

## **Conclave for Fishermans Bend Panel**

**Record of meeting**

**5<sup>th</sup> February 2018**

**1:30pm – 5:45pm**

**Meeting held at Council House 1, City of Melbourne**

### **Attendees:**

- Ms Leanne Hodyl, Managing Director, Hodyl + Co (chair)
- Ms Adelise Pearson, Strategic Planning/Urban Design Officer, City of Melbourne
- Mr David Sowinski, Coordinator Visualisation, 3d Visualisation Studio, DELWP
- Ms Sofia Anapliotis, Senior Urban Designer, City of Port Phillip

### **Purpose of the conclave:**

- To discuss and reconcile any differences between the respective built form models (if there are any differences)
- To document (in a joint statement) all matters you we are in disagreement or agreement (whichever the case might be) about regarding the respective 3D models
- Joint statement to be uploaded onto the Fishermans Bend Taskforce website by 12 noon on Thursday 8 February 2018.

The following statement has been prepared jointly by all attendees at the meeting. It documents the key points of discussion between the 3d modelling undertaken by Hodyl + Co, the City of Melbourne and the City of Port Phillip.

It was noted that the City of Melbourne and the City of Port Phillip are continuing to update their modelling. Hodyl + Co are preparing additional models as part of their submission to the panel process.

The models do vary, however, do not necessarily contradict each other. The variations are largely driven by difference in purpose of the modelling, different assumptions, different available baseline information and timing of preparation. These are summarised below.

### **1. Differences in the purpose of undertaking 3d modelling has resulted in different outcomes**

The purpose of undertaking the 3d testing varies between all three parties.

For each party, however, the overall benefit of modelling was agreed to be the integrated testing of quantitative and qualitative outcomes.

Each party agreed that the testing has provided clarity on the current strengths and weaknesses in the controls.

### **Hodyl + Co**

Hodyl + Co used the model as a working tool to iteratively test the Urban Design Strategy across a 12-month period and as overall communication tool. It was used to inform strategic development of the Urban Design Strategy. To this end, the model illustrates the preferred precinct built form scale of development, the application of overshadowing controls and the FARs and how they work together.

The model was developed across 2 stages:

- Built form testing of the application of the overall FAR and height limits at a precinct scale.
- Built form testing of the application of the FAR, height limits, setbacks and overshadowing for limited number of specific sites to test multiple contexts (range of FARs and heights). All of Lorimer and approximately 40 sites across the City of Port Phillip have been modelled.

The final model therefore captures this iterative process. It has been used to confirm that the controls work together across the precinct, however, not to document and communicate the application of the controls on every single site. This is clear in the inclusion of images from the model as 'illustrative' – see figures 49 to 52 of the Urban Design Strategy.

The Urban Design Strategy model does not assess application of a Floor Area Uplift (FAU).

### **City of Melbourne / City of Port Phillip**

The City of Melbourne and City of Port Phillip have undertaken comprehensive 3d modelling to prepare a detailed assessment of the DDO and zones, drawing from assumptions in the URBAN DESIGN STRATEGY as follows:

- Table 14: 'Built form assumptions in 3d testing' assumptions of the Urban Design Strategy (p98)
- Table A.3 Preferred housing mix
- Definitions of low, medium and high-rise in Figure 43 Proposed height limits for Fishermans Bend

The 3d modelling undertaken by City of Melbourne includes the whole of Lorimer where every single site has been tested. This incorporated a capacity assessment of the whole precinct to test if the built form controls deliver the population targets.

City of Port Phillip is undertaking testing of selected blocks across the three precincts. This also will assess potential spatial changes to the urban structure, including locations of parks and laneways.

Both City of Melbourne and City of Port Phillip have used the 3d model to assess preferred future character (as defined by the vision) and a range of built form typologies for each precinct.

Both Councils are using the 3d model to assess the application of an FAU and the overshadowing controls.

## **2. Timing of modelling has led to differences in the 3d model**

### **Hodyl + Co**

The URBAN DESIGN STRATEGY modelling was prepared through iterative testing over a 12-month period from September 2016 to August 2017 to inform the preparation of the URBAN DESIGN STRATEGY as noted above. The model has not been updated since this time.

### **City of Melbourne/ City of Port Phillip**

The City of Melbourne has been undertaking modelling for the Lorimer precinct over the past 5 years. The current model has been prepared to inform City of Melbourne's submission between November 2017 and February 2018 and models the Planning Scheme Amendment GC81 and the draft Framework.

City of Port Phillip model has been prepared between October 2017 and February 2018 and models the Planning Scheme Amendment GC81 and the draft Framework.

This has resulted in the key differences in the modelling:

- The City of Melbourne and City of Port Phillip models therefore include a more detailed assessment of the application of the controls on a site by site basis.
- For example, the Urban Design Strategy proposes street wall heights for all streets. The DDO, however, does not specify street wall height for some conditions, for example where the street wall directly interfaces public open space. Where there are gaps in the controls the City of Melbourne and City of Port Phillip has referred to the Urban Design Strategy for built form guidance.
- As noted above, the Urban Design Strategy model has not been updated to reflect the specific controls within the Planning Scheme Amendment GC81.

