Fishermans Bend Planning Review Panel

Amendment GC81 to the Melbourne and Port Phillip Planning Schemes

Sites:  
277-281 Ingles Street, Port Melbourne  
577 Plummer Street & 299 Bridge Street, Port Melbourne  
45-54 White Street, South Melbourne  
400-430 City Road, Southbank

Date of Statement: 10 April 2018  
Date of Inspections: 20 & 21st March 2016

Prepared For Submitters: APN DF2 Project 1 Pty Ltd, Delta Group Pty Ltd, Kador Group Holdings Pty Ltd and Wadhawan Holdings Pty Ltd  
Instructed By: Mills Oakley

Reference: G24517A1

STATEMENT TO FISHERMANS BEND PLANNING REVIEW PANEL BY JASON LEE WALSH, TRAFFIC ENGINEER
STATEMENT TO FISHERMANS BEND PLANNING REVIEW PANEL BY JASON LEE WALSH, TRAFFIC ENGINEER

Sites: 277-281 Ingles Street, Port Melbourne
577 Plummer Street & 299 Bridge Street, Port Melbourne
45-54 White Street, Port Melbourne
400-430 City Road, Melbourne

Amendment GC81 to the Melbourne and Port Phillip Planning Schemes

Fishermans Bend Planning Review Panel

Our Reference: G24517A1

COPYRIGHT: The ideas and material contained in this document are the property of Traffix Group (Traffix Group Pty Ltd – ABN 32 100 481 570, Traffix Survey Pty Ltd – ABN 57 120 461 510, Traffix Design Pty Ltd – ABN 41 060 899 443). Use or copying of this document in whole or in part without the written permission of Traffix Group constitutes an infringement of copyright.

LIMITATION: This report has been prepared on behalf of and for the exclusive use of Traffix Group’s client, and is subject to and issued in connection with the provisions of the agreement between Traffix Group and its client. Traffix Group accepts no liability or responsibility whatsoever for or in respect of any use of or reliance upon this report by any third party.
# Table of Contents

1. Introduction .................................................................................................................. 1
2. History of the Amendment .............................................................................................. 2
3. Fishermans Bend Planning Documents ........................................................................ 3
   3.1 Fishermans Bend Vision .......................................................................................... 3
   3.2 Draft Fishermans Bend Framework .......................................................................... 4
4. Car Parking Considerations ........................................................................................... 5
   4.1 Schedule 1 to Clause 45.09 Parking Overlay .......................................................... 5
   4.2 Adaptable Floor Plates ............................................................................................ 10
5. Transport Considerations ............................................................................................. 12
   5.1 Road Network ........................................................................................................ 12
   5.2 Public Transport ...................................................................................................... 13
6. Site Specific Assessments .............................................................................................. 15
7. Conclusions .................................................................................................................... 16
8. 577 Plummer Street & 299 Bridge Street, Port Melbourne ........................................... 21
   8.1 Site Location ........................................................................................................... 21
   8.2 Existing Road Network .......................................................................................... 21
   8.3 Strategic Framework Plan ....................................................................................... 22
   8.4 Site Specific Assessment ....................................................................................... 25
9. 277-281 Ingles Street, Port Melbourne ........................................................................ 28
   9.1 Site Location ........................................................................................................... 28
   9.2 Existing Road Network .......................................................................................... 28
   9.3 Fishermans Bend Context ...................................................................................... 29
   9.4 Site Specific Assessment ....................................................................................... 32
10. 44-54 White Street, South Melbourne ......................................................................... 34
   10.1 Site Location ......................................................................................................... 34
   10.2 Existing Road Network ......................................................................................... 34
   10.3 Fishermans Bend Context .................................................................................... 35
   10.4 Site Specific Assessment ....................................................................................... 38
11. 400-430 City Road, Southbank ................................................................................... 40
   11.1 Site Location ......................................................................................................... 40
   11.2 Existing Road Network ......................................................................................... 40
   11.3 Fishermans Bend Context .................................................................................... 41
   11.4 Site Specific Assessment ....................................................................................... 44
List of Figures

Figure 1: Bridge St, looking south from Plummer St .......................................................... 22
Figure 2: Plummer St, looking west ................................................................................. 22
Figure 3: Bridge St looking north ................................................................................... 22
Figure 4: Fennel St, looking east ...................................................................................... 22
Figure 5: Plummer & Bridge St Sites in Relation to Map 2 of Clause 37 ......................... 23
Figure 6: Plummer & Bridge St Sites - DFP Public Transport (Figure 5) ......................... 24
Figure 7: Plummer & Bridge St Sites - DFP Cycling Infrastructure (Figure 7) ............... 24
Figure 8: Plummer & Bridge St Site Locations - DFP Road Network (Figure 8) ........... 25
Figure 9: Plummer & Bridge St Sites - DFP Infrastructure Delivery in Sandridge (Figure 21) ............................................................................................................. 25
Figure 10: Fennel St, looking north-east ......................................................................... 29

**Figure 11: Ingles St, looking north-west to bridge** ...................................................... 29

Figure 12: Ingles St Service Road (south), looking south ................................................. 29
Figure 13: Bertie St, looking south .................................................................................... 29
Figure 14: Ingles St Site in Relation to Map 2 of Clause 22 ............................................. 30
Figure 15: Ingles St Site - DFP Public Transport (Figure 5) ............................................ 30
Figure 16: Ingles St Site - DFP Cycling Infrastructure (Figure 7) .................................... 31
Figure 17: Ingles St Site - DFP Road Network (Figure 8) ................................................ 31
Figure 18: Ingles St Site - DFP Infrastructure Delivery in Sandridge (Figure 21) .......... 32
Figure 19: White St, looking south ................................................................................ 35
Figure 20: Boundary St, looking north-west ................................................................. 35
Figure 21: Gittus St, looking north .................................................................................. 35
Figure 22: Woodruff St, view from Boundary St .............................................................. 35
Figure 23: White St Site in Relation to Map 2 of Clause 22 ............................................. 36
Figure 24: White St Site – DFP Public Transport (Figure 5) ........................................... 36
Figure 25: White St Site – DFP Cycling Infrastructure (Figure 7) .................................... 37
Figure 26: White St Site – DFP Road Network (Figure 8) ............................................... 37
Figure 27: White St Site – DFP Infrastructure Delivery in Sandridge (Figure 21) ......... 38
Figure 28: Cecil St, looking south ................................................................................... 41
Figure 29: Whiteman St, looking south .......................................................................... 41
Figure 30: City Rd, looking north .................................................................................... 41

G24517A1
Figure 31: Whiteman St, looking north to bridge underpass ................................................. 41
Figure 32: City Road Site in Relation to Map 2 of Clause 22 .................................................. 42
Figure 33: City Road Site – DFP Public Transport (Figure 5) .................................................. 42
Figure 34: City Road Site – DFP Cycling Infrastructure (Figure 7) .......................................... 43
Figure 35: City Road Site – DFP Road Network (Figure 8) ...................................................... 43
Figure 36: City Road – DFP Infrastructure Delivery in Montague (Figure 20) .......................... 44

List of Tables

Table 1: 2016 Journey to Work for Residents and Employees of SA2 Areas – Sustainable Travel Mode

List of Appendices

Appendix A  Qualifications
Appendix B  577 Plummer Street & 299 Bridge Road, Port Melbourne
Appendix C  277-281 Ingles Street, Port Melbourne
Appendix D  44-54 White Street, South Melbourne
Appendix E  400-430 City Road, Southbank
1 Introduction

I have been instructed by Mills Oakley on behalf of APN DF2 Project 1 Pty Ltd, Delta Group Pty Ltd, Kador Group Holdings Pty Ltd and Wadhawan Holdings Pty Ltd to undertake a traffic engineering assessment of the traffic and car parking components of Amendment GC81 to the Melbourne and Port Phillip Planning Schemes relating to the Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area.

