# Ministerial Planning Referral: TPM-2015-15 <br> 556-558 Lonsdale Street and 560-566 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne 

8 March 2016

Presenter: Jane Birmingham, Practice Leader Statutory Planning

## Purpose and background

1. The purpose of this report is to advise the Future Melbourne Committee of a Ministerial referral of a Planning Application at 556-558 Lonsdale Street and 560-566 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne (refer to Attachment 2 - Locality Plan). Council is not a recommending referral authority for the application however Council's comments on the application have been sought by the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP). The application is generally exempt from third party notice and review rights. The applicant is ERM Australia, the owner of the land is Melbourne Grand Apartments owned by Central Equity and the architects are Guilford Bell and Graham Fisher Architects.
2. The subject site is located within the Capital City Zone - Schedule 1 and is affected by the Heritage Overlay HO720 at 556-558 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne and Parking Overlay Schedule 1. 556-558 Lonsdale Street is also on the Victorian Heritage Register.
3. The planning application seeks approval for demolition of the commercial building at 560-566 Lonsdale Street and construction of a multi-storey building (233m) which cantilevers over the heritage building at 556-558 Lonsdale Street. The application proposes 887 apartments, $830 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of office and retail, 311 car spaces, an on site loading bay and residential facilities.

## Key issues

4. Key issues in consideration in this application are the appropriateness of the built form and its impact on public realm (including the new cross over to Lonsdale Street) and internal amenity.
5. The proposed development by virtue of its height and inadequate setbacks represents an over development of the site and would have adverse impact on the public realm and does not adequately respond to the urban context nor the development potential of the adjoining sites.
6. The proposed removal of a mature street tree results in the loss of a significant asset to Melbourne City Council and also results in the loss of future planting opportunities in this location.
7. The proposed crossover on Lonsdale Street could impede pedestrian flows, is a poor urban design outcome and results in the removal of a Loading Zone space which is used by neighbouring businesses.
8. The proposal would result in inadequate internal amenity by reason of reliance on long narrow passages for light to bedrooms of some apartments.

## Recommendation from management

9. That the Future Melbourne Committee resolves to advise Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning that the Melbourne City Council objects to the proposal for the reasons outlined in the delegate report (Attachment 4).

## Attachments

## Supporting Attachment

## Legal

1. The Minister for Planning is the Responsible Authority for determining this application.

## Finance

2. There are no direct financial issues arising from the recommendations contained within this report.

## Conflict of interest

3. No member of Council staff, or other person engaged under a contract, involved in advising on or preparing this report has declared a direct or indirect interest in relation to the matter of the report.

## Stakeholder consultation

4. Council officers have not advertised the application or referred this to any other referral authorities. This is the responsibility of the DELWP acting on behalf of the Minister for Planning.

## Relation to Council policy

5. Relevant Council policies are discussed in the attached delegate report (refer to Attachment 3).

## Environmental sustainability

6. A condition of the permit requires an environmentally sustainable design statement to be submitted demonstrating that the development has the preliminary design potential to achieve a 6.6 Star Rating against the STEPS Tool.

TPM-2015-15 556-558 Lonsdale Street \& 560-566 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne
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## PLANNING REPORT

## MINISTERIAL REFERRAL

| Application number: | TPM-2015-15 |
| :--- | :--- |
| DTPLI Application number: | $2015 / 32884$ |
| Applicant / Owner / Architect: | Melbourne Grand Apartments C/- ERM <br> Australia / Melbourne Grand Apartments - <br> owned by Central Equity / Guilford Bell and <br> Graham Fisher Architects |
| Address: | 556-558 Lonsdale Street \& 560-566 <br> Lonsdale Street, MELBOURNE VIC 3000 |
| Proposal: | Demolition of the existing building and <br> construction of a multi-level building (70 <br> storeys to a height of 233.5m). |
| Cost of works: | \$20 million |
| Date received by City of Melbourne: | 16 June 2015 |
| Responsible officer: | Kate Yuncken |
| Report Date: | 12 February 2016 |
| (DM\#9696767) |  |

## 1. SUBJECT SITE AND SURROUNDS

### 1.1. The site

The subject site comprises Nos.556-558 and Nos.560-566 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne and is located on the north side of Lonsdale Street between King and William Streets. The land is 'L' Shaped, with a frontage of 26.99 metres to Lonsdale Street and 36.24 metres to Healeys Lane and an overall area of approximately $2187 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.

