



24th October, 2018

Vicky Grillakis
Statutory Planning Branch,
City of Yarra.

**RE: PLANNING APPLICATION NO.: PLN18/0570
REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION
267-271 QUEENS PARADE, FITZROY NORTH**

Dear Vicky,

We are the architects and applicants for this proposal. We are in receipt of Council's RFI letter, dated 05.09.2018. In response to this we submit amended plans, further information and a detailed point-by-point reply, please refer below.

The amended plans have taken on board Council's concerns, in particular responses to matters of internal amenity and external urban design. The amended plans are also generally in line with the previous consistent design development undertaken by architect and client.

Confirmation of councils request regarding the Wind Impact Assessment Report, specifically the exact requirements of this report, is sought and addressed in Item 25 of 'Additional Report/Plans/Perspectives' section of this letter.

APPLICATION FORM

1. Confirm if the party wall easements will remain on the title. If you are proposing to remove these, please include this on the application form.

PA (Petridis Architects): it is proposed that all existing party wall easements over the 3 no. sub-sites be removed as party of the overall redevelopment. The reattached application form now acknowledges this.

USE

2. Provide further details regarding the motor vehicle showroom/sales. This is a permit required use and therefore further details are required e.g. hours of operation and staff.

PA: It is to be noted that a motor vehicles sales/showroom already exists on the site. There is currently a planning approval in place for this occupation.

It is proposed that the new showroom be open for business between the hours of 8.00 am and 6.00 pm, Monday-to-Saturday, closed Sunday. It is proposed that a maximum of 2 no. staff be employed at any one time.

PLANS

3. The A3 plans provided are difficult to read. Provide another clear set where the writing and notations are legible.



PA: The architectural drawings have been reformatted to an A3 size. There are now 88 A3 -sized drawings in the resubmission.

4. The design area analysis is illegible.

PA: The area analysis has been reformatted as 3 no. A3 sheets, TPA50, TPA51 and TPA52.

5. Length and width of the proposed awning and its setback from the kerb to be dimensioned.

PA: Undertaken, please refer TPA08 and TPA11.

6. Floor plans to have all setbacks and lengths of on-boundary walls dimensioned. Provide dimensions for all snorkel windows.

PA: This has been undertaken throughout the submitted documentation. Please note that the number of "snorkel" window has been reduced significantly in the redesign, in response to Council's critique, to be found later in this reply.

7. Elevations to include wall/building heights.

PA: This has been undertaken, please refer TPA31- TPA34; the elevations have been reset at 1:200 scale, however, to fit them into the requested sheet size.

8. Elevations/sections to include balcony balustrade/fence heights.

PA: This has been undertaken.

9. Internal dimensions to be included e.g. the width of corridors and lift lobbies.

PA: Done.

FURTHER DETAILS

10. Confirm where 'Basement Level B3 – sub floor' will be located on floor plans.

PA: For clarity, basement level B3 has been renamed as B4, and constitutes the proposed lowest of the basement levels. It is set at AHD 19.250. Please refer TPA04, as well as Section A-A, TPA39.

11. Confirm the capacity of the storage cages on 'Basement Level B3 – sub floor'.

PA: 58 no. storage enclosures are proposed for the newly-labelled B4 level: their individual volume capacity is nominated on the architectural drawings (TPA04). The proposed apartments on levels 17, 18 and 19 are all one-level apartments, and have significant storage opportunities available to their floor plans, externally and internally. These will make up the 3 no. additional storage enclosures.

12. A storage cage is located abutting the driveway – confirm if this will impact access.

PA: This storage enclosure will be for general maintenance use only, say, for external cleaning, gardening, etc., not for private residential use. There will be no impact of, or clash with, vehicular access to and from the basement carparks.

13. A number of doors open out onto the service road; confirm what these will be used for.

PA: It is proposed that these doors secure a series of services cupboards/meter enclosures. Their use will be intermittent, and will be for the use of external consultants, meter readers etc.

14. Provide further details regarding the 'indoor gardens'



PA: The proposed floor plans, in particular, the apartment type to the far east of the building envelope, levels 1-12, have been redesigned in response to Council's critique, to be discussed further below. The "indoor gardens" that were a feature of the original submission have been removed to make way for a formal living room, or 'front' room in these plans.

