

Urban Design Referral



URBAN DESIGN REFERRAL

Project: 1-7 Waterfront Place, Port Melbourne

Application No: 490/2020

Documentation: Architectural Plans – S57A Advertised April 2021

Planner: Jock Farrow

Date: 14 May 2021

Advisor: Brendan Baxter, Architect / Urban Designer, City Design

SUMMARY

The S57A April 2021 plan amendments generally address the larger design issues previously identified. However, the following detailed design and documentation issues need to be addressed before the proposal can be considered to achieve the very high standard of architectural design required for this significant gateway site.

The main issues identified below have all been previously raised, including in the earlier referral advice of January 2021 and the December 2020 review by the Office of the Victorian Government Architect (OVGA) Victorian Design Review Panel (VDRP).

REFERRAL

1. Landscape

The following advice complements the separate landscape architecture advice of 7/05/2021:

1. Consistency and design integration between landscape and architectural plans is required.
2. The facade greenery in planter boxes and roof are an integral part of the building's presentation, therefore a detailed garden maintenance regime, including access to balustrade planters and green roofs should be provided.
3. No details of the green wall shown on upper levels above cafe have been provided. This element should be arranged to not reduce passive surveillance of the north-south laneway link.
4. In the central laneway, planter boxes could be better arranged to provide privacy buffer to Townhouse 6 bedroom and bathroom and a softening element to the Loading bay wall
5. Outdoor public area to west of cafe will be very exposed in summer months and so shade and shelter solutions should be integrated with design, such as:
 - details of deep soil planting to sustain canopy trees shown in the plans, as locations are currently shown over basement parking structure, or
 - extend pergola beyond building line, which may support integrated planting or retractable awnings. (This would require Heritage Victoria approval.)

2. Western N-S Link

1. The revised canopy/pergola structure provides some increased sense of openness compared to the previous solid design, but the low height and broad width nevertheless reduces the public character, surveillance and sense of openness required for this space. Therefore, it is desirable to reduce the canopy's width. Also please coordinate with updated wind modelling to ensure acceptable pedestrian conditions: a small section of solid awning may better protect building edge conditions.

2. To mark space as a shared accessway, suitable details of pavement material need to be provided.

3. Sightlines & Circulation

1. The pedestrian laneway to the northwest corner of cafe creates a pinch point for circulation and restricts the required DDO sightline down to a single point. The landscape plan further reduces path width due to depth of planter boxes. Therefore, more 'opening up' of this corner is required – which could be achieved by angling the ground floor wall to match the alignment of the upper levels. This would also increase the sheltered outdoor dining area.
2. Resolving the circulation and sightline issue would remove the need for the 5m wide dedicated internal circulation space currently shown between cafe and providore areas, which is less practical as a public thoroughfare and also subject to adverse wind impacts. Retaining sightlines through transparent windows on each side of the cafe remains desirable.

4. Ground Floor Facades

Ground level facades should be finessed to support activity of the adjacent public spaces:

1. Full height glazing is shown along the length of the building edge to all ground floor frontages, which is considered a poor response. As discussed with VDRP, it is recommended that solid sections of wall be included at the base to better anchor the building to the ground and provide a more tactile interface to shopfronts. A 1:50 scale elevation / section would demonstrate this design response.
2. For the active uses adjoining streets and laneways, providing more sections of opening windows, serveries and doors to improve public realm interface.
3. Full height glazing is shown to ground floor service and private areas, such as the Loading Bay and Townhouse 6 ground floor bedroom and bathroom. Plastic privacy films are a very poor outcome, so more durable solutions such as high-level windows and solid sections of walling are required.

5. Eastern Public Space

The quality of this public space is compromised by limited interaction with ground floor uses and the extensive paving (as shown on architectural plans), therefore please provide

1. Small seating area(s), with deep soil plantings and less paving
2. Details of artwork
3. If possible, provide a permeable building edge or a smaller tenancy with direct access to the corner.

6. Wind Impacts

Updated wind assessment is required, which may trigger further design refinements to ensure that wind impacts are appropriately managed in the design at street level and balcony spaces, including:

1. achieving a seating criterion for at least one of the public spaces
2. single aspect apartments facing into the central laneway, including mid-level balconies. As noted below, external operable shutters may ameliorate wind impacts and privacy interface in these locations
3. refining design of doorways and air locks to functionally improve public circulation and mitigate harmful wind effects. This is important for the perception of publicness and accessibility.

