

Addenda 1.

Amendment C309 West Melbourne Urban Design Expert Evidence Leanne Hodyl

1 This addenda responds to a request for further detail in regards to Recommendations 2 and 5 in my original Expert Evidence Report (dated June 2019). Specifically I have been asked to respond to the following queries (received via email from Debbie Payne at the City of Melbourne on 26th June 2019).

- 'You recommend that non-residential uses in the Special Use Zone (SUZ) be regulated via a discretionary control, rather than a mandatory control (recommendation 2). Please provide your opinion as to what the planning controls should say about how the discretion to grant a permit should be exercised.'
- 'You recommend introduction of a floor area uplift (FAU) mechanism for social housing within the Flagstaff Precinct in addition to the minimum requirement for affordable housing that is required via the SUZ (recommendation 5). Please provide your opinion as to how any FAU should be calculated and implemented.'

Guidance on exercising discretion in regards to delivery of a minimum amount of non-residential uses.

2 As outlined in my original evidence I consider that some discretion is required due to:

- The potential unintended consequences of having smaller 'leftover' non-residential spaces that may need to be distributed onto upper floors .
- The varied suitability of different types of non-residential uses across the neighbourhood and within different building typologies (including heritage buildings).

3 The Purpose of the Schedule is:

- To implement the West Melbourne Structure Plan 2018 and support the development of West Melbourne as a vibrant, mixed use inner city neighbourhood with a genuine mix of retail, commercial, education and residential uses and affordable housing.
- To retain and increase local employment and facilitate an increase in jobs in West Melbourne.
- To support a less car dependent transport system by ensuring that opportunities to adapt and re-purpose car parks are protected, and to facilitate the adoption of sustainable transport alternatives.

- To encourage provision of new public open spaces throughout West Melbourne to meet the different needs of the growing community.
 - To develop the Spencer Street Village as a local activity centre with a mix of commercial, retail, residential and community uses to complement its activity centre function.
- 4 This purpose is delivered over the longer term by creating commercially sustainable, non-residential uses that support a vibrant, mixed-use neighbourhood and contribute to ongoing job growth.
- 5 Guidance on how discretion should be exercised should be related directly to maximising delivery of this purpose.
- 6 I would recommend the following additional guidance is therefore included in the Decision Guidelines under 'Use for Dwellings':
- Whether the provision of the minimum non-residential requirement results in a negligible proportion of the required floor area being splintered onto a separate floor, resulting in an impractical building design.
 - Whether the provision of less than the minimum amount of required non-residential floor area will deliver more jobs/sqm than the neighbourhood average jobs/sqm (as at 2018).

Calculation and implementation of FAU

- 7 In regards to the calculation method, I would recommend the application of the same approach that applies in the Hoddle Grid and Southbank which was established through the C270 Amendment. This approach provides a transparent and objective method of calculation. It would require the establishment of Gross Realisable Values (GRVs) for the different land uses within the Flagstaff precinct based on recent sales data.
- 8 The FAU should only be available for the delivery of social housing.
- 9 In regards to the implementation more broadly, the built form testing by Breathe Architecture demonstrates that there is some additional capacity that could be delivered within some sites across the precinct. In particular, this includes corner sites (and other sites with multiple frontages) and smaller infill sites where a high percentage of site coverage is supported.
- 10 The testing also demonstrates, however, that if the FAR was consistently increased across the Flagstaff precinct then a dominant tower and podium typology would result on most sites. This is particularly the case for sites that have been modelled with a higher FAR of 8:1. This would undermine the potential to deliver the preferred character outcome of diverse building typologies.
- 11 The FAU should therefore be capped at an additional FAR of 1:1 to deliver the multiple objectives that are central to the Amendment:
- Supporting housing growth
 - Maximising the opportunity to deliver additional social housing
 - Delivering the preferred character outcomes
 - Providing certainty for the community, developers and Council.