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Introduction

Overview

1. The endorsed vision for Sandridge is for it to develop as "one of Melbourne’s premium office and commercial centres, balanced with diverse housing and retail". This is a Vision that Council strongly supports.

2. However, a more detailed understanding of the opportunities and constraints that are present is needed to assess whether the proposed planning controls are likely to achieve this ambitious Vision. Ultimately, Council considers that several changes are needed. To better understand these changes and Council’s vision for Sandridge, Council has identified its “key moves” for Sandridge.

3. Council’s key moves facilitate the achievement of the Vision. They build on, and refine aspects of Amendment GC81, and in turn, the Framework.

4. The “key moves” for Sandridge include the following:

   - Intensive high-rise development focussed around the future Metro Station creating the commercial and civic centre of Fishermans Bend, supported by higher order retail activity, community hubs and residential apartments.

   - A high-rise scale for Council’s proposed ‘Core Retail Area’ focussed on Fennell Street and Bertie Street.

   - A new network of north-south laneways which maximise solar access and better facilitate office floorplates.

   - An integrated approach to public open space and community facilities to cater for residents, families and workers comprising:

     - a landmark Art and Cultural Hub co-located with an expanded urban plaza on the north-west corner of Plummer Street and Bridge Street;

     - a Sport and Recreation Hub and Education and Community Hub including a major P-12 (Primary and Secondary) School integrated with an expanded North Port Oval;

     - a Health and Well-being Hub integrated into a landmark mixed use building on the south-west corner of Bertie Street and the extension of Woolboard Road opposite Council’s proposed new large Sandridge North Park; and

     - an urban plaza integrated into an entrance to the proposed future Metro Station on the south-west corner of Bertie and Plummer Street in the heart of the Sandridge Core.

   - Potential for more campus style mid-rise buildings along the Westgate Freeway suited to major office headquarters, tertiary education and health uses.
- Development along Williamstown Road that responds to its interface with established low-rise residential areas.
- Vehicle, cycling and pedestrian bridge connections from Sandridge into Lorimer and the Employment Precinct over the West Gate Freeway from Bertie and Graham Streets.

5. These key moves are shown in the below plan. (extracted from page 7 of the Sandridge Precinct Urban Design Report).

![Diagram of Sandridge Precinct Urban Design Plan]

6. As outlined in Council's Stage 2 Overarching Submission, Council has prepared two 3D built form models to test and inform its position on Amendment GC81.
The first model is based on the outcomes provided for by DDO30 per Amendment GC81. It is a simple extrusion model of potential 3D building envelopes that shows the various height, setback and overshadowing controls relative land ownership patterns as well as existing and proposed streets and laneways to understand the possible built form outcomes allowed for by Amendment GC81. It differs from Ms Hodyl’s model which is predominantly based on the FAR controls and does not reflect the laneway locations shown in the Framework. Thus, it provides a good reference point to the maximum development outcome, while Ms Hodyl’s essentially shows the minimum.

The second model shows the cumulative effects of Council’s proposed changes to Amendment GC81 as they relate to heights, setbacks and urban structural elements such as the location of parks, community hubs, streets and laneways. So, in other words, this model shows the maximum development outcomes per Council’s proposed changes to the planning controls.

In both models, floorplate assumptions were applied to create realistic building envelopes as per the Council’s Stage 2 Overarchin Submission and the Urban Design Report that accompanied that submission.

A further, more detailed and precinct based Urban Design Report accompanies this submission that builds on the general principles outlines in the overarching Urban Design Report that accompanied Council’s Stage 2 Overarchin Submission. It is adopted as part of this submission. This written submission effectively summarises the content of that extensive report.

Key issues

Council submits that the key issues in relation to Sandridge are as follows:

- The preferred character statements proposed for the neighbourhoods in Sandridge do not offer a clear enough differentiation between the intended character, architectural typologies or building scales proposed for Sandridge.
- Further to this, the drafting of DDO30 fails to recognise the unique outcomes sought for each precinct, including Sandridge, and for the neighbourhoods within them.
- The street and laneway layout (as proposed in the Framework) in the central part of Sandridge creates blocks that are either too large or too small to facilitate commercial and retail development outcomes, and could curtail the scale of development that is intended for them by the Vision.
- The investigation areas for community hubs do not capitalise on place-making opportunities and ignore the inherent difficulties of locating some hubs within vertical mixed-use developments.
- As agreed by Ms Thompson, public open space proposed:
(a) either side of Plummer Street at the intersection of Bridge Street misses an important opportunity to facilitate a larger open space; and

(b) in the north of Sandridge is not shaped in a way that will facilitate the broadest function of use and pushes larger scale development too far away from the centre of Sandridge.