The site comprises two land parcels, being:
556-558 Lonsdale Street - Certificate of Title Volume 3329 Folio 634
560-566 Lonsdale Street - Certificate of Title Volume 9825 Folio 485
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The topography of the land is relatively level across the site. No. 560-566 Lonsdale Street is currently developed with a two storey commercial building which covers the entire site, and 556-558 Lonsdale Street comprises a two storey early Victorian terrace building currently used as a restaurant. The Victorian terrace is within Heritage Overlay HO720 and listed on the Victorian Heritage Register (ref HO441). The statement of significance from Heritage Victoria states the following:

The premises are of architectural significance as an illustrative example of a shop/house in 1850s Melbourne. Although not completely authentic, the scale and form of the building, and some of the interior spaces, are indicative of this early period. The shop window is probably amongst the earlier examples of its type.
The premises at 556-558 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne are of historical significance as one of the older surviving buildings in central Melbourne. This building appears to be one of the few in Melbourne, which remain largely intact from the 1850s.


Subject site - Lonsdale Street, Melbourne
The applicant has declared that the application will not breach any encumbrance on the subject site such as an easements or restrictive covenants.

### 1.2. Surrounds

The surrounding sites are developed with a range of building styles and heights. To the west are a number of properties that border the subject site. As demonstrated in the aerial images these properties range in height from to two to three stories and contain residential and commercial uses.


Subject site and surrounds (view from the west)


Subject site and surrounds (view from the south)
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Lonsdale Street has two lanes of traffic in either direction with a shared parallel parking/bus lane provided on both sides of the road and parking within the central median. Healey Lane, a Council owned lane, provides a north south pedestrian through block link and also provides vehicle access to the subject site.

## 2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposal seeks approval for demolition of the commercial building at 560-566 Lonsdale Street and construction of a multi-storey building which cantilevers over 556-558 Lonsdale Street.

The initial plans and application documents referred to the City of Melbourne for comment were received on 16 June 2015. DELWP and Council officers have met with the applicant on a number of occasions and have raised concerns with the absence of setbacks coupled with the height of the proposed tower.
The applicant subsequently amended the plans in response to DELWP and Council's and feedback. The changes include:

- Reducing the number of saddleback bedrooms
- Marginally increased the setbacks to the north
- Increasing the residential amenities offering
- Provision of a new bluestone footpath along Healeys Lane
- Revised vehicle access to the site following advice from waste and traffic engineers

The applicant also provided with the amended plans additional information as requested from DELWP. These amended plans and application documents were referred to the City of Melbourne for comment and were received on 16 December 2015.

## Uses

The application proposes the following uses for the whole site:
Proposed uses:

| Component | Proposed Plan |
| :--- | :--- |
| Residential Dwellings | Total: 887 <br> Studio: 99 <br> One bedroom: 251 <br> Two bedroom: 375 <br> Three bedroom:162 |
| Commercial (inc. Office \& Retail) | $830 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Car Parking Spaces | 311 spaces |
| Motorcycle Spaces | 3 spaces |
| Bicycle Parking | 274 spaces |
| Gross floor area (GFA) | $96,710.38 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Plot ratio | $44: 1$ |

## Buildings and works

The application proposes a new residential building located in the western section of the site at 560-566 Lonsdale Street with part of the tower cantilevering over the heritage building to the east. Specific details of the new residential building are as follows:

| Building height | 233.4 m to top of roof parapet (252.7AHD) <br> 70 levels (including mezzanine, and plant) |
| :--- | :--- |


| Podium height | 40 m (59.8AHD) up to level 10 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Front, side and rear setbacks | The podium is generally built to the north, east and south boundaries of the site (with the exception of a setback of 5 metre setback to the north, adjacent to 557 Little Lonsdale St). <br> The proposed tower has the following setbacks: <br> North - Minimum of 5.3 m to the façade of the building and 3.6 m to the balcony <br> South $-7 m$ to the façade of the building and $5 m$ to the balcony to Lonsdale Street and 3.8m to 552-554 Lonsdale Street <br> East - Minimum of 5 m to the façade of the building and 3.3 m to the balcony <br> West - 5 m to the boundary |
| Ground floor | Lobby, lifts and amenities, 3 retail tenancies, substation, waste storage, loading bay (accessed via Healeys Lane), substation, water meter assembly, gas meters, car parking and bicycle entry ramp (accessed via Lonsdale Street) |
| Mezzanine | Retail tenancy, lifts, bicycle and car parking |
| Level 1-9 (podium) | Car parking with a skin of apartments facing Lonsdale Street and Healeys Lane |
| Levels 10 (podium) | Residential amenities and apartments |
| Typical tower | Apartments |
| Materials and finishes | Predominately coloured glazing and painted concrete. Artwork in the form of an image is proposed to be located on the west facing podium. |
| Loading/unloading | A loading bay area is proposed via Healeys Lane with an area of 198m² |
| Vehicle access | Vehicle access via Lonsdale Street and servicing access for waste collection and loading/unloading via Healeys Lane. |

## Street Trees - Lonsdale Street

The application proposes to remove one street tree to construct a new crossover and driveway to service the future building. Construction will be within the tree protection zone of another street tree and canopy reduction pruning would be required to provide separation distance for the proposed building.


