus on access to main roads managed by the Department of Transport and identified 'Green Streets'. This would entail removing some of the access notations on the 'Access and Movement Plans'. Access notations would be removed from side streets and laneways.</li> </ul>

DDO number	DDO Requirement	Change recommended by Standing Advisory Committee	Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Including a new requirement which seeks to limit access from the main roads.</li> <li>- retaining the requirement that development should provide vehicular access from rear lanes or from side streets, however, this will be 'where possible'.</li> </ul> <p>The 'Access and Movement Plans' still include some traffic mitigation recommendations to assist future developments.</p>
DDO41 - DDO45	Vehicle Access Requirements	<a href="#">Development should not provide vehicle access from Bridge Road.</a>	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 11(c) for a response to this change.
DDO46, DDO47, DDO49, DDO50	Vehicle Access Requirements	<a href="#">Development should not provide vehicle access from Victoria Street.</a>	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> See Table 1: Recommendation 11(c) for a response to this change. Comments for Bridge Road apply to Victoria Street.
DDO41 - DDO50	Vehicle Access Requirements	Development should provide vehicular access from rear lanes or from side streets, <a href="#">where appropriate</a> . <del>in the preferred locations on Plan 2 of this schedule – Access and Movement Plan.</del>	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> The change is consistent with Council's preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021. Following the exhibition of Amendment C291yara, many submissions raised concern regarding the access provisions within the DDOs. In response, officers made amendments to the Access and Movement Plans and the Vehicle Access Requirements section of the DDO. (See above.)
DDO41 - DDO50	Vehicle Access Requirements	Where access is provided to an arterial road, access <del>should</del> <a href="#">would</a> be <a href="#">subject to Department of Transport approval and should be</a> limited to left-in/left-out.	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 11(c) for a response to this change. The change has been applied to all DDOs in Bridge Road and Victoria Street – in line with Recommendation 6 which seeks to amend all DDOs in accordance with Appendix F to provide greater clarity and operation.
DDO41 - DDO50	Vehicle Access Requirements	<a href="#">Development should enhance the amenity and safety of laneways that provide pedestrian and vehicular access to buildings.</a>	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> The change is consistent with Council's preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021. Following the exhibition of Amendment C291yara, many submissions raised concern regarding the access and movement provisions within the DDOs. To partially address this issue, Council adopted a requirement which seeks to improve the amenity and safety of laneways for vehicles and pedestrians.

DDO number	DDO Requirement	Change recommended by Standing Advisory Committee	Officer Response
DDO41 - DDO50	Pedestrian and Bicycle Access	Pedestrian and Bicycle Access <a href="#">Requirements</a>	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Drafting error raised during the hearing. Officers support this change.
DDO41 - DDO50	4.0 Advertising Signs	<del>Advertising</del> Signs	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> The heading <i>Advertising Signs</i> does not align the structure set out within Ministerial Direction 1 – Form and Content of Planning Schemes. The heading used should be <i>Signs</i> . Officers support this correction.
DDO41 - DDO50	Reference Documents	<del>Bridge Road &amp; Victoria Street Activity Centres – Review of Interim Built Form Controls – Analysis and Recommendations (MGS Architects and Urban Circus, April 2021)</del> <del>Built Form Review: Bridge Road – Heritage Analysis and Recommendations (GJM Heritage, April 2021)</del> <del>Traffic Engineering Assessment, Victoria Street and Bridge Road Activity Centres, Richmond (Traffix Group, April 2021)</del>	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 5 for a response to this change.
DDO41- DDO50	5.0 Application Requirements	A Traffic Engineering Report prepared by a suitably qualified traffic engineer that demonstrates how the development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– minimises impacts on the level of service, safety and amenity of the arterial road network (including tram services <a href="#">and bike lanes</a>),</li> <li>– reduces car dependence and promotes sustainable transport modes, and</li> <li>– which includes an assessment of the impacts of traffic and parking in the Precinct including the ongoing functionality of laneway/s, where applicable.</li> </ul>	<b>Officer recommended change:</b> Clarification of intent. Added bike lanes.
DDO41- DDO50	6.0 Decision Guidelines	The impact of development on traffic and parking in the nearby area, including on the functionality of laneways <a href="#">and bike lanes</a> .	<b>Officer recommended change:</b> Clarification of intent. Added bike lanes.

