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### Architectural Drawing Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawing Number</th>
<th>Drawing Title</th>
<th>DA Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Cover Spread</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Section A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Section B</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Section C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Typical Sections</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Interior Schedule</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Plan

- **Proposed**: Section L 36 WELLINGTON ST, COLLINGWOOD
- **Proposed Site Plan**: Section L 36 WELLINGTON ST, COLLINGWOOD
- **Proposed Base Plan**: Section L 36 WELLINGTON ST, COLLINGWOOD
- **Proposed Plan**: Section L 36 WELLINGTON ST, COLLINGWOOD
- **Section A**: Section A 36 WELLINGTON ST, COLLINGWOOD
- **Section B**: Section B 36 WELLINGTON ST, COLLINGWOOD
- **Section C**: Section C 36 WELLINGTON ST, COLLINGWOOD
- **Typical Sections**: Section L 36 WELLINGTON ST, COLLINGWOOD
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File: FOL/19/84657
Ref: HTF2019/0452

Amy Hodgen
Statutory Planning
Yarra City Council
Amy.Hodgen@yarracity.vic.gov.au

Dear Ms Hodgen

YARRA PLANNING SCHEME
PLANNING APPLICATION NO: PLN19/450
PROPOSAL: OFFICE DEVELOPMENT
ADDRESS: 36 WELLINGTON STREET COLLINGWOOD

Thank you for your email dated 11th October 2019 referring the above application to the Head, Transport for Victoria pursuant to Section 55 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.

The site does not directly abut any public transport routes however as the Green Travel Plan submitted with the applicant documents outlines, there are several options within the precinct to access the site via public transport. The development also provides bike parking and end of trip facilities on the ground floor which is encouraged and supported.

The Head, Transport for Victoria, pursuant to Section 56(1) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 does not object to the grant of a planning permit.

Should you require any further clarification, please feel free to contact James Noy on telephone 03 8582 7884 or email james.noy@ecodev.vic.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

MARK BURTON
Manager Place Planning & Referrals
Delegate of the Head, Transport for Victoria

6/11/2019

cc:
Hi Amy

Further to your email attached are a few thoughts:-

- Ground level seems fine. Bike arrival preferably auto doors given its configuration. Level 5 podium should have planter interface to south. The podium remains satisfactory.

- Scale is not supported. The mass and scale of the foreground building relative to the northern neighbour and western neighbours is excessive being both substantially less articulated and larger in bulk. The foreground lower development to the north is RL 42 vs a proposed RL 70 in this instance whilst the 1-17 Wellington form opposite is RL 57 but highly varied and articulated in scale.

- I would recommend removal of development in front of Gridline 4 above RL 41, as a means to avoid a pinch point in the boulevard maintaining the approximate scale of its foreground northern neighbour and better managing the lower scale form of its southern neighbours.

- Taller building can be better accommodated in the setback area where off-site impacts can also be managed to avoid excessive overshadowing of this important active transport corridor. The narrower east west profile will further mediate the show impacts on southern neighbourhoods and streets.

- The setbacks to the east for the height of building up to 40m is acceptable.

- Above 40m greater setbacks should be provided (above level 6) to the east north west and south interfaces. To ensure reasonable light and amenity to hinterland southern areas particularly given the substantial 38m+ length of the building façade with a 6m setback recommended as a minimum.

- Overall height in my view should not exceed RL 70 (50m)

- The site still has modest setbacks to finer grain neighbourhoods and unlike its northern neighbour has not responded to the grain of the neighbourhood with a variety of scaled elements. It is a smaller site yet seeks a larger plot ratio and built form impact outcome that is not supported in my view in an urban design and strategic sense.

Have a good weekend
Rob

ROB MCGAURAN DIRECTOR
ADJUNCT PROFESSOR OF ARCHITECTURE PRACTICE MONASH UNIVERSITY
ADJUNCT PROFESSOR OF ARCHITECTURE (URBAN DESIGN) MELBOURNE UNIVERSITY
MGS ARCHITECTS 10-22 MANTON LANE MELBOURNE 3000
T +61 3 9521 9809 WWW.MGSARCHITECTS.COM.AU
ARCHITECTURE URBAN DESIGN INTERIORS
PLEASE LET US KNOW IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS EMAIL UNINTENTIONALLY.
City of Yarra
Heritage Advice

Application No.: PLN 19/0452
Address of Property: 36 - 52 Wellington St, Collingwood
Planner: Amy Hodgen

Yarra Planning Scheme References: Clauses 43.01 and 22.10

Heritage Overlay No. Nil
Precinct: Nil.

In proximity are:
HO 140 59 Wellington Street Collingwood, the Vine Hotel.
HO 109: 55 Langridge Street Collingwood, the Former William Peatt Boot Factory.
HO 116 Northumberland Street Collingwood, the Former Victoria Old Distillery.

Figure 1 The Heritage Overlay map. The development site is indicated by a star.
Proposal

Demolition of existing garage(s)/former factory(ies) and construction of a 15 storey building with a splayed/cantilevered upper element at the south-east corner of Northumberland and Wellington Streets.

Drawing Numbers

50 Pages of drawings, montages etc. prepared by Jackson Clements Burrows Architects and with Council date stamp 4 Sep 2019.


Assessment of Proposed Works

No heritage fabric, i.e. the former Victoria Old Distillery, will be affected. The principal issue is the effect on the setting of the Distillery and any views to it from Wellington Street.

The principal view of the Distillery, silos and chimneys is from Wellington Street and this is the only view which identifies the site from any reasonable public vantage point. The silos are visible along a lane which runs off Northumberland Street, which is a somewhat obscure location and hard to find presently, and the new building will exacerbate this. It would be appropriate to provide interpretation of the Distillery so as to alleviate the loss of its identity from Wellington Street. (See below).

Figure 2
The view of the Victoria Old Distillery from the corner of Derby and Wellington Streets. This is the view in which the Distillery is identifiable.
Figure 3  A similar view of the Victoria Old Distillery further south. Note that the white gabled building has painted signage “Browers Grain”. This building should be researched and included in the interpretation signage.