7. Environmentally Sustainable Design

The proposed achievement of a 70% BESS rating representing excellence is supported as demonstrating design excellence.

8. Flood resilient design and equitable access

1. Access to the Gym, Providore and Cafe include large internal landings and steps, with platform lifts (?) also shown on plans. Given the small height difference, a short ramp would provide more equitable and dignified access than a platform lift. Ramps are also less expensive to both install and maintain, are quicker for people to use, and more reliable because they never break down.
2. The Gym floor level and/or doorway locations could be further improved to provide level access from at least one frontage i.e. current layout requires steps *up* from the street but steps *down* from the central laneway.

9. Tower: additional external shading + glazing

The slab projections will not achieve enough shading given the extensive amount of glazing oriented east, north and west. A small number of shade panels have been added to the western facade, which is a modest aesthetic and functional improvement, however:

1. details of panel 'operability' are unclear: do the panels slide or contain louvres?
2. to improve building performance, the number of shade panels could be increased to the western facade and also added to the eastern and northern facades.

Large areas of unshaded glass will detrimentally affect the building's presentation, amenity and sustainability. For example, triggering building code requirement to decrease the Visual Light Transmittance of clear windows into dark tinted glass would change the building's appearance, reduce activation of public areas and decrease the daylight amenity of all internal areas.

10. Plan and Facade Coordination & Detailing

Details of external window and door openings are currently unclear, so need to be resolved and clearly documented. This is important because they will affect the appearance of the building and because they are required for compliance with amenity and sustainability standards. For example:

1. Balconies and Wintergardens: details of balustrades and openings are unclear and inconsistent e.g. Wintergarden detail 03 on drawing A1100 shows no balustrade, opening sliding (?) door or waterproof balcony area. Similarly, detail 04 on drawing A1160 indicates balustrade but no other relevant details.
2. Openable windows (type, size and location) are not shown in elevations, in floor plans or in renders.
3. Spandrel panel detail is included detail 03 on drawing A1160 but location on elevations and plans is unclear.

11. Better Apartment Design Standards

1. While no full or detailed BADS review has been undertaken as part of this referral, it is apparent that some apartments have irregular and/or unresolved layouts that makes their interiors and balconies fall short of the amenity standards, despite claiming full compliance in the accompanying self-assessment. For example, circulation and living area dimensions in Building 01 Apartments 105 & 205. However, in most cases it appears that these shortfalls can be fully remedied with relatively minor internal revisions.

2. Space and screening for mechanical services (such as hot water units and air conditioners) are not included on balconies. It is important that these services are not permitted on balconies and that they are accommodated elsewhere in suitably screened locations. With the rooftop plant space being very restricted in area, this is an important coordination issue.

12. Residential interface between dwellings

The following residential interface between dwellings could be better resolved:

1. On levels 1 and 2, the apartments directly facing each other across the central laneway have a primary balcony to primary balcony interface of less than 12m. Operable screens may improve privacy interface as well as ameliorate wind impacts.
2. The Beach St townhouses have interface issues between separate dwellings. To resolve this issue, either: modify east facing windows (size, position) and/or adding external privacy and sun shade screens to the eastern windows.

Please contact the advisor if you wish to discuss these matters further.

Strategic Planner Referral

From: [Shelley Bennett](#)
To: [Jock Farrow](#)
Subject: Re: 1-7 Waterfront Place - 490/2020
Date: Wednesday, 28 April 2021 10:48:09 AM
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)
[image002.jpg](#)
[image003.jpg](#)
[image004.jpg](#)
[image005.jpg](#)
[Outlook-p4aaxi3a.jpg](#)
[Outlook-bzhix4t2.jpg](#)
[Outlook-femswe5l.jpg](#)
[Outlook-aedsahbu.jpg](#)
[Outlook-ezn2i04v.jpg](#)

Sorry Jock, I forgot to have a look. I've just opened the plans - looks they've changed the design to meet the upper level setback on the western side(8+5m=13m!) and the architectural features no longer encroach into the mandatory setbacks?! Great news! Do you need any further comments from me? Looks like they've done what we asked?

