



## Amendment C203port (Planning Scheme Review) to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme: Assessment of submissions, January 2022

This document assesses the submissions received to Amendment C203port (Planning Scheme Review) to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme. A total of eight submissions were received, with seven requesting changes to the Amendment and one recording no objection. A response to each submission and any recommended changes are recorded below.

| Submitter number and position                      | Issues raised  | Response and recommended changes   |
|--|--|--|
| 1<br>Resident of Melbourne<br>Seeking changes      | The submitter notes Amendment C203port proposes changes to planning controls applying to 414-418 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, yet there is no mention of the neighbouring site at 412 St Kilda Road, Melbourne. The submitter is concerned about exemptions to mandatory height controls in the Design and Development Overlay Schedule 26 (DDO26), given VCAT recently directed that a permit be granted to construct a 75 metre building at 412 St Kilda Road, Melbourne. This is despite DDO26 specifying a 65 metre mandatory height for the site. Subsequently, the submitter requests that exemptions to mandatory heights be removed and that the definition of 'building height' be revised as the "height of the outer most parapet of the structure".   | Amendment C203port proposes to delete the incorporated document applying to the land at 414-418 St Kilda Road, Melbourne. The site has been developed in accordance with the incorporated document and is now obsolete. Extensive built form controls applying to the site are contained in DDO26 sub-precinct 4E.<br><br>Amendment C203port is not a wholesale review of all local planning policy objectives and controls, and does not comprise a review of any zoning or overlay controls that apply to properties, including DDO26. As such, while the matters raised in this submission are noted, they are beyond the scope of Amendment C203port. The submitter is encouraged to raise these matters in any future review of DDO26.<br><br><b>Recommended change: No change required.</b>  |
| 2<br>Resident of Port Melbourne<br>Seeking changes | This submitter is concerned about Council's approach to heritage, in particular around how sightline controls are applied to proposed rear extensions to dwellings.<br><br>The submitter believes the extension to their next door neighbour's dwelling dominates views in Griffin Crescent, Port Melbourne and has undermined the heritage significance of the street. The submitter was advised that it was not possible to lodge an objection because the extension cannot be viewed within 90 degrees of the front door of the home and also because Council's Heritage Advisor supported the extension. In turn, the submitter is dissatisfied with how the planning permit application was handled.<br><br>The submitter is also concerned that their neighbour will paint the original house black according to some workers and that the original house will fall into a state of disrepair. | The Heritage Policy and Heritage Design Guidelines proposed by Amendment C203port are the outcome of an extensive review of heritage in the City of Port Phillip, informed by extensive consultation undertaken in 2019. This review has reinforced that Council's current approach for development within the heritage overlay, is generally sound with the changes to heritage proposed by Amendment C203port taking the form of updates to address known and identified gaps and issues and strengthen existing policies, rather than being a complete revision.<br><br>Planning permit applications are assessed in accordance with the provisions of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme. Parties can object to a proposed planning permit application and seek the review of the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal. Nevertheless, feedback relating to how the planning permit application referred to in the |



| Submitter number and position            | Issues raised  | Response and recommended changes   |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>submission was handled has been provided to Council's City Development department.</p> <p>Griffin Crescent is subject to paint controls, pursuant to Clause 43.02 (Heritage Overlay) of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme. Therefore, the landowner would require a planning permit to paint the house. Decision guidelines in the Heritage Overlay allow Council to refuse a planning permit if proposed works will adversely affect the significance of the heritage place.</p> <p><b>Recommended change: No change required.</b></p>  |
| <p>3<br/>Unknown<br/>Seeking changes</p> | <p>This submitter is requesting that Council prepare a standalone policy for rooming houses. The submitter suggests a specific standalone policy can ensure that the intensity and scale of developments will not adversely impact surrounding amenity. While policy to support the provision of affordable housing is "commended" by the submitter, they also suggest some locations and are better suited to rooming houses than other locations.</p> <p>The submitter also suggests a standalone rooming house policy can ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social housing dwellings are evenly dispersed within the City of Port Phillip, so there is not an oversaturation in a particular area which is more likely to cause amenity issues.</li> <li>• Rooming Houses have specific urban design requirements so that they are not unnecessarily distinguishable from other homes.</li> <li>• Policies are created to regulate the rent charged to tenants in privately run rooming houses, to ensure they remain affordable rather than being used to charge market rents.</li> <li>• Deliver housing in locations where there is demonstrated need and where there is access to services transport and employment opportunities.</li> <li>• Clearer requirements regarding internal amenity requirements.</li> </ul> | <p>Rooming houses are an as of right use in all residential zones subject to meeting the requirements of Clause 52.23 (Rooming house). Given the zones and Clause 52.23 are State policy, Council is not able to prohibit rooming houses in residential zones. The Department of Families, Fairness and Housing and Consumer Affairs Victoria regulate rooming houses rather than Council, despite requirements for rooming houses to be registered with Council.</p> <p>Given Amendment C203port either gives effect to policies already adopted by Council, implements the <i>Port Phillip Planning Scheme Audit 2018</i> or translates existing policy to accord with new Victorian Government requirements for planning schemes, it is not possible to include a standalone rooming house policy at this point. Further strategic work would be required to underpin a standalone rooming house policy in the planning scheme. Hence, no changes are recommended to include such a policy as part of Amendment C203port. However, the submitter's concerns have been noted and will be investigated during the upcoming preparation of the Housing Strategy.</p> <p>Nevertheless, existing policy in the planning scheme responds to many of the submitter's concerns regarding rooming houses. Pursuant to Clause 73.03 (Land use terms), rooming houses are included within the definition of a 'Residential building', which is defined as:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Land used to accommodate persons, but does not include camping and caravan park, corrective institution, dependent person's unit, dwelling, group</i></p> |



