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QUALIFICATIONS, EXPERIENCE AND AREA OF EXPERTISE

Dr. Gunn is a Registered Architect in Victoria, a Life Fellow of the Australian Institute of Architects, an Honorary Doctor of the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT). He is the recipient of many architectural awards for buildings of design excellence and architectural education including the 2011 A.I.A Gold Medal award and the A.I.A Victorian Chapter Presidents 25 year Award for Enduring Architecture, 2007.

Dr. Gunn was Head of School and then the inaugural Dean of Architecture and Building at RMIT University from 1972-1982 and was awarded an AM for architecture and education in 2012.

Dr. Gunn has directed architectural practices since 1963 during which period his contribution has been mostly involved with architectural and urban design.

During the years 2000 to 2010 he was engaged by the Docklands authority to provide design guidance for a series of high rise and urban space projects. This involvement led to Dr. Gunn being appointed as the Principal Architect for the authority in the latter part of his consultancy.

- See attached C.V. for all awards and publications.

EXPERTISE TO MAKE THIS STATEMENT

Over many years as a practicing architect, Dr. Gunn has acted as a design critic in both architecture and urban design, he has chaired and been a jury member for architectural awards programs for the Australian Institute of Architects in both Victoria and New South Wales.

His role as a design panel member on large projects occurred during his 10 years working with projects at Docklands. He participated with the State Government Architect and representatives of the urban design section of the City of Melbourne to select a preferred tenderer for projects for the Dockland’s authority in the Docklands Precinct, the Dandenong Revitalisation project and the Commonwealth of Australia Maribyrnong Defence site.

Much of Dr. Gunn’s interest in urban design has been in the pursuit of the quality of the public realm and the interaction of the interface between tall buildings and pedestrian zones at ground level. He regards this interface as the real determinant of the quality of life for those living, working and visiting our cities.
SCOPE

Dr. Gunn has taken instructions to prepare a witness statement and provide expert evidence at the forthcoming hearing from Minter Elliston who act for the Victorian Racing Club (VRC).

Dr. Gunn has taken instructions to prepare an Expert Witness Evaluation of the proposed rezoning and development proposals instigated by the Victorian Racing Club on two parcels of existing land as part of the Flemington Racecourse precinct.

INSTRUCTIONS

Dr. Gunn was instructed to provide an urban design review at the request of Flemington Hill and Epsom Road Advisory Committee in relation to the material before the Committee and within the scope of his expertise, express his opinion as to whether the proposal is appropriate having regard to:

- The potential benefits that could occur following a rezoning
- The assessment of the potential development against appropriate Urban Design Principles
- His own judgement and expertise and;
- The basis of his views relevant to the formulation of his opinion

THE FACTS, MATTERS AND ASSUMPTIONS ON WHICH THE REPORT PROCEEDS:

This report focuses on the following matters relating to the current Stage 1 report of the Flemington Hill and Epsom Road Advisory Committee:

- The Project
  - Opportunities and Constraints
  - Overview of the proposed developments
  - Site Context – adjacent neighbourhoods and Flemington Racecourse
- Site planning, built form, use and design character
- Residential typology and site planning
- Pedestrian and vehicular access, movement and parking
- Public open space and landscaping
- Legibility
THE REPORT ASSUMES THE FOLLOWING MATTERS WILL BE COMPLETED AT A LATER STAGE AND AS SUCH, ARE NOT CONSIDERED:

- Wind testing
- Traffic Evaluation
- Shadow Diagrams
- Waste Management Plan
- Environmental assessment

MATERIAL FORWARDED TO ASSIST REVIEW:

- “Flemington Life” – Book of plans, Exhibition version January 2016
  Woods Bagot Architects
- Flemington Hill and Epsom Road/Advisory Committee Stage 1 Report, 17 December 2016, including;
  o Appendix A – Terms of Reference
  o Appendix B - Consultation
  o Appendix C -
  o Appendix D – Exhibition Documents: Flemington Green Site
  o Appendix E – Exhibition Documents: Epsom Road Site
- Folder of Public Submissions from Minter Ellison
EXPERT WITNESS REPORT

A. REVIEW OF STAGE 1 ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

I am aware that this urban design review will, along with that of other consultants, form part of the consulting and hearing process for public appraisal in March 2016.

