

FISHERMANS BEND PLANNING REVIEW PANEL HEARING

DRAFT AMENDMENT GC81 TO THE MELBOURNE AND PORT PHILLIP PLANNING SCHEMES

MINISTER FOR PLANNING - PROPOSED CHANGES/CORRECTIONS TO PLANNING SCHEME MAP

No.	Planning Scheme Map in Tabled Document 156B	Related Planning Scheme Provision in Tabled Document	Issue	Proposed change/correction to relevant Planning Scheme Map in Tabled Document 156B
	Montague CCZ	CCZ - Tabled Document 156A		Montague CCZ
1.	Montague CCZ	CCZ 1.0p1	<p>Conditions opposite the following Section 1 uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Bank'; • 'Cinema based entertainment facility'; • 'Department store'; and • 'Supermarket'; <p>all state:</p> <p><i>Must be located in a core area with frontage to a primary or secondary active frontage street.</i></p> <p>However, the relevant map in Tabled Document 156B does not identify any 'primary or secondary active frontage street'.</p> <p>This is a mapping error. This detail was shown in Tabled Document 66E, Map 1.</p>	<p>Insert map layer with the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Primary active frontages' • 'Secondary active frontages' <p>as per Tabled Document 66E, Map 1 and update Legend in Tabled Document 156B accordingly.</p>

2.	Montague CCZ	CCZ 3.0p2	<p>Inconsistent language in permit requirement provision compared to legend in Planning Scheme Map.</p> <p>Planning scheme provision refers to ‘new streets, laneways or public open space’.</p> <p>The legend in the relevant Planning Scheme Map (Tabled Document 156B) refers to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Future open space’; • ‘Proposed road’; • ‘Indicative laneways’. <p>This is potentially confusing.</p>	<p>Amend legend in the Planning Scheme Map to refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘New public open space’; • ‘New road’; and • ‘New laneway (Location indicative)’.
3.	Montague CCZ	N/A	<p>Currently, the relevant Planning Scheme Map for Montague in Tabled Document 156B refers to two of the new open spaces by name but does not refer to any other new open spaces in Montague by name.</p> <p>Additionally, the CCZ provision comprising Tabled Document 156A does not refer to any new open space areas by name.</p> <p>This is potentially confusing.</p>	<p>Delete the following words from the Planning Scheme Map:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Montague North Park; • Montague Park;

4.	Montague CCZ	CCZ 4.0p2	<p>The provision states:</p> <p><i>A permit must not be granted or amended to construct a building or construct or carry out works where the vehicle access points and crossovers (not including openings for a road) are located along roads designated as 'no cross overs permitted' in the relevant Maps of this schedule, unless no other access is possible.</i></p> <p>Currently, the relevant map in Tabled Document 156B does not designate any roads as 'no crossovers permitted'.</p> <p>This is an oversight. Five roads in the Montague precinct are designated as 'no crossovers permitted' in Tabled Document 66E, Map 2.</p>	<p>Insert map layer identifying the following roads as 'No crossovers permitted' in the Planning Scheme Map:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City Road; • Boundary St; • Buckhurst St; • Normanby Rd; • Ferrars St; <p>as per Map 2 in Tabled Document 66E and update map Legend accordingly.</p>
5.	Montague CCZ	CCZ Map 2 PPS	<p>Map 2 in Tabled Document 66E specifies the proposed widths of any new/proposed roads as either 12, 18 or 22m.</p> <p>In Montague, the only proposed/new road is located south of Normanby Rd and has a specified width of 22m. This detail is missing from the relevant Map in Tabled Document 156B.</p> <p>This is an oversight.</p>	<p>Amend the Legend in Tabled Document 156B by replacing the words 'Proposed road' with 'New road – 22m wide'.</p>