DDO number	DDO Requirement	Change recommended by Standing Advisory Committee	Officer Response						
DDO41 - DDO44	6.0 Decision Guidelines	<del>The profile and impact of development along Palmer Street when viewed from the north side of Palmer Street and the south side of Bridge Road.</del>	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> The decision guideline applies to DDOs where Palmer Street is not located. Officers support the change as it improves the operation of the decision guidelines. The change is consistent with Council's preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021.						
DDO41 - DDO50	Various locations	Update references to figures numbers and plan numbers.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Numerous changes have been made to update references to plan and figure numbers throughout DDO41-DDO50. These are necessary to implement updates to the DDOs which include the inclusion of Interface J and other mapping changes.						
DDO41 - DDO44 & DDO48 - DDO50	Interface to residential properties in NRZ or GRZ requirements	<p><b>Table 3 – Residential interfaces</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Residential Interface</u></th> <th><u>Preferred requirement</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Interface H</u></td> <td><u>Heights and setbacks shown in Figure 1 of this schedule.</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Interface J</u></td> <td><u>Heights and setbacks shown in Figure 2 of this schedule.</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Residential Interface</u>	<u>Preferred requirement</u>	<u>Interface H</u>	<u>Heights and setbacks shown in Figure 1 of this schedule.</u>	<u>Interface J</u>	<u>Heights and setbacks shown in Figure 2 of this schedule.</u>	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> The change is consistent with Council's preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021. This is a drafting change to the DDOs to reflect the new Interface J. This change is necessary to improve navigation of the DDOs.
<u>Residential Interface</u>	<u>Preferred requirement</u>								
<u>Interface H</u>	<u>Heights and setbacks shown in Figure 1 of this schedule.</u>								
<u>Interface J</u>	<u>Heights and setbacks shown in Figure 2 of this schedule.</u>								
DDO41, DDO42 & DDO43	Plan 1 – Building heights and interfaces & Plan 2 – Landmarks	Update Plan 1 or 2 (as applicable) to the correct location of correct location and associated view cone of St Ignatius Church.	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 8 for a response to this change.						
DDO41, DDO42, DDO43 and DDO50	Plan 1 – Building heights and interfaces & Plan 2 – Landmarks	Update Plan 1 or 2 (as applicable) to accurately map landmarks and associated view cones.	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 9 for a response to this change.						
DDO41	Definitions	<u>Building Height has the same meaning as defined in the definitions at clause 73.01 except in relation to Numbers</u>	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 7 (a) for a response to this change.						

