

ATTACHMENT 2: AMENDMENT C171PORT (ST KILDA MARINA) – PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS AND OFFICER RECOMMENDED POSITION FOR ADOPTION

Table 1: Panel Recommendations

Panel Rec #	Panel recommended changes	Officer recommended changes
1	<p>Panel recommended change:</p> <p>The Panel recommends that Council:</p> <p>a) Adopt the Panel recommended version of Development Plan Overlay Schedule 2 (DPO2) as included in Appendix D.</p>	<p>Accept the Panel’s recommendation, subject to changes outlined below (see Recommendations 2 and 5).</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The version of the DPO2 marked-up by the panel in Appendix D of the Panel Report includes minor changes supported by Council officers during the Planning Panel, and as recommended by Council’s experts in heritage, urban design, planning and traffic, as well as the Panel’s recommendations (as outlined below). The version of DPO2 attached to this Report (Attachment 3) includes the following track-changes made after exhibition (using the Exhibition version of DPO2 as the base): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Panel recommendations (shown in yellow). Council officer supported changes during the Panel Hearing and supported by Panel (shown in blue). Council-endorsed position at panel endorsed on 29 January 2020 (shown in green).
2	<p>Panel recommended change:</p> <p>In DPO2, add the following requirement under ‘Content of Development Plan’:</p> <p>a) “A Community engagement report which outlines the consultation which has occurred to inform the preparation of the Development Plan, including but not limited to the following stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office of the Victorian Government Architect 	<p>Do not accept the Panel’s recommendation.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The preparation of a development plan is anticipated to be a developer led exercise. Council will not be the Applicant (either in preparing the development plan or subsequent planning applications). Council’s role, as the Responsible Authority, is to assess the development plan once it is submitted, and determine whether to approve it.

Panel Rec #	Panel recommended changes	Officer recommended changes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport for Victoria • Neighbouring owners and occupiers”. <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel considers the removal of third party rights for planning permit applications is appropriate, however it recommends further informal community consultation be a requirement to inform the Development Plan. • The Panel accepts a suitable level of informal and formal consultation has occurred to get to this point of the Amendment stage. Council relayed an extensive amount of community consultation which informed the Site Brief, including formation of a community member panel to prepare the document. The Site Brief was then translated into the DPO in a manner described as “faithful” by Council’s planning expert. Formal exhibition of the Amendment reached some 9,000 community members, called for public submissions to the exhibited Amendment and provided opportunities to present concerns through this Panel process. • The Panel considers the DPO should be amended to provide for some limited community consultation to inform preparation of the Development Plan. The panel considers that as Council is the owner, applicant and responsible authority, that these many hats have the potential to overlap and conflict with one another, whether subversively or not. The Panel considers this additional consultation step will add a beneficial layer of governance and community certainty. As this will form part the early site planning, the Panel does not foresee this will unnecessarily burden needed development flexibility. • While the panel acknowledged that Council has noted its formal public commitment of a non-statutory community consultation step prior to approval of the development plan, the Panel is mindful however that that commitment may not be realised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel’s recommendations mean that the applicant will be required to prepare a Community Engagement Report as part of the package of Development Plan documents to be submitted to Council. This will require further consultation with the community as part of the preparation of the Development Plan. In the course of the panel hearing, the panel was concerned that Council was not able to include a requirement to exhibit the proposed development plan as is found in some other DPO schedules. The inability to do this is due to a stricter approach by DEWLP to the drafting of planning provisions including schedules to overlays. Council explained to the panel that Council would likely undertake informal consultation but the panel was not convinced that Council would definitely do this. Thus it included the requirement for the community engagement report as an alternative. • Council officers support further consultation with the community on the draft development plan however the approach recommended by Panel is not a common approach and is not supported. • It is common practice for a council to informally consult with the community or other key stakeholders prior to the approval of a development plan. It is not standard practice for developers to directly consult with the community because of the need to ensure transparency and to ensure community views directly inform Council’s decision making process. • The approach recommended by Panel has been used in DPOs in Moonee Valley (C177) and Darebin (C180) which were introduced through 20(4) Ministerial Amendments, prepared by the Minister for Planning at the request of the Minister for Housing, Disability and Aging. These examples apply to large public housing sites where the Minister for Planning is the Responsible Authority. As 20(4) amendments, these amendments were not required to go through a formal exhibition and hearing process, and as such, are not considered to be comparable or useful examples in relation to AmC171port, which has been through an extensive consultation process. • Importantly, and consistent with Planning Practice Note 23, Amendment C171port underwent appropriate strategic planning and community consultation from the start. Officers note that consistent with the

