

██████████
Department of Transport and Planning
1 Spring Street
MELBOURNE VIC 3000

Submitted via online portal

12 June 2026

ADVERTISED PLAN

**Re: Response to Request for Further Information Request
Planning Permit Application No. PA2604379
846-858 Glenferrie Road, Hawthorn**

Dear ██████████

We act on behalf of the permit applicant, in respect of the land at 846-858 Glenferrie Road, Hawthorn (**the subject site**). We refer to DTP's correspondence dated 27 May 2026, which requests further information in respect of Planning Permit Application No. PA2604379 (**the application**), pursuant to Section 54 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 (**the Act**).

To satisfy DTP's request for further information and assist DTP with assessing the application, we are pleased to enclose the following:

- Amended Planning Submission prepared by UPco
- Amended Urban Context and Design Report prepared by Wardle Architects (tracked-changes version for officer consideration and clean version for notice)
- Amended Architectural Drawings prepared by Wardle Architects
- Amended Waste Management Plan prepared by Traffix Group
- Letter prepared by MEL Consultants addressing the RFI and preliminary comments
- Proposed permit conditions with track changes, based on the existing permit PP24/0934.

In addition to the above material, we have provided helpful commentary below to assist with DTP's further consideration of the application.

**This copied document to be made available
for the sole purpose of enabling
its consideration and review as
part of a planning process under the
Planning and Environment Act 1987.
The document must not be used for any
purpose which may breach any
copyright**

ADVERTISED PLAN

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Further Information Requested	Response
1) A Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) or Preliminary Risk Screen Assessment (PRSA) to identify any remediation and/or environmental audit related conditions required (as applicable) for the proposed use and works to proceed is recommended. The neighbouring properties at 844 and 842 Glenferrie Rd have recorded history for land uses that indicate potential soil contamination. This copied document to be made available for the sole purpose of enabling its consideration and review as part of a planning process under the Planning and Environment Act 1987. The document must not be used for any purpose which may breach any copyright	A PRSA is being prepared and will be submitted to the Responsible Authority during the permit application process. It is noted that the existing planning permit issued for the subject site allow sensitive uses and does not include a requirement for a PRSA, Audit or any other contamination requirements. This should be sufficient for the application to progress through the statutory planning process and addressed via suitable planning permit conditions, depending on the results of the PRSA.
2) Amended architectural plans showing: - Changes recommended by the Environmental Wind Conditions Study and Acoustic Report. - Correct maximum building height (56.8m). - Correct BFO3 envelopes including street wall height (width of Glenferrie Road reserve), wall on boundaries (11m), side setbacks. These should match those in the amended planning report – see item 3 below. - Details of storage for each dwelling, including internal and external amounts. - Overlooking diagrams for Lightwell 2 demonstrating how internal views will be avoided between habitable rooms, the corridor and maintenance balcony.	Please refer to the enclosed amended architectural plans which incorporate the information requested, noting the following: - No changes required as per Wind Assessment. - Correct maximum building height is indicated. - The correct maximum building height is dimensioned. - The external storage is provided in addition to the total storage requirement per apartment which is provided internally within the apartment. On this basis there is no requirement to allocate the external storage proposed. - The overlooking analysis demonstrates that potential views are limited.
3) Amended planning report including: Correct and precise details of the following items:	Please refer to the enclosed, amended Planning Report in which



ADVERTISED PLAN

Further Information Requested	Response
i. The BFO3 requirements for Standards BF05, BF06, BF07, BF09, BF12, for the site and the corresponding proposed amount/number – including proposed front setbacks, street wall and front wall heights, setbacks above the street wall and front wall, side and rear setbacks (including walls on boundaries), maximum floor plate sizes, entry or window percentages, deep soil extent. ii. The variations sought to these standards. iii. Deep soil and canopy coverage amounts and variation sought to Standard D10 (Clause 58.03-5). iv. Whether the proposal seeks a variation of Standard D13 (Clause 58.03-8), noting it does not comply with the 80% retention requirement for suspended solids, as noted by Council and in the SMP.	these correct and precise details are addressed.
4) Amended Environmental Wind Conditions Study, or letter from the same consultant, confirming: a. There have been no material changes to the built form which would impact on wind conditions, in the plans provided April 2026 or any subsequent revisions in response to this Request for Further Information letter. b. The expected wind conditions, given not all private open space has been assessed via a sensor. c. If all private balconies are expected to achieve a minimum of Walking Criteria. This copied document to be made available for the sole purpose of enabling its consideration and review as part of a planning process under the Planning and Environment Act 1987. The document must not be used for any purpose which may breach any copyright	The enclosed letter from MEL Consultants addresses the issue confirming that the design would not preclude, future, hypothetical food and drink premises outdoor/footpath trading if that were proposed at some point in the future. It is also noted that the following modifications have been made to the plans to address the wind mitigation recommendations of, as follows: • a lightweight canopy has been introduced to address downdrafts from northerly and westerly winds o mitigate wind impacts on the Level 9 balconies to the northern portion of the building, and to improve safety and comfort. • the balcony corners have also been enclosed to reduce cross-draughts and satisfy the wind engineering assessment criteria. • the canopy is integrated with the existing façade language of shifting erosion as a well-detailed, lightweight insertion



