

Planning Committee Meeting 24 June 2020

The following statement was submitted prior to the meeting. Submissions made live during the meeting include some variations and can be listened via our live stream webpage:

<http://webcast.portphillip.vic.gov.au/archive.php>

Dominic Zheng – Item 6.2 54-60 St Kilda Road, St Kilda

We would firstly like to thank the council officers, including the planning department, urban design and traffic engineers, for their well-considered report and recommendation.

We note this followed on from a productive community consultation meeting back in 24 February 2020 which was chaired by Andrew Bond. Following this meeting the project team undertook further consultation with a number of the submitters and with the Council planning officer which resulted in the revised plans which are before you this evening.

In terms of planning, we have sought to follow the previous permitted envelope (for the existing residential approval on the land) and have relocated the main entrance from Charnwood Rd to St Kilda Rd to activate St Kilda Rd south streetscape. The renowned local artist Reko Rennie has been commissioned to design and develop a custom artwork that commences outside the entrance. Rennie's work is represented in the National Gallery of Australia, the National Gallery of Victoria, Art Gallery of New South Wales, Art Gallery of Western Australia.

We also offer premium end of trip facilities located off the entrance lobby like other new office buildings in the CBD. We are keen to deliver a quality office building anchoring in a neighbourhood of landmark destinations.

We note that a number of offices along the leafy St Kilda Rd boulevard have been converted into residential apartments. As the extension of the boulevard and at the intersection of four vibrant neighbourhoods with seamlessly connected to the CBD, our vision is to upgrade and elevate the current two-level office building as an appealing, customisable option for professional services. Which is entirely consistent with the commercial 1 zoning of the land.

We have sought to provide large floor plates over seven levels with open-air balcony / terrace spaces including a significant green presence to distinguish 54-60 St Kilda Rd, St Kilda from traditional suburban office - delivering a totally curated experience for future tenants. The office proposal will strongly benefit the local community, boost the local economy and create more jobs all of which are positive outcomes particularly having regard to the current COVID crisis. Thank you for your time and we look forward to delivering this exciting new office project in accordance with the officer's recommendation.

Best Regards, Spacious Group

The following statement was submitted prior to the meeting and a summary of the statements were read out during the meeting by the Coordinator Governance.

Norma Walker - Item 6.2 54-60 St Kilda Road, St Kilda

I object to the proposal to construct a 7storey office building at 54-60 St. Kilda Road, St Kilda on the following grounds: Excessive Scale of Development

- 1 The building height exceeds the applicable discretionary height limit of 6 storeys and there is no justification for the excess under DDO 27.

- 2 The single storey street wall proposed for the St. Kilda Road frontage is inadequate in that it does not reflect the scale, heritage and architectural distinction of the existing St. Kilda Road frontages. Both Streets walls should only be 2-3 Stories. The proposed building will, to an excessive degree overlook the adjoining and nearby residential premises and their private open spaces. Appropriate screening of windows and decks should be a condition of permit as a minimum. Congestion, Noise, and Waste Management
- I Seeks enormous dispensation from the requirements of Clause 52.06. It will have with a shortfall of 114 car spaces i.e. 56 %. Where are visitors to the site going to park. This much office space and 3 retail shop fronts will create double parking etc.
 - II There is no provision for allocated spaces for service vehicles.
 - III There is no on-site loading facility.
 - IV No waste management report is included with the application at advertising.
 - V The current plan does not provide for separate toilet facilities for the retail spaces.

In Conclusion, this present proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site. It provides no visual cohesion to this area and is out of step with the street wall and building heights around it. Overwhelming the adjoining properties in terms of bulk and scale. The proposal is in excess of the Councils development framework from a scale, parking and design perspective.

John Kaufman – Item 6.3 3- 5 Prentice Street, St Kilda East

I have lived at a property on Prentice Street which has a 2-street frontage with Leslie street for close to 10 years. My children purchased a block in the Prentice street to be close to me but more importantly to their younger sister since family is very important to us.