On reviewing the *Terms of Reference and the Stage 1 report of the Advisory Committee*, it is clear that there has been a great deal of some analysis of the proposed rezoning and consequent development of the two precincts (Flemington Green and Epsom Road), within the land holdings of the Victorian Racing Club (VRC).

The exhibition proceeds on the proposal of the VRC in the proposed rezoning and consequent sale of the two proceeds of land for future development.

There are a number of key recommendations by the Advisory Committee based on the VRC submissions, consultants’ reports and proposals, and the support of both the Melbourne City Council and the Moonee Valley City Council and various relevant planning policies and regulations.

The concept of selling the land to provide funds for future investment, including a new grand stand, is logical and indisputable.

The task of the Advisory Committee, beyond supporting the rezoning, is to provide an ongoing process including a set of principles and guidelines to ensure the success of the two precincts in relation to the broad span of social, economic, environmental and historical criteria.

The exhibited schedule as it relates to density, mix, street layout, block sizes, built form, open space and use. As the OVGA comments suggest, the decisions about these important matters seem to be derived from previous modelling and assumption.

Some early conceptual, explanatory proposed building envelopes in the indicative proposed were selected would have been helpful.

The assumptions that have been made are included in the Advisory Committee’s Stage 1 report in which the draft controls include population densities, heights and built form.
B. REVIEW OF DRAFT CONTROLS

The various reports reviewed have included many comments on urban design principles and criteria, many of which are appropriate and applicable to the proposed development sites.

There are others that should be included but without a more descriptive vision statement and related objectives completing the process to a satisfactory level will be difficult.

Flemington Green Precinct

The process involved relates to that of a master planning exercise, particularly in the case of the Flemington Green Site which because of its size and complexity of uses, is a project which requires an inclusive approach in order to establish a consensus about the structure and function of the development process.

The strategies for a development should be directed toward planning principles that address such matters as;

- The integration of built form, useable spaces and their management
- The way in which these two elements co-exist and interlock to provide human scaled, unique places
- Built form in terms of scale, function and appropriate imagery
- The provision of services
- Sustainable matters including ESD and WSUD
- The economic and financial realities
- The inclusion of members of the local community in the setting of goals
- The role of different agencies in delivering the developments
- The process of selecting a highly skilled design team to implement the program

Flemington Green and Epsom Road sites have a commonality even though they are both at remote extremities of the racecourse precinct and of different site sizes and context.

They do have a commonality in terms of designated use, gateway locations and as contributory markers for the race course complex.

These are arguments for a degree of compatibility in the ultimate architectural and urban experience of the two developments. Instead of viewing them as separate and distinctly different urban forms, why not consider them as siblings of the one family, similar in structure and form yet idiosyncratic in terms of response and expression.

So that instead of perceiving the racecourse complex as an area of dispirit spaces and built forms, why not accept a broader vision and perceive the total environment as one containing a number of significant elements within an overall cohesive framework.

To this end, the greatest rewards would be gained by analysing the basic structure of the racecourse and develop a long term vision within which specific functions/buildings could be added organically over time.
Without strategic planning, constantly modified to meet changing expectations, there is a danger that any future additions and/or modifications will occur to the detriment of the environmental, strategic and aesthetic qualities of the overall Flemington Racecourse precinct.

The Victorian Racing Club should be applauded for making the development potential of the two precincts such an obvious opportunity and whilst it is appreciated that there is a financial reward in doing so, the Melbourne community also stands to gain through the provision of two potentially outstanding residential and mixed use developments.

The conversion of two relatively un-used, physically related Grey field sites into two desirable housing precincts supported and hopefully endorsed by an approved planning process, is an opportunity not to be missed and one of the program’s objectives should be to create an exemplar in terms of planning process, participation and quality design.

