

## MEMORANDUM

TO	Jessica Antolino, Heritage Victoria	FROM	Ainslee Meredith, Lovell Chen
RE	Permit application P40115 – RFI	DATE	8 October 2025

### **Re: Permit Application P40115 – St Patricks Cathedral Precinct, 2-20 Gisborne Street And 2-60 Cathedral Place And 371-449 Albert Street And 7-9 Lansdowne Street East Melbourne, Melbourne City (H0008)**

A request was received to provide further information in relation to the above permit application under s98 of the *Heritage Act 2017*.

The further information requested is as follows:

Further detail regarding the options considered in designing the new stair and entry ramp works, as these works were not presented or discussed at pre-application stage.

Your application has not included any information addressing s101(2)(b) of the Act regarding reasonable and economic use of the heritage place. It is a mandatory requirement for the Executive Director to consider the extent to which the application, if refused, would affect the reasonable or economic use of the registered place. You may wish to provide information to assist with this consideration. If you do not wish to provide further information regarding reasonable or economic use, you must advise of this prior to the date below otherwise your permit application will lapse. Further guidance can be found in the Heritage Victoria Policy *Reasonable or economic use. Relevant matters for the consideration of section 101(2)(b) of the Heritage Act 2017*.

Our responses to the request for further information are provided below.

#### *Further detail regarding the options considered in designing the new stair and entry ramp works*

Several alternative options were considered in designing the new stair and entry ramp (see attachments of Lovell Chen 'St Patrick's West Entry Studies' and Angelo Candalepas and Associates 'Cathedral West Entry Studies'). Alternative options included a central circular ramp and an offset ramp. The preferred option, which has an even distribution of ramps flanking a central stair, is considered balanced and proportionate in the context of the western front to the Cathedral. This option frames the primary entry and stained-glass windows above, as well as providing an area for the congregation to gather and a space for the inclusion of future artworks (statues) adjacent to the Cathedral. The materiality of this design is consistent and aligned with the Cathedral. The preferred option ensures that equitable and suitable access is achieved to the principal entry, while also being complementary to the Cathedral form and design (unlike the present ramps installed at the northern and southern transepts).

#### *Reasonable and economic use considerations*

(The below response focuses on reasonable use).

The proposed works entail reasonable use of St Patrick's Cathedral. The broader context for the works is the renewal of the St Patrick's Cathedral Precinct and the development of a master plan for the precinct. The master plan will be



the subject of a future submission to Heritage Victoria, with reasonable and economic use being major considerations in that submission.

The works that are the subject of this permit application predominantly involve conservation, compliance and works relating to the provision of religious services, all of which are necessary to support the continued use of the Cathedral as a place of worship (the purpose for which it was built). As discussed in the Heritage Impact Statement, the works are required to facilitate continued use of the space by members of the congregation and the general public. The upgrading and introduction of compliant access ramps, including to the primary (west) entry, are necessary to meet code and compliance requirements.

Refusal of this submission would have the following implications for the reasonable use of the place. Refusal would adversely affect the reasonable use of St Patrick's Cathedral in respect to its function as a place of worship that is available to all members of the community in line with contemporary expectations relating to universal access, patron and visitor services and amenities and public safety. Refusal would also adversely affect the reasonable use of the place in relation to its ability to deliver on its historic role into the future, and in line with expectations for a major place of workshop.