- Building heights in the northern part of Sandridge push density and built form towards the West Gate Freeway rather the future public transport nodes and misses an important opportunity to provide the potential for large floorplate employment generating land uses in the area near the Freeway where these floorplates will not affect the need for a finer grain of pedestrian connectivity near the future Metro Station.

- A large regional activity centre is required in the centre of Sandridge. However, core anchor land uses are not planned for in the commercial heart of Sandridge and there is the potential for the primary retail area to be diluted as it is stretched too far along Fennell Street and Plummer Street.

- Building heights in the Ingles-Fennell Triangle and in the western part of Sandridge are too high and will detract from the primacy of the central part of Sandridge.

**Summary of Council's position on the key issues**

**Built form outcomes and architectural typologies**

12. The character area / neighbourhood breakdown that is currently proposed for Sandridge in the MSS (at page 40) be modified to allow for more refined guidance to be provided about the built form outcomes and architectural typologies that anticipated for Sandridge.

13. Further to this, a precinct specific DDO schedule should be created for Sandridge (as well as for the other precincts), including statements relating to the preferred built form outcome and architectural typologies for each neighbourhood within the precinct.

**Layout of streets and laneways**

14. An additional east-west street is required to run parallel to the south of Fennell Street between Bridge Street and Ingles Street.

15. Laneways in the central part of Sandridge should be realigned to run predominantly perpendicular to Fennell Street.

16. The option to provide one arcade style through block link per street block in lieu of an open to the air laneway where a large commercial development is proposed should be provided.

**Specific sites for Community Hubs and integration with a revised public open space network**

17. A larger open space should be located on the north-west corner of the realigned Plummer Street and Bridge Street, and this space should be co-located with a proposed district sized stand-alone Arts and Cultural Hub.
18. A more regularly shaped major piece of public open space should be located on the north-west corner of Bertie Street and the extension of Woolboard Road ('Sandridge North Park')

19. The Health and Wellbeing Hub proposed in Wirraway should be relocated to Sandridge to offer a more district style function and located on the south-west corner of Bertie Street and the extension of Woolboard Road as part of a mixed-use development on the Goodman owned site (opposite the Sandridge North Park).

20. An Education and Community Hub comprising both a primary and secondary school should be co-located with the proposed Sandridge Sports and Recreation Hub site to the immediate west of North Port Oval.

Retail development and active frontages

21. A ‘Core Retail Area’ should be earmarked in the blocks contained within Bridge Street, the extension of Woolboard Road, Ingles Street and Woodruff Street, with Fennell Street and Bertie Street as its ‘main streets’.

22. The DPO should be used to enable suitable sites for a required and necessary series of large format anchor retail uses such as full line supermarkets, and other consolidated retail developments to be nominated, and protected from development that would prejudice their subsequent delivery. The DPO should be used to also ensure that these uses are master planned into the broader context of this key area.

23. Within the Core Retail Area, Fennell Street and Bertie Street, along with key laneways near their intersection should be nominated as ‘Primary Active Frontages’, with all other streets in this area to be nominated as ‘Secondary Active Frontages’.

24. Streets in the ‘Non-Core’ areas in the eastern part of Sandridge should be deleted as Secondary Active Frontages.

Urban Structure

25. For the reasons explained in Council’s Stage 2 Overarching Submissions (at paragraphs 65-72, and 109), a future urban structure plan should be included within the CCZ1 as per Council’s proposed plan1.

Building / Street Wall Heights and Core / Non-Core designation

26. Building heights for the developable land in the block containing the Sandridge North Park should be increased to 40 storeys and included as part of the Core Area for Sandridge.

1 Mr Sheppard’s addendum report agreed with Council.
27. Unlimited building heights to the north in Lorimer should be moderated to ensure that they do not overshadow the Sandridge North Park.

28. Building heights along the Westgate Freeway should be lowered to provide for larger floorplate campus style development that are suited to major office headquarters or tertiary / health related uses such as a university or hospital. This area should be solely designated as Non-Core.

29. Buildings heights near the revised public open space layout at the corner of Plummer Street and Bridge Street should be amended to accord with the relocation of the overshadowing control from the southern to the northern side of Plummer Street.