Kind regards,

Shelley Bennett

Principal Strategic Planner | Strategy, Design and Sustainability
T: 03 9209 6535 | W: www.portphillip.vic.gov.au
St Kilda Town Hall | 99a Carlisle Street, St Kilda, Victoria 3182

Arborist Referral

From: [Rachel Jackson](#)
To: [Jock Farrow](#)
Subject: RE: 490/2020, 1 & 7 Waterfront Place, PORT MELBOURNE VIC 3207
Date: Wednesday, 3 February 2021 2:45:26 PM
Attachments: [image328815.jpg](#)
[image458863.jpg](#)
[image612429.jpg](#)
[image127771.jpg](#)
[image045628.jpg](#)

Hi Jock,

I have reviewed the Preliminary Arboricultural Assessment report by Greenwood Consulting, dated 1 September 2020).

Tree 48 (as numbered in the report), an *Agonis flexuosa* on the western side of the site, has measurements in excess of the minimum required for protection under Local Law. The tree may not be removed without a Significant Tree Removal permit.

The remaining trees listed for removal to facilitate the development are not considered Significant by Council's Local Law. Removal of the remaining onsite vegetation to facilitate the development can be completed without a permit.

An Arboricultural Impact Assessment report is required for review, prior to approval of the permit for works at this site. The report must be prepared by a suitably qualified Arborist (AQF level 5 or equivalent) and include:

- trees on neighbouring properties with TPZs that fall within the subject site,
- the nature strip tree(s) adjacent the property.

The report must follow the guidelines from Council Arboriculture Victoria and comply with the Australian Standard 4970:2009 Protection of Trees on Development Sites. The TPZ measurements of the palm species, listed in the Greenwood Consulting report, need to be updated to reflect the correct method of determining the TPZ as per AS4970-2009: Protection of Trees on Development Sites; "The TPZ of palms, other monocots, cycads and tree ferns should not be less than 1 m outside the crown projection".

Should the report find that any works encroach into 10% or more of the Tree Protection Zone, or into the Structural Root Zone of any tree, and the design cannot be modified to reduce the incursion, then a non-destructive root investigation (NDRI) must be conducted and documented, with a root map to show the location, depth and diameter of all roots found along the line of the proposed works. The findings, photographs and recommendations should be presented in the impact assessment report.

Regards,

Rachel Jackson
Arborist | Construction, Contracts and Operations
T: 03 8563 7363
St Kilda Town Hall | 99a Carlisle Street, St Kilda, Victoria 3182
Rachel Jackson
Arborist | Construction, Contracts and Operations
T: 03 8563 7363 | W: www.portphillip.vic.gov.au
St Kilda Town Hall | 99a Carlisle Street, St Kilda, Victoria 3182



Sustainable Design Referral



Planning Application referral to Sustainable Design Advisor

Application no:	490/2020					
Address:	1 & 7 Waterfront Place, PORT MELBOURNE VIC 3207					
Status:	S57a Lodged/ Referred to Planner					
Planner:	Jock Farrow					
Description:	Use and development of the land, to carry out works and construct a 10 storey mixed use building over two basement levels, comprising dwellings, retail (shop, food and drink premises, wellness centre), a restricted recreation facility (gymnasium), public toilets, and a reduction in car parking requirements					
Dates	Pre-Application	Lodgement	Notice of Decision	Appeal lodged	Permit Issued	VCAT outcome Outcome date
		07-Aug-2020				

Referral Type:

Residential Extension Single dwelling (new) Multiple Dwellings **Mixed Use** Non-residential

Application Status:

Pre-app Prelim check RFI Advertising **Reporting** VCAT Condition Completion

Documents/Plans for Review:

- Architectural Plans - E55038/21
- ESD Memo - E54542/21
- Cover letter (explanation of changes) - E54530/21

PLANNER – referral

Date xx/xx/xx

To the Sustainable Design Advisor

Please review and provide comment on the above project. This is a further referral following discussions with Steven McKeller and the subsequent lodgement of amended plans. Please review and advise what conditions should be included on any permit that may issue.

Kind regards

Jock

Hi Jock,

The plans and supporting documents listed in the referral above have been reviewed. See detailed comments below.