Figure 4  The site under construction on the north-east corner of Wellington and Northumberland Streets (opposite this site) already dwarfs any heritage buildings in proximity as does the building in the background on the corner of Wellington and Langridge Street and which is in between the two wings of the William Peatt Boot factory.
The existing context is one of high buildings up to 14 or 17 storeys as is evident from an inspection of the surrounding streets and also as demonstrated on the “Design Response: Proposed Massing” sheet (p. 11). As these high buildings have emerged on non-heritage sites, the heritage buildings have become dwarfed or are considerably less prominent than they were originally and until recently e.g. the Yorkshire Brewery Brew Tower (HO414).

The relevant policy is

**Setbacks & Building Height (22.10-3.3)**

To ensure that the height of new development is appropriate to the context of the area (as identified in the Site Analysis Plan and Design Response) and respects the prevailing pattern of heights of the area where this is a positive contribution to neighbourhood character.

**Design Guidelines**

New development that is higher than adjacent buildings should adopt a secondary setback for the higher building component which:

- Aligns to the street pattern;
- Retains existing view lines to nearby heritage places and other key features.

The height of new development abutting land in a Heritage Overlay should:

- Adopt a façade height to the street frontage which is no higher than the adjacent building within the Heritage Overlay;
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- Design and site taller structures so that they do not visually dominate surrounding heritage places; and
- Match the floor levels of the adjacent heritage building.

On this site the application of the above policy is difficult and if applied literally, would be somewhat at odds with what has occurred already – the height and bulk of the new buildings has had a considerable impact on the immediate vicinity (Langridge/Wellington/Derby Streets) which is broader than just individual heritage sites. The Pott Boot factory is now visibly split by a development on the south-east corner of Langridge and Wellington Streets.

Application of the above policy would require a setback from Northumberland Street so as to retain existing view lines to the Distillery and silos, which would be possible but this would be unlikely to retain the visual prominence of the Distillery. Adoption of a facade height to the street frontage, i.e. Northumberland Street, which is no higher than the adjacent building within the Heritage Overlay would not achieve anything in retaining the view from Wellington Street as the view would be blocked. Any design of a taller structure on this site so that it does not visually dominate the surrounding heritage places is probably unachievable and would not benefit the Distillery in any meaningful way and nor the Vine Hotel given the scale of the permitted development on the abutting site to the south in Wellington Street. In establishing floor – to – ceiling heights for the new tower, it appears that they have been matched acceptably with those of the Distillery “tower” (TP2-101)

Considering all of the above, it is difficult to say that what is proposed is unacceptable, even though unfortunate in terms of views from Wellington Street. This is probably the most reasonable approach to development on this site. Where there has been an opportunity for literal application of the policy it has occurred.

A small setback of 3.021 – 3.638 metres is proposed between the new tower and the Distillery “tower” above Level 01-03 which is an acknowledgement of the heritage building. It will retain some visual separation in views from Northumberland Street, albeit limited.

The nature of the context, both historically and presently, is industrial, somewhat robust and utilitarian. The proposed design adopts a somewhat rustic/raw/hard/repetitive geometry and materiality which is appropriate. The “Visualisations. Perspective View” (unnumbered) shows an oblique view along Northumberland Street in which some echo of the rendered banding of the Distillery “tower” is reflected in the new tower. The building will be lightened and be somewhat transparent through the use of extensive and regularly-spaced fenestration and glazing. Brickwork of varying colours has become common in the immediately vicinity and its application has had varied success. In this design the use of brick cladding is a reference to the red brick heritage buildings, including the Distillery, and based upon the perspectives, appears that it will be aesthetically appropriate.
Interpretation and Photographic Archive

Develop an interpretation programme for the Distillery which provides a brief illustrated history and which signposts its location from Wellington Street. It is envisaged that there would be some illustrated signage at the Northumberland Street end of the internal lane, and some signposting at the corner of Wellington and Northumberland Streets. The Interpretation must also include information which indicates that Collingwood was the centre of Melbourne’s brewing/distilling/maltings industry and provide links/locations of the Yorkshire Brewery Brew Tower, (Roberts Street, Collingwood), Victoria Brewery, (Victoria Parade, East Melbourne) and the maltings and silos in Elington Street, Abbotsford and the Richmond Maltings in Gough Street. Much of the necessary historical information is contained in conservation management plans held by Council at the heritage desk.

Before any demolition commences and to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority, an archival photographic record of buildings on the site should be prepared in accord with Heritage Victoria’s standard guidelines as an accepted methodology. Is envisaged that external photographs and representative internal photographs would suffice, plus any relevant equipment related to the brewing/maltings industry. The archive should be lodged in Council’s Collingwood Library local history collection. This should be a permit condition.
Figure 7  The lane off Northumberland Street. The interpretation signage should be installed at the north end (foreground) either on the development site, noting the proposed vehicle access in this location to the basements, or freestanding generally in this location.

Recommendation / Comments:

Overall, given the context, the proposed building is acceptable.

However, so as to alleviate the loss of the visual identity and principal view of the Distillery (brew tower, silos, chimneys) from Wellington Street, an interpretation programme as set out above must be prepared and installed and to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. This should be a permit condition.

Before any demolition commences, an archival photographic record of buildings on the site should be prepared in accord with Heritage Victoria’s standard guidelines and the archive should be lodged in Council’s Collingwood Library local history collection. This should be prepared as set out above and as a permit condition to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

Signed:

Anthemion Consultancies

Yarra Heritage Advice

Yarra City Council – Internal Development Approvals Committee Attachments – Wednesday 11 March 2020
Robyn Riddett
Director – Anthemion Consultancies
Date: 13 November, 2019.
11 October 2019

Yarra City Council
PO Box 168
RICHMOND 3121

Attention: Amy Hodgen

Dear Amy

36-52 Wellington Street, Collingwood
Development Application Acoustic Review

SLR Consulting Pty Ltd (SLR) has been retained by the City of Yarra to review the acoustic assessment report prepared for the commercial development proposed for 36-52 Wellington Street, Collingwood.