30. Building heights in the Ingles-Fennell Triangle and the western part of Sandridge should be lowered to retain and emphasise the primacy of the central part of Sandridge. This site should have the DPO applied to it to enable the integrated master planning of the residual land leftover after it is dissected by the tram bridge landing.

31. Building heights in the western part of Sandridge (outside of the Core Area) should be lowered to align with the intended built form character and architectural typologies for this area to create a transition in the skyline between the Core of Sandridge and the Core of Wirraway.
Submissions

Preferred Character and Architectural Building Typologies

32. Council has throughout this Advisory Committee process made a range of general submissions regarding the need for more refined statements about the built form outcomes and architectural typologies between different precincts and the neighbourhoods within them. This precinct based submission makes further submissions about where they should apply and how they ought to be given effect for Sandridge to achieve the Vision.

33. Council proposes only a minor change to the boundary of the Sandridge North area as proposed as part of the MSS as part of Amendment GC81. This is shown below (being an extract from page 8 of the Council's Sandridge Urban Design Report) We return to the reasons for this later in this submission.

Figure 2. Changes to Sandridge sub-precincts proposed by Council

34. The above sub-precinct diagram can be compared to the existing precincts shown at page 40 of the MSS as proposed by Amendment GC81.
35. As well as proposing changes to the boundaries of these sub-precincts, or neighbourhood areas, Council also proposes that further information is added to that diagram about which building typologies are preferred in each of the neighbourhoods. This is shown below and extracted from page 12 of the Council’s Sandridge Urban Design Report.

![Diagram of Sandridge sub-precincts]

**Figure 3. Council’s preferred building typologies within Sandridge sub-precincts**

36. Given that this is discussing built form outcomes, Council submits that this ought to be the basis for exercising discretion under the DDO. On this basis, Council considers that the DDO is the rightful place for this content in the Planning Scheme.

37. Furthermore, the Preferred Character as described currently proposed by Amendment GC81 in the MSS at pages 36 and 37 should be modified to accord with what we have set out at pages 9 to 11 of the Sandridge Urban Design Report. That text is marked up to show the changes proposed.

38. Given that the built form character intended by the Vision is to be markedly different within each precinct and the neighbourhoods within them, Council concludes that a precinct-based DDO schedule should be created for Sandridge (as well as for the other precincts) including statements relating to the preferred built form outcome and architectural typologies for each neighbourhood. The Vision document at page 12 (per Strategic Direction 5) refers to creating *distinctive* neighbourhoods that reflect their unique locations, histories and urban form.
39. As we have said previously, one DDO schedule for the entire Fishermans Bend is tasked with trying to do too much. A simplified approach that tied the Fishermans Bend wide aims to more localised and specific aims would provide a much better statutory framework to assess built form.

Layout of streets and laneways

Block size

40. The Sandridge ‘Core Area’ is comprised of predominantly large land parcels with few existing internal streets. The Sandridge Cadastre plan at page 4 in document #123 clearly shows this. This owes to its current collection of predominantly coarsely grained industrial buildings.

41. Amendment GC81 proposes some new east-west streets and one new north-south street to assist in breaking up this coarse urban structure. It also proposes to realign Plummer Street so that it forms a continuous boulevard with Fennell Street. This is all shown in Figure 4 on page 13 of Council’s Urban Design Report.

42. One of the key elements of ensuring the success of Sandridge as a ‘premium office and commercial centre’ is ensuring that the new street blocks that are created:

- can accommodate commercial and retail development;
- are legible and permeable; and
- reinforce key structural features such as the Fennell-Plummer Street ‘civic boulevard’ and its key north-south streets.

43. To understand whether the blocks created by the proposed street network is likely to achieve the intended outcomes, benchmarking was undertaken by Council to compare what the Framework proposes against those of the Melbourne CBD.

44. While there is some variation, a standard street block in the Melbourne CBD is approximately 100 metres by 200 metres.

45. In contrast, the three blocks annotated in the map below are much larger. These three blocks range in length from 140 metres to 210 metres and are substantially deeper than those on the north side of Fennell Street (approximately 70 metres to 100 metres).
Figure 4. Proposed new streets shown in Amendment GC81

Figure 6. Benchmarking of Sandridge Core Area blocks against CBD block sizes

Figure 7. Average CBD block sizes
The proposed blocks were also benchmarked against a range of central city style retail and commercial developments. This is shown in page 14 and 15 of Council's Urban Design Report.

