

Future Melbourne Committee 1 August 2017

6.3 Planning Permit Application: TP-2016-1031, 10 Magenta Place Carlton

Carlton Residents Association acknowledges that the deletion of one storey and the provision of relatively small setbacks to the south facing balconies, were positive concessions offered in the amended application.

However CRA has two remaining concerns. They relate to the construction management plan and the architectural treatment of the east wall

Construction Management Plan

CRA notes that the report recommends that any permit issued should be subject to the submission of a construction management plan to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority – Construction Management Group.

There have been recent instances where permits have been issued by CoM for developments, on similarly demanding sites, without the provision of a construction management plan. The resultant consequences can be verified by the CoM Site Services Department, who are currently trying to manage the King & Godfree redevelopment site which is without a site management plan. The Magenta Place site is far more demanding than the King & Godfree one.

The tighter physical constraints presented by Magenta Place, are compounded by its use by the Post Office for access to their loading bay from 4.30 am to 5.00 pm or beyond. Long term closures could be a serious issue, however it appears that the P.O. has had little or no knowledge of this proposal.

Further, the type of construction proposed may not be a planning issue, but the precast concrete panels detailed, present a logistical challenge of serious proportions. Assuming that the 3.6 m entry to Magenta Place permits the required access, it is difficult to envisage a large crane and a semi-trailer loaded with precast concrete panels both in Magenta Place at the same time to facilitate the unloading and erecting of the panels.

The need for a detailed construction management plan is essential, to establish both viability and the subsequent management.

East Wall

CRA has concerns relating to the east facing wall. This wall is largely visible from street level and especially from elevated view points with sight lines over the roofs of the single storey buildings to the east.

The application describes the wall as being 'grey textured concrete' with little detail having been provided. This wall has the potential of presenting a large expanse of bland concrete dominating the small scale properties to the east, until such time as they may be, similarly developed. Not a desirable urban design outcome.

CRA believes that the treatment of this wall requires greater attention than the report offers and approval of the aesthetic treatment be a permit condition.

As a final comment, CRA believes that the development should be assessed as five stories, not four as described in the report, due to the height and extent of the structure above roof level.

Warren Green
For Carlton Residents Association Inc