Details of the report are as follows.

- **Title:** Acoustic Planning Report, 36-52 Wellington Street, Collingwood
- **Date:** 28 June 2019
- **Reference:** 60604099
- **Prepared for:** Hines 36 Wellington Property Pty Ltd
- **Prepared by:** AECOM Australia Pty Ltd

The report was prepared to address potential noise impacts to and from the proposed development.

1 Background

*(Sections 1.0 and 2 of the report)*

The project is proposed to comprise:

- Ground floor food and drinks premises
- Five levels of offices
- Roof top plant area and external terrace
- Two (2) levels of basement carparking

Surrounding uses include:

- Minor and local roads to the west and north
- Commercial premises on the eastern and southern boundaries
- The nearest noise sensitive receivers are located in Northumberland Street (east) and Cambridge Street (west).
SLR Comments: The subject development and surrounding uses have generally been described and/or identified. However, we note that there is also a mezzanine plant room on the eastern side of the building.

The locations of the nearest noise sensitive receivers are not clearly indicated in the acoustic report. We understand that there is an approved multi-level mixed use development at 1-57 Wellington Street (opposite the subject site, on the western side of Wellington Street) and that the sensitive receiver to the east is the 10 storey residential tower in the silo building at 21 Northumberland Street. We also understand that there are residents in the building to the west of the silo at 17 Northumberland Street. These dwellings are adjacent to the mezzanine plant area.

Little detail is provided regarding the proposed ground floor food tenancies. One of these is large (533 m²) and the second quite small (80 m²). Both premises will be opposite the approved mixed use development at 1-57 Wellington Street. There is potential for noise from these tenancies to impact occupants of the proposed dwellings if extended trading hours are proposed.

2 Noise to the Subject Development

2.1 Noise Measurements

(Section 3.2 of the report)

Attended and unattended noise measurements were undertaken to quantify noise impacts to the subject development. The primary source of noise in the areas was identified as road traffic. Noise measurements were undertaken at the Wellington Street façade of the building and in Victoria Parade during afternoon peak hour. Noise logging was undertaken from a first floor window overlooking Wellington Street from 5-11 June 2019. The logger location is shown in Figure 4.

The measurement results are presented in Table 2 of the acoustic report, and are 65 to 67 dBA L eq at the Wellington Street façade. Higher levels were measured on Victoria Parade, however these will undergo attenuation before arriving at the façade (Victoria Parade is 110 m south of the subject site).

SLR Comments: The measurements undertaken can be expected to quantify typical worst case noise impacts to the subject development.

2.2 Internal Design Targets

(Section 4.1 of the report)

AS/NZS2107 design noise targets are nominated for the commercial building. The targets are provided in Table 4 of the report.

SLR Comments: The nominated targets are reasonable.

2.3 Façade Upgrade Treatments

(Section 5.1 of the report)

Thermal double glazing comprising 6 mm glass, 12 mm air cavity and 10.38 mm thick laminated glass is proposed to control the measured external noise. Advice is also provided for controlling noise through façade walls and the roof (the roof upgrade is also designed to control noise from roof mounted mechanical plant).
**SLR Comments:** The proposed glazing can be expected to achieve the nominated internal design targets.

### 3 Noise from the Subject Development

#### 3.1 Noise Criteria

*(Section 4.2 of the report)*

Noise from the subject site, including mechanical plant noise and noise from the retail tenancies, is proposed to be assessed to SEPP N-1.

SEPP N-1 limits have been determined from land use zoning, and from the $L_{eq}$ noise levels obtained at the façade of the existing building on the development site.

Zoning level calculations have been determined for 21 Northumberland Road and are provided in Table 7 of the report, and are equal to 59 dBA (day), 53 dBA (evening) and 48 dBA (night).

The background noise levels measured at the façade of the building are presented in Table 6.

The calculated noise limits are presented in Table 8 and are equal to 59 dBA (day); 53 dBA (evening) and 48 dBA (night).

**SLR Comments:** Based on the zoning circles shown in Table 7, AECOM’s SEPP N-1 limits have been calculated for 21 Northumberland Street. This is an appropriate receiver location to consider because some apartments are likely to overlook mechanical plant on the roof of the development building and / or be exposed to noise from the mezzanine plant area. The background noise data obtained at the Wellington Street façade is, however, unlikely to be representative of receivers at 17 and 21 Northumberland Street (which are further away from traffic noise sources).

The zoning level calculations shown in Table 2 indicate that the Commercial 2 zone (C22) has been designated ‘Type’ 2. The correct designation is ‘Type’ 3, which would result in higher zoning levels.

Zoning levels and noise limits have not been determined for the multi-level apartments proposed for 1-57 Wellington Street. From our calculations the zoning levels for these apartments would also be higher than AECOM have determined for 21 Northumberland Road. The background noise data obtained in Wellington Street would be suitable for determining noise limits at this receiver location. Taking the above into consideration, the noise limits for this location would be slightly higher than AECOM have identified.

In summary, there are some technical issues around the derivation of SEPP N-1 noise limits presented in the report which should be addressed.

#### 3.2 Mechanical Plant

**SLR Comments:** AECOM observe that there will be substantial mechanical plant on the roof of the subject development, and have recommended a roof / ceiling upgrade to control noise from this equipment to the offices below. However, noise to the potentially overlooking apartments at 21 Northumberland Street has not been considered. This is not unreasonable because the mechanical design is unlikely to be sufficiently progressed to allow a full assessment.
However, it is recommended that the final mechanical design be reviewed by a suitably qualified acoustic consultant to ensure that SEPP N-1 noise limits are met.

We also note that any plant on the mezzanine level will also need to comply with SEPP N-1.