This benchmarking found that the smaller blocks proposed by Amendment GC81 north of Fennell Street could not accommodate large footprint retail and commercial development such as full line anchor stores or large shops such as Myer or David Jones within the Bourke Street Mall and Collins Place (the latter being almost 100 metres in depth).

Conversely, the larger block (south of Fennell Street) was nearly double the size needed to accommodate these uses. This is shown below.

---

**Figure 5.** Benchmarking of blocks north and south of Fennell Street between Bertie and Ingles Streets
49. An comparison to the Hoddle Grid suggests that these blocks in Sandridge are too large and should be broken up into two smaller blocks by a new east-west street. We note that Mr Sheppard came to the same conclusion without knowing which specific block Council was referring to.

50. The additional east-west street is required across the three blocks from Bridge Street to Boundary Street to achieve the preferred built form and pedestrian permeability outcomes in the Sandridge core area. This outcome is shown below being an extract from page 17 of the Urban Design Report.

![Map of new streets proposed by Council](image)

Figure 8. New streets proposed by Council

51. What follows from the above is that Council seeks the recommendations set out on page 17 of its Sandridge Urban Design Report.
Locations of laneways

52. As has been noted by many parties, CCZ1 as originally proposed by Amendment GC81 required development to ‘make provision for’ laneways these as per a map in the planning controls that did not in fact specify their location.

53. In addition, policy proposed to form part of Clause 22.15 as part of Amendment GC81 encourages laneways no more than 100 metres apart in ‘Non-Core’ areas, and no more than 50 metres apart in ‘Core’ areas or within 200 metres of public transport routes.

54. Lanes shown for Sandridge in the ‘Precinct Actions’ section of the Framework are shown at intervals as close as 30 metres apart in some cases (show below being an extract from page 19 of the Urban Design Strategy).

![Diagram of laneways]

Figure 10. Built form created by proposed laneway configuration in Amendment GC81

\[^2\] Noting that the Minister’s Part B submission now proposes to include the ‘Precinct Actions’ maps from the Framework that show these within CCZ1.
55. The location of laneways as proposed by the Framework has a significant effect on the built form and pedestrian permeability of Sandridge based on the current ownership patterns.

56. These proposed east-west laneways limit the development potential of some sites in an unnecessary and undesirable manner. Narrow blocks created by these lanes also preclude the larger retail or commercial tenancies that one would expect to establish over time on these blocks and are a key part of the vision for Sandridge. Refer to page 20 of Council’s Sandridge Urban Design Report for Figure 11 below.

57. Council submits that these laneways should be replaced with laneways that generally run perpendicular to Fennell Street. It is submitted that these, coupled with Council’s proposed new street as per Figure 10 on page 19 of Council’s Sandridge Urban Design Report (and below) will create a more legible layout of streets and laneways that will support the desired land use and development outcomes.
Maddock's

Figure 14. Built form created by proposed laneway configuration proposed by Council

Benchmarking the new layout against commercial tower floorplates

58. As explained in Council's Stage 2 Overarching Submission and its accompanying Urban Design Report, Council also undertook a benchmarking exercise to understand floorplate dimensions for residential and commercial towers and the relationship with block size. This is illustrated on page 21 of the Council's Sandridge Urban Design Report.

59. It is submitted that to facilitate commercial floorplates, one laneway per block could be a through-block link in the form of an arcade, or similar where a 50-metre laneway spacing to facilitate a stand-alone office building. This is shown in the above graphic.
Specific sites for Community Hubs and integration with a revised public open space network

Sandridge Arts and Cultural Hub

60. Council has already made submissions to this Advisory Committee about the opportunity to create a landmark civic building in the form of an Arts and Cultural Hub, integrated with a consolidated civic open space on the north-west corner of Plummer Street and Bridge Street. On any view, this is a major place-making initiative that can set the tone for Sandridge and put it on a path to success. Council stands by these submissions and does not seek to restate its case other than to point out that:

- the 'investigation area' approach to identifying sites for the Arts and Cultural Hub unhelpfully covers most of Sandridge;

- the construction difficulties of co-locating this type of facility within a vertical mixed-use development is likely to be subject to similar issues as those outlined for Sport and Recreation Hubs in the Mesh Report given the generally large areas required for such Hubs and the difficulties with building on top of them. This means that it is likely to be undesirable to most developers as a candidate for a FAU proposal;

- land acquisition will almost certainly be required to facilitate the realignment of Plummer Street as the site is unlikely to be able to achieve its FAR (assuming two towers);

- open space is currently proposed by Amendment GC81 to be taken from sites on both sides of the realigned Plummer Street alignment over and above what will be left over from the disused section of the current alignment for Plummer Street; and

- Council's proposition creates the opportunity to efficiently deliver a large stand-alone library and art gallery in Sandridge to act as a key civic node for Sandridge in what is a key location. See below extracted from page 25 of the Council's Sandridge Urban Design Report.