Kind regards,

Steven McKellar

Sustainable Design Advisor

Outcome:

- The application demonstrates an acceptable outcome for ESD
- The application does not demonstrate best practice for ESD

Suggested Action:

- ESD improvements required prior to decision > Re-Refer to Sustainable Design
- Approve subject to conditions as listed below

Items required to be addressed via conditions:

Items required to be addressed via conditions:

G11 - Updated Sustainable Management Plan

Concurrent with the endorsement of plans, a revised Sustainable Management Plan must be submitted to, be to the satisfaction of and approved by the Responsible Authority. The revised Sustainability Management Plan must be generally in accordance with the ESD design memo 'Further Initiatives to BESS Excellence' that commits to at least a 70% BESS score for the development but modified to be consistent with items specified in condition 1 of this permit. When approved, the Plan will be endorsed and will then form part of the permit and the project must incorporate the sustainable design initiatives listed.

G12 - Implementation of Sustainable Design Initiatives

Prior to the occupation of any building approved under this permit, the provisions, recommendations and requirements of the endorsed Sustainability Management Plan must be implemented and complied with to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

G13 - ESD Implementation Report

Prior to the occupation of any building approved under this permit, a report (or reports) from the author of the Sustainability Management Plan (SMP), approved under this permit, or similarly qualified person or company, must be submitted to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and must confirm all measures specified in the approved SMP and WSUD report have been implemented in accordance with the approved plans.

G19 - Incorporation of Water Sensitive Urban Design initiatives

Prior to the occupation of any dwelling/building approved under this permit, the provisions, recommendations and requirements of the endorsed Water Sensitive Urban Design Report must be implemented and complied with to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

G20 - Construction Management Water Sensitive Urban Design

The developer must ensure that throughout the construction of the building(s) and construction and carrying out of works allowed by this permit;

- a) No water containing oil, foam, grease, scum or litter will be discharged to the stormwater drainage system from the site;
- b) All stored wastes are kept in designated areas or covered containers that prevent escape into the stormwater system;
- c) The amount of mud, dirt, sand, soil, clay or stones deposited by vehicles on the abutting roads is minimised when vehicles are leaving the site.
- d) No mud, dirt, sand, soil, clay or stones are washed into, or are allowed to enter the stormwater drainage system;

- e) The site is developed and managed to minimise the risks of stormwater pollution through the contamination of run-off by chemicals, sediments, animal wastes or gross pollutants in accordance with currently accepted best practice.

Specific conditions to support design excellence

Prior to the issue of a Statement of Compliance, electrical plans must be submitted to the responsible authority showing that the whole development will be serviced by an embedded network. Within one month of the first owners' corporation meeting required under the Owners Corporations Act 2006, a copy of the executed contract with the Embedded Network Operation, confirming that all electricity supplied to the entire development will be 100% accredited Green Power (or equivalent 100% renewable energy generation), must be submitted to Council. As per the memo 1 Innovation credit has been assigned in BESS on the provision that this condition is satisfied.

Items required to be shown on plans, pursuant to condition 1:

Full details of operable external shading devices to east and west façade including dimensions, design details, materials, operability, to be shown on elevations as well as the floor plans. 1 Innovation credit can be assigned in BESS if this condition is satisfied.

Optional condition regarding removal of natural gas

Provide electric heat pumps for all hot water systems as per the memo instead of the other option to provide gas boosted system—Ensuring that all cooking appliances are electric induction systems will remove the need for the development to be connected to natural gas. 1 Innovation credit can be assigned in BESS if this condition is satisfied.

Waste Management Referral

From: [Waste Management Plan Referrals](#)
To: [Jock Farrow](#)
Cc: [Waste Management Plan Referrals](#)
Subject: RE: 490/2020, 1 & 7 Waterfront Place, PORT MELBOURNE VIC 3207
Date: Friday, 4 December 2020 12:15:51 PM

Hi Jock,

Apologies, got the calculation mixed up.
Recycling bins are suffice for both residential and commercial tenements.

This WMP is approved.

Kind regards,

Binita Shrestha

Waste Technical Officer | Construction, Contracts and Operations

T: 03 9209 6423 | M: [0435 652 186](tel:0435652186)

Operations Centre | 69-81 White Street, South Melbourne, Victoria, 3205

CITY OF PORT PHILLIP

MEMORANDUM

Comments from Traffic Engineers.

