



MICRO NEWS UPDATE – 02 November, 2020

**NEW PLANNING APPLICATION AT
STONNINGTON COUNCIL FOR
10 STOREY MIXED USE BUILDING OVER THE
RAILWAY LINE AT WINDSOR**

Proposed development at: 24–26 & 28 Chapel St,
Windsor for a mixed use 10 storey building
comprising of a residential hotel and retail
premises, a reduction in the car parking and bicycle
facilities requirements; and advertising signage
associated with the residential hotel.

Details of the proposal are on the Stonnington website where the planning
application is currently at public
advertising. <https://eplanning.stonnington.vic.gov.au/EPlanning/Public/PlanningRegister.aspx?search=basic&reference=0361%2f20>

Should you wish to lodge an objection at Stonnington Council a sample
notice of objection form is attached as a guide. Please adapt it to
highlight your specific concerns. You do not have to include all the
points listed. Council and VCAT are now required '(where appropriate)
to have regard to the number of objectors in considering whether the
use or development may have a significant social effect' so, if this
proposal causes concern, please lodge an objection either on the
Stonnington Council website or by mailing your objection to
Stonnington Council ASAP.

Together we can make a difference to our precinct.

For all the news and updates go to www.jaagstkilda.com

STRENGTH IN NUMBERS

Planning Unit
City of Stonnington
PO Box 21
PRAHRAN VIC 3181

Dear Madam/Sir

Re: Planning Permit Application 0361/20

Land: 24-26 & 28 Chapel Street and the air space above railway, Windsor VIC 3181

Planning Application: Demolition and construction of a mixed use building in an Activity Centre Zone, Public Use Zone and Heritage Overlay; use of the land for a residential hotel and retail premises, a reduction in the car parking and bicycle facilities requirements; and advertising signage associated with the residential hotel.

I hereby lodge my objection to the above Application for the following reasons:

- The proposal is a substantial over-development of a small site with a floor-site area ratio radically in excess of that of its context.
- The proposal neglects the potential to enhance the baseline characteristics of the context, i.e., its role as a suburban retail strip. The “public benefits” do not justify its failure to do so.
- Because its development was not anticipated, the site is not identified in specific policies, the proposal does not satisfy the street interface provisions for either adjacent defined area to which it might be linked.
- The site is mainly within heritage overlay H0126, which is relevant as a means of protecting the character of both sides of Chapel Street as much as it is in protecting existing heritage fabric.
- By breaking the consistency of shopfront interfaces and protective street verandahs in Chapel Street with a setback frontage and a disoriented facade, the proposal maintains the present disruptive separation of sites on either side of the rail reserve.
- There is not any traditional role or particular desirability for a marker of the rail corridor.
- The lack of any on-site car parking and loading zone is not a valid reason for a built form envelope to be expanded beyond that sought under the relevant planning scheme provisions. Car parking at this location are at a premium and this development should not rely on public car parking, rather it should be self-sufficient with the statutory car parking requirement for the residential hotel and retail facilities.
- With proposed provision of only 12 bicycle parks, 3 of which are on the street and 3 at the rear of the building, it is considered that this is totally inadequate for the proposed residential hotel and retail use.
- The site may be a "unique opportunity", but this does not excuse a disregard of its constraints and limitations or the relevant provisions of the planning scheme.
- The proposed "street-wall" is too weak. It is only just higher than the non-significant “Paint Spot” and is notably lower than the typical two-storey heritage buildings to the north. The podium needs to be one storey higher in order:
 - to respond to the context,
 - to provide a greater sense of enclosure to the street and
 - to better conceal what rises up behind [at a lesser setback than is asked for by Council].

- The articulation of the shopfronts and hotel entry is inadequate. The typical shopping street rhythm of narrow frontages separated by piers is not maintained, except at the hotel entry. Introduction of piers at alternate modules would deal with this and would provide more flexibility for subdivision of the retail areas into smaller units.
- Retail and hotel entries should be recessed to enhance street front articulation and to provide better transition between the footpath and interiors.
- The architectural purity of the facades is unrealistic. Retail units will require signs and some sort of framework providing for their location/s is essential.
- The structure of the proposed street canopy would be heavier than the unrealistic single line shown on the elevations. It needs to be indicated whether this might be acceptable to carry signage of some sort. The signage provisions available won't be adequate for commercial tenants - even the hotel, which will probably require something that identifies it from a distance, probably lit. Better to design sign locations into the scheme rather than to have to find them when they are demanded in subsequent applications by tenants.
- Through the centre of the site a public plaza and landscaped park has been inserted. The park links up through a proposed bike path to a new park positioned in the existing council carpark site, referred to as a future strategic site. As the developer of the planning proposal of the residential hotel and retail provides no on-site open space for its guests, staff or traders a contribution to the cost of this public plaza and landscaped park should be a permit requirement as well as a public art contribution.

_____ Signature
_____ Name
_____ Address
_____ Email
_____ Date