1. This SIN provides further information in response to Document 325 tabled by the Review Panel which included:
   a. A graph of FARs compared to heights sub-precinct (sorted by sub-precinct)
   b. A graph of FARs compared to height by sub-precinct (sorted by heights)
   c. A table of FAR, character and height limits (summary table of sub-precincts, core/non-core areas, hybrid development, building scale, Total FAR, Lowest maximum height (storeys) and tallest maximum height (storeys)

2. This material provides a summary of the proposed controls in a format which at first view suggests a misalignment between the proposed FARs and the proposed height limits. This is due to the method of representing the FARs and heights against the same vertical scale axis. This suggests a significant gap between the FARs which are in the range of 2.1 – 7.4 and the height limits which range from 4 storeys to unlimited.

3. The material in this SIN has been provided to assist in explaining the relationships between the FARs, maximum height limits, building typologies, scale and primary function (determined by location core or non-core area). It demonstrates the intent of the controls in delivering the preferred character in each area.

4. The SIN provides further information regarding the degree of ‘fit’ for each sub-precinct area. The fit is determined by:
   a. Preferred typologies – hybrid developments vs single typologies (non-hybrid)
   b. Maximum building heights
   c. FARs

5. The tabled material includes some minor errors that originally appeared in SIN 15. Table 1 below provides the correct heights for each sub-precinct and has also been updated to reflect the changes proposed in the Part C DDOs and CCZ. This includes the deletion of area M2 – Non-core and the additional of area M4 – core. The reasons for all corrections are noted within the Table.
### Table 1: Updated table with revised maximum building heights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-precinct</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Core/Non-core</th>
<th>Residential FAR</th>
<th>Total FAR</th>
<th>Lowest maximum height (storeys)</th>
<th>Tallest maximum height (storeys)</th>
<th>Explanation of change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Hybrid (predominantly mid-rise)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>20 storeys</td>
<td>24 storeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Mid-rise</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>Change: Revised core area results in no non-core M2 area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Hybrid (predominantly mid-rise)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>24 storeys</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Mid-rise</td>
<td>Non-core</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>Change: Revised core area results in a core area in M2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>Hybrid (predominantly mid-rise)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4 storeys</td>
<td>20 storeys</td>
<td>Correction: One site of 4 storeys within core area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>Low rise</td>
<td>Non-core</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4 storeys (mandatory)</td>
<td>4 storeys (discretionary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Hybrid (predominantly mid-rise)</td>
<td>Non-core</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12 storeys</td>
<td>24 storeys</td>
<td>Change: Boundary of sub-precinct areas revised to align with core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Hybrid (predominantly mid-rise)</td>
<td>Non-core</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12 storeys</td>
<td>24 storeys</td>
<td>Correction: Lowest height limit is 12 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Hybrid (predominantly high-rise)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>12 storeys</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Low mid-rise</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4 storeys (mandatory)</td>
<td>12 storeys</td>
<td>Correction: Site north-west of North Port Oval is within core and 12 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-core</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4 storeys (mandatory)</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>Hybrid (predominantly mid-rise)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>12 storeys</td>
<td>24 storeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-core</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12 storeys</td>
<td>24 storeys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L1</strong></td>
<td>Hybrid (predominantly mid-rise)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>12 storeys</td>
<td>24 storeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L2</strong></td>
<td>Mid-rise</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>10 storeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L3</strong></td>
<td>Hybrid (predominantly mid-rise)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>18 storeys</td>
<td>18 storeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L4</strong></td>
<td>Hybrid (predominantly high-rise)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W1</strong></td>
<td>Mid-rise</td>
<td>Non-core</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6 storeys</td>
<td>6 storeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W2</strong></td>
<td>Hybrid (predominantly mid-rise)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6 storeys</td>
<td>24 storeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W3</strong></td>
<td>Low mid-rise</td>
<td>Non-core</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6 storeys (mandatory)</td>
<td>6 storeys (discretionary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W4</strong></td>
<td>Mid-rise</td>
<td>Non-core</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6 storeys</td>
<td>6 storeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correction: Wirraway mid-rise areas are 6 storeys, not 8.

