

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.


Name: * Daniel Soussan

Email address: * dsoussan@tract.net.au

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: * 6.1 Ministerial Planning Referral: TPRM-2019-34, 572-574 Lonsdale Street, 256-260 King Street, 248-250 King Street and Gough Alley, Melbourne

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am. Please see attached submission.
Please note I have requested to make the submission in person (and will be doing so on behalf of the speakers from Cox (Simon Haussegger), Charter Hall (Simon Stockfeld) and Hickory (Michael Argryou) – to be lodged shortly) but we are organising a back up plan via zoom from Cox's office on Flinders Lane if required.

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:  [20210517_tract_submission_to_fmc_18_may_2021_agenda_item_6.1.pdf](#)
293.50 KB · PDF

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: * Yes

If yes, please indicate if you would like to make your submission in person, or via a virtual link (Zoom) to the I wish to make my submission in person

meeting.

(Please note, physical attendance will be limited in accordance with City of Melbourne security protocols and COVID-safe plans and be allocated on a first registered, first served basis.) *

Dear Councillors

**Future Melbourne Committee - Agenda Item 6.1 – Ministerial Planning Referral: TPMR-2019-34
572-574 Lonsdale Street, 256-260 King Street, 248-250 King Street and Gough Alley, Melbourne**

Tract Consultants Acts for 572 Lonsdale Pty Ltd, the permit applicant in the above matter which is due to be heard at the Future Melbourne Committee on Tuesday 18 May 2021.

We note that the original pre-application meeting for this project with officers from the City of Melbourne and DELWP was held back in December 2018 and the application was formally lodged 5 December 2019.

An extensive and highly qualified project team was established to inform the design of this project from its inception and through an iterative and collaborative design evolution over the past two years and more.

The project team comprised (inter alia): Hickory (as the land owner and builder); Charter Hall (Joint venture partner); Cox Architecture (Architecture); Tract (Planning & Landscape); Floth (Services & ESD); WSP (Traffic & Waste); Mel Consulting (Wind); and Bryce Raworth (Heritage).

On behalf of our client and the entire project team we wish to thank the City of Melbourne officers, and in particular the planning and urban design departments, for their comprehensive and diligent assessment of the proposal.

The FMC agenda papers and Delegate Report provide an excellent summary of the project, its compliance with the relevant provisions of the Melbourne Planning Scheme, and the evolution of the design.

We also thank the officers for their feedback during the application process that has led to the high quality and site responsive proposal which is now before the committee.

The proposal represents a significant redevelopment opportunity to revitalise what is an important and prominent corner site (the corner of King and Lonsdale Streets) that has for many years had a less than illustrious reputation. In summary we note:

- The proposal provides for an attractive, high quality, architecturally designed, and energy efficient office building comprising 24,000sqm of A grade office floorspace, 800sqm of retail.
- The proposal has been specifically designed to conserve and reinvigorate the existing heritage building (the former Kilkenny Inn) in a manner consistent with the City of Melbourne's heritage policy.
- The proposal provides for a new through block link / extension to Manton Lane – connecting Little Lonsdale Street through to Lonsdale Street.
- The proposal will attain a minimum 5 star green star certification through the Green Building Council of Australia (GBCA).
- This \$250m project will deliver \$11,973,500 in direct public benefit, which is nearly 14 times the amount which would be required for the modest floor area uplift sought.

Finally, we note that the project will deliver in the order of 1000 new jobs during construction, will provide a workplace of the future for in the order of 2,000 office workers upon completion, and will generate significant annual returns into the local economy.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. The project team looks forward to delivering this exciting development for the City of Melbourne.

Yours sincerely

Daniel Soussan

Senior Principal

Tract

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Simon Stockfeld

Email address: * Simon.Stockfeld@charterhall.com.au

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: * 6.1 Ministerial Planning Referral: TPRM-2019-34, 572-574 Lonsdale Street, 256-260 King Street, 248-250 King Street and Gough Alley, Melbourne

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Verbal submission.

Submissions will not be accepted after 10am. Please note we have requested to attend the meeting for this verbal submission (along with Daniel Soussan – Tract, Simon Haussegger – Cox and Michael Argryou – Hickory) but have a back up plan to present virtually from Cox's office on Flinders Lane if this isn't possible.

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: * Yes

If yes, please indicate if you would like to make your submission in person, or via a virtual link (Zoom) to the meeting. (Please note, physical attendance will be limited in accordance with City of Melbourne security protocols and COVID-safe plans and be allocated on a first registered, first served basis.) * I wish to make my submission in person

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Simon Haussegger

Email address: * simon.haussegger@cox.com.au

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: * 6.1 Ministerial Planning Referral: TPRM-2019-34, 572-574 Lonsdale Street, 256-260 King Street, 248-250 King Street and Gough Alley, Melbourne

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Verbal submission – will be accompanied by a slideshow presentation which will be provided before midday tomorrow as required.

Submissions will not be accepted after 10am. Please note we have requested to submit in person (along with Daniel Soussan – Tract, Simon Stockfeld – Charter Hall and Michael Argryou – Hickory) but have a back up plan to do this virtually from the Cox office on Flinders Lane in case this doesn't pan out.

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: * Yes

If yes, please indicate if you would like to make your submission in person, or via a virtual link (Zoom) to the meeting. (Please note, physical attendance will be limited in accordance with City of Melbourne security protocols and COVID-safe plans and be allocated on a first registered, first served basis.) * I wish to make my submission in person

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Michael Argyrou

Email address: * michael@hickory.com.au

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: * 6.1 Ministerial Planning Referral: TPRM-2019-34, 572-574 Lonsdale Street, 256-260 King Street, 248-250 King Street and Gough Alley, Melbourne

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am. Verbal submission.
Please note we have requested to attend the meeting for this verbal submission (along with Daniel Soussan – Tract, Simon Haussegger – Cox and Simon Stockfeld – Charter Hall) but have a back up plan to present virtually from Cox's office on Flinders Lane if this isn't possible.

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: * Yes

If yes, please indicate if you would like to make your submission in person, or via a virtual link (Zoom) to the meeting. (Please note, physical attendance will be limited in accordance with City of Melbourne security protocols and COVID-safe plans and be allocated on a first registered, first served basis.) * I wish to make my submission in person

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Rohan Neville

Email address: *

rohanneville@ara-group.com

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: *

Item 6.2: 1 & 3 Southgate Avenue and 16–60 City Road, Southbank

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.

Speaker 1 of 3 for applicant.

Presentation to follow.

Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

Yes

If yes, please indicate if you would like to make your submission in person, or via a virtual link (Zoom) to the meeting. (Please note, physical attendance will be limited in accordance with City of Melbourne security protocols and COVID-safe plans and be allocated on a first registered, first served basis.) *

I wish to make my submission in person

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Brendan Rogers

Email address: *

brogers@urbis.com.au

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: *

Item 6.2: 1 & 3 Southgate Avenue and 16–60 City Road, Southbank

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.

Speaker 2 of 3 for applicant.
Presentation to follow.

Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

Yes

If yes, please indicate if you would like to make your submission in person, or via a virtual link (Zoom) to the meeting. (Please note, physical attendance will be limited in accordance with City of Melbourne security protocols and COVID-safe plans and be allocated on a first registered, first served basis.) *

I wish to make my submission in person

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Nicky Drobis

Email address: *

ndrobis@fkaustralia.com

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: *

Item 6.2: 1 & 3 Southgate Avenue and 16–60 City Road, Southbank

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.

Speaker 3 of 3 for applicant.

Presentation to follow.

Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

Yes

If yes, please indicate if you would like to make your submission in person, or via a virtual link (Zoom) to the meeting. (Please note, physical attendance will be limited in accordance with City of Melbourne security protocols and COVID-safe plans and be allocated on a first registered, first served basis.) *

I wish to make my submission in person

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * John Smith

Email address: * smithjg@bigpond.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Your question

QUESTIONS FOR CofM

1. These questions concern the need for a Traffic Management Plan BEFORE Council support/approval tonight. Quay West is a hotel & residential apartment building critically effected by the ARA proposal. Road access to Quay West is also the ONLY road access to the Southgate site. Therefore owners/residents need reassurance that their rights of access are protected including unrestricted access to their underground carpark.

Have Council planning staff actually visited the site to better understand the impact of the redevelopment on Quay West owners and residents? Will Council commit to unrestricted carpark access

2. Related to Traffic Management Plan have council staff properly considered emergency vehicle access? The average age of residents is at the higher level with consequent health issues for some?

3. Another question concerns the proposed use of the "Publically Accessible Open Space" which is some 2000 square metres in area. It will remain owned and managed by ARA. What restrictions on usage times is envisaged? The Open Space is 20m from the Quay West building at its nearest point. Noise will be an issue. Will events be limited to day time i.e. no event after Dusk?

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Mehmet (Mem) Aziz

Email address: * mem8aziz@gmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Your question

ARA intentionally avoid any communication with the residents of Quay West. What will City of Melbourne do to ensure the new development will not harm the health and safety of the rate payers and residents.

The development will inevitably cause unliveable conditions and major issues for my partner and me. All our windows are facing the development, which link to our living room and bedroom. We would lose our privacy completely due to the development.

1. Noise & dust: we'll not be able to access our balcony, and forced to keep our windows and curtain closed at all time.

1. No natural sunlight: We will be completely overshadowed by the new development.

2. Glare and invasion of privacy: the glass exterior of the new development will be a complete invasion of privacy of all residents on the west side, especially for apartments below level 7.

3. Smell, heat, and noise: The new development is less than 10m away from our balcony. The constant cooking smell from restaurant kitchen exhaust, the heat from air-conditioning system, and the noise from retail & event will make our apartment unliveable.

Alternatively, I wish to ask my question live via Zoom
select the applicable option below if you wish to ask the Future

Melbourne

**Committee your
question in person
at Town Hall or via
a virtual link
(Zoom) to the
meeting.**

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Damien Gardiner

Email address: * dgardiner@claytonutz.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: * Ministerial Planning Referral: ID-2020-3 1 & 3 Southgate Avenue and 16-60 City Road, Southbank

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

The Langham Hotel submits that Council should refuse to adopt the recommendation of the Council's delegate, and instead refer the matter to be re-considered in order to recognise and address the concerns raised by Langham and other affected parties.

