

**Privacy acknowledgement: \***

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

**Name: \***

Ruben Monsanto Jnr.

**Email address: \***

[r.monsanto@elenbergfraser.com](mailto:r.monsanto@elenbergfraser.com)

**Date of meeting: \***

Tuesday 3 August 2021

**Agenda item title: \***

292-300 City Road, Southbank TP-2019-979

**Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.**

Submission by project architects with associated presentation

**Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.**

**Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee live via phone or Zoom in support of your submission: \***

Yes

**Privacy acknowledgement: \***

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

**Name: \***

Jamie Govenlock

**Email address: \***

[JGovenlock@urbis.com.au](mailto:JGovenlock@urbis.com.au)

**Date of meeting: \***

Tuesday 3 August 2021

**Agenda item title: \***

292-300 City Road, Southbank TP-2019-979

**Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.**

An oral submission will be made in support of the proposal by Jamie Govenlock, Director, Urbis.

**Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.**

**Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee live via phone or Zoom in support of your submission: \***

Yes

**Privacy acknowledgement: \*** I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

**Name: \*** Donnie Chen

**Email address: \*** [donniechen92@gmail.com](mailto:donniechen92@gmail.com)

**Date of meeting: \*** Tuesday 3 August 2021

**Agenda item title: \*** Future Melbourne Committee Meeting – TP-2019-979 – 292-300 City Road, SOUTHBAN

**Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.** Key issues about the project – 1. City Road is a very and high traffic street – with ShadowPlay Preppers already used part of the city road as guest parking – a new hotel with a new lane way – will certainly increase the traffic issue 2. As mentioned, Nextdoor is Shadow Play by Preppers and Bank Apartment Service hotel opposite – it will cause an unhealthy hotel business competition in this area.

**Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee live via phone or Zoom in support of your submission: \*** No

**Privacy acknowledgement:** I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

\*

**Name: \*** Tony Penna

**Email address: \*** [president@southbankresidents.org.au](mailto:president@southbankresidents.org.au)

**Date of meeting: \*** Tuesday 3 August 2021

**Agenda item title:** Agenda Item 6.2 Planning Permit Application – TP-2019-979, 292-294 & 296-300 City Road, Southbank

\*

**Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.**

Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Alternatively you may attach your written



submission by uploading your file here:

[fmc\\_meeting\\_no.\\_17\\_agenda\\_item\\_6.2\\_planning\\_permit\\_application\\_tp2019979\\_292294\\_296300\\_city](#)

189.21 KB · PDF

**Please indicate whether you** No

would like to  
address the Future  
Melbourne  
Committee live via  
phone or Zoom in  
support of your  
submission: \*



PO Box 1195 South Melbourne VIC 3205  
Phone: 03 9028 2774  
ABN 58 986 783 321 Cert. of Inc. A0036364B  
info@southbankresidents.org.au  
www.southbankresidents.org.au

## **Submission to Future Melbourne Committee**

Future Melbourne Committee Meeting No. 17, Tuesday 3 August 2021  
Town Hall Commons, Ground Floor Melbourne Town Hall  
Agenda Item 6.2 Planning Permit Application: TP-2019-979, 292-294 & 296-300 City Road, Southbank

Southbank Residents Association (SRA) would like to make a submission regarding the Planning Permit Application TP-2019-979, located at 292-294 and 296-300 City Road.

### **Summary**

The SRA notes that this application involves:

- Demolition of the existing buildings with retention and restoration of the façade at 300 City Road,
- Construction of a multi-storey single building - 27 above ground levels plus one basement level,
- Use of the site as a residential hotel and associated hotel office and retail facilities,
- Setback of the building 6.0m from the facade at 300 City Road,
- 27 car parks located in the basement level and exiting onto Haig Lane,
- A new shared laneway (with glazed roof) allowing off road drop-off/pickup to the hotel.

The primary purpose of the building appears to be a hotel with associated function rooms, bars and cafe for the use of patrons. A secondary purpose appears to be a business centre allowing co-working arrangements rather than dedicated office accommodation.