In the course of preparing this statement, I inspected the subject sites on 20th and 21st March 2018, reviewed development plans and background material, and assessed the car parking and traffic impacts of the proposal.

My qualifications and experience to undertake the following assessment are set out in Appendix A.
2 History of the Amendment

The Fishermans Bend Planning Review Panel has been appointed to review proposed Planning Scheme Amendment GC81 for Fishermans Bend, and its appropriateness in delivering the Fishermans Bend Vision (2016).

The Fishermans Bend area was rezoned in 2012 by the former Minister for Planning as Capital City Zone. In 2013 the Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area Draft Vision was released and then introduced in 2014 as an incorporated document to the Melbourne and Port Phillip Planning Schemes.

Interim planning controls were introduced applying to the area in April 2015 by the Minister for Planning and, following the appointment of a Ministerial Advisory Committee (MAC) in June 2015 and the Fisherman’s Bend Taskforce in February 2016, the Fishermans Bend Vision was subsequently released in October 2016. Further interim planning controls were introduced in November 2016.

Planning Scheme Amendment GC81 has been prepared to implement the Fishermans Bend Vision (2016) and the draft Fishermans Bend Framework through a variety of planning controls.

The Terms of Reference state that in considering Planning Scheme Amendment GC81, the Panel must consider:

a. The State policy context of the Fishermans Bend area.
b. The extent to which the proposed changes to the Capital City Zone Schedule 1 (Port Phillip Planning Scheme) and Capital City Zone Schedule 4 (Melbourne Planning Scheme) allows for the Fishermans Bend Vision, September 2016 to be achieved.
c. The extent to which all other proposed changes sought by GC81 allows for the Fishermans Bend Vision, September 2016 to be achieved.
d. All relevant submissions made in regard to the proposed changes to the Port Phillip and Melbourne Planning Schemes.
e. An assessment of whether the proposed planning provisions make proper use of the Victoria Planning Provisions and are prepared and presented in accordance with the Ministerial Direction on The Form and Content of Planning Schemes.

I have been engaged by Mills Oakley on behalf of a number of landholders within the Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area to provide:

- An analysis of the traffic and parking components of Amendment GC81 and the draft Framework Plan; and
- My opinion on the traffic and car parking components of Amendment GC81 as they relate to individual subject sites.

I have reviewed the Amendment in the context of the Panel’s terms of reference.
3 Fishermans Bend Planning Documents

3.1 Fishermans Bend Vision

The Vision sets out the future development of Fishermans Bend up to 2050.

The Vision outlines ten strategic directions with those aligned to traffic listed as follows

2. *The timely provision of infrastructure*

*Fishermans Bend is supported by a holistic infrastructure plan and funding model that promotes the early delivery of catalyst projects, co-ordinates the staged delivery of key infrastructure by all levels of government and the private sector and balances the transition of existing industries.*

3. *A place that is easy to get around*

*Fishermans Bend is underpinned by an integrated and sustainable transport network that provides ease of movement, both within the district and to surrounding areas, including the CBD. Walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure ensures that people use sustainable transport modes as their first choice.*

5. *Distinctive and unique neighbourhoods*

*Fishermans Bend is home to a series of distinct neighbourhoods that reflect their unique locations, histories and urban form. The planning and design of each precinct responds to elements such as proximity to the CBD, Yarra River, Port and the Bay, as well as a rich layering of indigenous, natural and industrial heritage. A grid of safe and inviting streets and public spaces is complemented by well-designed buildings of different types and scales.*

Four distinct neighbourhoods are established in the Vision, comprising Montague, Lorimer, Sandridge and Wirraway, supplemented by the Employment Precinct.

Other key components of the Vision, in my mind, are summarised as follows:

- The Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area will provide 60,000 jobs (now 80,000) and dwellings for 80,000 people.
- The area will “boast unprecedented levels of walking, cycling and public transport connectivity that will set a new benchmark for Melbourne”.
- The Vision will be supported by the Framework which will “outline strategies for transport infrastructure...” (p5)
- The Vision includes:
  - “a target for 80 percent of transport movements to be made by public transport, walking or cycling”
  - “An integrated transport strategy including cycle paths, tram lines and an underground rail line”
The transport planning and road space allocation “puts walking first” and “activity centres will be located close to public transport and key community spaces and distributed so that most daily needs will be met within approximately ten minutes walk from home”. (p9)

The “Lorimer Precinct Directions” include the need to “support an east-west active and public transport link to connect to the CBD and the Employment Precinct” (p23) that will support the “Sandridge Precinct Directions” to “development of multi-modal transport corridors to connect with surrounding suburbs” (p25)

A new train station is identified in Sandridge supported by new tram extensions along Plummer and Fennel Streets and bus routes through the surrounding precincts.

World-class transport is identified for the Employment Precinct

3.2 Draft Fishermans Bend Framework

The Framework (currently in draft format) is proposed as a reference document in the Melbourne and Port Phillip Planning Schemes, and is also mentioned in a number of Clauses.

The Framework replaces the strategic directions of the Vision with eight sustainability goals.

Sustainability goal 1 is a well connected and liveable community. It includes figures that illustrate the proposed future public transport network (Figure 5), cycling infrastructure (Figure 7) and road network (Figure 8).

The public transport network includes two new tram routes, north and south of the freeway. The tram routes will connect Docklands, Southern Cross Station and the Hoddle Grid by an extension from Collins Street across the Yarra River.

The southern route is aligned along Plummer Street, and the northern route along Turner Street.

Two alternative future underground train routes are illustrated north and south of the freeway. Both routes connect to Southern Cross Station, across the Yarra River, and provide a metro station in Sandridge. The northern route diverts and follows the Turner Street alignment with a station central to the Employment Precinct, whilst the southern route follows the Plummer Street alignment with a station in Wirraway.

A series of existing and new bus routes are included.

The Cycling Infrastructure plan (Figure 7 of the Framework) shows strategic cycling corridors and a number of new bridges across the West Gate Freeway and Yarra River to connect the neighbourhoods and Employment Precinct, as well as Docklands, the CBD and South Melbourne.

The road network figure illustrates a grid network with an objective to prioritise walking and cycling, while still facilitating vehicle access.

