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Role of GC81

Panel Terms of Reference
• “Planning Scheme Amendment GC81 has been prepared to implement the Vision for Fishermans Bend through a suite of permanent controls including … a new Fishermans Bend Framework.”

Vision
• “Fishermans Bend will need to be more than just a great place to work, invest and do business – it must also be a great place to live.”

Draft Framework
• “The draft Fishermans Bend Framework is a plan for the parks, schools, roads, transport, community facilities and services to ensure the liveability of the area as it grows over the next 30 years.”

Draft GC81 Objective
• “will ensure that Fishermans Bend develops as a State significant urban renewal precinct which will make it a great place to live, work, visit and invest.”
Objectives of GC81

Specifically, GC81 aims to meet objectives by-
• Providing for the fair, orderly, economic and sustainable use and development of land.
• Securing a pleasant, efficient and safe working, living and recreational environment.
• Enabling the orderly provision and co-ordination of public utilities and other facilities for the benefit of the community.
• Facilitating development in accordance with the above objectives.
• Balancing the present and future interests of all Victorians.
FBURA in Context

Existing Community
• Private Ownership
• Heritage Overlays
• Employment
• Residential and community assets for/of 16k residents, 30k workers

Previous Use
• Contamination

Current Use
• Port
• Freeway
• Utilities
• Open space

Geography / Geology
• Silt not bedrock
• Watertable
• Height above sea level
Assumptions

Funding will be sufficient and available

Planned Infrastructure is sufficient for expected population and workforce
  • Transport Plan
  • Private transport goals
  • Open Space strategy

Density Controls and Review mechanism are appropriate

Precincts will align with Vision

The framework and planning controls will provide certainty
Testing the Assumptions (Pt I)

Funding

- How much is required?
- Where will it come from?
- When will it be available?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 Infrastructure Estimate</th>
<th>No of Dwellings</th>
<th>2015 Developer Contribution</th>
<th>Total Contribution</th>
<th>Shortfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$907m</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>$16000</td>
<td>$672m</td>
<td>$238m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Testing the Assumptions (Pt II)

Planned Infrastructure
• Catalyst Projects – are they sufficient?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip Type</th>
<th>Tram Mode Share</th>
<th>Passenger No.</th>
<th>Trams Required</th>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>VITM Modelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (260,000)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26,325</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0:57</td>
<td>6:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (97,500)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13,163</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1:55</td>
<td>6:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Health, education, community services
• Where and when?
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Testing the Assumptions (Pt III)

Other infrastructure

- The road network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip Type</th>
<th>2020 Estimates</th>
<th>2050 Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55% Car Mode Share</td>
<td>20% Car Mode Share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,400 No of trips</td>
<td>52,000 No of trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55% Car Mode Share</td>
<td>20% Car Mode Share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54,500 No of trips</td>
<td>52,000 No of trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>84,900</td>
<td>104,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Open Space
- Emergency services
Testing the Assumptions (Pt IV)

Other infrastructure

• The road network
• Open Space
  ➢ Pressure on Murphy’s Reserve and PMCRR
  ➢ Tragedy of the commons
  ➢ Expropriation of community assets

• Emergency services
  ➢ Fire, Ambulance, SES
  ➢ Police?
Testing the Assumptions (Pt V)

Density Controls
- Expected population vs sustainable population
- Who controls the review mechanism and how will it work?

Precinct Plans
- Will they align with Vision

Planning Controls
- Will Revised GC81 + finalised Framework provide certainty?
Assessment against Objectives

Providing for the fair, orderly, economic and sustainable use and development of land?
- Probably not fair
- Certainly not orderly
- Economic and/or sustainable? Unknown

Securing a pleasant, efficient and safe working, living and recreational environment?
- Insufficient infrastructure
- More unknowns, therefore unsecured!
- Efficiency and safety vs overcrowding

Enabling the orderly provision and co-ordination of public utilities and other facilities for the benefit of the community?
- Little evidence of co-ordination

Facilitating development in accordance with the above objectives?
- Development led by individual landowners

Balancing the present and future interests of all Victorians?
- Assessment of interests?
Where are we?

Conclusion

- Uncertain infrastructure rollout
- Uncertain governance framework
- Uncertain funding
- Uncertain timing

Unlikely GC81 will achieve anyone’s objectives

- Despite improvements over earlier planning controls
- Despite review mechanism
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Hold GC81 over until strategic framework is finalised

Strategic framework can’t be finalised until certainty is provided over
⇒ Infrastructure amount and type
⇒ Its location
⇒ Cost
⇒ Source of funding
⇒ Timing

Certainty that governance arrangements can provide consistency
⇒ With earlier decisions
⇒ With the agreed Vision
⇒ Accountability
⇒ Clear understanding of issues that must be taken into account

Include funding and governance arrangements as part of the Framework documents
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