Langham Hotel respectfully submits that the FMC should recognise that Council's recommendation will carry significant weight with DELWP, and that the development as proposed will have significant adverse impacts on surrounding landowners (particularly Langham Hotel), and on the surrounding area as a result of the , scale and design of the proposed development. The FMC should be fully informed in relation to these impacts, which can only occur after a more extensive and considered consultation process. This has not occurred to date, and adversely affected parties such as Langham Hotel have no confidence that their concerns have been understood and will be adequately addressed.

Consultation on the development has been wholly inadequate. Stakeholders have not been provided with key documents which has resulted much uncertainty around important aspects of a development proposal which will have detrimental impacts on its neighbours. In the absence of these documents, Council cannot be satisfied that the Delegate's report has fully considered the amenity and operational issues raised by Langham.

Langham Hotel is concerned that the limited and piecemeal release of information in relation to the proposed development suggests that the design response may be inappropriate in the context of the site, and does not achieve the design outcomes required for this highly prominent and critically important precinct. Langham will suffer impacts to its light, loading and other key operational rights. Despite being raised on several occasions, these concerns have not been adequately addressed, and the Delegate's report and proposed amendments to the Incorporated Document do not provide any level of certainty that Langham's interests will be adequately protected.

Please indicate Yes
whether you
would like to
verbally address
the Future
Melbourne
Committee in
support of your
submission: *

If yes, please I wish to make my submission in person
indicate if you
would like to
make your
submission in
person, or via a
virtual link (Zoom)
to the meeting.
(Please note,
physical
attendance will be
limited in
accordance with
City of Melbourne
security protocols
and COVID-safe
plans and be
allocated on a first
registered, first
served basis.) *

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Damien Gardiner

Email address: *

dgardiner@claytonutz.com

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: *

Ministerial Planning Referral: ID- 2020-3

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[questions_for_fmc_the_langham.docx](#) 26.65 KB · DOCX

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

Yes

If yes, please indicate if you would like to make your submission in person, or via a virtual link (Zoom) to the meeting. (Please note, physical attendance will be limited in accordance with City of Melbourne security protocols and COVID-safe plans and be allocated on a first registered, first served basis.) *

I wish to make my submission in person

Questions for the Future Melbourne Committee on Agenda Item 6.2

1. In its submission dated 7 October 2020, Langham raised a number of significant concerns in relation to proposed changes to Southgate Avenue. Those concerns relate to the potential for pedestrian conflict as a result of the introduction of a dedicated pedestrian corridor, and the impact of the proposed reconfiguration of Southgate Avenue and the development on loading docks relied upon by Langham. Against this background:
 - a. To what extent have Langham's concerns in relation to these issues been considered, and how will these issues be resolved?
 - b. Noting that condition 37 of the draft Incorporated Document indicates that issues in relation to loading are to be addressed through a Loading Management Plan, how does the Council consider that Langham's concerns will be sufficiently understood and addressed, particularly given that the required Loading Management Plan is to be submitted to and approved by the *City of Melbourne Infrastructure & Assets Branch*, with no input from Langham (as a directly and significantly affected party)?
2. Under DDO 60, development must achieve the following design objectives:
 - a. to reinforce the breadth and grandeur of the Yarra River;
 - b. to maintain the existing low-scale urban form along the river corridor;
 - c. to maintain the landscape character of St. Kilda Road as a dominant visual element.The proposed development is 105m (compared with a preferred building height of 24m), has a floor area ratio of 8.5:1 compared with the preferred ratio of 6:1 and pushes built form to almost the limit of every relevant setback. Council has a once-in a generation opportunity to guide the design of one of Melbourne's most visible and prominent sites. To what extent and in what way does Council consider that the proposed development, which adds so much height, bulk and scale (pushing the development envelope to the limits), responds to specific demands stemming from the building's unique, prominent and highly significant site context?
3. The *Southgate Project Act 1994* contains important interface protections for Southgate owners and tenants including in respect of fire protection, prevention and escape routes, provisions of services, structural integrity and access to natural light and ventilation. Langham considers that the proposed development undermines Langham's statutory rights under the *Southgate Project Act*. The Officer's report does not refer to the Act other than (at 84) to state 'legal advice may need to be obtained by DELWP as to whether the applicant's interpretation of the Act is correct'. If Council has not received this advice (as would appear to be the case from the commentary in the Officer's report) on what basis is Council satisfied that the proposal is consistent with the *Southgate Project Act*?
4. Langham is the beneficiary of several registered and unregistered property rights (easement) over the development site which are critical for hotel operations (including in relation to fire safety). The proposal will significantly and detrimentally affect those interests. Such interests are normally tightly protected under planning schemes (clause 52.02). However, consultation and engagement on this issue has been inadequate in the present case. While a planning scheme amendment may provide for the creation and removal of easements under s36 of the *Subdivision Act 1988*, the officer's report:
 - a. does not refer to s36 at all;
 - b. contain a statement from Council under s36(1);
 - c. discuss Langham's concerns; or
 - d. address the purported necessity of the easement variations.Furthermore, condition 74 of the draft Incorporated Document refers to an Easement Plan with an unspecified date and which Langham has not seen. The drafting of the condition is also unclear. Against this background, to what extent did Council consider Langham's submissions on this issue? Does Council propose to make a s36 statement, and on what basis is it satisfied that the significant interference with Langham's easement rights is acceptable?

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Lino Scidone

Email address: * lino.scidone@gmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: ARA city Rd planning permit

*

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Have accepted that it's called progress but in regard to the demolition of All or part of Southgate would like to know what the planning permit being endorsed today is for . The media reports 800 million development so is what is being endorsed today the whole development from Pure South to my venues of la camera and waterslide bar or just half the development and then the other half to be possibly demolished and built later probably meaning a disruption to Southgate for 10 years . The other question I have since I not only own venues in the area but live at eureka will the development of the Bmw site the Esso site the Southbank site abd the upgrade of the promenade be in stages or will Southbank be a construction site for no one to use for the next ten years .

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: * No

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Peter Silcock

Email address: *

silcockpete@gmail.com

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Your question

The drawings show the east section of Southgate Ave will be two-way even further east than the turning circle for Quay West Suites. Is there going to be a new traffic light on City Rd to allow traffic to turn left under St Kilda Rd overpass?

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Peter Silcock

Email address: *

silcockpete@gmail.com

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Your question

I am concerned that delivery vehicles will back up in front of Quay West Suites and the rear of Hamer Hall. Many small vehicles make deliveries presently (and this will no doubt increase with the additional restaurants and retail outlets in the design) and, while larger vehicles will go underground via the lifts, only a few metres have been allowed on ground level for 'retail drop off' (page 58). Please confirm that the east end of Southgate Ave will not become clogged as a waiting area for delivery vehicles.

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Simon Talbot

Email address: *

Daniela.Celi@parks.vic.gov.au

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: *

6.3

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[130521_future_of_melbourne_committee_and_avc_st.pdf](#)

200.74 KB · PDF

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

No

13 May 2021

Future of Melbourne Committee Members
City of Melbourne
GPO Box 1603
Melbourne VIC 3001

Dear Committee Members

EOI Yarra River Activation and The Yarra Botanicals Activation (Australian Venue Co.)

The Yarra Botanicals Activation (Australian Venue Company) represents one of the most thorough Expression of Interests (EOI) and associated assessment processes completed by Parks Victoria and the City of Melbourne.

The genesis of this activation commenced in 2016 with the Premier of Victoria Daniel Andrews appointing the Lower Yarra River Management Advisory Committee comprising of Linda Weatherson; Director of City Operations at the City of Melbourne, Jonathan Metcalfe; Principal for JNM Advisory Pty Ltd and Christine Trotman; Director East Gippsland Water and Parks Victoria.

This Committee's assessment report categorically recommended increased activation; *"The Yarra is a central feature of one of the world's most liveable cities – Melbourne. The future development of its facilities, activities and natural values need to support Melbourne's role as a leading world city."*

These works were further supported with the City of Melbourne, Tourism Action Plan 2016-2019; *"With a growing CBD population and city revitalisation that continues to attract visitors globally, it's important that Yarra commercial berthing operators invest in high quality touring product that reflect an engaging mix of on-water experiences without compromising the river."*

Based on recommendations from these Plans in November 2018, Parks Victoria released a two stage Expression of Interest (EOI) process for Yarra River Activation. The EOI sought stationary commercial and/or recreational concepts to obtain a licence for up to 3-years, with the objective of delivering a contemporary mix of innovative waterside concepts.

Following a comprehensive multi-agency assessment process (including City of Melbourne Executives), Parks Victoria awarded Australian Venue Company 'preferred proponent' status in July 2019 at the conclusion of the Stage 2 process.

Yarra Botanicals submitted a design with proven capability to deliver safe and accessible activities, encouraging engagement and appreciation of the river and its banks. Their proposal provided new opportunities to connect with public and private spaces, complementing the natural surrounds of the waterway.

Furthermore, the Australian Venue Company have an exemplary record operating as Tenants at two Parks Victoria facilities; employing disadvantaged youth, supporting COVID impacted staff and connecting with Traditional Owners in both story-telling and ingredient sourcing.

In conclusion Parks Victoria is dedicated to strengthening the health, wellbeing, liveability and economy of Victoria. Throughout history the Yarra has been revered and equally ignored with industry turning its back on the river. More than ever, Melbournians need to strongly embrace the Yarra, recognising its importance in creating a liveable and vibrant city with Yarra Botanicals activation being a legitimate key driver in supporting this outcome.

Yours sincerely

Simon Talbot
Executive Director Commercial, Planning and Recovery

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Paul Waterson

Email address: * Paul.Waterson@ausvenueco.com.au

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: * 6.3 Planning Permit Application: TP-2020-427, Yarra River adjacent to Lower Promenade, Southbank (north of 4 Riverside Quay)

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:  [city_of_melbourne_eoi_yarra_river_activation_yarra_botanicals.pdf](#)
2.15 MB · PDF

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: * Yes

If yes, please indicate if you would like to make your submission in person, or via a virtual link (Zoom) to the meeting. (Please note, physical attendance will be limited in accordance with City of Melbourne security protocols and COVID-safe plans and be allocated on a first registered, first served basis.) * I wish to make by submission via Zoom

Future City of Melbourne Committee Members

City of Melbourne

GPO Box 1603

Melbourne VIC 3001

14th May 2021

Dear Committee Members,

EOI Yarra River Activation and The Yarra Botanicals Activation (Australian Venue Co.)

