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“There should be certainty, transparency and consistency with the introduction of new planning controls.”
The Framework Page 8

What I support

- Four mixed use neighbourhoods;
- Different themes, core and non-core areas;
- Public transport infrastructure and new roads;
- New public open space network and community infrastructure; and
- National employment precinct.

Fishermans Bend Precincts

- Montague
- Lorimer
- Sandridge
- Wirraway
- Employment Precinct
The fundamental problems?

The population challenge

• The starting point for the creation of new urban form should be an iterative process are commenced with a built form outcomes.

  Built form ↔ Population

Deferred / uncertain public transport delivery

• Public transport is a catalyst project and underpins built form and population objectives.

  Public transport led
The fundamental problems?

**The governance challenge**

- There is an absence of an overarching government / delivery organisation.

  The successful co-ordination and delivery of the renewal program of a State Significant Project, requires a single co-ordinating body.

**The delivery challenge**

- Absence of an Infrastructure Contributions Plan.
- FAR and opt in FAU tools seek a public acquisition outcome where a PAO should be used.
- DC exist but lack of DCP.

  Opt in FAU is constrained because other controls, ie. / overshadowing

  Potential for DPO to deliver infrastructure early and other planning outcomes.
Core and Non-core Areas and Active Street Frontages – Capital City Zone
Overshadowing – Design and Development Overlay
Other matters

- Transitional Provisions
Celebrating Heritage (Figure 18)
Figure 77: Additional places of potential cultural heritage significance
Infrastructure delivery in Sandridge (Fishermans Bend Framework, Figure 21)
Proposed Controls
FAR: 3.3 : 1 (Sandridge Non-Core)
Building Height: 24 Storeys

The Site
Site Area: 4,070 sqm
Buildable Area: 4,070 sqm
Total GFA: 55,000 sqm
FAR: 13.5:1 (achieved under this option)
Floor to floor height: 4m (ground level & level1) - 3.3m (level 2 & above)

Floor area ratio (FAR) 3.3 : 1
4,070sqm x 3.3 (FAR) = 13,431sqm
**Proposed Controls**
- FAR: 3.3 : 1 (Sandridge Non-Core)
- Building Height: 24 Storeys

**The Site**
- Site Area: 4,070 sqm
- Buildable Area: 4,070 sqm
- Total GFA: 54,500 sqm (Envelope FAR + FAU)
- FAR + FAU: 13.4:1 (achieved under this option)
- Floor to floor height: 4m (ground level & level1) - 3.3m (level 2 & above)
- Site Coverage: 80%

**Potential Fit**
- Floor area ratio (FAR) 3.3 : 1
  - 4,070sqm x 3.3 (FAR) = 13,431sqm
- Floor area uplift (FAU) 10.1 : 1
  - 4,070sqm x 10.1 (FAU) = 41,069 sqm
Citipower - No. 90-96 Johnson Street, South Melbourne
24 Storey Option

Proposed Controls
FAR: 3.3 : 1 (Sandridge Non-Core)
Building Height: 24 Storeys

The Site
Site Area: 4,070 sqm
Buildable Area: 4,070 sqm
Total GFA: 39,800 sqm
FAR: 9.78:1 (achieved under this option)
Floor to floor height: 4m (ground level & level1) - 3.3m (level 2 & above)

Floor area ratio (FAR) 3.3 : 1
4,070sqm x 3.3 (FAR) = 13,431sqm
Proposed Controls
FAR: 3.3 : 1 (Sandridge Non-Core)
Building Height: 24 Storeys

The Site
Site Area: 4,070 sqm
Buildable Area: 4,070 sqm
Total GFA: 39,100 sqm (Envelope FAR + FAU)
FAR + FAU: 9.60:1 (achieved under this option)
Floor to floor height: 4m (ground level & level1) - 3.3m (level 2 & above)
Site Coverage: 73.70%

Potential Fit
- Floor area ratio (FAR) 3.3 : 1
  - 4,070sqm x 3.3 (FAR) = 13,431sqm
- Floor area uplift (FAU) 6.3 : 1
  - 4,070sqm x 6.3 (FAU) = 25,669 sqm
Citipower - No. 90-96 Johnson Street, South Melbourne
20 Storey Option