We have never had issue with carparking over the 10 years except on the odd occasion of the pub down the road holding a major event which is usually over in 2hours. This is not anecdotal evidence but objective evidence supported by photographs provided to council and town planning.

I understand 3 independent expert car parking demand assessment reports also confirm this as does the detailed assessment from town planning that -

the amendment proposed will have no adverse impact on the amenity, or the on street parking availability, in Leslie and Prentice Streets

Since moving into the Prentice street I have met a number of neighbours who all own property in the street who have also have supported the application and they have done this in submissions initially with town planning and now have asked me to read their further support tonight. I will note their names and summarise their support. Nick Giannouloupoulos, Frank Torcasio, Rosie Katsikis, Danny Gluck & Rosaria Thorsen

I believe, there is compelling expert evidence to justify supporting this application. I hope that the Councillors adopt the recommendations of the expert and the town Planning Department and approve this application.

Simon Kaufman – Item 6.3 3- 5 Prentice Street, St Kilda East

My name is Simon Kaufman, I am the applicant with respect to town planning application for 5 Prentice Street, St Kilda East.

At the outset, I want to say that I respectfully request that the Councillors adopt the recommendation set out in the report prepared by the expert Town Planning Department and approve my application.

Firstly, I'd like to touch on my background and why this application was made.

My sister, Veronica, and I purchased the land at 5 Prentice Street in 2014. We are not developers. We purchased this land because our family, including our and little sister now 8 years old, live in Prentice Street and our dream was to move in to live close to family. Our design is for the construction of 2 dwellings, one for each of us. One unit faces Leslie Street and the other faces Prentice Street, each dwelling has 2 bedrooms and 1 off street car space. The design was approved and the construction is now almost complete. We were not married at the time this design was approved. A two-bedroom unit was more than sufficient for our working lifestyles. Since then, our lives and goals have changed. I am married and now have a baby daughter. Accordingly, I have made this application to split the large second bedroom in each dwelling into 2 rooms so as to accommodate growing families. There is no change to the built form or to the windows in this application. We are seeking a dispensation from providing a second off-street car parking space for each dwelling.

My wife and I currently live on Carlisle St. We are environmentally conscious and are able to share 1 car due to the abundance of public transport connectivity in the area. The off-street parking provided for at the dwellings is more than sufficient for our needs even with an extra bedroom.

I have obtained 3 independent expert car parking demand assessment reports as I wanted to verify the concerns of the objectors as they will soon be my neighbours. The objective evidence in each of the 3 expert reports is conclusive, that is:

- the amendment proposed will have no adverse impact on the amenity, or the onstreet parking availability, in Leslie and Prentice Streets. The reports said that on-street parking is available in both streets in the critical overnight period if it was required;
- It is not correct, as the objectors have assumed, that a corollary of adding 1 bedroom to a dwelling is that there will be a greater demand for on-street parking. Based on ABS data, car ownership is impacted by whether there is an increase in footprint/size of a development and whether the development is well supported by public transport. There will be no change in footprint or floor area of each dwelling under this application. Due to excellent public transport connectivity, we are unlikely to need more than 1 off-street car parking space anyway.

These opinions support my observations over the last 9 years as to available parking in both streets. No objector has provided any independent evidence to support their objection. All objections are based on subjective views and, with respect, should be given less weight by Council in making a decision as compared to the independent views expressed in the three expert reports I have furnished.

Council's Town Planning Department has recognised that the application fits within Port Phillip's planning policies and that there is compelling expert evidence to justify supporting this application. I hope that the Councillors adopt the recommendations of the expert Town Planning Department and approve this application.

