NOTE:

1. This Technical Note has been prepared with the assistance of Lovell Chen, and responds to the matters identified in Section 8 of the ‘Preliminary and Further Information’ request made by the IAC on 25 July 2016 (Request).

2. For ease of reference, this Technical Note adopts the topic headings set out in the Request and reproduces the relevant ‘references’ and ‘requests’ prior to setting out MMRA’s response.

8.1 Recommendations for specific mitigation measures

(i) Reference

Technical Appendix J Historic Heritage Impact Assessment (HHIA) at page XXVII states that, in addition to Environmental Performance Requirements:

More specific mitigation measures which could be employed at particular locations or heritage places as part of compliance with the performance requirements have also been identified in the report.

Examples of more specific mitigation measures provided in the HHIA include in relation to 65 Swanston Street (D-graded in HO505) at p278:

It is, however, a building of sufficient value and distinction as to warrant consideration for retention, even if this was a partial retention (façade) with
new build behind.

In relation to the Flinders Street Railway Station Complex (VHR H1083) at p265:

Visibility/awareness of the escalators (carrying patrons) rising within the building should be limited as far as is possible in views to the building, including at night... In terms of a design response, the replacement shopfronts should be positioned on the alignment of the original. It is recommended that new glazing be divided into multiple panels reflecting the typical arrangement of the original shopfront glazing and plinth to maintain a consistent presentation of the building at the pedestrian interface.

(ii) Request

The IAC requests:

39. a summary of the specific mitigation measures (including design) in the HHIA and advise whether these will be implemented and if so, how these would be incorporated into project approvals if they are not specified in Environmental Performance Requirements

40. clarification on whether the risk ratings provided for risks HHO1 to HHO35 assume the implementation of these mitigation measures.

MMRA Response:

Request 39

3. In the Historic Heritage Impact Assessment (HHIA), specific mitigation measures are identified and have informed the development of the Environmental Performance Requirements (EPRs) for each precinct, and in are presented in the consolidated table of EPRs at section 17.0 of the report.

4. A summary of the key possible mitigation measures referenced in the HHIA is included at Attachment A of this Technical Note. As for the EPRs themselves, some of the mitigation measures relate to the project as a whole, while others are tailored to particular heritage places.

5. The possible mitigation measures provide guidance as to how the relevant EPRs could be achieved, either across the project or for the specific heritage place referenced. Some of the possible mitigation measures also include an additional level of detail to assist in interpreting and complying with the EPRs. This detail is likely to be relevant in terms of guiding further design and documentation work, and in highlighting particularly relevant considerations in this process. In some cases, including the example cited by the IAC of Flinders Street Station, there is additional commentary about particular issues provided in the analysis in the HHIA.

6. The mitigation measures suggested in the HHIA are not intended to be prescriptive. In that regard, it would be more appropriate for these to be
referenced as ‘possible mitigation measures’ rather than ‘proposed mitigation measures’ as they appear in the HHIA.

7. While it is anticipated that the suggested mitigation measures may be adopted in many cases, it would also be possible to achieve compliance with the EPRs with alternative mitigation measures or measures that are not in all respects identical to those proposed in the HHIA. This is particularly the case where the mitigation measures relate to the design process, where detailed design is yet to occur, and a range of issues and considerations will be brought to bear as part of that work.

8. Rather, it is expected that the suite of possible mitigation measures in the HHIA would be considered in detailed design, as part of the process of achieving compliance with the EPRs.

9. In terms of project approvals, for all places included in the Victorian Heritage Register or the Victorian Heritage Inventory (for archaeological sites), approval will be required under the *Heritage Act 1995*. This is in addition to the requirement to comply with the EPRs.

10. For the Victorian Heritage Register sites, the usual processes of lodgment of permit applications with appropriate documentation, including heritage impact statements, would occur. As part of the permit application process, there would also be referral requirements and public notification may also be required. In the event that permits were to be issued under the *Heritage Act 1995*, these could include conditions. Permit and consent conditions would be expected to include archaeological management measures based on the archaeological management plans referenced in CH6.

11. For places that are not listed in the VHR or the VHI, it would be expected that consideration would be given to the possible mitigation measures specified in the HHIA in assessing compliance with the EPRs.

**Request 40**

12. The residual risk ratings for HHO1 to HHO35 in the HHIA assume that a level of mitigation can be achieved. While it is anticipated that the possible mitigation measures in the HHIA may be adopted in many cases, it is also possible to achieve compliance with the EPRs with alternative mitigation measures or measures that are not identical to those proposed in the HHIA.

8.2 **Information about physical works used in the HHIA**

*(i) Reference*

*The HHIA includes a risk and impact assessment that considered potential consequences of the project on heritage values, including physical impacts arising from works.*

*The IAC understands that this risk assessment is based on specific works occurring. The EES does not, however, comprehensively identify the specific works relied upon.*
Two examples of where the risk assessment appears to rely upon works not specified in the EES are:

at p265 in relation to the Flinders Street Railway Station Complex (VHR H1083):

Proposed works included in the Concept Design include the construction of an underground connection to Flinders Street Station accessing the public concourse at level 1. Within the station building, it is anticipated works would include the demolition of two shopfronts, internal wall structure and interiors of retail premises to Flinders Street (currently occupied by Scissors and Cignall, Figure 129); demolition of floors and ceilings to these spaces and floors and internal walls to level one above to enable escalator access to the concourse.

New infrastructure in place at the completion of the project would include two reconstructed shopfronts at ground level to Flinders Street, new escalators and pedestrian links within the station building.