Proposed Controls
FAR: 3.3 : 1 (Sandridge Non-Core)
Building Height: 24 Storeys
Site Coverage: 70%
6m Laneway

The Site
Site Area: 4,070 sqm
Buildable Area: 4,070 sqm - 492 sqm (laneway) = 3,578sqm
Total GFA: 44,420 sqm (Envelope FAR + FAU)
FAR + FAU: 10.9:1 (achieved under this option)
Floor to floor height: 4m (ground level & level1) - 3.3m (level 2 & above)

Potential Fit
- Floor area ratio (FAR) 3.3 : 1
  4,070sqm x 3.3 (FAR) = 13,431sqm
- Floor area uplift (FAU) 7.6 : 1
  4,070sqm x 7 (FAU) = 30,989 sqm
Citipower - No. 90-96 Johnson Street, South Melbourne
24 Storey Option

Proposed Controls
FAR: 3.3 : 1 (Sandridge Non-Core)
Building Height: 24 Storeys
Site Coverage: 70%
6m Laneway

The Site
Site Area: 4,070 sqm
Buildable Area: 4,070 sqm - 492 sqm (laneway) = 3,578sqm
Total GFA: 37,144 sqm (Envelope FAR + FAU)
FAR + FAU: 9.1:1 (achieved under this option)
Floor to floor height: 4m (ground level & level1) - 3.3m (level 2 & above)

Potential Fit
Floor area ratio (FAR) 3.3 : 1
4,070sqm x 3.3 (FAR) = 13,431sqm

Floor area uplift (FAU) 5.8 : 1
4,070sqm x 5.08 (FAU) = 23,713 sqm
**Figure 16** Modelling for 90-96 Johnson Street (as included in Addenda 2) which supports proposed character for sub-precinct S5 - hybrid development and useable communal open space.

---

**Proposed Controls**
- FAR: 3.3 : 1 (Sandridge Non-Core)
- Building Height: 24 Storeys
- Site Coverage: 70%
- 6m Laneway

**The Site**
- Site Area: 4,070 sqm
- Buildable Area: 4,070 sqm - 492 sqm (laneway) = 3,578sqm
- Total GFA: 23,200 sqm (Envelope FAR + FAU)
- FAR + FAU: 5.7:1 (achieved under this option)

**Potential Fit**
- Floor area ratio (FAR) 3.3 : 1
  - 4,070sqm x 3.3 = 13,431sqm
- Floor area uplift (FAU) 2.4 : 1
  - 4,070sqm x 2.28 = 9,276 sqm
- Total coverage = 30%

Note: All dimensions approximate.

---

Heggen testing of Hodyl Addenda 6
Figure 16: Modelling for 90-96 Johnson Street (as included in Addenda 2) which supports proposed character for sub-precinct S5 - hybrid development and useable communal open space.

Proposed Controls
- FAR: 3.3 : 1 (Sandridge Non-Core)
- Building Height: 24 Storeys
- Site Coverage: 70%
- 6m Laneway

The Site
- Site Area: 4,070 sqm
- Buildable Area: 4,070 sqm - 492 sqm (laneway) = 3,578sqm
- Total GFA: 27,138 sqm (Envelope FAR + FAU)
- FAR + FAU: 6.66:1 (achieved under this option)

Potential Fit
- Floor area ratio (FAR) 3.3 : 1
  - 4,070sqm x 3.3 (FAR) = 13,431sqm
- Floor area uplift (FAU) 2.4 : 1
  - 4,070sqm x 3.36 (FAU) = 13,707 sqm
- Total coverage = 30%

Note: All dimensions approximate.

Heggen testing of Hodyl Addenda 6
CitiPower Conclusions and Recommendations

- The built form disparity between the mandatory FAR and the opt in FAU is too great.
- Such a divergent built form outcome is poor planning practice and will reduce certainty.
- The mandatory FAR should be reviewed and increased.
- A consequential re-calibration of the mix of development contributions in any DCP may be required.