The Framework describes the next steps in the planning process to include precinct planning for each precinct, where finer grain detail will be established on, amongst other things, street cross sections and network.
4 Car Parking Considerations

4.1 Schedule 1 to Clause 45.09 Parking Overlay

Parking Objectives

The objectives of the proposed Schedule are:

To support long term sustainable transport patterns and minimise road congestion in the Fishermans Bend urban renewal area.

To create a liveable and connected community that uses active transport options in preference to private motor vehicles.

To provide for the future adaptation of car parking to other use, the evolution of transport share schemes and innovations in transport technology.

To ensure the design of car parking areas within developments deliver a high quality public realm by minimising the impact of car parking on the streetscape and maintaining active street frontages.

These objectives generally align with the Fishermans Bend Vision strategic directions, albeit in my view they go beyond what a schedule to a Parking Overlay can achieve. In my opinion, the objectives of the Schedule should simply be to; identify appropriate rates of car parking for Fishermans Bend; support the use of alternative transport modes; and through design allow for the future adaptation of podium parking and minimise the impact of car parking on the streetscape.

The schedule aims to achieve the objectives by setting maximum parking rates rather than minimum, and requiring the provision of motorcycle spaces, car share and additional bicycle spaces.

To achieve the design objectives, the Schedule outlines additional design standards to those contained within Clause 52.06-9.

Permit Requirement

A permit is not required under Clause 52.06-3 to reduce (including to zero) the number of car parking spaces required under Clause 52.06-5 or in this schedule provided alternative parking as set out in Clause 6.0 of the schedule forms part of a car parking plan approved in accordance with Clause 52.06-8, unless no car parking spaces are proposed to be provided in which case a car parking plan is not required.

A permit must not be granted to provide more than the maximum provisions specified in this schedule, unless alternative parking, as set out in Clause 6.0 of this schedule, forms part of a car parking plan approved in accordance with Clause 52.06-8.

This is confusing, and it is not clear why or when a permit is required. I also think the requirement errs in effectively setting rates for motorcycle parking, car share parking and bicycle parking within the parking plan. This is not the right place for provisional rates.

I think the intent is to set maximum car parking rates and require a permit if additional car parking is sought.
In this regard, I prefer the methodology of the existing Fishermans Bend Parking Overlay Schedule (Schedule 1 to 45.09 of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme and Schedule 13 to 45.09 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme). It first establishes what the maximum car parking rates are then sets out the permit requirements and decision guidelines to consider when applying for additional parking.

The establishment of rates can also include motorcycle parking rates and car share rates. However, Clause 52.34 deals with bicycle parking rates, and accordingly a bicycle parking rate should not be set in the Parking Overlay, or if it is there is further wording required in Clause 52.34 that defers the bicycle parking rate to the Car Parking Overlay.

**Number of car parking spaces required**

The Vision targets 80% of transport movements to be made by public transport, walking or cycling.

I agree that setting maximum car parking rates for inner city development is an influencing factor and an appropriate way to assist in managing future parking demands and reducing the potential for traffic congestion related to private car usage. That is, setting maximum rates helps to support sustainable transport modes.

However, in my view, the more important factors in achieving the Vision target will be the early provision of suitable and reliable public transport, and the realisation of the concept of a 10 minute city allowing most daily needs to be accessed within a 10 minute walk.

The setting of maximum parking rates is a well established practice in a number of Major Metropolitan Activity Centres, including within the Melbourne Central City, Docklands, City of Melbourne’s Inner City Areas (ie North Melbourne, Carlton etc), and Southbank.

These Schedules set a range of maximum parking provisions from a maximum of 1 space per dwelling to 2 spaces per dwelling. Importantly, these sites have superior public transport accessibility than is provided to Fishermans Bend now, and in most cases will still have even once the train and tram routes are extended into the urban renewal area.

A review of ABS Data for these areas was undertaken to understand the relationship between travel mode choice and the maximum parking rate.

A summary of the 2016 Journey to Work for the SA2 areas for Melbourne, Southbank, Docklands and Carlton is shown for residents and employees alongside the Schedule to the Parking Overlay Rate that applies to residents and commercial uses.

For comparison, the ABS Journey to Work data for the existing Port Melbourne – Industrial SA2 Area (including Fishermans Bend) shows that there is currently a high demand for car-based travel by existing employees (84%). On-street parking was prevalent during my observations. In my mind, this largely is a factor of the existing poor public transport accessibility, and to a lesser extent, the largely unrestricted on-street parking opportunities.
Table 1: 2016 Journey to Work for Residents and Employees of SA2 Areas — Sustainable Travel Mode¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA2 Area</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Dwelling Rate</th>
<th>Commercial Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>Max 1 space</td>
<td>Max 5 per 1,000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbank</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>Max 1 space</td>
<td>Max 1-4 per 100m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docklands</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>Max 1.5-2 spaces</td>
<td>Max 1-4 per 100m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>Max 1 space</td>
<td>Minimum Clause 52.06 Rates Apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident in relation to residential, that a maximum rate of 1 space per dwelling is assisting in achieving a residential travel mode rate of around 80% for Melbourne, Docklands, Southbank and Carlton, consistent with the Vision target. Consequently, I do not think it is necessary for the schedule to be overly aspirational in setting a maximum rate of 0.5 spaces per dwelling. I also say this in the context of consistency with other Capital City Zone areas, and the understanding that the delivery of any improved public transport may not happen for some time.

Setting a reduced rate of 0.5 spaces per dwelling, as a maximum, is excessively onerous on developers where there is a market that is likely to have a higher level of car dependency in the short term.

Accordingly, I am of the view that the Parking Overlay should be amended to reflect a maximum rate of 1 space per dwelling. Additionally, I believe the decision guidelines should include an assessment of the availability of public transport, and the type of dwelling, as determining factors in deciding whether additional parking should be permitted. That is, if the improved public transport is not delivered in a timely manner, dwellings will be more reliant on private car use and should be allowed more car parking, particularly for family dwellings.

The parking rates for commercial uses are not proposed to change from the existing Schedule, and can be appropriately managed. However, similar to the dwellings the decision guidelines should include public transport to allow for consideration of more car parking until such time as the public transport is delivered or at least funded.

I am satisfied that the rates for car share, motorcycle and bicycle parking are appropriate in the context of the Vision. However, I believe the rates for motorcycle and car share should be included in the ‘number of car spaces provided’ section rather than in the car parking plan requirements.

The increased requirements for bicycles should be referenced in Clause 52.34, albeit I acknowledge that an overlay clause for bicycles is not currently provided within 52.34.

¹ % of sustainable transport is calculated as the sum of “car as passenger”, “public transport”, “motorcycle”, “bicycle”, “walked”, “taxi”, “other” and “worked at home”. It excludes travel responses “car as driver”, “truck”, “did not go to work” and “method of travel not stated”.