![Diagram showing land required for public open space and other landmarks in Sandridge](image)

Figure 16. Land required from 577 Plummer Street and 299 Bridge Street proposed in Amendment GC81.
This submission intends to build on the above points by explaining the nature of each proposal and its implications from a built form perspective.

Amendment GC81 applies a combination of 24 storeys and unlimited building heights to the sites directly north of Council’s proposed Arts and Community Hub. However, they are also subject to proposed mandatory overshadowing controls that effectively limit the building heights at 23 storeys.

The same issue applies to sites on the eastern side of Bridge Street which are limited to 20 storeys when the controls are modelled.

The modelled DDO30 outcome for the surrounds is shown below being an extract from page 27 of Council’s Sandridge Urban Design report.

To re-state its preferred outcome, Council proposes to:

- increase the public open space on the north-side of Plummer Street (within 577 Plummer Street) to 3,000 square metres (excluding the Bridge Street linear park) to create a generously sized new civic square;
- reduce the amount of open space on the southern side to 1,500 sqm (through removal of public open space from 299 Bridge Street, and only providing public open space within the existing road reserve);
- relocate the overshadowing controls proposed by Amendment GC81 from the open space on the southern side of Plummer Street to Council’s proposed enlarged public open space on the northern side of Plummer Street to create a high quality civic space; and
- co-locate the Sandridge Art and Cultural Hub with the open space on the balance of the 577 Plummer Street adjacent to the proposed enlarged open space.
Council’s proposed outcome will ensure that crucial community infrastructure can be delivered in Sandridge early and in the right spot noting that the tram is listed for delivery between 2020 and 2025. This does away with the need for the investigation area. We refer to figure 19 and 20 of the Urban Design Report at pages 28 and 29.

Ms Thompson also recommended consolidating the open space in this location but preferred the south-side of Plummer Street. On open space grounds alone, this may be the better option. However, as we said in relation to Montague, where you can achieve multiple outcomes with one move, that move should be preferred. Council therefore respectfully submits that Ms Thompson’s recommendation for the south side location did not consider a wider range of considerations such as creating a landmark civic building and land use that can be integrated with this key public space, nor did it consider the efficiencies of utilising land that is likely to have to be acquired. Indeed, she conceded this in cross-examination.

The modelled outcome of Council’s proposal is shown below looking westwards towards JL Murphy Reserve.

An added benefit of Council’s proposed outcome for the proposed changes to building heights and overshadowing controls is that they result in greater built form scale in the central part of Sandridge that is closer to the future Metro Station entries planned along Fennell Street.
On balance, Council submits that this is a far superior outcome that will deliver multiple benefits and demonstrable a higher net community benefit on all levels.

Figure 21. Maximum building heights that can be achieved with the Civic Space and Art and Cultural Hub proposed by Council.

An annotated map showing the changes to the height controls that result from this change follows (extracted from page 31 of Council's Sandridge Urban Design Report).
Sandridge North Park

72. Council has also already made submissions to this Advisory Committee regarding Council's proposal for a reconfigured park in Sandridge North on the north-west corner of Bertie Street and the future extension of Woolboard Road.

73. We note that Ms Thompson agrees with the need for a park of this scale in this vicinity but prefers a location that is immediately south of where Council proposes the park on the other side of the intersection of the proposed extension of Woolboard Road and Bertie Street.

74. Council does not seek to re-state its case about the need for this park. Instead, this submission builds on those previous submissions and explains why its proposition is superior to both the elongated park proposed by Amendment GC81, and the one proposed by Ms Thompson, when a wide range of considerations are brought into view. Council’s preferred location for the Sandridge North Park is shown on page 33 per Figure 24 of its Sandridge Urban Design Report with the strips of land along Woolboard Road narrowed and the park provided on the north-west corner of Bertie Street and Woolboard Road which is currently the Toyota site.
75. From the outset, it is important to note that retaining Toyota as a key business in Sandridge is a priority for Council, and the building at this location is one that is considered that could easily exist into the medium to longer term. Therefore, the creation of Sandridge North Park is not an outcome that Council seeks to be implemented in the short term. Perhaps, it could be part of a larger redevelopment in the future that retains Toyota's presence in Fishermans Bend on a permanent basis noting the desire to foster a high-end engineering focus for the Employment Precinct over time.

