

## 8. Design and Development Overlays (DDOs)

104. 6 of the 51 submitters requested changes to either Schedule 56 to the Design and Development Overlay (DDO56) or Schedule 57 to the Design and Development Overlay (DDO57) or both.

**Table 1; Requested changes to Schedule 56 to the Design and Development Overlay (DDO56)**

<b>Schedule 56 to the Design and Development Overlay (DDO56)</b>	
<b>Submitter 17</b>	<b>Council officer response</b>
A minimum 5 metre setback from the north edge of the northern footpath on Spring Street.	Do not agree to a 5 metre setback to Spring Street. The proposed 3 metre setback provides for street landscaping, widening of footpaths and addresses the sensitive residential area to the south while providing for good development opportunities.
Extend the restriction on locating services (currently applied to Gordon Street and La Trobe Terrace) to also apply to Spring Street, to protect residential amenity.	Not supported. The provision to “ <i>Avoid locating services on Gordon Avenue and Latrobe Terrace....</i> ” is due to their role as primary pedestrian and activation frontages.

	<p>While DDO56 does not specifically restrict services on Spring Street, the following provision applies to the submitters request:</p> <p>“Services, loading and waste areas should be accessed away from main streets and public spaces and located within basements or upper levels.”</p>
<b>Submitter 20</b>	<b>Council officer response</b>
<p>Building heights:</p> <p>Requests 12+ storeys on larger sites along Gordon Avenue, supported by shadow studies and prior planning approvals.</p>	<p>The request to increase heights to 12+ storeys is not supported. The exhibited controls are discretionary and deliberately establish a mid rise built form along Gordon Avenue to balance redevelopment opportunities with protection of amenity, solar access, and character.</p>
<p>Site Coverage:</p> <p>Opposes the 60% site coverage cap on C1Z land, noting it is more restrictive than the adjacent GRZ (70%). Seeks higher site coverage to support active ground floors, efficient podium layouts, and stronger public realm outcomes.</p>	<p>Not supported. The 60% site coverage is proposed to apply to Gordon West in the Gordon Avenue precinct owing to large allotment sizes and potential to deliver significant open space and public realm. The preferred site coverage is discretionary and was informed by the UDF’s built form testing and engagement feedback.</p>
<p>Interface treatments:</p> <p>a) Remove the mandatory 3 metre front setback on Gordon Avenue and Spring Street, arguing it is unnecessary and limits development outcomes.</p> <p>b) Reconsider street wall height controls on the south side of Gordon Avenue, suggesting human-scale design can be achieved without strict height limits.</p> <p>c) Reduce tower separation requirements (currently 20 metre for buildings over 8 storeys), which are considered excessive and above normal planning practice.</p>	<p>Council officers have considered interface treatments and offer the following response:</p> <p>a) Do not support the request to remove the mandatory 3 metre front setback. The 3 metre ground level setback is based on a site analysis and is intended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid a cluttered and inconsistent streetscape.</li> <li>• Reduce safety risks from concealed spaces.</li> <li>• Protect landscaped areas that support the UDF vision.</li> <li>• Improve amenity for ground floor dwellings.</li> </ul> <p>Removing this control risks undermining the corridor’s identity. Upper-level setbacks and street wall/podium heights remain discretionary to allow design flexibility.</p> <p>b) Street Wall Height – The preferred maximum street wall or podium height for Gordon Avenue is 15 metres and responds to existing scale and massing of built form. This is a discretionary provision and provides flexibility where applications can show it meets design objectives.</p> <p>c) Tower separation – Agreed. Recommend amending Figure 6 and Figure 7 of DDO56 to require a preferred 6 metres side separation for all buildings built to boundary</p>