² Schedules 1 & 2 to the Parking Overlay (Melbourne Planning Scheme)
³ Schedules 6-11 of the Parking Overlay (Melbourne Planning Scheme)
⁴ Schedule 12 of the Parking Overlay (Melbourne Planning Scheme)
Decision Guidelines

I think the appropriate starting point for the decision guidelines is to adopt the existing decision guidelines in the Schedule and amend or add to these as required. In this regard, I provide the following commentary on the guidelines proposed.

- **Any effect on designated principal freight routes within or immediately adjacent to Fishermans Bend.**
  
  Acceptable.

- **Whether car parking is to be provided in a stand-alone building used for precinct car parking.**
  
  I am not satisfied that sufficient research has been undertaken to specifically reference precinct car parking, and I also do not think a material difference in traffic generation will be achieved if car parking is provided in a stand-alone building rather than in individual sites. Therefore I would delete this as a decision guideline.

- **Whether the provision of car parking negatively impacts the creation of a high quality, active public realm.**
  
  Acceptable.

- **The future adaptability of the car parking areas and ability to transition to future uses over time.**
  
  I think the concept of adaptability has some merit in the consideration of parking above the maximum rates. I have more to say on adaptability in the design standards.

- **Whether the proposal includes alternate parking requirements under Clause 6 of this schedule.**
  
  Not necessary as I believe it is appropriate to establish car share and motorcycle parking rates in the spaces required section.

- **The suitability of the car parking plan as set out in Clause 6.0 of this schedule, which forms part of a car parking plan approved in accordance with Clause 52.06-8.**
  
  Not necessary as I believe it is appropriate to establish car share and motorcycle parking rates in the spaces required section (Section 3.0).

- **Impacts the proposed car parking rates will have on creating sustainable transport patterns, which preference walking, cycling and public transport use.**
  
  Acceptable.

Requirements for a car parking plan

I am of the opinion that the rates for car share, motorcycle and bicycles are better placed in other parts of the Schedule or in the case of bicycles in other parts of the Scheme.
Design standards for car parking

This section of the Overlay intends to provide additional design requirements. I provide the following review of the matters which I think need further consideration.

Car parking should be provided within a building, fronted with active uses and not visible from the street, with a floor to floor height of not less than 3.8 metres.

I acknowledge that the statement contains a ‘should’ rather than a ‘must’, allowing some flexibility, however I still think there is further clarity required, and more importantly whilst I understand the concept of adaptability (3.8 metre floor to floor height) there are imposts in the delivery.

Firstly, the statement should not apply to basement parking, and the component relating to the floor to floor height should not apply to parking provided within an automated system.

Adaptability can have significant consequences for development, and is onerous in the context of the requirements for neighbouring areas. Specifically, adaptability requires a flat floor plate and therefore limits the way parking can be provided. The statement also requires a floor to floor height of 3.8 metres per level compared to a typical podium car parking floor to floor height of 2.5 – 2.7 metres, which means adaptable parking levels will increase the overall height of buildings, and comparatively will provide less spaces per level as ramps will need to be longer. This means parking is less efficiently provided and consequently more expensive.

If any parking is proposed to be provided off-site, the recipient site should be located within convenient walking distance (200 metres) of the subject site, and should be a part of a precinct parking facility.

I agree if parking is to be provided off-site then it needs to be in convenient walking distance. Two hundred (200) metres is appropriate for residential parking, however I believe 400 metres is acceptable for commercial parking. Furthermore, I don’t think it is necessary for parking to be provided in a precinct parking facility.

Vehicle access ways, crossovers and car park entries should be provided from secondary streets or side laneways where available. If crossovers are provided on primary street frontages they must be:

- Consolidated to provide shared access to multiple buildings.
- Designed to give priority to pedestrian movement.
- Include intermediate pedestrian refuges if the vehicle access or crossover is more than 6 metres.

I am generally comfortable with this statement, but the must should be changed to a should as there may be a circumstance that arises where a property only has a primary street frontage and can not consolidate access.

Additionally, Clause 52.06 has recently been amended to require a crossover width of 6.1 metres for two-way access, and there may be circumstances where a wider crossover is required to facilitate commercial vehicle access. Consequently, the third bullet point should be amended to more than 7.0 metres rather than 6 metres.
The design and layout of car parking areas should:

- Ensure the layout and design of car parking areas encourages sharing of car parking spaces between different uses with different peak demand patterns.
  Acceptable, noting that residential parking would not fall in to this criterion.
- Include provision for future conversion of car parking areas to alternative employment generating uses.
  I have already expressed my view that adaptability is onerous.
- Allow natural ventilation, without compromising the provision of activated frontages.
  Natural ventilation will be difficult to achieve if the car park is sleeved with activated frontages.
- Ensure the use of car lifts, turntables and stackers do not result in cars queueing on the street.
  Acceptable.
- Include the provision for internal queueing and minimise the need for cars to queue on street.
  Acceptable.
- Provide dedicated parking for car share and car charging stations.
  Acceptable.
- Make provision for easily accessible short term temporary parking and drop-off/pick-up zones.
  I don’t agree with this provision, as not all uses will require or should have to provide for short term parking. Furthermore, it is unclear whether the short term parking will form part of the maximum allowable provision or will be additional. Lastly, it is likely that most larger sites will be developed with podium parking, which will typically not be easily accessible for short term parking.

Decision guidelines for car parking plans
I am generally comfortable with the additional guidelines in this clause, with the exception of ‘the extent to which the car parking areas (not located within a basement) are designed for future adaptation and repurposing’, for the reasons that I have already expressed.

4.2 Adaptable Floor Plates

Throughout various clauses in the Planning Schemes (Melbourne and Port Phillip) there are policy directives to provide for adaptable floor plates to allow for future conversion of car parking levels to commercial uses. Those clauses include Clause 21.04-7 Subdivision; Clause 22.15-3 (Port Phillip) & 22.27-3 (Melbourne) Policy, Sustainable Transport; Schedule 1 (Port Phillip) & Schedule 4 (Melbourne) to Clause 37.04 – Capital City Zone, Clause 3.0 Subdivision; and Schedule 30 (Port Philip) & Schedule 67 (Melbourne) to Clause 43.02 Design and Development Overlay.

Presumably these clauses are based on a premise that car ownership will reduce in the foreseeable future.
I appreciate the concept of adaptability, however I think there needs to be further investigation into the practical delivery and justification of its benefits before it is entrenched in the Planning Scheme.

Some of the matters that need further consideration are:

- This will be a new ideology for developers in how to provide and fund car parking.
- Who will own (or want to own) the car parking area? Presumably developers will not want to retain ownership of the parking area. Does that mean that the parking area resides in an owners corporation, and then spaces are individually leased?
- What is the tenure of a lease for an individual car space?
- How will car parking levels be adapted if they are sleeved as directed by other parts of the Scheme (no natural light)?
5 Transport Considerations

5.1 Road Network

The policy setting for the future Fishermans Bend road network is established in Clause 22.15-3 (Port Phillip) and Clause 22.27-3 (Melbourne) Policy. More particularly, the pertinent parts of these clauses state:

New Streets, laneways and pedestrian connections

It is policy to create a connected, permeable and accessible community that prioritises walking, cycling, and public transport use, by:

- Ensuring new streets, laneways and pedestrian connections are:
  - No more than 100 metres apart, and no more than 50 metres apart in core areas as shown on Map 1 to the Capital City Zone Schedule 1, or within 200 metres of public transport routes.
  - Align with and connect to existing and proposed streets, laneways and paths.
  - Provide direct access to existing or proposed public transport stations and routes.

