

12/5/2021

Name withheld

Mr Jim Betts

Secretary of the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

Submitted via the major projects web portal

Attention: Karl Fetterplace

Objection to the SSDA 34196 50-52 Phillip St, New Hotel/Residential Building

Stage 1 Concept DA

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above proposal currently on public exhibition. I object to the proposal for the following reasons.

1. Negative heritage impacts on Phillip St.

I am not opposed to conservation and adaptive reuse of the former Public Works building at 50 Phillip St, but the way the building cantilevers over Phillip St detracts from Phillip Lane and the entire heritage precinct. The area is shabby at present and could do with some beautification, but this enormous overhanging building will turn it into a slum like back alley.

The proposal needs to be amended to avoid this overhang.

2. Negative impact on Astor and west facing apartments, and the amenity of the environment around it.

There appear likely to be many negative impacts both on the Astor itself, and loss of privacy of the communal roof space, but also due to the way in which Phillip Lane is to be used for access to the car park and also for delivery bays. Phillip Lane is narrow and awkward for trucks to negotiate. This results in the need for much backing of trucks with associated beep beep beep. This goes on at night since deliveries come at night due to heavy city traffic during the day, as does the bottle collection from bars, as does the daily garbage collection in the early hours of the morning, and during the day there are deliveries with the same noise level. This already has very negative impact on the western facing apartments of the Astor – and has been the subject of countless complaints to the City Council. The proposed building will both increase the truck traffic, and the noise. It will also increase the car traffic with coming and going from the hotel entrance and moving cars into the car park, together with associated people and voice noise and slamming of car doors at all hours of the day and night. Then there is the increased volume of taxis.

The Intercontinental Hotel site managed to provide access for parking and deliveries from Phillip St, and this current proposal I believe needs to be amended to achieve this -since Phillip St is far better able to cope with this volume of traffic.

3 Uncertainty re the final design

Although it is asserted that this is a “concept” stage, the small size of the site and the huge building proposed mean that many key issues – such as overhanging upper floors, and heavy

use of Phillip Lane for deliveries and parking access- will be set and not capable revision at the final design stage. If access for vehicles from Phillip St were to be feasible, I presume this would need revision of the concept itself. I ask the Department to refuse consent to any application for an envelope in the absence of certainty regarding the final design in a highly sensitive heritage and residential area.

4 Small size of the site for such a large building appears to have led to features of the “concept” as presented which will crowd and overwhelm Phillip Lane.

Where there is a little more open space, at the Bent St end, little coffee shops have evolved. Melbourne has made great use of these laneway spaces for coffee shops and seating areas which have become a tourist attraction and a pleasant space to be. The proposal removes all hope of such things developing in Phillip lane because it jams a huge structural pillar in the lightwell space (removing space), and also appears to be building out over a current small open space used for workmen and parking. So, there will be a huge overhanging building AND increased buildings jammed right up to every possible boundary. The result will be a slum like alley way, and a historic and heritage lane, onto which a number of significant historic building abut, will be destroyed. I believe for this reason that the concept proposal be refused, and that the future of Phillip lane be determined before any such “concept” proposal is presented.

The proposed building will have a very negative impact on the surrounding environment, surrounding residents, and in an area with many heritage buildings where there is an opportunity to enhance the heritage features, instead of destroying heritage features. Setting an envelope on the basis of a “concept” plan is totally inappropriate for such an area. For this reason I strongly urge the Department to refuse the application.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Your sincerely

Name withheld