3.3 Noise from Ground Floor Food and Drink Tenancies

(Section 6.0 of the report)

The report includes the statement that if music is proposed to be played within the ground floor café tenancy it should either be at a level that is inaudible outside the café, or separately assessed to ensure that SEPP N-2 noise limits are not exceeded.

SLR Comments: The assessment provided for music noise from the café is adequate and we would suggest that it is included as a permit condition.

The proposed hours of operation for the two food and drinks tenancies are not provided in the report, and if operation outside the SEPP N-1 day period is proposed, we would recommend that noise from patrons be assessed in the report given the proximity of the proposed apartments at 1-57 Wellington Street.

4 Summary

Our review of the acoustic assessment report for 36-52 Wellington Street is provided above. The report addresses noise to the subject development, and identified SEPP N-1 noise limits. We suggest the following:

- The exact locations of all sensitive receiver locations be clearly indicated in the report. From our understanding the critical receivers will be:
  - The proposed mixed use development at 1-57 Wellington Street
  - Occupants of the silo tower at 21 Northumberland Street
  - Occupants of the building west of the silo tower, and immediately adjacent the subject development.
- SEPP N-1 noise limits be determined for all receivers potentially affected by noise from the development. This may involve conducting additional background noise measurements relative to receivers at 21 Northumberland Street. Lower level receivers in this development are likely to be exposed to quite low levels of background noise.
- An assessment of noise from all mechanical plant and equipment be conducted during the detailed design phase of the project, to ensure that SEPP N-1 noise limits are not exceeded.
- An assessment of patron noise from the proposed food and drink tenancies be conducted if the tenancies are to open outside standard daytime hours, as defined in SEPP N-1.
- Music from the food and beverage tenancies is to be played at background levels and is not to be audible outside the tenancies. If higher levels of music are proposed, a formal assessment of this noise to SEPP N-2 should be conducted.

Dot points 1 and 2 should be addressed in a revised acoustic report. The other items could reasonably be addressed via permit conditions.
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Regards,

Dianne Williams
Associate – Acoustics
TO: Amy Hodgen (Statutory Planning)
FROM: Christian Lundh (Urban Design) and Julia Mardjuki (Open Space)
DATE: 10 October 2019
SUBJECT: 36-52 Wellington Street Collingwood
APPLICATION NO: PLN19/0450
DESCRIPTION: Full demolition of existing buildings and the construction of a fourteen storey building plus two basement levels associated with office, cafe and food and beverage outlet on the ground level.

COMMENTS SOUGHT

Urban Design and Open Space comments have been sought on the development at the above address, in particular on the public realm and private domain interface along Wellington Street and Northumberland Street. Comments are provided below and are based on the Landscape Town Planning Report dated 10 September 2019 and additional information sought from Town Planning Drawings dated June 2019.

In summary, the drawings are not yet acceptable from an Urban Design perspective. Detailed comments are provided below and we request that the applicant provides a response to each of these items.

Note: The extent of this review is limited to the proposed development’s integration with the streetscape and public realm.

Details required on drawings

The following details are required on the drawings:

- Clear distinction between existing and proposed street trees.
- On-street parking bays and line marking that are impacted by the proposal.
- Existing and proposed power/light poles; show on plans and on renders.
- Spot levels, fall/grading along the footpath interfaces. Levels shown on TP 1-103 indicates fall towards the building. Section A (TP02-03) indicates fall towards the building, assumed incorrectly represented in render.
- Indication of surface drainage type, locations and materiality.
## 1. Capital works

There are no known capital works being led by the Urban Design team directly around the site.

## 2. Ground Floor Interface

The proposed open interface / atrium creating a continuous interface and flow between the private and public domain is supported from an urban design perspective. Materiality, levels and drainage requires further resolutions and details refer further comments below.

## 3. Street Trees

- Potential to install 3 No. additional street trees along Northumberland Street.
- Coordinate proposed trees with street light locations and other services infrastructure.
- Provide further details on the tree protection measures for the existing street tree prior to development. This must comply with AS1970-2009 Protection of Trees on Development Sites.
- Potential to incorporate structural cell/structural soil and passive irrigation to tree pits should be incorporated subject to engineering requirements.

## 4. Pedestrian and Vehicular Entrance

- Should tactile indicators and handrails be required due to steps/steep grade change; an appropriate setback within the property boundary must be allocated. No tactile or handrails can be located or protrude into the public realm / footpath or obstruct any desired pedestrian line of travel.

## 5. Surface materials

- The proposed use of brick paving in the public realm / road is not supported.
- Urban design and Open Space do support the principle of a better public realm outcome and a more cohesive space achieved through a better quality material. The use of bluestone pavers as per the City of Melbourne standards for pedestrian and vehicular standards could be applied. This is subject to resolving an outcome that satisfies the engineering requirements such as the camber on the road, the kerb profile and drainage.
- A delineation of the title boundary will need to be made through a high quality public realm material such as a metal banding.

## 6. Street Furniture and Fixtures

- The seat by the planter box next to the services and bin area is not supported. Refer notes under section 7 for suggested changes.
- Opportunity to install 1 - 2 No. bench seat along Wellington Street in accordance with City of Yarra Public Domain Manual.
- Potential to install additional bike hoops for building visitors along Wellington Street. City of Yarra Sustainable Transport to confirm requirements. Bike hoops to be in accordance with City of Yarra Public Domain Manual.
### 7. Suggested Improvements and Considerations

- **Northumberland Street;**
  Consider to end the extent of the proposed brick pavement by the edge of the building canopy. Extend the planter box (seat removed) by the vehicle access to the edge of the canopy. Planter box could then act as an ‘end’ to the brick pavement facing east.

- **Northumberland Street;**
  Potential to ‘anchor’ the suggested steel edge that would delineating the property boundary along Northumberland Street by extending the tree pits slightly to the edge of the property line, abutting the steel edge/property boundary.