- Encouraging on sites more than 3,000 square metres, new streets, laneways or paths to used to create mid-block through links and define and separate buildings.

The proposed road network is then illustrated as Map 2 in Schedule 4 (Melbourne) and Schedule 1 (Port Phillip) to Clause 37.04- Capital City Zone. Map 2 also denotes the proposed Metro alignment, identifies ‘no crossover’ streets, road closures, and some land identified for road widening.

Specifically, these Clauses require for subdivision or buildings and works, roads to be provided generally consistent with the street and laneway layout illustrated in Map 2.

Upon review of the background documentation, it is apparent that the proposed road network is premised on the road network within the Hoddle Grid, and looks to achieve a connected and permeable network to prioritise sustainable transport.

The Hoddle Grid road network is largely based on a grid network that provides primary streets at approximately 200 metre centres. The primary streets are supplemented by secondary streets (such as Flinders Lane and Little Collins Street) that are evenly spaced between the primary streets. Interestingly in the Hoddle Grid network, the secondary streets are only provided in an east-west arrangement. North-south movements between the primary streets are provided by laneways, albeit these laneways tend to only extend for a single block (unlike the east-west secondary streets). That is, beyond primary streets there is no direct link in a north-south direction, rather if on foot, one meanders through the laneway system.

It is important to understand that the grid network necessitates intersection control at cross-intersections, and in the case of the Hoddle Grid, these controls are provided as traffic signals.
I am generally supportive of the adoption of a grid network, and believe this type of network has the ability to encourage a permeable and walkable network. However, I am of the view that the controls are overly prescriptive in requiring new streets / laneways that are no more than 50 metres apart in core areas or within 200 metres of public transport. A network with 100 metre spacing will provide for a very walkable network, as evidenced in the Hoddle Grid network.

The other consideration is whether the grid network should be as permeable in both directions, as the implication will be that the network ends up with traffic signals at 100 metre centres in both the east-west and north-south alignments. Again, the Hoddle Grid network only provides for the 100 metre spacing of roads in the east-west alignments, which reduces the number of traffic signals required.

From a traffic perspective, the grid network assists in distributing motorists from individual precincts to the arterials, in a balanced manner as motorists have more than a single option to access the arterial network. The permeability becomes less important in areas where there is unlikely to be through traffic, such as those areas adjacent to the West Gate Freeway. In these areas, the provision of roads can be less regimented with more flexibility as to where roads are provided.

I note that the detail shown in Map 2 is less than prescribed in the road network in the Draft Framework Plan. I am of the view that Map 2 has struck a reasonable balance in illustrating the important roads in each precinct, without regimenting where laneways should be provided. Furthermore, I’m not convinced that the Framework should even show this level of detail. This can be prescribed upon formation of the precinct plans.

A number of the supporting reports for the Amendment (GTA Evidence, Minister’s Part A Submission etc) mention future precinct planning that is to take place to support the more fine-grain detail of each of the precincts. Much like Precinct Structure Planning (PSP) in Greenfields areas would take place once a growth corridor/strategic framework plan has been prepared. It is understood that separate plans will be prepared for each of the Montague, Sandridge, Wirraway and Lorimer precincts following the adoption of the Framework Plan and Planning Scheme amendments.

This approach is considered to be an appropriate process to allow for more detailed and responsive plans to be prepared for each precinct.

I also note that a number of the documents provided in support of the amendment detail that the future cross-sections provided for each of the roads will be detailed at the precinct planning stage, yet there are reservation widths nominated for different street types.

Clearly there has been some thought in arriving at the nominated reservation widths, which presumably has been informed by a preferred cross section. This detail should be provided.

### 5.2 Public Transport

The proposed Amendment to the Melbourne and Port Phillip Planning Schemes contains broad statements regarding public transport, but there is no detail about where or how it is to be provided, beyond Map 2 showing the proposed metro alignment. There is no information on tram routes.

Detail for the public transport is contained within the draft Fishermans Bend Framework, which is a proposed reference document within the Scheme.
The Framework at Figure 5 shows the metro alignment extending from Southern Cross Station, through the Yarra River to connect to a station within Sandridge. The alignment is then illustrated as diverging in two branches, with the northern alignment travelling through the Employment Precinct and providing a station within, and the southern alignment travelling through Wirraway with a station within. Both alignments continue to the west to connect to Newport.

I understand that only one of the alignments will be constructed with further investigation required to select the preferred alignment.

Figure 5 within the Framework also illustrates two new tram routes. Both routes cross the Yarra River at Hartley Street. The northern route runs along Turner Street, whilst the southern route travels along Fennel Street and Plummer Street.

There are also a number of new bus routes proposed to supplement the existing bus network.

The Vision for Fishermans Bend is predicated on providing a sustainable transport network, with the metro rail and tram routes in particular being key planks to realising the Vision.

Without the improvements to public transport, the area will remain car dependent.

I am of the view that given the importance of the public transport network, the Melbourne and Port Phillip Planning Schemes should include reference to the proposed public transport network, particularly the proposed rail and tram network.

It is also imperative that funding mechanisms are established that will allow the most timely delivery of this infrastructure. I understand that a funding model is being developed. Ideally, the preferred public transport routes and funding model should already have been developed to better inform the Amendment.

An important aspect of delivering the public transport is to ensure the land that is required is preserved and available at the time funding becomes available. In my view, the only way to guarantee the availability of that land is to impose a public acquisition overlay for the public transport routes. Otherwise, if no PAO is applied, part of the route may not be available at the necessary time, as individual land parcels may not develop, and therefore the authority will have no trigger to gain access to the land.
6 Site Specific Assessments

I have assessed the car parking and traffic implications of GC81 for four individual land owners within Fishermans Bend. The sites are:

- 277-281 Ingles Street, Port Melbourne
- 577 Plummer Street & 299 Bridge Street, Port Melbourne
- 45-54 White Street, South Melbourne
- 400-430 City Road, Southbank

My assessments for each of these sites is attached as Appendix B to Appendix E.
7 Conclusions

Having reviewed Amendment GC81 to the Melbourne and Port Phillip Planning Schemes and the relevant documentation relating to the Fishermans Bend Planning Review Panel, I am of the opinion that:

a) The draft Schedule to the Parking Overlay should be reviewed and amended to be simplified and structured in a similar way to the existing Schedule to the Parking Overlay.

b) Setting a reduced rate of 0.5 spaces per dwelling, as a maximum, is onerous and should be amended to a maximum rate of 1 space per dwelling. The decision guidelines should include an assessment of the availability of public transport, and the type of dwelling, as determining factors in deciding whether additional parking should be permitted to allow for the event that the improved public transport is not delivered in a timely manner.

c) A number of other recommendations are made in the body of my evidence relating to the explicit wording and inclusions in the Schedule to the Parking Overlay regarding decision guidelines and design standards.

d) The idea of adaptability of car parking requires further investigation into the practical delivery and justification of its benefits before it is entrenched in the Planning Scheme.

e) I am generally supportive of the adoption of a grid road network, however am of the view that the controls are overly prescriptive in requiring laneways to be no more than 50 metres apart and 100 metres would be sufficient in most cases.

f) The preparation of individual precinct plans is appropriate.

g) Without improvements to public transport, the area will remain car dependent and the Melbourne and Port Phillip Planning Schemes should include reference to the proposed public transport network, particularly the proposed rail and tram network.

h) It is imperative that funding mechanisms are established that will allow the most timely delivery of this infrastructure.

i) The only way to guarantee the availability of the land required for public transport is to impose a public acquisition overlay for the public transport routes.