The proposed developments would be in close proximity to the CBD, within the confines of the culturally significant Flemington Racecourse and adjacent to neighbouring residential and public use zones containing extendable infrastructure.

Another major and equally significant benefit, particularly to the Flemington Green Site, is the opportunity to create a mixed use, pedestrian oriented precinct – a unique urban centre capable of sustaining a self-generating, self-perpetuating community.

With sensitive planning, high quality human scaled spaces and architecturally appropriate buildings, an extraordinary opportunity presents itself to develop two residential precincts of substance and delight for those that will reside, work, recreate and visit.

A lot of material relating to urban design has been published and used over the past few years. The development of principles based on improving the lifestyle of urban dwellers in particular, is directed at that sector of the population that tends to live in higher density communities in urban conurbations.

However, the successful outcome of the application of such worthy principles requires more than a pedantic condition that states a case but does not implement. Successfully designed projects also rely on the application of thoughtful, responsive design ideas by creative designers.

Written texts can suggest an inclusive approach to a design problem but the conversion of text to high quality outcomes is totally dependent on the thoughtfulness, sensitivity and implementation skills of the designer.

So much public architecture and urban design is often criticised as inhuman and repressive. The reason is not because of a lack of knowledge or academic literature, for there is a bounty of information available in the form of books, texts and existing, generally older urban constructs.

The real reason is the type of thinking adopted by many so called, successful designers who seem fixated by the notion that built form and related open spaces should be designed as ‘urban kicks’ – an object viewing related experience, rather than one to be experienced by human beings.
This self-deluding approach to producing urban design, whether it be architecture or landscape, negates a fundamental issue and that is that the user public needs responsive designed buildings and spaces designed by socially conscious designers.

Responsive places are those that provide its users with an essentially democratic setting, enriching their opportunities by maximising the degree of choice available to them.

Some design principles considered appropriate to the proposed Flemington Racecourse developments of Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 are as follows;

- **Context** – an appreciation of the surrounding built environment and the need for a compatible response
- **Permeability** – Where people can go or not – provide accessible connections that link desirable destinations
- **Variety /Diversity** – The range of uses and typologies that make a place vibrant and different
- **Legibility** – How easily people can understand what opportunities are offered – either spaces, buildings or markers
- **Robustness** – The potential for buildings to perform multiple purposes
- **Visual Appropriateness** – Design the external expression of buildings and spaces appropriate to the needs of users and visitors
- **Richness** – People’s choice and response to sensory experiences created by modifying surfaces and detailing.
- **Personalisation** – The extent to which people can affect their own environment; self-identification within the constraints of group living is a challenge
- **Heritage elements** – their retention and sympathetic inclusion in any redevelopment

These principles cover a wide range of social and physical matters relating to the production of built environments that, if applied with some creative thinking, should add to the quality of life of those living, working and visiting these proposed Flemington Racecourse developments.
C. **HEIGHT CONTROLS**

The towers, their height, their juxtaposition with podiums and the contribution they might make to the urban fabric of both precincts deserve some serious analysis. Whilst their height offers both opportunities, their appropriateness needs to be assessed against relevant, justifiable criteria.

There are precise heights nominated for the three towers on the Flemington Green precinct and one on the Epsom Road precinct. An adequate justification for the towers and their height has not been provided. There are two possible reasons why they have been designated so.

1. *That the towers would provide prime visual markers for the Flemington Racecourse.*
   *A matter of heroic symbolism.*
2. *To achieve greater density on confined land parcels.*

(1) This is a plausible reason for marking the racecourse and its environs. There are many ways the towers could attain uniqueness as embedded markers of the Flemington Racecourse whilst providing excellent accommodation for residents. However all will require a very high level of design skill based on relevant references and a sensitive approach to contextual integration.

(2) Residential density is an important aspect of current urban thinking particularly in relation to urban sprawl and any opportunity to convert existing, undeveloped Grey field sites to residential developments of densities greater than normal should be grasped with alacrity. There is an ongoing debate about whether similar densities can be housed in high rise towers on small footprints as against medium rise density buildings on large footprints. There is no easy answer to this debate because of site specific idiosyncrasies and the relevant heights governed by economic, environmental and social parameters. As well, various site locations are subjected to different planning and urban design guidelines by local municipal authorities.