15. Provide information regarding the screening separating the balconies of different apartments. For example, between 1.1 and 1.2, between 1.3 and 1.4, and between 2.3 and 2.4.

PA: The proposed screening between abutting balconies will be constructed of framed, frosted glazing, 1700 mm height.

BETTER APARTMENT DESIGN STANDARDS (BADS)

16. Provide a BADS Schedule to include a column which confirms compliance for each of the included standards. The schedule should also include an overall compliance percentage for each of these. Following the receipt of this, additional information may be required.

PA: An Overall Compliance Analysis has been provided, please refer TPA75.

17. Provide a distance measurement of the breeze path on BADs Assessment Floor Plans.

PA: This has been provided on all Clause 58 assessment sheets.

MATERIALS

18. Confirm if the south-west red coloured wall is proposed to be Perspex.

PA: It is confirmed that the feature red wall to the front south-west, north-west and north-east of the proposed building will be constructed of a select Perspex eternal lining (incorporating a mix of 4 no. separate colours); the Perspex lining will be part of a much more complex, composite, fire-engineered lightweight clad wall system.

19. Elevations need to be annotated with proposed materials and finishes.

PA: This has been undertaken, in particular on the north-west elevation drawing, TPA32, as well as the perspectives, TPA36 and TPA38.

20. Delete the words 'or similar' within the materials legend.

PA: This has been undertaken.

21. A range of material images are shown on the floor plans, it is unclear where these will be used.

PA: These have now generally been removed from the architectural drawings.

22. A schedule of finishes (including color samples), detailing materials and colours of external surfaces.

PA; Please refer TPA35 and TPA37.

ADDITIONAL REPORT/PLANS/PERSPECTIVES

23. Delete landscaping from architecture plans and provide a separate landscape plans indicating;

- a. Any existing and proposed street trees and overhanging trees on adjacent properties;
- b. Any planting proposed;



- c. Location of any proposed underground services;
- d. Planting concept showing lawn areas, garden areas and planting themes;
- e. Indication of open space functions, especially private open space areas for recreation, storage and service areas, front gardens and communal land; and
- f. Measures to protect any trees and their root systems during construction

PA: Council's directions in this matter have been followed, the architectural drawings are now clear of landscaping elements; a series of detailed landscape concept plans have been produced in response, and are included as part of the overall resubmission; please refer TPA77- TPA88.

24. An Acoustic report, prepared by a suitable qualified Acoustic Consultant, addressing the noise impacts of the proposal on surrounding residential properties as well as from the proposed commercial uses to the proposed dwellings within the development.

PA: An acoustic report has been prepared by Efficient Energy Choices, phone 9331 3695, dated October 24, 2018, and is included with this resubmission.

25. A Wind Impact Assessment Report, prepared by a suitably qualified person or firm providing an analysis of the impact of wind on the street and surrounding area (as relevant), as a result of the construction of the proposed building. The report must outline industry accepted standards/assessment criteria and show whether the impacts of the proposed development meet them or not. If relevant criteria are not met, recommended changes to the building should be made and incorporated into the development.

PA: A number of relevant firms were interviewed and considered for this task; each firm offered a wide range of analysis and assessment services; it is unclear what is expected by Council, and further elaboration is requested. The consultant fees are substantial; Council's clear direction will be relied upon, for the application to get this matter right.

The services offered by the firms pursued, which included GWTS, MEL Consultants and Windtech, included 'desktop assessments', and 'environmental wind conditions studies' (also known as Wind Tunnel Assessments. It is unclear which methodology Council wishes the applicant to pursue to satisfy the request for a Wind Impact Assessment Report.

It is to be noted that the other planning applications in the site triangle were not required to obtain wind assessment reports.

26. Additional perspectives showing the proposal from longer range views along Queens Parade, Hoddle Street, High Street and Heidelberg Road.

PA; This has been undertaken, please refer TPA47, TPA48 and TPA49. The design has been significantly modified to respond to Council's critique. The ancillary 3D model has been amended to reflect these design improvements, and inserted into longer range, but still local, views: Heidelberg Road, driving up to the local overpass; Hoddle Street (near Clifton Hill railway station); Queens Parade, within the heart of the shopping centre; and High Street, Northcote, couple of views walking up the hill.