- **Northumberland Street;**
  Consideration could be made when undertaking further design development for the property to the north (part of separate endorsed development), to review the proposed tree locations along the north side of the street to align with the trees proposed within this application, to enhance the cohesion of the street.
Planning Referral

To: Amy Hodgen
From: Julia Mardjuki (Open Space)
Date: 11/10/2019
Subject: Referral comment on Landscape plans
Application No: PLN19/0450
Description: 15 storey office building with ground floor retail
Site Address: 36 – 52 Wellington Street, Collingwood

If a permit is issued, can we get clarity on these details:

- There’s a huge mix of plants proposed, can we get a more specific planting plan show the type, location, quantity, height at maturity and botanical names of all proposed plants;
- Ensure all plants are not on the DELWP Advisory List of Environmental Weeds in Victoria;
- There were some vertical and cascading plants proposed. Please provide any details around the climbing frames or associated infrastructure;
- show the type, location, quantity, height at maturity and botanical names of all proposed plants;
- provide a specification of works to be undertaken prior to planting; and
- detail plant/planting maintenance schedules and requirements.
Planning Referral

To: Amy Hodgen
From: Paul Whitten (Arborist)
Date: 24/09/2019
Subject: Referral comments on Street trees
Application No: PLN19/0450
Description: 15 storey office building with ground floor retail
Site Address: 36 – 52 Wellington Street, Collingwood

The proposed canopies on the Wellington St frontage must have a minimum 3.5m clearance in radius from the street trees.

This allows for an expected canopy width of 3m radius and clearance from infrastructure of 0.5m

Regarding the proposed tree plantings on the north frontage in Northumberland Street:

- There appears (on google street view) to be underground assets that will prevent planting in this location
- If planting is possible and approved, all pedestrian access will be via private property as it will occupy the majority of the available footpath.
- Plant selection must consider shading from north adjacent development, soil volumes and probable use of green infrastructure to limit damage to proposed brick paving.
I refer to the above Planning Application received on 5 September 2019 in relation to the proposed development at 36-52 Wellington Street, Collingwood. Council’s Civil Engineering unit provides the following information:

**CAR PARKING PROVISION**

AECOM Traffic Impact Assessment report Revision D dated 27 August 2019

**Proposed Development**

Under the provisions of Clause 52.06-5 of the Yarra Planning Scheme, the development’s parking requirements are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
<th>Quantity/ Size</th>
<th>Statutory Parking Rate*</th>
<th>No. of Spaces Required</th>
<th>No. of Spaces Allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>18,308 m²</td>
<td>3 spaces per 100 m² of leasable floor area</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Drink</td>
<td>616 m²</td>
<td>3.5 spaces per 100 m² of leasable floor area</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>571 Spaces</strong></td>
<td><strong>82 Spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Since the site is located within the Principal Public Transport Network Area, the parking rates in Column B of Clause 52.06-5 now apply.

To reduce the number of car parking spaces required under Clause 52.06-5 (including to reduce to zero spaces), the application for the car parking reduction must be accompanied by a Car Parking Demand Assessment.

**Car Parking Demand Assessment**

In reducing the number of parking spaces required for the proposed development, the Car Parking Demand Assessment would assess the following:

- *Parking Demand for Office.* The office component of the development would be providing 82 on-site parking spaces, which equates to a rate of 0.44 spaces per 100 square metres of floor area. Throughout the municipality, a number of developments have been approved with reduced office rates, as shown in the following table:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Site</th>
<th>Approved Office Parking Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60-88 Cremorne Street PLN170626 issued 21 June 2018</td>
<td>0.72 spaces per 100 m² (200 on-site spaces; 27,653 m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-16 Northumberland Street PLN160436 issued 14 June 2017</td>
<td>0.89 spaces per 100 m² (136 on-site spaces; 15,390 m²)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although slightly lower than the above rates, the proposed office parking rate of 0.44 spaces per 100 square metres of floor space is considered appropriate having regard to the site's proximity to public transport services and its connectivity to the on-road bicycle network.

- **Parking Demand for Food and Drinks Premises.** The parking demand generated by the food and drink premises would be accommodated off-site. A staff parking demand rate of 1.0 space per 100 square metres of floor area could be adopted. Applying this rate would equate to a staff parking demand of six spaces. Customers to the food and drink premises would be drawn from the office at the subject site as well as from nearby businesses and residences.

- **Availability of Public Transport in the Locality of the Land.** The site is within walking distance of tram services operating along Smith Street-Gertrude Street and Victoria Parade. Bus services also operate along Victoria Parade. Employees also have the option of using rail services, which can be accessed from North Richmond railway station.

- **Convenience of Pedestrian and Cyclist Access.** The site has very good pedestrian connectivity to public transport nodes and to the on-road bicycle network.

- **Multi-Purpose Trips within the Area.** Customers to the food and drinks premises and clients to the office might combine their trips by engaging in other activities or business whilst in the area.

### Appropriateness of Providing Fewer Spaces than the Likely Parking Demand

Clause 52.06 lists a number of considerations for deciding whether the required number of spaces should be reduced. For the subject site, the following considerations are as follows:

- **Availability of Car Parking.** The level of on-street parking that takes place in the vicinity of the site is very high. Areas of unrestricted parking, such as Glasgow Street, are fully occupied and usually from early morning periods. On-street parking for employees is not a practical or viable option.

- **Car Parking Impact of Nearby Developments.** The surrounding area contains a number of large scale approved developments and sites that are currently being considered, as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved Developments</th>
<th>Developments under consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73-77 Wellington Street</td>
<td>60-88 Langridge Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-44 Oxford Street</td>
<td>60-52 Langridge Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-94 Cambridge Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Langridge Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-71 Wellington Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-16 Northumberland Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-21 Derby Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-57 Wellington Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-75 Langridge Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It is not unreasonable to assume that some sort-stay customers, patrons and clients to these developments (food and drink, retail, office uses) may already be parked in the local area (multi-purpose trips). The parking controls within the Collingwood area are time restricted which provide frequent turnover in parking. Although the parking occupancy may be very high at certain times, the turnover in parking provides opportunity for customers and patrons to park short-term. Car parking in the surrounding area should be considered on an area wide-basis rather than on a site/individual basis. Spare on-street car parking capacity would be shared amongst sites within the surrounding area.