Ground floor plan


Perspective - King and Lonsdale Street
Section of the proposal
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## 3. BACKGROUND

### 3.1. Heritage Victoria Register

As stated above in Section 1.1,556-558 Lonsdale Street is included within Heritage Overlay HO712 and listed on the Victorian Heritage Register VHR No. H440. As such, a heritage permit is required for the proposal from Heritage Victoria.
Accordingly, no planning permit is required under the Heritage Overlay.
On 23 September 2014, Heritage Victoria referred a Heritage Application to the City of Melbourne (HV-2014-69). Council advised by letter that the Heritage Application was not supported primarily because inadequate information had been provided to allow the proposal to be fully assessed.
On 16 December 2015 Heritage Victoria issued Heritage Permit (P22062) which allows the:
Intrusion into the airspace above the registered building footprint by an adjoining proposed high-rise redevelopment plus repair works to the registered heritage building

## 4. PLANNING SCHEME PROVISIONS

The following provisions of the Melbourne Planning Scheme apply:

| State Planning <br> Policies | - Clause 9, Plan Melbourne |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | - Clause 11.01, Activity Centres |
|  | - Clause 15.01-2, Urban design principles |
|  | - Clause 15.02-1, Energy and resource efficiency |
|  | - Clause 17.01, Commercial |
|  | - Clause 18.02-2, Cycling |
|  | - Clause 18.02-5, Car parking 21.02, Municipal Profile |
| Municipal <br> Strategic <br> Statement | - Clause 21.03, Vision |
|  | - Clause 21.05, City Structure and Built Form |
|  | - Clause 21.06, Built Environment and Heritage |
|  | - Clause 21.08, Economic Development |
|  | - Clause 22.01, Urban Destansport |

- Clause 22.23, Stormwater Management (Water Sensitive Urban Design)

| Statutory Controls |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Clause 37.04 | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Pursuant to Clause 37.04-1 and 1.0 of CCZ1, a planning permit is not } \\ \text { Capital City } \\ \text { Zonuired to use the land for accommodation or retail premises. }\end{array}$ |
| (Outside the retail 1 |  |
| core) (CCZ1) |  |\(\left.\quad \begin{array}{l}Pursuant to Clause 37.04-4 and 3.0 of CCZ1, a permit is required to <br>

construct a building or construct or carry out works. <br>
Pursuant to Clause 37.04-4 and 4.0 of CCZ1, a permit is required to <br>
construct a building or construct or carry out works, and to demolish or <br>
remove a building or works.\end{array}\right]\)

## Particular Provisions

| Clause 52.06 <br> Car Parking | Refer to PO1 regarding car parking rates. <br> Clause 52.06-8 provides design standards for car parking. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Clause 52.07 <br> Loading and <br> vehicles of | Pursuant to Clause 52.07, no building or works may be constructed for <br> the manufacture, servicing, storage or sale of goods or materials unless: <br> 'Space is provided on the land for loading and unloading <br> vehicles as specified in the table below. |
| -The driveway to the loading bay is at least 3.6 metres wide. If a <br> driveway changes direction or intersects another driveway, the <br> internal radius at the change of direction or intersection must be <br> at least 6 metres. |  |
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|  | - The road that provides access to the loading bay is at least 3.6 metres wide.' <br> A permit may be granted to reduce or waive these requirements if either: <br> - The land area is insufficient. <br> - Adequate provision is made for loading and unloading vehicles to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.' <br> For a floor area of 2600 square metres or less in a single occupation, the minimum loading bay dimensions are: <br> - Area 27.4 square metres <br> - Length 7.6 metres <br> - Width 3.6 metres <br> - Height clearance 4.0 metres <br> The development therefore requires a loading area of 27.4 m 2 for the retail component only. The combined refuse room and loading dock have an area in excess of $130 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ with a height clearance in excess of 5.0 metres within the refuse room, well in excess of the above requirement, a planning permit is not required pursuant to Clause 52.07. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Clause 52.34 <br> Bicycle Facilities | Pursuant to Clause 52.34-2, a permit is required to reduce or waive any requirement of Clause 52.34-3 and 52.34-4. <br> Table 1 of Clause 52.34-3 specifies the following relevant rates: <br> - Office - 1 employee space each 300 square metres of net floor area if the net floor area exceeds 1000 square metres and 1 visitor spaces to each 1000 square metres of leasable floor area if the net floor area exceeds 1000 square metres <br> - Retail premises - 1 employee space to each 300 square metres of leasable floor space and 1 visitor space to each 500 square metres of leasable floor space <br> Table 2 of Clause 52.34-3 states: <br> - If 5 or more employee bicycle spaces are required, 1 shower for the first 5 employee bicycle spaces, plus 1 to each 10 employee bicycle spaces thereafter. <br> Table 3 of Clause 52.34-3 states: <br> - 1 change room or direct access to a communal change room to each shower. The change room may be a combined shower and change room. <br> Based on the above rates, the proposal requires: <br> - 183 employee spaces for the offices <br> - 55 visitor spaces for the offices <br> - 5 employee space for the retail premises <br> - 3 visitor spaces for the retail premises <br> The proposal includes 368 bicycle parking spaces and 36 showers therefore, no planning permit is required pursuant to Clause 52.34. |
| Clause 52.36 <br> Integrated Public <br> Transport <br> Planning | An application for an office in excess of 10,000 square metres of leasable floor area must be referred to PTV for comment. DELWP is responsible for this referral requirement. |