The SRA supports this application on the basis of compliance with the planning scheme and only if the following concerns are taken into consideration.

### **Heritage**

Beginning with the heritage aspect of this design, SRA is in favour of the retention and restoration of the façade at 300 City Road. The two-storey classic revival style building at 296-300 City Road was constructed c.1900 and the building is graded 'significant' in Council's Heritage Places Inventory February 2020 (later amended May 2021). The SRA is in favour of the intention to retain the Edwardian-era classical revival styling, and agree with the recommendation to undertake a restoration of the façade.

### **Parking**

SRA was surprised to see that this proposed development of a 28-storey residential hotel building above the basement level has only made provision for 27 car spaces. This provision of 27 car spaces is below the maximum 121 spaces required by the Melbourne Planning Scheme and substantially less than the maximum allowable in the Parking Overlay.

This provision is inadequate and SRA requests consideration be given to increasing this to a minimum of 60, or 50% of the spaces required. On street parking in the area is limited and the argument that most hotel guests won't have a car is short-sighted, given the unpredictability of the pandemic and the encouragement for Victorians to holiday within the state.

### **Bike spaces**

It is slightly unclear whether this application provides for 20, 25 or 35 bike spaces, nevertheless all provisions fall short of the 56 spaces required by the Melbourne Planning Scheme. It is also less than the statutory requirement of one bike space for each 10 hotel rooms for employees/residents and one space for each 10 hotel rooms for visitors/shoppers/students. With the proposed total of 344 hotel rooms in this development, this equates to a requirement for 68 bike spaces.

SRA requests that the number of bike spaces be increased accordingly.

### **Access**

Currently, it appears that access from the port cochere to the raised ground floor level hotel lobby and bar is via a set of external stairs. There's no visible lift platform or wheelchair ramp visible and SRA asks that the permit specify a clearly detailed lift platform or other measures to secure DDA-compliant access.

Furthermore, SRA agrees with the recommendations by Urban Design to provide a distinct pedestrian path clear of vehicle traffic against the eastern frontage and a distinct pedestrian path clear of vehicle traffic against the through-link's western frontage (minimum 1.2m in width).

### **Setbacks**

SRA notes the improved streetscape resulting from the façade at 300 City Road being retained with the new building being setback 6.0 metres from the boundary.

This setback reduces to 5.0 metres from Level 05 upwards, and the setbacks above the street wall are less than the preferred 10m. We query whether these setbacks meet the design intent of the 6.0m setback for heritage facades and express our concern over the precedent this might set for future developments.



### **Community**

While the building seems to provide little benefit to non-patrons, there does seem to be the potential for local residents to make use of the bar and café facilities. There would be further benefit for hotel patrons and Southbank residents and visitors if there was additional consideration given to street level activation, and for this development to be incorporated in an update to the City Road Masterplan.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, SRA would like to see the recommendations outlined above taken onboard prior to endorsing this development.

Yours sincerely,

Tony Penna  
President  
Southbank Residents Association



**Privacy acknowledgement: \***

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

**Name: \***

Tristan Davies

**Email address: \***

[melbourneheritageaction@gmail.com](mailto:melbourneheritageaction@gmail.com)

**Date of meeting: \***

Tuesday 3 August 2021

**Agenda item title: \***

.2 Planning Permit Application: TP-2019-979, 292-294 & 296-300 City Road, Southbank

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[2021\\_mha\\_objection\\_300\\_city\\_road\\_cofm.doc](#) 160.77 KB ·

DOC

**Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee live via phone or Zoom in support of your submission: \***

Yes

29 July 2021

City of Melbourne  
City Planning and Infrastructure,  
PO Box 1603  
Melbourne Vic 3001  
[planning@melbourne.vic.gov.au](mailto:planning@melbourne.vic.gov.au)



**Re: TP-2019-979; 296-306 City Road Southbank, Partial demolition; construction of a multi-storey building.**

Melbourne Heritage Action is pleased to see that some attempt has been made to do more than just retain a façade and a short length of side wall, an approach that is widely seen (by the average observer) as little more than token facadism, and is now firmly described as unacceptable by the heritage guidelines.

