

19 September 2023

Fusion Project Management
 Via email: jordan@fusionpm.com.au

Attention: Jordan Hollett

139-149 Boundary Road, North Melbourne

Response to Council Comments

Dear Jordan,

onemilegrid has previously undertaken a Transport Impact Assessment, Loading Management Plan and Waste Management Plan of the approved development at 139-149 Boundary Road, North Melbourne. A Section 72 amendment application (CoM ref TPM-2020-2/B) was submitted to Council and subsequently received comments from relevant Council departments.

onemilegrid has reviewed the comments and provides the following information in response.

Table 1 Response to Council Comments

Council Comment	OMG Response
Amendment Application – Preliminary concern	
<p>1. As outlined by Waste and Recycling below, concern is are (sic) raised regarding the changes to the plans which result in Council waste vehicles being unable to service the building. Collection of residential waste by private contractors is generally only accepted where there is no alternative.</p> <p>Within the context that this amendment application seeks to make relatively substantial changes to the basement levels, it is queried if there are alternative design solutions (i.e. to the lower ground floor level as well) to accommodate an MRV.</p>	<p>See Waste and Recycling comment responses below.</p>
Endorsement – Outstanding issues	
<p>1. Condition 1(h) of the permit has not been satisfied.</p> <p>The plans still reflect works outside of the title boundary and on Boundary Road, including the provision of 20 visitor bike racks. Works outside the title boundary are subject to separate approvals, which are captured by the civil conditions; therefore, should not be reflected on the plans for endorsement.</p> <p>Concern is also raised if the proposal is relying on land outside of the title boundaries for part of the bicycle parking space provision.</p>	<p>Plans have been updated to provide visitor bicycle space within the site. A total of 40 visitor spaces have been relocated within the site adjacent the retail tenancies and the northern laneway, with no net change to bicycle parking provision.</p> <p>See Section 3.3.2 of the Transport Impact Assessment.</p>

Council Comment	OMG Response
<p>3. As outlined by Traffic Engineering below, there are outstanding concerns with the Traffic Impact Assessment and Loading Management Plan. Conditions 47 and 48 have not yet been satisfied.</p>	<p>Loading Management Plan has been prepared to address Condition 47. Transport Impact Assessment addresses Condition 48.</p>
<p>Transport Engineering comments The submitted TIA is not accepted, and must be amended to include the following, to the satisfaction of the City of Melbourne (CoM):</p>	
<p>Confirmation that all spaces, ramps, grades, transitions, accessways and height clearances are designed generally in accordance with the Melbourne Planning Scheme (MPS) or AS/NZS 2890.1:2004.</p>	<p>See Design Assessment in Section 4.1 of the Transport Impact Assessment. We can confirm that all spaces, ramps, grades, transitions, accessways and height clearances are designed generally in accordance with the Melbourne Planning Scheme (MPS) or AS/NZS 2890.1:2004.</p>
<p>In addition to the proposed mirror, a flashing light/device must be installed at the vehicular exit on Alfred St to warn pedestrians/motorists of exiting vehicles and vice-versa. A narrow road hump must also be installed close to the exit, to slow both entering/exiting vehicles.</p>	<p>Mirror, flashing light and speed hump to be provided. These are detailed on amended development plans (TP2.03). See Design Assessment in Section 4.1 of the Transport Impact Assessment.</p>
<p>Keep Clear road-marking must be provided on the eastbound carriageway of Alfred St at the site access.</p>	<p>Works external to the site are subject to separate approvals. Keep Clear line-marking is not considered necessary on Alfred Street which is a dead-end local road.</p>
<p>Given the relatively narrow footpath on Boundary Rd, the provision of bicycle hoops on the footpath is not supported. All visitor bicycle parking must be accommodated on site</p>	<p>All bicycle parking accommodated on-site. See plans and Section 3.3.2 of the Transport Impact Assessment.</p>
<p>20% of the resident bicycle spaces must be provided as horizontal bicycle racks in accordance with the Australian Standard for Bicycle Parking.</p>	<p>At least 36% of provided bicycle parking spaces provided on-site are provided at on-ground bicycle hoops, in excess of the requirement to provide 20% of spaces as horizontal. Additionally it is noted that on-ground hoops can be easily accommodated within the basement without impact to bicycle parking provisions.</p>

