

**Table of expert witness recommendations & Council response - C433ggee**

No.	Document subject of recommendation	Recommendation	Reference in expert witness statement	Council response
<b>John Glossop (JG) recommendations - Planning</b>				
1.	DDO56 and DDO57	<p>Various drafting changes to DDO56 and DDO57 to improve clarity and respond to Planning Practice Notes.</p> <p>The drafting changes are set out in Appendix D to JG expert witness report</p>	JG - Paragraphs 60, 116(b)	Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 DDO56 and DD057.
2.	DDO57 Figure 4 'Type 6D residential interface' Map 1	Information (height limits, indicative open space and setback controls) regarding the Railway Sidings on Map 1 in DDO57 should be deleted or the site should be clearly identified as being excluded from the control. If the site is deleted, Rear Interface Section 6D could also be deleted.	JG - Paragraphs 64-65, 65, 116(c)	Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 DD057.
3.	DDO56 Map 1	Map 1 of DDO56 should be amended to remove references to storeys.	JG - Paragraphs 77, 116(d)	Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 DDO56.
4.	DDO56 Table 3: Street interface (Mandatory ground level setback)	In Table 3: Street interface, amend the column heading 'Mandatory ground level setback' to 'Mandatory minimum ground level setback' to make clear the setbacks are a mandatory 'minimum'.	JG - Paragraph 81 (1 <sup>st</sup> bullet point)	Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 DDO56. .
5.	DDO56 Table 3: Street interface (Mandatory ground level setback)	Consider whether DDO56 should specify a 0m setback to Pakington Street consistent with DDO7	JG - Paragraphs 81 (3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet point), 116(e)	Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 DDO56.
6.	DDO57 Table 2: Street interface Type 1D 2-28 and 17-19 Church St 2-6 and 1-7 Pakington St	In DDO57, reconsider instances where the preferred maximum street wall height exceeds the preferred maximum building height.	JG - Paragraph 81 (4 <sup>th</sup> bullet point) Paragraph 116(f)	<p>Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 DDO57.</p> <p>For Street interface Type 1D, the 'Preferred max street wall/podium height' is 36m yet the preferred max building heights vary from 22m to 36m. This is proposed to be addressed by amending Table 2 so as not to specify a 'Preferred maximum street wall/podium height' or 'Preferred minimum setback above street wall/podium' for these properties (i.e. they would both say 'None specified').</p>
7.	DDO57 Table 2: Street interface Type 1D	Reconsider requiring a 3m mandatory front setback at Type 1D interfaces given commercial setting and existing conditions (for example. the building at 2-28 Church St not currently setback)	JG - Paragraph 81 (5 <sup>th</sup> bullet point)	<p>Recommendation partly accepted. See Version 1 DDO57.</p> <p>Retain 3m mandatory setback for Church Street (as key E-W street) important as seeking public realm to a commercial setting. Exception being 2-8 Church Street which has effectively has frontage to Stubbs Avenue - front setback discretionary.</p>

