**ATTACHMENT 10 – LIST OF CHANGES TO EXISTING SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

| **Section and page**  | **Summary of content and changes** | **Detailed changes**  | **Justification for change/no change**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Both Bentleigh and Carnegie Structure Plans  |  |
| New section to cover strategic sites.  | New section which outlines the purpose and objectives to each strategic site. |  |  |
| Consistently and accurately apply the different terms used for open space and public space throughout the plans. | Currently the *Structure Plans* refer to these spaces in a number of ways. |  | Consistency of terminology.  |
| 3.0 Buildings Change map where HO means change to shoptop classification from standard to heritage. | Bentleigh – Fig 3 (page 20) and Carnegie – Fig 3 (page 19)  |  | To reflect identified heritage significance of sites. |
| Contents  | Update to contents page. |  | To reflect changes made to documents. |
| Bentleigh Structure Plan  |  |  |
| 5.0 Parking and Movement (page 44)  | Remove reference to ‘trams’.  |  | Error: no trams in Bentleigh.  |
| 3.0 Buildings (page16) | Remove reference to significant community benefit being a key focus for Strategic site B. |  | There is no floor uplift proposed for Bentleigh. We want community benefit but not significant community benefit in same manner as what is proposed for Carnegie. |
| All maps  | Show 8 Vickery Street as extension of the strategic site which is immediately to south. |  | Provides better opportunity to develop land in this location. Church is next property to north. |
| 5.0 Parking and Movement (pages 46-7) | The provision: ‘Relocate Vickery Street Car park to Horsely Street public car park and repurpose for diverse housing and employment’ is not reflected in pages 29, 31 or 33. | Change wording in third dot point to relocate Vickery Street car park to Horsley Street public car park and repurpose the site for public space – ie. new public plaza. | Amend for consistency.  |
| 3.0 BuildingsIN3Z site – 99 Brewer Rd | Mark on map and give direction to future housing typology. | Housing type not heritage and character housing but garden townhouse, but which addresses its locational context. | Site presently industrial with large site coverage adjoining heritage property and railway line. Approach this site consistent with existing policy of supporting higher development yield while ensuring development consistent with prevailing landscape scale. |
| Carnegie Structure plan  |  |  |  |
| Change boundary of **all** maps to include commercial area to south as specified in the urban form report  | Ie. Fig 1 (page 13)Fig 3 (page 19)Fig 4 (page 20-21) |  | Due to findings of the heritage review.  |
| All maps | Identify the lot that isn’t part of railway corridor on Koornang Road. |  | This lot is in private ownership. |
| 6.0 Urban Renewal – Figure 13 | Change height of sites identified as heritage significant on east side of Koornang Road from 5 storey to 4 storey. |  | To reflect heritage significance of site.  |
| 6.0 Urban Renewal  | Insert section to provide further information on community benefit requirements and how they will be determined. |  | To add weight to the requirement.  |
| 6.0 Urban Renewal  | Re-order urban design principles and divide into strategic direction principles and built form principles.  |  | Reordered to make clearer. |
| Quality Design Guidelines - Residential Areas |
| All typologies –garden setting and landscaping in all types | Change wording to make clearer the tree planting requirement. Urban apartment calculation not to include rear setback. |  | Clarity.Urban apartment has insufficient room for canopy trees within rear setback. |
| All typologies – front fencing | Front fence maximum height for main roads should be 1.8m not 2m. |  | Clarity and consistency across all typologies. |
| All typologies –primary outlook | Clarify in diagrams that 6m setback for primary outlook applies to side and rear. |  |  |
| 2.2 Minimal change side setback (page 14) | Include the secondary image that shows side setback to balcony.  |  | Clarity. |
| 2.3 Garden townhouse overview (page 18)  | Remove reference to ‘medium density’ in objective section and in second bullet in summary section. |  | Clarity/alignment with minimum garden area requirement in planning scheme. |
| 2.3 Garden townhouse (page 21), 2.4 Townhouse and apartment mix (page 29) and 2.5 Garden apartment (page 37) | Change diagram for rear setback to show the 6m setback for secluded private open space. |  | Clarity |
| 2.5 Garden Apartment (pages 36 and 37) | Change setbacks at front and rear to allow a ‘three storey podium’, removing the tiered setbacks at level 3 and 4. Replace imagery and remove associated guidance for ‘built form presents as two storeys’.  |  | Design testing has shown original setbacks were not practical and too restrictive on housing yield. New controls deliver same ‘garden corridor’ at the front and rear of the site with a focus on more greenery and landscaping. |
| 2.6 Urban apartment (page 44) | Change side and rear back setback diagram and include an additional diagram to improve guidance in relation to whether it is abutting urban apartment/non-residential area or a residential building. |  | Clarity. |
| Quality Design Guidelines - Commercial and Mixed Use Areas |
| 4.3 Community Benefit | Remove sentence ‘….and will be clarified through future strategic work’.Delete final section ‘Community benefit examples’ as it just repeats previous section.  |  | This chapter doesn’t provide clarity but adds confusion. Has been revised to ensure consistent message as per revised structure plan wording on this and proposed policy. |