| General Provisions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Clause 61.01 <br> Administration <br> and enforcement <br> of this scheme | The Minister for Planning is the responsible authority for this planning <br> permit application as the total floor area of the development exceeds <br> 25,000 square metres. |
| Clause 65 <br> Decision <br> GuidelinesBefore deciding on an application or approval of a plan, the responsible <br> authority must consider the decision guidelines of Clause 65. |  |
| Clause 66 <br> Referral and <br> Notice Provisions | These provisions set out the types of applications which must be <br> referred under Section 55 of the Act or for which notice must be given <br> under Section 52(1)(c) of the Act. |

## Planning Scheme Amendments C262 \& C266

Planning Scheme Amendment C262 was gazetted into the Melbourne Planning Scheme on 4 September 2015 to provide interim built form controls for 12 months within the Capital City Zone Schedules 1, 2 and 3, including the subject site. Changes to the Capital City Zone Schedules include increased control of shadow impacts and more stringent wind effect requirements. The amendment inserts a new Schedule 10 to Clause 43.02 Design and Development Overlay to introduce mandatory built form controls and a discretionary site plot ratio and makes the City of Melbourne a recommending referral authority at the Schedule to Clause 66.04.

The amendment also made changes to Clause 22.01 - Urban Design Policy within the Capital City Zone and Clause 22.02 - Sunlight to Public Spaces to reflect the built form outcomes sought from the changes to CCZ and DDO10.

Amendment C266 to the Melbourne Planning Scheme was gazetted on Monday 16 November 2015. This amendment was required to ensure that applications lodged prior to the gazettal of Amendment C262 are assessed against the version of the scheme in operation at the time (including the former Clauses 22.01 and 22.02) of lodgement.

In summary, the planning controls and policies that apply to this application are those that are prior to Amendment C262 (Built Form Controls).

## 5. PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

The application has been referred to the City of Melbourne for comment by the DELWP. Pursuant to CCZ1 and DDO1, the application is exempt from the notice requirements of Section 52 (1) (a), (b) and (d), the decision requirements of Section 64 (1), (2) and (3) and the review rights of Section 82 (1) of the Act.

Melbourne City Council has been provided with copies of two objections (one addressed to the Minister for Planning and the other Council and has been forwarded to the Minister. The key issues raised by objectors are:

- A poor response to Local Context and Policy
- An inappropriate scale of development, excessive scale and bulk
- Poor podium treatment and setbacks
- An inappropriate typology
- Excessive off site overshadowing impacts
- Poor internal amenity
- Poorly dimensioned and specified common areas
- Poor design expression
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- Adverse amenity impacts on residential properties (excessive height, noise and loss of natural light)


## 6. REFERRALS

The application was referred to the following internal departments:

- Urban Design
- Engineering (Traffic, Civil and Waste)
- Urban Sustainability (Street Trees)

The comments received are summarised below.

### 6.1 Urban design

The proposal is still considered an overdevelopment of the site, and is not supported.

## Tower setbacks and scale

The proposed tower setback from the north boundary has been increased from about 4 m to an average in the order of 5.5 m . This remains insufficient, as do the other boundary setbacks.