Table of expert witness recommendations & Council response - C433ggee

No.	Document subject of recommendation	Recommendation	Reference in expert witness statement	Council response
8.	DDO57 Table 2: Street interface Type 2B	Reconsider requiring a 2m mandatory side street setback at Type 2B interfaces (for C1Z land facing Pakington Street and to side streets) given small size of lots.	JG - Paragraphs 81 (5 <sup>th</sup> bullet point), 116(g)	Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 DDO57.  Proposed to change from mandatory to discretionary
9.	DDO57 Table 2: Street interface Type 2A	Reconsider requiring a 2m mandatory side street setback at Type 2A interface given: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- recently constructed building on Pakington Strand site with zero setback to Waratah St;</li> <li>- existing building at 2 Waratah St (immediately west of Pakington Strand site) with zero setback to Waratah St.</li> </ul>	JG - Paragraphs 86 -87	Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 DDO57.  Proposed to change from mandatory to discretionary  Note: Building constructed pursuant to Planning Permit 1628/2004.
10.	DDO57 CI 2.0 Buildings and works Open space interface Figure 8	Consider deleting Figure 8 given the exact location of new open space is unknown and instead retain a written requirement that spaces be publicly accessible, open to the sky and receive good solar access along with some guidance around the total size of open space anticipated.	JG - Paragraph 89	This is partly addressed by proposed requirement under 'Active Frontages':  <i>Ensure laneways and pedestrian links are publicly accessible, safe (comply with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design guidelines), receive adequate access to sunlight and are open to the sky.</i>  Recommendation partly accepted. See Version 1 DDO57.  Even if the location new open space is only indicative, a generic diagram can provide useful guidance on built form interface expectations. Propose to edit diagram to refine building envelope to be more generic, label as <u>max 50%</u> and edit spring equinox line to correct angle.
11.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works Site coverage, Map 2  DDO57 CI 2.0 Buildings and works Site coverage, Map 3	Reconsider reasonableness of preferred maximum site coverage requirements of 60% in Map 2 of DDO56 and Map 3 of DDO57 particularly having regard to small lot sizes and lack of built form testing	JG - Paragraph 93	Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 DDO56 and DD057.  Change preferred maximum site coverage for C1Z land on Map 2 in DD056 from 60% to 70%.  Change preferred maximum site coverage for MUZ land on Map 3 in DDO57 from 60% to 70%, consistent with the default site coverage requirement for MUZ land in clauses 54, 55 and 57.
12.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works Floor area ratios & Table 2: Floor area ratios  DDO57	Reconsider utility of the discretionary FARs noting they create additional complexity to DDO and are not used to allow an uplift where a community benefit or innovative design is provided	JG - Paragraph 95	Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 DDO56.  Remove FARs in DDO56.  No FARs in DDO57.
13.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works Solar access, wind and weather & Table 3: Street interface	Resolve the tension in DDO56 between the discretionary requirement that there should be no additional overshadowing of the southern footpaths of Autumn / Gordon / Spring Streets and the interface street setback requirement (of 6m) for buildings facing Latrobe Terrace.	JG - Paragraphs 99, 117	Refer to built form modelling for 202-210 Latrobe Terrace (cnr Gordon Ave / Latrobe Terrace) at Appendix A to COGG Part B Submission. The testing demonstrates that the preferred maximum building height of 10 storeys or 36 metres can be achieved here compliant with the overshadowing requirement for Gordon Street, with a ground level

Table of expert witness recommendations & Council response - C433ggee

No.	Document subject of recommendation	Recommendation	Reference in expert witness statement	Council response
		Consider if a greater setback is required to provide solar access and if this is reasonable?		setback of 6 metres from Latrobe Terrace but a 15 metre setback of the two upper-most levels from Gordon St.  Change proposed – Council proposes to change the Latrobe Terrace ground level setback to a discretionary 6 metre minimum – reflective of Central Geelong controls for the railway station precinct in the ACZ1 on opposite side of Latrobe Terrace.  See Version 1 DD056
14.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works Solar access, wind and weather  DDO57 CI 2.0 Buildings and works Solar access, wind and weather, Table 3: Solar access	Resolve inconsistency between relevant time for assessment of overshadowing in DDO56 and DDO57:  DDO56 – requires overshadowing to be calculated between 11am and 2pm on 22 September  DDO57 – requires overshadowing to be calculated between 10am to 2pm on 22 September	JG - Paragraphs 100, 118	No change proposed.  Note DDOs street orientation is different.  Pakington North (DDO57) already receives 10-2 solar access. Aim to maintain upon redevelopment.
15.	DDO56 Map 1 & Figures 3, 4 and 5	Consider appropriateness of showing indicative laneways and pedestrian links on Map 1 in absence of a PAO  Consider appropriateness of requirements for interfaces to new laneway (pedestrian) (see Figure 3), laneway (service) (Figure 4) and laneway (new streets) (see Figure 5) given some of the smaller lot sizes	JG - Paragraphs 101-102	Changes proposed to description of laneways and labelling.  See Version 1 DD056.
16.	DDO57	Consider inclusion of a rear interface map like Map 2 in DDO56	JG - Paragraph 105 (1 <sup>st</sup> bullet point)	No change proposed.  Not considered necessary to include map as only one rear residential interface (refer G8 in Fig 22 in UDF for location – rear of Autum Street north side) shown in DDO56 Fig. 1 direct residential interface treatment).
17.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Building separation'  DDO57 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Building separation'	To avoid confusion, amend the below requirement as marked-up:  <i>Balconies <del>must</del>should not encroach into side setbacks.</i>	JG - Paragraph 105 (2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet point)	Recommendation accepted. Made in track changes.  See Version 1 DD056 and DDO57
18.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works  DDO57 CI 2.0 Buildings and works	Introduce wording to make clear that where requirements are expressed with a must they are mandatory	JG - Paragraph 105 (2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet point)	Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 DD056 and DDO57
19.	DDO56, all Figures  DDO57, all Figures	For clarity, ensure section drawings are unadorned envelopes. For example, removing canopy trees from the drawing	JG - Paragraph 105 (3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet point)	No change proposed.