It is understood that no works are proposed to the external structure and fabric of the building; specifically the stone plinth and piers and masonry structure with render dressings to the external facade ...

at p297-8 Table 63 ‘Comments on new above ground elements within the Flinders Gate Precinct (H0505)’ states in the Assessment Project column “notional building envelopes have been reviewed as part of the assessment” and “future oversite development is indicated to the west and set back to the north”.

(ii) Request

The IAC requests advice on:

41. whether the risk assessment is based on specific works occurring, if so, a complete list of any specific works relied upon in forming the assessment

42. whether that list has been provided to other specialists

43. what mechanisms exist for ensuring that the works relied upon in forming the assessment, as opposed to any other works, are carried out.

MMRA Response:

Request 41

13. Technical project information was provided to all specialists to inform the EES risk and impact assessment. The technical project information was
captured in an internal MMRA working document, which has informed the EES Chapter 6 Project Description.

14. The project information included potential design outcomes and built form at various locations along the project alignment, as well a description of the possible construction methodology. All information has been used in the HHIA prepared by Lovell Chen for the EES.

15. The technical information referenced in the HHIA included plans and diagrams covering:
   a) indicative building envelopes for above ground structures;
   b) indicative station designs (limited to a small number of plans and cross-sectional material); and
   c) notional building envelopes for future oversite development at CBD South.

16. A list of the plans and diagrams is include at Attachment B to this Technical Note.

Request 42

17. The same technical information was provided to all specialists undertaking impact assessments for the EES.

Request 43

18. The technical information, including plans and diagrams, provided indicative station designs and building envelopes. This informed the assessment of the key issues for affected heritage places in risk and impact assessment. It also informed the development of the EPRs and possible mitigation measures.

19. The intention of the EPRs is such that the same outcome can be achieved and risks can be managed regardless of the specific works undertaken to reduce the impacts.

20. The final design outcome could therefore differ from the works as depicted, and the EPRs and possible mitigation measures have been developed on that basis.

8.3 Cumulative impacts within a precinct

(i) Reference

The impact assessment within the HHIA is structured to consider each place within a precinct individually. The cumulative impacts within a precinct have not been addressed as a whole. For example, the HHIA states at p273:

Demolition and/or other works to graded buildings

A number of graded buildings in the precinct are proposed to be demolished. Each is considered in turn below.
(ii) Request

The IAC requests:

44. an assessment of the cumulative historic heritage impacts within precincts.

MMRA Response:

Request 44

21. The heritage issues and impacts of the project occur at a series of discrete locations.

22. The concept of a cumulative heritage impact could be considered on the basis of a location (project precinct). In this context, it is noted that a summary of the key heritage issues and impacts is provided at the end of each precinct assessment in the HHIA.

23. Based on the example provided, the reference to ‘precinct’ in the IAC’s request may also mean ‘Heritage Overlay precinct.’

24. The Heritage Overlay precincts affected are as follows, with a comment on cumulative impact, if any. This review has been undertaken by Lovell Chen and is based on the HHIA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Precinct</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tunnels/Domain</td>
<td>South Yarra Precinct (HO6 in the Melbourne Planning Scheme) emergency access shaft in Fawkner Park (refer HHIA section 7.6.7.3) and tram works in Toorak Road West as part of Early Works (refer HHIA section 16.5.7.1). These works would not have an adverse cumulative impact on HO6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western portal precinct</td>
<td>Kensington Precinct (HO9 in the Melbourne Planning Scheme): impact relates to the demolition of graded residences in one location. The cumulative impact of these works has been assessed at section 8.6.1.3 of the HHIA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden station precinct</td>
<td>No Heritage Overlay precincts affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkville station precinct</td>
<td>Carlton Precinct (HO1 in the Melbourne Planning Scheme). Impact on the precinct is assessed at section 10.6.5.3 of the HHIA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD North station precinct</td>
<td>No Heritage Overlay precincts affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD South station precinct</td>
<td>Flinders Gate Precinct (H505 in the Melbourne Planning Scheme – see Figure 1): impact relates to the demolition of graded buildings and the construction of new station infrastructure within the precinct, with the potential for future oversite development (Note – oversite development is not part of the EES).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Precinct</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As detailed in the HHIA, this precinct includes a series of key VHR-registered buildings, along with graded and ungraded buildings in the Melbourne Planning Scheme. The precinct abuts other HO precincts, including the Flinders Lane precinct, the Block Precinct and Collins Street East precinct, with the effect being one of blanket HO controls over a relatively wide area of the city. The outcome in this precinct would be a change in terms of the built form on both Swanston and Flinders Streets and within the City Square, however with only limited loss of significant heritage fabric. There would be extensive demolition on Swanston Street, however the buildings here do not comprise a consistent or cohesive streetscape. Recognising the extent of change would be substantial, particularly on Swanston Street, the design for the new build would be expected to be developed and delivered in a manner that is appropriately responsive and respectful of the heritage context, and of individual heritage buildings. The north and south-western entries are proposed for locations of some sensitivity (City Square and Federation Square, the latter outside HO505). Equally, both sites are contemporary public spaces and the heritage sensitivities are limited. Overall, assuming care in detailed design, the cumulative impact is not one which would compromise the heritage values of the precinct. The gateway aspect of the precinct, with a strong heritage presentation to the south on Flinders Street and key relationship to Princes Bridge and Flinders Street Station, would be maintained. Flinders Street Station, St Paul’s Cathedral and Young and Jackson’s Hotel would still dominate and hold this key intersection. More change would occur on Swanston Street, but the streetscape here is less cohesive and can readily accommodate change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1  Heritage overlay precinct mapping in the vicinity of the CBD South station precinct (Melbourne Planning Scheme)
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