*Opportunity for Height*

The chance to rezone the two sites for potential development on the Flemington Racecourse precinct must be capitalised as a major opportunity to celebrate the Flemington Racecourse as a sporting institution of great significance whilst providing some much needed high density housing and mixed use activity.

In urban design terms the surplus land around the Flemington Racecourse is an opportunity not to be missed. It can be expected that the Racecourse will remain integral to Melbourne’s cultural and social fabric and as an event space will remain important to Melbourne’s identity long into the future.
In proposing the physical form of any proposed development, the relative flatness of the land including that of the racecourse almost demands the inclusion of higher built forms to mark and celebrate from afar the symbolic stables of the Flemington Racecourse.

The optimism that generated the proposed rezoning is well founded and the VRC should be applauded for the foresightedness of its approach to involve Melbourne City and Moonee Valley Councils and the local community and other stakeholders in the early planning process.

There are a number to reasons why the inclusion of all buildings would add to the quality of urban fabric including:

1. Towers would be ideal legible markers for the racecourse and its surrounds
2. The obvious need to provide increased residential densities could be capably met with a mix of low, medium and high buildings.
3. The low position of the three typologies could create a wonderful physical environment with low level pedestrian zones, middle level, interactive buildings and high towers, all forming a cohesive and well designed, pulsating and interactive urban environment.

Towers need to be considered as components of a structural model in which all building types whilst diverse in their presentation are part of a compatible series of outstanding built forms.

In this case height is an important and legitimate component of a good urban design response. The existing character conditions of surrounding areas do not mark or celebrate the racecourse precinct. Height is the best way to mark and celebrate the precinct in views to the site or seen as a backdrop to televised events.

Of course it is important that the design be well done and while introduction of high towers into the development program will pose challenges, the relationship with their surrounds and with the active pedestrian levels are extremely important design matters.
D. **URBAN DESIGN REVIEW OF PROPOSED PRECINCTS**

There are two main precincts proposed for rezoning and subsequent development. The two parcels of land differ in terms of position, context, scale and use.

**PARCEL 1:  *Flemington Green Site***

The Flemington Hill site is located toward the western boundary.

This precinct is proposed as a mixed use zone containing some low level (2-4 floor) town houses and apartments over sub ground car parking and 3 high rise towers over podium structures (2-4 floors) containing town houses, retail and commercial uses in which car parking is positioned within the curtilage of the podium and sleaved by the residential and retail functions.

**PARCEL 2:  *Epsom Road Site***

The Epsom Road site is located adjacent to the eastern boundary and is accessed via Epsom Road. The proposed development has a relatively small footprint and consists of a low rise enveloping residential complex separate from a high rise residential tower by a large garden court. Car parking is below ground and vehicular and pedestrian access is proposed from Epsom Road.
PARCEL 1:  Flemington Green Site

For the sake of visualisation I have made comments on each of the precincts referencing some of the previous architectural work that had been undertaken.

1a)  LOW LEVEL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

- The proposed development is comprised of 2-4 storey residential blocks addressing the existing streets; Fisher Parade to the west, existing housing to the north, the Flemington Racecourse to the south and Leonard Crescent to the east. East of Fisher Street another similar residential block is sited.
- Some permeability is proposed with internal small streets but could be increased by creating strategic links through blocks to encourage more effective pedestrian penetration. The position and character of the proposed park is questionable and could offer more effective use if it were more contained and protected from prevailing southerly winds.
- The interaction potential of those living in residential buildings and those on the street as passers-by could be improved with a more conscious design approach.
- More thoughtful landscaping should be incorporated as part of the design of the precinct to encourage users to prop and stay and the inclusion of a coffee shop would assist in fostering greater interaction for both habitable residents and visitors.
- The proposed architectural expression is rather monolithic and too consistent, diminishing the potential for a vital and stimulating urban character defined by diversity within a cohesive framework.
- There should be a diversity of public spaces to cater for different user groups and different activities e.g. Small protected sun lit spaces adjacent to a servicing facility for those wishing to stay, integrate and communicate, and larger spaces for more active uses.
- To enhance the use of public spaces, the design of containing elements, be they walls or buildings, should be appropriately scaled and consciously designed to project a responsive architectural language.