I have made all the inquiries that I believe are desirable and appropriate and there are no matters of significance I regard as relevant, which to the best of my knowledge, have been withheld from the Panel.

JASON LEE WALSH
DIRECTOR
TRAFFIX GROUP
10 APRIL 2018
Appendix A
Qualifications
Amendment GC81 to the Melbourne and Port Phillip Planning Schemes
Fishermans Bend Planning Review Panel

Name
Jason Lee Walsh - Director, Traffix Group Pty Ltd

Address
Suite 8, 431 Burke Road
GLEN IRIS
VICTORIA 3146

Qualifications
My educational qualifications and membership of professional associations are as follows:-

- Bachelor of Civil Engineering, Monash University
- Bachelor of Science, Monash University
- Member, Victorian Planning & Environmental Law Association

Experience
I have approximately 20 years experience in Traffic Engineering including,

- 1995-2000 at Turnbull Fenner (now Traffix Group), including short term placements at the cities of Bayside and Whittlesea,
- 2000-2011 at Grogan Richards Pty Ltd (now Cardno),
- 2011-present at Traffix Group.

Areas of Expertise

- Car parking and Traffic.
- Traffic advice and assessment of land uses and development proposals to planning authorities, government agencies, corporations and developers (including major residential, retail, food and drink, commercial, industrial, institutional and mixed use projects).
- Preparation and presentation of evidence before VCAT and Panels.

Expertise to Prepare this Assessment
My experience and expertise over the past 20 years, including involvement with varied forms of developments, qualifies me to comment on the traffic implications of the proposed development.

Instructions
I was instructed by Mills Oakley on behalf of APN DF2 Project 1 Pty Ltd, Delta Group Pty Ltd, Kador Group Holdings Pty Ltd and Wadhawan Holdings Pty Ltd to undertake a traffic engineering assessment and prepare an evidence statement for the Amendment GC81 to the Melbourne and Port Phillip Planning Schemes at Fishermans Bend Planning Review Panel.
Facts, Matters and Assumptions Relied Upon

- Exhibited Documents
- Submissions
- Site inspection.
- Relevant experience.

Documents Taken into Account

See above.

Identity of Persons Undertaking Work

Jason Walsh as per the evidence statement.

Carlo Morello (Senior Associate, Traffix Group) assisted with preparation of the evidence report.

Summary of Opinions

See Conclusions section of the evidence statement.
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8.1 Site Location

The sites at 577 Plummer Street and 299 Bridge Street are located on the northern and southern sides of Plummer Street abutting Bridge Street.

They are both irregular shaped sites with frontages to Bridge Street and Plummer Street.

Both sites are currently occupied by Delta Group and include a number of existing one and two storey warehouse and office buildings. Vehicle access to both sites is provided via a number of locations to both Plummer and Bridge Streets.

8.2 Existing Road Network

Fennel Street operates in a north-east to south-west direction between Brady Street and terminating at Bridge Street opposite the north-east boundary of the site. It has a road reserve of approximately 30 metres and currently provides for a wide two-way carriageway with 45 degree angled parking on the southern side and parallel parking on the northern side.

Plummer Street operates in an east-west direction between the two subject sites. It has a road reserve of approximately 25 metres, providing a single two-way carriageway with parallel parking on both sides. Its intersection with Bridge Street is approximately 50 metres south of the Fennel Street intersection. The intersection to the west of the site, with Graham Street, is signalised.

Bridge Street operates in a north-west to south-east direction past the eastern boundaries of the subject sites with an existing road reserve of 30 metres. In the vicinity of the subject sites, Bridge Street provides for two-way traffic with parking on both sides. South of Plummer Street, there is 45 degree parking on the eastern side and parallel parking on the western side. North of Plummer Street, parking on both sides is parallel. North of Plummer Street, a dedicated bicycle lane is also provided in both directions.

Photos of the existing road network are provided at Figure 1 to Figure 4.
8.3 Strategic Framework Plan

The draft Strategic Framework Plan and exhibited documents identify the following key characteristics with regard to transport relating to the proposal:

- The new tram route extension running along Fennel Street and Plummer Street runs between the two sites, and requires:
  - A set-back of the northern side of Plummer Street of 16 metres (affecting 577 Plummer Street).
  - A realignment of Plummer Street at the intersection with Bridge Street to allow for a more direct tram connection to Fennel Street (and setback of the south-east corner of the 577 Plummer Street site).
- The previous alignment of Plummer Street at the Bridge Street intersection is proposed to be provided as new public open space, and additional public open space is proposed within the northern portion of the Bridge Street site.
- Two potential metro routes are nominated along Fennel Street splitting at Bridge Street to run along Plummer Street or diverting north toward the Employment Precinct. Both alignments affect the Plummer Street site.
- Plummer Street is nominated as a Strategic Cycling Corridor and also as ‘No Crossovers’ Permitted.
- A new 22 metre east to west road is nominated running through the Bridge Street site, toward its southern boundary, and is nominated with future on-road bicycle lanes. It ultimately connects between JL Murphy Reserve and Bertie Street.
- A new 22 metre east to west road is nominated running to the north of the Plummer Street site, through the adjacent land, ultimately providing a connection between Ingles Street through to the west of Salmon Street.

The location of the subject site with regard to the Clause 37 Capital City Zone Maps and the transport, road, bicycle and precincts maps in the Framework are provided at Figure 5 to Figure 9.

![Figure 5: Plummer & Bridge St Sites in Relation to Map 2 of Clause 37](image-url)
Figure 6: Plummer & Bridge St Sites - DFP Public Transport (Figure 5)

Figure 7: Plummer & Bridge St Sites- DFP Cycling Infrastructure (Figure 7)
8.4 Site Specific Assessment

It is clear from the preceding section that a large proportion of the Bridge Street site is encumbered by the potential metro rail alignments and the setbacks required along the southern boundary for the new tram extension.