Further Information Requested		Response
		within the masonry façade. It reinforces the design intent of softening the building edges and breaking down the overall massing.
5)	Amended landscape plan showing: - With better resolution – the words on the landscape plan provided are not legible. - Deep soil and canopy coverage amounts.	Further to subsequent discussions with DTP (Rowan Farmer) on 28 May 2026, we understand that the submitted landscape plan already satisfies this request.
6)	Proposed permit conditions with track changes, based on the existing permit PP24/0934.	Please refer to the enclosed tracked changes version of the existing permit.
7)	Amended waste management plan, showing: - Whether a private waste collection service is proposed. - Whether each waste stream will be collected by a separate waste vehicle.	Please refer to the amended Waste Management Plan (WMP).

ADVERTISED PLAN

RESPONSE TO PRELIMINARY COMMENTS

Preliminary Comment		Response
1)	As advised in the Eligibility Letter dated 30/4/2026, the maximum building height variation sought under the BFO3 remains a concern, noting the adverse shadowing and visual bulk impacts. A maximum height consistent with the BFO3 is encouraged. In order to remain eligible for DFP, the proposal must meet the \$50 million development cost threshold and provide the minimum affordable housing contribution for DFP eligibility. Any amended proposal must be accompanied by an amended QS report and affordable housing report (as applicable).	The planning submission and accompanying design report prepared by Wardle Architects presents a compelling urban design case for the proposed building height, notwithstanding the variation to the preferred maximum building height. This compelling urban design case is further underpinned by an equally compelling public benefit basis for the proposed height exceedance, including: 17.5% affordable housing contribution.

This copied document to be made available for the sole purpose of enabling its consideration and review as part of a planning process under the Planning and Environment Act 1987. The document must not be used for any purpose which may breach any copyright

**This copied document to be made available
for the sole purpose of enabling
its consideration and review as
part of a planning process under the
Planning and Environment Act 1987.
The document must not be used for any
purpose which may breach any
copyright**

ADVERTISED PLAN

- Reduced external amenity impacts (shadowing) to backyards to the east by providing more generous eastern setbacks compared to the permissible BFO3 envelope.
- Design excellence that makes a meaningful and positive contribution to the emerging character of the area.
- Widened laneway to facilitate redevelopment of the broader precinct, including land in the HCTZ to the east.
- A comparable Floor Area Ratio, between the BFO3 permissible development envelope and the proposed.

This is further reinforced in the design Report on Page 5, by a comparison between the public benefits of the approved development, what's required to achieve the BFO3's deemed to comply envelope and this proposal.

- 2) For comfortable footpath condition for any outdoor seating, Standing Criterion is used for short duration, stationary activities generally less than 15-20 minutes. This could be considered appropriate for a café, however some screening or other wind mitigation methods may be beneficial for further wind amelioration.

The enclosed letter from MEL Consultants addresses the issue confirming that the design would not preclude, future, hypothetical food and drink premises outdoor/footpath trading if that were proposed at some point in the future.

CONCLUSION

We trust the enclosed information clearly explains the proposal, satisfying DTPs request for further information and addressing the preliminary comments received.

However, should DTP be of the opinion that the further information request is not satisfactory, on behalf of the permit applicant, we request a further 30 days to provide any outstanding information pursuant to Section 54(1) of the Act.

We now look forward to receiving DTP's notification instructions and DTP's favourable assessment of the application.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me on [REDACTED].

Yours sincerely



Associate



encl

UPco acknowledges the Traditional Owners of Country throughout Australia and acknowledges their continuing connection to land, waters and community. We pay our respects to the people, the cultures and the Elders past and present.

**This copied document to be made available
for the sole purpose of enabling
its consideration and review as
part of a planning process under the
Planning and Environment Act 1987.
The document must not be used for any
purpose which may breach any
copyright**

**ADVERTISED
PLAN**