Thank you for consideration of our application for a Planning Permit for Yarra Botanicals. We strongly believe that Yarra Botanicals will become an iconic drawcard for Melbourne's CBD. Other key benefits from the Project include:

- Employment for at least 70 team members each year who will generate annual salaries of \$2.3m
- \$1.75m will be spent with local food and beverage suppliers each year.
- \$4.1m will be spent on constructions costs spend with local construction companies, sub-contractors, and key suppliers during year one
- 240,000 annual visitors to the CBD.

Background

In 2018 Parks Victoria released a two stage Expression of Interest (EOI) for Yarra River Activations, seeking commercial or recreational concepts to obtain a license for up to 3 years.

Australian Venue Co (AVC) was awarded the preferred partner in July 2019 at the conclusion of the stage 2 process. The concept "Yarra Botanicals" represents a significant opportunity for AVC, The City of Melbourne and Parks Victoria to work together to create a truly world class destination for Melbourne.

This project provides a rare opportunity to highlight the beauty of the Yarra River and celebrate the environment whilst boosting the city economy. Australian Venue Co were then, and are still now, grateful for the appointment. As an organisation we felt the full impact of the pandemic on our CBD venues and team members and as such are highly motivated to deliver on these goals for The City of Melbourne and Parks Victoria.

The Yarra Botanicals Activation represents the most thorough Expression of Interest (EOI) and associated assessment processes completed by Parks Victoria and the City of Melbourne.

Yarra Botanicals will deliver an outstanding visitor experience, boost the city's post-covid economic recovery and create a one-of-a-kind destination that preserves the Yarra's cultural and environmental integrity.

Boosting City Economy & Supporting Post-Covid Recovery

Yarra Botanicals is expected to attract 240,000 visitors annually and to draw Melburnians and tourists alike into the Southbank precinct. As an unmissable new food & beverage destination in Southbank, Yarra Botanicals will drive footfall back to the CBD and support the recovery of the post-covid economy.

Activating the Southbank precinct and the river will have positive flow-on effects for other nearby businesses and help revitalise the precinct. It will become a must-visit tourist destination, due to its impressive Melbourne city skyline views, standout botanic design features and complete brand experience that celebrates native Australia through food, beverage, and events.

More than 70 team members will be employed on Yarra Botanicals. AVC is committed to ensuring that these employees come from diverse backgrounds and providing opportunities for less advantaged workers through flexible working hours and strong training systems.

Yarra Botanicals will have a comprehensive marketing & PR strategy that will ensure it is a year-round destination, by introducing a series of activations and events that coordinate with and complement City of Melbourne's seasonal events and campaigns.

A One-Of-A-Kind Activation

We understand that the Yarra River is a special place, of significant environmental, heritage and cultural significance. It would be a privilege to activate this location, and we will continue to invest significant resources in ensuring that we deliver an outstanding experience.

To get the proposal to this stage has been a 3-year journey. Over this time, we have devoted significant resources and capital to the project, considered our opportunities and options carefully and developed strategic plans to ensure the success of the activation.

We have a team of several highly experienced and motivated experts in operations, marketing and legal/compliance working on this project, and will expand the project team as it progresses.

The approval process has been exacting, and the project requires licenses from multiple parties, including relevant waterways managers and statutory authorities.

We have set the bar high and will deliver best-in-class results that cannot easily be replicated. The significant barriers to entry require an uncommon level of investment, resourcing and will that few organisations are equipped to provide.

Alignment to Parks Victoria and The City of Melbourne's Vision for Activating the Yarra River.

Our vision throughout this process was to create a vibrant social destination that pays tribute to our heritage, reflects Melbourne, and increases awareness of the natural environment in line with the goals of the organisations involved.

Our primary goal for Yarra Botanicals is for the venue to be recognised locally, nationally, and internationally as the number one destination of choice on the Yarra River, connecting people to nature in a real life and relevant way, raising public awareness of the environment and how its attributes truly embody Healthy Parks, Healthy People.

Australian Venue Co consider themselves an expert when it comes to curating quality activations in the City of Melbourne and have a history of doing so successfully. We also consider ourselves collaborative and proactive champions of the City of Melbourne and a respected partner of Parks Victoria, we have a track record of success with both organisations.

We eagerly await the opportunity to continue to execute on our plans for this incredible location.

Kind regards,

Paul Waterson

Chief Executive Officer
Australian Venue Co

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * john smith

Email address: * johnasmith2000@aol.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: * Planning Permit Application for a floating restaurant and live music venue on the river, North of 4 Riverside Quay.

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

The proposal is for live music and a DJ both with amplified music till after midnight on most nights. We are residents of Eureka Tower and are already disturbed from time to time by loud voices, car noises that are captured and circulated around the buildings that already exist from Riverside Quay and surrounding streets. The addition of amplified sound from a barge docked in the space that faces our building will certainly create a constant flow of additional excessive noise that will erode our quiet enjoyment of our existing living conditions to a point that is unreasonable and unacceptable. It appears that there is no sound limits proposed and that distance is the measure. In the proposed location there is ZERO noise absorbing materials. All sound will flow and then echo and reverberate around the square creating an environment we must avoid.

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in No

support of your
submission: *

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Keith Staite

Email address: * kstaite@hotmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: Future Melbourne Committee

*

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

A floating venue would create noise problems, rubbish problems and noisy behaviour late into the night in what is an area of high density living.

The noise of patrons and music so close to our homes would be totally unfair. the noise from the floating restaurant on the other side of the river is already a noise nuisance.

Rows and rows of rubbish bins in a living area creates smells, rats and would diminish the living environment of all the residents.

We have recently seen the new jetties and boats anchored which is much more in keeping with the daytime nature of the area, leaving the evening for restaurants rather than rackety noise and behaviour from another floating venue. Restaurants that are already struggling and needing propping up from the council.

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne No

Committee in
support of your
submission: *

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Frank Tudic

Email address: *

ftudic@hotmail.com

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: *

Future Melbourne Committee

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

The proposed plan to have music till 1 am is totally unacceptable . This will clearly have an impact on the residents and their right to a peaceful and quite existence . I cannot fathom why in a suburban neighbourhood this would not be tolerated or approved . It's a disgrace that it would even be contemplated.Approval for the venue is understandable, however the noise and the waste management proposal is not appropriate.

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

No

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Paul Cooper

Email address: * paul@project-143.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: * 6.3 Planning Permit Application: TP-2020-427, Yarra River adjacent to Lower Promenade, Southbank (north of 4 Riverside Quay)

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

As long-standing residents of Eureka Tower who face the river we are concerned about our amenity being significantly disrupted by noise if the proposed planning permit is approved. Noise at night travels a considerable distance and we submit (based on prior experience) that noise is insufficiently abated by being 100m from the proposed aspects of waste management (bin emptying) from either Southgate Ave or Southbank Boulevard (p20) or as implied per Figure 5 (below the text Option 3 Collection Point) in Riverside Quay.

Further concern is the proposed hours of operation (p21) stated as being until 1:00am every day and it is further proposed that there be live music until 11:00pm Mon to Sat and until 9:0pm on Sunday, with background music being played outside these hours. We note it is proposed to have amplified music playing at the restaurant and a DJ booth has been provided at ground floor level. As residents we believe it is unreasonable to expect amplified music to be permitted until 11pm Mon to Sat with the proposed mitigation being simply "distance will be in excess of 100m from site". Such mitigation is clearly insufficient as demonstrated in the past when Signal (northern side of Yarra) previously played amplified sound during performances and such sound was clearly heard and disturbed sleep of residents to the point where City Melbourne agreed to have such amplification cease at 10pm. We submit that hours for amplified music cease at 10pm Mon to Sat since past experience has demonstrated that the sound will easily carry and disturb residents of Eureka Tower from the distance proposed in this planning permit.

We particularly strongly object to this planning permit allowing amplified music until 11pm and based on prior

decision of City of Melbourne for operation of Signal amplified sound to cease at 10pm we believe consistency in the application of this rule would respect both the rights of residents and people who may wish to attend such a venue.

Please indicate No
whether you
would like to
verbally address
the Future
Melbourne
Committee in
support of your
submission: *

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Michelle Buza

Email address: *

mb1enterprises@gmail.com

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: *

Young Family

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

My family and I live in the quiet building Eureka towers. Noise travels up and can be quite disruptive. I am shocked to hear of a proposal of live outdoor music 6-7 days per week until late hours. Not only will this be intolerable for my young child and child on the way as well as us adults, but it will drop the value of the expensive properties we live in. It's great to have a restaurant, but loud music in a residential area is unfair and unnecessary. Please reconsider.

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

No

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Marielle Soni

Email address: * marielle@soni.com.au

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: 6.3

*

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

It is disappointing to see the Southbank residents again overlooked in relation to Melbourne City Council's determination to put profits of alcohol businesses ahead of safe, enjoyable, living environments for inner city families.

The Floating restaurant and live music venue proposed for north 4 Riverside Quay has been vehemently opposed in the past, yet once again arises but with no community notice.

The activities along the river during the opening up of the city post lockdown has proven to residents and visitors alike how inappropriate further restaurants and bars on this promenade are.

1. Waste management – even with less visitors to the area during this sensitive time, the amount of garbage, broken glass, cigarettes, vaping pods, plastic, food, you name it – the waste has increased. There are alcohol tins and bottles there every day now. How a floating bar with 600+ drunk revellers are going to improve the waste / pollution issues we already have here is beyond me. One just has to look at the Arbory Afloat across the river – it is a floating skip. There are glasses, bottles, cigarettes, you name it – all trapped in the water and along the footpath. The bins are constantly overflowing, it stinks to walk past it. If this is the example set, then it will only increase the already unmanageable waste problem we have. We literally have mounds of rubbish overflowing bins and footpaths and our precious river and wildlife. The river now is choking with waste. This development claiming that waste management is manageable, when the reality is we can see already it is not, is completely misleading.

