

Request to be heard?: No - Copy of Directions and

Precinct: Lorimer

Full Name: Andrew Brown

Organisation:

Affected property: 90 Lorimer Street

Attachment:

Comments: re Fishermans Bend framework sustainability goal 1 - what transport modelling has been undertaken, or proposed to be undertaken, to support public transport options that highlight congestion and travel times - what assumptions have been made on transport needs to Fishermans Bend precinct on those living and working in area, v working / living in other areas - what strategies are proposed to reduce transport needs by having larger percentage of persons living and working within Fishermans Bend precinct? (should this not be an objective?) - the Auercon light rail report (2013) proposes crossing the Yarra River from Collins street but the terms of reference for the report were limited to cost / journey times for example and not referencing the community impacts (e.g. property values, businesses e.g. marina, visual street scapes) and what total cost impact the options would have. The report should be recommissioned as part of the Fishermans Bend framework to look at total impacts, not just project costs. The report also supported a Bascule bridge, as opposed to a Fixed bridge, allowing all watercraft access. Why is this not in the Fishermans Bend framework. Traffic modelling of all options should be undertaken, in particular, route 109 (option 5) as its the lowest cost solution with the least amount of infrastructure changes Objective 1.11 and 1.12 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) are good initiative but having FAU's that can be modified based upon 'public benefit' does not provide the community with certainty that building design and height controls will be applied equally nor that the controls will be applied at all. What is public benefit and who decides? the community or the Planning Minister? What strategies will be applied to building applications to ensure the Fishermans Bend precinct has building designs that integrate into the precinct (review the collective, not individual) Objective 1.13 suggest that building separation for below 20 stories be amended to say 10, or, the controls made consistent with those above 20 stories. The livability of existing apartments is testament that broader separations are required What design codes and building reviews will be undertaken to minimise the wind tunnel affect which is downside of Docklands living presently?