Fishermans Bend draft framework + planning controls
Introduction

• Brief information about myself

  • We are a household of four people and live in an apartment in the City of Port Phillip

  • I am a graduate of architecture, working mainly on residential projects

  • My interests are sustainable & communal living…

  • …which I found reflected in the aspirations of the Vision for Fishermans Bend and I would like to see the aspirations transform into a built environment

• My motivation to review the draft framework + planning controls are based on the following two questions:

  • ‘Will the framework + planning controls deliver what the Vision aspires to?’

  • ‘Would I want to live or work in Fishermans Bend?’
Issues of concern raised in my submission

• Density

• Affordable housing

• Community services

• Housing diversity

• Bike and pedestrian path along the waterfront

• Side- and rear setback controls
Density 1 - residents/ha

• To achieve the projected demand of dwellings of 80,000 residents by 2050 an average density of 323 residents/ha is required

• The density figures have been aligned with the distinctive features and desires for the precincts, resulting in 480 residents/ha for Lorimer and Montague

• To understand the proposed densities I compared them with current population densities which were around 50 residents/ha for inner city suburbs in 2016 (profile.id.com.au/port-phillip)

• The proposed density for Lorimer and Montague is 9.5 times higher than the current density of an inner city suburb

Recommendation

> to increase commercial floor area in Lorimer and Montague in lieu of residential floor area which can be provided in Sandridge and Wirraway North

> to aim for a density range between 250 and 400 residents/ha max. within the four precincts
Density 2 - FAR + FAU

- The Urban-Design-Strategy report, prepared by Hodyl + Co, explains the assumptions made to establish the preferred floor area ration (FAR) controls. One assumption is that only 75% of the total development will be built by 2050. The FARs have been ‘inflated’ to deliver the number of dwellings required by 2050.

![Fig.1 FAR ratios based on 80,000 residents in 2050 - assumption 75% of total development built](page 18 Fishermans Bend Framework, page 77ff Urban-Design-Strategy-171017)
Density 2 - FAR + FAU continued

- The outcome of the future population in Fishermans Bend applying the preferred floor area ratios (FAR) to all developable land is 25% higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAR ratios ‘real’</th>
<th>49,196</th>
<th>106,689 residents (+25% development = 12299 dwellings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36,897</td>
<td>target: 80,000 residents (2050)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28,585</td>
<td>New dwellings required (2050) &gt; FAR ratios developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,312</td>
<td>Existing dwellings &amp; approved planning permits (2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.3 100% of total development built, using FAR ratios as per Fig.1
Density 2 - FAR + FAU continued

- The provision of 6% affordable housing is proposed using floor area uplifts (FAU). The public benefit ratios of the FAUs have been outlined in the document ‘How to calculate floor area uplifts and public benefits in Fishermans Bend’.

- Note: The table below demonstrates only one of three public benefit categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dwellings</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>56,814</th>
<th>123,286 residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAU ratio: 1 affordable dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,213</td>
<td>6% affordable housing (based on target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAU ratio: 8 market dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,704</td>
<td>dwellings required to provide 6% affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR ratios ‘inflated’</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,897</td>
<td>target: 80,000 residents (2050)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28,585</td>
<td>New dwellings required (2050) &gt; FAR ratios developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,312</td>
<td>Existing dwellings &amp; approved planning permits (2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.2  FAR + FAU based on 80,000 residents in 2050 - assumption 75% of total development built
(page 18 Fishermans Bend Framework, page 77ff Urban-Design-Strategy-171017)
Density 2 - FAR + FAU continued

- Applying the same calculation based on the future population of Fishermans Bend being 100% developed incl. the provision of 6% affordable housing will result in doubling the population target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dwellings</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>164,388 residents (potential outcome of FAR + FAU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAU ratio: 1 affordable dwelling</strong></td>
<td>2,951</td>
<td>6% affordable housing (based on 100% development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAU ratio: 8 market dwellings</strong></td>
<td>23,608</td>
<td>dwellings required to provide 6% affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAU ratios ‘real’</strong></td>
<td>49,196</td>
<td>106,689 residents (+25% development = 12299 dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36,897</td>
<td>target: 80,000 residents (2050)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28,585</td>
<td>New dwellings required (2050) &gt; FAR ratios developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,312</td>
<td>Existing dwellings &amp; approved planning permits (2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig.4** FAR + FAU - **100% of total development built**
Density 2 - FAR + FAU continued

Recommendation

> to reduce FARs to meet the target of a total population of 80,000 residents as to align with the provision of the community services

> community services incl. transport must operate on the assumption the target of 80,000 residents might not be met in 2050…

> … or use FAUs to meet the target by providing additional dwellings (capped)

> FAUs should generally be used for commercial floor area only to stop the dog chasing its tail (more residential FAUs create more demand for public benefits they meant to provide)
Affordable housing

- FAUs are negotiable options which may or may not deliver the desired 6% affordable housing for Fishermans Bend.

- In case FAUs have been applied, the outcome of a 50% increase in the number of dwellings / residents to deliver 6% affordable housing is too costly (higher density, lack of community and transport services etc.)

- The Affordable housing options paper, prepared by Judith Stubbs in 2013 does state that there is a need for 20% affordable housing. The parameter of the framework will not guarantee even 6%.

- The vision of an inclusive community in Fishermans Bend will not be met.