- Relevant Local Policy or Incorporated Document. The proposed development is considered to be in line with the objectives contained in Council’s Strategic Transport Statement. The site is ideally located with regard to sustainable transport alternatives and the reduced provision of on-site car parking would potentially discourage private motor vehicle ownership and use.

Adequacy of Car Parking

From a traffic engineering perspective, the waiver of parking associated with the office and food and drink premises is considered appropriate in the context of the development and the surrounding area. Whilst the office's on-site parking provision is lower than empirical office car parking demands, the constrained on-street parking conditions would be a disincentive for employees to drive to work. The site is well serviced by public transport services. The operation of the new office and food and drink premises should not adversely impact on existing parking conditions in the area, which are already constrained.

The Civil Engineering unit has no objection to the reduction in the car parking requirement for this site.

TRAFFIC GENERATION

Trip Generation

AECOM has conservatively assumed an office traffic generation rate of 1.0 trip per on-site parking space for both AM and PM peak hours. Using the rate adopted by AECOM, each peak hour would generate 82 trips. Typically, the office trip generation rate used for developments is 0.5 trips per on-site space in each peak hour.

Directional Splits and Traffic Distribution

Directional split assumptions in each peak hour for the office traffic –

- AM Peak – 10% outbound (8 trips), 90% inbound (74 trips); and
- PM Peak – 90% outbound (74 trips), 10% inbound (8 trips).

The traffic distribution assumptions made by AECOM in section 4.1.2 of the report are considered reasonable.

Traffic Impact – Intersection of Wellington Street and Northumberland Street

The traffic impact of the Wellington Street/Northumberland Street intersection was assessed using the SIDRA program, which measures intersection performance. SIDRA modelling works well under free flowing traffic conditions and may have limitations, such as queuing of downstream traffic. The results of the post-development modelling suggest that the intersection is expected to operate satisfactorily during the PM peak hour. (During the PM peak hour, traffic from 2-16 Northumberland Street would exit their site via Glasgow Street).
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## Development Layout Design

**SBJ Architects**  
Drawing Nos. TP 1-101, TP 1-102 and TP 1-103  
Revision 2 dated 23 August 2019  
TP 2-105 and TP 3-103  
Revision 1 dated 23 August 2019

### Layout Design Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access Arrangements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Entrance</td>
<td>The development entrance has a wall-to-wall width of 8.55 metres and satisfies the Australian/New Zealand Standard AS/NZS 2890.1:2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>The exit lane of the development entrance has adequate sight lines of pedestrians. The sight triangle has not been superimposed on the drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headroom Clearance</td>
<td>The car park has a minimum headroom clearance of 2.2 metres and satisfies AS/NZS 2890.1:2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Ramped Accessways</td>
<td>The internal ramp has 3.0 wide lanes with 300 mm kerbs and a 900 mm wide median, which satisfies AS/NZS 2890.1:2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Car Parking Modules</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-grade Parking Spaces</td>
<td>The dimensions of the parking spaces (2.6 metres by 4.9 metres) satisfy Design standard 2: Car parking spaces of Clause 52.06-9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Parking Space</td>
<td>With the exception of the length (which satisfies Design standard 2), the accessible parking spaces satisfies the Australian/New Zealand Standard AS/NZS 2890.6:2009. No bollard has been provided in the shared area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisles</td>
<td>The aisle widths range from 6.4 metres to 7.325 metres and satisfy Table 2: Minimum dimensions of car parking spaces and accessways of Clause 52.06-9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Depths and Setbacks</td>
<td>The columns along the west row of parking spaces of Basement 01 and Basement 02 satisfy Diagram 1 Clearance to car parking spaces of Clause 52.06-9. The positions of all other columns throughout the car parks are non-compliant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearances to Walls</td>
<td>Clearances of no less than 300 mm have been provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind Aisle Extension</td>
<td>In Basement 02, a blind aisle extension of 1.321 metres has been provided, which satisfies AS/NZS 2890.1:2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Spaces</td>
<td>The dimensions of the motorcycle spaces (12 metres by 2.5 metres) satisfy AS/NZS 2890.1:2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gradients</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp Grade for First 5.0 metres inside Property</td>
<td>The upward grade of 1 in 10 satisfies Design standard 3: Gradients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp Grades and Changes of Grade</td>
<td>The ramp grades and changes of grade satisfy Table 3 Ramp Gradients of Clause 52.06-9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Grades at Bases of 1 in 4 Ramp Sections</td>
<td>The 2.0 metre long transition grades at the bases of the 1 in 4 ramp sections are considered insufficient. The lengths of the 1 in 8 transition grades at the bases of the 1 in 4 ramp sections must be no less than 2.5 metres in length in order to satisfy the ground clearance requirements for the B99 design vehicle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Agenda

**Attachment 10 - Engineering Referral Comments**

### Other Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loading Arrangements</td>
<td>A single bay (2.6 metres by 4.9 metres) has been provided in Basement 01 and would be serviced by small vans/commercial vehicles the size of a B85 design vehicle. There is no objection to this arrangement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Rigid Vehicle – Turning Movements at Development Entrance</td>
<td>The swept path diagram for the small rigid vehicle (waste collection vehicle) exiting the site appears to be using the right side (inbound lane) of the development entrance. Clarification on this matter should be provided by the applicant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Circulation</td>
<td>No swept path diagrams have been provided to demonstrate vehicle turning movements between the access and the internal ramped accessway (particularly in Basement 02 at the south end of the ramp).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Passing Movements – Northumberland Street</td>
<td>The provision of parallel on-street parking on the north side of Northumberland Street would reduce the effective carriageway width of the road. How would vehicle passing conflicts be managed in Northumberland Street, particularly during the peak hours?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Design Items to be Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>The pedestrian sight triangle (2.0 metres by 2.5 metres) should be superimposed on the drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Depths and Setbacks</td>
<td>Columns that are non-compliant are to be repositioned or redesigned such that they do not encroach with the parking space clearance envelopes (i.e. - Diagram f of Clause 52.06-9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Grades at Bases of 1 in 4 Ramp Sections</td>
<td>The 1 in 8 transition grades at the bases of the 1 in 4 ramp sections must have lengths of no less than 2.5 metres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Passing Movements – Northumberland Street</td>
<td>Information on vehicle passing movements/potential vehicle conflict at the western section of Northumberland Street to be discussed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL ENGINEERING CONDITIONS