2. Competition – we already have numerous bars and restaurants in Southbank. They are struggling. To add another competitor in this market, in this monopoly of food / alcohol businesses is damaging to the long standing businesses that have supported this community for years, struggled through COVID, only to be have further competition. It makes no commercial sense.
3. Safety – we have seen drunken behaviour, violence and crime increase in Southbank recently. Mainly because the only entertainment the council can think of is alcohol. If plying people with alcohol is the only way the council can think of to lure people back into the city, they have a distinct lack of creative vision for the future of Melbourne and I regret my local council vote.
4. Noise – the temporary outdoor dining set up along the green patches of the Southbank promenade were a disaster. The noise blaring from these outdoor venues competed against the noise blaring from 5 metres across the footpath from the plethora of bars already located in the area. It made it unbearable to walk along there. Most people here are families, couples, people walking their dogs, workers cycling to/from work, they don't want to fight through outdoor nighclubs to get home, to enjoy their neighbourhood. There are enough of night venues there already, let the river be a sanctuary for people who want to enjoy the connection to the small bit of nature they can get in the city. Enjoy the city views without 600+ drunk people blocking the views and thoroughfares. The noise carries, much like the wind through those breaks between the buildings. Live music and drunk people until 1 am every night will harshly impact the rights of residents to enjoy their home, enjoy peace.
5. The temporary outdoor areas proved to local residents that developing those lower promenade areas into more alcohol based businesses is bad for the community. Most of the time, the furniture sat there empty, but successfully blocked off areas that residents used for walking and quiet enjoyment, playing with children and pets.
6. This proposal shows a distinct lack of understanding by the council for the Southbank community.

Please indicate No
whether you
would like to
verbally address
the Future
Melbourne
Committee in
support of your
submission: *

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Peter Buza

Email address: *

petergbuza@gmail.com

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: *

Planning Permit Application for a floating restaurant and live music venue on the river, North of 4 Riverside Quay

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.

Please add a noise limit to this venue as this is a residential area

Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

No

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Richard scorgie

Email address: *

ricscorg@hotmail.com

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: *

Noise Complaint

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.

Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

I am writing to protest the level of noise that will affect residents at The Eureka Towers. I do not wish to hear live music in my home. Children need to sleep and I need to wake early for work. Noise should be kept to a reasonable level and should be set to reasonable times. This is not too much to ask.

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

No

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Eleonora Mentyukova

Email address: * ementyukova@gmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: * Noise

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

We're a family with small kids living in Eureka tower permanently facing the river.

So far we can hear music from buskers in the evenings (if any) from our apartment and on weekends kids already struggling to fall asleep on some days when buskers are playing music after 8pm

We're permanent residents of Eureka and hope that council will start considering and taking into account residents views vs business proposals .

Thanks
Eleonora

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: * No

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Claire Alexander

Email address: * claire.alexander.email@gmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: * Item 6.3 Planning Permit Application for a floating restaurant and live music venue on the
reviver North of 4 riverside quay

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

As an owner at Riverside quay I am deeply concerned about the proposal for a floating restaurant and live music venue at riverside quay

There are two concerns about the proposal that warrant objections being raised:

Waste management.

Last time bins were to be emptied from Riverside Quay. This time the text on page 20 proposes either Southgate Ave or Southbank Boulevard. However Figure 5 below the text includes an Option 3 Collection Point in Riverside Quay, so it seems it is still a possibility. Nevertheless, both the other two proposed collection points present problems for waste collection.

Noise.

The hours of operation (page 21) will be until 1:00am every day and it is proposed that there be live music until 11:00pm Mon to Sat and until 9:0pm on Sunday, with background music being played outside these hours. It is argued (page 24) that 'The requirements of this clause however only relate to sensitive uses within 50 metres of the Site. There are no sensitive uses as defined by the Clause within 50 metres of the Site. Therefore a planning permit is not required.' and on page 28 'It is proposed to have amplified music playing at the restaurant and a DJ booth

has been provided at ground floor level. No dance floor is notated on the plans. The nearest residential uses to the subject site are the Eureka Tower and Freshwater Place. The Langham Hotel is also in proximity to the Site. All of these sensitive uses are located are in excess of 100 metres from the Site. It is considered that this separation is insufficient to ensure the proposed use of amplified music will not have an unreasonable effect on the amenity of nearby noise-sensitive uses.'

There is no mention of any loudness controls or restrictions in the planning application. Such controls should be specified in the same way as loudness controls on buskers. Background music until 1:00am is a worrying concern. Also the tall buildings around Riverside Quay Square and across the river mean that any nearby loud music will echo around this space and be clearly audible until 1am by residents.

Hence I object to this project receiving planning permission in its current form.

Thank you

Claire Alexander

Please indicate No
whether you
would like to
verbally address
the Future
Melbourne
Committee in
support of your
submission: *

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Helen Alexander

Email address: * helenkate.alexander@gmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: Item 6.3

*

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

As an owner at Riverside quay I am deeply concerned about the proposal for a floating restaurant and live music venue at riverside quay

There are two concerns about the proposal that warrant objections being raised:

Waste management.

Last time bins were to be emptied from Riverside Quay. This time the text on page 20 proposes either Southgate Ave or Southbank Boulevard. However Figure 5 below the text includes an Option 3 Collection Point in Riverside Quay, so it seems it is still a possibility. Nevertheless, both the other two proposed collection points present problems for waste collection.

Noise.

The hours of operation (page 21) will be until 1:00am every day and it is proposed that there be live music until 11:00pm Mon to Sat and until 9:0pm on Sunday, with background music being played outside these hours. It is argued (page 24) that 'The requirements of this clause however only relate to sensitive uses within 50 metres of the Site. There are no sensitive uses as defined by the Clause within 50 metres of the Site. Therefore a planning permit is not required.' and on page 28 'It is proposed to have amplified music playing at the restaurant and a DJ booth

has been provided at ground floor level. No dance floor is notated on the plans. The nearest residential uses to the subject site are the Eureka Tower and Freshwater Place. The Langham Hotel is also in proximity to the Site. All of these sensitive uses are located are in excess of 100 metres from the Site. It is considered that this separation is insufficient to ensure the proposed use of amplified music will not have an unreasonable effect on the amenity of nearby noise-sensitive uses.'

There is no mention of any loudness controls or restrictions in the planning application. Such controls should be specified in the same way as loudness controls on buskers. Background music until 1:00am is a worrying concern. Also the tall buildings around Riverside Quay Square and across the river mean that any nearby loud music will echo around this space and be clearly audible until 1am by residents.

Hence I object to this project receiving planning permission in its current form.

Thank you

Helen Alexander

Please indicate No
whether you
would like to
verbally address
the Future
Melbourne
Committee in
support of your
submission: *

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Ed Tan

Email address: *

tan@regalinvest.com.au

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: *

6.3 Planning Permit Application: TP-2020-427, Yarra River adjacent to Lower Promenade, Southbank (north of 4 Riverside Quay)

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.

Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Dear Sir/Madam, I write with concern for the floating restaurant to be built near my place of residence at Eureka Tower and I would like music/noise to stop at 9pm everyday and no large rubbish collection located on Riverside Quay as this is my front door. Thank you.

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

No

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Julie Risbey

Email address: *

pjrisbey@bigpond.com

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: *

6.3Planning Permit Application: TP-2020-427, Yarra River adjacent to Lower Promenade, Southbank (north of 4 Riverside Quay)

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.

The evidence for a fundamental flaw submission is shown in the attachment.

Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[210518_fmc_tp2020427_objection_with_attachment.pdf](#) 1.90

MB · PDF

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

No

18 May 2021

Objection to the Proposed Development of a Pontoon (Restaurant) on the Yarra River adjacent to Lower Promenade, Southbank (north of 4 Riverside Quay)

We write to formally object to the issuance of a planning permit for the Yarra Botanical development (TP-2020-427)

In 2019, the Australian Venue Co (the applicant) submitted a proposal for pontoon tavern. Faced with strong objection for a tavern, the applicant now submits a temporary pontoon for use as "restaurant".

It appeared that the applicant replaced the word "tavern" for "restaurant". The Future Melbourne Planning Committee did not detect that the applicant's intent use of the pontoon is still a tavern. The proposed Interior Floor Plan for a "restaurant" (Burton Carter, page 9 of 34) is similar to the Interior layout (Bruce Henderson Architects TP-2019-551) submitted in 2019 for a tavern (refer both plans attached).

Page 23 of 24: the interior layout clearly did not meet with the Restaurant Land Use Terms - Clause 73.03 which stated that the tables and chairs are set out for at least 75% of patrons present on the premises at any one time. The majority of the furniture layout is consistent with a premise intended for drinking and not food consumption (as in the case for a restaurant).

The current furniture plan on both levels combined showed a capacity of over 300 seating with only 120 seats being the "restaurant dining arrangement". Page 21 of 34 reported intent maximum capacity as being as 647 patrons and staff. Such a submission clearly demonstrated the applicant's intent to use as a tavern. The proposed commercial kitchen is undersize and would not be adequate to cater to a restaurant capacity of 300 (let alone over 600 maximum capacity). It is noted that the proposed layout showed more bar space than kitchen.

Page 21, 28 of 34: the applicant's proposal to have a DJ booth, live and amplified music till 11pm and background music thereafter, with intended operation hours till 1am is consistent with intent a tavern use while submitting as a restaurant.

This "noise" is further justified in the submission on the basis that this will not have an impact on local residents as the nearest residential building is located in excess of 100 metres from the subject site. As residents of Eureka Tower, we can confirm that we are regularly subjected to the sounds of buskers singing along the promenade without amplification when located more than 100 metres away from the building.

Clearly, the applicant submitted the proposed development under the pretext for a restaurant but with intent to use it as a tavern.

A tavern was identified as *"land used to sell liquor for consumption on the premises. It may include accommodation, food Tavern for consumption on the premises, entertainment, dancing, amusement machines, and gambling."*

There are numerous bars and taverns (especially licensed liquor establishment) including restaurants, bistros and cafés with licenses to sell liquor along the riverfront and Southbank (premises of Freshwater Place not in this list), namely;

- Arbory Bar
- Arbory Afloat
- Teatro
- ENA
- Tutto Bene
- Blue Train
- The Deck
- Melba
- La Camera
- Mikayo
- Red Emperor
- Waterside Bar
- Pure South
- The Deck
- Waterfront
- Hophaus Euro Bar Bistro
- PJ O'Brien's Irish Pub
- BearBass
- Ponyfish Island
- Belgian Beer Café
- Asado
- Ludlow Bar
- Hopscotch Urban Beer Bar
- Breslin Bar
- Left Bank

There are more than sufficient licensed liquor premises along Southbank Riverfront and there is no need to create a additional pontoon Tavern.