For a building of this height (225m, 67 storeys), average setbacks from both streets need to be at least 10 m (consistent with Cl 22.01 ). To ensure well-spaced towers together with equitable development rights for adjoining properties, setbacks in the order of 10 m should be provided from common boundaries (unless air-rights have been purchased from these properties, and their development potential correspondingly constrained).

## Building Program

To minimise the extent of inactive frontage at ground level, it would be ideal if the loading bay could be accessed off the carpark driveway (or if it replaced the carpark entry, with the parking deleted); as a minimum, the loading bay should be narrower and the retail space increased. To help maximise activation, it would be preferable to have only one entry to the main lobby. We support the placement of the substation deep within the building.

The blank west wall will be highly visible. The design strategy for this wall could succeed. Similar attention needs to be given to visible portions of the blank north podium elevation. Deeper modelling of lower-level street elevations is warranted than is currently shown, and there should be recesses to balance the projections. Green walls are supported, but would need to be designed and maintained in such a way as to ensure that they thrive, and to still present well in the event that plants fail.

In addition to its prominence in the Lonsdale St streetscape, the building will terminate views up Crombie Lane, which is part of a north-south pedestrian route of increasing significance. It is questionable whether the current design achieves the quality warranted for such a prominent building, and the design certainly does not justify exemption from the Cl 22.01 design standards discussed in paragraph 1 above.

## Building Elevations

The applicant is now proposing a graphic based on an old photo to the blank west wall. This could succeed, subject to the design being well-resolved and well-integrated. More detailed information would be needed to assess this.

The provision of green walls to the loading bay doors is an interesting idea.

## Public Space

## Page 29 of 35

We are supportive of the Healeys Lane footpath being paved in bluestone.

### 6.2 Engineering

## Traffic

- The proposed parking provision is acceptable as it is below the maximum car parking requirement specified by PO1.
- Motorcycle and bicycle parking provisions meet the statutory requirements of the MPS however additional spaces should be provided. Considering the maximum parking limitation of 893 car parking spaces, it is requested that a minimum of 18 motorcycle spaces be provided.
- The proposed area of loading facilities meets and exceeds the requirements specified by Clause 52.27 . However, confirmation of the height clearance within the loading dock is required.
- While the applicants' traffic assessment indicates that the security door will be set back from the Lonsdale St boundary, the door does not appear to be shown on the plans. In order to ensure that entering vehicles do not stop on the footpath \& obstruct pedestrians/traffic while waiting for the door to open, the door should be offset at least $5-6 \mathrm{~m}$ from the site boundary. Ultimately, a planning permit condition could specify that the access arrangements are to be provided to the satisfaction of Melbourne City Council's traffic engineers.
- The proposal to provide a new double width crossover to Lonsdale St is generally not supported, given that other properties along this section of the street are typically accessed via the abutting laneways rather than via Lonsdale St directly. The new crossover would result in the removal of up to 8 m of Loading Zone space, which is used by neighbouring businesses.
- The impact of the vehicles accessing/egressing the site on the operation of the nearby signalised pedestrian crossing should be comprehensively assessed (including SIDRA analysis), to the satisfaction of Melbourne City Council's traffic engineers.
- Appropriate measures should be provided to ensure that vehicles don't turn right into/from the site, either via the centre-of-road parking bays (if there are no parked vehicles) or via the Keep Clear road marking opposite Crombie Ln (then travelling wrong way westbound). This may require the installation of No Right Turn signs/other measures, to the satisfaction of ES.
- The swept path diagrams indicated that access/egress into/from some of the parking spaces requires several turning manoeuvres. In order to avoid any possible issues being raised by future residents of this development regarding the parking difficulties, it is recommended that they be asked to park their vehicles in the space allocated to them, prior to making a decision to purchase the dwelling. Any of the spaces which require > 1 manoeuvre to either access/egress for a B85 vehicle (i.e. spaces requiring $\geq 1$ corrective manoeuvre) should be clearly marked as 'small car' spaces. Any of the spaces requiring > 5 manoeuvres to either access/egress (i.e. spaces requiring $\geq 5$ corrective manoeuvres) should be deleted, as they are not considered to be reasonably accessible.
- A note should be placed on the planning permit, stating:
"Council may not change the on-street parking restrictions to accommodate the access, servicing, delivery \& parking needs of this development. As per Council's policy, the developments in this area are not entitled to resident parking permits. Therefore, the residents/visitors of this development will not be eligible to receive parking permits \& will not be exempt from any on-street parking restrictions. Vehicles parking/stopping illegally in Healeys Lane may block access to/egress from the loading dock. The City of Melbourne will not get involved in resolving any access difficulties/disputes that may occur as a result of vehicles parking in this laneway.
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Vehicles may not be able to access some of the parking spaces in a single movement \& may need to make corrective manoeuvres in order to do so. Council will not accept responsibility for any damage incurred to the vehicles within the car park".