Panel Rec #	Panel recommended changes	Officer recommended changes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel considers a similar requirement to the provision included in DPOs in Moonee Valley and Darebin could be appropriate. These provide for consultation and opportunity for the community to make non statutory submissions for Council consideration. The Panel views this approach as an acceptable way forward to allowing for some community input into the Development Plan. 	<p>Ministerial Direction on the Form and Content of Planning Schemes, under the DPO, there are no statutory processes for exhibiting the plan or making submissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council has already committed to a process to informally consult with the community when an application for the development plan is received to allow the community to comment on the development plan prior to Council's consideration. Officers recommend that this is a more appropriate form of consultation than the approach recommended by the Panel. Officers have recommended that a specific resolution is made at this Council Meeting to formalise the commitment that Council will undertake non-statutory consultation on the Development Plan, once a development plan has been lodged for Council's consideration and approval. In relation to the other stakeholders referenced by the Panel in their recommendation, officers note: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport for Victoria will be consulted regardless of whether required through a "community consultation report", as the Access and Movement Plan which forms part of the Development Plan must be to their satisfaction (see Recommendation 8 below). Council has established a Design Review Panel comprised of design experts which has been involved with the Marina procurement process and which functions as an alternate design review to the service offered by the OVGA, who is typically involved in state initiated projects, such as was the case with the Darebin/Moonee Valley amendments.
3	<p>Panel recommended change:</p> <p>The Panel recommends Table 1 in DPO2 is amended as follows:</p>	<p>See below.</p>
	<p>a) Under Built Form Envelopes 1 and 2 in the Development outcomes column:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Allows for sightlines between Marine Parade, key public spaces, and landmarks and Marina Activity Area". 	<p>Accept the Panel's recommendation.</p> <p>Reasons:</p>

Panel Rec #	Panel recommended changes	Officer recommended changes
	<p>(Note: Panel’s recommended additional words are shown in <i>italics</i>).</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The addition of the text “and landmarks” was recommended by Council’s urban design expert in his evidence. • This was to recognise the views to and across the Marina to local and regional landmarks and their importance in linking place and broader context with mid-ground Esplanade Hotel and Palais views and background city view against a foreground harbour and active boating zone. • The Panel considers it appropriate to include the encompassing term “landmarks” for the built form outcomes sought for Areas 1 and 2. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is generally consistent with the view lines identified in the Site Brief and included in the proposed DPO2.
	<p>b) Under Civic Heart Public Space:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Specific requirements column “...or an alternative location providing an equivalent level of amenity, <i>views and aspect</i>” • In the Development outcomes column “Is accessible to the public with areas of solar access and shade <i>with a minimum 50% of space accessing sunlight between the hours of 10am and 3pm at the winter solstice June 22</i>”. • In the Development outcomes column “<i>Ensures wind speed standards for sitting and standing are achieved</i>”. <p>(Note: Panel’s recommended additional words are shown in <i>italics</i>).</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The addition of requirements relating to the Civic Heart were recommended by Council’s urban design expert in his evidence, to ensure high-amenity outcomes are achieved. • Council officers agreed with the urban design expert’s recommendation regarding wind protection in the Civic Heart during the Planning Panel. 	<p>Accept the Panel’s recommendation.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is consistent with the intent of the Site Brief that the Civic Heart will be a key new publicly accessible open space within the Marina. Accordingly, the Civic Heart should be afforded a high level of amenity, which these recommendations will help to achieve.