Joseph Indomenico – Item 6.5 11 – 41 Buckhurst Street, South Melbourne

Intro

- On behalf of Alpha 14 Pty Ltd, we express our sincere thanks and gratitude to the officers at Council who have worked with us to reach this important milestone.
- This milestone is the result of an extensive and highly collaborative pre-lodgement and assessment process involving several workshops, discussions, emails exchanges and phone calls. Importantly, Council Officers have been involved in each step of the process and like others have influenced each decision made by the project team. We stress, it wasn't until the State Government and Council Officers indicated their in principle support of the design concept that an application was made with the Minister.
- It is our position that the application is entirely consistent with the planning scheme requirements relevant to the redevelopment of the site and broader State and Local policies, and as such, should be supported by Council as per the clear and strong recommendation contained within the Planning Department's delegate report.
- Given the time constraints that we are all under, I believe it's only necessary to provide comment on some of the key components of the application and why they are acceptable. These being:
 - Our flood response
 - Our affordable housing proposition
 - Overall height

Flood Response

- The project team has been involved in several discussions and workshops with Melbourne Water, DELWP, the Taskforce and Council in relation to a precinct wide solution to flood storage and street design and activation in Buckhurst Street and Buckhurst Lane.
- Whilst significant progress has been made by all relevant stakeholders, a final solution to this precinct wide issue is yet to be secured. Given this, we are forced to rely on the current statutory provisions and designing a building that balances the competing objectives of the planning scheme when it comes to managing flood risk and achieving street activation and accessibility.
- We have made it clear to all relevant stakeholders that a condition could be added to the permit that requires adjustments to be made to the ground floor, should a precinct wide solution is secured prior to the commencement of the development. Importantly, initial design work has been undertaken to date to confirm that adjustments can be made to the ground floor with ease without requiring further design amendments to the overall building.

Affordable Housing

- The proposal includes 7 Affordable Houses and 5 Social Houses.
- As detailed within the delegate report, we have put forward three models that can facilitate the delivery of Affordable Housing at the site.

Height

- As noted in the Delegate Report, the site lies within Area M5 of the Montague Precinct in Fishermens Bend.
- The planning control identifies that the preferred building typology for this area is:

“Predominantly mid-rise developments with some high-rise forms on larger sites where well-spaced, slender towers can be demonstrated to provide sunlight access to streets with a particular focus on Buckhurst Street, incorporating a tooth and gap typology.”

- The planning control defines ‘mid-rise’ as buildings between 7-15 storeys and ‘high rise’ as buildings greater than 16 storeys.
- When we break-down the preferred character statement for Area M5, it is clear that our application satisfies the tests for a ‘high rise’ building.
 1. **The site is large** by way of the substantial consolidation that has occurred to create a development parcel in the order of XXsqm.
 2. **The tower forms are well spaced and slender** and align with the Taskforce’s expectation. We can take Council to pre-lodgement advice provided by the Taskforce, as well as the Taskforce’s formal referral response on the application which clearly defines what a well spaced and slender tower is and how our development is achieving it.
 3. **The building does not overshadow street** or future public open space areas nearby. Our application material confirms this.
- In addition to the ‘high rise’ tests being met, we also note that:
 1. The height of the building is not in any way setting a precedent as it is consistent with what has been approved and / or under construction nearby. We draw the Council’s attention to clause 6.12 of the delegate report.
 2. Any reduction in height will change the overall composition of mass, bulk and scale, and will undermine the comprehensive analysis that has been carried out by the project team, Council’s planners and the State Government, including the Taskforce.
 3. Any reduction in height will result in a reduction in affordable housing through the loss of yield.

Patrick Brennan - Item 6.6 134 – 142 Ferrars Street, South Melbourne

1. The amendment to the existing condition is sought due to a change in the proposed ownership model – the development is proposed to be **built-to-rent**, rather than build-to sell as was originally intended when the permit was issued. Due to the proposed ownership arrangements, the current condition cannot be satisfied.
2. We note that the Council report suggests the proposed affordable housing period is 15-years, however **20-years** is what has been agreed with DELWP and by our client.
3. A summary **of the proposal** is provided as follows:
 - **6% affordable housing** - i.e. Six (6) of the proposed dwellings.
 - Tenants for the affordable housing units would be selected in accordance with established affordable **housing eligibility criteria** and / or in partnership with existing affordable housing providers.
 - Affordable housing units would be rented at rates which meet the test of ‘**affordable**’ having regard to the income bands published by the State Government and specified in Section 3AB – Specification of Income Ranges of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 and agreed with the Responsible Authority.
 - The affordable housing units would be offered as affordable housing for a period of **20 years**.