DDO number	DDO Requirement	Change recommended by Standing Advisory Committee	Officer Response						
		<a href="#">2-70 Bridge Road, Richmond (even numbers - between Punt Road and Rotherwood Street) where building height is measured for the purposes of this control as the vertical distance from natural ground at the centre of the Bridge Road frontage of the site to the roof or parapet at that point.</a>							
DDO41	Overshadowing Requirement	<p><b>Table 2 - Overshadowing</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Hours and dates</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><a href="#">Any part of the opposite footpath of Lennox Street and Church Street, measured from the property boundary to the existing kerb (including any opposite kerb outstands, seating and/or planting)</a></td> <td><a href="#">10am to 2pm at 22 September</a></td> </tr> <tr> <td><a href="#">Alexander Reserve</a></td> <td><a href="#">10am to 2pm at 22 September</a></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Location	Hours and dates	<a href="#">Any part of the opposite footpath of Lennox Street and Church Street, measured from the property boundary to the existing kerb (including any opposite kerb outstands, seating and/or planting)</a>	<a href="#">10am to 2pm at 22 September</a>	<a href="#">Alexander Reserve</a>	<a href="#">10am to 2pm at 22 September</a>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>The change is consistent with Council's preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021.</p> <p>This is a drafting change to the DDO to aid in readability.</p>
Location	Hours and dates								
<a href="#">Any part of the opposite footpath of Lennox Street and Church Street, measured from the property boundary to the existing kerb (including any opposite kerb outstands, seating and/or planting)</a>	<a href="#">10am to 2pm at 22 September</a>								
<a href="#">Alexander Reserve</a>	<a href="#">10am to 2pm at 22 September</a>								
DDO41	Plan 1 – Building heights and interfaces	Update Plan to apply a 21m height mandatory height to the rear of 146-148 Bridge Road.	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 7(b) for a response to this change.						
DDO41	Plan 1 – Building heights and interfaces	Update Plan 1 to improve mapping of Interface J near 242 Bridge Road.	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 7(c) for a response to this change.						
DDO43	Plan 1 – Building heights and interfaces	Update Plan 1 to show 21m discretionary height applying to the rear of 393-395 Bridge Road.	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 10 for a response to this change.						
DDO43	Plan 1 – Building	Update Plan 1 to show Church Street as a 'Green Street'.	<b>Officer recommended change:</b>						

DDO number	DDO Requirement	Change recommended by Standing Advisory Committee	Officer Response
	heights and interfaces		Corrects an error. Church Street is shown as a 'Green Street' in DDO41, DDO42, DDO49 and DDO50 and in the Interim Built Form Review. However, the annotation was omitted on Plan 1 in DDO43.
DDO44	Interface to residential properties in NRZ or GRZ requirements	<a href="#">Development at 198-242 Burnley Street should provide a 3 metres landscape setback to the southern boundary to 244 Burnley Street and a 1.3 metre landscape setback to the western boundary to 2 Stratford Street and 53-57 Neptune Street.</a>	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 11 (a) for a response to this change.
DDO44	Interface to residential properties in NRZ or GRZ requirements	Development at 566 Bridge Road should provide an <del>6m</del> <b>8m</b> landscape setback to the eastern boundary with the Racecourse Heritage Precinct and 6m to the southern boundary to 65 Stawell Street.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Do not support</b> Officers do not support the 6m landscape setback (as exhibited) on the eastern boundary of the Officeworks site as recommended by the Committee. Instead, officers recommend the retention of the 8m landscape setback to this boundary as adopted by Council on 21 December 2021 in response to submissions. The 8m setback is necessary to ensure the protection of sunlight to the properties to the east. The change ensures shadows would not extend beyond a shadow caused by a 1.8m fence at the Equinox.
DDO44	Plan 2 - Access and Movement	Include in the Legend to Plan 2: 'Burnley Street access may be considered depending on size of car park and discussions with the Department of Transport'	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 11(b) for a response to this change.
DDO44	Plan 2 - Access and Movement	In Plan2, remove the potential pedestrian link from 566 Bridge Road, Richmond.	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 11(d) for a response to this change.
DDO44	Decision Guidelines	<del>The impact of the development on view lines to the Pelaco sign; the Richmond Town Hall; and the belfry and spire of the Ignatius' Cathedral.</del>	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> The change deletes viewlines to landmarks that are not applicable to DDO49. Officers support the change as it improves the operation of the decision guidelines. Consistent with Council's preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021.
DDO44	Decision Guidelines	The impact of vehicular access arrangements on the operation of the tram routes along Bridge Road. <del>and Church Street.</del>	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> DDO44 does not apply to Church Street. Officers support the removal of the reference to Church Street.
DDO45	Plan 1 – Building	Update Plan 1 to show Gardner Street as a 'Green Street'.	<b>Officer recommended change:</b>