- Pedestrian visibility splay is proposed at the exit from the car park in accordance with Clause 52.06, which is supported.


## Civil design

- We support the provision of a new bluestone footpath in Healeys Lane. The footpath is required from the stormwater drainage point of view. The road abutting the subject land along Healeys Lane has the high point on the pavement centreline with a fall to each side of the road. As a result, the stormwater running down the street during heavy rains might cause flooding to the building. Alternatively, the finished ground floor levels of the building adjacent to the road shall be designed 150 mm above the abutting road pavement. We recommend to confirm with our traffic engineers that they have no objection to the provision of the footpath. If the new footpath is supported by our Traffic Team we recommend to include the following condition into the planning permit:
The new bluestone footpath in Healeys Lane must be constructed prior to the occupation of the development, in accordance with plans and specifications first approved by the City of Melbourne - Engineering Services.
- The existing and new footpath shall be extended to the boundaries of the loading bay entry off Healeys Lane.
- The hydronic vertical gardens fixed to gate and façade of the building abutting Healeys Lane shall not project beyond the street alignment.
- The canopy of the building encroaching over Healeys Lane shall be designed at a minimum height of 5.0 metres from the road pavement.
- The architectural drawings TP-158 and TP-159 show alterations the footpath levels in Lonsdale Street and Healeys Lane to accommodate access to the building. We object to the proposed entrance levels to the building. The entrance levels to the building shall be redesigned to maintain the continues gradient of the footpath along the street. We also recommend to include the following condition into the planning permit:
Prior to the commencement of the development, the detailed drawings showing the entrance levels of the building adjacent to the road infrastructure must be submitted to and approved by the City of Melbourne - Engineering Services.
- We object to the outward opening door projecting into Lonsdale Street. The door shall be redesigned such that it does not project beyond the street alignment when open, when closed or when being opened or closed.


## Waste

The submitted WMP has several issues that will need to be addressed:

- The size of the waste compactor is inappropriate. Council will only collect the equivalent of the residential component for this development. Therefore with the residential generating up to $84,040 \mathrm{~L}$ of waste the garbage compactor either needs to be smaller and collected two a week or larger and collected once a week at 3:1 compaction.
- The size for the recycling compactor is inappropriate. Council will only collect the equivalent of the residential component for this development. Therefore with the residential generating up to $91,360 \mathrm{~L}$ of recycling the compactor either needs to be smaller and collected three a week or larger and collected twice a week at 2:1 compaction.
- Swept path diagrams are using the wrong sized vehicle for this collection method. Swept paths need to show unloaded truck in and loaded truck out as the compactor can change the dimensions of the truck once loaded (overhang makes it longer on
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exit). Council trucks are as follows: Up to 19 m 3 unloaded is 8 m and up to 25 m 3 is 9 m unloaded - loaded will depend on compactor lengths.

### 6.3 Urban Sustainability

The proposed removal of the tree raises serious conflict with City of Melbourne tree retention policy, which does not support tree removal for development.

It also contravenes the principle of the Urban Forest Strategy to increase canopy cover within the City. Furthermore, the location of the crossover will result in the loss of a planting location in perpetuity which is of considerable concern.
This means that there is no potential for replanting and loss of environmental services, which is less than desirable given predicted climate change, urban heat island and the mitigating effect trees have on this.

The simple point in time costs we provide for tree removals would therefore be substantially undervalued compared to the loss of all future services.

This sets a dangerous precedent for tree removal and loss of planting sites within the City.
On this basis Urban Sustainability strongly objects to the proposal and believes a redesign is required that allows for retention of the trees and planting sites.

## 7. ASSESSMENT

The application seeks the approval for demolition of existing commercial building at 560-566 Lonsdale Street and construction of a multi-storey building which cantilevers over 556-558 Lonsdale Street. The key issues for consideration in the assessment of this application are:

- Heritage
- Built form
- External amenity impacts
- Tree protection
- Engineering
- Environmentally sustainable design
- Stormwater management

These issues are addressed in the following sections.

### 7.1. Heritage

The eastern lot of the site is listed on the Victorian Heritage Register and no permit is required under the Heritage Overlay to develop a heritage place which is included on the Victorian Heritage Register.

