

**FISHERMANS BEND PLANNING REVIEW PANEL HEARING
DRAFT AMENDMENT GC81 TO THE MELBOURNE AND PORT PHILLIP PLANNING SCHEMES**

MINISTER FOR PLANNING SUBMISSIONS RESPONSE

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and may be updated during the hearing. It is made subject to all further submissions of the Minister for Planning to the Review Panel including his formal right of reply at the conclusion of the hearing.

ISSUE		Submissions raising this issue	RESPONSE	Related planning control
Drafting and content of the proposed planning control				
1.	Technical and grammatical errors and duplication in amendment documentation. Submitters also raised the issue that the maps in draft Framework identifying areas for new streets, laneways and public open space are high level and cannot provide guidance or certainty for land owners.	67, 71, 87, 89, 92, 121, 134, 150, 153, 157, 160, 163, 165, 167, 172, 182, 184, 188, 203, 205, 206, 208, 212, 215, 217, 223, 240, 250	<p>The draft amendment documentation has been reviewed. Technical and grammatical errors have been corrected. The revised documentation has been circulated as part of the 'Part A Submission'. Further improvements are recommended by our expert witnesses, Leanne Hoydl and John Glossop's evidence. These will be considered together with drafting improvements suggested by other submitters.</p> <p>Maps have been updated in our Part A to provide further clarity. Additional improvements to maps have been recommended in Leanne Hodyl's expert evidence and are under consideration.</p>	Various
The policy intent for the area				
2.	Support for the overall vision for Fishermans Bend and draft Framework strategies and targets.	35, 45, 64, 73, 75, 77, 78, 83, 102, 103, 106, 123, 139, 148, 152, 176, 182, 184, 186, 188, 196, 197, 199, 206, 208, 211, 212, 215, 221, 223, 240, 247	We thank submitters for their support.	N/A
3.	The name 'Fishermans Bend' separates the	22	Fishermans Bend is the overarching urban renewal	N/A

	area from the residents of Port Melbourne.		area designation for five distinct precincts, Montague, Lorimer, Wirraway, Sandridge, and Fishermans Bend proper, the Employment Precinct. It is expected that over time as these precincts become more widely recognised for their own unique character these names will take greater significance. Individual Precinct Plans will be developed after the finalisation of the overarching Framework that will assist in defining and strengthening these individual identities drawing on local heritage and cultural values.	
4.	Details and justification behind the targeted 80,000 residents to 2051.	7, 71, 87, 90, 91, 94, 95, 96, 104, 120, 130, 131, 144, 157, 173, 175, 182, 184, 188, 217, 226, 242, 244, 250, 171	<p>The Vision for Fishermans Bend was completed in September 2016 following public consultation earlier that year. The Vision describes how Fishermans Bend will be planned for 80,000 residents. The number of residents is based on a number of factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The aspirations for the precinct described in Plan Melbourne (2017). - What is a reasonable number of residents to cater for Melbourne’s growing population. - Balancing the requirements of growth and dwelling density for an inner Melbourne mixed-use precinct with urban design and development principles to provide a high amenity and liveable urban renewal precinct. - Ensuring a range of densities across the four precincts to provide for a viable extension to the CBD, and a transition to established lower density areas. - The ability of the utility, roads, public transport and other infrastructure elements to reasonably cater for the growth. - The need to create communities, jobs, and entertainment whilst reflecting the building and cultural heritage of Fishermans Bend. - Delivering a Green Star sustainable 	MSS

			<p>community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Background reports summarised in the draft Framework and earlier work by Places Victoria undertaken in 2012–13 (available on the web site: www.fishermansbend.vic.gov.au) contributed to development of the population target of 80,000 residents by 2050. <p>The Urban Design Strategy and expert evidence of Leanne Hodyl has tested 80,000 residents and 80,000 jobs to 2050 and reinforced this will deliver the vision for each precinct.</p>	
5.	Support for the creation of five distinct precincts with the overall Fishermans Bend.	22, 64	We thank submitters for their support.	MSS
6.	It has been noted that the development of a successful plan for the Employment Precinct and its integration with the other precincts will be vital to the success of Fishermans Bend.	64	<p>In progressing future planning for the Employment Precinct, consideration will be given to the sectors that best align with the Fishermans Bend vision to develop a leading design, engineering and advanced manufacturing precinct. Attracting a diversity of businesses including start-ups to multinationals, will be important to creating a vibrant and innovative Employment Precinct.</p> <p>In December 2017 the University of Melbourne announced that it will open an engineering campus within the Fishermans Bend Employment Precinct in the early 2020's.</p>	N/A
7.	Submitters also have suggested to rename the Employment Precinct to a more unique name and its own postcode.	232	The Employment Precinct has historically been known as the locality of 'Fishermans Bend'. Any name changes will need to be considered by Government in conjunction with the community.	N/A
Housing targets				

8.	Greater community diversity through housing affordability and jobs.	22, 247	The draft Framework recognises the need for diversity in residents, workers, housing types and built form. The planning controls include many initiatives to mandate and/or promote this diversity, recognising the land is privately owned with existing land uses.	LPP
9.	A number of submitters made submission on the need to include mandatory (inclusionary) affordable housing, the rate at which this is proposed varied between submitters generally from 6-40%, with some submitters also recommending social housing, public housing, and community housing also to be required. Other submitters said there should be no affordable housing target.	31, 58, 64, 118, 125, 139, 142, 148, 176, 185, 188, 209, 210, 212, 227, 239, 243, 246, 247	<p>The 6 per cent target is described in the Framework. A 5 per cent baseline target was identified as aligning with IMAP assessment of inner city needs. A 10 per cent overall target was considered to reflect affordable housing need and social mix. There is also a need to consider development economics to facilitate feasible development. A significantly higher mandated requirement will unreasonably impact on development feasibility.</p> <p>The draft Framework target of 6 per cent affordable housing can be achieved a number of ways. One of the ways is through the Floor Area Uplift Ratio of 1:8 for an affordable housing public benefit, which is supported by the Affordable Housing Industry Advisory Group (AHIAG) (Submitter No. 243). The Taskforce continues to work with AHIAG to explore affordable housing options. In addition, over time the State Government may request that DHHS explore opportunities for investment in affordable housing in Fishermans Bend.</p> <p>The Victorian Government is enabling the supply of affordable housing through the planning system, with reforms to make it easier for councils, developers, and community housing agencies to collaborate on its delivery.</p> <p>The reforms include changes to legislation that, for</p>	LPP

