



Minutes

Meeting: Pentridge Resident's Community Group (RCG)

Date: 30.05.16

Time: 6:00 – 7:30pm

Venue: Pentridge, 1 Champ Street, Coburg, Victoria 3058

Chairperson: Liza McDonald

Minutes: Hannah Martin

Present:

Community	Michael Wade of Moreland City Council, Michael La Porta and Robert Stansall
Shayher Group	Anthony Goh, Robert Coghi and Scott Tseng
Facilitators	Liza McDonald, Hannah Martin
Architect	Craig McLeod of Particular Architects

1. **Introduction**

1.1 **Shayher:**

- (a) welcomed residents and explained the purpose of the meeting as set out in the Terms of Reference that was previously circulated;
- (b) sought Residents to express initial feedback and thoughts and primary concerns about the development.

1.2 **Residents** expressed the following concerns:

- (a) the role and responsibility of Council;
- (b) the perceived indifference of the State government;
- (c) National heritage values and heritage retention; and
- (d) community ignorance.

1.3 **Resident** requested clarification over attendees, the process of selecting attendees, and enquired about the absence of an attendee with heritage experience.

1.4 Shayher explained that:



- (a) it expected 5 attendees, 2 of whom were unable to make it which included a representative of the National Trust;
- (b) it expected the representative of the National Trust to attend future meetings; and
- (c) the process of selecting attendees involved an assessment of the responses of prospective attendees to its publicised (through newsletters that were distributed to residents around Coburg and its website) expression of interest; and
- (d) attendees from a range of community groups are invited, to ensure an accurate community representation and ensure an ability to reach outcomes.

1.5 **Shayher** noted that the RCG remains open to new members, and the group is expected to grow.

2. **Masterplan**

2.1 **Shayher** explained the Master plan with reference to the 3D model present at its office, identifying the areas that are allocated for residential, retail, commercial and open space uses.

2.2 **Resident** enquired about the naming process behind the roads – in particular “Success Lane”. **Shayher** explained that the names were previously nominated in consultation with the Council, however advised that there may be some opportunity in the future to re-name one of the roads.

2.3 **Shayher** explained:

- (a) the primary change between the original 2009 Masterplan and the revisions reflected in the 2014 Masterplan was to redistribute the residential bulk above the shopping centre in the 2009 plan to the other proposed residential apartment blocks and buildings in front of A Division to open up the view of the Western A Division Annex, when entering from the Champ Street archway;
- (b) the number of apartments and the gross floor area specified in the 2009 Masterplan is the same as that specified in the 2014 Masterplan;
- (c) that it will continue to work with various architects and Heritage Victoria on each building;
- (d) the key elements of the 2014 Masterplan are the retail/shopping centre/piazza precinct focused on food and beverage and the hotel precinct;
- (e) its current focus is on the retail/shopping centre/piazza precinct which it will seek the views of the the RCG on;
- (f) in implementing the Masterplan and the buildings on site, it is focused on minimising fabric loss and intends to keep the look and feel as intact as possible whilst adaptively reusing the existing Heritage buildings, for example, an Arts centre to be created, currently a Ballet company interested, along with a theatre.



2.4 **Resident** raised concerns about pedestrians, cyclists, delivery access points along Champ Street, the subsequent ‘unnecessary’ damage to the wall, and over the way in which the wall will be demolished (referring to past developers).

2.5 **Shayher** explained that:

- (a) the road openings and the provision for pedestrian and cyclist access as per the Masterplan; and
- (b) the new openings in the walls are buttressed with structural steel in order to implement the ‘interpretation element’. This may be in the form of a silhouette (for example a prison worker) as part of the heritage interpretation on the site.

3. Architecture

3.1 **Architect (for Air Apartments only)** explained:

- (a) the revised plans for Air Apartments, including details about the acquisition and restrictions that remain from past developer; and
- (b) the need to respect and utilise the heritage fabric – but also maintain safety “we want to make sure, for everyone; kids, women, families this is always safe”;
- (c) the changes between Shayher Group and previous developers, including a lack of commitment and poor design structure in the previous design on the part of the previous developer.
- (d) the current designs are light, larger and ensure that bedrooms are all given windows to increase their liveability.

3.2 **Resident** requested the configuration details of the Air Apartments.