	above 4 storeys, to manage building massing and amenity while providing flexibility for alternative design solutions.
<p>Floor Area Ratios (FAR):</p> <p>Opposes cumulative restrictions of FAR combined with height, setback, and coverage controls. Recommends a more flexible, performance based approach</p>	<p>FARs are discretionary and aligned with preferred heights and site coverage to set clear development expectations. They are designed to provide flexibility, encourage varied building typologies, and deliver site specific outcomes while ensuring consistency with the UDF vision. Performance based flexibility exists where exceptional design quality and public benefit can be demonstrated.</p>
<b>Submitter 28</b>	<b>Council officer response</b>
<p>Make wind and solar controls mandatory in DDO56 (consistent with PPN59 and other DDOs in Geelong and Melbourne). Ensure the phrase “a permit cannot be granted...” is applied for shadow and wind requirements.</p> <p>Alternatively, a decision guideline should be provided within both schedules relating to solar and wind protection of the public realm.</p>	<p>The amendment seeks to balance development potential with amenity. The adopted approach reflects the community feedback for clear controls while ensuring sufficient flexibility for site responsive design and innovative outcomes.</p> <p>Agree to update Decision Guidelines in DDO56 to include:</p> <p>“Whether the development achieves comfortable wind conditions”.</p>
<p>Wind impacts:</p> <p>a) Replace the word “safe” with “comfortable” to align with PPN93 and other DDOs.</p> <p>b) Apply consistent trigger points for wind assessments (set at 5 storeys, not 16m).</p>	<p>a) Agree to change “safe” with “comfortable” in DDO56. The change aligns with Clause 58.04-4 which specifies “comfortable” wind conditions for public land and publicly accessible areas on private land and other DDOs in the Geelong planning scheme.</p> <p>b) Not supported. 16 metres is consistent with the ACZ – Central Geelong and ensure wind assessments are consistent across land uses.</p>
<p>Solar access:</p> <p>a) Amend the Design Objective in DDO56 to duplicate what’s in DDO57 by including the following objective:</p> <p><i>“To protect the amenity of key public spaces including footpaths, future plazas and new public open spaces from overshadowing impacts.”</i></p> <p>b) Adopt winter solstice (not spring equinox) as the test date for overshadowing of public open spaces in DDO56.</p>	<p>a) Not supported. The following proposed objective to be more appropriate as it balances landscaping, solar access and wind:</p> <p><i>“To ensure high quality architectural design that integrates landscaping, maintains solar access and ensures comfortable wind conditions within the public realm.”</i></p> <p>b) Not supported. The testing of solar access to public open spaces at spring equinox reflects existing controls in Geelong’s planning scheme. Solar access controls measured at winter solstice would overly constrain development potential and was not supported through UDF testing.</p>
<b>Submitter 51</b>	<b>Council officer response</b>

<p>Requests additional control/objective to address the development interface with Latrobe Terrace and Church Street.</p>	<p>Agree to include the following change to DDO56:</p> <p>Access, parking and services</p> <p><i>“New development that abuts Latrobe Terrace to avoid direct access to Latrobe Terrace (where possible) and make use of the local road network for access”.</i></p>
---	---