			<p>the first time in Victoria, introduce a state-wide definition of affordable housing, a new objective for the planning system to facilitate its supply, and a new pathway for how public and private sectors can work together to deliver it.</p> <p>The changes to the <i>Planning and Environment Act 1987</i>, which come into effect 1 June 2018, provide the foundation for Victoria's planning system to facilitate the supply of more affordable housing across the state, and are the first step in delivering a clear voluntary framework for affordable housing agreements to enable industry and councils to negotiate the provision of affordable housing in a proposed development. It is important to note that the changes to the <i>Planning and Environment Act</i> do not set a mandatory requirement but support the use of section 173 voluntary agreements to deliver affordable housing.</p>	
10.	Some submitters requested more detail on how affordable housing will be delivered and recommended that more options for the provision of social and affordable housing was required and not just to reply on the floor area uplift. This included the provision of a cash in lieu payment option.	23, 26, 88, 132, 139, 142, 149, 153, 164, 168, 176, 206, 210, 212, 230, 239, 240, 243, 247	<p>Planning for affordable housing in Fishermans Bend aligns with a number of Victorian Government policies including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plan Melbourne - Direction 2.3 to increase the supply of social and affordable housing, in particular Policy 2.3.3 Strengthen the role of planning in facilitating and delivering the supply of social and affordable housing. - Homes for Victorians - Fishermans Bend is included as a key urban renewal precinct in the Victorian Government's affordable housing policy, as part of increasing development opportunities in the inner and middle suburbs. - HomesVic - Fishermans Bend is listed as a priority area in the Government's shared equity scheme, helping eligible first home buyers by reducing the amount of money 	LPP

			they need to purchase their own home. See also response above.	
11.	Concerns that the term affordable housing actually means social housing and that undesirable individuals would locate within Fishermans Bend. One submitter recommended replacing the definition of affordable housing within the draft Framework with the definition within the <i>Planning and Environment Act 1987</i> .	175, 239, 246	In the <i>Planning and Environment Act</i> , affordable housing relates to income cohorts, not delivery model. Social housing is one form of delivery of affordable housing (Note, that the definition of affordable housing in the <i>Planning and Environment Act</i> does specify 'social housing'. "For the purposes of this Act, affordable housing is housing, including social housing, that is appropriate for the housing needs.." It then references the income cohorts). The draft Framework includes strategies to identify government sites that would be suitable for affordable housing (Strategy 3.5.4). Refer also to the response above. The Homes for Victorian definition of affordable housing is: Affordable housing is housing that is appropriate for the needs of a range of very low to moderate income households, and priced (whether mortgage repayments or rent) so these households are able to meet their other essential basic living costs.	LPP
Employment targets				
12.	Further details and justification behind the targeted 80,000 jobs to 2051.	87, 90, 91, 94, 95, 96, 104, 120, 130, 131, 144, 157	The employment forecast is aligned with the realisation of the Vision. The four rezoned precincts (Lorimer, Montague, Sandridge and Wirraway) employment target is 40,000 workers and are aligned with the urban structure identified in the draft Framework. The employment target for Sandridge is particularly important as it will create a similar employment density to Docklands or Southbank. In particular, this redistribution aligns with the heavy rail alignment with a station located in Sandridge.	MSS

			<p>While the light rail and other investments will support the Sandridge activity core, the heavy rail station will be critical to it reaching its full employment potential. To achieve this level of growth it will need to be highly connected (internally, to the central city and broader metropolitan economy) and provide a diverse high amenity environment.</p> <p>The balance of the employment will be in the employment precinct</p> <p>The advice of the economics expert considered this question and concluded; <i>"The target of 40,000 jobs for the four CCZ precincts is appropriate and broadly consistent with other inner-city precincts. Given Fishermans Bend will be rapidly evolving strong and directive policy is required to manage the transition process to ensure broader community benefits are realised, rather than a focus on individual site outcomes."</i> – Expert evidence of Julian Szafraniec , paragraphs 81 and 82.</p>	
Built form				
Height controls				
13.	Some submitters have suggested that areas of unlimited height are not supported and a maximum 12 storey height limit or 10-20 storeys is proposed.	26, 70	<p>The height controls were established through a process of rigorous testing*. Proposed building heights have been implemented to ensure a better urban design outcome for the whole of Fishermans Bend. They represent a balance between site, building amenity and public realm amenity. Generally, and submit to consideration of submissions we do not support changes to proposed heights.</p> <p>*Please refer to Urban Design Strategy by Hodyl and Co, draft Framework, Expert Witness Statement by Leanne Hodyl from Hodyl and Co.</p>	DDO

14.	Some submitters have suggested the proposed height limits in Wirraway Precinct will result in a poor planning outcome which does not realise the potential of the precinct to contribute to urban consolidation and the policy objectives of Clause 11.02 and Clause 16 of the State Planning Policy Framework.	80, 137	The height controls were established through a process of rigorous testing*. Proposed building heights have been implemented to ensure a better urban design outcome for the whole of Fishermans Bend. They represent a balance between site, building amenity and public realm. The vision for Wirraway Precinct is to create a new neighbourhood that supports moderate job growth and a high degree of housing choice, in particular, family-friendly housing. We do not support the changes to proposed heights. *Please refer to Urban Design Strategy by Hodyl and Co, draft Framework, Expert Witness Statement by Leanne Hodyl from Hodyl and Co.	DDO
15.	Some submitters have been opposed the 18-storey discretionary provision in Lorimer. It is suggested that the area south of Lorimer Street and east of Rogers Street should be included in the 'Unlimited height' area rather than being in a 'mid-rise infill' area with smaller tower development.	713, 89, 163, 165	See response above. Tower developments are supported in Lorimer. South of the Lorimer open space these have an unlimited height as amenity impacts on the freeway to the south will be minimal. North of the open space, these are limited in height to align with the revised population targets and to maximise the amenity of the Lorimer open space and the new fine grain network of laneways.	DDO
16.	Some submitters have raised concerns that the 24-storey height limit proposed on Lorimer Street is too high and will limit the views and also create the wind tunnel.	26	See response above.	DDO
17.	A number of submitters raised concerns on the proposed height controls for their site	63, 71, 79, 80, 87, 93, 102, 104, 109, 120, 123, 131, 135, 136, 137, 141, 143, 146, 150, 162, 163, 169, 172, 180, 182, 185, 200, 222, 230, 237, 238, 242, 217	See response above.	DDO

