From: Donna Bilke

To: planning.panels@delwp.vic.gov.au

Cc: Rhodie Anderson; Maree Fewster; Colin Charman; "iPitt@besthooper.com.au"; "info@emhs.org.au";

"butcher42@bigpond.com"; "planningcra@gmail.com"; "melbourneheritageaction@gmail.com";

"koddie@bigpond.com"; "felicity.watson@nattrust.com.au"; "Iriordan@tract.net.au"; "frankp@townplanning.com.au"; "info@hothamhistory.org.au"; "lauragoodin@gmail.com"; "talbcook@tpg.com.au"; "liz.drury@justice.vic.gov.au"; "simon@fulcrumplanning.com.au"; "tcincotta@besthooper.com.au"; "planning@au.kwm.com"; "gary@goldlaw.com.au";

"jennifermcdonald12@hotmail.com"; "parkvilleassociation@gmail.com"; "dscally@besthooper.com.au";

"emarson@besthooper.com.au"; "dvorchheimer@hwle.com.au"; "kmarkis@hwle.com.au"; "sallv.macindoe@nortonrosefulbright.com"; "tamara.brezzi@nortonrosefulbright.com";

"sue@glossopco.com.au"; "jcicero@besthooper.com.au"; Rhodie Anderson;

"mckendrick@pppartners.com.au"; "rath@pppartners.com.au"; "kmartin@humanhabitats.com.au";

"nataliereiter@bigpond.com"; "mark.ryder@rydercom.com.au"; Matthew Beazley
Amendment C258 Melbourne Planning Scheme [RCL-Documents.FID1184059]

Subject: Amendment C258 Melbourne Planning Scheme [RCL-Docur Date: Monday, 26 November 2018 4:28:10 PM

Attachments: image001.png

image002.png image003.ipg image004.ipg

Letter submission to Amendment C258.pdf

#### Dear Madam

Please see attached correspondence in relation to the above matter.

Kind regards Donna

#### Donna Bilke

Legal Assistant/Paralegal

Assistant to Rhodie Anderson & Gemma Robinson



Level 11, 360 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne Victoria 3000

T: +61 3 9321 7859 | F: +61 3 9321 7900

DBilke@rigbycooke.com.au | www.rigbycooke.com.au



Rigby Cooke Lawyers is a member of Lawyers Associated Worldwide (LAW)

This electronic mail contains information that is privileged and confidential, intended only for use of the individual or entity named. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, copying or use of the information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error please delete it immediately from your system and inform us by email on IT@rigbycooke.com.au. Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

Virus Disclaimer: It is the recipient's duty to virus scan or otherwise test this email before loading it onto any computer. No warranty is given by Rigby Cooke that this email is free from computer viruses or any other defect or error. Rigby Cooke is not liable for any loss or damage incurred by any person loading this email or if liable Rigby Cooke's obligation will be limited to retransmitting this email to the intended recipient.

## **RIGBY COOKE LAWYERS**

Our ref: **REA:20181738** Direct dial: 03 9321 7832

Your ref: Direct email: randerson@rigbycooke.com.au

Page: 1/2

Level 11, 360 Elizabeth Street Melbourne Victoria 3000

GPO Box 4767

Melbourne Victoria 3001 T+61 3 9321 7888

F +61 3 9321 7900 www.rigbycooke.com.au ABN 58 552 536 547

DX 191 Melbourne

26 November 2018

Jenny Moles
Panel Chair
Planning Panels Victoria
1 Spring Street
MELBOURNE VIC 3000

By Email: planning.panels@delwp.vic.gov.au

Dear Madam

# Amendment C258 Melbourne Planning Scheme Submissions by Bennett's Lane Custodians

We continue to act for a group of companies described to the Panel for convenience previously as Bennett's Lane Custodians (**BLC**).

We write in response to the Panel's letter dated 14 November 2018 directing each late submitter to advise the Panel as to whether they agree to the alternative course suggested by the Panel in Part 3 of its letter.

We note that the Panel's letter makes reference to document 105, which is correspondence from this office. With respect, the Panel has misunderstood the intention of our letter – that letter states that until Amendment C328 is resolved, the Heritage Policies (read plural as compared to what is understood now to be the Council officer's submission to the Panel advocating for a singular policy) should not be applied to BLC's land.

We advise that it may be possible to explore the process of Amendment C258 if clause 22.04 is removed from consideration in the Amendment – but it is not entirely clear what the Panel's direction was in this respect noting that the 'suggested alternative way' states:

...This might be done by a clause of the policy itself referring to certain properties being excluded from its operation, or by application of a Specific Controls Overlay under Clause 45.12 of the Planning Scheme. ... and

... There may be some variation to this course as suggested in outline by the Panel

Subject to the leave given, we are happy to attend a further directions hearing on a suitable date to make submissions in respect of the Panel's alternate course.

This email transmission is intended to be transmitted to the person named. Should it be received by another person, its contents are to be treated as strictly confidential. It is a privileged communication between the firm and the person named. Any use, distribution or reproduction of the information by anyone other than that person is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please contact us on 61 3 9321 7888.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation

### **RIGBY COOKE** LAWYERS

Our ref: REA:20181738 Letter to: Planning Panels Victoria

Your ref: Page: 2/2

As to the suggestion that certain properties be excluded from the application of policy, this raises two concerns:

- The question of how it would be proposed that clause 22.04 (or clause 45.12 or any other variation of the Panel's suggested alternative course) would continue to have operational effect; and
- The implication that the Panel has formed a view that clause 22.04 ought be amended.

As to the second of these concerns, it is submitted that this should be included in the Panel's deliberations as to recusal, because however well intended, it creates an undeniable perception that the Panel's timetabling/desire to continue to hear this matter is standing before the Panel's full and independent consideration of all submissions and is seeking to constrain those who have only recently had an opportunity to join.

Whatever outcome is reached, BCL strongly rejects any suggestion that there ought be any further hearing dates in this matter this year, by this, or with respect upon recusal, an alternate Panel.

Yours faithfully

Rigby Cooke Lawyers