| Submitter number and position | Issues raised | Response and recommended changes   |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--|
|                               |               | <p><i>accommodation, host farm, residential village or retirement village.</i></p> <p>Therefore, given the inclusion of rooming houses within the definition of residential buildings, provisions in Clause 55 (Two or more dwellings on a lot and residential buildings) apply. Clause 55 (known commonly as ResCode) contains provisions on a range of matters raised by the submitter including neighbourhood character, site layout and massing, managing internal and external amenity impacts, and detailed design. Within each provision are objectives and standards that new development, including rooming houses, should meet.</p> <p>The State policy in Clause 55 is augmented by policy proposed by Amendment C203port, Urban design matters are addressed by the policy proposed by Clause 15.01-1L-02 (Urban design). In particular, Clause 15.01-1L-02 contains strategies seeking new buildings to "facilitate high quality urban design and architecture that integrates with the prevailing neighbourhood character and contributes to the amenity and vitality of the area". Broader strategies addressing built form, the presentation of buildings to the public realm, street level frontages are also contained within Clause 15.01-1L-02. Further, policy proposed in Clause 16.01-1L-01 (Housing diversity) encourages new housing to be accessible and liveable, including new rooming houses.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that many of the private rooming houses in Port Phillip have been changing their focus, similar to other shared accommodation provision across Victoria, and have instead been increasingly accommodating international students and workers rather than people on lower incomes or facing other disadvantage. However, Council does not have the ability to regulate rent charged to tenants of privately run rooming houses to ensure they remain affordable.</p> <p>That said, Clause 16.01-2L (Affordable housing) includes policy to encourage a broad range of affordable housing, including rooming houses. It also retains longstanding policy supporting the retention of registered rooming houses and preventing their conversion into other residential uses such as backpackers' lodges. Similarly, Clause 16.01-2L addresses the submitter's view that affordable housing should not be distinguishable from other development.</p> |



