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1 Introduction

1. Human Habitats acts for Salta Properties (Salta), the owner of 87 Cook Street, Port Melbourne. We have been instructed to make this submission in response to the Fishermans Bend Draft Framework Plan and Draft Planning Scheme Amendment GC81 (the Draft Amendment).

2. As the Draft Plan is presently lacking details in relation to planning for the employment precinct, we make this submission specifically in relation to the Rocklea Drive walk and cycle bridge (the Rocklea Drive Bridge) proposal.

3. Naturally, as a major landowner in the employment precinct Salta reserves the right to make representations in relation to the planning framework for the employment precinct at such time as this becomes available.

4. In summary, Salta does not support the proposal for the Rocklea Drive Bridge of the Draft Amendment. Specifically, my client submits that:

   - The Rocklea Drive Bridge conflicts with Salta’s development objectives for the site which are aligned to the existing and future planning vision for the Employment Precinct.

   - The conflicting information regarding the location of the bridge raises procedural fairness issues that are yet to be resolved by the proponent for the Draft Amendment.

   - Although not entirely without merit, the need for the Rocklea Drive bridge connection has not been demonstrated.

   - The location that has been selected is for the northern part of the Rocklea Drive Bridge is impractical and will result in the unnecessary acquisition of private land.

   - In the event that a need for this connection can be established, it is clear that the GMH site demonstrates a superior location from a planning and sustainable transport perspective.

5. In summary, we request either of the following recommendations from this Planning Review Panel:

   - That the Rocklea Drive Bridge be abandoned.

   - That the northern part of the Rocklea Drive Bridge be located on the former GMH site and designed to link in with the future University of Melbourne campus.
2 Background

6. 87 Cook Street, Port Melbourne is an L shaped site of 28,659 sqm zoned Industrial 1. The site is located on the corner of Salmon and Cook Streets the site is currently improved 19 office/warehouse units completed in early 2004.

7. The Total Lettable Area of these units equates to 19,694m² with the units ranging in size from 669 sqm to 1,561 sqm with a 29% office ratio.

8. In addition to street based at-grade visitor car parking, the site benefits from a four level multi deck car park providing 403 bays which is shared by the 19 office/warehouse units.

9. Unlike other similar developments (for example the site to the north) Salta has retained the site in a single ownership to more easily facilitate its future development.

10. Salta is currently preparing a planning permit application to develop a part of the site (the south-west corner as highlighted in Red in Figure 1 below) for a new commercial building.

11. The design response has been developed by Gray Puksand architects with collaboration from a range of expert consultants following a site and urban context evaluation process. This has included discussions with planning experts within DELWP and the City of Melbourne. This application is in the process of being finalised with a view to lodgement in the near future.
3 Submissions

3.1 Salta’s development objectives

12. The proposal for a commercial building with showroom at ground level with car parking and commercial office space at the upper levels. The purpose of the development proposal is to accommodate a motor vehicle manufacturer and retailer to the site.

Figure 2 - Artist's impression of proposed development at 87 Cook Street

13. Salta believes that the ‘brand’ of the location as an advanced engineering hub, exposure to a busy main road, excellent access and introduction of an exciting architectural addition will be attractive to a number of potential luxury motor vehicle businesses.
14. However, the bridge connection to Gateway Court (which is a private road) will likely impact the ability for the development (and existing units on the site) to gain vehicle access. This will be particularly important when considering the need for large transport vehicles that would need to access the site.

Figure 3 - Site plan for proposed development at 87 Cook Street

15. This proposal will also impact the ability for other units within the broader development to access their tenancies and in turn impacting the broader development of the site.
3.2 Conflicting information

16. As acknowledged by Mr Kiriakidis during cross examination there is significant conflict in the various background documentation regarding the location of the Rocklea Drive Bridge. Unfortunately, despite our client’s submission in this case, there has been no meaningful attempt to resolve this issue.

![Diagram showing Wirraway for new bridges and existing bridge upgrades](image)

Figure 5 - Extract from Draft Framework Plan - Delivering the Employment Precinct

Figure 6 - Extract from Draft Framework Plan - Wirraway

17. Whilst a relatively minor point in the context of the other broader procedural fairness issues that are being raised, it is fair to say that the differences between the various approaches for some landowners in the precinct are significant.

18. Depending on which part of the documentation they referred to, landowners may have a different understanding of the potential implications of the Draft Amendment. This is most apparent when reviewing the detailed plans for Wirraway and the Employment Precinct in the Framework Plan.
3.3 Need

19. We note that a bridge spanning 150 metres over the Westgate Freeway will be an expensive piece of public infrastructure. This will be made all the more expensive if a significant amount of private land is acquired as part of this exercise.

20. Given the significant cost it is reasonable to question the need for the Rocklea Drive Bridge - particularly bridges that are only 200-250 metres walking distance from an existing bridge that provides a direct connection into the employment precinct.

Figure 7 - Spacing between bridges
3.4 Impractical location

21. We submit that the location for the northern part of the bridge is impractical as it will result in private land within the employment precinct being unnecessarily acquired.

22. The implications of this are not just monetary. This action displaces businesses and undermines investments that have been made noting that these commercial units are incubators of small business.

23. The northern part of the bridge "lands" on 87 Cook Street which is a single landholding owned by Salta. The north-south internal road (known as Gateway Court) is a private road that provides access to all commercial units and is critical to the operation of the businesses that occupy these commercial units.

24. If the Salta site is selected as the location for the northern part of the bridge, it would potentially necessitate the compulsory acquisition of the entire landholding.

25. In addition, the continuation of this connection to the north to meet the proposed light rail route [as per the Draft Amendment] will also impact a series of strata titled commercial units at Phillip Court, Port Melbourne.

3.5 GMH site demonstrates a superior alternative

26. The 2017 Open space strategy that informed the amendment sought to enable a public connection to the Turner Street extension via the GMH site.

Figure 8 - Extract from Public Space Strategy 2017 (Map 4, Page 38)
27. It is our submission that this approach is sensible for a range of reasons.

- This part of the GMH site is **relatively unencumbered** and currently a vacant car park.
- There is no additional **cost** in acquiring land for this purpose as it is already government owned.

Figure 9 - Western interface with adjacent GMH site
There are **no physical limitations** on the amount of land that can be allocated for this connection ensuring that an optimal urban design outcome can be achieved.

- By delivering people directly into the future University of Melbourne campus, it will result in an **optimal sustainable transport outcome**. Certainly, it was evident in Mr Kiriakidis' evidence that he was also unclear as to the precise location of the bridge and had not formed a view about which was better. This is therefore now a matter for the Review Panel.

- **The current plan for the new engineering campus** at Fishermans Bend appears to anticipate a north-south link that could be adapted for this purpose. This demonstrates that there is no practical reason why this could not be located on the former GMH site.
4 Conclusion

28. For these reasons Salta does not support this element of the Draft Amendment in the current form. We request either of the following recommendations from this Planning Review Panel:

- That the Rocklea Drive Bridge be abandoned.
- That the northern part of the Rocklea Drive Bridge be located on the former GMH site and designed to link in with the future University of Melbourne campus.
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