Table of expert witness recommendations & Council response - C433ggee

No.	Document subject of recommendation	Recommendation	Reference in expert witness statement	Council response
				Trees illustrated are indicative and a preferred outcome in line with the vision. Inclusion of trees is consistent with DDO50 (South Geelong).
20.	DDO56 Map 1	The naming of pedestrian / service / new streets should be consistent between Map 1 and Figures 3-5.	JG - Paragraphs 101, 119	Refer to response to recommendation 15
21.	Clause 11.03-6L-06, 'Pakington North Precinct', and 'Gordon Avenue' 'Objectives'	Amend objectives for both precincts to delete reference to providing transitions given both DDO56 and DDO67 prescribe interface requirements to address this.	JG - Paragraph 108 (1 <sup>st</sup> bullet point)	Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 CI 11.03
22.	Clause 11.03-6L-06, 'Pakington North Precinct', 'Strategies'	Amend second strategy as marked-up below: <i>Encourage retention of existing heritage design elements in buildings and street infrastructure, whilst encouraging sympathetic feel in creating Pakington North's own distinct character.</i>	JG - Paragraphs 108 (2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet point), 120(a)	Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 CI 11.03
23.	Clause 11.03-6L-06, 'Pakington Strand', 'Strategies'	Add the words 'where appropriate' to end of second strategy about ensuring opportunities to deliver car parking for public use within the basement, rear or podium of new developments.	JG - Paragraphs 108 (5 <sup>th</sup> bullet point), 120(b)	Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 CI 11.03
24.	Clause 11.03-6L-06, 'Gordon Avenue Precinct', 'Strategies'	Clarify the third strategy below: <i>Provide landscaped setbacks to Gordon Avenue, which can support a canopy tree in the residential center of the precinct.</i>	JG - Paragraphs 108 (4 <sup>th</sup> bullet point), 121(a)	Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 CI 11.03  The intent of the strategy is to provide landscaped setbacks along Gordon Avenue to improve the amenity of what is currently a low-amenity traffic route both in the public realm and internally within the lower levels of new buildings. Key to this is providing consistent front setbacks that support canopy tree planting and potentially, footpath widening. See Gordon Avenue UDF, page 82.
25.	Clause 11.03-6L-06, 'Pakington Strand' Map 12: Indicative concept plan for Pakington Strand DDO57 Map 1	Review the interface treatments for the new internal roads within Pakington Strand for consistency between Clause 11.03 Map 12 and DDO57 Map 1.	JG - Paragraphs 108 (final bullet point), 122	Recommendation partly agreed. See Version 1 CI 11.03  DDO57 'Building Design' requirement relating to Pakington Strand is proposed to be edited to remove reference to the Indicative Concept Plan in Clause 11.03-6L-06.
26.	Clause 16.01-2S (Social and affordable housing)	Delete cross reference to map at Clause 11.03-6L-06 and instead insert the map into Clause 16.01-2S	JG - Paragraph 110	Recommendation partly agreed, See Version 1 CI 16.01-2S  Text proposed to be updated to refer to the Key Development Area maps at Clause 16.01-1L-02 Increased housing diversity areas. Maintaining a cross-reference instead of including the maps is consistent with existing policy in Clause 16.01-2L Social and affordable housing. However, Council welcomes advice from the Panel for consideration as part of Council's current Planning Scheme Review.