The amended 3D design model has been re-presented in this resubmission, please refer TPA42- TPA46.

27. Provide a written analysis of the proposal against non-compliance with policy at Design and Development Overlay (Schedule 20 – Queens Parade).

PA: Please refer Preliminary Assessment Item 14, below.

PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

1. Numerous design elements within the proposal appear out of context and unsympathetic to the surrounding streetscape.
2. The proposed material choices, use of circular elements and overall architectural design detail of the building.

PA, 1., 2.: The design of the building closely reflects its site, its location, and its proposed uses. It will read as a tall, slender exclamation mark at the end of a run of ever larger building forms. It will be seen as a contrasting foil to the more regular, monumental designs leading up to it.

The 3 no. adjacent buildings are reliant on simple forms and relatively narrow slit windows punched into large, solid, plain wall surfaces. The proposed juxtaposition on the subject site will be a glass building, heavily articulated by balconies.

The “unsympathetic” design elements referred to by Council include a series of curved elements, red colouring, and an upper level building form that appears to be bursting out of its envelope. These are all direct and specific references to the proposed vehicle showroom that takes up the first 3 levels of the building, and will dominate the pedestrian street view. The proposed red, black and satin chrome finishes reflect the cars on display in the showroom. The curves of the corner balconies reflect the many curves prevalent in vehicle design. The complex curves within the verandah street overhang allude to the speeds possible with car travel. The shape and burst of the upper level building form reflects a V8 engine block bursting out of its bonnet.

3. The overwhelming scale and height of the building.
5. Sheer scale of the proposal as it presents to Queens Parade and Hoddle Street (overall height and street wall).

PA: 3., 5.: The question of height and scale has been at the forefront of all design considerations. Petridis Architects studied and modelled all the approved and constructed developments in the subject triangle. This modelling is illustrated in TPA42. The heights and design (and subsequent redesign) of 267-271 Queens Parade are based on this modelling. The subject building represents the exclamation mark to the run of adjacent developments: the shape, size and exposure of the site has influenced the long, slim, elegant building form that has been presented.

The subject site is also the first property one views when entering the City of Yarra from Northcote (City of Darebin), and is treated here as a gateway opportunity to the City of Yarra. This type of discussion took place between Petridis Architects, the owner of the property, and Council during the pre-application phase. At the time, there were no planning scheme guidelines with regard to height. Council requested formal urban design input, and Alexander Urbanism (phone: 9650



2081) was taken on board by the owner. Their instructions further informed the design, and their written response was included in the original submission.

Council's comments have been taken on board, however, and an effort has been made to reduce the height: it now stands at 69,6 metres.

4. Lack of setbacks and poor transition of the proposed building with the adjacent buildings.
6. Limited side and rear setbacks have been provided. Additional setbacks are required to provide equitable development opportunities for No. 501-503 Hoddle Street and additional side setbacks are required abutting No. 249-265 Queens Parade. Council is also concerned with the extent of sheer walls along the service road.

PA, 4., 6.: There are 2 adjacent buildings: 1. the existing low-level office building to the south-east is separated from the subject site by a laneway; the proposed development has a run of minor bedroom and kitchen windows along the laneway; 2. the approved apartment building to the south-west has proposed setbacks off the relevant common boundary; the subject building reciprocates with setbacks of its own, including 2.0m, 2.3m., 3.0m. and 3.8m. The streetscape perspective view (TPA42) clarifies that the setback between these 2 proposed buildings will not be dissimilar to setbacks which have been approved and are being constructed adjacent.

7. Overall height, lack of articulation and extent of sheer walls along the south-west elevation.

PA: The building has been designed as a three-dimensional form from the outset. The final design reflects the exposed, "island" position of the site. It has been developed to be viewed from all directions. The design is heavily articulated, and can be interpreted as a foil to its more monolithic neighbours. This articulation is best expressed in the series of 3D views presented in TPA42 - TPA46.

8. The protrusions outside of title boundaries, such as the balcony areas over the awning and the service lane. This is unacceptable; contain all works within title boundaries.