The use of mandatory versus discretionary controls				
18.	The complexity of the planning controls and how much flexibility should be allowed through the use of discretionary and mandatory controls.	57, 66, 87, 90, 91, 94, 95, 96, 104, 109, 115, 120, 121, 130, 131, 136, 148, 154, 156, 160, 173, 184, 185, 200, 201, 202, 205, 206, 212, 217, 240, 242, 249	<p>The planning controls represent a variety of discretionary and mandatory requirements. The requirements proposed to be mandatory are considered to be non-negotiable in order to achieve the Vision for Fishermans Bend. Discretion has been used to allow for innovation and design excellence where a degree of flexibility is appropriate and would not diminish the ability for Fishermans Bend to become a world leading example of urban renewal.</p> <p>The first set of planning controls introduced by Amendments C170 to the MPS and C102 to the PPPS and later, by Amendment GC7, allowed for a great degree of discretion. This allowed for a more market driven approach to urban renewal. The outcome of this approach is considered to have been unsatisfactory with mandatory heights introduced by GC29 and then later mandatory setbacks introduced by GC50.</p> <p>For example, the Floor Area Ratio is proposed to be mandatory (unless a Floor Area Uplift is agreed to by the responsible authority), while the height controls are proposed to be discretionary (with the exception of the 4 storey mandatory height limit proposed to protect the interface with the existing residential areas to the south of Fishermans Bend). The floor area not used for a dwelling as required by the local policy is a discretionary requirement to allow a degree of flexibility to address various site constraints.</p> <p>The Floor Area Ratio needs to be mandatory. to ensure the population and the proposed infrastructure provision align. In contrast, the height</p>	Various

			<p>limits have been set as discretionary to allow for capacity to accommodate a Floor Area Uplift at the discretion of the Responsible Authority and also for design excellence and a mix of built form typologies (avoiding a flat skyline with all developments building to the top of the mandatory height limits as is currently occurring).</p> <p>The proposed combination of mandatory and discretionary controls throughout the planning controls offers an appropriate balance between flexibility and certainty.</p>	
Building setback requirements				
19.	Some submitters have suggested that building separation for below 20 storeys be amended to 10 storeys, or, the controls made consistent with those above 20 stories.	3	Addressed in the expert evidence supplied by Leanne Hodyl of Hodyl and Co. See Section 5, Paragraph 171-183	DDO
20.	Some submitters have urged that setbacks should be more flexible. Some of the submitters suggested instead of mandatory setbacks, there should be varied towers setbacks across the area which will create different tower forms.	58, 63, 157, 185, 196, 244	Addressed in the expert evidence supplied by Leanne Hodyl of Hodyl and Co. See Section 5, Paragraph 163-170	DDO
Overshadowing requirement				
21.	Some submitters are opposed to allocating the proposed open spaces in the south part of the nominated sites to protect them from overshadowing. In some of the cases, the location of the open space in the south part of the site will limit the development viability.	71, 110, 141, 143, 150, 157, 163, 165, 182, 185, 196	<p>It is important to provide sunlight access to proposed open spaces on the southern side of the street or a site. Sunlight access to open spaces is mandatory to ensure sunlight is not eroded over time due to cumulative impacts of future development. For this reason, we do not support the changes to proposed heights.</p> <p>The Urban Design Strategy by Hodyl and Co, draft Framework, Expert Witness Statement by Leanne Hodyl from Hodyl and Co supports this position.</p>	DDO

22.	Submitters have not supported the overshadowing protections on south side of Plummer Street.	167, 172	Addressed in the expert evidence supplied by Leanne Hodyl of Hodyl and Co.	
23.	Submitters have argued that overshadowing controls should be discretionary as opposed to mandatory.	89, 169, 217	In order to allow sunlight access to important public open space, the planning controls balance a variety of discretionary and mandatory requirements. The requirements proposed to be mandatory are considered to be non-negotiable in order to achieve the Vision for Fishermans Bend. Discretion has been used to allow for innovation and design excellence where a degree of flexibility is appropriate and would not diminish the ability for Fishermans Bend to become a world leading example of urban renewal.	DDO
24.	Submitters have requested no overshadowing effect to the North Port Oval for all periods of the year.	195	The overshadowing controls proposed for North Port Oval are the highest levels with sunlight access protected from 11am–2pm on the winter solstice.	DDO
The Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and Floor Area (Uplift)				
25.	Support for the floor area ratio approach introduced in draft Fishermans Bend Framework.	45, 64, 153, 212	We thank the submitter for their support.	CCZ
26.	The bases of the 75% of total sites developed by 2050, as stated as an assumption in the Urban Design Strategy and potential implications for exceeding population projections and the capacity of planned infrastructure.	129, 153, 168	The FAR, if delivered as described in the Framework will result in 80,000 residents and 40,000 workers. The delivery of an FAU is at the discretion of the Responsible Authority the FAU needs to be monitored to understand the degree to which developers choose to 'opt-in' and if necessary modified over time depending on market response.	CCZ
27.	The proposed floor area ratios in Lorimer are inadequate and will result in the underutilisation of the precinct.	79	Addressed in the expert evidence supplied by Leanne Hodyl of Hodyl and Co. See Section 4.2, Paragraph 125 – 128.	CCZ

28.	The proposed floor area ratio for Sandridge non-core area is too low.	220	Addressed in the expert evidence supplied by Leanne Hodyl of Hodyl and Co. See Section 4.2, Paragraph 125 – 128.	CCZ
29.	Sites within Montague are too small to warrant a floor area ratio of 3:1 in non-core and 6:1 in core area. The mandatory setbacks and controls aren't feasible in the Montague Precinct.	146	Addressed in the expert evidence supplied by Leanne Hodyl of Hodyl and Co. See Section 4.2, Paragraph 125 – 139.	CCZ
30.	Some of the submitters have requested that floor area ratio for their sites to be changed.	17, 58, 63, 67, 71, 83, 84, 90, 91, 94, 95, 96, 104, 130, 131, 135, 136, 143, 150, 173, 175, 182, 196, 217, 242, 250, 253	Addressed in the expert evidence supplied by Leanne Hodyl of Hodyl and Co. See Section 4.2	CCZ
Response to industrial interfaces				
31.	There are a number of heavy industrial businesses that we are unlikely to relocate due to the strategic importance of their site and business requirements. More detail is required on the interface between existing industrial occupiers and new developments.	40	There is no intention for any existing business to cease trading or relocate their business due the future development activities. Fishermans Bend currently contributes significantly to the economic wellbeing of Melbourne and it is important that this be allowed to continue as the transition from commercial/industrial land uses towards mixed-use occurs. We note Strategy 1.8.2 of the draft Framework requiring reverse amenity provisions. We also note application requirements within the CCZ that are designed to address this.	CCZ
Architectural excellence				
32.	Submitters have sought clarity on the role of architecture which has been explicitly referenced seven times in the Draft Framework - with reference to ensuring architectural diversity, protecting architectural heritage and to delivering	153, 160, 176, 185, 188, 253, 212	The Urban Design Strategy encourages architectural diversity and built form typologies. The visions for each precinct also encourage high quality urban character. The controls can be complemented by the establishment of a design review panel for Fishermans Bend similar to or using the Office of the	LPP