Those guidelines were well advanced by the time that this proposal was submitted, and so we would have expected something more than mere facadism, and we are pleased that Council has negotiated a slightly better result.

However, it appears that what is called 'retention behind the façade of 6m depth' is actually completely new construction in modern materials. There does not seem to be any good reason why the ACTUAL structure of heavy timber beams and columns (at about 5m in from the façade) could not be retained (or dismantled and re-erected) to create the platforms and roof proposed, providing a much more characterful space, and one that would read clearly with the façade rather than the new building.

We also see that it appears that the façade is not being completely restored – while it is stated that the existing timber window frames will be retained and repaired, the plans indicate that the window frames are replaced in white painted steel (or this is possibly placed in front of behind the original frames ?), and that four window at ground level would be turned into doors. If this were a heritage building simply being refurbished, neither of those actions would normally be considered appropriate.

The timber window frames should be retained and repaired, without any additional framing in front or behind, and all the ground level windows should remain windows. While Area 3 DDO requires 80% of the facade to be openings, the existing windows provide a high degree of connection between interior and the street (and it would seem very unlikely that anyone would sit outside next to the traffic of City Road in any event).

Kind regards,

Rohan Storey  
Vice -President  
**Melbourne Heritage Action**

**Privacy acknowledgement: \***

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

**Name: \***

Rachel Lunn

**Email address: \***

[rachel.lunn@melbournewater.com.au](mailto:rachel.lunn@melbournewater.com.au)

**Date of meeting: \***

Tuesday 3 August 2021

**Agenda item title: \***

6.3: C384

**Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.**

Melbourne Water wishes to present a VERBAL submission to the agenda item. Please refer to Toby Hayes – thank you.

**Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.**

**Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee live via phone or Zoom in support of your submission: \***

Yes

**Privacy acknowledgement: \***

I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

**Name: \***

Kathryn Pound

**Email address: \***

[kathryn.pound@portphillip.vic.gov.au](mailto:kathryn.pound@portphillip.vic.gov.au)

**Phone number \***

0392096619

**Date of meeting: \***

Tuesday 3 August 2021

**Agenda item title: \***

6.3 Amendment C384

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[copp\\_submission\\_to\\_fm\\_meeting\\_3\\_august\\_signed.pdf](#)

332.91 KB · PDF

**Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee live via phone or Zoom in support of your submission: \***

No



Enquiries: Kathryn Pound

File Ref: N/A

2 August 2021

Alison Leighton  
Deputy Chief Executive Officer  
City of Melbourne  
Via email & Online submission to Council Meeting

St Kilda Town Hall  
99a Carlisle Street  
St Kilda  
Victoria 3182

[www.portphillip.vic.gov.au](http://www.portphillip.vic.gov.au)

**ASSIST Customer Service**  
☎ 9209 6777

Dear Ms Leighton

**Submission to Future Melbourne Committee 3 August 2021 Agenda Item 6.3 Planning Scheme Amendment C384 Inundation Overlays and the Good Design Guide**

The City of Port Phillip congratulates the City of Melbourne on the preparation of Amendment C384 to manage flood risks and plan for flood resilient communities now and in the future.

Amongst other things, Amendment C384 proposes to include the *Good Design Guide for Buildings in Flood Affected Areas of Fishermans Bend, Arden & Macaulay* (the Guide) as a background document to the City of Melbourne Planning Scheme.

The Guide was developed in partnership with Melbourne Water, City of Melbourne and City of Port Phillip.

We support the inclusion of the Guide as a background document to the City of Melbourne Planning Scheme. This will ensure consistent guidance is provided by both Councils and Melbourne Water on how built form should respond to flood risk, particularly in the Fishermens Bend Urban Renewal Area.

Port Phillip City Council formally adopted the Guide at its Council meeting on 21 July 2021. The minutes and agenda can be viewed here: <https://www.portphillip.vic.gov.au/about-the-council/council-meetings/2021-meetings-and-agendas>.