Panel Rec #	Panel recommended changes	Officer recommended changes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel recommended focusing on the Civic Heart, given it will be the foremost place for rest and leisure. The wording within the DPO suggests there is potential for the civic heart to have alternative locations as guided by the Concept Plan. While flexibility in location is accepted as necessary to respond to specialist technical input, the Panel considers the expectations for reasonable enjoyment of the Civic Heart should be set. It considers mandated minimum shadow impacts on the civic heart, measured on the winter solstice and wind comfort standards are required. 	
	<p>c) Under Peninsula promenade path:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Specified requirements column, add “Provide for sitting areas at key locations along the path for comfort and amenity”. In the Development outcomes column add “Provides landscape improvements to the entire setback zone between Building Areas 2 and 3 and the water’s edge”. <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The additional text was recommended by Council’s urban design expert in his evidence, to ensure high-amenity outcomes are achieved for the Peninsula Promenade. The panel considered that presentation and anticipated future public access along Peninsula Promenade are important given the clear desire lines along the Bay Trail’s southern approach into this currently restricted access area. The panel recommended that this area should be landscaped and include areas in which to sit. 	<p>Accept the Panel’s recommendation.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is consistent with the general intent of the Site Brief that the Peninsula Promenade will be a key new public path and landscaped space within the Marina. These recommendations will help to enhance the quality of this space.

Panel Rec #	Panel recommended changes	Officer recommended changes
	<p>d) Under Marina Promenade in the Specific requirements column:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Incorporate areas of <i>seasonally-appropriate</i> shade along the Marina Promenade”. <p>(Note: Panel’s recommended additional words are shown in <i>italics</i>).</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel considers the provision which seeks shade along Marina Promenade should be qualified to be <i>seasonally appropriate</i>. 	<p>Accept the Panel’s recommendation.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is consistent with the general intent of the Site Brief.
	<p>e) Under Waste management in the Development outcomes columns, add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Minimise the visual, <i>amenity</i> and operational impact of waste management facilities and storage”. <p>(Note: Panel’s recommended additional words are shown in <i>italics</i>).</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The additional text was recommended by Council’s urban design expert in his evidence, to ensure waste management is designed and treated appropriately within the site. Whilst the current content of the Development Plan includes a requirement for provision of a Waste Management Plan, it does not establish how and where decisions regarding indicative waste storage and collection points and how these choices should be guided. Logically these core storage and collection points should not be located on primary walks or promenades and should be integrated within built form wherever possible rather than in freestanding enclosures. • Council officers agreed with the urban design expert’s recommendation during the Planning Panel, as the appropriate management of waste would enhance the amenity of the site, consistent with the Site Brief. Council officers included a new row in Table 1 of the DPO2 to address waste management as part of a revised DPO2 tabled at the Panel (see Attachment 3). • The Panel recommends adding the word ‘amenity’ to the development outcomes for waste in Table 1 of Schedule 2 to manage the amenity impacts of waste management. 	<p>Accept the Panel’s recommendation.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is consistent with the general intent of the Site Brief, which seeks to achieve high quality built form outcomes for the Marina site.

Panel Rec #	Panel recommended changes	Officer recommended changes
4	<p>Panel recommended change:</p> <p>Delete the following at Table I in DPO2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Under “Dry Boat Storage Buildings” in the Development outcomes column: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o “Maintains a clear hierarchy of built form, which ensures the dry boat storage (whether the existing, or a new building) remains the most prominent and visible feature within the Marina complex”. <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This change was recommended by Council’s heritage expert in his expert evidence. • Council officers agreed with the heritage expert’s recommendation during the Planning Panel, as the building height for form envelope 3 is higher than the building height for built form envelopes 1 and 2. • The Panel considers that the building envelopes, expressed heights and view line management will give built form in Area 3 appropriate prominence and for this reason, the Panel does not consider this provision pertaining to built form hierarchy is necessary. 	<p>Accept the Panel’s recommendation.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council officers agree that the built form envelopes, maximum building heights and view lines to be protected will ensure the dry boat storage is the most prominent building on the site and this additional requirement is not essential.
5	<p>Panel recommended change:</p> <p>The Panel recommends adding the following to the Figure 1 Concept Plan in DPO2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Point Ormond to Palais theatre view line as a “<i>views to markers and/or outlook to landmarks</i>” b) The Thackeray Street to the Marina view line as a “<i>views to marina activity</i>” c) The Dickens Street to the Bay interface view line as a “<i>key pedestrian connection</i>”. <p>Reasons:</p>	<p>Accept the Panel’s recommendation.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Site Brief identifies the importance of maintaining key views through the site. • The Point Ormond to Palais theatre view line is an elevated view line across the top of the site which will need to be managed when considering the height of any buildings within Built Form Envelope 2. • The Thackeray Street view line is likely to result in a slightly greater setback for Built Form Envelope 2 from Moran Reserve. Importantly, it is noted that this is not considered to be of great consequence as this location has already been identified as the “preferred vehicle route for

