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1. SUPPORTED ASPECTS OF AMENDMENT

- Vision for a high level of self-containment
- Urban structure
- Defined podium-tower and mid-rise areas
- Built form and housing diversity
New parks

Excellent local public transport

Fine-grain street network (with alignment flexibility)

Services

Sufficient density to support a wide range of jobs and homes balance

1.1 Self-containment
1.2 Urban structure

- Primary organisation around public transport
- Radial boulevards/ civic spines
- North-south connections
- Distinct neighbourhoods
- Nodes of intensity
1.3 Podium-tower & mid-rise areas
1.3 Podium-tower & hybrid examples
1.3 Podium design

- Facades
- Fine-grain
- Laneways
- Frontages
- Active

Controls re:
Need for strong
1.3 Podium design: Bourke St, Victoria Harbour
Burnley St, Richmond & Amsterdam

Building envelope controls to balance diversity and growth

Diverse urban environments
Diverse housing types
Diverse built form characters

1.4 Diversity
2. SUPPORTABLE ASPECTS OF AMENDMENT WITH REVISIONS

- General built form controls
  - Street wall heights
  - Tower setbacks
  - Site coverage
- Built form along southern edge
- Overshadowing controls
  - Convert to discretionary, to allow a judgement about impact on amenity (e.g. Melbourne DDO10)
Discretionary to contribute to diversity and contribute to a more diverse environment. Increase on corner of two principal streets to 60m (17-18 storeys), up to 30m along each street frontage, to express the urban distance of 30m along each street frontage, to express the urban

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET WIDTH</th>
<th>STREET HEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5m</td>
<td>&gt;18m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-22m</td>
<td>20-22m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-30m</td>
<td>230m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduce minimum to ensure spatial definition. Increase on wide streets for better spatial definition.

2.1 Street wall heights
2.2 Tower side & rear setbacks

- Significant impact on developability above podium height—particularly in Montague (narrow lots)
- Why stepped rather than gradual increase (e.g. C270)?
- Amend to 6m up to a height of 36m, with gradual increase as the building rises above 36m to 10m setback at height of 100m
Discretionary with clear guidance

2.2 Tower side & rear setbacks
2.3 Site coverage

- Replace site coverage provision with requirement for communal open space
- Further work to determine appropriate level of provision
- Family-friendly housing need not preclude taller buildings
2.4 Southern Edge

- Discretionary minimum 10m setback above
- Discretionary maximum 4 storey street wall
3. ASPECTS OF AMENDMENT REQUIRING FURTHER WORK

- Confirmation of public transport
- Desired built form character in each precinct -> density & infrastructure planning
- Location of new streets, lanes and parks
- Delivery of employment
  - Integration with residential
  - Quantum in Wirraway following decision re Metro 2 alignment
- Relationship between employment core and density gradient
- Identification of landmark sites
- Flood mitigation design solutions
- Street-edge services design solutions
- Richer set of ideas and more resources
No strategic basis for density and building heights

- Value of FARs in determining built form undermined by FAU
- Elsewhere car parking typically in basement
- Different street widths
- NSW FSR results in a building ~30% bigger than same Vic FAR
- Built form benchmarks not comparable, e.g.:
- Employment component (2x in Southbank, 2.5x in CBD)
- Residential density benchmarks not useful due to varying proposed changes in Almighty Sandridge
- Not based on infrastructure, amenity or sustainability

3.1 FAR Controls

- Academic exercise, based on population targets, rather than formulation of place-based characters that optimise growth (e.g.)
3.1 Example: Wirraway non-core

- Only 2.1:1/ 187 pph within ~100m from Plummer Street tram/train & activity centre—less than half density of award-winning examples cited in UDS
- $\frac{1}{2}$ of density and $\frac{1}{3}$ of height in core
- Low density and height not needed to deliver particular built form model or family-friendly housing
- 6 storeys not viable
dwellings potential for ~5,500 additional communal open space
- All have generous central
- Hybrid (3:4:1, 6-18 stores)
- Vancouver (3:2:1, 3-24 stores)
- Barcelona (3:6:1, 7 stores)
- Alternative built form models

3.1 Example: Wirraway non-co
3.1 Example: Hybrid developments

East Village, Sydney

The Melburnian
3.1 Example: Hybrid developments
3.2 Potential built form markers
3.3 Street edge services

services cabinets
avoid streets edge with
Explore precinct utilites to
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- Resolve public transport
- Precinct structure planning
  - Block by block
  - Work with landowners
  - New street and lane alignments
  - New public open space locations
  - Land use
  - Built form (-> density)
  - Access
- Refine built form controls
- Explore flood mitigation solutions
- Explore precinct services