The proposed “pontoon restaurant with intent to use as a Tavern” in the Yarra River will cause significant compromise to and will downgrade, the enjoyment of public space by Southbank visitors and residents alike, as the:

- proposed development blocks off significant views towards the River, closing off the openness of the linear public space along the Promenade.
- proposed “pontoon restaurant with intent to use as a Tavern” will generate a potential increase in intoxicated behavior in the precinct, creating additional noise contamination to the nearby residents, this is especially so for intoxicated customers heading to the Riverside Quay taxi queue.
- unruly behavior of Taxi drivers’ along Riverside Quay which has been an ongoing and unresolved issue for many years that is likely to increase as patrons of the proposed new business will increase the demand for taxis and further exacerbate the current taxi issue, including generating additional noise contamination at “unearthly hours”
- likelihood of rubbish being deliberately or inadvertently discarded into the waterway that will further pollute the already vulnerable river system.

Page 20 of 34: the Waste Management Plan reported that the waste collection point will be from either Option 1 - Southbank (Southgate) Avenue or Option 2 - Southbank Boulevard. However, the illustrated plan identified a third option without explanation – that is the collection point at Riverside Quay opposite Eureka Tower (see image below). We strongly object to the proposed bin point as we would be subjected to regular noise disturbance from waste collection during unearthly hours in the morning in front of our building



As residents of Eureka Tower, we do hear bottles rattling when they are brought out at night, and when they are emptied into waste trucks early in the morning. This is especially so during festive events that were held in Southbank where additional waste was generated.

Therefore, noise contamination that will inevitably be generated by the proposed premises, would not be welcome. Proposed placement of refuse disposal in front of Eureka Tower is unacceptable.

In summary, the above scrutiny showed that the applicant’s submission plan for a “pontoon restaurant” is not true (the renamed of “tavern” to “restaurant” actually illustrated an intent to cheat the use of proposed premise – a criminal offence) i.e. the applicant clearly wants to use the proposed pontoon as a “tavern” (drinking establishment) and not as a “restaurant”. The Future Melbourne Planning Committee should not endorse such an ill-intent proposed development. The submission which comprise deliberately concealed “ill-intended use” should be rejected.

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Janice Carey

Email address: * jscarey333@gmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: * 6.3 Planning Permit Application: TP-2020-427, Yarra River adjacent to Lower Promenade, Southbank (north of 4 Riverside Quay)

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

The documentation for the development describes a substantial establishment with capacity for 647 patrons and staff with

- Hours of operation: 10am to 1am the following day, 7 days a week
- Live music will be provided patrons during the following hours: – Thursday 6pm to 11 pm – Friday and Saturday 5pm to 11 pm – Sunday 5pm to 9pm
- Outside of the above times, background music will be played through a computer using selected playlists.

Our objection is that we find that musical buskers with amplifiers along the riverfront are already fully audible to us in the upper floors of Eureka. Those sounds are an existing feature of the neighbourhood, are occasional, and usually in daylight hours, not during our evenings and after we go to bed. To asset that amplified music to 1 am is a gross intrusion to our work life. To suggest otherwise shows a complete lack of appreciation of the lived experience.

Prior to proceeding, Council is welcome to perform noise level tests of the planned volume and style of performance at the high-rise levels of our building and we will gladly request the Eureka Owners Corporation and Building Management facilitate access.

We note that documentation of the proposal also states that objections received to date related solely to bicycle access, but this is not my understanding. Our household has communicated via the Eureka Owners Corporation/Building Management previously raising concerns over noise and waste management.

Please indicate No
whether you
would like to
verbally address
the Future
Melbourne
Committee in
support of your
submission: *

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Dan O'Keeffe

Email address: * danok@bigpond.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: * Item 6.3 Planning Permit Application TP-2020-427

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[fmc_meeting_no_11_agenda_item_6.3_planning_permit_application_tp2020427.pdf](#)

382.03 KB · PDF

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

No

Submission to Future Melbourne Committee

City of Melbourne, Council Meeting Room, Melbourne Town Hall Administration Building
18 May 2021, 5.30pm – Meeting No.11
Agenda Item FMC 6.3 Planning Permit Application: TP-2020-427, Yarra River adjacent to Lower Promenade, Southbank (north of 4 Riverside Quay)

Concerns about Planning Permit Application:

TP-2020-427 Yarra River adjacent to Lower Promenade, Southbank (north of 4 Riverside Quay)

Overview: The intention to activate the area is desirable and the proposed concept is imaginative, however the execution is inadequate in several aspects and these need to be addressed before this application is approved.

The inadequacies are contained within two areas:

- **Waste management.**

In the previous version of this application that was rejected by Council, the bins were to be placed on the footpath of Riverside Quay. This time the text on page 20 proposes either Southgate Ave or Southbank Boulevard.

However, Figure 5 on page 20 includes an Option 3 Collection Point in Riverside Quay in addition to the other two. It seems that Riverside Quay is still on the table, although this was previously rejected by Council.

Indeed, the other two proposed collection points present problems for waste collection.

Southbank Boulevard: This area is being congested by becoming a multi-purpose space. The space beside the red steps needs to cater for i) pedestrians, ii) two lanes of cyclists, iii) four parking spots for commercial vehicles and iv) a loading bay as well as an emergency access space which is usually caters for the overflow of commercial delivery vehicles.

Also being effectively a dead-end street, it makes it difficult for a large garbage truck to enter, collect waste and then depart. In nearby Cook St, also a dead-end, the truck needs to reverse in, so it can exit the street after collection.



Southgate Avenue: This area is also a dead-end and has similar issues of access. There is currently some space for bins in front of the side entrance to the vacant Exxon-Mobil building, but that situation is likely to change once construction on the new building begins.



At the very least, the proposal should specify the following:

- How many bins per day will be put out,
- The size of the bins,
- The precise location of the bins, and
- The movement of the garbage truck in the street when collecting the waste.

The lack of clarity on this issue suggests that the application not be approved, until these matters are resolved.

There is also another aspect of waste management that needs to be considered, that of human waste - sewerage. It is surprising that for a 60 m long floating structure with nine (9) cubicles, that there is no mention of this issue in the document. Unlike Arbory Float, this floating venue does not have an adjacent land-based venue to connect to.

- **Noise.**

The hours of operation (page 21) will be until 1:00am every day and it is proposed that there be live music until 11:00pm Mon to Sat and until 9:0pm on Sunday, with background music being played outside these hours.

There is no mention of loudness levels, either in the application or in the provisions of the Melbourne Planning Scheme.

However the City of Melbourne has loudness regulations that apply to buskers along the promenade, adjacent to this venue and in other parts of Melbourne. These regulations should apply to the live music venue as well. There should be one rule for all.

One key difference in this instance is that the music venue will continue with background music until 1:00am, long after the buskers must stop. Being background music, does not change the issue of loudness. This case will require its own regulation with the loudness level set at a value at least 10 dB below the busking level.

Further, considering the venue is a commercial operation, there should be an expectation of professional standards in managing the loudness level, both inside and outside the venue. This should include:

- Daily monitoring of the loudness level adjacent to both the East and West ends of the venue. A professional dB meter should be used, not a phone app, which are not considered accurate enough in the industry. This monitoring is to be recorded and the records to be available for inspection.

Of particular concern in Southbank is the tall buildings around Riverside Quay Square and across the river which mean that any nearby loud music will echo around this space and be clearly audible by residents. Some consideration should be given to this aspect.

There is another aspect of noise in public spaces that only recently coming to notice. Low frequency sounds travel a long way. This is evident in the suburbs when the 'doof doof' from a distant party travels across the roofs. However in the city with many high rise buildings, these sounds hit buildings face on.

There have been continuing complaints from residents at Quay West with the "noise" emanating from the Arbory Float. Investigations by Arbory management indicate that the issue is not with the loudness level but rather the low frequency noise.

The proposers of this application should be required to have a sound engineer provide a specification on how low frequency noise should be managed by way of insulation, and/or operating procedures such ensuring the background avoids specific settings after 9pm.

There are also a few administrative aspects that are not mentioned in the application:

- How much rent is being paid and to whom?
- Is there a review period, e.g. of 12 months, to allow the operation to continue for the full three years.

Having endured the constant battle for several years now of asking buskers who were exceeding the loudness regulation, to turn down their amplifier, personally, I view the prospect of this development with trepidation, fearing it will drive us out of the area.

In summary, the matters that need to be addressed before this application is approved are:

- Provide information on the bins, where they will be located and the movement of garbage trucks to collect the waste,
- Detail how human waste will be removed from the floating venue,
- A requirement that the venue must abide by the loudness regulations that apply to buskers,
- The development of loudness regulations to music after 11pm,
- The design of procedures to control low frequency noise.

Yours sincerely,

Dan O'Keeffe OAM
Southbank Residents Association

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Jacqui Cooper

Email address: * j.cooper06@gmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: * 6.3 Planning Permit Application: TP-2020-427, Yarra River adjacent to Lower Promenade, Southbank (north of 4 Riverside Quay)

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

My objection is not an argument about whether 100 m is adequate for noise abatement from amplified music. My objection is that the arrangement will destroy the quality of life for the residents who will be subjected to unrelenting noise until late into the night.

If the floating venue goes ahead as planned it will mean:

No resident can get to sleep until the noise ends at 11.00 pm. This is unfair to anyone (school children, workers, etc) who will want to get to sleep at a more reasonable hour.

All residents will be subjected to noise and music so that any quiet enjoyment of their own activities will be taken from them. (Imagine having to listen to someone else's music all day every day.)

Please limit amplified noise to end at 10.00 pm. Please limit the volume of the amplified noise to a level agreed to by the venue and residents. When PonyFish Island was developed the owners agreed to noise limiting processes and this venue has been within acceptable noise limits including at night. Please don't blow our "livable city" status with resident-battering and unrelenting noise levels.