Table of expert witness recommendations & Council response - C433ggee

No.	Document subject of recommendation	Recommendation	Reference in expert witness statement	Council response
27.	<p>Clause 16.01-2L 'Social and affordable housing' re: Pakington North and Gordon Avenue precincts</p> <p>Clause 16.01-2L.01 'Social and affordable housing' (current scheme) re: South Geelong Key Development Area</p> <p>Clause 16.01-2L.02 'Social and affordable housing' (current scheme) re: Highton Shopping Centre Increased Housing Diversity Area</p>	The three social and affordable housing policies for different key development/increased housing diversity areas at Clause 16.01-2L should be consolidated.	JG - Paragraphs 110, 123	Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 CI 16.01-2S
28.	<p>Clause 02.03-1 (Settlement)</p> <p>Retail Strategy</p>	If Pakington North is intended to become a part of the Pakington Street Specialised Activity Centre, Clause 02.03-1 (Settlement) should be updated to reflect this. It currently states that the boundaries of all retail centres are delineated in the Retail Strategy and the Retail Strategy does not show the land to be included.	JG - Paragraphs 113, 124	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This can be reviewed as part of the current Planning Scheme Review.</p>
29.	Zoning and Environmental Audit Overlay maps	The Amendment should ensure that the requirements of Minister's Direction No. 1 is met	JG - Paragraph 116(a)	
<b>Amanda Roberts (AR) recommendations – Urban design</b>				
30.	<p>Clause 11.03-6L-06</p> <p>Pakington Street Geelong West</p> <p>Pakington North</p>	<p>Refine wording of Pakington North strategies to clarify intent. E.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilitate new open spaces within large sites including Pakington Strand and the Rail Sidings Yard.</li> <li>New development should strengthen Pakington North's distinct character through the retention of existing heritage elements and design responses that positively contribute to the precinct.</li> </ul>	AR - Paragraph 38	<p>Recommendation partly accepted – see Version 1 CI 11.03</p> <p>Open space at Pakington Strand clarified to be a single open space area.</p> <p>Rail Siding Yard references proposed to be removed.</p> <p>Other revisions made to heritage and character strategy.</p>
31.	<p>Clause 11.03-6L-06</p> <p>Pakington Street Geelong West</p> <p>Pakington Strand</p>	Podium level car parking is coupled with the requirement for any podium car parking to be wrapped with active uses on its primary interface with the public realm/street and for other visible podium car parking to be designed to positively contribute to the quality and character of the building.	AR - Paragraph 54	Recommendation partly accepted – see Version 1 CI 11.03
32.	<p>DDO56</p> <p>CI 2.0 Buildings and works</p> <p>'Building and floor heights'</p>	Resolve inconsistencies between Map 1 of the DDO and Figure 20 of the UDF regarding the preferred height at the corner of McNicol Street and Spring Street.	AR - Paragraphs 83, 177	No change required

Table of expert witness recommendations & Council response - C433ggee

No.	Document subject of recommendation	Recommendation	Reference in expert witness statement	Council response
	Map 1 Gordon Avenue UDF Figure 20: Building Heights Map			The UDF does not nominate a preferred height for this site however is closest to the 4-storey preferred height area which is shown in the DDO map.
33.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Building and floor heights' Map 1	Model the preferred 10-storey maximum height along Latrobe Terrace to confirm acceptable overshadowing outcomes, particularly for the southern footpaths of Autumn Street and Gordon Avenue.  <b>*Note overlap with recommendation number 13</b>	AR - Paragraphs 83, 177	Refer to response to recommendation 13.
34.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Building and floor heights' Map 1  Gordon Avenue UDF Figure 20: Building Heights Map	Resolve inconsistencies between Map 1 of the DDO and Figure 20 of the UDF regarding the preferred height at the corner of McNicol Street and Spring Street.	AR - Paragraphs 83, 177	No change required.  Whilst this site is in the Gordon Avenue UDF area, the UDF did not nominate a preferred maximum building height for the site. However, Council considered the most appropriate height to be 15 metres or 4 storeys, given its location on the south side of Spring Street adjacent to an established residential area. Accordingly, this was adopted in the DDO56 Map 1..
35.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Floor area ratios', 'Table 2: Floor area ratios'  Gordon Avenue UDF	Remove the use of FARs and rely on the preferred heights and site coverage  OR  a) Undertake targeted built form modelling to test whether sites can achieve reasonable development outcomes, considering front, side, and rear setbacks, testing at least two representative lots within each site coverage area.  b) Present FARs consistently as ratios (e.g., 2.4:1 rather than 2.4).  c) Provide clearer guidance in the UDF on the location and function of landscape areas, particularly where significant residual open space remains after setbacks are applied.  d) Conduct built form testing to show how nominated FARs translate into building height, site coverage, and open space outcomes.  e) Clearly justify the selection of specific FARs.  f) Clarify whether proposed laneways contribute to site coverage calculations.  g) Provide guidance on the preferred location and role of residual open space.  <b>*Note overlap with recommendation number 12</b>	AR - Paragraphs 88, 178	Accept recommendation to remove FARs. See Version 1 DDO6