The Guide is intended to be introduced as a background document to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme through a future planning scheme amendment.

We look forward to continuing our collaborative partnership with City of Melbourne and Melbourne Water. If you require any support in the exhibition of the Guide or presenting it to any Independent Panel (if required), please let us know.

Please contact Kathryn Pound, Manager City Strategy, Design & Sustainability on (03) 9209 or [kathryn.pound@portphillip.vic.gov.au](mailto:kathryn.pound@portphillip.vic.gov.au) if you require any support of other assistance from the City of Port Phillip.

Your sincerely

*Kylie Bennetts*

**Kylie Bennetts**  
**GM City Growth and Organisational Capability**

**Privacy acknowledgement:** I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

\*

**Name: \*** Tony Penna

**Email address: \*** [president@southbankresidents.org.au](mailto:president@southbankresidents.org.au)

**Date of meeting: \*** Tuesday 3 August 2021

**Agenda item title:** Agenda Item 6.3 Planning Scheme Amendment C384 – Inundation Overlays and the Good Design Guide

\*

**Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.**

Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[fmc\\_meeting\\_no.\\_17\\_agenda\\_item\\_6.3\\_planning\\_scheme\\_amendment\\_c384\\_inundation\\_overlays\\_and\\_t](#)

111.16 KB · PDF

**Please indicate whether you** No

would like to  
address the Future  
Melbourne  
Committee live via  
phone or Zoom in  
support of your  
submission: \*



PO Box 1195 South Melbourne VIC 3205  
Phone: 03 9028 2774  
ABN 58 986 783 321 Cert. of Inc. A0036364B  
info@southbankresidents.org.au  
www.southbankresidents.org.au

## **Submission to Future Melbourne Committee**

Future Melbourne Committee Meeting No. 17, Tuesday 3 August 2021  
Town Hall Commons, Ground Floor Melbourne Town Hall  
Agenda Item 6.3 Planning Scheme Amendment C384 - Inundation Overlays and the Good Design Guide

Southbank Residents Association (SRA) would like to make the following submission regarding Planning Scheme Amendment C384 - Inundation Overlays and the *Good Design Guide*.

### **Planning Scheme Amendment C384**

SRA understands that Planning Scheme Amendment C384 proposes to update the maps of areas prone to flooding and other associated planning controls.

It is also understood that the proposed new flood overlay will cover the majority of the suburb of Southbank.

It is well known that Southbank has had a long-standing problem with stormwater and flash flooding and the Southbank Residents Association has lobbied the City of Melbourne on this issue many times in the past. As such, the SRA welcomes Planning Scheme Amendment C384 and is optimistic that the new overlay will aid in the facilitation of improvements in the future.

### **Good Design Guide**

The SRA has reviewed the *Good Design Guide for Buildings in Flood Affected Areas in Fishermans Bend, Arden and Macaulay* and note that it is a shared resource for councils and the private development sector, and seeks to provide information to assist in the design of private development in flood affected areas.

The SRA acknowledges that the approaches outlined in the *Good Design Guide* to manage flood risk aren't applicable to other areas outside Fishermans Bend, Arden and Macaulay. It is stated that those suburbs have drainage strategies to manage and mitigate flooding into the long term which other suburbs (presumably Southbank) do not have.

SRA shouldn't miss an opportunity to remind this Committee that we definitely need better drainage strategies in Southbank. Just this week, several vehicles were trapped in floodwater at the Dudley Street underpass in Docklands, so it's clear Southbank isn't the only suburb in the municipality experiencing flooding problems.





While not encompassing Southbank, SRA is supportive of the design principles outlined in the *Good Design Guide* and the inclusion of the Guide as a background document in the Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C384.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, SRA would like to express support for an exhibition period of the proposed Planning Scheme Amendment C384, during which time SRA aims to engage a consultant to assist us in making a formal submission.

We will also be keeping our members informed of the proposed Planning Scheme Amendment C384, and encouraging them to engage, ask questions and make submissions of their own.

Yours sincerely,

Tony Penna  
President  
Southbank Residents Association