Vehicle Crossing

Before the development commences, or by such later date as approved in writing by the
Responsible Authority, the new vehicle crossing must be designed and constructed:

- In accordance with any requirements or conditions imposed by Council.
- Demonstrating satisfactory access into and out of the site with a vehicle ground clearance
  check using the B99 design vehicle, and be fully dimensioned with actual reduced levels (to
  three decimal places) as per Council’s Vehicle Crossing Information Sheet;
- At the Permit Holder’s cost; and
- To the satisfaction of Council.

Construction Management Plan

- A Construction Management Plan must be prepared and submitted to Council. The Plan
  must be approved by Council prior to the commencement of works. A detailed dilapidation
  report should detail and document the existing and post-construction conditions of
  surrounding road infrastructure and adjoining private properties.

Road Asset Protection

- Any damaged roads, footpaths and other road related infrastructure adjacent to the
  development site as a result of the construction works, including trenching and excavation
  for utility service connections, must be reconstructed to Council’s satisfaction and at the
  developer’s expense.

Impact of Assets on Proposed Development

- Any services poles, structures or pits that interfere with the proposal must be adjusted,
  removed or relocated at the owner’s expense after seeking approval from the relevant
  authority.
- Areas must be provided inside the property line and adjacent to the footpath to
  accommodate pits and meters. No private pits, valves or meters on Council property will be
  accepted.

Discharge of Water from Development

- Only roof runoff, surface water and clean groundwater seepage from above the water table
  can be discharged into Council drains.
- Council will not permit clean groundwater from below the groundwater table to be
  discharged into Council’s drainage system. Basements that extend into the groundwater
  table must be waterproofed/tanked.

Removal, Adjustment, Changing or Relocation of Parking Restriction Signs

- No parking restriction signs or line-marked on-street parking bays are to be removed,
  adjusted, changed or relocated without approval or authorisation from Council’s Parking
  Management unit and Construction Management branch.
- Any on-street parking reinstated as a result of development works must be approved by
  Council’s Parking Management unit.
- The removal of any kerbside parking sensors and any reinstatement of parking sensors will
  require the Permit Holder to pay Council the cost of each parking sensor taken out from the
  kerb/footpath/roadway. Any costs associated with the reinstatement of road infrastructure
  due to the removal of the parking sensors must also be borne by the Permit Holder.
### ADDITIONAL ENGINEERING ADVICE FOR THE APPLICANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Point of Discharge</td>
<td>The applicant must apply for a Legal Point of Discharge under Regulation 133 – Stormwater Drainage of the Building Regulations 2018 from Yarra Building Services unit. Any storm water drainage within the property must be provided and be connected to the nearest Council pit of adequate depth and capacity (legal point of discharge), or to Council’s satisfaction under Section 200 of the Local Government Act 1989 and Regulation 133.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vehicle Crossing – Cross Section

The designer is to submit a 1:20 scale cross section for each proposed vehicle crossing showing the following items:

- Finished floor level 2.0 metres inside property
- Property line surface level
- Surface level at change in grade (if applicable)
- Bullnose (max height 60mm) – must be clearly labelled
- Surface level at the bottom of the kerb
- Surface level at the edge of channel
- Road level 1.0 meter from the edge of channel
- Road levels

- Please note the cross section must be fully dimensioned. As shown in the sketch below.
- Please show both the existing and proposed surface.
- The maximum allowable cross-fall between points B and C is 1:40 (2.5%).
- A bullnose (max 60mm) is permitted at point D, however not compulsory.
- The levels shown must be exact reduced levels, to three decimal points. Interpolation of levels is not acceptable.
- The designer must demonstrate that an 85th or 99th percentile vehicle profile can traverse the design cross section as per the Australian/New Zealand Standard ground clearance template (AS/NZS 2890.1:2004).
- Significant level changes to the existing footpath level B to C will require additional level design either side of the proposed crossing.
- Please include any additional levels or changes in grade that are not shown in the diagram.
Planning Referral

To: Amy Hodgen
From: Chloe Wright
Date: 10/10/2019
Subject: Strategic Transport Comments
Application No: PLN19/0450
Description: 15 storey office building with ground floor retail
Site Address: 36 – 52 Wellington Street, Collingwood

I refer to the above amendment proposal referred on 05/09/2019, and the accompanying Traffic report prepared by AECOM in relation to the proposed development at 36 – 52 Wellington Street, Collingwood. Council’s Strategic Transport unit provides the following information:

Access and Safety

Wellington Street separated bike lanes

There are two redundant crossovers at the Wellington Street side of the site. The development should include construction of a raised concrete barrier for the protected bike lane adjacent to the redundant vehicle crossovers at Wellington Street. The extension of the concrete barriers must be consistent with the current concrete barriers and should be shown on the plans prior to endorsement.

Northumberland Street treatment

It is understood that the proposed brick treatment within the road reserve is not supported by other Council Units and an alternative treatment will be proposed. The alternative material for Northumberland Street should provide a smooth surface that is appropriate for cyclists to access the site from Wellington Street and Northumberland Street.

