Dear Sir/Madam,

As directed by the Inquiry and Advisory Committee considering the Environment Effects Statement (EES), Works Approval Application, draft planning scheme amendments affecting the Banyule, Boroondara, Manningham, Nillumbik, Whitehorse, Whittlesea and Yarra planning schemes and public submissions in accordance with the Terms of Reference approved by the Minister for Planning, this is the joint statement of business and economic experts in relation to the North East Link EES.

The purpose of the conclave is to support the IAC by finding areas of agreement between the specialists – confined to areas that are considered in their statements and to identify areas of disagreement.

Details of Meeting

The experts met at the offices of GHD at 9am on 26 July 2019. The attendees were:
- Marianne Stoettrup (MS) chair and notetaker
- Michael Barlow (MB)
- Brian Haratsis (BH)

Content of experts’ statements

A comparison of the content of the experts’ statements is provided in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>BH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business impact assessment with focus on effects on businesses that would be displaced and affected by the project</td>
<td>Employment land use assessment with focus on use of residual land at the Bulleen Industrial Precinct post construction phase</td>
<td>Economic impact assessment of impacts on Manningham Council Area with displacement of businesses from Manningham Employment lands study to identify areas in Manningham for rezoning for industrial purposes Employment land use assessment with focus on use of residual land at the Bulleen Industrial Precinct post construction phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below sets out the key issues considered by the experts in their statements and where there is agreement, disagreement or agnostic on the issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue №</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>BH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Workforce issues affecting potentially unemployed workers. Is there a need for an additional EPR that focuses on the ongoing future employment welfare of the workforce?</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intent of the workforce EPR was discussed. It was agreed that there is a need for an additional EPR that focuses on the ongoing future employment welfare of the workforce. Firstly workers should be encouraged to go with a displaced business, but if the business closes, then instigate support such as job skills training, outplacement services, offer of retraining, and potentially a transitional package for a period of time (possibly up to a couple of years). Ideally this activity would be provided close to the current workforce location, for example at the Bulleen Hub.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue №</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>BH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>An EPR is required to the management process of transition for businesses in the BIP and post construction.</td>
<td>Do not agree an EPR is needed. There should not be a requirement that Manningham manage the process; some businesses may not want to relocate within Manningham. Residual land ownership to follow standard legal procedures.</td>
<td>It is agreed that an EPR is required to manage the relocation of the businesses from the BIP. It is appropriate to use the residual BIP land (post construction) for employment purposes, but it is not necessary to create a specific EPR for this purpose.</td>
<td>An EPR is necessary because otherwise it falls back to the LAC Act and pre-planning for the shift of clusters will not occur. Manningham should do this funded by NELA because the Websters Road Precinct is the key to the project. Manningham should be given the residual land so it can accommodate any uses wanting to return and plan the Precinct appropriately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was general discussion about an EPR pre-construction but no agreement on the entity that should be solely responsible for undertaking it. Post construction there was disagreement about the zoning and planning for the Bulleen Industrial Precinct, but it was acknowledged it depended on the Websters Road Precinct.

### Issue 3
The displacement of over 80 businesses at Bulleen is significant.
- **MS**: Agree
- **MB**: Agree
- **BH**: Agree
  - Think that most businesses will relocate; a small number will close mainly due to personal circumstances (age, lack of enthusiasm for rebuild in a new location, etc.).
  - Most businesses will relocate. Many businesses likely to go south because that still provides access to their market.
  - Will close because there is nothing in Manningham which will have significant impact on Manningham’s economy (primary and secondary impacts on Manningham’s economy). Council should be compensated for loss of businesses.

### Issue 4
Loss of employment as a result of the project
- **MS**: Limited employment loss as most businesses will relocate and maintain employment; some unemployed find other work
- **MB**: Limited employment loss as most businesses will relocate and maintain employment; some unemployed find other work
- **BH**: Concerned that the impact will be higher

### Issue 5
Co-location of businesses that form a cluster (construction, auto services) would assist customer attraction and business to business cooperation
- **MS**: Agree
  - All else equal, emphasise location that can accommodate a number of businesses together
- **MB**: Agree
  - All else equal, emphasise location that can accommodate a number of businesses together
- **BH**: Agree
  - All else equal, emphasise location that can accommodate a number of businesses together

### Issue 6
A location in Manningham would be the priority for relocation for many businesses
- **MS**: Agreed
- **MB**: Agreed
- **BH**: Agreed

### Issue 7
Websters Road – Council-owned land that consists of Council Depot and a quarry (not yet completely filled) inside the UGB, and a site with a Garden Waste Plant outside the UGB. It is adjacent to a small industrial area.
- **MS**: Agreed that council-owned land at Websters Road is a good option for several businesses
  - Agnostic about which site at Websters Road; the priority is to
- **MB**: Agreed that council-owned land at Websters Road is a good option for several businesses
  - An issue that the Garden Waste site is outside of UGB, but believes the
- **BH**: Agreed that council-owned land at Websters Road is a good option for several businesses
  - Thinks that Manningham should take carriage of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue №</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>BH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pursue the option which would enable relocation of some Bulleen businesses to Websters Road within the timeframe of their displacement.</td>
<td>effort to decamp uses (Depot to Garden Waste Site and Bulleen Industrial to Depot site) is time consuming and may or may not be achieved in time to benefit displaced businesses. Investigate Websters Road Precinct for industrial land. If the land is found capable to be viably used for industrial purposes. The necessary approvals should be pursued immediately.</td>
<td>rezoning and planning of Webster Road. Move depot to garden waste site and use depot site for industrial which will allow Council to rationalise the uses. Council is agnostic about which site. Council wants compensation for loss of loss of public land at Websters Road and for the economic loss to the municipality. Investigate Websters Road precinct to determine it is viable. NELA to fund the Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bulleen residual land post construction. Priority use?</td>
<td>Employment land, predominantly industrial to maintain industrial land in this region</td>
<td>Employment land, predominantly industrial to maintain industrial land in this region</td>
<td>Employment land but also to permit residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Preston Industrial Precinct as a location for displaced businesses</td>
<td>Businesses may or may not be interested in a masterplanned development in Preston. They would also look at Whitehorse and other locations depending on their individual circumstances.</td>
<td>Businesses would look at a number of locations to suit their individual circumstances.</td>
<td>Businesses would not be interested in a masterplanned development on identified vacant land in Preston. Would be interested in locations east of Bulleen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bulleen residual land post construction. Should there be an EPR that directs the uses and management of the process post construction?</td>
<td>Use planning tools (zoning) to restrict its use to employment purposes.</td>
<td>Zoning of the land should be used to restrict its use to employment purposes, including office.</td>
<td>Manningham Council should obtain the residual land free of charge and have carriage of the rezoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue №</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>BH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fragmentation of Bulleen residual land post construction</td>
<td>Development left to market.\An EPR directing contractor behaviour not needed.</td>
<td>and development process. Needs an EPR to give Manningham carriage of the process. Post construction it should continue to plan and own the residual land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerning the consolidation or minimisation of the fragmentation of land (EPR LU1), agree that the EPR be augmented to stipulate that land is returned for employment uses</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree except land be returned for employment and residential uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Entry and egress to Bulleen residual land post construction</td>
<td>Silent on this point</td>
<td>Provide a service road for access to Site A just south of Austin Street with sufficient clear distance from the intersection for safe access.</td>
<td>Provide for access to Site A midblock approximately. Other solutions are in report for sites B and C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

We, the undersigned, acknowledge this as an accurate representation of our joint expert meeting.

Marianne Stoettrup

Michael Barlow

Brian Haratsis