76. Putting that to one side for the moment, it is important to note that Council’s proposition for the park needs to be accompanied by other changes to Amendment GC81 for it to reach its fullest potential from a surrounding built form perspective. Importantly, these changes will also enable the outcome to be facilitated through the FAR provisions at some time in the future.

77. Firstly, it is important to note that DDO30 as proposed by Amendment GC81 places mandatory overshadowing controls on the proposed elongated version of the park along Woolboard Road. This serves to limit heights in this location to the north to 12 storeys (see map below extracted from page 36 and 37 of Council’s Urban Design Report).

![Figure 27: Building height and overshadowing controls proposed in Amendment GC81](image-url)
Secondly, it is important to note that Amendment GC81 proposes that the extension of Woolboard Road will ultimately go through the existing Toyota Gallery building.

Thirdly, Amendment GC81 proposes a mix of Core and Non-Core areas in this area that are aligned with the boundaries of the 12 and 24 storey height areas (shown below).

The effect of this is to essentially push the potential for taller buildings towards the Westgate Freeway though one would have to access the proposed FAU scheme to achieve these heights as currently proposed (see below).
To be able to achieve Council’s proposed outcome:

- the entire block containing the proposed park and the remnant developable area needs to be changed to be ‘Core Area’ noting that it is currently a combination of the two; and

- the remnant developable parcel needs to be increased from 24 to 40 storeys.\(^3\)

These changes are shown below from page 43 of Council’s Sandridge Urban Design Report.

\(^3\) This can be facilitated through the removal of the overshadowing controls on the southern side of Woolboard Road extension. Other consequential changes to heights are required because of the movement of the overshadowing control further north.
83. The effect of these changes will ensure that Sandridge is afforded an additional large open space that meets the need identified by Ms Thompson, will help reinforce the urban structure of Sandridge, enhance the amenity of the area for workers and residents and have the added benefit of pushing the potential for taller buildings away from the Westgate Freeway further into the centre of Sandridge.

84. It is Council’s submission that this will help to create a complementary large open space ‘anchor’ in the northern part of Sandridge at the opposite end of Bertie Street to North Port Oval, with the linear park proposed by Amendment GC81 connecting these spaces. This is shown diagrammatically at page 39 of the Council’s Urban Design Report and modelled looking south down Bertie Street on Figure 31 at page 40 of the same report (reproduced below).
Protecting Sandridge North Park from overshadowing in Lorimer

85. As unlimited height buildings are proposed on the other side of the Westgate Freeway in Lorimer, Council also tested how tall these buildings could go without contravening the mandatory overshadowing controls that would apply on the reconfigured and relocated Sandridge North Park⁴.

86. This testing confirmed that these sites in Lorimer could be built to heights of between 56-60 storeys before they begin to overshadow Council’s proposed Sandridge North Park. This is shown below as an extract from page 44 of Council’s Sandridge Urban Design Report. It should be noted this outcome was tested using the City of Melbourne’s 3D model for the Lorimer Precinct.

⁴ These overshadowing controls are the same as those proposed the elongated park that is proposed by Amendment GC81.
Council therefore submits that it is necessary to apply the mandatory overshadowing control for Sandridge North Park to DDO67 in the Melbourne Planning Scheme to ensure that the two planning schemes complement each other.

A Health and Wellbeing Hub integrated with the Sandridge North Park

A Health and Wellbeing Hub is proposed within a large investigation area within the Wirraway Precinct. This hub would provide a cluster of health services. No Health and Wellbeing Hub is proposed for Sandridge. Council submits that the Health and Wellbeing Hub would be better located more centrally in the heart of Fishermans Bend such as within the Core of Sandridge.

Further, it is submitted that this type of facility would be well suited to being delivered in a vertical mixed use development (as opposed to other more spatially specialised facilities such as, but not limited to Sport and Recreation Hubs).

Council submits that there would be an enormous benefit in locating this type of facility in the lower levels of a building on the south-west corner of Bertie Street and future extension of Woolboard Road, opposite where the open space is currently located. Other than the obvious benefits that this would bring from the perspective of clustering civic spaces and strengthening the northern end of the Sandridge City centre.
Council notes that the owner of this land (Goodman) has indicated as part of its submission to Amendment GC81 that it has a desire to deliver several community hubs. The location proposed by Council is identified in Figure 40 at page 49 of its Sandridge Urban Design Strategy.