**Table 2; Requested changes to Schedule 57 to the Design and Development Overlay (DDO57)**

<p><b>Schedule 57 to the Design and Development Overlay (DDO57)</b></p>	
<p><b>Submitter 28</b></p>	<p><b>Council officer response</b></p>
<p>Make wind and solar controls mandatory in DDO57 (consistent with PPN59 and other DDOs in Geelong and Melbourne). Ensure the phrase “a permit cannot be granted...” is applied for shadow and wind requirements.</p> <p>Alternatively, a decision guideline should be provided within both schedules relating to solar and wind protection of the public realm.</p>	<p>Mandatory wind and solar controls are not supported. The amendment seeks to balance development potential with amenity. The adopted approach reflects the community feedback for clear controls while ensuring sufficient flexibility for site-responsive design and innovative outcomes.</p> <p>Council officer supports strengthening Decision Guidelines in DDO57 to include:</p> <p>“Whether the development achieves comfortable wind conditions”.</p> <p>And to amend the following Decision Guideline in DDO57:</p> <p>“Whether the development retains solar access to the locations specified in table 3 to this schedule”.</p>
<p>Wind impacts:</p> <p>a) Replace the word “safe” with “comfortable” to align with PPN93 and other DDOs.</p> <p>b) Apply consistent trigger points for wind assessments (set at 5 storeys, not 16m).</p> <p>c) Remove wording in DDO57 that limits wind reporting to commercial buildings; apply requirements consistently across both schedules.</p>	<p>a) Agree to change “safe” with “comfortable” in DDO57. The change aligns with Clause 58.04-4 which specifies “comfortable” wind conditions for public land and publicly accessible areas on private land and other DDOs in the planning scheme.</p> <p>b) Not supported. 16 metres is consistent the ACZ – Central Geelong and ensures wind assessments are consistent across land uses.</p> <p>c) Agree to remove the word “commercial” in the wind report requirements in DDO57 as they are not limited to commercial buildings.</p>
<p>Solar access:</p> <p>a) Clarify vague terms such as “all other streets” in DDO57 and provide specific time periods for solar access.</p> <p>b) Extend solar access controls to 3pm (instead of 2pm) for better protection of eastern Pakington Street footpaths.</p>	<p>a) Not supported. The reference to “All other streets” in Table 3 is considered clear as it follows the specific solar access requirements for Pakington and Waratah Streets and therefore applies to all remaining streets within the precinct. Introducing additional time-based requirements for the side streets would significantly constrain the development potential of the corner sites, particularly on narrower lots. Overshadowing impacts on</p>

<p>c) Update decision guidelines in DDO57 to reference both “all other streets” and public open space.</p>	<p>the southern footpaths can be appropriately assessed and managed through the planning permit process to ensure unreasonable outcomes are avoided.</p> <p>b) Not supported. Extending solar access controls to 3pm and testing at winter solstice (rather than equinox) were considered but not adopted as this would substantially constrain development potential and was not supported through UDF testing. The equinox standard reflects established practice in Geelong DDOs.</p> <p>c) Do not support updating the decision guidelines for solar access in DDO57 for the same reason stated in point a) above.</p>
<p>Open Space: Specify approximate sizes for proposed new open spaces in DDO57, rather than leaving it to permit stage.</p>	<p>Not supported. The Pakington North UDF identifies a lack of open space within the precinct and provides the objective to “establish new open space within strategic sites of Pakington Strand and Railing Sidings Yard. However, the UDF did not specify the exact requirements for any future open space. Council is in the process of developing an Open Space Strategy which may look to provide greater detail regarding size, category of park and associated uses which would inform an application at the planning permit stage.</p>
<p><b>Submitter 35</b></p>	<p><b>Council officer response</b></p>
<p>Remove mandatory street wall/interface controls and any other mandatory requirements.</p>	<p>The request to remove mandatory controls is not supported.</p> <p>Ground level setbacks are the only mandatory control in DDO57.</p> <p>These setbacks ensure a soft transition between larger scale mixed-use buildings and adjoining fine-grain residential or heritage streetscapes.</p> <p>They allow for landscaping and urban greening, consistent with objectives to deliver urban cooling, biodiversity benefits, and improved amenity.</p> <p>They also help manage pedestrian amenity, safety, and sightlines at narrow residential streets, which was a core concern raised during engagement.</p> <p>All other controls are discretionary.</p>
<p>Delete the two indicative open space/plaza locations shown on Map 1 of DDO57, as they pre-empt site specific design, compromise redevelopment potential, and were applied only due to the large site size. Suggest Council</p>	<p>Do not agree to remove the two open space/plaza locations shown on Map 1 of DDO57.</p> <p>The property in question is located on the corner of Waratah Street and Pakington Street</p>