Dear Jock

I have assessed the following documents:

- The amended plan received 12 April 202 (Reference E54537/21)
- The swept path analysis report received 12 April 2021 (Reference E54537/21)
- Carparking provisions analysis report (Reference E55489/21)
- Traffic report received 16 November 2020 (Reference E185464/20).

Reference is also made to previous application comments from Council's Traffic Engineer provided by 25 November 2020(PD20/181433)

The proposal is to construct a mixed-use development comprising:

- 38 x one-bedroom apartments
- 54 x two-bedroom apartments
- 15 x three-bedroom apartments
- 5 x four-bedroom apartment
- 1 x five-bedroom apartment
- 6 x three-bedroom townhouses
- 535 square metres of retail
- 183 square metres of food and drinks premise
- 675 square metre gymnasium
- 279 square metre wellness centres.

A total of 208 car spaces and 16 motorbike spaces are proposed on the site over two basement levels. A total of 206 bicycle parking spaces are provided across the site.

Car Park Layout:

Accessways:

- The accessway dimensions are generally in accordance with the Planning Scheme and Australian Standard. It is noted that the accessway width narrows to 5.9 metres at the disabled spaces. This is acceptable in this case.
- A minimum headroom clearance of 2.2 metres is provided above the accessways. This is acceptable.
- The car park entrance "garage door" at Beach Street must be located at least 6 metres from the property boundary to reduce conflict with pedestrians while entering vehicles prop for its opening.
- A Car Parking Management Plan (CPMP) is required as a condition of permit including a line-marking plan, and more specific details regarding the car park access controls and location of intercom system to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

Car parking spaces:

- All car parking spaces accord with the Planning Scheme.

- Additional clearance has been provided for spaces adjacent to walls.
- Swept path assessment has been provided demonstrating acceptable access to and from parking spaces. It is noted that some spaces may require multiple manoeuvres. This is acceptable as the spaces are allocated to residents only.
- Wheel stops are used throughout the car park to prevent vehicles overhanging into accessways and abutting car spaces. This is acceptable.

Headroom

- A minimum headroom clearance of 2.2 metres is provided above the car spaces. This meets the requirements of the Planning Scheme and Australian Standards.
- The plans indicate that a minimum headroom clearance of 2.5 metres is provided above the disabled spaces and the waste collection and loading zone on the Basement 1 level. The traffic report states a minimum of 2.8 metres is provided above these areas. This is acceptable in both cases.

Gradient of ramps

- The proposed gradient of the accessways accords with the Planning Scheme.

Bicycles

- 47 bicycle spaces are required under the Planning Scheme comprising 5 spaces for employees, 24 spaces for residents and 18 spaces for visitors.
- The development proposes 206 spaces across the site comprising 166 spaces for residents, staff and accredited visitors on the site, 22 visitor spaces for the general public on the site, and 18 spaces along the footpath on Waterfront Place.
- Access to the bicycle parking facilities is acceptable.
- We have no objection to installing additional bicycle rails on public land. However, we would suggest having some bicycle spaces along Beach Street as well. In view of the above, the applicant shall fund the supply and installation of at least nine bicycle rails on public land. Installation shall be arranged by the Responsible Authority along the Waterfront Place and Beach Street frontage of the site or a nearby location.
- A Car Parking Management Plan (CPMP) is required as a condition of permit including how to use the bike racks and where residents, staff and accredited visitors should park.
- Resident and staff parking are proposed to be provided using a mix of vertical, horizontal and the Cora E3DT-GT staggered bicycle parking systems. The systems are acceptable and provide ground level parking options on the site.
- Ten electric bicycle parking spaces are proposed on the site using horizontal rails in secure and public locations. This is acceptable.
- A shower, change room and lockers have been provided for the commercial tenancies on the site. This is acceptable.

Pedestrians

- A pedestrian sight triangle is provided on the western side of the accessway. This is acceptable.

Loading and waste collection

- A loading area is provided on the site at the ground level measuring 11.0m length by 8.6m width with a 4.8m high clearance. This is acceptable.
- A swept path assessment has been provided demonstrating acceptable ingress and egress for Small Rigid Vehicles (SRVs up to 6.4m long) and Medium Rigid Vehicles (MRVs up to 8.8m long). The traffic report states that the majority of deliveries will be undertaken by SRVs with the occasional MRVs. The loading arrangement is satisfactory.