On 16 December 2015 Heritage Victoria issued Heritage Permit (P22062) which allows the:
Intrusion into the airspace above the registered building footprint by an adjoining proposed high-rise redevelopment plus repair works to the registered heritage building

### 7.2. Built form

With regard to built form, Clause 22.01, Urban Design within the Capital City Zone, 22.20, CBD Lanes, provides policy guidance including building design, facades and public spaces.
The proposed building has a clearly differentiated podium/tower configuration, which is the preferred building typology described in the Urban Design Policy.
In terms of setbacks, Clause 22.01 states that towers should be setback 10 metres from street frontages. The proposal clearly does not comply with this policy with a 7 metre setback from the façade of the building and a 5 metre setback from the balconies to Lonsdale Street. The minimum tower setback in combination with the height of the building at 223.4 metres
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will result in a building which will overwhelm the pedestrian and be visually intrusive and dominant from Lonsdale and King Streets and surrounds. This intrusion will adversely affect these streetscapes.

Of relevance to the setbacks, Clause 22.01 also states that towers greater than 45 metres should be setback 24 metres from any surrounding towers. The closest towers are the adjoining property to the north at 557-561 Little Lonsdale Street ( 84 metres), 270 King Street ( 67 metres) and 479 La Trobe Street ( 99 metres). The tower at 557-561 Little Lonsdale Street consists of 212 apartments and is setback 5 metres from the subject site's northern boundary (ref to aerial photographs above - site and surrounds).

The lack of building setbacks from the northern and (for part) southern boundaries are considered to prejudice redevelopment opportunities for these properties. It is noted that Clause 22.01 generally encourages development above 45 metres to be setback 24 metres from any surrounding podium-tower.
The policy does however allow a reduction in tower separation setbacks where it can be demonstrated that towers are offset and habitable room windows do not directly face one another and does not limit the redevelopment of adjoining sites. It is noted that, although the properties to the north and south have not been developed with towers, future potential amenity impacts such as overlooking and loss of outlook could occur if developments of similar built form were to occur on these sites in the future. The setbacks from the north and south boundaries between the proposed tower and the boundaries of adjoining properties are therefore also considered inadequate.
The proposed reduced tower setbacks have a resulting impact in terms of wind. Clause 22.01, Urban Design within the Capital City Zone, comprises design standards for wind protection including, 'towers should be appropriately set back from all streets at the podium to assist in deflecting wind downdrafts from penetrating to street level'.

The submitted Pedestrian Wind Environment Study prepared by WindTech and dated 25 September 2015 indicates that treatments are required for certain locations to achieve the desired wind speed criteria for pedestrian comfort and safety. The suggested treatments include canopies along the eastern and southern aspects of the development which may prevent future street trees from being established along this section of Lonsdale Street. Should the application be supported, this matter needs to be addressed.


Photographs of the Wind Tunnel Model (left image view from north east and right image south west) demonstrating the built form character of the area (proposed is circled in red) 25 September 2015

The proposed height at 233 metres is not in keeping with the emerging built form character of the immediate surrounding area which is demonstrated by the image above. The proposed building is more than twice the height of other building within this city block and surrounds.
It is also noted that there are taller buildings within this western section of the CBD including the recently approved towers at 250 Spencer Street (former Age site) and the Rialto at 525 Collins Street. However these buildings are on much larger sites, incorporate greater setbacks and therefore can accommodate this higher built form.
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Notwithstanding the concerns above, it is acknowledged that proposal will have some beneficial built form impacts in terms of improved ground floor active frontages along Healeys Lane. However, these benefits do not outweigh the negative impact of the proposal resulting from the lack of setbacks coupled with the excessive height.

### 7.3. Plot ratio

Although the new built forms controls do not apply to the application, there has been much discussion within the planning jurisdiction about plot ratios. Amendment C262 to the Melbourne Planning Scheme introduced plot ratios as a consideration into Clause 22.01 Urban Design Policy within the Capital City Zone. The policy states that:

The maximum site plot ratio should not exceed 24:1 and the maximum plot ratio for any city block within the Capital City Zone should generally not exceed 12:1.

The application has a plot ratio of $44: 1$ for the whole of site (including the site area of the heritage building). The site plot ratio sought is substantially greater than that encouraged by policy. This leads to the conclusion that the density of the proposal is too high and therefore represents an overdevelopment of the site.

### 7.4. Amenity of proposed dwellings

The Guidelines for Higher Density Residential Development are relevant to the consideration of this application. Element 5 of the Guidelines relates to building layout and design. Objective 5.4 relates to ensuring that a good standard of natural light and ventilation is provided to internal building spaces. It encourages the provision of direct natural lighting and ventilation to all habitable rooms and discourages the use of borrowed light.