Table of expert witness recommendations & Council response - C433ggee

No.	Document subject of recommendation	Recommendation	Reference in expert witness statement	Council response
36.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Interfaces', Table 3 Map 1  Gordon Avenue UDF Figure 22. Interface Map, Figure 23. Proposed Public Realm Upgrades	Ensure alignment between UDF and DDO in labelling, metrics, and diagrams.  For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re: Diagram G6 for Ripley St in UDF, text below diagram specifies a 5m landscape setback, while the diagram itself specifies a 2m landscape setback and Table 3 in the DDO specifies a 2m mandatory ground level setback</li> <li>Proposed laneways (G9-G11) are not consistently identified across the UDF and DDO, creating ambiguity as to whether they are existing or preferred elements</li> </ul>	AR - Paragraphs 90-92, 98, 179	Change partly accepted. See Version 1 DDO56  Laneways shown on Map 1 on DDO56 are indicative.  Minor edits to wording of laneway policy to clarify labels.
37.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Interfaces', Figure 2. Future Park Interfaces  Gordon Avenue UDF	Reconsider the Future Park Interface to allow for a landscape transition zone between public parkland and private development (approx. 2m recommended).	AR - Paragraphs 93, 98, 179	Recommendation accepted. See Version 1 DDO56  Edit diagram to require ground floor setback to park.
38.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Interfaces', Table 3 and Figures 1-5  Gordon Avenue UDF, Diagrams G5, G6 and G7	Correct and clarify UDF diagrams and DDO controls so setbacks are measured consistently to building edges, not balconies.  [Diagrams G5 to G7 show setbacks measured to balcony edge rather than building edge]  <b>*Note overlap with recommendation number 17</b>	AR - Paragraphs 94, 98, 179	Recommendation partly accepted. See Version 1 DDO56  Minor edits to DDO to clarify balconies should not encroach into side setbacks.
39.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Interfaces', 'Figure 1. Direct residential'  Gordon Avenue UDF	Undertake built form testing to justify a 5m ground-level setback plus a 5m upper-level setback above two storeys, noting this significantly exceeds typical ResCode requirements.	AR - Paragraphs 98, 179	No changes proposed  Council observes that Figure 1 in the DDO56 faithfully translates the Figure 22 interface G8 in the Gordon Avenue UDF. Council acknowledges the preferred minimum setbacks will be excess of ResCode requirements.
40.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Building Separation' Figures 6, 7 and 8	Clarify how building separation requirement applies when podium or street wall heights exceed four storeys, such as Latrobe Terrace.	AR - Paragraphs 102, 105, 180	Changes proposed – see Version 1 DDO56  The upper-level setback requirements are discretionary.  Table 3 has been edited to show preferred setbacks above street wall/podium are 'minimum' setbacks.  Figure 7 is proposed to be removed as unnecessary (consistent with Council officer response to submitter 20 per Council report 25 Nov 2025).
41.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Building Separation' Figures 6, 7 and 8	Reconsider upper-level side setback requirements and separation distances, particularly where they exceed comparable controls in other planning schemes.	AR - Paragraphs 103-105, 180	No change proposed.  Note upper-level setbacks are discretionary.