- On-street parking space is not guaranteed and any future request for on-street loading zones may not be supported.
- The Waste Management Plan should be referred to Council's Waste Management department for assessment.
- Waste collection is proposed on the site. Swept path assessment is provided for mini rear loader waste collection vehicles. This is acceptable.

Traffic Generation and Impact:

- The applicant's traffic engineer has stated that up to 66 vehicle movements can be expected during the respective peak hours. The daily traffic generated by residents is estimated to be 488 trips.
- A conservative estimate of 4 trips per employee and visitor parking space has been applied. The estimated daily traffic generated by the site is expected to be in the order of 568 trips, comprising 488 residential trips and 80 trips made by employees and accredited visitors.
- The traffic report has identified that trips will be distributed: 60 percent to the east and north using Beach Street and Bay Street; 20 percent to the north via Princes Street; and, 20 percent to the west via Beach Street. This appears to be reasonable.
- Traffic to and from the site will be restricted to left-in and left-out to and from Beach Street. Drivers are expected to undertake U-turns at the roundabout intersections of Beach Street/Swallow Street and Beach Street/Princes Street depending on the origin and destination of the trips.
- A SIDRA assessment of traffic queuing and delays has been undertaken at the intersections of Beach Street/Swallow Street and Beach Street/Princes Street. The additional traffic generated by the development is not expected to significantly increase queues and delay. The development is not expected to create significant adverse impact on traffic operations on the surrounding road network.
- The traffic report advises that U-turn bans can be introduced at the medians in Beach Street to prevent conflict and damage to kerbs and landscaping. In the future, if the council officers find any problems at this location that would be causing significant congestion or safety concerns then we could look into introducing a "No U-turn" sign.
-

On-street parking and vehicle crossovers:

- The existing on-street parking is generally a mix of short-term and long-term ticketed parking, with a small number of unrestricted parking spaces.
- Parking surveys undertaken in 2018 and 2019 indicate available parking opportunities in the surrounding area. At least 65 spaces were available in the surrounding area with greater parking availability overnight.
- A new double crossover is proposed on Beach Street. This will require the relocation of an existing bus stop and shelter.
- The applicant is required to submit a Functional Layout Plan (FLP), showing details of the crossover and changes to affected assets (e.g. trees, shelter, signage, line-marking), to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
- Approval from the Department of Transport is required to support the relocation of the bus stop and shelter.
- The new crossover should incorporate kerb extensions adjacent to match with the indented parking layout along Beach Street.
- The applicant is responsible for all costs, including those incurred by Council for associated changes to the street layout and assets.
- The new vehicle crossover to Beach Street shall be installed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

Parking overlay and parking provisions:

Use	Rate	Area/Number	Required	Provision	Shortfall/Surplus
One and two-bedroom dwelling	1 space per dwelling	92	92	93	0
Three or more bedroom dwelling	2 spaces per dwelling	27	54	54	0
Residential visitors	N/A	119 dwellings	0	28	+28
Food and drink / Retail	1 spaces to each 100 sq m	718 sq m	32	13	-19
Gymnasium and wellness centre	N/A	954 sq m	N/A	10	N/A
Visitors	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	N/A
			178	208	-19

- The proposal has a shortfall of 19 spaces under the Planning Scheme for the food, drink and retail uses. Noting that parking rates for the gymnasium and wellness centre are not specified in the Scheme.
- I am generally satisfied that the majority of residents and employees have sufficient long-term parking provision on the site.
- It is suggested that the surplus 28 residential visitor spaces be made available for staff that require.
- Residents/visitors/staff of the development will not be eligible for resident or visitor parking permits and will need to abide by on-street parking restrictions.
- Note that the assessment for the appropriate rate for car parking provision lies with Statutory Planning. Reference should be made to CoPP's Sustainable Parking Policy. We also suggest comparing previous approved parking provision rates of adjacent developments as part of the Planning team's assessment / determination.

Please email me if you have any questions.

Kind regards

Ted Teo/ Harry Rehal
Traffic Engineer

Acoustic Consultant Referral

From: [Darren Tardio](#)
To: [Jock Farrow](#)
Subject: RE: Planning Applications - 490/2020 - 1-7 Waterfront Place PORT MELBOURNE VIC 3207
Date: Sunday, 21 March 2021 9:42:06 PM
Attachments: [image004.png](#)
[image001.png](#)
[Port Phillip C104 Panel Report.pdf](#)

[External Email] Please be cautious before clicking on any links or attachments.