| Submitter number and position                  | Issues raised  | Response and recommended changes   |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>Turning to affordable housing more broadly, noting that some rooming houses change market rents, Clause 16.01-2L (Affordable housing) contains policy supporting the location of affordable housing within walking distance from the Principal Public Transport Network, Major Activity Centre or Neighbourhood Activity Centre, encompassing most of the municipality and recognising its suitability for affordable housing. Underpinning this policy is the City of Port Phillip Housing Needs Assessment and Allocations Framework (Beverley Kliger and Associates, 2019), which identifies local need. This framework projects the shortfall of social housing in the City of Port Phillip will increase from 4,432 units in 2016 to 6,540 units in 2025, in turn indicating that social housing is required throughout the municipality. Social housing managed by housing associations and housing providers is subject to a regulatory framework managed by the Housing Registrar. This is distinct from private rooming houses, which are governed by a separate regulatory framework. Again, the submitter's concerns have been noted and will be investigated during the upcoming preparation of the Housing Strategy.</p> <p><b>Recommended change: No change required.</b></p> |
| <p>4<br/>City of Yarra<br/>Seeking changes</p> | <p>The City of Yarra submission addresses the translation of the existing local Environmentally Sustainable Development at Clause 22.13 into the proposed Clause 15.02-1L (Environmentally Sustainable Development). The City of Yarra submits that</p> <p><i>...the removal of the best practice definition from the ESD policy risks weakening the policy by allowing an excessively broad interpretation of best practice in relation to environmentally sustainable design.</i></p> <p>Consequently, the City of Yarra is "concerned that the weakening of the local ESD policy through the removal of best practice would present sub-standard development outcomes."</p> <p>Therefore, the City of Yarra submits that as a member of the Council Alliance for a Sustainable Built Environment (CASBE) the City of Port Phillip should pursue a revised version of the exhibited Clause 15.02-1L with the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Best Practice definition:</li> </ol> | <p>As a condition of authorisation to prepare and exhibit Amendment C203port, the Minister for Planning required Council to change the drafting of the proposed Environmentally Sustainable Development (ESD) policy at Clause 15.02-1L from the version adopted by Council on 7 July 2021 for exhibition. Council's adopted position is generally consistent with CASBE's.</p> <p>The drafting proposed by the City of Yarra is both consistent with Council's adopted position, CASBE's latest position and Council officer's submission to Amendment C269yara to the Yarra Planning Scheme, which proposes to update their local ESD policy in a similar way to that proposed by Council's adopted version of Amendment C203port.</p> <p>The Panel report relating to Amendment C269yara is yet to be released however the revised strategy and sunset clause set out in Yarra's submission was recently considered in the Planning Panel the report for Amendment C131 to the Hobsons Bay Planning Scheme.</p>   |



| Submitter number and position   | Issues raised   | Response and recommended changes  |
|---|---|---|
|   | <p>Under the heading 'Strategies' (and before the subheading 'Energy performance') replace the existing text with:<br/><i>Achieve Best Practice environmentally sustainable development that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Is relevant to with the type and scale of the development</i></li> <li>• <i>Responds to site opportunities and constraints</i></li> <li>• <i>Utilises a combination of locally available techniques, methodologies and systems that, have been demonstrated to achieve optimum ESD outcomes</i></li> <li>• <i>Encompass the full life of the build.</i></li> </ul> <p>2. Expiry date and policy guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the heading Expiry replace the word 'comparable' with 'equivalent' in accordance with the original policy.</li> <li>• Under the heading Policy guidelines insert as a final guideline:<br/><i>In determining an application, the responsible authority will consider as appropriate:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Whether an ESD plan or framework has previously been approved by the responsible authority.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>The Panel for Hobsons Bay Amendment C131 recommended that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Clause 15.02-1L (Environmentally sustainable development) be reworded to reflect the preferred Council Alliance for a Sustainable Built Environment and Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning wording.</i></p> <p>This included the use of the best practice strategy set out in Yarra's submission and an amended 'sunset clause'.</p> <p>However, despite supporting CASBE's position, Council is bound by the conditions issued by the Minister for Planning when they granted authorisation for Council to prepare and exhibit Amendment C203port.</p> <p><b>Recommended change: No change required.</b></p>  |
| <p>5</p> <p>Resident of St Kilda and Heritage Consultant</p> <p>Support with changes.</p> | <p>The submitter supports the translation of the structure and much of the content from the existing Heritage Policy, noting this is "important as validation and continuity of past practice," however makes a number of suggestions to the proposed Heritage Policy at Clause 15.03-1L and Heritage Design Guidelines including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimising duplication between the Heritage Policy and Heritage Design Guidelines by moving content to the Heritage Design Guidelines.</li> <li>• Removing illustrations and images from the Heritage Design Guidelines as they could be "leading" and only address some situations.</li> <li>• Amending the documents to support an "interpretive" approach to heritage, rather than a "contextual" approach.</li> <li>• Changing the name of the Heritage Design Guidelines to 'Design Guidelines for Heritage Places'.</li> <li>• Removing the distinction between consistent and diverse streetscapes.</li> </ul>   | <p>The submitter's general support is noted.</p> <p>The Heritage Policy and Heritage Design Guidelines proposed by Amendment C203port are the outcome of an extensive review of heritage in the City of Port Phillip, informed by extensive consultation undertaken in 2019. The outcomes of the review reinforced that Council's current approach to heritage is generally sound with the changes to heritage proposed by Amendment C203port taking the form of updates to address known and identified gaps and issues and strengthen existing policies, rather than being a complete revision. Hence, longstanding policies, such as sightline controls are recommended to be retained as exhibited.</p> <p>The Heritage Policy has been updated to implement new Heritage Design Guidelines (City of Port Phillip, 2021), proposed to be a background document to the planning scheme. Background documents do not form part of the planning scheme but provide background and explanation to provisions (in this case, the updated</p> |