Council Comment	OMG Response
<p>While this development on its own is not expected to have a significant impact on the operation of the surrounding road network, the cumulative impact of this and other developments will require the signalisation of the Alfred St / Boundary Rd intersection, as noted in my comments in relation to the adjacent Pace/Tapestry developments (refer to DM# 13472593 attached). The developer of the subject site must liaise with the developers of the Pace/Tapestry and provide a comprehensive SIDRA analysis of the cumulative impacts of these sites on the operation of both the Alfred St / Boundary Rd and Boundary Rd / Racecourse Rd intersections. The developer of the subject site must also be required to contribute to the cost of signalisation of the Alfred St / Boundary Rd intersection.</p>	<p>Permit conditions relating to the updated Transport Impact Assessment do not reference any requirement for SIDRA analysis of the Boundary Road/Alfred Street intersection. It is noted that the scheme on which the approval is based considered a provision of 326 car spaces on-site. The proposed scheme considers a reduction to 237 spaces, with an associated reduction to traffic generation and impacts.</p> <p>As such, it is clear that if the approved scheme did not warrant traffic assessment or signalised control at Boundary Road, then the amended scheme also does not.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Macaulay Structure Plan does not include any provision for upgrade of intersections along Boundary Road.</p>
<p>As the proposed increase in traffic generation will impact on the operation of Boundary Rd, which is an Arterial Road managed by the Department of Transport and Planning (DTP), this application must be referred to DTP for approval.</p>	<p>The application has previously been referred to Department of Transport and Planning (DTP) and conditions provided.</p> <p>As noted above, there will be a decrease in traffic from the scheme on which the planning permit was based.</p>
<p>6 motorcycle parking spaces must be provided on site.</p>	<p>The permit conditions do not include any requirement to provide motorcycle parking spaces.</p>
<p>3 car share and electric charging space be provided on-site</p>	<p>Noted on the plans: <i>"A minimum 32A electric vehicle charging circuit is to be provided to enable future installation of fast charge units for 20% of car parking spaces."</i></p> <p>Provision has been made for the accommodation of electric vehicle charging.</p>
<p>The submitted LMP is not accepted, and must be amended to include the following: The developer must not rely on the existing on-street Loading Zone restriction in Boundary Rd to accommodate the site's loading requirements. This/other Loading Zone restrictions may be removed/alterd at any time in the future at the discretion of CoM if deemed appropriate (e.g. to provide protected bike lanes, bus stops, etc).</p>	<p>Loading is proposed to occur wholly on-site, and is not reliant on on-street Loading Zones. Noted in Section 2.3 of the Loading Management Plan.</p>

Council Comment	OMG Response
<p>Waste and Recycling comments:</p> <p>CoM endeavour to collect all residential waste, and only relinquish the collections to a private operator as a last resort.</p> <p>The WMP states that private collections have been nominated for the following reason: "It is proposed to utilise a private contractor to manage the collection and disposal of all waste streams associated with all components of the development including the residential, retail and café uses. It is acknowledged that it is preferred for residential waste collection to be undertaken by Council in the City of Melbourne, however the ramp has been redesigned with an apex to satisfy Melbourne Water requirements, which has reduced the available ramp length to provide sufficient clearance for a service vehicle."</p> <p>I have a few concerns – the previous submissions did not have this obstacle as they nominated a Council collection of residential waste. Why wasn't there a need to satisfy Melbourne Water's requirements in the previous submissions?</p> <p>Are you able to verify this justification for the applicant not being able to provide sufficient space for a Council waste vehicle? If you aren't, can we resolve this issue with the applicant prior to progressing any further with the WMP?</p> <p>The applicant would need to provide extensive justification as to why they now can't accommodate a Council waste vehicle (8.8m MRV) when they previously could.</p>	<p>The ramp has been redesigned with an apex at RL5.60 to satisfy Melbourne Water requirements.</p> <p>Without this requirement for a bund, providing a compliant access ramp to the loading area for an 8.8m medium rigid vehicle (MRV) required a ramp length of approx. 27.5 m. To provide a compliant ramp and to include the MW required apex, a total length of 50 m would be required, pushing the loading bay further into the site, with flow-on impacts including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Impacting structural columns; ➤ Loss of dwellings above; ➤ Impacts to the waste chute termination room and chute penetrations; ➤ Loss of at least 6 parking spaces; and ➤ Potential impacts to the stair core. <p>The applicant had previously been in discussions with Melbourne Water to remove the requirement to achieve the apex, given the significant impacts this would have on the basement design and waste collection. However this removal did not eventuate and the waste collection strategy needed to change as a result.</p>

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss the above.

Yours sincerely



James Dear

Director

onemilegrid

m: 0481 110 642

d: (03) 9982 9717

e: james.dear@onemilegrid.com.au

P/R: Adam Gardiner/James Dear