Panel Rec #	Panel recommended changes	Officer recommended changes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel considers that Council’s urban design evidence provided a comprehensive analysis of identified views and recommended three key additions from the exhibited Concept Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the Point Ormond to Palais Theatre view line ○ Dickens Street to Bay interface view line to continue straight along its street axis to the Bay interface, and consequently reconfigure Area 2 ○ Thackeray Street to Marina view line (and concurrently manage overshadowing on Moran Reserve and accommodate potential vehicular access). • Submitters also sought to include the Thackeray Street to Marina view line and ensure openness qualities typical of marinas. • The Panel considers the Point Ormond to Palais Theatre view line is an important regional outlook and should be specifically identified in the Concept Plan. Potential heights of 15 metres plus 3 metres of architectural features in Area 3 will be seen in this view and management of form is necessary. • The Panel considers the Dickens Street to Bay interface line should be realigned along the street axis and Built Form Envelope 2 consequentially reconfigured. As well as establishing local context, sightlines along this residential street and key pedestrian connection into the site will progressively and engagingly open to the Bay interface and open horizon beyond the site when travelling along its axis. • The Panel considers Thackeray Street to Marina view line should be added to the Concept Plan. This view establishes the site’s context along this residential street, as occurs for the parallel residential streets further north. The Panel considers this view line will beneficially manage the site’s Moran Reserve interface and potential vehicular access. 	<p>public boat ramp and trailer parking” in the Site Brief and DPO2 Concept Plan, which essentially already protects this view line.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Dickens Street view line will slightly reduce the size of Built Form Envelope 2. This is considered acceptable as a large amount of flexibility is maintained for building placement within the site given the limits on commercial floorspace relative to the large built form envelopes. • Council offers propose the following clarification to the Panel’s recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Dickens Street to the Bay interface view line is to be added as a new “views to the Bay” rather than as a “key pedestrian connection”, consistent with the Panel’s discussion. Accordingly, the existing key pedestrian connection and the view to the Bay from within the Preferred ‘Civic Heart’ envelope will remain unchanged.
6 & 7	Panel recommended change:	Accept the Panel’s recommendation. Reasons:

Panel Rec #	Panel recommended changes	Officer recommended changes
	<p>6. The panel recommends deleting the amended and extended Heritage Overlay 187, the Permit Exemptions Incorporated Document and the inclusion of the Heritage Statement to the list of Reference Documents at Clause 22.04.</p> <p>7. The panel recommends including the following requirement under “Content of Development Plan” in DPO2 for the Heritage Impact Assessment:</p> <p>a) “Identifies how the fabric of the original dry boat storage facility will be retained, repurposed, integrated or interpreted”.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel considered that the site holds local level heritage significance and demonstrates a unique visual aesthetic, particularly the Beacon, dry boat storage buildings and the harbour and its infrastructure. • Although Council’s heritage expert supported the proposed heritage controls for the site, the panel considered that heritage would be more appropriately managed via the DPO2 using the heritage assessments referenced within and required by its provisions. This approach was seen to be less confusing to the panel than Council’s approach of applying a heritage overlay with an Incorporated Document that allowed for demolition of heritage buildings within the heritage overlay. • Ultimately the Panel considers that economic objectives should be more highly weighted to support site redevelopment feasibility for a regional facility rather than protecting part of a locally significant heritage complex. • The Panel considers that a new dry boat storage facility is preferred to allow continued regional level marina functions and it will likely need to remain in the same location, namely Built Form Envelope 3. The Panel sees that more boat users attracted by upgraded facilities have flow on economic benefits of enabling investment in public infrastructure, further aided by Council’s unique facilitatory position. For these reasons, the Panel considers that greater 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council officers consider that this approach is acceptable as it still manages the heritage significant of the site, albeit via the DPO2, rather than through the more standard approach of the Heritage Overlay. • This approach means that no planning permit will be triggered for demolition of buildings on the site which are not within a Heritage Overlay. • Council officers consider that the inclusion of the requirement in recommendation 7 will appropriately recognise the heritage significance of the dry boat storage facility. • As a consequential change of not applying the Heritage Overlay to the broader Marina Site (remaining only on the Beacon), the Port Phillip Heritage Review will no longer be updated with the revised Citation 2057. Therefore, officers recommend the following text is removed from the DPO2, under the requirements for a Heritage Impact Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Responds to the guidelines set out in Citation 2057 (St Kilda Marina) in the Port Phillip Heritage Review (June 2019).