## **3. Key differences in assumptions are leading to different outcomes**

### **Hodyl + Co**

Hodyl + Co assumptions for the 3d modelling include:

- Only FAR is modelled
- No FAU is modelled
- Generally the following floor to floor height limits have been modelled (however with some variations noted)
  - All levels within base buildings / podiums – 3.8m
  - Upper levels (above base building/podium) – 3.2m
- Unlimited areas are modelled to a maximum of 40 storeys
- Overshadowing testing for unlimited height areas has therefore been tested for buildings up to 40 storeys
- Upper level setbacks from laneways applied from the centre line of the laneway

### **City of Port Phillip**

- FAR and FAU is being modelled to test overall capacity, built form outcomes and overshadowing within the allowed built form envelopes (heights and setbacks)
- Floor to floor heights are 4m at the ground level and 3.8m for remaining floors in the podium
- Floor to floor heights above the street wall allow for 3.8m in commercial buildings (within Sandridge core areas)
- Overshadowing controls are tested using 3.8m floor to floor heights with the proposed height limits
- To date, unlimited areas are modelled to 40 storeys (this is still being assessed)
- Side and rear setbacks: habitable interfaces are assumed in Wirraway (above base building/podium); a mix of non-habitable and habitable interfaces are generally used in other areas. The Better Apartment Design Standards definition of what constitutes a habitable space is adopted. The modelling assumes that non-habitable includes commercial. Non-habitable interfaces are assumed for the base building (except in Wirraway)
- Upper level setbacks from laneways applied from the centre line of the laneway

### **City of Melbourne**

- FAR and FAU is being modelled
- Floor to floor heights are 4m at the ground level and 3.8m for remaining floors in the podium; above podium 3m floor to floor heights are adopted
- Unlimited areas are modelled until the FAR is achieved (therefore exceed 40 storeys)
- Upper level setbacks from laneways applied from the building line

## **4. Different information has been utilised in making modelling decisions in regard to site ownership / site consolidation**

- Hodyl + Co utilised the cadastre base together with aerial photographs to do site modelling
- City of Melbourne and City of Port Phillip used cadastre, aerial photographs and rates data

This has led to the following differences:

- Minor differences in the design of some sites, including, for example, potential opportunities for laneway locations.
- Hodyl + Co have not accounted for recent sales which have resulted in the subdivision or consolidation of some sites which would appear in Council's rates databases.

## **5. Varied floor plate assumptions have been adopted**

The following differences in the model are noted.

### **Hodyl + Co**

Hodyl + Co have generally used the assumptions as outlined in the Urban Design Strategy Table 14. There are examples in the model, for example where small site sizes or irregular shapes have led to different floor plate sizes being adopted.

Residential floorplates of 900m<sup>2</sup> are used as this is in line with the design objective for slender towers. Generally over 900m<sup>2</sup> building assume that it could be a commercial building. Overall floorplates have generally been driven by the setback controls.

### **City of Port Phillip**

City of Port Phillip have assumed all tower floorplates outside of the core in Sandridge are residential. Residential floor plate sizes are based on City of Port Phillip's benchmarking (what the market is delivering) where residential floorplates can be in the order of 30m wide and 75m deep (total of 2,250m<sup>2</sup>).

### **City of Melbourne**

City of Melbourne have tested both the Urban Design Strategy assumptions assuming all towers are residential and prepared a second set of modelling which allows larger residential floorplates up to 25 x 50 metres (1,250m<sup>2</sup>).

Hodyl + Co agree that a greater variety of floor plates sizes than shown in Table 14 are suitable and could be preferable to accommodate particularly commercial uses which could exceed 2,000m<sup>2</sup>.

Residential floorplates in the order exceeding 1,250m<sup>2</sup> are not supported by Hodyl + Co and City of Melbourne as this does not meet the objective of delivering slender towers. This is supported in principle by City of Port Phillip, however, it's noted that the BADS would allow much larger floorplates to be delivered, based on benchmarking.

## **6. Car parking**

### **Hodyl + Co**

The Urban Design Strategy assumes that all car parking is above ground, however has not tested car parking layout or access issues at a site level. The FAR rates already account for car parking provision.

### **City of Melbourne**

The City of Melbourne has assumed all car parking is above ground and has assessed the proposed car parking provision rates into the capacity modelling outputs.

## **City of Port Phillip**

The City of Port Phillip has assumed that car parking is above ground and are assessing the potential layout for car parking at a site by site level. In particular this is being undertaken on narrow sites in the Montague precinct.

### **7. Application of street wall heights**

There are instances where two different street wall height controls meet at a corner.

- Hodyl + Co have applied the higher street wall height on corner where two different heights intersect
- City of Port Phillip have applied the higher street wall height to the corner
- City of Melbourne have modelling the lower street wall height continuing through to the corner

### **8. Open space locations and testing of overshadowing**

All have modelled the open space according to the draft Framework.

One park has been identified where the preferred height limit in the Urban Design Strategy does not align with the overshadowing controls. This is Montague North Park where it is not possible to achieve a 24 storey height limit and meet the overshadowing controls. It is agreed between the City of Port Phillip and Hodyl + Co that this is the case and the height limit will need to be reassessed to a lower height.

### **9. Laneway locations**

Due to the iterative method of preparing the model, Hodyl + Co has not modelled all of the laneways as specified in the final Framework.

City of Melbourne has modelled laneways as per the draft Framework and applied the local policy controls for additional through block links.

City of Port Phillip has prepared two version of modelling - laneways as per the draft Framework (1<sup>st</sup> model) and as applied through the local policy (2<sup>nd</sup> model).