	architectural excellence and support the architectural design in Objective 1.9.6. Submitters have suggested a strategy which promotes design excellence by requiring developments to be assessed by an expert panel.		Victorian Government Architect's Design Review Panel. This has been recommended by the MAC and both councils. The inclusion of a review panel has merit and will be considered. This decision has no impact on the draft planning controls and will be determined later.	
Transport				
Timing for the provision of new and upgraded public transport infrastructure and services				
34.	Support for the provision of a metro line in Fishermans Bend. Requested certainty around the likelihood and timing of any potential train line.	24, 40, 63, 71, 73, 87, 90, 91, 94, 95, 96, 130, 131, 148, 157, 173, 182, 191, 206	<p>The draft Fishermans Bend Framework includes recommended options for the provision of transport in Fishermans Bend. These recommendations have been made to support land use planning and the development of the land use Framework, as well as to inform the development of the more detailed precinct plans.</p> <p>The transport recommendations have been informed by the Fishermans Bend Integrated Transport Plan which provides an assessment of the likely requirements for the transport network supporting the planning and development of Fishermans Bend out to 2050.</p> <p>The Fishermans Bend Integrated Transport Plan provides recommendations for the development of the Fishermans Bend transport network as it is developed overtime, in-line with population and employment growth.</p> <p>The draft Fishermans Bend Framework proposes a staged implementation of public transport, commencing with an upgrade of bus services which is already underway. It is proposed that this be followed by upgrades to and the introduction of new light rail (tram) services, and by heavy rail in the longer term.</p> <p>Detailed planning and full business case development will be required prior to any</p>	N/A

			government decision on the delivery of specific infrastructure.	
35.	The early delivery of the tram in the next 5 years.	34, 35, S40, 75, 77	See above.	N/A
Transport targets				
36.	The transport and mobility target of 80% of trips by sustainable transport may not be achievable.	74	<p>The potential for Fishermans Bend to be home to 80,000 people and 80,000 workers by 2050 presents a significant challenge to the existing transport network.</p> <p>The <i>Fishermans Bend Integrated Transport Plan</i> responds to this challenge by setting international best-practice targets, objectives and design principles that have informed the development of transport recommendations for Fishermans Bend.</p> <p>This includes prioritising planning of high-quality walking, cycling and public transport linkages to support meeting the target of 80 per cent of movements by sustainable transport.</p>	CCZ/PO
The proposed new tram bridge over the Yarra River				
37.	Some of the submitters supported the proposed tram alignment.	13, 46, 64, 101, 112, 122, 153, 188, 204	We thank the submitter for their support.	N/A
38.	Do not support the construction of the proposed tram bridge over the Yarra River at Yarra's Edge.	4, 5, 14, 15, 16, 18, 30, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 59, 60, 69, 77, 81, 85, 86, 97, 98, 99, 105, 107, 111, 113, 117, 119, 129, 132, 138, 144, 151, 155, 161, 174, 193, 216, 218, 225, 228, 231, 233, 235, 236	<p>Transport for Victoria assessed a number of possible tram alignments into Fishermans Bend, including a tunnel option.</p> <p>These assessments helped inform the recommendations made in the draft Fishermans Bend Framework.</p> <p>Further detailed planning and full business case</p>	N/A

			development, including consideration of all high capacity public transport alignment and construction options, as well as timing of delivery, will be required prior to any government decision.	
38.	The proposed bridge over Yarra River will devalue the properties in Yarra Edge.	8, 33	See response above.	N/A
39.	Further detailed information on the height and design of the bridge over Yarra River.	5, 124, 248	See response above.	N/A
40.	Further information on environmental impact of the tram and bus bridge over Yarra River.	7	See response above.	N/A
The function of various roads				
41.	Submitters raised concerns about Lorimer Street, as the road is currently at capacity with heavy traffic, is unsafe with the mix of users, has limited traffic management and is noisy. These issues will increase with a new signalised tram crossing and with the increase in container traffic from Webb Dock. The issues on Lorimer Street have not been addressed for many years and the draft Framework should provide alternate freight routes, restrict hours of operation, provide additional traffic control; road widening's, improve sight lines and improve pedestrian crossings.	24, 85, 97, 111, 122, 132, 161	<p>The draft Fishermans Bend Framework has considered the impact of growth on current traffic. The transport recommendations in the draft Fishermans Bend Framework provide a range of transport options for the community including access by private vehicle while increasing the usefulness of public transport, cycling and walking. A new connection between Fishermans Bend and the Bolte Bridge was opened in December 2017 (Cook Street connection) providing a more efficient exit point. Its impact on Lorimer street will be reviewed once full traffic conditions resume in early 2018.</p> <p>Transport for Victoria assessed a number of possible tram alignments into Fishermans Bend, including a tunnel option. These assessments helped inform the recommendations made in the draft Fishermans Bend Framework. Further detailed planning and full business case development, including consideration of all high capacity public transport alignment and construction options, as well as timing of delivery, will be required</p>	CCZ

			prior to any government decision.	
42.	Submitters have suggested to reduce the potential for Plummer and Fennell Streets to become a major vehicle thoroughfare by allowing only pedestrians, cyclists and public transport movements to have full continuous and unimpeded access along the full length in both directions.	153	The Plummer and Fennell civic spine will provide quality public transport, pedestrian and cycling connections through Sandridge and into Wirraway. Further detail, including cross sections for the road network will be developed as part of the detailed Precinct Plans.	CCZ
43.	Submitters suggested to change east west collector roads to local streets to ensure all collector roads in Sandridge and Wirraway are north south which distribute longer through vehicle trips to the existing arterial road network.	153	The transport recommendations in the draft Fishermans Bend Framework provide a range of transport options for the community including use local streets and arterial roads around Fishermans Bend. Further detailed information on transport networks, including the road network will be developed as part of the detailed Precinct Plans.	CCZ
Freight routes				
44.	Support for the provision of designated freight route through Fishermans Bend.	32, 45, 77, 125, 206, 232	We thank the submitter for their support.	N/A
45.	Concerns regarding the impact of proposed freight rail connection on the Marina. Consideration should be given to innovative technology to meet the freight demand.	59, 64, 108, 112, 114, 212, 129, 133, 134, 140, 144, 153, 166, 188	The draft Fishermans Bend Framework recommends safe guarding a future road and rail corridor to connect Webb Dock to Swanson/Appleton Docks which, depending on port growth, may need to be constructed over the next 40 years. The Westgate Freeway alignment is recommended for long term corridor protection as the strongest due to the ability to accommodate a road and rail corridor separated from other road users and provides a proposed future bridge of similar height to the Bolte Bridge across the Yarra River. The proposal indicated in the Integrated Transport Plan notes that the link would be at a similar height to the Bolte Bridge. Further detailed planning and full business case development for any possible future road and rail	N/A