Panel Rec #	Panel recommended changes	Officer recommended changes
	<p>emphasis should be placed on providing a new facility, rather than retaining the existing facility, and options to integrate or interpret the existing facility can be explored during later design stages. Workable options could be to represent identified features such as the zig-zag roofline, the visible storage shelves or even extend to retain some small boat storage supply if needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the panel did not support the extension of the Heritage Overlay, the Permit Exemptions Incorporated Document and the inclusion of the Heritage Statement to the list of Reference Documents at Clause 22.04 is no longer necessary. The Heritage Overlay HO187 will continue apply to the Beacon. 	
8	<p>Panel recommended change: The panel recommends amending Clause 4.0 – Requirements for development plan under Content of Development Plan in DPO2 to read:</p> <p>a) An Integrated transport and access plan prepared by a qualified person, <i>to the satisfaction of Department of Transport and the responsible authority, which includes ...</i></p> <p>(Note: Panel’s recommended additional words are shown in <i>italics</i>).</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council’s traffic expert gave evidence that Marine Parade is a Road Zone Category 1 and a primary arterial road under the Planning Scheme, and any change in vehicle access to Marine Parade would require the approval of the Department of Transport (DoT). He suggested including DoT as an approval authority with the Integrated Transport and Access Plan. The Panel agrees with Council’s traffic expert that traffic impacts can and will be appropriately addressed under the Integrated Transport and Access Plan requirements. This is key strategic work that informs the Development Plan including where and how access to the site (including signalisation) should be provided, upgraded or changed. 	<p>Accept the Panel’s recommendation.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council officers consider this requirement to refer the Integrated Transport and Access Plan to Department of Transport is appropriate, especially if changes are proposed to access to the site from Marine Parade, which is a declared arterial road.

Panel Rec #	Panel recommended changes	Officer recommended changes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel recommends that DoT should be included as an approving authority for any Integrated Transport and Access Plan. 	
9	<p>Panel recommended change: The panel recommends adding the following Specific Requirements to Table I under 'Bike parking' in DPO2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Provide adequate bicycle facilities for employees, marina users and visitors. Provide bike share facilities for marina visitors in key arrival points both for visiting vessels and visitors to the precinct. Provide short stay bicycle facilities adjacent to key hospitality destinations within the precinct. Provide secure bike storage areas for marina users and staff of all uses within the development at benchmarks that demonstrate leadership in green travel solutions. Provide bicycle repair station facilities for the use of visitors, employees and marina users. <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council's urban design expert suggested additional requirements be included in the DPO2 to cater to bicycles and encourage green travel to reduce vehicle generation at the site (as outlined in the recommendation above). The Panel accepts these suggestions and considers they should be included as specific requirements under bike parking in Table I of the DPO. 	<p>Accept the Panel's recommendation.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Site Brief includes mandatory outcomes to provide bike parking exceeding the requirements set out in the Planning Scheme and provide bicycle facilities to exceed 5 Star Green Star equivalent for staff, marina users and visitors. It also includes a discretionary outcome to improve cycling amenity such as end of trip and cycle repair facilities. The panel's recommendation is generally consistent with these outcomes. Council offers propose the following clarification to the Panel's recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rather than requiring provision of bike share facilities, officers consider that it is more appropriate to require provision for space for future bike share facilities. Council's traffic expert advised that the Melbourne Bike Share scheme was axed in late 2019 noting it did include a parking location opposite the Palais Theatre in St Kilda. In recent times JUMP has commenced a trial operation but is restricted to Melbourne CBD and surrounds and is a private organisation. While bike share may develop and extend its services in the future in the same way car share has, it is not appropriate to have bike share facilities as a specific Development Outcome.