3.3 **Architect** responded one, two or three bedroom apartments are the main configurations. Each bedroom has access to natural daylight. In terms of the quality of accommodation stating that there is no comparison between Shayher Group and the previous developer and that the focus is on owner occupation rather than investors, with full panoramic views available.

3.4 **Resident** raised concerns around affordability and balcony size.

3.5 **Architect** explained that all corner apartments have views from two sides, meaning that these views are affordable. The area of the balconies of each apartment exceeds the minimum requirements approximately 11-16 square metres. Some apartments may have two balconies which is unique for residential properties outside the CBD.

3.6 **Resident** requested information on parking and images of the Air Apartments.

3.7 **Architect** explained that:



- (a) there are 57 additional car spaces for the QM Building and Industry Lane, where this is necessary;
- (b) the images are not yet available;
- (c) there is one car space for every apartment and there is the capacity for three bedroom apartments to have two car spaces;
- (d) there is an intention to rebuild the wall on Pentridge Boulevard and build a community facility (internal community space – e.g. home theatre and kitchen space for functions) at the base of the building that forms part of the podium. This will form a space for residential and recreational activities, and hosting facilities.
- (e) “[this is] the best way to celebrate heritage sites, in the best way possible is to allow people to interact with the building and enjoy on a daily basis throughout the whole complex”.

3.8 **Resident** requested environmental credentials of Air Apartments.

3.9 **Architect** responded that the minimum standards will be adhered to, but have not yet been precisely determined. Shayher will provide a report as part of its planning application about the extent to which it has gone ‘over and above’ the minimum standards.

4. Other

4.1 **Shayher** explained, in the context of environmental credentials, that it has put in place a 600,000 litre underground storm water system for flushing and water storage, and has used LED lighting throughout the site. Considerable thinking underlies the implementation of the Masterplan, and the need to be sustainable in the long term.

4.2 **Shayher** noted:

- (a) in the context of reactivating the site, “this is not a random scatter of buildings, someone has thought about it thoroughly”, trying to reactivate the site.
- (b) it is important to distinguish between heritage and planning, and as to heritage, to keep in mind that it is about both protection/ restoration and reuse/reactivation in the long term.

4.3 **Resident** expressed concern over the commitment (long term) for Shayher.

4.4 **Shayher** responded that it is committed over the long term. The investments it has made in renewing the infrastructure, renewing the roads and restoring the heritage demonstrates its that it is committed long term.

4.5 **Resident** expressed concern of the lack of ‘green space’ and number of concrete buildings and roads.



- 4.6 **Architect** explained that all the ‘hatched areas are green’, and that the front is predominantly green.
- 4.7 **Resident** expressed desire to support native vegetation. **Shayher** took this under consideration.
- 4.8 **Resident** raised questions around roads and materials, including use of asphalt and concrete, rather than bluestone.
- 4.9 **Shayher** explained:
- (a) that bluestone has been incorporated in some areas of the new roads with diamonds allowed for brass plates that form part of the heritage interpretation – these have been incorporated into the footpath at various locations that will act as a trigger to inspire interest in heritage areas. These areas will also be easy to find, and interesting for visitors; and
 - (b) the preference of Heritage Victoria to limit the introduction of further bluestone into the design in general so as to not ‘muddy the waters’ between the new roads and the original heritage bluestone walls and buildings.
- 4.10 **Resident** suggested that Shayher should attend protestor meetings if they would like to engage with the community.
- 4.11 **Shayher** explained that as the RCG continues, the numbers will grow with more representatives from the community, and that the idea is to get an accurate representation of the community, having each group represented accordingly. The aim is to have a clear discussion over areas that can be improved and have community input.
- 4.12 **Resident**, referring to previous designs in Coburg, expressed hope in the opportunity to make Pentridge great, recognized and celebrated. “You (Shayher) are taking a purposeful approach to deliver a legacy”.
- 4.13 **Resident** offered feedback regarding invitation/response process and making it more accessible. **Shayher** took this under consideration.

5. Next meeting agenda items

- 5.1 Greenery – saturation of the footprint.
- 5.2 The openings in the wall.
- 5.3 Spotted Gum on Champ Street.
- 5.4 The extent of community consultation.