Hi Jock,

Apologies I ran out of time on Friday!

I have completed the review of the 1-7 Waterfront application and acoustic report.

1. I did some digging on the C107 Amendment. I have attached the Panel decision with relevant sections highlighted. While it isn't clear how the 45dBA and 30dBA numbers were derived, it is obvious that the Panel hearing at the time was severely lacking in expert evidence. 45dBA is a very high number for industrial noise inside a dwelling! I tend to agree with the submissions made on behalf of PoMC at the time, however it seems they did not go to the hearing with any real evidence. That said, the decision has been made and I will base my review on that, but it is worthwhile noting that:
 - a. SEPP N-1 compliance is an outdoor assessment. While the internal noise requirements of DDO23 have a pragmatic intention, PoMC is correct that it does not actually protect them. If a complaint is made in the future, it will be PoMC's responsibility to control the noise.
 - b. There are other existing residential uses surrounding the 1-7 Waterfront property. This means that even if there was a SEPP N-1 non-compliance at 1-7 Waterfront, PoMC are also likely to be non-compliant at many other properties anyway. So it is difficult to really argue that 1-7 Waterfront is encroaching on PoMC operations anyway. PoMC's concern is therefore a reasonable one in-principle, but should not really change anything for them in practice.
2. At 5.1 and 5.2 of the Acoustic Report, the consultant is relying on some very brief attended noise measurements on the site. Normally, I would be ok with this however this is inadequate in this case to reasonably justify they have captured normal noise emissions from the Port. An hour on site could have captured anything or nothing. The Port would obviously have varying noise emissions and while I can appreciate that it would be difficult to know when the 'Port facilities are in full operation' (to use the terms of DDO23). A pragmatic way of dealing with this would be for the consultant to carry out long-term noise monitoring (at least 7-days) using an unattended noise logger on the site.
3. There is no commentary in the Acoustic Report on whether Port noise was audible at any of the monitoring positions. The remainder of the report seems to base recommendations on other sources of noise (trams and traffic). From this, I take it to mean that Port noise was not picked up. This reinforces my comments above, that longer monitoring should be required to at least justify that either the Port does not typically generate noise at this location.
4. At 5.4 and 6.1 of the Acoustic Report, the measured data is 15-min but they have assessed against 1-hour. This may be immaterial, but it does not make a lot of sense to me. The requirement under SEPP N-1 is also 30-minutes. DDO23 does not mention a time interval but I think it is logical that this component should at least follow SEPP N-1 in-lieu of any other reference.
5. Table 4 of the Acoustic Report has minimum glazing requirements so there is something to hold the Developer to later, as nothing is noted on the Plans. The markups at Appendix A of the Acoustic Report show the different glazing requirements.
6. The Acoustic Report does not detail the calculations, however I can approximate that:
 - a. They recorded a level of 69dBA on the south facing façade
 - b. The proposed windows for bedrooms would result in an internal level of 35-40dB(A). This does not meet the DDO23 requirement of 30dB(A) in bedrooms.
 - c. The above might just be because the consultant has taken the measured noise level to not be coming from the Port, so the DDO23 is essentially ignored. As above, it would have assisted if they simply explained in the report that they did not

measure any noise from the Port.

I would not endorse the Acoustic Report in its current form, though I think the issues can easily be resolved by the consultant carrying out a more detailed assessment and providing some context here. Overall, the apparent shortcuts and lack of information makes it difficult to understand what they have actually assessed.

My recommendations:

1. Request the Applicant's acoustic consultant to provide the following:
 - a. Confirm if the Port was audible during measurements, or if the measured noise levels are inclusive of Port noise and what noise level the Port was generating.
 - b. Confirm how it was established that the Port was in full operation as required by DDO23. Alternatively, provide long term continuous monitoring (at least 7-days) to reasonably sample and establish the variability of Port operations.
 - c. Based on the level of Port noise at the site, confirm how the proposed glazing will satisfy DDO23, in particular for bedrooms.

Feel free to call to discuss further.

Darren Tardio

Director

Enfield Acoustics Pty Ltd