			freight connection are yet to commence and will be required prior to any government decision.	
Pedestrian permeability				
46.	Submitters suggested to prioritise north south laneways in Sandridge and Wirraway (every 50 metres in core areas and every 100 metres in non-core areas) to increase pedestrian permeability and improve access to sunlight. Limiting east-west laneways will also assist in establishing a street block pattern that supports the feasibility of preferred built form typologies.	153	<p>The proposed laneway network is noted as indicative. There may be enhancements to the laneway network by prioritising the north south laneways in Sandridge and Wirraway Precincts rather than the east west laneways currently proposed, these would be agreed through future permit applications.</p> <p>Further detailed information on laneways will be developed as part of the detailed Precinct Plans.</p>	LPP
Car parking rates				
47.	Whilst it was acknowledged that there is a need to encourage alternative travel modes to reduce traffic associated with private motor vehicle trips, many submissions requested more car parking to be made available, as there is no direct correlation between car ownership, parking supply and traffic volumes. Submitters have suggested that the carparking rates be reconsidered.	24, 58, 67, 71, 80, 87, 90, 91, 94, 95, 104, 109, 115, 120, 128, 130, 131, 135, 137, 139, 146, 157, 173, 175, 185, 186, 188, 203, 205, 206, 208, 217, 222, 223, 226, 240, 242, 250	<p>The target for Fishermans Bend to achieve 80 per cent of trips by public and active transport has been outlined in the draft Fishermans Bend Framework. To assist achieving this target a more restrictive car parking ratio is proposed. This notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the recent trend across inner Melbourne to reduce car parking rates including vacancy rates in developments - reduced uptake of driving licences in younger people - approved applications within Fishermans Bend to date - future potential for autonomous vehicles to remove the need for in building car parking as these would be shared resources. <p>The planning of Fishermans Bend has been undertaken to ensure that daily needs including community infrastructure, open spaces and schools are within an easy walk from dwellings, this reduces the need for private vehicles.</p>	CCZ/PO

			<p>The planning of Fishermans Bend has been recommended to ensure that work and tertiary related needs can be met with strong public transport, walking and cycling options for residents and businesses.</p> <p>The planning controls allow the applicant to exceed the 0.5 spaces per dwelling rate subject to the approval of the responsible authority.</p>	
48.	Several submitters stated the introduction of the Parking Overlay schedule for the area was a significant mode shift and recommend this be rolled out across Melbourne.	212	See above response.	PO
49.	Some submitters requested stronger controls for no private cars be allowed and reliance be solely on transport links, walking, cycling, bike share, shop online delivery services, community buses, Uber and car share, therefore reducing the need for podiums for car parking.	227	See above response.	PO
50.	Submitters suggested that parking charges should be kept at a reasonable cost and kerbside parking should be maximised, incorporating smart parking rates to provide a diversity of mobility choices, market responsiveness and incentivise modal shift. Multi-level car parking needs to be provided adjacent to sports and recreation hubs.	149	See above response.	N/A
51.	Submitter did not support the retention of car parking areas in a single common property title or support the floor to ceiling	185	The requirement for adaptable car parking areas provides flexibility in future adaptation of buildings.	CCZ/PO

	heights to enable future adaptation, as this requirement will increase ramp lengths, make it difficult to accommodate in smaller lot sizes and is not flexible enough to permit beneficial design outcomes.			
52.	Include a new commitment for further work to review car and bike parking rates and car share arrangements that will help delivery the draft Framework's mode share targets.	153	Further detailed information on transport networks, including bike parking, will be developed as part of the detailed Precinct Plans.	PO
Traffic and cyclist safety				
53.	Submitters raised concern on the safety of proposed cycling routes when they cross the three main roads (Montague St, Ingles St and Bay St/Crockford St).	9, 140, 170	The detailed design of the cycle route will be developed for the precinct plans, however preliminary designs have attempted to reduce impacts to residents. There are no proposals to open current dead-end roads to vehicle traffic but rather to permit cyclists to utilise the route. To make the route attractive and safe a number of new signalised intersections will be required including at Ingles Street/Bay Street and Montague Street/Buckhurst Street. The route provides an important connection between the Montague Precinct and the CBD and Bay, including in the short-medium term the connection to the Bay Street activity centre.	N/A
54.	Support from submitters was provided for the expansion of budgeted bus services and for further services to be delivered early on dedicated routes on larger and minor roads to support usage. The submitters raised concern that said current bus services do not assist the congestion as long travel times are experienced and the light and heavy rail options, as not committed to, will not assist the problem in the short to medium term.	18, 32, 248	The public transport plan in figure 5 of the draft Framework displays a number of new and upgraded bus services. Where possible bus lanes will be introduced to enhance the operation of these services. Detailed cross-sections of streets will be developed as part of the detailed Precinct Plans.	N/A

Provision for electric cars				
55.	Submitters suggested a ratio of electric charging points be included in the streetscapes and within developments to support the transition to electric vehicles.	28, 29, 248	There are currently no guidelines in relation to electric charging points. We welcome further discussion on whether there is a need to set a ratio for electric charging points for future electric vehicles over time.	PO
Impact on the Port of Melbourne				
56.	Support for the protection and land use buffers and access to the Port of Melbourne.	170, 206, 153	The important role of the Port has been considered and is supported by the draft Framework and planning controls.	ESO
57.	Port of Melbourne should be recognised and protected in any further planning including precinct planning.	134	The precinct planning, including for the Port of Melbourne, whilst not including any of the current land zoned for port activities, will need to acknowledge the need for port buffers which are already in place, and be developed in a manner that ensures that the port continues to have access to the network. This is a key principle of the Fishermans Bend Integrated Transport Plan.	N/A
58.	Protection of the port and its long-term viability including its important relationship with the water.	170, 206	See response above.	CCZ
Infrastructure (including community infrastructure)				
Timing for delivery of infrastructure				
59.	Detailed timetable and implementation plan for required for the delivery of infrastructure in conjunction with population growth.	20, 142, 148, 153, 171, 183, 188, 212, 215, 247	The draft Fishermans Bend Framework includes recommended options for the provision of transport in Fishermans Bend. These recommendations have been made to support land use planning and the development of the land use	N/A