Table 2: Council Officer supported changes to DPO2 during the Planning Panel Hearing

DPO2 section	Council officer supported changes (supported by the Panel)	Reasons for changes
Clause 4: Requirements for Development Plan	Add a principle to Parking and Access to minimise vehicle entry points to the site to avoid conflict points with the Bay Trail, where possible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This change was deemed necessary during the panel hearing, to provide clarity on the preference for a single vehicle entry point to the site, to minimise conflict with the Bay Trail.
Clause 4: Table 1: Specific Requirements	Further requirements added to the development outcomes for the 'Built Form Envelope 1 and 2', element, relating to landscaping, overshadowing, views to the Marina and integration with Moran Reserve.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These additions were recommended by Council's urban design expert and were supported by Council officers during the panel hearing as they were generally consistent with the intent of the Site Brief and will enhance the development outcome. These changes do not unduly constrain future development.
	Inclusion of additional development outcomes included for the element 'Publicly Accessible Open Space' that ensure high levels of pedestrian amenity relating to solar access, passive surveillance, minimising vehicle impacts and ensuring comfortable wind conditions within publicly accessible open spaces.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These additions were recommended by Council's urban design expert and were supported by Council officers during the panel hearing as they were generally consistent with the intent of the Site Brief and will enhance the amenity of the publicly accessible open spaces within the site. These changes do not unduly constrain future development.
	Inclusion of a new 'Element' for Waste Management was added to Table 1, to minimise the visual amenity and operational impacts of waste management facilities and storage on the site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These additions were recommended by Council's urban design expert and were supported by Council officers during the panel hearing as appropriately locating, designing and managing waste on the site is considered important to protect high quality amenity within the site. The DPO2 includes a requirement for a Sustainability Management Plan – these inclusions provide specific guidelines for waste management. These changes do not unduly constrain future development.
Clause 4: Content of Development Plan	Under the Urban Concept Report, requirements have been included for additional detail to be provided regarding project vision and key design principles, attributes of pedestrian and cycling areas, view analysis, design quality and language, guidelines for interface responses and sections for built form, movement networks and landscapes, and the location of heritage buildings and infrastructure and significant vegetation to be retained.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These additions were recommended by Council's urban design expert and were supported by Council officers during the panel hearing as they ensure that a broader range of design principles and concepts are considered in the preparation of the Development Plan (essentially the 'master plan' for the site) to demonstrate a highly-resolved design concept for the site. In practice, these changes require that additional information will need to be submitted with the Development Plan. A well-

DPO2 section	Council officer supported changes (supported by the Panel)	Reasons for changes
		<p>resolved Development Plan will help to guide future permit applications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These changes do not unduly constrain future development.
	<p>Under the Landscape and Public Realm Plan, requirements have been included for additional detail to be provided regarding the percentage of the site designated as publicly accessible open space, landscape sections for promenades, streets and pedestrian connections, management of landscape areas including relationship to the sustainable management plan and concepts for street furniture, landscaping, materials and finishes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These additions were recommended by Council’s urban design expert and were supported by Council officers during the panel hearing as they ensure that the public realm will be highly-resolved and high quality. • In practice, these changes require that additional information will need to be submitted with the Development Plan. A well-resolved Development Plan will help to guide future permit applications. • These changes do not unduly constrain future development.
	<p>Under the Integrated Transport and Access Plan, requirements have been included for additional detail to be provided regarding bike storage and end of trip facilities and bike parking provision.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These additions were recommended by Council’s urban design expert and were supported by Council officers during the panel hearing as they ensure appropriate bicycle facilities are considered early on in the design process. • These changes do not unduly constrain future development.
<p>Figure I: Concept Plan</p>	<p>Amend Figure I Concept Plan to show both options for vehicle entry to the site (the retention of the Dickens Street signals and the 'preferred' location from the Site Brief).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This change was deemed necessary to provide clarity on what is intended for the existing Dickens Street signals. • During the panel hearing, Council officers accepted that retaining the option of the existing access point at Dickens Street should not be precluded, if the cost to relocate the entry (and signals) is not feasible, or there is lack of support from DoT. If so, the alternative may be that the Dickens Street signalised entrance would remain, and any future site developer would need to demonstrate how it would manage conflicts and ensure safety for pedestrians and cyclists. • This change does not unduly constrain future development.