| Submitter number and position | Issues raised  | Response and recommended changes   |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
|                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to both commercial and residential signs.</li> <li>• Amending sightline controls.</li> <li>• Checking captions and including different sample photographs in the Heritage Design Guidelines.</li> <li>• Including a longer bibliography of resources.</li> <li>• Greater emphasis and use of pre-application meetings, including prior to the preparation of formal plans.</li> <li>• Drafting suggestions to the Heritage Policy including suggestions to the policy content and format of the policy, including additional numbering and headings. Suggestions to policy content include:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ References to the Burra Charter and State policy.</li> <li>○ Policies around to Council's statutory obligations relating to heritage.</li> <li>○ Policies on operational matters such as engaging heritage consultants.</li> <li>○ Amending the policy to support an "interpretive" approach to heritage, rather than a "contextual" approach.</li> <li>○ Supporting adaptive reuse of heritage buildings.</li> <li>○ Requiring the preparation of a Cultural Heritage Management Plan for major applications.</li> <li>○ Requiring the preparation of a Heritage Impact Statement.</li> <li>○ Amending the proposed policies on specific topics addressed in the proposed Heritage Policy.</li> <li>○ Adding definitions at the end of the policy (or embedded within the guidelines).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>local heritage policy). In this way, there is some duplication between the proposed Heritage Policy and the Heritage Design Guidelines.</p> <p>Images, illustrations and text in the Heritage Design Guidelines are intended to explain to planning permit applicants what heritage outcomes are sought by Council and how they can be achieved, rather than being used to prescribe a particular outcome. Applicants can undertake research to inform design concepts and development proposals without the need to include a bibliography, where resources could be outdated or links to websites may become broken over time. Most applications would be supported by technical advice from a heritage advisor, architect or similar professional.</p> <p>Further, the Heritage Design Guidelines distinguish between consistent and diverse streetscapes to reflect that different parts of the municipality have different characteristics, which in turn require a different design response.</p> <p>The Heritage Design Guidelines support a "contextual design approach that complements heritage places and the settings by assessing the opportunities and constraints that arise from an understanding of historic values and character." This approach is supported by the Burra Charter, referred to by the submitter. Contextual design does not obviate interpretive approaches, rather it seeks to respect the context, strengthen the scale and character of the original, and should not overpower the original.</p> <p>An illustration of acceptable commercial signs in heritage areas is shown on page 5 of the proposed Heritage Policy. Signs in residential areas is addressed by existing policy in Clause 52.05 (Signs), in particular Clause 52.05-13 (Category 3 – High amenity areas) and Clause 52.05-14 (Category 4 – Sensitive areas).</p> <p><i>Planning Practice Note 1 – Applying the Heritage Overlay</i> (Victorian Government, 2018) refers to Heritage Design Guidelines being prepared for specific heritage places. Therefore, to maintain consistency in terminology, this approach has been applied to the general Heritage Design Guidelines, which apply to all heritage places, proposed by Amendment C203port as a Background Document to the planning scheme.</p> |