As noted within the main section of my evidence, I am of the view that a Public Acquisition Overlay should be applied along the future metro and tram alignments. This will preserve the land for not only the physical space required for the future infrastructure, but also facilitate its timely delivery and allow for acquisition of the land in the event that the land is not developed (and therefore the requirement to set aside the land for the responsible authority is not triggered).
In the general context of the future grid style road network, the proposed road which is located within the southern portion of the Plummer Street site is a logical response to continuing this grid network. I do note, however that it provides only relatively local access in the larger precinct context as it terminates at JL Murphy Reserve and is truncated at Bertie Street (where Woodruff Street is off-set and doesn’t provide for a continued through route).

Plummer Street and Williamstown Road are nominated as ‘No Crossover Permitted’ roads, and therefore the new road will provide for access opportunities for mid-block land parcels which front either of Plummer Street or Williamstown Road, and do not have an alternative road frontage. In this regard it will benefit both northern and southern lots.

Whilst the location of the road appears to be set based on the existing lot boundaries, in my view it is inequitable in its siting as it is wholly contained within the northern land parcels, whilst the southern land parcels take benefit but do not contribute.

In this regard, consideration should be given as to how this shared road resource should be funded. Furthermore, the delivery of this road becomes contingent on Delta Group’s desire to develop. If Delta does not develop, the road will not be delivered and the mid-block southern lots would need to gain vehicle access from Williamstown Road (a ‘no crossover’ street and existing bicycle route) should they choose to develop prior to Delta.

With regard to the proposed north to south indicative laneway nominated on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, it is unclear whether this laneway sits within the subject land, or in the adjacent land to the west. Clarity is required to understand where the laneway is sited.

Presumably, the exact siting of this laneway will be discussed and represented when the Sandridge neighbourhood precinct plan is prepared.
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9.1 Site Location

The site at 277-281 Ingles Street is located within the Sandridge Precinct on the north-western corner of the intersection of Ingles Street and Fennel Street.

It is an irregular shaped site with frontages to Ingles Street, Fennel Street and Bertie Street. A rectangular lot severs the subject site’s frontage to Ingles Street.

I am advised that an application has been with Council and the Department since 2014 (MPA/14/0014) for the redevelopment of a portion of the site, which excludes the heritage building and the warehouse / office buildings fronting Fennel Street. The proposal has seen a number of iterations in response to changes in the Strategic Framework and Vision of Fishermans Bend, with the latest plans lodged in 2017 proposing four towers providing residential and commercial uses and a new east to west road through the site connecting Ingles Street with Bertie Street. The inclusion of the east to west road has largely been dictated by the Department.

9.2 Existing Road Network

Fennel Street operates to the south-east of the subject site, in a north-east to south-west direction between Brady Street and Bridge Street. It has a road reserve of approximately 30 metres and currently provides for a wide two-way carriageway with 45 degree angled parking on the southern side and parallel parking on the northern side.

Ingles Street operates in a north-west to south-east direction, from Lorimer Street through to Pickles Street in Port Melbourne. Along the north-eastern boundary of the subject site, Ingles Street has an elevated two-lane bridge across West Gate Freeway with one-way service roads providing local access to fronting properties between Fennel Street and the freeway. The service road fronting the subject site operates one-way north-westbound and provides for angled parking on both sides. A connection is provided beneath the Ingles Street bridge to the northern service road which operates one-way south-eastbound.

Bertie Street extends from Williamstown Road in a north-west alignment, terminating at the West Gate Freeway. Two-way traffic is accommodated with 45 degree angled parking on both sides.

Photos of the existing road network are provided at Figure 10 to Figure 13.
9.3 Fishermans Bend Context

The draft Framework Plan and exhibited documents identify the following key characteristics with regard to transport relating to the proposal:

- A new north-east to south-west 22 metre road to be provided through the centre of the site connecting Bertie Street and Fennel Street.
- The tram route extension along Fennel Street operates to the south-east of the development site, with road widening proposed to the southern side of the road (not directly impacting on the subject site).
- A potential metro route and station located along the Fennel Street abuttal to the site.
- The Fennel Street and Ingles Street abuttals are nominated as Strategic Bicycle Corridors.
- Bertie Street is proposed to provide a new off-road cycling path.
- Ingles Street, Bertie Street and Fennel Street are nominated as “No Crossover” streets.
• The Infrastructure Delivery in Sandridge illustrated in the Framework Plan nominates laneways running north-west from Fennel Street and parallel to the new north-east-to-south-west roadway which runs through the subject land.

• A new 12 metre road is proposed on the north-western abuttal, within the adjacent land, that connects Boundary Road with Bertie Street underneath the Ingles Street overpass.

The location of the subject site with regard to the Clause 37 Capital City Zone Maps and the transport, road, bicycle and precincts maps in the Framework are provided at Figure 14 to Figure 18.
Figure 16: Ingles St Site - DFP Cycling Infrastructure (Figure 7)

Figure 17: Ingles St Site - DFP Road Network (Figure 8)
9.4 Site Specific Assessment

The application plans currently lodged with the Department and Council contemplate the provision of a new north-east to south-west road through the subject site. However, it is noted that the provision of this road has largely been included to progress the application.

I acknowledge the provision of the new north-east to south-west road seems logical in the vision to provide a permeable network, however in these particular circumstances the road only provides limited vehicular access for the broader network as the Ingles Street bridge effectively severs further connections to / from the north.

Whilst the road is not necessary from a broader accessibility point of view, it or the other designated laneways on the Infrastructure Delivery plan are necessary to provide for access to individual lots beyond the No Crossover streets.

To this end, as long as access is provided via either the laneways or the proposed new road, the exact location of each does not need to be regimented or prescribed at this time.

If access is provided via the north-west to south-east laneway or the proposed new road, then the laneway running parallel to Fennell Street is not necessary.

Whilst cycling priority is acknowledged along Ingles Street, the presence of the bridge and service roads would permit the potential for local vehicle access to be provided separate to the bicycle provisions. In this regard, designation of this part of Fennell Street as a “No Crossover” street is not necessary from a traffic perspective.

Lastly, there needs to be greater resolution as to what is required to be protected and / or preserved for the provision of the metro alignment and future underground railway station at the south-eastern boundary of the site. If land is required for the station or if protective measures are necessary then they should be stipulated.
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10.1 Site Location

The site at 44-54 White Street, South Melbourne is irregular in shape and has frontages to White Street at its east, Gittus Street at its west and Boundary Street at its south-west.

The site is currently occupied by double storey warehouse and office building with vehicular access available from Gittus Street and Boundary Street.

The site to the immediate south of the subject site is currently operating as the City of Port Phillip Refuse & Recovery Centre.

10.2 Existing Road Network

Boundary Street operates along the southern boundary of the subject site from Fennel Street in the north-west to Normanby Road in the south-east, where it continues as Woodgate Street to Montague Street. It has a road reserve of approximately 30 metres and currently provides for a wide two-way carriageway with angled parking on both sides of the road. There is currently no footpath on the northern side of Boundary Street.

White Street operates in a north south direction from Brady Street in the north to Boundary Street in the south. It has a road reserve of approximately 30 metres and currently provides for a wide two-way carriageway with 90 degree angled parking on the western side and parallel parking on the eastern side.