DDO number	DDO Requirement	Change recommended by Standing Advisory Committee	Officer Response				
	heights and interfaces		Corrects an error. Gardner Street is shown as a 'Green Street' in DDO43, and in the Interim Built Form Review. However, the annotation was omitted on Plan 1 in DDO45.				
DDO46	Table 1 - Street Wall Heights and Setbacks	In Interface I – Minimum side/rear wall setback – Preferred requirement: <del>1-11 Hoddle Street</del> – 2m setback on eastern boundary <a href="#">as shown on Plan 1</a> .	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Officers support the drafting change to DDO46 as its minor in nature and reduces text within the DDO.				
DDO46	Table 1 - Street Wall Heights and Setbacks	In Interface I – Minimum upper level setback – Preferred requirement: <a href="#">For properties which abut Little Hoddle Street - 6.5m from the property boundary</a> <a href="#">An additional 3m setback at the uppermost level for development over 30m on the western side of Little Hoddle Street</a> <a href="#">For other properties - 4.5m from the centreline of the laneway</a>	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 12(a) for a response to this change.				
DDO46	Decision Guidelines	The prominence of the heritage street wall in the vistas along Victoria Street, <del>Church Street</del> and local streets.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> DDO46 does not apply to Church Street. Officers support the removal of the reference to Church Street.				
DDO47	Overshadowing Requirement	<b>Table 2 – Overshadowing</b> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Hours and dates</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><a href="#">Any part of the opposite footpath of Shelley Street, Charles Street, Nicholson Street and Church Street, measured from the property boundary to the existing kerb (including any opposite kerb</a></td> <td><a href="#">10am to 2pm at 22 September</a></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Location	Hours and dates	<a href="#">Any part of the opposite footpath of Shelley Street, Charles Street, Nicholson Street and Church Street, measured from the property boundary to the existing kerb (including any opposite kerb</a>	<a href="#">10am to 2pm at 22 September</a>	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> The change is consistent with Council's preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021. This is a drafting change to the DDO to improve readability.
Location	Hours and dates						
<a href="#">Any part of the opposite footpath of Shelley Street, Charles Street, Nicholson Street and Church Street, measured from the property boundary to the existing kerb (including any opposite kerb</a>	<a href="#">10am to 2pm at 22 September</a>						



DDO number	DDO Requirement	Change recommended by Standing Advisory Committee	Officer Response
		<a href="#">outstands, seating and/or planting).</a> <hr/> <a href="#">Butler Street Park.</a> <a href="#">10am to 2pm at 22 September</a>	
DDO47	Plan 1 – Building heights and interfaces	Updated Plan to correct location of Interface H for properties at the northern end of Little Charles Street.	<b>Officer recommended change:</b> Makes a mapping correction. Interface H was on an angle and did not follow the property boundary. This has been corrected.
DDO47	Decision Guidelines	The prominence of the heritage street wall in the vistas along Victoria Street, <del>Church Street</del> and local streets.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> DDO47 does not apply to Church Street. Officers support the removal of the reference to Church Street.
DDO47	Decision Guidelines	<del>The impact of the development on view lines to the Richmond Town Hall and Skipping Girl sign.</del>	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> The change deletes viewlines to landmarks that are not applicable to DDO47. Officers support the change as it improves the operation of the decision guidelines.
DDO48	Interface to residential properties	<b>Interface to residential properties in NRZ or GRZ requirements</b> Development should protect the amenity of existing residential properties <a href="#">in the Neighbourhood Residential or General Residential Zones</a> in terms of visual bulk, overshadowing of private open space, overlooking and vehicle access.  <a href="#">Development in the Commercial 2 Zone should be setback from side and rear boundaries to ensure adequate daylight and minimise direct views to habitable rooms and private open space of dwellings in the Mixed Use Zone.</a>	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> The change is consistent with Council’s preferred version of the Amendment adopted on 21 December 2021. Following the exhibition of Amendment C291yara, submissions raised concern regarding the amendment would cause overshadowing and amenity issues. In response to submissions, Council proposed to insert additional requirements to ensure considerations apply to the Commercial 2 Zone as the requirements for this zone to consider amenity are not the same as the Commercial 1 Zone. In the Commercial 2 Zone, there is a focus on the impacts of warehouse and industry uses. The Committee has supported this insertion in their Appendix F version of DDO48.
DDO48	Table 1 - Street Wall Heights and Setbacks	In Interface C – Minimum upper level setback – Preferred requirement: <a href="#">For properties along Elizabeth Street between Hoddle Street and Little Hoddle Street: 3m</a>	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 13 (c) for a response to this change.