| Submitter number and position   | Issues raised  | Response and recommended changes  |
|---|--|---|
|   |  | <p>The intent of many of the submitter's suggestions are already captured in the proposed Heritage Policy and Heritage Design Guidelines or the new application requirements to be introduced to the schedule to the Heritage Overlay (Clause 43.01), Other suggestions duplicate existing State policy, duplicate the <i>Planning and Environment Act 1987</i>, refer to operational matters or do not conform with Victorian Government drafting requirements for planning schemes. Some suggestions also undermine best practice, for example supporting tall front fences to provide for secluded private open space undermines the creation of safe streets with passive surveillance.</p> <p>As such, only minor changes relating to sustainability and services, as well as other minor clarifications are recommended to the proposed Heritage Policy and Heritage Guidelines.</p> <p>Council encourages pre-application meetings prior to lodging a planning permit application. However, the level of advice that can be provided depends on the amount of information provided.</p> <p><b>Recommended change: Update Heritage Policy as per Attachment 5 and Heritage Design Guidelines as documented in Attachment 6.</b></p> |
| <p>6<br/>Resident of St Kilda and Heritage Consultant<br/><br/>Support with changes</p> | <p>This submitter is "greatly pleased that Port Phillip is moving to strengthen" its heritage policy and guidelines, given "egregious examples of facadism and unsympathetic additions, especially to commercial buildings." However, the submitter makes the following suggestions to the proposed Heritage Design Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend demolition guidelines wording to reflect that many places graded Significant do not have a Statement of Significance</li> <li>• Require that "two structural bays" be conserved when partially demolishing a commercial or industrial building and clarify that retention of only a facade will not generally be permitted.</li> <li>• Directly setting out when full demolition might be required.</li> <li>• Outlining when relocation might be considered appropriate.</li> <li>• Choosing an example of a building with commercial additions that has greater upper level setbacks compared with the example on page 38.</li> </ul> | <p>The submitter's general support for Amendment C203port is noted.</p> <p>The submitter's suggestion to update demolition guidelines in the Heritage Design Guidelines with respect to many places graded Significant not having a Statement of Significance is supported.</p> <p>Likewise, the Heritage Design Guidelines will be updated to recommend that "two structural bays" be conserved when partially demolishing a commercial or industrial building.</p> <p>However, in other instances the intent of the submitter's other suggestions is already captured in the Heritage Policy and Heritage Design Guidelines without the need for additional detail. For example, the Heritage Design Guidelines address facadism on pages 16 and 17 and the proposed Heritage Policy at Clause 15.03-1L contains a the strategy to "Avoid demolition where it would result in the retention of</p>  |



| Submitter number and position   | Issues raised  | Response and recommended changes  |
|---|--|---|
|   |  | <p>only the façade and/or external walls of a Significant or Contributory building.”</p> <p>Further, the proposed Heritage Policy contains strategies addressing demolition and relocation, setting out when demolition and relocation of a heritage place may be supported. This does not need to be duplicated in the Heritage Design Guidelines.</p> <p>While the front setback of the building shown on page 38 of the Heritage Design Guidelines is less than the recommended setback, the purpose of the image is to demonstrate the appropriate use of lightweight and simple materials for visible additions. Therefore, the image caption will be updated to more clearly reflect this intent. As such, replacing the image with another is not required.</p> <p><b>Recommended change: Update Heritage Policy as per Attachment 5 and Heritage Design Guidelines as documented in Attachment 6.</b></p> |
| <p>7</p> <p>Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change</p> <p>No objection</p> | <p>None</p>  | <p>Council appreciates advice from the Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change that it has no objection to Amendment C203port.</p> <p><b>Recommended change: No change required.</b></p>  |
| <p>8</p> <p>National Trust of Australia (Victoria)</p> <p>Support with changes</p>      | <p>The National Trust congratulates "the City of Port Phillip for undertaking this important strategic work to guide planning decisions in the municipality", which underpins Amendment C203port. While generally supporting the amendment, the National Trust provides feedback and suggested changes to policies relating to the proposed Heritage Policy at Clause 15.03-1L.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthen demolition policies to discourage 'demolition by neglect' and policies to promote the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings.</li> <li>Amend demolition policies to reflect that many places graded Significant do not have a Statement of Significance.</li> <li>Require that "two structural bays" be conserved when partially demolishing a commercial or industrial building.</li> </ul> | <p>The submitter's general support is noted.</p> <p>The submitter's suggestion to update demolition guidelines in the Heritage Design Guidelines with respect to many places graded Significant not having a Statement of Significance is supported.</p> <p>Likewise, the Heritage Design Guidelines will be updated to recommend that "two structural bays" be conserved when partially demolishing a commercial or industrial building.</p> <p>However, other aspects of the National Trust's submission are not supported.</p> <p>The proposed Heritage Policy at Clause 15.03-1L contains a strategy around discouraging the "complete demolition" of buildings and features unless they are not structurally sound and defects cannot be</p>   |