Table of expert witness recommendations & Council response - C433ggee

No.	Document subject of recommendation	Recommendation	Reference in expert witness statement	Council response
		[Provides example of 6m side setback above four storeys resulting in 12m building separation.]		Note built form controls are seeking more generous spacing than Central Geelong noting different area context.  Difficult to test building separation due to number of variables (on a site-by-site basis).  Figure 7 is proposed to be removed as unnecessary (consistent with Council officer response to submitter 20 per Council report 25 Nov 2025).
42.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Building Separation' Figures 6, 7 and 8	Model preferred side setbacks to confirm developable building envelopes remain.	AR - Paragraphs 104, 105, 180	No change proposed  Testing of side setbacks undertaken.  There are limited developable building envelopes remaining at higher levels of small lots if lots are not consolidated, which is consistent with the intent to encourage lot consolidation.  Side setbacks at upper levels are considered reasonable for area context. Figure 7 is proposed to be removed as unnecessary (consistent with Council officer response to submitter 20 per Council report 25 Nov 2025).
43.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Active frontages'? 'Building design'?  Gordon Avenue UDF	Include dedicated guidance in the UDF and DDO for landscaping and open space outcomes to support active frontages. This should reflect community engagement findings and Council climate and environmental strategies.  Suggested guidance: a) Provide integrated soft landscaping within sites to mitigate urban heat island effects, enhance biodiversity, and support engaging streetscapes; b) Require at least 60% of front setback areas to comprise planted/soft landscaping; c) Maximise deep soil planting areas within front and rear setbacks to support establishing canopy trees; d) Encourage green roofs, green walls and landscaped balconies to enhance biodiversity and visual amenity; e) Encourage planting palettes to comprise a minimum of 40% indigenous and 40% native species; f) Encourage provision of communal garden spaces at podium and rooftop levels.	AR - Paragraphs 113, 181	Recommendation partly accepted.  Edits made to Building Design (DDO56 and DDO57) to include encourage further landscaping and greening opportunities.
44.	DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Solar access, wind and weather'	Clarify where canopies or weather protection are required and the applicability of active frontage requirements.	AR - Paragraphs 116, 118, 182	Change proposed – see Version 1 DDO56  Requirement for 'continuous' weather protection along building proposed to be removed as per JG recommendation.

Table of expert witness recommendations & Council response - C433ggee

No.	Document subject of recommendation	Recommendation	Reference in expert witness statement	Council response
		<p>It should be limited to streets where there is a 0m lot setback and exclude laneways, effectively only applying to Pakington Street and Madden Avenue (in DDO56)</p> <p><b>*Note overlap with recommendation number 47</b></p>		No other change proposed. Weather protection important contribution to amenity, even if not a zero lot setback.
45.	<p>DDO56 CI 5.0 Application requirements</p>	<p>Amend the application requirement for shadow diagrams to reflect the overshadowing requirements under Building and Works.</p> <p>Application requirements currently ask for overshadowing diagrams between 10am and 3pm but overshadowing requirement in ci 2.0 'Building and works' under 'Solar access, wind and weather' relates to between 11am and 2pm.</p> <p><b>*Note overlap with recommendation number 14</b></p>	AR - Paragraphs 118, 129, 182	<p>Recommendation accepted – see Version 1 DDO56</p> <p>Propose consistent more generic text for DDO56 and DDO57, noting different solar access requirements (commencing 11am and 10am respectively).</p>
46.	<p>DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Solar access, wind and weather'</p> <p>DDO57 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Solar access, wind and weather'</p> <p>Table 3: Solar access</p>	<p>Undertake built form testing to identify whether preferred maximum building heights can be achieved in majority of cases whilst complying with solar access controls.</p> <p>If yes, make the solar access controls mandatory rather than discretionary (e.g., "Development must not overshadow the footpath on the opposite side of the street between 11am and 2pm on 22 September").</p>	AR - Paragraphs 118, 182	<p>The built form modelling for DDO57 documented in Comprehensive Built Form Testing (February 2026) (page 25, Scenario C) and the Pakington North UDF (Appendix, pages 83-86) indicates the preferred maximum building height controls can be achieved in conjunction with solar access controls. For example, the Scenario C section of Pakington Street (between Clonard Ave and Collins Street) illustrates that a building height of 15 metres can be achieved whilst complying with the solar access requirements (see page 26).</p> <p>The equivalent built form modelling for DDO56 was completed not documented in a report. However, Council is comfortable with maximum building heights can be achieved in the majority of cases whilst complying with the solar access controls.</p> <p>Council seeks the Panel's advice on whether the proposed solar access controls should be mandatory as recommended by Ms Roberts.</p>
47.	<p>DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Solar access, wind and weather'</p> <p>DDO57 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Solar access, wind and weather'</p> <p>Table 3: Solar access</p>	<p>Consider offsetting overshadowing controls from property boundaries to allow for potential public realm improvements.</p> <p>For example, 'Development must not overshadow the public realm for a distance of # metres from the property boundary.'</p>	AR - Paragraphs 118, 182	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>Solar access controls proposed relate to footpaths and future public open space and are discretionary.</p> <p>Seek Panel commentary on whether solar access controls should be mandatory and include offset from property boundaries.</p>
48.	<p>DDO56 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Site coverage' Map 2</p> <p>DDO57 CI 2.0 Buildings and works</p>	<p>Provide further detail on the preferred location and treatment of undeveloped land, particularly along Latrobe Terrace, to clarify intended site coverage outcomes.</p>	AR - Paragraphs 125, 126, 183	<p>Change proposed –see Version 1 DDO56</p> <p>Latrobe Terrace setback is proposed to be discretionary not mandatory.</p> <p>Specific reference to 10m width of indicative access laneways removed.</p>