"Where quality urban spaces have been developed they encourage through their comfort, attractiveness and vitality or repose, intense human, urban activity."

– Jan Gehl ‘Cities for People’

1b)  TOWERS AND PODIUMS

- The conglomerate of the towers above 2-4 storey podiums to the south of the proposed development zone not an appropriate response to either the surrounding context or the obvious need to mark the site as legible features.
- The towers are glazed forms of varying height sheathed with superficial treatments of dubious referential meanings.
• They are not a thoughtful design response to an extraordinary opportunity to create an organic visual and physical union with the proposed adjacent low level residential development.
• The question could be asked why there is not a cohesive visual relationship between the tall buildings on the Flemington Hill site and the one proposed for the Epsom Road site. A family of buildings both low and high and of quality design would help to define the Flemington Racecourse as a unique place with a renowned architectural character.
• The current proposed design lacks any strong identifiable urban design or architectural expression and is not capable of being a referential legible marker for this renowned racing environment.
• The urban model of tower above low level 2-4 storey podium is a common urban construct and is one way to mitigate the turbulent wind effect on pedestrians at street level.
• It also allows above ground carparking to be sleeved by commercial, retail and residential uses in order to enhance the vitality and interaction of the façade treatment.
• In principle, the solution seems to satisfy the economic and built form criteria but the ultimate design resolution requires some more extensive, responsive design particularly relating to visual character and social aspiration.
• There seems to be a presumption that the image of a tower over a podium creates a significant visual attraction worthy of accreditation whereas the effect on those using the streets and public spaces is neither convincing nor appropriate. The symbolic ‘stick on a pancake’ imagery offers little in terms of the portrayal of a diverse and interactive, human scaled, architectural expression.
• The diversity of visual character and use at ground level could be achieved by providing articulated vertical elements with frequently positioned doorways within different but sensitively designed shop fronts and by extending the vertically segmented façade elements above the podium top to create a more interesting graphic skyline.
• The proposed planer landscaped tapestries and the lack of any volumetric, organising elements will not encourage people to use the podium space for any worthwhile purpose and will not provide attractive visual outlets for those living in the apartments at the same level.
• Such vertically extended elements could act as ‘pop ups’ that are inserted into the podiums’ vast spaces as engaging, liveable, functional elements that define a series of intimate spaces and provide visually containing edges.
PARCEL 2:  Epsom Road Site

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The site for rezoning abuts Epsom Road to the east of the racecourse and is bounded on the north by the VRC Committee building and the Jockeys Convalescent buildings and associated garden to the south.

Direct vehicular and pedestrian access is available from Epsom Road.

The physical restrictions, imposed by adjacent buildings, has reduced the amount of land available for development. The proposed development consists of a single tall residential tower edged at the base by low level residential buildings to the north and east. A contained ground level courtyard divides the two elements.

There is no doubting that the height and mass of the tower building will create a legible landmark to signal the edge of the Flemington Racecourse although there is little to associate its architectural expression as a relevant referential statement and certainly not one that is responsive to its context. Nor does the building place any credence on sustainable matters. Its consistent elevational expression in no way responds to solar activity and balconies at high levels in tower buildings tend to be mostly unusable because of high wind velocities and the uncomfortable conditions they generate.
E. CONCLUSION

Both potential development sites present a prime opportunity to integrate a symbolic and strategically important urban development with a legendary sporting arena and its surrounds.

The planning process and ultimate development design guidelines will hopefully ensure that the completed project will add to the quality of the whole precinct, offering an exemplar in terms of urban insertion and creating a heraldic presence for the Flemington Racecourse.
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