6.			<p>Drafting error. The Legend in Tabled Document 156B refers to '106 tram corridor', rather than '109 tram corridor' which runs through the Montague precinct.</p> <p>This is a drafting error.</p>	<p>Amend the Legend in Tabled Document 156B by replacing the words '106 tram corridor' with '109 tram corridor.'</p>
7.	Montague CCZ	N/A	<p>Numerous items appear in the Legend in Tabled Document 156B which are either not relevant to the Montague Precinct or not referred to in the CCZ.</p> <p>This is potentially confusing.</p>	<p>Delete the following from the Legend in Tabled Document 156B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing open space • Private open space • Potential metro station • Future tram corridor • New bridge/existing bridge upgrade • Indicative 12m wide street • Potential freight alignment • Education and community hub (secondary) • Health and wellbeing hub
8.	Montague CCZ	N/A	<p>Legibility. The amount of detail/layers appearing on the map makes it very difficult to read.</p>	<p>Remove the map layer relating to Community Infrastructure Investigation Areas, identify the Map as Map 1 and insert the residual map layer into a new Map, Map 2: Community Infrastructure Hub Investigation Areas.</p> <p>Remove the following from the Legend in Map 1:</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sport and recreation hub • Arts and cultural hub • Education and community hub (primary); <p>And relocate into new Map 2: Community Infrastructure Hub Investigation Areas.</p>
9.	Montague CCZ	N/A	Clarity. Currently, no orientation accompanies the Map.	Add North arrow next to map to provide orientation.
10.	Montague CCZ	N/A	Legibility. It is difficult to read the Map due to the scale.	Amend the Scale Bar in Tabled Document 156B to improve legibility.
	Montague DDO	DDO - Tabled Document 66F		Montague DDO
11.	Montague DDO	DDO 2.0 and Map 2: Building Heights	<p>Drafting error. Tabled Document 66F planning scheme provision and Map 2: Building Heights refers to building heights by reference to ‘metres’ rather than ‘storeys’.</p> <p>However, the Montague DDO Map refers to building heights in terms of ‘storeys’ rather than ‘metres’. This is a drafting oversight.</p>	<p>Amend the Legend in Tabled Document 156B as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace ‘4 storey mandatory’ with ‘15.4m mandatory’; • Replace ‘8 storey’ with ‘29.4m’; • Replace ‘12 storey’ with ‘42.2m’; • Replace ‘20 storey’ with ‘67.8m’; • Replace ‘24 storey’ with ‘80.6m’.

12.	Montague DDO	DDO 2.0 and Map 2: Building Heights	<p>Clarity. The relevant Planning Scheme Map in Tabled Document 156B includes a notation '6 storey' for a strip of land south of the West Gate Freeway, east of Montague Street and north of Munro St.</p> <p>This height is consistent with Tabled Document 66F Map 2, albeit it was expressed in metres. However, there is no corresponding height referred to in the Legend in Tabled Document 156B. Additionally, it should be expressed in 'metres' rather than 'storeys' as set out above.</p>	<p>Update the Legend in Tabled Document 156B to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23m.
13.	Montague DDO	DDO 2.0p86	<p>Legibility. The amount of detail/layers appearing on the map makes it very difficult to read.</p> <p>Additionally, the map includes details which are not expressly referred to by reference to the map in the DDO provision and are therefore unnecessary.</p> <p>For example, the provision does not refer to any of the following items in the Legend of the Map:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed road; • Existing road; • Indicative laneway; • Indicative 12m wide street; • Neighbourhood equinox; 	<p>Remove the layer of detail from the map showing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed road; • Existing road; • Indicative laneway; • Indicative 12m wide street; <p>and delete from the Legend in Tabled Document 156B accordingly.</p> <p>Also delete the following from the Legend in Tabled Document 156B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood equinox and associated text; • Winter solstice; • Future open space.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter solstice; • Future open space. <p>In some cases, it is unnecessary to include these items. In other cases, it is confusing.</p>	<p>Simplify the reference to and presentation of public open space on the Map by identifying public open space (new and existing) not subject to overshadowing controls by shading light green and identifying in Legend as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public open space (No overshadowing controls); <p>And identifying new and existing public open space subject to overshadowing controls by shading a darker green and identifying in Legend as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public open space (overshadowing controls). <p>The DDO provision will need to be updated to aid interpretation of the overshadowing controls in the Map.</p>
14.	Montague DDO	N/A	Clarity. Currently, no orientation accompanies the Map.	Insert North arrow next to map to provide orientation.
15.	Montague DDO	DDO 2.0p.48 DDO 2.0p.62	The DDO provision includes specific setback requirements or variations to setback requirements for buildings which interface with the Route 96 and 109 tram corridors but the corridors are not shown in any Map.	Show the '109 tram corridor' and '96 tram corridor' on the Planning Scheme Map and update the Legend accordingly.