			<p>Framework, as well as to inform the development of the more detailed precinct plans.</p> <p>The transport recommendations have been informed by the <i>Fishermans Bend Integrated Transport Plan</i> which provides an assessment of the likely requirements for the transport network out to 2050, in-line with population and employment growth.</p> <p>Detailed planning and full business case development will be required prior to any government decision on the delivery of specific infrastructure.</p>	
60.	<p>Submitters have supported the delivery of community infrastructure as integrated hubs, however, they have raised concerns that there is no certainty that Floor Area Uplift (FAU) approach will be taken up by the market and will achieve delivery of the desired hubs. Submitters have requested for a funding plan to demonstrate the alternative funding mechanism for delivery of community infrastructure.</p>	20, 142, 148, 153, 188, 212, 215, 247	<p>We welcome the support for the delivery of community services in integrated hubs.</p> <p>Supporting the draft Framework is a draft Community Infrastructure Plan. This plan takes a strategic, spatial and long-term approach to the development of community facilities. The plan discusses two approaches to the delivery of community infrastructure (pg. 64–77 of the draft Community Infrastructure Plan). The first is the 'business as usual' approach or a standalone model and is commonly used by government to deliver community facilities. These are typically funded directly by government (via taxes, rates, grants and/or other means). The South Melbourne Primary School/community facilities in Montague Precinct is an example of this method of delivery.</p> <p>The alternative approach is to integrate the facility into a mixed-use development. A developer constructs the community facility to a specification prepared by the government. The facility is thus integral to the mixed-use development. This is the preferred mechanism for delivery of community infrastructure in Fishermans Bend. Once adopted, further details on the mechanism for delivery including the performance specifications will be</p>	CCZ

			<p>undertaken.</p> <p>An integration of community facilities into a mixed-use development is preferred as it allows risks to be better allocated between the public and private sector.</p> <p>There has been no decision taken as to which community facilities are delivered via either approach. The intent is to track market acceptance and then modify the delivery as necessary.</p>	
61.	<p>There is a strong support for delivering additional government primary schools and secondary schools in Fishermans Bend, however, there are concerns that the proposed number of government schools (4 primary schools and 1 secondary schools) won't be sufficient for the future population in Fishermans Bend by 2050. Submitters have sought further details and evidences to show the proposed number of government schools will meet the demand of future communities in Fishermans Bend.</p>	32, 125, 139, 168, 226, 247	<p>The location and number of schools in Fishermans Bend has been identified in collaboration with Department of Education and Training. Investigation areas have been identified in the draft Fishermans Bend Framework.</p> <p>The proposed timing for delivery of schools has been identified in Fishermans Bend Community Infrastructure Plan (page 67). The dates are indicative and assume population growth as projected. The Plan will be regularly reviewed as the population grows. There is scope for the delivery of schools via developers agreeing to 'opt-in' to the FAU process.</p>	N/A
62.	<p>Provision of a new 24/7 police station in Fishermans Bend has been requested by the submitters. The concern has been raised that currently there is a high crime rate in Port Melbourne and more rigorous plan is need for the safety of future communities.</p>	70	<p>Fisherman Bend currently does not justify the need for a dedicated police station. As the population increases the need for new station(s) will be required. The timing and location for these will be considered by a future government.</p>	N/A
63.	<p>Submitters have sought more clarification on 'investigation areas' identified for the location of future community</p>	20, 58, 84, 89, 96, 131, 163, 165, 205, 238	<p>Investigation areas identify the areas which are suitable for establishing each type of hub. Each area has been selected based on the proximity to public</p>	N/A

	infrastructure. They requested further explanation to describe how responsible authority will approach the sites which are located within investigation areas. There has been also a concern that the investigation areas were limited and should be broadened to provide more flexibility and increase the opportunities for delivery of community infrastructure.		transport and open space, and the vision for the precinct. Where there is interest from developers to provide one of the proposed community infrastructure hubs (identified in the Fishermans Bend Community Infrastructure Plan) within a location outside the investigation area, the responsible authority will review and assess the proposal.	
Impact on existing infrastructure				
64.	Concerns that the proposed controls do not go far enough to protect existing industries/warehouses that wish to remain in the Fishermans Bend area and which will need to operate in an environment with an encroaching residential population. The reverse amenity impact measure do not go far enough and that the amenity impacts plan required under the schedule to clause 34.07 needs to go into more detail with appropriate assessment criteria.	89	Businesses and jobs within Fishermans Bend are critical to a successful capital city zone. The draft Framework identifies the need for ongoing collaboration between businesses and government to ensure the impacts of reverse amenity between existing businesses and new residents particularly can be managed. See application requirement of the proposed CCZ schedule.	N/A
Open space				
65.	Support for the proposed open space target and network.	21, 64, 176, 180, 188, 229	The delivery of a quality network of public open space is important to ensure Fishermans Bend is a liveable place for residents and workers. We thank the submitter for their support.	CCZ
66.	More detail is required regarding the intended redesign and upgrade of infrastructure and facilities of existing open spaces.	21, 27, 195	The draft Framework is a high-level strategy and does not describe details on redesign or upgrades to the existing open spaces. These will be considered in the future plans, notably the precincts plans. These plans will be prepared in consultation with Council	N/A

			and will also be publicly consulted on prior to finalising.	
67.	The Go-Kart Track, Melbourne Grammar Sports Fields and Yarra River frontage should be for public use.	10, 21, 27, 139	<p>While we welcome the support for the wider use of existing sports fields, the Melbourne Grammar Sports Fields are privately run facilities subject to future agreements.</p> <p>The Go-Kart Track is identified as future open space in the Public Space Strategy, and included in the proposed public open space and green links within the Employment Precinct. Additional public open space in the Employment Precinct, including the Go Kart Track will be considered as part of the precinct planning. The Yarra River frontage between the Westgate bridge and Pier 35 is publicly accessible now. The balance to Bolte Bridge is subject to a lease as part of the Port of Melbourne and therefore not publicly accessible.</p>	N/A
68.	Greater detail on the future design and functionality of each of the open space, existing and proposed.	10, 27, 248	Design and function of open spaces will be further explored and identified as part of the precinct planning.	N/A
69.	Requests for changes to the proposed open space.	17, 21, 68, 89, 102, 109, 153, 162, 200, 238, 250	<p>The Public Space Strategy identified the need for a 200 metre walkable catchment of open space for every resident and worker. Open space in this area is required to meet this target.</p> <p>The locations of open spaces in the draft Framework were selected in the development of the Public Space Strategy and are supported strategies in Objective 3.7 – Ensure a distribution of diverse, well designed and safe public open spaces. A number of these open spaces are consistent with the Draft Vision 2013 document and the current Strategic Framework Plan July 2014 (amended September 2015).</p> <p>Requests for changes to open space through submissions have been reviewed by Joanna</p>	CCZ