| Submitter number and position   | Issues raised  | Response and recommended changes  |
|---|--|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide further direction around relocation, so it is clearer when relocation might be considered appropriate.</li> <li>An example that better illustrates the relevant policies and includes appropriate setbacks should be found to replace the example of an addition to a commercial building on page 38 of the Heritage Design Guidelines.</li> </ul>  | <p>rectified. This is intended to discourage demolition by neglect as it sets a test for when complete demolition of buildings and features may be appropriate.</p> <p>Similarly, the Heritage Policy contains policy prioritising the adaptation of a heritage place over demolition. This policy is augmented by the Heritage Design Guidelines, containing further guidance on how to successfully achieve the adaptive reuse of a heritage places.</p> <p>The Heritage Policy provides sufficient direction around the relocation of a heritage place. By adding the suggested content, the application of the policy will be unclear, undermining its intent. Again, the policy is augmented by guidance on page 17 of the Heritage Design Guidelines specifically addressing the preparation of relocation plans, generally addressing the matters raised by the submitter.</p> <p>While the front setback of the building shown on page 38 of the Heritage Design Guidelines is less than the recommended setback, the purpose of the image is to demonstrate the appropriate use of lightweight and simple materials for visible additions. Therefore, the image caption will be updated to more clearly reflect this intent. As such, replacing the image with another is not required.</p> <p><b>Recommended change: Update Heritage Policy as per Attachment 5 and Heritage Design Guidelines as documented in Attachment 6.</b></p> |
| <p>9</p> <p>Council Alliance for a Sustainable Built Environment (CASBE)</p> <p>Seeking changes</p> | <p>The <i>Council Alliance for a Sustainable Built Environment (CASBE)</i> is a collaborative alliance of Victorian councils committed to the creation of a sustainable built environment within and beyond their municipalities. CASBE's focus is on applying widely accepted Ecologically Sustainable Development (ESD) principles to the built environment through the Victorian statutory planning system.</p> <p>The City of Port Phillip is one of 38 CASBE member councils and one of the six original councils to seek to formally introduce a local ESD policy in its planning scheme.</p> <p>CASBE is concerned removing the definition of 'Best Practice' from the ESD policy proposed at Clause 15.02-1L will "leave the term Best Practice open to interpretation", undermining the "considerable</p> | <p>As a condition of authorisation to prepare and exhibit Amendment C203port, the Minister for Planning required Council to change the drafting of the proposed Environmentally Sustainable Development (ESD) policy at Clause 15.02-1L from the version adopted by Council on 7 July 2021 for exhibition. Council's adopted position is generally consistent with CASBE's.</p> <p>The drafting proposed by CASBE is consistent with Council's adopted position and Council officer's submission to Amendment C269yara to the Yarra Planning Scheme, which proposes to update their local ESD policy in a similar way to that proposed by Council's adopted version of Amendment C203port.</p> <p>The Panel report relating to Amendment C269yara is yet to be released however the revised strategy and sunset clause set out in</p>   |



| Submitter number and position | Issues raised  | Response and recommended changes   |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
|                               | <p>effort” CASBE member councils spent “articulating the meaning of Best Practice for the planning policy context.”</p> <p>CASBE maintains that the term Best Practice must be very clearly communicated within the body of the policy.</p> <p>Therefore, CASBE submits that given the City of Port Phillip is a CASBE member it should pursue a revised version of the exhibited Clause 15.02-1L with the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Best Practice definition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under the heading ‘Strategies’ (and before the subheading ‘Energy performance’) replace the existing text with: <p><i>Achieve Best Practice environmentally sustainable development that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Is relevant to with the type and scale of the development</i></li> <li>• <i>Responds to site opportunities and constraints</i></li> <li>• <i>Utilises a combination of locally available techniques, methodologies and systems that, have been demonstrated to achieve optimum ESD outcomes</i></li> <li>• <i>Encompass the full life of the build.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Expiry date and policy guidelines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the heading Expiry replace the word ‘comparable’ with ‘equivalent’ in accordance with the original policy.</li> <li>• Under the heading Policy guidelines insert as a final guideline: <p><i>In determining an application, the responsible authority will consider as appropriate:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Whether an ESD plan or framework has previously been approved by the responsible authority.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ol> | <p>Yarra’s submission was recently considered in the Planning Panel the report for Amendment C131 to the Hobsons Bay Planning Scheme.</p> <p>The Panel for Hobsons Bay Amendment C131 recommended that:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Clause 15.02-1L (Environmentally sustainable development) be reworded to reflect the preferred Council Alliance for a Sustainable Built Environment and Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning wording.</i></p> <p>This included the use of the best practice strategy set out in Yarra’s submission and an amended ‘sunset clause’.</p> <p>However, despite supporting CASBE’s position, Council is bound by the conditions issued by the Minister for Planning when they granted authorisation for Council to prepare and exhibit Amendment C203port.</p> <p><b>Recommended change: No change required.</b></p> |