Council submits that this would result in an integrated place making opportunity that links users of the park with users of the community hub.

Retail development and active frontages

Sandridge Retail Core Area

We have already submitted in our overarching Part 2 submission that Sandridge has the potential to develop into a large regional activity centre over time. The planned population is expected to generate the need for multiple full line supermarkets and ‘mini-majors’, as well as a large range of specialty retail and associated entertainment / hospitality uses.

As illustrated in Figure 41 on page 51 of Council’s Urban Design Report, Amendment GC81 focusses ‘Primary Active Frontages’ along the Fennell-Plummer Civic Boulevard. While the logic of this appears sound at first glance, Council submits that it will be necessary to concentrate activity in key locations along Fennel Plummer Civic Boulevard given its length.

As we submitted earlier, Amendment GC81 lacks guidance around core tenets of activity centre planning, particularly as it relates to anchor retail uses as well as the extent and location of primary active frontages.

Council’s key move here is to create a well-defined activity centre core that can support a clustering of retail and mixed use development to activate and provide spaces for retail anchors within the central part of Sandridge.

To achieve this, Council submits that a ‘Core Retail’ area should be nominated within the larger Core Area and that the key retail activity should be concentrated along Fennell Street between Ingles Street and Bridge Street and along Bertie Street so it can act as the key north-south street to intensify activity close to the future Metro Station. This is illustrated this in Figure 42 on page 53 of Council’s Sandridge Urban Design Report. In this scenario ‘Primary Active Frontages’ are limited to Fennell Street and Bertie Street within this area again as shown in Figure 42 on page 53 of the same report.

It follows that the remainder of the streets and laneways in this Core Area, as well as Plummer Street to the west are obvious candidates as ‘Secondary Active Frontages’ within this area. We have shown this on the same Figure 42 of the same report.
99. Secondary Active Frontages are also proposed in the Non-Core areas along Johnson Street, Boundary Street and the new east-west street that is proposed to connect Johnson Street to Woodruff Street. Council does not support this outcome.

100. The likely long time frame that will be required for the advent of retail uses in the activity centres is a vexed issue.

101. If it is the case that no anchor retail uses such as full line supermarkets are likely to be commercially viable until the late 2030’s (but that several are required)⁵, how and where will they establish if key sites are built out by residential development?

102. Council submits that this provides strong justification for the use of the DPO and we continue to advocate for its use to identify and protect these longer term large floorplate anchor retail land use opportunities in what Council is identifying as the ‘Core Retail Area’.

103. It may be that Precinct Plans eventually negate the need for this and if this comes to fruition, the DPO can potentially be removed. But for now, the DPO is required to ensure the orderly and strategic long term planning of the area. This is even more true given the uncertainty about the content, timing and statutory implementation of these plans.

---

⁵ Per the Essential Economics Report.
Urban Structure Plan

104. As per Council's other submissions on this matter, a significant omission from Amendment GC81 is the inclusion in one of the proposed planning controls of a plan that brings together the layered structuring elements of place (activity centres, key streets, open spaces and civic infrastructure and the like). We note that Mr Sheppard agreed with Council on this matter. A plan that would fulfil that purpose based on the urban structure that Council is proposing is included below extracted from page 55 of Council's Sandridge Urban Design Report.

Building and street wall heights

Campus Development

105. A 24-storey height applies the area immediately north of Council's proposed Sandridge North Park. This is a Non-Core area. It is identified as 'Area S1' in the sub-precinct map. (refer to page 8 of Council's Urban Design Report).

106. The proposed Preferred Character of the Non-Core area of Sandridge North (Area S1) in the MSS envisages 'Hybrid developments of mid-rise perimeter blocks and tower developments with potential for larger commercial uses, including campus style developments'.

107. As outlined in its Stage 2 Overarching Submission, Council is seeking to create a skyline for Fishermans Bend that reinforces the primacy in terms of potential heights to the central part of Sandridge rather than the West Gate Freeway.
To do so, a transition is needed between the Sandridge Core and Non-Core Areas. This differentiation is needed to help create a different character for each neighbourhood, consistent with the Vision.

Council considers that 24-storey height in this location will result in predominately tower-podium forms. Council does not support this outcome.

Instead, Council considers that this area represents a significant opportunity to pursue mid-rise campus style office development, such as those outlined in Council’s Stage 2 Overarching submission.

