

Panel Recommendations and summary of officer response

Panel recommendation	Officer response
<p>1. Amend Design and Development Overlay Schedule 23, as shown in Appendix F, to:</p> <p>a) replace the word ‘must’ with the word ‘should’ in the second paragraph of the ‘Building separation, amenity and equitable development requirements’</p>	<p>Officer recommendation: Accept</p> <p>In response to evidence from Council’s urban design and planning witnesses and submitters, the Committee supported a change to Clause 2.7 (building separation, amenity and equitable development requirements) from mandatory (as exhibited) to discretionary requirements. The Committee considered there is no strategic justification for mandatory controls to this clause, and they may have unintended consequences for developing narrow lots. Council officers supported this change in its Part C version of DDO23.</p> <p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p> <p><i>See change no. 34 in Attachment 3.</i></p>
<p>b) to clarify the application of mandatory and preferred maximum street wall heights and mandatory and preferred maximum building heights.</p>	<p>Officer recommendation: Accept</p> <p>This proposed change was included in the Preferred version of the amendment considered by Council in December 2021 and referred to the Committee. Proposed changes were made to the legend in Map 1 and in Clause 2.5 to clarify the intent of the provisions.</p> <p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p> <p><i>See changes no. 3, 18 - 20 in Attachment 3.</i></p>
<p>c) delete after the words “the proposal will achieve each of the following”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “excellence for environmentally sustainable design measured as a minimum BESS project score of 70%” • “provision of end-of-trip facilities, including secure bicycle parking, locker and shower facilities and change 	<p>Officer recommendation: Partially accept</p> <p>Officers do not support the deletion of the criteria for BESS. The requirement is required in DDO23 to help mitigate the environmental impact of intensified development. It aligns with Council’s strategic objectives in the Council Plan and Amendment C269yara in terms of environmental outcomes. Officers</p>

Panel recommendation	Officer response
<p><i>rooms in excess of the requirements of Clause 52.34”</i></p>	<p>consider there is strong correlation between the BESS requirement and built form.</p> <p>Officers support the deletion of the requirement in relation to end of trip facilities.</p> <p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p> <p><i>See change no. 21-22 in Attachment 3.</i></p>
<p>d) delete the words “where a proposal includes dwellings, it also achieves each of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>housing for diverse households types, including people with disability, older persons, and families, through the inclusion of varying dwelling sizes and configurations</i> • <i>accessibility provision objective that exceeds the minimum standards in Clauses 55.07 and/or 58 as relevant</i> • <i>communal and/or private open space provision that exceeds the minimum standards in Clauses 55.07 and/or 58, as relevant.”</i> 	<p>Officer recommendation: Partially accept</p> <p>Officers do not support the deletion of the private and communal open space criterion. The requirement is required in DDO23 to help mitigate the increased demand for open space, increased dwelling sizes, and amenity impacts of intensified development. It aligns with Council’s strategic objectives in the Council Plan and Amendment C269yara in terms of creating high standards of amenity on-site. Officers consider there is strong correlation between the private /communal open space requirement and built form.</p> <p>Officers support the deletion of the criteria in relation to diverse housing types and accessibility.</p> <p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the detailed officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p> <p><i>See change no. 23 in Attachment 3.</i></p>
<p>e) to refer to ‘low-rise to mid-rise’ in the second design objective</p>	<p>Officer recommendation: Accept</p> <p>This wording was supported by officers and included in the officer Part C version of the DDO submitted at the end of the hearing. It is a minor change adding the word ‘rise’ after ‘low’.</p> <p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the detailed officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p> <p><i>See change no. 1 in Attachment 3.</i></p>
<p>f) to change Map 1 to show the preferred maximum street wall height for the land abutting the east side of the Oxford Street</p>	<p>Officer recommendation: Accept</p> <p>In response to submissions, Council undertook further shadow testing to determine the</p>

Panel recommendation	Officer response
<p>Reserve with a street wall height of 11 metres</p>	<p>potential impact upon the Oxford Street Reserve. At its meeting on 21 December 2021, Council proposed to reduce the <i>preferred</i> street wall height from 14 metres to 11 metres. The reduction in street wall height was included in Council's preferred version of DDO23.</p> <p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the detailed officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p> <p><i>See change no. 27 in Attachment 3.</i></p>
<p>g) to show on Map 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area 1 and Area 2 combined to form Area A • Area 3 renamed Area B. 	<p>Officer recommendation: Accept</p> <p>The issue was identified at the hearing. Officers support the change as there is little distinction between Area 1 and 2.</p> <p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the detailed officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p> <p><i>See changes no. 13, 15 & 25-26 in Attachment 3.</i></p>
<p>h) to clearly distinguish the upper level setback requirements applying to heritage and non-heritage buildings and to improve the clarity and intent of the provisions</p>	<p>Officer recommendation: Accept</p> <p>The issue was identified at the hearing. Changes were proposed to Clause 2.4 by officers in the Part C version. The clause has been restructured to divide the requirements into those applying to heritage and non-heritage buildings. Officers support the change.</p> <p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p> <p><i>See changes no. 6 - 12, 14 & 16 - 17 in Attachment 3.</i></p>
<p>i) modify 'Building height requirements' to state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"Architectural features (except service equipment or structures) may exceed the mandatory or preferred maximum building height."</i> • <i>"Service equipment and/or structures ... may exceed the mandatory or</i> 	<p>Officer recommendation: Accept</p> <p>The issue was identified at the hearing. Officers support the change as it clarifies the intent of the requirement and that the exemption applies to mandatory and preferred building heights.</p> <p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p>