16.	Montague DDO	N/A	Legibility. It is difficult to read the Map due to the scale.	Amend the Scale Bar to improve legibility.
17.	Montague DDO	DDO 2.0, Table 1 Public open space hierarchy and overshadowing requirements	<p>Inconsistency. Currently, the relevant Planning Scheme Map for Montague in Tabled Document 156B refers to two of the new open spaces by name but does not refer to any other new open spaces in Montague by name.</p> <p>Additionally, while the provision comprising Tabled Document 156A refers to some parks by name including ‘Montague North’, ‘Montague’, ‘Montague Park’, it does not refer to all parks by name. This is potentially confusing.</p>	<p>Delete the following words from the Map:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Montague North Park; • Montague Park. <p>The purpose of representing the various areas of open space in this Map is to identify those open spaces subject to overshadowing controls.</p>
18.	Montague DDO	DDO Map 2: Building Heights	<p>Inconsistency. Currently, the relevant Planning Scheme Map for Montague in Tabled Document 156B shows the building height for 43 - 49 Buckhurst Street, Port Melbourne as 29.5 metres.</p> <p>This height is inconsistent with Tabled Document 66F Map 2, which shows the height as 42.2m.</p> <p>This is a drafting error.</p>	Amend the Planning Scheme Map to show 43-49 Buckhurst Street, Port Melbourne as 42.2m.

	Montague MSS	MSS Clause 21.06 – Tabled Document 66D		
19.	Montague MSS	MSS Clause 21.06	Legibility and relevance to Clause 21.06, MSS. The following details are identified in the Planning Scheme Map but are not specifically referred to in the planning scheme provision.	<p>Remove the map layer/s which show the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic cycling corridor • Existing off road cycling path • Existing on road cycling path • Proposed on road cycling path • Proposed off road cycling path • Existing open space • Future open space • Private open space • Indicative laneways • Proposed road • Indicative 12m wide street; <p>and update the Legend accordingly by removing reference to the same.</p>
20.	Montague MSS	MSS Clause 21.06	Mapping errors. There are some minor inconsistencies between the sub-precinct boundaries as presented in the map in Tabled Document 66D and the Montague MSS Map in Tabled Document 156B.	Correct presentation of sub-precinct boundaries to align with those presented in map in Tabled Document 66D.
21.	Montague MSS	MSS Clause 21.06	Legibility. In the south-east part of the Montague precinct, the sub-precinct boundaries as depicted in Tabled	Amend Legend to identify Sub-precinct boundaries as ‘indicative’.

			Document 156B are not always aligned with cadastral boundaries. This is reflective of the relatively crude depiction of the sub-precinct boundaries in Tabled Document 66D due to the scale of the map and also because the precinct planning is still being undertaken.	
22.	Montague MSS	MSS Clause 21.06	<p>Clarity/legibility. A grey broken line representing the precinct boundary appears on the Map. However, there is no corresponding item in the Legend.</p> <p>Due to the extent of overlap between the precinct boundary and sub-precinct boundaries, it is difficult to show both boundaries clearly on a single map/at once.</p> <p>Given a single map has been prepared for each precinct to include in the MSS, it is unnecessary to show the precinct boundary on the Map.</p>	Remove map layer with grey broken line representing the precinct boundary from the Map.
23.	Montague MSS	N/A	Clarity. Currently, no orientation accompanies the Map.	Insert North arrow to provide orientation.
24.	Montague MSS	N/A	Legibility. It is difficult to read the Map due to the scale.	Amend the Scale bar to improve legibility.