These types of buildings can deliver more flexible floorplates and layouts for occupants through the inclusion of internal atriums and shared space and support commercial headquarters, tertiary education and health care uses which would ultimately contribute to the success of Sandridge as a commercial centre.

Figure 49. Building height controls proposed in Amendment GC81
112. To facilitate a campus form of development, reducing the building heights to 12 storeys and removing the street wall requirement to allow sheer street walls is recommended to attract a different building typology. Council has shown an example of what this may look like below from page 64 of the Council's Sandridge Urban Design Report.

Figure 54. Built form outcomes proposed by Council

Ingles Street Triangle

113. An outcome of the unlimited height areas is that it creates the potential for tall buildings on the triangle of land on the north-east corner of Ingles Street and Fennell Street where heights are only limited by the flight paths towards Essendon Airport at around 90 storeys. Council does not support this outcome.
114. While Council agrees that this is a key gateway into Sandridge, it considers that a landmark building demonstrating design excellence at this location can achieved without building to this height. Discussion around this is found at page 62 of Council’s Sandridge Urban Design Strategy.

115. Council submits that a maximum height of 40 storeys should be applied for this street block. This height provides substantial development opportunities and floor area while also reinforcing the primacy of the Retail Core, west of Ingles Street by ensuring that taller towers are focussed in this area. This block should also be identified on the proposed Urban Framework Plan as a key site for a landmark development.

_Sandridge West_

116. The creation of a transition between the Core and Non-Core Areas is a key principle of Council.

117. A 24-storey height applies to Sandridge West, however, the preferred future character for this area per Amendment GC81 envisages ‘hybrid developments of mid-rise perimeter blocks and tower developments’.

118. Council’s built form testing indicates that podium tower forms are likely to be the dominant form of development on these sites.

119. Thus, a reduction in heights to 12 storeys is recommended for three blocks east of Graham Street and west of the new north-south street, north and south of Plummer Street. This is shown in Figure 55 on page 65 of Council’s Urban Design Report (extracted below).

120. This transition in height is sought to reinforce the Sandridge Core as the commercial and retail centre of Fishermans Bend, deliver a transition in heights to Wirraway and facilitate the mid-rise typologies sought for this location, consistent with the Vision.
Maddocks

Figure 55. Building height controls proposed by Council

Street walls

121. Council submits that street wall heights should be encouraged to be a maximum of 8 storeys along Fennell Street given its width and its overall prominence as the key civic boulevard for Fishermans Bend. This is illustrated in Figure 45 and 47 on page 57 of Council’s Sandridge Urban Design Report as compared to what Amendment GC81 proposes which is illustrated in Figure 44 and 46 of page 57.

122. Given Council’s earlier submissions regarding the importance of Bertie Street, it is considered that it should have the same street wall conditions, except in its southern reaches where its overall height slips below this height as it nears North Point Oval. In these areas, the prevailing building height would suffice.

123. All other streets could reasonably revert to the methodology proposed by Mr Sheppard.
Specific changes requested

124. The character areas / neighbourhood breakdown that is currently proposed for Sandridge in the MSS be modified in the manner shown in these submissions and relocated to a precinct-specific DDO schedule for Sandridge as built form outcomes.

125. Amend all relevant Maps in CCZ1 and DDO30 to include an additional 22 metre road in the Sandridge ‘Core Area’ parallel and to the south of Fennell Street (between Bridge and Boundary Street).

126. Amend all relevant Maps in CCZ1 and DDO30 to show laneways predominantly running perpendicular to Fennell Street.

127. Amend CCZ1 and DDO30 maps to show the proposed changes to public open space per Council’s submissions.

128. Amend CCZ1 to show specific sites for Community Hubs as per Council’s submissions.

129. Amend CCZ1 to include the Sandridge Future Urban Structure Plan as proposed by Council.

130. Amend CCZ1 to introduce a Retail Core Area within the Sandridge Core Area as proposed by Council.

131. Amend the designation of Primary and Secondary Active Frontages as per Council’s submissions.

132. Amend CCZ1 to introduce a future urban structure plan as per Council’s submissions.

133. Amend the overshadowing controls within DDO30 to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme and DDO67 to the Melbourne Planning Scheme to update the overshadowing controls per Council’s submissions.

134. Amend the building and street wall heights in DDO30 as per Council’s submissions.

Terry Montebello
Maddocks
Lawyers for Port Phillip City Council