Panel recommendation	Officer response
<p><i>preferred maximum building height provided that: ..."</i></p>	<p><i>See change no. 24 in Attachment 3.</i></p>
<p>j) to state "Development should not increase the amount of overshadowing as caused by existing conditions measured between 10am and 2pm on 22 September for the following areas of open space and/or public realm: ..."</p>	<p>Officer recommendation: Accept</p> <p>This proposed change was included in the Preferred version of the amendment considered by Council in response to submissions in December 2021 and referred to the Committee. Proposed changes were made to Clause 2.6 to remove the reference to satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and clarify the intent of the provisions.</p> <p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the detailed officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p> <p><i>See change no. 33 in Attachment 3.</i></p>
<p>k) to include an additional dot point that requires lower levels of development should</p> <p><i>"incorporate adaptable building structures, layouts and non-residential unit sizes so as to allow for a variety of uses over time"</i></p>	<p>Officer recommendation: Accept</p> <p>This proposed change was included in the Preferred version of the amendment considered by Council in response to submissions in December 2021 and referred to the Committee. Proposed changes were made to Clause 2.8 to promote adaptable building layouts.</p> <p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the detailed officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p> <p><i>See change no. 42 in Attachment 3.</i></p>
<p>l) to include an additional requirement that "Development should provide for landscaping that provides a positive contribution to the public realm such as canopy trees where possible, green walls or planter boxes"</p>	<p>Officer recommendation: Accept</p> <p>This proposed change was included in the Preferred version of the amendment considered by Council in response to submissions in December 2021 and referred to the Committee. Proposed changes were made to Clause 2.8 to ensure landscaping is integrated into the building design and provides for a softening of the building edge towards the public realm.</p> <p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the detailed officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p>

Panel recommendation	Officer response
	<i>See change no. 36 in Attachment 3.</i>
<p>m) to include a range of minor drafting changes to improve the clarity and intent of the ‘Other design requirements’</p>	<p>Officer recommendation: Accept</p> <p>Officers accept the Committee’s drafting recommendations in ‘Other design requirements’ outlined in Appendix F and have made the proposed changes to the DDO text to aid in readability and clarity.</p> <p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the detailed officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p> <p><i>See changes no. 37-41 & 43-45 in Attachment 3.</i></p>
<p>n) to modify the second last requirement to state “Where a ground level setback is provided to achieve practicable vehicle access to a laneway, a minimum headroom clearance of 3.6 metres should be provided to any overhang of the first floor”</p>	<p>Officer recommendation: Accept</p> <p>Officers accept the Committee’s proposed wording. The wording was proposed by Council’s traffic expert and included in the officer Part C version of the DDO submitted at the end of the hearing.</p> <p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the detailed officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p> <p><i>See change no. 46 in Attachment 3.</i></p>
<p>o) include a range of drafting changes to improve the clarity and intent of some requirements.</p>	<p>Officer recommendation: Accept</p> <p>Officers accept the Committee’s drafting recommendations in Appendix F and have made the proposed changes to the DDO text to aid in readability and clarity.</p> <p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the detailed officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p> <p><i>See changes no. 2, 4, 5, 35, 47 – 52 in Attachment 3.</i></p>
<p>p) show in Map 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • greater differentiation between colours and consideration of other cartographic tools to improve the map’s legibility • reference to ‘Preferred maximum building heights’, ‘Mandatory maximum building heights’ and 	<p>Officer recommendation: Accept</p> <p>Officers accept the Committee’s recommendations and have made the proposed changes to Map 1 to aid in readability and clarity.</p>

Panel recommendation	Officer response
<p>'Mandatory maximum street wall heights' in the legend headings and text</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the name 'Little Oxford Street' on the map • 'Public Open Space' on the legend • the extension of the Cambridge Street Reserve in a different colour green to 'Public Open Space' and adding 'Potential future open space under investigation' to the legend. 	<p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the detailed officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p> <p><i>See changes no. 28-32 in Attachment 3.</i></p>
<p>13. Following the implementation of the Planning Policy Framework translation process, the following documents should be included in the Schedule to Clause 72.08 (Background documents):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Brunswick Street and Smith Street Built Form Review: Collingwood Built Form Framework, 2018</i> • <i>Collingwood Mixed Use Pocket Heritage Analysis and Recommendations, 2018</i> • <i>Supplementary Heritage Report: Collingwood South (Mixed Use) Precinct, 2021.</i> 	<p>Officer recommendation: Accept</p> <p>Officers accept the Panel's recommendation and following the implementation of the Planning Policy Framework will request the insertion of the background documents into Clause 72.08.</p> <p>Refer to the Report and Attachment 3 for the detailed officer response to the changes made in Appendix F of the Committee Report.</p>