PA: Council's critique has been taken on board. The initial, submitted design responded to a very public, exposed site by taking on a more active interface with the abutting 3 no. streets. In this resubmission, all balconies and building elements have now been returned to the confines of title boundaries, apart from the street level verandah overhang.

9. A number of kitchen areas seem inadequately sized for two-bedroom dwellings

PA: The proposed kitchen sizes and styles reflect current apartment internal design thinking, only slightly larger. A positive comparison can be made with the approved designs of the abutting apartment buildings.

10. Lack of dwelling diversity – sizes and types

PA: The proposed development targets larger apartment sizes, generally 2 and even 3-bedroom apartments. There will be a consistency in the apartment palette mix that will be offered to the real estate community. There are no 1-bedroom apartments in the proposal. In this way, the development will complement the abutting developments, which appear to be targeting (1) smaller apartments, or



(2) retired living situations.

11. The development includes a number of narrow balcony edged which would have limited usability.

PA: Council's critique has been taken on board: the balcony in question was at the feature northern corner of the subject site, and ranged from the fourth floor to the sixteenth floor. The design has been amended significantly to make this balcony viable, and is incorporated in this resubmission.

12. The prevalence of bedrooms with snorkel windows with adjacent long sheer walls and the subsequent adverse impact on their daylight access. For example, Apartment 2.4 has a snorkel window with sheer walls abutting it for at least 4m in length.

PA: The apartments within the building envelope, fourth-floor-to-sixteenth-floor have been redesigned significantly: there are now no obvious "snorkel" windows in the development. (although apartment-type 1.2, 2.2, 3.2 etc. has a bedroom window 1230 mm width, recessed 730 mm. depth).

13. Apartment type '-4' between levels 2-12 has a long and awkward corridor.

PA: In this significant redesign, apartment-type 1.4, 2.4, 3.4 etc. gains a second sitting area at the front of the floor plan; the previous long and awkward corridor has been deleted, the questioned internal garden has also been removed.

14. Policy non-compliance within Design and Development Overlay (Schedule 20)

On 23rd August, 2018, Planning Scheme Amendment C241 was gazetted by the Minister for Planning. The amendment introduced an interim Design and Development Overlay to guide the heights and setbacks of new development so that their scale and form responds to the character of Queens Parade. The amendment affects the subject site and is included in the Yarra Planning Scheme as Design and Development Overlay (Schedule 20) (DDO20). The subject site is located within Precinct 5C.

The preferred heights for this precinct are as follows:

- Building Height – Maximum 49m
- Front Street Wall – Maximum 35m
- Upper Level Setbacks – Minimum 10m

This proposal exceeds the preferred maximum height and does not meet the preferred minimum upper level setbacks. The proposal exceeds the preferred maximum street wall along Hoddle Street also. The overall height of the proposal does not fit within the general design objective of supporting a new mid-rise character in the precinct.

PA: The planning application for 267-271 Queens Parade was formally submitted to Council before the Planning Scheme gazettal. The application was based on a long design gestation process that included liaison with Council at a number of pre-application meetings, as well as with adjoining and nearby property owners/developers.



At no stage was the matter of the Interim Design and Development Overlay brought up. Although it comes as a surprise, it does provide order to potential future development along Queens Parade as a whole. The irony is that all of the sites in the subject triangle at this northern end of Queens Parade have already gone through formal planning applications.

The subject site exceeds the maximum building heights, maximum front street wall heights, and minimum upper level setbacks. It needs to be noted that these are preferred heights, rather than mandatory heights. It is also to be noted that the site is 17.80 metres in width, and a preferred minimum upper level setback of 10 metres is unfeasible.

The design, and resubmitted redesign, have been based on a long process that involved studying and understanding the site, and the adjoining approved developments, engaging adjoining developers and urban designers. The design aims to stand out from the recently approved projects adjacent, and to act as a “gateway” to the municipality as a whole. The design seeks to be different.

If Council is satisfied with the information provided, and the responses, we request the proposal proceed to public notification. It is again acknowledged the client seeks confirmation on the extent of the Wind Impact Assessment Report, as earlier addressed, prior to moving forward with engaging a consultant to complete the report. If any of the information is deemed unsatisfactory, we request an extension of time to provide additional information.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "George Petridis", written over a thin horizontal line.

George Petridis,
Petridis Architects.