Correction: Wirraway mid-rise areas are 6 storeys, not 8.

Correction: Wirraway mid-rise areas are 6 storeys, not 8; 12 storey height limit included within transition area.

Change: Increase in height proposed in the Wirraway DDO from 4 to 6 storeys.

Correction: Wirraway mid-rise areas are 6 storeys, not 8.
Degree of ‘fit’ – relationship to preferred typologies

6. The graphs in the Document 325 suggest a very loose fit between the FARs and the maximum building heights. The modelling in Ms Hodyl’s evidence and prepared by DELWP demonstrates, however, that the overall maximum building heights are generally reached within each sub-precinct although not on all sites.

7. The ‘looseness’ of fit differs significantly between proposed ‘hybrid’ and ‘single typology (non-hybrid)’ developments. This is because different outcomes are sought between these two different typologies. This is demonstrated in Figure 1 below. Example 1 demonstrates the relationship between the height envelope (the overall built form envelope before proposed parks, streets, laneways and building setbacks are taken into account), the building envelope and the FAR.

8. Example 2 demonstrates the closer relationship between the height envelope, building envelope and FAR for non-hybrid developments.

E.g. 1: Relationships between height envelope, building envelope and FARs for hybrid developments. The ‘fit’ of the FAR within the height envelope and building envelope is looser than in singular typology developments.

Figure 1: Relationship between height envelope, building envelope and FARs for hybrid and non-hybrid developments.

E.g. 2: Relationships between height envelope, building envelope and FARs for single typology developments. The ‘fit’ of the FAR within the height envelope and building envelope is not as loose as hybrid developments.

Figure 1: Relationship between height envelope, building envelope and FARs for hybrid and non-hybrid developments.
9. Built examples of this ‘fit’ are included in figures 2-8 below. These demonstrate the development outcomes for three of the precedent images that were included in the character statements tabled for Montague, Wirraway and Sandridge (Documents: M2, W3 and S3).

10. Figure 2 is a precedent image of the Malvern Hill Apartments included to demonstrate the preferred character and building typologies sought for Area W4 in Wirraway.

![Figure 2: Malvern Hill Apartments, Malvern (building typology, communal open space)](https://architectureau.com/articles/malvern-hill-apartments/)

Figure 2: Malvern Hill Apartments, Malvern (building typology, communal open space)

![Figure 3: Malvern Hill Apartments, overall development – 2 – 5 storeys](https://architectureau.com/articles/malvern-hill-apartments/)

Figure 3: Malvern Hill Apartments, overall development – 2 – 5 storeys

---

1 https://architectureau.com/articles/malvern-hill-apartments/

2 Google Earth image.
Figure 4: Malvern Hill Apartments, overall height envelope shown in pink.

11. Malvern Hill Apartments – Development summary:
   a. Height range: 2 to 5 storeys
   b. Site area: 5,328m² (measured in Urban Circus)
   c. GFA of development: 11,721m²
   d. FAR: calculated at 2.2:1
   e. Potential GFA in height envelope: 26,640m²
   f. % ‘fit’ between GFA of development and GFA of height envelope: 44%

12. This example demonstrates a low-mid-rise development where a single typology is to be delivered: the ‘fit’ is 44%.

13. Figure 5 is a precedent image of the Melburnian included to demonstrate the preferred character and building typologies sought for Area S5 in Sandridge.
Figure 5: The Melburnian, overall development

Figure 6: The Melburnian, overall development with height envelope in pink

14. The Melburnian, St Kilda Road – Development summary:
   a. Height range: 3 to 20 storeys
   b. Site area: 9,701m² (measured in Urban Circus)
   c. GFA of development: 45,665m² (estimated from Urban Circus)
   d. FAR: calculated at 4.7:1
   e. Potential GFA in height envelope: 194,035m²

3 Google Earth image.
4 Urban circus model.
f. % ‘fit’ between GFA of development and GFA of height envelope: 23%

15. This demonstrates that the ‘fit’ must be significantly looser when a range of building scales and communal open space is sought. In this instance the fit is 23%.