Gittus Street operates north-south between Brady Street and Boundary Street also with a road reserve width of 30 metres accommodating two-way traffic, parallel parking on the western side and angled parking on the eastern side. There are currently no footpaths on either side of Gittus Street.

Woodruff Street operates north-east to south-west from Boundary Street to Bertie Street, albeit at Ingles Street, it staggers to the south. It has a road reserve width of 30 metres.

Photos of the existing road network are provided at Figure 19 to Figure 22.
10.3 Fishermans Bend Context

The draft Framework Plan and exhibited documents identify the following key characteristics with regard to transport relating to the proposal:

- A new road is proposed to operate within the southern portion of the site, connecting White Street to Boundary Street. At Boundary Street, the new road is proposed opposite Woodruff Street (existing). At White Street, the new road is a continuation of another new road which extends through to Johnson Street.
- Gittus Street is proposed to be closed and converted to public open space.
- The southern section of Boundary Road, south of the new east-west road, is also proposed to be closed and converted to public open space.
- The alignment of the new road opposite Woodruff Street will create a small triangular parcel of land in the southern portion of the subject site, which the draft Framework Plan identifies as public open space.
- Boundary Street, to the south of Woodruff Street, is proposed with an off-road cycle path connecting to Woodruff Street.
The draft Framework Plan identifies an ‘indicative laneway’ running north-south from the new east-west road up to Brady Street (which runs parallel to Westgate Freeway) through the subject site.

Boundary Street, along the subject site is identified as a “No Crossovers” street.

The subject site is located approximately 150 metres south-east of the new tram line identified to operate along Fennel Street & Plummer Street.

The location of the subject site with regard to the Clause 37 Capital City Zone Maps and the transport, road, bicycle and precincts maps in the Framework are provided at Figure 23 and Figure 27.

Figure 23: White St Site in Relation to Map 2 of Clause 22

Figure 24: White St Site – DFP Public Transport (Figure 5)
Figure 25: White St Site – DFP Cycling Infrastructure (Figure 7)

Figure 26: White St Site – DFP Road Network (Figure 8)
10.4 Site Specific Assessment

The subject land is located in an area of Fishermans Bend that has limited permeability as the West Gate Freeway acts as a barrier to the north, and there is no existing or proposed connection through to the east until Munro Street. In this regard, permeability is sought north-south through this area to allow motorists and pedestrians to travel to and from the south to access the broader road network and proposed facilities.

In this regard, it seems illogical to close the existing road infrastructure of White Street and Gittus Street, and replace those connections with a new road through the subject land. Furthermore, in my mind the road encumbers the subject land without benefitting others. The new road is flanked by new open space on the southern side and therefore will not provide access to the existing Council land. To this end, it is only providing access to the subject land, and does not need to be provided as there are other frontages.

Additionally, the location of the new road opposite Woodruff Street will form a new cross-intersection, and would desirably be signalised. This would create a need for further infrastructure and cost when the existing network is sufficient.

Accordingly, I am of the view the road is not necessary for vehicle accessibility and therefore can be deleted from the plan.

For pedestrians, permeability can be provided by the future open space connecting Johnson Street through to Boundary Street.
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11.1 Site Location

The site at 400-430 City Road, Southbank, is located toward the eastern extent of the Montague Precinct. It is triangular in shape and is bound by Whiteman Street at the west, City Road at the south-east and Cecil Street at the east.

The site is currently occupied by a number of two and three-storey buildings which are understood to be occupied by office and warehouse uses.

The site is located immediately east of the City Road Light Rail station, located on the western side of Whiteman Street. Direct access is provided to the light rail stop via pedestrian ramps from Whiteman Street.

The existing site takes vehicle access via a number of crossovers to each of the surrounding roads, some of which appear disused.

11.2 Existing Road Network

City Road operates along the south-eastern boundary of the site and provides an arterial link between Port Melbourne and South Melbourne passed the subject site. In the vicinity of the subject site, it provides for two lanes of traffic in each direction with kerbside parallel parking permitted on both sides.

The intersections of Cecil Street and Whiteman Street are currently controlled by signalised intersections. Immediately west of the site, City Road passes beneath the light rail overpass and then provides a connection to Montague Street and West Gate Freeway.

Cecil Street operates along the eastern boundary of the subject site and provides for two-way traffic with parallel parking in both directions separated from a kerbside Copenhagen style bicycle treatment by raised medians.

Cecil Street provides a connection between Albert Street in the south and links to the north-east via an underpass to Haig Street underneath West Gate Freeway. The intersection at City Road is a signalised cross-intersection.

Whiteman Street operates two-way past the subject site’s western boundary with parallel parking on both sides and a wide two-way traffic carriageway. Beginning from City Road it provides a through connection to the north beneath West Gate Freeway to Southbank. Its intersection with City Road is a signalised T-intersection.
11.3 Fishermans Bend Context

The draft Framework Plan and exhibited documents identify the following key characteristics with regard to transport relating to the proposal:

- City Road is nominated as ‘No Crossovers’ Permitted
- Cecil Street is nominated as a Strategic Cycling Corridor and City Road is nominated with future on-road bicycle lanes.
- A new indicative laneway is nominated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Montague east to west through the site from Cecil Street to Whiteman Street approximately mid-block to the site.

The location of the subject site with regard to the Clause 37 Capital City Zone Maps and the transport, road, bicycle and precincts maps in the Framework are provided at Figure 32 to Figure 36.
Figure 32: City Road Site in Relation to Map 2 of Clause 22

Figure 33: City Road Site – DFP Public Transport (Figure 5)
Figure 34: City Road Site – DFP Cycling Infrastructure (Figure 7)

Figure 35: City Road Site – DFP Road Network (Figure 8)
11.4 Site Specific Assessment

The subject site is effectively an island site, removed from the larger Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area and, as noted in the preceding sections, is currently very well serviced by an arterial and local road network, and also an existing light rail route that links to/from the Central City.

Signalised intersections at City Road provide for appropriate accessibility to the existing road network and there is limited additional transport infrastructure required in the immediate vicinity of the site that would provide benefit to it, or the site located further east of Cecil Street but still within the Fishermans Bend boundary.

In terms of pedestrian permeability and traffic accessibility, the indicative laneway provides relatively limited benefit to the accessibility for the site and through to Whiteman Street given the current spacing of the road network. I note that the existing entry to the light rail stop is via the southern end of Whiteman Street, and therefore at present the new indicative laneway would not provide benefit for accessibility between the light rail access and City Road.

Furthermore, whilst the indicative laneway on the Infrastructure Plan appears to be sited along a property boundary, I understand that the parcels are controlled by one owner (Wadhawan Holdings Pty Ltd – the submitter) and therefore the need to provide a laneway through the site would unnecessarily encumber their ability to develop the larger site as a whole.

In essence, the isolation of this site from the larger precinct, and having the benefit of the existing infrastructure that services it, would suggest that from a traffic engineering perspective this site should be considered in isolation to the wider precinct and not be encumbered by the infrastructure needs of the precinct west of the light rail line. That is, it should be removed from the precinct and considered separately.