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1 INTRODUCTION

This submission has been prepared by Mesh Planning on behalf of Marlton Investments Pty Ltd. Marlton Investments Pty Ltd are the owners of 189-193 Ferrars Street, South Melbourne.

189-193 Ferrars Street, South Melbourne is comprised of two parcels – the first being 5m wide with a depth of approximately 20m and the other being 10m wide with a depth of 16-19m. Both parcels are currently occupied by single storey buildings which are built boundary to boundary and which gain direct vehicle and/or pedestrian access from Ferrars Street and both of which have rear access potential to the rear via Railway Place.

Ferrars Street has a quite wide road reserve width (30m) with established street trees on both sides and angle parking on one side and parallel parking on the other and Railway Place has a width of approximately 4.5m (see Figures 1-4).

Figure 1 – Subject Land - Zoning
Figure 2 – Subject Land – Existing Facades

Figure 3 – Subject Land – Rear Lane
2 SUBJECT LAND STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The subject land parcels occupy a strategic location in proximity to Southbank, City Road and the City Road light rail (see Figures 5 and 6).
It is significant that the subject land parcels are two of a relatively large number of smaller land parcels in the locality (see Figure 7).
From a place making and general good urbanism perspective, it is important to note that the desirable characteristics of this part of South Melbourne are:

- the mix of smaller and larger parcels,
- variable heights,
- presence of heritage buildings of varying character and quality,
- mix of land uses,
- ‘industrial’ employment/commercial buildings that have proven to be adaptable for a range of other purposes,
- an offset, modified grid movement network comprising a wide primary street network that is supported by a finer network of supporting streets and laneways that have been deliberately deflected at key locations,
- balanced but variable street cross sections that support vehicle access but which also make provision for pedestrian amenity, active street fronts and general liveability,
- consistent, well defined building lines along street fronts and rear abutals,
- existing street trees and other small pieces of formalised public open space,
- variable street trees and kerb materials; and
- variable frontage widths and cross-over details.
The collective the presence of these characteristics has produced, over time, an eclectic mix of land use activities and ‘human scale’ liveability which is highly valued as a distinctive and desirable attribute of the inner part of Melbourne.

The relevance of this commentary, is not to attempt to persuade the Panel that the Precinct does not have significant redevelopment potential or to seek to preserve parts of the precinct but rather to emphasise that:

- Smaller land parcels are very important and they will play a significant role in the delivery of diverse outcomes within the precinct;
- Whilst a clear vision and objectives are very important, there is danger associated with implementation of planning and urban design requirements that assume conditions are the same on all sites;
- The balance between delivery of desirable, organic, diverse outcomes and sameness is very delicate; and
- Discretion should be available to deal with particular site conditions where they do not conflict with the vision or objectives.

3 PROPOSED CONTROLS

A review has been conducted of the proposed planning controls (at the time of exhibition). The impact of the proposed controls is summarised below and following (see Figure 8).

- Subject site is located within the Montague Precinct.
- The proposed Capital City Zone, Schedule 1 nominates that site as ‘core activity’.
- In the proposed CCZ schedule the total floor area ratio is 6.1:1, therefore maximum floor area is 1,628.7m².
- The proposed DDO schedule notes:
  - Street wall height to Ferrars street cannot exceed 8 storeys (30m)
  - Street wall height to laneway cannot exceed 4 storeys (15.4m)
  - Building should be set back 5m and must be setback 3m from new and existing streets and laneways (measured from the centreline of the laneway).
  - Minimum ground floor height of 4m and 3.8m for lower levels up to street wall, that accommodate employment uses.
- Port Phillip proposed changes to DDO schedule – minimum floor area for buildings not to be used as a dwelling in a ‘core’ area must provide 1.6:1 FAR which is 427m². A permit may be granted if the built form envelope available makes it impractical to provide the minimum floor area ratio. If used for employment uses ground floor must be 4m and 3.7m for at least the first 4 floors.
- No cross-overs are allowed along Ferrars Street (as per proposed CCZ) therefore the site must be rear loaded.
- Car parking should be provided within a building, fronted with active uses and not visible from the street, with a floor to floor height of not less than 3.8m (proposed Car Parking Schedule – Clause 7).
- Car parking for sites in core areas facing laneway, streets and adjoining sites should be sleeved with active uses (proposed Car Parking Schedule, Clause 7).
Figure 8 – Summary of proposed planning controls
4 KEY CHALLENGES FACING NARROW AND IRREGULAR SHAPED lots

It is important to recognise that innovative developments can be delivered on narrow and irregular shaped lots, however to facilitate such outcomes it is essential to recognise some of the particular challenges that are likely to be encountered.

Several submissions have outlined in detail the challenges/issues faced by narrow lots which are summarised below:

> Building typology
  
  o There is a need to ensure the planning controls encourage a range of building typologies

> Built form and set backs
  
  o The limited site area of narrow blocks often results in the development covering 100% of the site. Therefore, there are generally no front, side or rear setbacks.
  
  o Uncertainty regarding street wall heights and the need for clear mapping of these requirements.

> Access and parking
  
  o On site parking is limited and generally requires car stackers due to the constrained site area.
  
  o Access to car parking is often provided from the rear street/laneway.
  
  o Slewing of car parking on narrow sites is very difficult to achieve given the limited depth and width of the lot.
  
  o In some instances, no parking is able to be provided on site.

5 WHAT IS REQUESTED

The urban design report that was prepared by the City of Port Phillip (Fishermans Bend Planning Review Panel Urban Design Report April 2018) at pages 42-45 benchmarks a range of building typologies and recognises the important role of smaller and narrow sites in contributing to built form diversity. That same report however seeks to distinguish between core and non-core parts of the precincts favouring the outcome where height is directed to core locations and where non-core areas accommodate mid-rise and other outcomes.

This general approach is supported on the proviso that it can be clarified, as has been recommended by Leanne Hodyl (Fishermans Bend GC81 Panel Hearing Urban Design Expert Evidence Summary 14 March 2018) that the subject land and surrounds should be included within the amended core area (see Figure 9). Extension of the core area boundary is recommended for the subject site and immediate surrounds due to:

- Proximity to Southbank
- Proximity to City Road,
- Proximity to the light rail,
- Abuttal to an existing laneway and beyond to the light rail reserve resulting in the absence of any amenity conflicts,
- Frontage to Ferrars Street, and
- Proximity to planned infrastructure.
Figure 9 – Extract from Leanne Hodyl Summary of Evidence
It is noted that this recommendation is also supported by extension of the ‘core activity’ area as illustrated in the revised CCZ map circulated by the Minister for Planning (document 156b) – refer to figure 10 below due to its proximity to public transport, proximity to the proposed school and community hub and new park.

Figure 10 – Revised CCZ map

In terms of land use outcomes, the mixed use designation as per the City of Port Phillip submission is supported (see Figure 11). If inclusion of more detailed sub-precinct level guidance is supported by the Panel then the typologies that have been recognised by the City of Port Phillip for area M4 are supported (see Figure 12). In relation to interpretation of wall heights, the City of Port Phillip position is supported such that the light rail reserve abuttal is acknowledged (see Figure 13).
Figure 11 – Extract from City of Port Phillip Urban Design Report April 2018
Figure 12 – Extract from City of Port Phillip Urban Design Report April 2018
Figure 13 – Extract from City of Port Phillip Urban Design Report April 2018
6 CONCLUSION

It is respectfully requested that the Panel consider the matters that have been raised in this submission in formulating its recommendations.

Chris De Silva
Director