16. Figure 7 is a precedent image for Area M3 in Montague.

![Figure 7: Concept Blue Apartments, corner Russell and Latrobe Street, overall development](google-earth-image)

17. Concept Blue Apartments, corner Russell and Latrobe Street, Melbourne – Development summary:
   
   a. Height range: 2 to 27 storeys
   
   b. Site area: 4,524m² (measured in Urban Circus)

---

5 Google Earth image
6 Urban circus model
c. GFA of development: 39,934 (estimated from Urban Circus)
d. FAR: calculated at 8.8:1
e. Potential GFA in height envelope: 113,109m$^2$
f. % ‘fit’ between GFA of development and GFA of height envelope: 35%

18. This development is also a hybrid, however includes less communal open space than the Melburnian and only 1 tower. The ‘fit’ is 35%.

19. The built form envelopes illustrated in DELWPs modelling (documents M14, S11, W10 and L18) communicate the height envelope applied to each site and not the detailed building envelope.

20. The current ‘fit’ between proposed FARs and height envelope, based on gross site areas, ranges from 14% to 79%. There is a clear distinction of ‘fit’ between hybrid and single typology developments as demonstrated in figure 9.

21. It is important to note that these are a ‘fit’ based on gross site areas. The precedent examples included above, are for net site areas, which will result in a higher percentage. Moderating the degree of fit for net developable site area in Fishermans Bend would, on average, increase the percentage fit by approximately 30%. This is the average difference across Fishermans Bend between net and gross developable site area. The different between net and gross developable site area varies between precincts.
Figure 9: Relationship of FARs and heights described as percentage ‘fit’ to building typology and scale (blue – Singular typology, yellow – hybrid typology in core areas with height limits, pink – hybrid in core areas with unlimited height, purple – hybrid, non-core)
Degree of ‘fit’ – relationship to maximum height limits and preferred scale

22. The degree of fit is determined by the relationship between the FARs and the maximum height limits. The height limits have been determined by a range of factors including relationship to character, building typologies, function (core or non-core) and overshadowing.

23. The overarching built form strategy for Fishermans Bend is set by the Urban Design Strategy (Hodyl + Co), which identifies the preferred mix of building scale and typologies for each precinct (figure 42, p89). This has been articulated through the character statements tabled for each precinct by the Minister’s – Documents M2 (Montague), S3 (Sandridge), W3 (Wirraway) and L7 (Lorimer) and in the updated Part C DDOs which provide further clarity on the built form outcomes sought for each overall precinct and sub-precinct areas.

24. A summary of the key drivers for the height limits in each sub-precinct as determined by these built form outcomes is shown in Figure 10. This is provided here as a summary of the relationship between the building scales (low, mid, high-rise) and typologies as defined by the sub-precinct areas.

25. As the height limits are moderated to deliver preferred character outcomes in each sub-precinct and to respond to specific site conditions (e.g. overshadowing or transitioning to low-scale neighbourhoods), the degree of fit varies within and between sub-precincts that have the same FAR. This is deliberate.

26. Figure 11 demonstrates that there is a general correlation between the FARs, and maximum height limits that is directly related to the preferred typologies (hybrid/singular typology), scale (low, mid or high rise) and function (core/non-core) defined for each sub-precinct. Generating diversity of built form outcomes is a key driver of the overall Urban Design Strategy, however, as this demonstrates the proposed controls are intentional.
Figure 10: Summary of the height limits in relationship to building scale and sub-precinct boundaries.
Figure 11: Relationship of FARs to heights to building typology and scale noting sub-precinct area (e.g. L4 = Lorimer 4), Core (C) or Non-core (NC)