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Transport Targets

- The 80% of trips by sustainable modes is important and achievable – it is similar to other inner Melbourne Areas now. Fishermans Bend can only achieve this target if it replicates the transport networks and mix of land uses in these areas.
- 90% of school trips by sustainable modes is likely to be only realistic for internal trips by students living and studying within Fishermans Bend.
- A Walk Score of 90% is readily achievable with a mix of land uses and an important target.
Public Transport Provision

- Vision of 80/20 mode split target is achievable, but not without a CBD-like public transport system
- Early and effective public transport is critical to achieving this target
- None of the supporting transport studies include the 80/80 pop/jobs target or the university
- ‘Locking down’ the Metro rail alignment and committing to its delivery is vital to realising Fishermans Bend
- As the key piece of public infrastructure, the Metro should be set first, and the surface transport network and development densities planned around it
- The proposed planning controls do not sufficiently protect the light rail or Metro rail alignment – no map or overlay protecting these routes
The Employment Precinct is a NEIC.

The NEIC will have a metropolitan wide worker catchment.

The NEIC will not be competitive with other inner areas without metro services (Docklands, E-gate, Arden, etc.).

A station in Wirraway is too far away to support the Employment Precinct.

The northern tram route alone is incapable of supporting the proposed jobs.

Employment per car space generates around 5 times more private vehicle trips than dwellings – public transport is critical to the 80/20 mode split target.
Metro Rail Alignment

- Current modelling does not include the additional 20k jobs (increasing from 13k existing to 40k) in the Employment Precinct
- 40k jobs in the Employment Precinct plus university will generate significantly greater transport demand than the 17k/4k pop/jobs in Wirraway
- Does this effectively predetermine an Employment Precinct Metro station – not Wirraway?
- Should a Metro rail alignment option now be investigated for a ‘three station’ alternative, with both Wirraway and the Employment Precinct serviced?
Proposed Parking Overlay

- The controls need to be substantially re-worked in my view to have any chance of a consistent interpretation
- The controls as exhibited are unclear, poorly worded and structured and open to wide interpretation
- The practical outcome of adopting the controls in their current form will result in unnecessary confusion and ‘planning effort’ spent on the interpretation of these requirements
- What do the controls allow to be included? Cl. 52.06, Cl. 45.09 and Cl. 52.34
Parking Overlay – Key Issues

- It is not clear when a permit is required from Section 2.0
- It is not clear if Column B rates are being applied as maximum parking rates
- The decision guidelines at Section 4.0 are confusing, need to be clearer and need to reference Clause 52.06 specifically
- It is unusual that Section 6.0 is used to specify provision of car share, motorcycle and bicycle parking, the equivalent section of Clause 52.06 only specifies plan details, not parking requirements
Parking Overlay – Key Issues

- If no car parking is provided, the extra ‘parking’ requirements under Section 6.0 don’t apply
- I agree with the intent of providing these additional ‘parking’ options (car share, bicycle, motorcycle parking)
- The controls are not clear about criteria to exceed maximum car parking rates
- Inclusion of references to PPS is premature
Change to maximum of 0.5 car spaces/dwelling

- Not necessary and premature to impose a maximum of 0.5 spaces/dwelling - a maximum 1 space/dwelling is acceptable
- 0.5/dwelling is substantially below current Parking Overlay in Melbourne CC, including Docklands, Southbank, Carlton, North Melbourne
- Fishermans Bend will not have equivalent access to public transport and alternative transport modes to any of these areas in the short-medium term (possibly even long-term)
- 80/20 mode split is possible with a limitation of 1 space/dwelling (as inner areas of Melbourne already achieve)
- Not sufficiently flexible to account for different dwelling types, including larger/family dwellings
Adaptable Car Parking

- Adaptable floor plates are supported, but there are practical implications of how these are implemented if mandated:
  - automatic parking systems
  - certain carpark layouts
  - dealing with constrained sites
  - generally makes car parking provision less efficient
- Difference between ITP (3m) versus controls (3.8m)
Car Share Requirements

- What is intended with car share provision?
- Is the commitment to the space or the car share vehicle?
- Who has access?
- How does the requirement for car share relate to existing Council policies and research (Boyle Report)?
Parking Precinct Structures (PPS)

- PPS is no different to commercial carparks for commercial uses
- There are practical implementation and market acceptance issues – esp. for residential parking
- The ITP (page 50) outlines significant challenges to PPS
- This is a largely untested concept
- The framework and controls do not clearly set out how PPS is to be implemented or the benefits of constructing a PPS to a developer
- Inclusion of PPS in the controls is premature
Commitment to the alignment and provision of metro rail services is vital to realising the vision of Fishermans Bend.

The transport targets are achievable and worthwhile targets.

The Parking Overlay needs to be substantially reworked.

Lowering the maximum car parking rate for dwellings to 0.5/dwelling is inflexible, premature and unnecessary to achieve the transport targets of the Vision.

Parking Precinct Stations should be removed from the controls.