DDO number	DDO Requirement	Change recommended by Standing Advisory Committee	Officer Response
		<a href="#">Elsewhere</a> – 6m	
DDO48	Table 1 - Street Wall Heights and Setbacks	In Interface D – Minimum upper level setback – Preferred requirement: <a href="#">For properties along Hoddle Street south of Elizabeth Street: 3m (except within 5 metres of a heritage property where an upper-level setback should be 6 metres)</a> <a href="#">Elsewhere</a> – 4.5m	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 13 (b) for a response to this change.
DDO48	Table 1 - Street Wall Heights and Setbacks	In Interface I – Minimum side/rear wall setback – Preferred requirement: 2m minimum setback along Little Hoddle Street <a href="#">as shown in Plan 1</a> <del>to the eastern boundary of 15-25 Hoddle Street, 6-8 Elizabeth Street and 35-81 Hoddle Street and to the western boundary of 28-30 Regent Street, 31-33 Little Hoddle Street and 5 Elizabeth Street.</del>	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> Officers support the drafting change to DDO48 as its minor in nature and reduces text within the DDOs.
DDO48	Table 1 - Street Wall Heights and Setbacks	In Interface I – Minimum upper level setback – Preferred requirement: <a href="#">For properties which abut Little Hoddle Street - 6.5m from the property boundary</a> <a href="#">An additional 3m setback at the uppermost level for development over 30m on the western side of Little Hoddle Street</a> <a href="#">For other properties - 4.5m from the centreline of the laneway</a>	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 12(a) for a response to this change.
DDO48	Plan 1 – Height and Interface Plan	Amend Plan 1 to apply Interface C to 46 to 60 Regent Street.	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 13 (d) for a response to this change.
DDO48	Plan 2 – Access and Movement	Amend Plan 2 to apply access not supported to the southern side of Elizabeth Street, between Hoddle and Regen Streets. Remove access preferred from the land zoned Transport Zone east of Regent Street.	<b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b> The Committee has supported these changes that were presented at the Hearing by Council’s Traffic expert. This has been acknowledged in the Committee’s Appendix F of the Report. Council’s expert submitted:

DDO number	DDO Requirement	Change recommended by Standing Advisory Committee	Officer Response
			<p><i>These properties have alternative access via Little Hoddle Street (proposed to operate as a 'shared zone') and/or Regent Street or in the case of the Transport Zone unlikely to have any vehicle access. The car wash site on the corner of Hoddle Street and Elizabeth Street is significantly constrained by the PAO (as shown below) and direct access for any redevelopment is unlikely to be supported by the relevant road authority. This site is also constrained by the intersection configuration on the east approach (see aerial below) to the extent that access should be desirably reduced with any significant redevelopment. It is therefore inappropriate to depict this frontage as 'access preferred'.</i></p>
DDO48	Plan 2 – Access and Movement	Correct Plan 2 to terminate the southern end of Little Hoddle Street at the property boundary of 67-81 Hoddle Street and 84 Regent Street.	Refer to Table 1: Recommendation 13(e) for a response to this change.
DDO49	Decision Guidelines	The impact of the development on view lines to the St Ignatius Church <del>and Skipping Girl sign.</del>	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>The change deletes a viewline to a landmark that is not applicable to DDO49. Officers support the change as it improves the operation of the decision guidelines.</p>
DDO50	Decision Guidelines	The impact of the development on view lines to the <del>St Ignatius Church and</del> Skipping Girl sign	<p><b>Officer Recommendation: Support</b></p> <p>The change deletes a viewline to a landmark that is not applicable to DDO50. Officers support the change as it improves the operation of the decision guidelines.</p>