Sincerely, Jacqui Cooper

Please indicate whether you would like to No

verbally address
the Future
Melbourne
Committee in
support of your
submission: *

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Charles Sowerwine

Email address: * c.sowerwine@gmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: 6.4 Planning Scheme Amendment C387 Hoddle Grid Heritage (Permanent controls)

*

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

The RHSV strongly supports the Officers' Recommendation 7.2, that FMC "Refers all submissions to Amendment C387 as listed in Attachment 2 to an independent Panel appointed by the Minister for Planning for consideration by the Panel.

The RHSV has strongly supported C 387. I refer to our letter to CoM Team Leader Heritage Strategy, 2 December 2020, which I attach. \

Nothing in the submissions received by Council suggests to us any need to revise Amendment C 387. The objectors are generally driven by a desire to avoid controls on their properties and the objections are generally in regard to specific designations. The excellent research of the Hoddle Grid Study has guaranteed the solidity of Amendment C 387. Nothing in the objections leads us to conclude that any significant revision would be justified.

We therefore urge FMC to proceed by approving the recommendations. We commend CoM and its Heritage Team for this work.

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[rhsv_sub_com_c387_20.12.02.pdf](#) 1.63 MB · PDF

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

No



ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF VICTORIA INC.

239 A'Beckett Street, Melbourne 3000

2 December 2020

City of Melbourne,
GPO Box 1603,
Melbourne VIC 3001.

Attention: Team Leader – Heritage Strategy

Amendment C387melb

The Royal Historical Society of Victoria (RHSV) is a peak body representing approximately 340 community historical societies throughout Victoria. Since its formation in 1909, the RHSV has been a stakeholder in the City and a partner of the City in the development and improvement of the City, particularly in regard to preserving and making effective use of its significant heritage assets, so much a factor in the City's success. The RHSV Heritage Committee continues the RHSV's longstanding commitment to the preservation of our heritage, believing that we are all entrusted with the tasks of maintaining the legacy of the past for the good of future generations. This is particularly so in the central city.

The RHSV, both as a heritage body and as a stakeholder in the City, strongly supports Amendment C387melb. We have followed the work done by the Hoddle Grid Heritage Review and we have been pleased to note that the study has been exemplary in its conduct. We commend the Melbourne City Council Urban Strategy section and Heritage Team for their excellent work. The study is exemplary and once implemented will provide a sound and solid base for heritage protection and development of the CBD within this context.

Implementation is urgent to provide clarity and certainty for developers and for property owners. The excellent work done for the Review gives Council a unique opportunity to progress heritage conservation as well as development. Melbourne's historic fabric is crucial to its charm and to its ability to attract visitors. Maintaining what remains of it is one of the most significant challenges facing Council. The historic fabric of Melbourne provides the atmosphere and the charm to draw people back to the City following the difficult period from which we are just now emerging.

That atmosphere and charm owe much to Melbourne's Victorian heritage. In his classic *Victorian Cities* (1963: 277ff), Lord Asa Briggs described Melbourne as one of the world's greatest and most intact Victorian cities. 'Seldom', Briggs argued, 'can domestic architecture have produced such a rich variety of "imposing" styles' as in Melbourne' (p. 289). But while the Victorian side of Melbourne is what first captures attention, followed closely by the interwar Art Deco buildings, the modernist architecture of the period following World War II is also fundamental to the city's charm and amenity. It is one of the great virtues of C387melb that it recognises, analyses and protects this aspect of the city's built form in listing the significant post-war buildings. Increasingly, these will become as essential to Melbourne's identity as the City's Victorian heritage.

If we have a criticism of the study, it is that it stops in 1975. Experience has shown that delays in carrying out heritage studies result in losses, often significant. There is a great deal of outstanding post-1975 architecture in the City. Twenty years into this century, it is time to consider the heritage of the late 20th Century. A study covering the period 1975-2000 is urgently needed and we hope and trust that Heritage Strategy is looking at carrying this out soon after C387melb is formally adopted.

We therefore urge Council to maintain Amendment C387melb in its current state. No doubt there will be some property owners who will see the Amendment as possibly limiting the profit they can draw from their sites, but the good of all property owners and ratepayers will be served by maintaining and enhancing the City's ability to provide an attractive place to work, live and visit. Amendment C387melb will do a great deal in this direction by maintaining what makes Melbourne unique among world cities, its substantial heritage.

Amendment C387melb provides ample opportunity for development to accommodate future growth whilst ensuring that the charm which makes the City so attractive is maintained. The alternative is for Melbourne to become one of so many major cities which the visitor can barely remember.

We trust that the Amendment will be maintained intact and will go on to the next stage of the process and be implemented in 2021.

Yours,

(Professor) Charles Sowerwine, FAHA,
Chair, Heritage Committee,
Royal Historical Society of Victoria.

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * MARK A MCMAHON

Email address: * mark@mcmahonpg.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: * Item 6.4

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: * Yes

If yes, please indicate if you would like to make your submission in person, or via a virtual link (Zoom) to the meeting. (Please note, physical attendance will be limited in accordance with City of Melbourne security protocols and COVID-safe plans and be allocated on a first registered, first served basis.) * I wish to make my submission in person

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Felicity Watson

Email address: *

felicity.watson@nattrust.com.au

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: *

Agenda Item 6.4 Amendment C387 Hoddle Grid Heritage (Permanent controls)

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[2021_05_17_ntav_submission_to_fmc_re_hoddle_grid_heritage_review.pdf](#)

144.09 KB · PDF

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

No



17 May 2021

Future Melbourne Committee
City of Melbourne
GPO Box 1603
Melbourne VIC 3001

6 Parliament Place
East Melbourne
VIC 3002

Email: conservation@nattrust.com.au
Web: www.nationaltrust.org.au

T 03 9656 9818

Re: Agenda Item 6.4 Amendment C387 Hoddle Grid Heritage (Permanent controls)

Dear Councillors,

The National Trust of Australia (Victoria) is pleased to write in strong support of the recommendations relating to the Hoddle Grid Heritage Review outlined in the report for Agenda Item 6.4.

We would like begin by congratulating the City of Melbourne on progressing this ground-breaking heritage study, which represents the first comprehensive review of the Central Business District in over two decades. As a member of the Hoddle Grid Heritage Review External Reference Group, the National Trust has been pleased to provide input into the preparation of the study, and we look forward to advocating strongly for its implementation.

Proposing heritage protection for 137 individual places and five precincts across the Hoddle Grid, this review encompasses all urban and built places previously identified in heritage studies that were never implemented, and various other places which have been identified through a process of extensive community consultation and engagement.

This amendment strongly aligns with the mission of the National Trust to 'inspire the community to appreciate, conserve and celebrate its diverse natural, cultural, social and Indigenous heritage' and vision that our 'diverse heritage is protected and respected, contributing to strong, vibrant and prosperous communities'.

Furthermore, we understand the Amendment implements Action 2.2 of Council's Heritage Strategy 2013, to 'Progressively undertake a review of heritage in the high-growth and urban renewal areas and mixed use areas of the city'. The Amendment also aligns with Council policy seeking to conserve and protect places of identified heritage significance, including Clauses 21.06 of the Municipal Strategic Statement and Clause 22.04 of the Local Planning Policy Framework.

We strongly believe that the implementation of this review will provide greater certainty and clarity for developers and the community, encouraging more sensitive development outcomes for these important places. We also believe this review will ensure that Melbourne's distinctive 'heritage brand'—a major draw-card for tourism and events—is maintained and celebrated.

We note that Council received 43 submissions in opposition to the inclusion of 48 places within Heritage Overlays in the Amendment. These submissions raised issues such as whether places warrant heritage protection, or if heritage protection should be applied to places with live planning permits.

The National Trust is sympathetic to the tensions that exist within the community regarding the application of the Heritage Overlay to private properties. However, we strongly believe that the net community benefit of the recognition of these heritage places outweighs the impacts on individual owners. We believe that places of cultural heritage value play a significant role in defining the identity of a municipality, and should be assessed and protected for future generations on this basis.

Furthermore, we believe that these issues are most appropriately addressed through the next stage of the Planning Scheme Amendment process, which provides all parties with the opportunity to make submissions before an independent panel appointed by the Minister for Planning.

We believe the assessment process that has informed Planning Scheme Amendment C387 has been comprehensive and rigorous, and provides sound justification for Council to progress the Amendment.

In conclusion, we urge the Future Melbourne Committee to accept all Recommendations provided by Management as set out in Agenda Item 6.4. We applaud the courage and leadership shown by the City of Melbourne in progressing this review, and look forward to supporting the implementation of the heritage review at a future Panel hearing.

Yours faithfully,

Felicity Watson
Executive Manager—Advocacy
National Trust of Australia (Victoria)

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Luke D

Email address: *

LUKE.DENHAM@HALLANDWILCOX.COM.AU

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: *

Report to the Future Melbourne Committee: Planning Scheme Amendment C387 Hoddle Grid Heritage (Permanent controls)

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit **by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.** Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Attached.

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[submission_future_melbourne_committee_meeting_on_18_may_2021.pdf](#)

124.41 KB · PDF

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

No

Future Melbourne Committee meeting on 18 May 2021 Submission to Agenda Item 6.4: Amendment C387melb

We act for AMP Capital Investors Ltd, the manager (on behalf of Sunsuper Pty Ltd) of the building at 330 Collins Street in Melbourne (site), in relation to Amendment C387 to the Melbourne Planning Scheme (**Amendment**).

On 16 December 2020, we filed a submission to the Amendment on behalf of our client. Our submission set out our objection to the application of the Heritage Overlay to the site (**HO1320**), as proposed under the Amendment, on the basis that the existing building on the site does not have the requisite heritage value (**Submission**).

On 13 May 2021, Council uploaded to its website a copy of the report of the Future Melbourne Committee (**FMC Report**), Attachment 2 of which included a “Management Response” to our Submission.

We make the following further written submissions, in reply to the Management Response set out in the FMC Report, for consideration by the Committee prior to its meeting on 18 May 2021.

1 Engagement with expert evidence

The Management Response does not reference the expert evidence annexed to and supporting the Submission.

It is not clear from the Management Response whether the Committee or its consultant GJM Heritage considered the expert evidence, prepared by leading experts Mr Bryce Raworth and Geoffrey Edwards (together, the **expert evidence**), annexed to the Submission. The reports were prepared at considerable expense and effort by us, our client, and the experts involved.