Table of expert witness recommendations & Council response - C433ggee

No.	Document subject of recommendation	Recommendation	Reference in expert witness statement	Council response
	'Site coverage' Map 3			Site coverage generally aligns with envisaged building envelope footprints.
49.	DDO57 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Rear interface' Figure 4: Type 6D residential interface Map 2	Review excessive rear setbacks (e.g., Type 6D) that exceed typical ResCode standards.	AR - Paragraphs 140, 141, 184	No change proposed  DDO57 Figures 1-8 implement UDF section 3.4 (Development and Interface Management).  Note occurrences of preferred setbacks in excess of ResCode setbacks.  Note setbacks are discretionary and reflect intended character.
50.	DDO57 CI 2.0 Buildings and works Figure 8: Open space interface	Revise wording of notation to clarify intent as marked-up below:  <i>'maximum 50% of open space to be overshadowed between 11am and 2pm at the winter solstice.'</i>	AR - Paragraphs 146, 147, 185	Changes proposed - see Version 1 DDO57  Changes made to diagram and text to clarify scope and intent.
51.	DDO57 CI 2.0 Buildings and works Building separation  Figure 9: Preferred side separation for buildings built to boundary  Figure 10: Preferred side separation for buildings not built to boundary	Model preferred side setbacks to ensure feasible development envelopes remain including.  <b>*Note overlap with recommendation number 42</b>	AR - Paragraphs 150, 151, 186	Refer to response to recommendation number 42
52.	DDO57 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Active frontages'	In relation to the first requirement, clarify the reference to "depth" (whether referring to setbacks, articulation, or built form).	AR -Paragraphs 158, 159, 187	Recommendation accepted – see Version 1 DDO57  Text proposed to be edited to clarify – depth of façade articulation.
53.	DDO57 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Solar access, wind and weather'	Clarify where weather protection (such as awnings) is required, including by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarifying if it is intended to apply specifically to pedestrian priority streets and active frontages</li> <li>Limiting the requirement to streets with 0m lot setbacks and explicitly nominate where awnings are expected.</li> </ul> <b>*Note overlap with recommendation 44</b>	AR - Paragraphs 161, 162, 188	Refer to response to DDO56 recommendation 44
54.	DDO57 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Access, parking and services'	In relation to the 8 <sup>th</sup> requirement, amend as follows:  <i>Provide easy access to bicycle parking facilities with end-of-trip change rooms, showers and lockers where practical.</i>	AR - Paragraphs 164, 165, 189	Change proposed - see Version 1 DDO57  Text removed as per recommendation from JG noting (presume noting covered by other policy, e.g. CI.52.34).
55.	DDO57 CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Site coverage' Map 3	Provide further detail on site coverage outcomes for the Woolworths Site (Pakington Strand) and the Rail Sidings Site including by:	AR - Paragraphs 167, 168, 190	Change proposed - see Version 1 DDO57  Maps within DDO57 proposed to be updated to reflect exclusion of the Rail Sidings site from application of the DDO57.