Bicycle Parking Provision

Statutory Requirement

Under the provisions of Clause 52.34-3 of the Yarra Planning Scheme, the development’s bicycle parking requirements are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
<th>Quantity/Size</th>
<th>Statutory Parking Rate</th>
<th>No. of Spaces Required</th>
<th>No. of Spaces Allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office (other than specified in the table)</td>
<td>18,308 sqm</td>
<td>1 employee space to each 300 sqm of net floor area if the net floor area exceeds 1000 sqm</td>
<td>61 employee spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 visitor space to each 1000 sqm of net floor area if the net floor area exceeds 1000 sqm</td>
<td>18 visitor spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail premises</td>
<td>616 sqm</td>
<td>1 employee space to each 300 sqm of leaseable floor area</td>
<td>2 employee spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The development provides a total of 117 additional employee bicycle spaces and 9 additional visitor bicycle spaces over the total requirements of the planning scheme.

Adequacy of visitor spaces

28 visitor spaces are provided at the Northumberland footpath. The following comments are provided in relation to visitor spaces:

- Council’s best-practice rate recommends 1 visitor space to each 500 sqm of leasable floor space. This generates a recommended rate of 38 visitor spaces. 10 additional visitor spaces should be provided to meet the best practice rate. It is recommended that additional visitor bicycle spaces are provided at the Wellington Street footpath.
- The location of the proposed visitor spaces at Northumberland Street is in an area that is visible from the public realm and easily accessible to visitors at the site, and is therefore acceptable.
- All visitor parking is provided as a horizontal at-grade hoop. It is recommended that the visitor bike hoops are angled to maximise the pedestrian access way.

Adequacy of employee spaces

Number of spaces

180 spaces are proposed within a bike store room at the ground floor of the development. Council’s best practice rate recommends 180 employee spaces.

Design and location of employee spaces and facilities

The design and location of employee spaces and facilities is adequate for the following reasons:

- Employee bike parking is located within a secure facility at the ground-floor, in an easy to access location.
- Pursuant with AS2890.3, at least 20% of the employee bicycle spaces should be provided as horizontal at ground-level spaces. 38 spaces are provided as horizontal rails, which meets the requirement for 20% of the total bike spaces to be horizontal rails.

Electric vehicles / share cars / other relevant topics

Council’s BESS guidelines encourage the use of fuel efficient and electric vehicles (EV). It is noted that five EV charging bays are provided at Basement 01. Provision of electrical wiring to allow easy retrofitting of additional EV charging in the future should be provided throughout the car park. A minimum 40A single phase electrical sub circuit should be installed for this purpose.

---

1 Category 6 of the BESS offers this advice.

2 Category 6 of the BESS offers the following for best-practice guidance for employee office rates: ‘Non-residential buildings should provide spaces for at least 10% of building occupants.’ Assuming a floor-space occupancy of 1 staff member to 10 sqm (which is the maximum rate allowed under the National Construction Code for fire safety), providing bicycle spaces for 10% of occupants results in a rate of 1 space per 100 sqm of floor area.
**Green Travel Plan**

It is noted the applicant has supplied a Green Travel Plan (GTP). The GTP is generally adequate, however should be modified to include the following information:

(a) the types of lockers proposed within the change-room facilities, with at least 50% of lockers providing hanging storage space;
(b) security arrangements to access the employee bicycle storage spaces; and
(c) signage and wayfinding information for bicycle facilities and pedestrians pursuant to Australian Standard AS2890.3;

**Recommendations**

The following should be shown on the plans before endorsement:

1. A minimum of 38 visitor bicycle spaces must be provided in a location easily accessible to visitors of the site. All visitor spaces should be provided as a horizontal bicycle rail and must meet clearance and access-way requirements of AS2890.3 or be otherwise to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.
2. A minimum of 186 employee bicycle spaces must be provided. At minimum 20% of employee bicycle spaces must be provided as horizontal bicycle rails.
3. Notations indicating dimensions of the employee and visitor bicycle spaces and relevant access ways to demonstrate compliance with Australian Standard AS2890.3 or be otherwise to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.
4. The car park must be electrically wired to allow for additional EV charging bays to be installed in the future. A minimum 40A single phase electrical sub circuit should be installed to these areas for this purpose.
5. Construction/extension of the raised concrete barrier for the Protected Bike Lane adjacent to the redundant vehicle crossovers at Wellington Street.

Regards

**Chloe Wright**
Sustainable Transport Officer
Strategic Transport Unit
Planning Referral

To: Amy Hodgen
From: Atha Athanasi (Contract Management Officer – City Works Services)
Date: 07/09/2019
Subject: Referral comments on Waste Management Plan
Application No: PLN19/0450
Description: 15 storey office building with ground floor retail
Site Address: 36 – 52 Wellington Street, Collingwood

The waste management plan for 36-52 Wellington Street, Collingwood authored by AECOM and dated 15/08/19 is not satisfactory from a City Works branch’s perspective. Issues to be resolved include, but may not be limited to the following:

1. Five collections per stream is an excessive number and should be reduced.
2. Please detail how hard waste will be managed.
3. Please provide an explanation of how risk will be managed
4. A clause must be included in the plan regarding potential review into the service if operational requirements change.

Further clarification provided 27/02/2020:

The easiest way to minimise truck movements would be to have a larger waste room that can accommodate more bins, however they have other options they could explore if this is not practical.

Risks associated with the management and collection process for waste at the development.
**Planning Referral**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To:</th>
<th>Amy Hodgen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Paul Whitten (Arborist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>24/09/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>Referral comments on Street trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No:</td>
<td>PLN19/0450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>15 storey office building with ground floor retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>36 – 52 Wellington Street, Collingwood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed canopies on the Wellington St frontage must have a minimum 3.5m clearance in radius from the street trees.

This allows for an expected canopy width of 3m radius and clearance from infrastructure of 0.5m.

Regarding the proposed tree plantings on the north frontage in Northumberland Street:

- There appears (on google street view) to be underground assets that will prevent planting in this location
- If planting is possible and approved, all pedestrian access will be via private property as it will occupy the majority of the available footpath.
- Plant selection must consider shading from north adjacent development, soil volumes and probable use of green infrastructure to limit damage to proposed brick paving.