			Thompson's expert witness statement and recommendations for changes have been identified in her statement. This is currently under consideration.	
70.	Further evidence and justification required for the location, size and design of public open space.	10, 87, 91, 130, 131, 139, 143, 157, 167, 169, 173, 222, 237	See above response.	CCZ
71.	Proposed open space will have a negative effect on existing industrial uses and existing open space uses.	163, 165, 252, 247	Public open space is planned to be delivered over time between now and 2050. Therefore, not all open spaces are required to be delivered early, and existing uses can continue to operate until land is required.	CCZ
72.	As existing open spaces should be excluded from the calculations of quantum of open space.	226	90 per cent of Fishermans Bend is privately owned and therefore existing open spaces were identified as significant opportunities. Over time these spaces are proposed to be redesigned and access increased through partnerships with key stakeholders that currently occupy these significant spaces. In this new high-density environment, all open spaces will need to support a multitude of activities.	CCZ
73.	Connections between open spaces within and outside of the study area should be identified in the draft Framework shown as links and loops.	21	These shall be identified in more detail in the precinct planning.	N/A
74.	Support for the 50% tree canopy cover target.	27, 188	The target of 50% tree canopy cover will reduce urban heat island effect. We thank the submitter for their support.	LPP
Economic viability				
75.	Concerns about the economic viability of the both the proposed and interim planning controls.	36, 58	Expert evidence provided by Luke Mackintosh of Ernst and Young has tested the development viability of both the interim and proposed control and confirmed that the development viability between the two is marginable.	Various

Heritage				
76.	Support the ambitious targets to retain and celebrate the social, intangible history and heritage. Further work needed to maintain and strengthen the cultural heritage of the area, into the precinct planning. Strengthen the importance of heritage in the sustainability goals.	22, 139, 219, 234, 247	We thank the submitter for their support. The places that are currently included within the heritage overlays have been identified through previous local and state government studies. The latest Heritage Study (Biosis 2016) recommends many other properties to be included, is currently being reviewed by both councils.	N/A
77.	Support for the respect, recognise and protect the Aboriginal history and heritage and the inclusion of Indigenous Australian 'caring for country' concepts in the Framework. Encouragement to continue working with the Aboriginal communities.	153, 214, 219, 234, 247	We welcome support for the inclusion of Aboriginal Australian heritage and Caring for Country concepts.	N/A
78.	Buildings identified by the Heritage Study are not worthy for recognition. Sites shown in framework for heritage protection that are not identified in the Heritage Study.	22, 57, 63, 149, 234, 238	The places that are currently included within the heritage overlay have been identified through previous local and state government heritage studies. The most recent Heritage Study (Biosis 2016) recommends additional properties to be included. This report is currently being reviewed by both councils.	N/A
79.	Heritage controls are not strong enough. Heritage properties identified in the City of Melbourne heritage study should have immediate protection. Ongoing heritage evaluation of sites should occur. Assessment of the GMH site should be undertaken as a matter of urgency.	219, 171, 64	We welcome support for the social history and heritage of the area and ongoing engagement of the community, and how this can be represented to create a distinct character for Fishermans Bend. Further investigation will be undertaken by the City of Melbourne as part of Employment Precinct planning.	N/A
80.	Greater recognition is required to retain the existing industrial buildings in the area to provide a uniqueness through the incorporation of them into new	64	We welcome support for the need to retain and build on Fishermans Bend's unique industrial heritage this will be further developed through the precinct planning.	LPP

	developments and as a fourth benefit under the proposed FAU.			
81.	Through ongoing planning, including precinct planning build on and celebrate each precincts history of innovation in science, engineering and technology in the precinct through urban design and other means.	22, 139, 219, 234, 247	See above response.	N/A
Sustainability				
82.	Support for the objectives and strategies within the draft Framework including biodiversity, net zero emissions, smart city approach to waste management.	23, 64, 206, 245	We thank the submitter for their support. The sustainability goals underpin the approach to the draft Framework.	LPP
83.	Further detail is required on planting strategies and maintenance programs for green infrastructure. Native and indigenous planting should be required.	28, 78, 125	This level of detail is not appropriate for inclusion in planning controls, but could be included in future guidance developed for applicants in the form of a fact sheet or further detail in the precinct plans.	LPP
84.	The 4 star green star rating is not high enough.	28, 39, 64, 92, 125, 139, 153, 160, 188	<p>While we would be very pleased to see developers aspiring beyond the certified 4 Star Green Star Design & As-Built (or equivalent certification scheme) minimum requirement, we are also aware that a large part of the market, in particular for residential development, has not yet adopted environmental certification and is relatively unfamiliar with the processes and requirements.</p> <p>The 4 Star level has been set to be achievable by all, while lifting the level of environmental performance of typical projects. We note that the requirements to achieve 4 Star Green Star will be increased over time by the GBCA, and we would also anticipate that future iterations of the planning controls for Fishermans Bend (and potentially across the City of</p>	CCZ

			Melbourne and Port Phillip) would require a higher star rating.	
85.	Further detail, additional and stronger sustainability targets such as net zero emissions and mode share targets are required.	139, 153, 160, 177, 188, 199, 212, 219, 224, 248	The sustainability targets have been developed to ensure the targets are achievable by 2050. The proposed targets balance the need for sustainability measures with the current technology and industry standards. Further detail and interim targets may be developed as part of the implementation plans.	N/A
86.	Further controls required to encourage the use of sustainable building materials, and supported the use of innovative techniques.	28, 75	It is difficult to include a planning control around sustainable building materials as there are a very wide range of approaches appropriate at different building types, scales and construction methodologies. However, Green Star Design & As-Built (and equivalent schemes) do include credits for sustainable and responsible building materials, which are sought by many developments.	LPP
87.	Support for green star communities and the requirement for buildings to achieve a certified Green Star Design & As-Built rating.	23, 28, 188, 206, 224, 245)	We thank the submitter for their support.	CCZ
88.	Suggest including a NABERS Energy Commitment Agreement requirement for appropriate building types. Submitters have suggested that ISCA (infrastructure sustainability) ratings are required for the construction and operation of open spaces.	54	We would be strongly supportive of developers of relevant building types committing to and achieving NABERS Energy and other NABERS performance ratings. However, Commitment Agreements are currently only available for commercial office developments which are not expected to be a primary development type across most of Fishermans Bend. Requiring development to be designed to perform in line with the relevant NABERS Energy rating could be included as a suggested additional target in future sustainability submission guidance provided to	LPP