2 Inefficient use of Council resources

We suggest that it would be an inefficient use of Council's resources to continue to recommend the application of a Heritage Overlay to 330 Collins Street, Melbourne and to refer that point to a future panel hearing given that:

- (a) the FMC Report does not appear to engage with the Submission or reference the expert evidence in support of the Submission;
- (b) Council has issued a permit (TP-2016-1004) which allows for “[B]uildings and works to increase the floor area and construct building to title boundary at ground and first floors in accordance with the endorsed plans”; and
- (c) heritage protection for this site will only be sought by Council if Permit TP2016-1004 is not acted upon.

3 Requisite heritage value and Management Response generally

The Management Response lacks sufficient detail to understand the FMC's response to the “matters” raised in the submission.

For example, the Management Response states:

-
- (a) *“the assessment of the building (as contained in the exhibited heritage citation) provides sufficient justification for the application of the Heritage Overlay.”*
 - (b) *“there is a clear link between the ‘Children’s Tree’ sculpture and the plaza as it was commissioned specifically to sit within this space.”*

However, in making these points, the Management Response does not address the following observations:

- (a) The building only demonstrates post-war CBD development generically in that it is a relatively large 1960’s office building. The building does not assist observers in understanding the post-war construction boom better than most other places or objects in Melbourne, including ICI House, former BHP House, and the former Royal Insurance Group Building at 440 Collins Street.

The building does not display characteristics of a high quality than typical for post-war modernist office buildings. Construction materials used are standard for all multistorey buildings of this era, which are difficult to appreciate in any case due to low intactness.

- (b) The sculpture can be appreciated in its own right and the fact that it was conceived concurrently and remains in the same place as the building does not mean that they are thematically connected. Their historical link is unlikely to be evident to most observers.

The Management Response makes the final point that *“Amendment C387 does not affect permit TP-2016-1004 which allows for alterations to 308-336 Collins Street.”*

However, the suggestion that Amendment C387 does not affect the Permit appears to be circular. A letter from Council to our client dated 17 February 2021, refusing the request to extend the operation of the planning permit, states that the site’s proposed inclusion in Amendment C387 is *“relevant”* to the refusal, as it would render the extension *“inappropriate to the heritage of the site”*.

We respectfully request that the Committee review this submission prior to its meeting on 18 May 2021 and, in doing so, critically re-evaluate the Management Response to the Submission.

Yours faithfully

Hall & Wilcox

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Lucy Eastoe

Email address: *

leastoe@besthooper.com.au

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: *

Amendment C387 re item 47 588-600 Little Collins St

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.

Please see attached letter.

Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[submission_council_meeting.pdf](#) 620.36 KB · PDF

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

No

Contact:
Direct line:
Email:
Principal:
Our Ref:



18 May 2021

Lord Mayor Sally Capp & Councillors
City of Melbourne
By online submission

Dear Madam,

588-600 Little Collins Street, Melbourne VIC 3000
Amendment C387 Melbourne Planning Scheme

We act on behalf of the Roman Catholic Trust Corporation for the Diocese of Melbourne, the registered proprietor of the land at 588-600 Little Collins Street, Melbourne ("The subject site").

Our client has filed a submission to Melbourne City Council in respect to Amendment C387. As relevant, Amendment C387 proposes to apply Heritage Overlay HO1355 Stellar Maris Seafarer Centre, 588-600 Little Collins Street to the subject site.

We have reviewed the Council meeting agenda, which as relevant to our client's submission, recommends Council resolve to refer it to an independent planning panel for consideration. We appeal to the Councillors to resolve to remove proposed HO1355 from Amendment C387 on the basis that the proposed heritage overlay does not meet the threshold for listing as set out in Planning Practice Note 1.

In considering we request we highlight the following:

1. Amendment C387 proposes to apply a site-specific heritage place to the subject site, namely, Heritage Overlay HO1355 Stellar Maris Seafarer Centre, 588-600 Little Collins Street ("HO1355").
2. We understand the listing is proposed having regard to the occupation of the site by Stella Maris Seafarers.
3. In our opinion the significance of the place does not meet the necessary thresholds to warrant the application of the Heritage Overlay.
4. The application of HO1355 to the subject site is inconsistent with Practice Note 1 – Applying the Heritage Overlay. As relevant Practice Note PPN1 advises:

*An appropriate test for a potential heritage place to pass in order to apply the Heritage Overlay is that it has 'something' to be managed. **This 'something' is usually tangible** but it may, for example be an absence of built form or presence or some other special characteristic.*

Best Hooper Pty Ltd

Level 9/451 Little Bourke Street
Melbourne VIC 3000, Australia

PO Box 13312
Law Courts 8010

T (03) 9670 8951
F (03) 9670 2954

www.besthooper.com.au
ACN 137 307 692

DX 215 Melbourne

5. The purported significance sought to be protected by the listing, namely the occupation and association of the site by Stella Marais Seafarers Centre is not “something” to be managed.
6. The historical use of the site is overstated and by no means remarkable or to the extent that it warrants protection by the Heritage Overlay.
7. Stella Maris is not the only occupant or user of the land. The occupation in heritage terms is relatively recent.
8. The Statement of Significance focuses upon the use and occupation of the land, which is not a tangible asset. In the absence of there being any built form significance, in our opinion the Heritage Overlay is not the appropriate tool to apply to recognise or protect any historic use of the land.
9. The building has also been substantially altered. It is not of any architectural significance or quality to the extent that would warrant its protection.

In light of the above submissions, our client requests that Council resolve pursuant to Section 23 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* to amend the form and content of the proposed Amendment. Specifically, our client requests that Council resolve to remove proposed HO1355 from Amendment C387.

Yours faithfully
BEST HOOPER

COPY

Contact:
Direct line:
Email:
Principal:
Our Ref:



17 December 2020

City of Melbourne

By email only:

Dear Madam,

588-600 Little Collins Street, Melbourne VIC 3000
Amendment C387 Melbourne Planning Scheme

We act on behalf of the Roman Catholic Trust Corporation for the Diocese of Melbourne, the registered proprietor of the land at 588-600 Little Collins Street, Melbourne ("The subject site").

Our client has instructed us to file a submission to Melbourne City Council in respect to Amendment C387. As relevant, Amendment C387 proposes to apply Heritage Overlay HO1355 Stellar Maris Seafarer Centre, 588-600 Little Collins Street.

Our client does not support the application of the Heritage Overlay to the subject site on the basis that:

1. The proposed listing is contrary to Practice Note 1 – Applying the Heritage Overlay.
2. The subject site does not meet the requisite threshold for the application of a site-specific heritage overlay.
3. The proposed listing is contrary to the objectives and purpose of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* (Vic).
4. The Statement of Significance focuses upon the use and occupation of the land, which is not a tangible asset. In the absence of there being any built form significance, in our opinion the Heritage Overlay is not the appropriate tool to apply to recognise or protect any historic use of the land.

In support of these submissions, we make the following remarks:

1. The subject site is located within Capital City Zone – Schedule 1 and affected by the following overlays:
 - Design and Development Overlay – Schedule 12;
 - Design and Development Overlay – Schedule 10;
 - Environmental Significance Overlay – Schedule 2; and

Best Hooper Pty Ltd

Level 9/451 Little Bourke Street
Melbourne VIC 3000, Australia

PO Box 13312
Law Courts 8010

T (03) 9670 8951
F (03) 9670 2954

www.besthooper.com.au
ACN 137 307 692

DX 215 Melbourne

place to Indigenous peoples as part of their continuing and developing cultural traditions (social significance).

8. The merits of the significance is expressed as follows in the draft Statement of Significance:

Why it is significant?

The Stella Maris Seafarer's Centre is historically significant for the tangible evidence it provides of part of the history of Melbourne as a trading port, and of the prevailing concerns for the religious, moral and social welfare of people in the shipping trade. The place has a long association with the adjoining St Augustine's Church through its role from the late 1960s in continuing the Catholic Church's official missionary work to provide pastoral care, services and support for seafaring people, begun by the Church in the mid-nineteenth century. It is also important for its links to St Augustine's Church (631-653 Bourke Street) built in 1867, one of Melbourne's oldest Catholic churches, and the associated St Vincent de Paul Society, whose members were active in caring for seafarers from the late 1880s. (Criterion A)

The Stella Maris Seafarer's Centre is of social significance for its strong association with a Catholic community of lay staff and volunteers, and religious staff, that offer a dedicated mission to seafarers through their work at the Centre and at Melbourne port. The Stella Maris Seafarers' Centre was created through the efforts of this community, and the association is long-standing. The social significance of the Stella Maris Seafarer's Centre is reflected through a strong sense of connection and shared community identity along with a sense of ownership and pride in the Centre as a place and the services offered. (Criterion G)

9. In our opinion the significance of the place does not meet the necessary thresholds to warrant the application of the Heritage Overlay.
10. The application of HO1355 to the subject site is inconsistent with Practice Note 1 – Applying the Heritage Overlay.
11. As relevant Practice Note PN1 advises:

An appropriate test for a potential heritage place to pass in order to apply the Heritage Overlay is that it has 'something' to be managed. This 'something' is usually tangible but it may, for example be an absence of built form or presence or some other special characteristic.

12. In our opinion:
- a. The purported significance sought to be protected by the listing is not "something" to be managed.
 - b. In the alternative, the historical use of the site is overstated and by no means remarkable or to the extent that it warrants protection by the Heritage Overlay.
13. Whilst our client does not dispute the fact that Stella Maris has occupied part of the land for an extended period of time:
- a. The organisation is not the only occupant or user of the land.
 - b. The occupation in heritage terms is relatively recent in heritage terms.
14. The Statement of Significance focuses upon the use and occupation of the land, which is not a tangible asset. In the absence of there being any built form significance, in our opinion the

Heritage Overlay is not the appropriate tool to apply to recognise or protect any historic use of the land.

15. The building developed on the subject site has been substantially altered. In our opinion the architecture of the building, its era and age does not meet the threshold for the application of the Heritage Overlay.
16. The methodology of the background studies which underpin the preparation of Amendment C387 are not based upon any sound strategic rationale or rigor. The amendment is merely an attempt by Council to protect a large collection of buildings which are by no means unique, remarkable or of importance.
17. Our opinions in this regard are supported by the fact that the subject site has not been previously identified in previous heritage studies:

PREVIOUS STUDIES

Central Activities District Conservation Study 1985	Ungraded
--	----------

Central City Heritage Review 1993	Ungraded
--	----------

Review of Heritage overlay listings in the CBD 2002	Ungraded
--	----------

Central City Heritage Review 2011	Ungraded
--	----------

In light of the above submissions, our client request that Council resolve pursuant to Section 23 of the *Planning and Environment Act* 1987 to amend the form and content of the proposed Amendment. Specifically, our clients requests that Council resolve to remove proposed HO1355 from Amendment C387.