The proposed floor plans do not show habitable rooms that are reliant on borrowed light. The floor plans do however include a number of apartments with saddleback bedrooms. The corridor between the bedroom and edge of the building (natural light source) varies in width and depth. The reduced access to natural light for these rooms is not acceptable.
Modifications to the layout of these apartments should be required to reduce the length of the corridors to the bedrooms or by making them wider.

### 7.5. $\quad$ Tree protection I New Vehicle Crossover on Lonsdale Street

The proposal proposes the removal of a mature street tree in Lonsdale Street and the construction of a new vehicle cross over.
The proposed removal of the tree raises serious conflict with City of Melbourne tree retention policy, which does not support tree removal for developments.
It also contravenes the principle of the Urban Forest Strategy to increase canopy cover within the City. Furthermore, the location of the crossover will result in the loss of a planting location in perpetuity which is of considerable concern.
This means that there is no potential for replanting and loss of environmental services, which is less than desirable given predicted climate change, urban heat island and the mitigating effect trees have on this.

Melbourne City Council's Urban Sustainability Branch have strongly objected to the proposal and believe a redesign is required that allows for retention of the trees and planting sites.
The proposal to provide a new double width crossover to Lonsdale St is not supported, given that other properties along this section of the street are typically accessed via the abutting laneways rather than via Lonsdale St directly. The new crossover would result in the removal of up to 8 m of Loading Zone space, which is used by neighbouring businesses, could impede pedestrian flows, and is considered to be a poor urban design outcome. Melbourne City Council Traffic Engineers have also advised that the proposed vehicle roller door is required to be setback 5 metres from the building line to prevent vehicles from queuing in the Lonsdale Street.

### 7.6. Engineering

As outlined above in Section 6.2, ESG provided detailed comments including not supporting the new vehicle access from Lonsdale St, requiring the roller door to be relocated and restricting right turns to and from the site. These matters need to be resolved if the application is to be supported.

### 7.7. Environmentally sustainable design

Clause 22.19 (Energy, Water and Waste Efficiency) requires that applications be accompanied by:

- A Waste Management Plan.
- An ESD Statement demonstrating how the development meets relevant policy objectives and requirements.

For buildings over $2,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ in gross floor area the Sustainable Design Statement must include a statement from a suitably qualified professional verifying that the building has the preliminary design potential to achieve the relevant Performance Measures set out in Clause 22.19-5. These include a 5 star rating under a current version of Green Star - Multi Unit Residential rating tool or equivalent for residential development with a gross floor area of more than $5,000 \mathrm{~m} 2$. With regard to water efficiency, retail premises with a floor area of up to 2,000 square metres should achieve 5 points for Wat-1 credit under a current version of the Green Building Council of Australia's Green Star Retail rating tool or equivalent.

A Sustainability Management Plan prepared by F2 Design was received on 8 July 2015 with the application. The report forms part of the application submission. It includes the following advice:

- The development has the potential to achieve a 6.6-Star rating against the STEPS Tool.

The application includes a WMP prepared by SALT and dated 20 November 2015. As noted above at Section 6.2, ESG raised concerns about the size of the waste and recycling compactors and swept path diagrams are using the wrong sized vehicle for this collection method. These matters must be resolved if the application is supported.

### 7.8. Stormwater management

Clause 22.23, Stormwater Management (Water Sensitive Urban Design), requires that applications include a Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) Response addressing the details set out in Clause 22.23-4.

The submitted Sustainability Management Plan prepared by F2 Design received on 8 July 2015 provides commentary relating to the proposed WSUD approach including on-site collection for toilet flushing and for garden irrigation.

## 8. OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Department of Environment Land Water and Planning be advised that the Melbourne City Council objects to the proposal on the following grounds:

1. The proposal by virtue of its height and inadequate tower setbacks represents an overdevelopment of the site.
2. The proposal by virtue of its height and inadequate tower setbacks will have an overbearing and adverse impact upon the amenity of the public realm and is contrary to relevant provisions of the Melbourne Planning Scheme, including Clause 22.01 and 34.07.
3. The proposal does not adequately respond to the development potential of the adjoining sites.
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4. The proposal would result in inadequate internal amenity by reason of reliance on long narrow passages for light to bedrooms.
5. The proposed removal of a mature street tree results in the loss of a significant asset to Melbourne City Council and also results in the loss of future planting opportunities in this location.
6. The proposed crossover on Lonsdale Street could impede pedestrian flows, is a poor urban design outcome and results in the removal of a Loading Zone space, which is used by neighbouring businesses.
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