<p>instead explore land acquisition for open space elsewhere.</p>	<p>in the Pakington North precinct. The site was established as a key strategic site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• as it acts as a gateway and anchor within the precinct.</li> <li>• to reinforcing pedestrian movement along key east–west connections.</li> <li>• to create opportunities for landmark buildings.</li> </ul> <p>Strategic sites are expected to contribute public plazas, open space, or streetscape improvements as part of redevelopment. Their selection was informed by the need to balance housing growth with community infrastructure and amenity outcomes. The plaza/open space locations are indicative and intended to be delivered generally in accordance with Map 1, allowing some design flexibility at the permit stage.</p>
<p>Remove winter solstice overshadowing requirements linked to the proposed open space locations and delete the reference to the north side of Waratah Street footpath in the solar access diagrams (Appendix 6.4). These requirements are seen as unfeasible and not supported.</p>	<p>Not supported. The overshadowing requirements for open space in DDO57 ensures new development protects solar access to key public spaces, consistent with the Pakington North UDF objectives and the overshadowing/solar access studies undertaken for the precinct.</p> <p>Council officer notes the built form testing and overshadowing requirements performed for Pakington North precinct and DDO57 was measured at spring equinox. The UDF specifies both winter solstice and spring equinox at different points in the document and DDO57 referenced winter solstice incorrectly.</p> <p>Recommend amending DDO57 to be consistent with built form testing and change the overshadowing requirements to open space from winter solstice to spring equinox (10am-2pm) in line with the Pakington North Community Panel Summary Report p.48 (May 2024).</p>
<p>Remove the 60% site coverage control, as it is inappropriate for a key urban renewal site in an activity centre and more akin to suburban residential standards.</p>	<p>The request to remove the 60% site coverage requirement is not supported. The control ensures sufficient space for landscaping, open space, and amenity outcomes within large strategic sites. The preferred site coverage balances redevelopment opportunities with broader public realm benefits expected in a specialised activity centre. The control is discretionary and provides flexibility where design objectives can be met.</p>

<p>Update references in DDO57 regarding pedestrian permeability objectives to align with the correct planning scheme clause.</p>	<p>DDO57 is referring to the correct clause of the planning scheme, 11.03-6L-06, which is part of the same amendment.</p>
<p><b>Submitter 39</b></p>	<p><b>Council officer response</b></p>
<p>Remove mandatory ground level setbacks in the Type 2B interface (Waterloo Street frontage). Instead, apply discretionary controls to allow site specific design responses and avoid poor design outcomes caused by rigid requirements.</p>	<p>See response to submitter 35 in DDO57.</p>
<p>Reconsider rear setback controls where C1Z land abuts residential zones (NRZ/GRZ). Allow greater wall heights at rear interfaces to achieve more practical floorplates and appropriate transitions, consistent with Pakington Street's linear subdivision pattern.</p>	<p>The exhibited controls provide for rear setbacks and height transitions to manage amenity impacts such as overshadowing, privacy, and noise at sensitive residential interfaces. These standards were informed by built form testing and community panel feedback and are necessary to ensure compatible transitions to lower-scale neighbourhoods. These controls are discretionary and provide for design flexibility.</p>
<p>Convert mandatory design requirements in DDO57 to preferred requirements, enabling more flexibility and better design outcomes in future redevelopment.</p>	<p>The request to remove mandatory controls is not supported.</p> <p>Mandatory provisions are limited to ground level setbacks, as these are fundamental to achieving the design vision and public realm outcomes for Pakington North. Retaining them as mandatory ensures certainty in delivering safe, landscaped, and high-amenity interfaces. Converting them to preferred provisions would undermine these objectives.</p> <p>See response to submitter 35 in DDO57.</p>
<p><b>Submitter 51</b></p>	<p><b>Council officer response</b></p>
<p>Include an additional, control requirement/objective to address the development interface with Latrobe Terrace and Church Street as per the attachment to this submission.</p>	<p>Agree to include the following changes to DDO57:</p> <p>Access, parking and services</p> <p><i>“New development that abuts Church Street to avoid direct access to Church Street (where possible) and make use of the local road network for access”.</i></p> <p>Amend the following strategy to include (Where possible, provide access via local streets):</p> <p><i>“Minimise or consolidate vehicular access points and carefully design ramps into basements to support increased amenity and safety for pedestrians and bicycles.”</i></p>