Recommendation

- to guarantee the desired 6% affordable housing been made a mandatory requirement in the planning schemes delivered through the FARs

- to make up the shortfall of the demand for 20% affordable housing using other revenues
Community Services - delivering schools

- 5 educational and community hubs (4 primary and 1 secondary schools ) are proposed for Fishermans Bend

- Demographics of school age children in 2050 as per Fishermans Bend Population & Demographics Paper, p.10ff are:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Primary Students</th>
<th>Secondary Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montague</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorimer</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandridge</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wirraway</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>1079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Applying a market share value similar to Docklands with 65% for primary schools and 35% for secondary schools (p.40, School provision review for Docklands final report) reduces the demand to 3530 primary students and 1444 secondary students

- On average each Government primary school in Victoria provides education to around 320 students (Summary statistics for Victorian Schools in July 2017). Even if the intake numbers are doubled to 640 students, 5.5 primary schools are required for Fishermans Bend

- On average each Government secondary school in Victoria provides education to around 950 students (Summary statistics for Victorian Schools in July 2017). If you increase the intake numbers by 50% to 1425 students, 1 secondary school is sufficient
Community Services - continued

- The market share is questionable as surrounding primary and secondary schools in CoPP are deemed at capacity or beyond (2017) hence further demand will seek alternatives in Fishermans Bend. Additionally, it is not taking into account whether catholic and private school’s capacities might not increase in the future to be an alternative to government schools.

- The proposed number of schools only partly meets the demand.

- The numbers provided are based on the population target of 80,000 residents. Any increase of population will increase the demand for community services such as schools.

Recommendation

> to review the demand for schools and make long term provisions today (such as land acquisition, public acquisition overlays in the planning schemes)
Housing Diversity

- The Fishermans Bend Vision and framework aspires for diversity and choice in housing and affordable housing.

- The lowest proposed density in Fishermans Bend is in the non-core area of Wirraway with a FAR of 2.1 and a discretionary height of 4 storeys. A small lot of 300sqm allows for a development of 610sqm up to 4 storey high. The development outcome will most likely not result in single occupancies.

- Approx. 10% of the total developable area in Fishermans Bend is limited to 4 storey developments by the proposed building height controls.
Housing Diversity

• Mid-rise developments with a site coverage of 70% are the desired outcome aligning with the residential densities sought in Fishermans Bend (p.63, Urban Design Strategy, prepared by Hodyl + Co). Typologies such as Narrow infill, Row, Shoptop, Courtyard and Perimeter Block are a result of site restrictions rather than a urban design concept. In summary they all propose apartment living.

• The vision of diversity and choice of housing in Fishermans Bend will not be met.
Bike and pedestrian path along the waterfront

- The crown land north of Lorimer St should have been included into the Vision and framework for Fishermans Bend as an opportunity to provide a cycling and pedestrian path connecting the foreshore of Port Phillip Bay with the Yarra trail.

- The proposed on-road cycling path along Lorimer St could be avoided.
Bike and pedestrian path along waterfront - continued

Recommendation

> to review the lease agreement with the Port of Melbourne regarding current activities on crown land

> to create a vision for public use of crown land and incorporate the vision into Fishermans Bends framework

> to avoid the on-road cycling path if you can provide off-road cycling path connecting two existing cycling paths along the waterfront
Side- and rear setbacks

• Port-Phillip-GC81-43_02s30:
  
  **Build form requirement** regarding walls on side and rear boundaries:
  
  “Walls built on or within 200mm of a side or rear boundary must not exceed 6 storeys and 23 metres.”

  **Built form outcome:**
  
  “Walls on a side or rear boundary must provide for equitable development of adjacent development sites.”

• Overshadowing and blocking solar access is a big concern in high density developments

• If planning controls prevent basic ESD principles to be applied to design energy efficient buildings Fishermans Bend can not promote itself as ‘a leading example for environmental sustainability’

• The vision of a ‘low carbon community’ in Fishermans Bends will not be met

**Recommendation**

> to review setbacks to south boundaries to allow for solar and daylight access to adjoining properties. Solar access should be guaranteed equally to all sites down to ground level
Side- and rear setbacks - continued

- Some photos taken in Montague and Southbank in March 2018:
Conclusion

> ‘Will the framework + planning controls deliver what the Vision aspires to?’

- In my submission I have only raised issues of concern. I am confident the framework + planning controls will lead to the aspired outcome regarding integrated transport links, prosperity, mixed uses and activities.

- Lack of affordable housing, housing diversity and community services does not create communities for people of all ages and backgrounds as aspired. It is going to attract smaller households with above average incomes, preferring the proximity to the workplace either within the precinct or in the CBD.

- Density higher than 300 residents/ha can only be achieved with mid and high rise developments, which are typically less sustainable requiring more energy to ventilate, heat and cool while preventing daylight and sunlight access by overshadowing the surrounding buildings, open spaces and streetscapes. It contradicts the aspiration of a low carbon community.
Conclusion

The framework + planning schemes do not commit

- to affordable housing and therefore an inclusive community
- to primary schools required to meet the demand of the future population in Fishermans Bend and surrounding suburbs
- to world-class sustainability
Conclusion

> ‘Would I want to live or work in Fishermans Bend as aspired for 2050?’

• Yes, I would like to live and work in Fishermans Bend for its integrated transport network, mixed use typologies and proximity to workplaces.

• Communal living is based on communication between neighbours and there is a limit before housing becomes anonymous. I would seek housing typologies with a maximum of 30 residents therefore I am restricted to lower density, non-core areas.

• But being a moderate income household my aspiration to live in Fishermans Bend will stop right here as I will not be able to afford to live there.

THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO RAISE MY CONCERNS.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.