4. We submit that the 20-year affordable housing period is appropriate due to the additional financial burden carried by the owner which would ordinarily be passed onto an affordable housing provider. This includes:
 - Maintenance of the affordable dwellings and common areas.
 - Maintenance and replacement of fixtures, fittings, furniture, appliances.
 - Owners corporation fees.
 5. We also note that Council's report suggests that Council's RFI has not been addressed. A written response to this request was provided on **2 December 2019**, and repeated requests were made by our office and DELWP over last **7-months** for Council to clarify its position. We were advised that this matter would be heard at tonight's meeting on Monday.
 6. The approved development has commenced, and the amendment seeks to facilitate the **delivery of affordable housing on this site within the next 12-18 months**.
 7. The outcome if Council were to oppose this amendment, will most likely be a delay to this development and delay the delivery of affordable housing on this site.
-

The following statements were submitted prior to the meeting and a summary of the statements were read out during the meeting by the Coordinator Governance.

Chris Connell – Item 6.3 3- 5 Prentice Street, St Kilda East

On-site car parking is a Valuable asset to the owner/ occupier. On-site car parking is a Valuable asset to the neighbours and the City of Port Phillip.

I have been designing for over 30 years with experience in Interior and Architectural projects. Internal layout and configuration is critical from the initial brief through to construction completion and on-site parking is an important factor.

The City of Port Phillip Integrated Transport Strategy Document 2018-28 'MOVE, CONNECT, LIVE' states on page 10 "Our road networks are finite and we have limited ability to increase on-street car parking capacity" and "if car ownership trends continue there will be a 24% increase in the number of cars owned in The City of Port Phillip" **"Our Current Supply Of On-Street Car Parking Spaces Is Barely Enough To Meet Current Demands"**

It is the responsibility of the Designer/ Architect to offer the best solution by applying their experience, principles of the Planning guidelines i.e. RESCODE and ensure the designer has explored all avenues to achieve and provide a good design outcome for the Developer. Importantly making effort to minimise or eliminate any impact to the neighbour's amenities and privileges and Parking availability. From the current approved drawings and on-site built conditions, the long room/2nd bedroom of each dwelling and layout of the bathrooms and passage, one would presume it was always the intention to divide this 2nd bedroom creating a 3rd.

From my experience given the size of the blocks from both Prentice and Leslie Streets the Applicant could have provided 3 Bedrooms plus the required 2 on-site car parking spaces being it tandem or stacker options and COMPLIED with RESCODE. From the outset 2014 (5-6 years ago) the Architect had the opportunity to design responsibly and appropriately. NOW, with the project in its final stage of completion the applicant requires an extra bedroom and to waiver an on-site car space to each dwelling. In brief RESCODE states 2

bedrooms require 1 on-site car space 3 Bedrooms require 2 on-site car spaces. Is the car parking waiver warranted? as stated in the City of Port Phillip report to this Application.

Given the sensitivity to this Application and with the number of objectors to waiver the on-site car parking space to each dwelling, I trust council will take serious consideration of the RESCODE guidelines regarding 2 & 3 bedroom developments with appropriate car parking requirements and NOT support this application.

Claire Szymczyk - Item 6.7 101 Salmon Street, Port Melbourne

We'd like to thank the officers for their work on this application and their recommendation for support. We have worked hard to address Council's previous concerns and are confident that the amended proposal before you will contribute positively to Fishermans Bend. This amended application provides the opportunity to bring the project in line with the recast vision for the Wirraway Precinct. The proposal now includes significant social/community benefits and represents a high-quality design that will contribute to the public realm and assist in the transition of the area to a vibrant, mixed-use and family-friendly precinct.