We request that Council consider the above submission and refer it to any independent Planning Panel to consider the amendment.

Yours faithfully
BEST HOOPER

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Ewan Ogilvy

Email address: * planningcra@gmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: * 6.5 Planning Scheme Am C380 Zoning Corrections of Public Open Space etc

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[am_c380_zoning_corrections_to_public_open_space_cra_letter_to_fmc18_may_2021_fin.pdf](#)

766.55 KB · PDF

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

No



The Carlton Residents Association Inc
A0034345G ABN 87 716 923 898
PO Box 1140 Carlton Vic 3053
planningcra@gmail.com
www.carltonresidents.org.au

Zoning corrections of public open space and anomalies in the Planning Scheme Am.
C380melb – Submission from the Association to the FMC 18 May 2021 Agenda Item 6.5
13 May 2021

To The Lord Mayor and Councillors of the City of Melbourne

In the Association's view, there are two major issues in contention:

- Whether or not an existing open space reservation associated with a full/partial road closure, or centre of the road median strip, should be regarded as an "ancillary open space" or whether the recreational and "greening" opportunities provided by these spaces should be regarded as their primary purpose.
- The second major issue in contention concerns the need, or otherwise, of any statutory process, to confirm the status of these open spaces.

Clearly, open space reservations associated with full or partial street closures would require a statutory process. In this context, the Association does not understand why this statutory process has not been completed in those situations where open space reservations have been in place for ten or more years. In our original Submission, the CRA gave the example of the Lytton Reserve which closed off Cardigan Street at Cemetery Road East.

In relation to Carlton's centre of the road median strips, the CRA believes that the historical context is important. Since, many of Carlton's medians were established over eighty years ago, and since the Council has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars [if not millions of dollars] over the decades maintaining and extending these valuable assets, we do not understand how their legal status as **primarily** parks can be in doubt. Further, since the streets where they are located were not discontinued [but reconfigured] we do not understand how any current discontinuance of road process can be applied retrospectively after so many decades of use. More specifically:

- The Association does not understand why Clause 8 of Schedule 10 to the **Local Government Act** "Power to narrow or widen roads" is not applied in those cases where a road is not being discontinued, but reconfigured to provide valuable open space and greening opportunities.
- While many median strips serve a diversity of purposes [from traffic control and calming to the provision of open space for recreational and greening initiatives] the Association believes that the generous width of many of Carlton's historic medians [at around 7 metres] results in these medians being MUCH wider than is required for any traffic control function. Under these circumstances, we argued that their primary purpose is to provide additional open space for greening and recreational initiatives. [See images on following page.] Quite simply, median strips and other reservations that primarily serve a traffic control function do not require 7 metres; the careful placing of bollards or raised kerbing would be more than adequate.
- In our view, these are just the kind of initiatives being supported in recently adopted Council reports. For example, the Hodyl + Co 2018 Report to Council **Sunlight access to public parks**, revises the tiered approach to protecting sunlight access to parks. **More specifically, it treats ALL parks as equal and acknowledges that often the most important park is the one closest to where someone lives or works.**

- It must also be noted that most of the streets of Carlton are NOT actually zoned as road reservations; instead, **most road space is zoned for residential, commercial and mixed uses**. Since buildings of any description are rarely located on roads, this extension of zones beyond the building line is very misleading. In this context, it would be much more accurate to replace these zoning categories with a **Public Park and Recreation zone** in those situations where the primary purpose of the reservation is **not** traffic control.

Finally, although the Association has withdrawn as a Party at any Planning Panel Hearing, we do urge the Council to acknowledge that many of our street based open space reservations deserve to be formally acknowledged in the Planning Scheme for the valuable greening and recreational opportunities which they provide.

Carlton Residents Association Inc]

Carlton residents enjoying the Drummond Street Median Strip December 2019.

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Chris Thrum

Email address: *

mineralsands@hotmail.com

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: *

6.5

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: *

Yes

If yes, please indicate if you would like to make your submission in person, or via a virtual link (Zoom) to the meeting. (Please note, physical attendance will be limited in accordance with City of Melbourne security protocols and COVID-safe plans and be allocated on a first registered, first served basis.) *

I wish to make my submission in person

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Judy Anderson

Email address: * judy.anderson@startupvictoria.com.au

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: * 6.7 Draft Economic Development Strategy for Public Consultation

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[startupvic_limited_letter_of_support_draft_economic_development_strategy.pdf](#)

49.74 KB · PDF

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne Committee in support of your submission: * No



SUPPORTING FOUNDER SUCCESS

www.startupvictoria.com.au



/StartupVictoria/



@StartupVic



/company/startup-victoria/

Future Melbourne Committee
City of Melbourne
120 Swanston Street
Melbourne, VIC, 3000

17 May 2021

Draft Economic Development Strategy 2031

Letter of Support

Dear Committee members,

I am writing to provide my endorsement of the Draft Economic Development Strategy 2031.

Having been involved throughout the industry consultation process, I believe many of the recommendations included in the report accurately reflect the immediate needs and priorities of the startup ecosystem.

It is my hope that the Future Melbourne Committee pass the resolution to present the draft strategy to the public for further input.

Startup Victoria will promote the draft strategy across its channels to encourage community and stakeholder input between the stated consultation period.

Beyond public consultation, I recommend the Future Melbourne Committee consider a review of all Actions that relate to the startup ecosystem every 12 - 18 months. The startup ecosystem is maturing rapidly and the Economic Development Strategy must be able to adapt as needed to any changes in market conditions. Ensuring the City of Melbourne is providing the most relevant and impactful support it can over the next ten years.

Thank you for your continued support of the startup community.

Regards,

CEO Startup Victoria

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Tim Bracher

Email address: * exoff@yarrariver.melbourne

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: 6.7 Economic Development Strategy

*

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

The Yarra River Business Association commends the Council on its initiative to produce a ten year economic development strategy, and especially to maintain a longer term focus during a period of short term needs and activations to address the COVID recovery.

The Council's responsiveness and innovation in tackling the immediate needs of City businesses has been exemplary. The emphasis on getting monetary injection to the coalface was a very refreshing approach and it is hoped that this attitude will continue.

The document, while necessarily an overview, is specific in its goals. Like a capital works program, its recommendations need accurate timelines and an annual commitment to certain projects on a rolling basis. Otherwise it will languish like so many strategies before it.

In particular, recognition that the CBD will need re-imagining and re-purposing in the post COVID era is both prescient and innovative. We must not be troubled by a changing CBD, but rather we need to read the trends and get ahead of the change, to enable us to fully capitalise on it.

Similarly, the call for a new organisation Visit Melbourne shows initiative and leadership by Council, especially following the demise of Destination Melbourne in 2018, which has left a great vacuum for many CBD tourism and hospitality businesses.

The strategy is also not frightened to recognise the huge bridge-building task ahead of us in re-establishing Melbourne's international education credentials. The past 12 months has revealed how bereft our CBD is without its annual influx of students from around the world. Our famed welcome and hospitality to them is now being eclipsed by other countries, and the economic and social damage to Melbourne as a result could be long lasting.

Please indicate No
whether you
would like to
verbally address
the Future
Melbourne
Committee in
support of your
submission: *

Privacy acknowledgement: *

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: *

Ben Rossiter

Email address: *

brossiter@victoriawalks.org.au

Date of meeting: *

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: *

Agenda item 6.8

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[fmc_exhibition_street_17_may2021.pdf](#) 125.61 KB · PDF

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne

No

Committee in support of your submission: *



Victoria Walks Inc.
Level 7, 225 Bourke Street
Melbourne VIC 3000
P: 03 9662 3975
E: info@victoriawalks.org.au
www.victoriawalks.org.au
Registration No. A0052693U

Future Melbourne Committee (FMC)
City of Melbourne
GPO Box 1603
Melbourne VIC 3001

17 May 2021

Exhibition Street Stage 2 bike lane and streetscape upgrade

Dear Councillors,

I am writing to indicate Victoria Walks' support for the draft Exhibition Street Public Realm Concept Plan and Community Engagement approach to be for approved for consultation with the community and stakeholders, prior to finalising the concept plan for endorsement – Agenda item 6.8, FMC Meeting No 11, Tuesday 18 May 2021.

Victoria Walks' congratulates the City for continuing to improve walking amenity and the public realm within central Melbourne and supports the intention for expanded footpaths, upgrades to cycle infrastructure, planning for trees and improved street furniture.

Victoria Walks urges the City to consider extending the footpath on the north western corner of Bourke and Exhibition Streets, outside Elephant and Wheelbarrow, to ease pedestrian footpath congestion and improve pedestrian road safety by reducing the crossing distance.

Victoria Walks also asks the city to erect no motorcycle parking signs on all the footpaths on surrounding blocks if dedicated motorcycle parking is provided in the centre median on Exhibition St.

Victoria Walks also strongly advocates the City allocate budget to make infrastructure changes to the 'Little Streets' to commence converting them into permanent pedestrian priority zones.

Yours sincerely,

Executive Officer

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Alexander Sheko

Email address: * apsheko@gmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 18 May 2021

Agenda item title: 6.8 Exhibition Street Stage 2 bike lane and Streetscape upgrade

*

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

I am writing to support the officer recommendations in regard to this item. This submission represents my personal views and not that of any other person or organisation.

Separated cycling infrastructure is key to supporting more people to cycle particularly under represented groups such as women, children and the elderly.

As a City of Melbourne resident, I am hugely supportive of the cycling improvements that have been delivered in the past year or so, and urge Council to continue this excellent work.

I am also pleased to see footpath extensions and planting form a key part of this proposed project.

This project will positively contribute to Exhibition Street as a great place for people, and prioritises walking and cycling as space efficient and sustainable transport modes.

I look forward to seeing more excellent improvements to transport and place in the City of Melbourne.

Please indicate No
whether you
would like to
verbally address
the Future
Melbourne

Committee in
support of your
submission: *