Table of expert witness recommendations & Council response - C433ggee

No.	Document subject of recommendation	Recommendation	Reference in expert witness statement	Council response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly articulating the preferred location and function of non-built areas within the two sites.</li> <li>Clarifying whether the 20% undeveloped land within the Woolworths Strategic Site is intended to front Waratah Street or be flexibly located, and provide equivalent clarification for the Rail Sidings Strategic Site.</li> </ul> <p><b>*Note overlap with recommendation number 11 regarding Rail Sidings Yard and Map 1 in DDO57</b></p>		Refer to response to recommendation 11.
<b>Sophie Jordan (SJ) recommendations - Planning</b>				
56.	DDO57 Maps 1 to 3	Remove the Rail Sidings Yard within DDO57 mapping.  <b>*Note overlap with recommendation number 2</b>	SJ - Paragraph 85	Recommendation accepted – see Version 1 DDO57
57.	DDO57 Map 1	Remove specific references to future open space locations on Pakington Strand site from Map 1.	SJ - Paragraph 130	Recommendation partly accepted – see Version 1 DDO57  Council propose to remove the indicative open space location from the south-east corner of the site on the basis that it is not the preferred location for open space/a plaza. On reflection, the preferred location for any open space on the Pakington Strand site is on the south side of the heritage building.
58.	DDO57 Map 1	Undertake further analysis to justify the intended role, function, size, delivery mechanism, and ownership/management of proposed open space, including clarification as to why two areas of proposed open space are identified on the same land and what other opportunities exist elsewhere in the centre.	SJ - Paragraph 131	Refer to response to recommendation 57.  Indicative open space on south side of the heritage building to remain in Indicative Concept Plan, to inform future masterplanning and redevelopment of Pakington Strand site. The indicative open space/plaza in the south-east corner is proposed to be removed from the Indicative Concept Plan noting it is not the preferred location for open space.
59.	DDO57 CI 2.0 Buildings and works	Undertake more built form and solar access testing which: (a) defines building envelopes consistent with DDO57 preferred requirements; and (b) tests an open space area in the south-eastern corner of the Pakington Strand site and the impact that solar access requirements will have on the height and interface of built form to its north.  <b>*Note overlap with recommendation number 45</b>	SJ - Paragraphs 132, 148-149, 150	Refer to built form testing modelling documented in the Comprehensive Built Form Testing (Feb 2026) (page 25, Scenario C) and the Pakington North UDF (Appendix, pages 83-86).  Majority of built form controls are discretionary.  Refer above - open space in south-east corner location proposed to be removed (not preferred compared to advantages of open space location in front of heritage building).
60.	Pakington North UDF Section 6.4 Solar Access Study	Detail the built form parameters used for the Solar Access Study, including inputs and confirmation of analysis.	SJ - Paragraph 154	The parameters used for the solar access study for DDO57 are detailed in section 6.4 of the Pakington North UDF and at pages 21 to 23 and 24 to 26 of the Comprehensive Built Form Testing (February 2026). The analysis is detailed on pages 24 and 26.
61.	DDO57 Map 3	Review the preferred site coverage (60%) for Pakington Stand and (Railway Sidings Yard) to ensure it facilitates an	SJ - Paragraph 167	Refer to response to recommendation 11.

Table of expert witness recommendations & Council response - C433ggee

No.	Document subject of recommendation	Recommendation	Reference in expert witness statement	Council response
		appropriate level of development commensurate with its strategic role and does not penalise the site due to an open space requirement.  <b>*Note overlap with recommendation number 11</b>		
62.	Pakington North UDF Clause 11.03-6L-06 Pakington Street Geelong West Pakington North	Delete the pedestrian link to Donaghy Street and clarify the intended status of new roads and pedestrian links (public vs private), including widths and expected acquisition process.  <b>*Note overlap with recommendation number 15</b>	SJ - Paragraph 171	No change proposed.  The Indicative Concept Plan at CI 11.03-6L-06 is "indicative in nature. New streets and pedestrian links are labelled as indicative. Council considers retention of the Plan appropriate to inform a future potential masterplanned redevelopment of the Pakington Strand site.
63.	DDO57, Map 1	Revise street interface type mapping for street corners so the main frontage treatment continues along the side street.  <b>*Note overlap with recommendation number 9</b>	SJ - Paragraph 176	No change is proposed noting this is a preferred/discretionary requirement – main street interface can follow building around corner but intend to allow flexibility of building design to not prescribe wrapping length along the side street.
64.	DDO57, CI 2.0 Buildings and works 'Street interface'	Add guidance describing corner building street interface responses, including how far the main frontage treatment should extend before transitioning.  Suggested wording could be:  <i>The street wall on corner buildings should continue main frontage street wall height for a minimum of x metres along the side street, with a transition in height to match the rear interface where required</i>  <b>*Note overlap with recommendation number 63 regarding street interface</b>	SJ - Paragraph 177–178	Refer to response to recommendation 63.
65.	DDO57	Delete all references to the preparation of a master plan and the Indicative Concept Plan for Pakington Strand CI 11.03-6L-06 and DDO57. OR Introduce another overlay control such as a Development Plan Overlay onto the Pakington Strand site.	SJ - Paragraph 194	No change proposed to CI 11.03-6L-06 – concept plan is indicative and a master-planned approach to redevelopment of a large site is reasonable.  Change proposed to DD057 – remove reference to the Indicative Concept Plan in the built form requirement for improved pedestrian amenity and permeability across the Pakington Strand Strategic Site.