			<p>developers.</p> <p>We agree that ISCA ratings would be an appropriate way to benchmark the sustainability performance of open space and other infrastructure, and would encourage relevant authorities to investigate this.</p>	
89.	Submitters supported the water management approach, in particular the sewer mine and third pipe requirements.	64	We thank the submitter for their support.	LPP
90.	Submitters noted potential opportunities for captured stormwater in the GMH site to be treated within Westgate Park to increase lake and wetland water levels.	10	A key objective of the sewer mine is to provide recycled water for irrigation to open spaces, including Westgate Park. Details of stormwater use within the GMH site have not yet been finalised.	NA
91.	Submitters suggested that a waste and contaminated soil management strategy is required. Submitters believe that organic waste collection systems should be mandatory in all buildings.	92, 125, 139, 188, 248	Contaminated waste and soil is managed via the relevant legislative framework. As there is currently very limited collection and treatment infrastructure for food waste in inner Melbourne, and also no well accepted building systems to separate food waste (particularly in high density residential developments), it is not yet possible to mandate this requirement.	LPP/EAO
92.	Submitters raised concerns that climate change impacts have not been fully considered in the draft Framework and asked for further information.	21, 125, 139, 153, 177, 212	In addition to the targets and strategies outlined in the draft Framework, and as well as the commitment to achieve a Green Star Communities rating, future work is planned to outline pathways to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions for Fishermans Bend, and to develop a Climate Change Readiness Strategy.	LPP
Environment				
93.	<p>Alternative mechanism used for flood mitigation ensuring this is to an adequate level. Including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The need for further detail in how flooding will be addressed. 	9, 45, 83, 153, 176, 188, 214, 227	Comprehensive flood mapping has been carried out across Fishermans Bend and extensive liaison is ongoing with councils and Melbourne Water to address existing and future flooding, including by increasing existing drainage. The range of climate	LPP

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Higher floor areas for retail and cafes are not useable. - No support for raised floor levels. - Flooding and drainage have not been resolved. 		change risks and open space/public realm responses will be integrated during the precinct planning stage. A future study will be developed to assess climate change risks and catalogue the range of responses, including those that can be provided by open space and the public realm. While an ideal solution to flooding might avoid raised floor levels, given the many constraints within Fishermans Bend it is anticipated that raised floor levels will still form part of any solution.	
94.	Further information on contamination having regard to past industrial activities. Alternative remediation mechanisms for a streamlined cost effect process.	83, 103, 116,125, 198	Potential ground contamination is a serious issue, and the protection of sensitive uses from contamination is important for the protection of human life. The application of the EAO to address this issue within Fishermans Bend is an important step to ensuring the safety of the residents and workers. The requirement for soil remediation has been imposed on the land zoned Capital City Zone within Fishermans Bend since the initial rezoning occurred in 2012. The changes proposed by the planning controls will make soil remediation requirements more transparent by applying the EAO.	EAO
95.	Consideration of potential impacts of major hazards facilities and pipelines.	189, 198	The management of infrastructure and development in proximity of the HPGTP would continue to be managed consistently with other high density inner city development such as Docklands and the CBD.	N/A
96.	How pollution from current industrial and commercial activities and traffic emissions from the M1 Westgate Freeway and Bolte Bridge will be managed.	198	The proposed Capital City Zone schedule includes an application requirement that developments within 100 metres of the West Gate Freeway incorporate noise attenuation measures in accordance with Australian Standard 2107 and SEPP N- 1. Airborne emission considerations are required in the applications for new existing industry or warehouse in the Capital City Zone. Further discussion on whether additional	CCZ

			requirements for emissions from the Westgate or Bolte Bridge are necessary are welcomed as part of the hearing process.	
Current permit application				
97.	The amendment should include transitional provisions.	57, 67, 68, 71, 87, 90, 94, 95,96, 104, 109, 120, 130, 143, 179, 182, 186, 187, 200, 203, 205, 207, 217, 223	Transitional provisions are not proposed. (see Part A response – paragraphs 231-235)	CCZ/DDO
98.	Support for the exclusion of transitional provisions.	153	See above.	CCZ/DDO
Governance				
99.	Requires a clear governance model to deliver the outcomes sought in the vision and draft Framework. This model should detail roles and responsibilities, leverage collective strengths of all stakeholders and enable a facilitation and brokering approach by government.	35, 45, 64, 66, 75, 103, 110, 139, 153, 176, 183, 188, 190, 205, 206, 215, 221, 224, 240, 245, 247	<p>Fishermans Bend is a large and unique urban renewal area and will require a governance model that recognises this.</p> <p>We note that current responsibilities for the delivery of Fishermans Bend are located with a number of different government organisations and have been successfully coordinated to date through the work of the Fishermans Bend Taskforce and cross-government cooperation group.</p>	N/A
Funding and finance				
100.	Lack of Fishermans Bend Funding and Finance Plan.	23, 35, 45, 58, 64, 68, 118, 135, 137, 139, 148, 153, 183, 188, 194, 205, 206, 208, 215, 238	<p>The draft Fishermans Bend Framework is a long term strategic plan for the development of Fishermans Bend to 2050. A plan for the indicative funding, finance, timing and delivery of infrastructure to support the renewal of Fishermans Bend is currently being prepared and will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How much funding will be required from the local, State and Federal Governments? - What fees and charges will apply to developers, residents and businesses and ensuring the fees and charges are economically viable? 	N/A

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The degree to which the Government borrows funds in advance of revenue to promote earlier development. - Which infrastructure is required up front and which can be delivered as the population grows? e.g. a delivery plan. - What balance is appropriate between one-off developer charges and annual residential charges? - What balance is appropriate between existing landowner charges and future developer charges? 	
101.	A staging plan and committed timeline for delivery of essential infrastructure such as tram line, walking and bike paths and community infrastructure is required. (Submitters 40, 64)		<p>The draft Framework recognises the important role catalyst projects play in developing the precinct and have identified the following for early delivery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bus and tram – planning has started - Sewer mine – planning has started - Montague Precinct School/park – underway - GM Holden site – underway 	N/A
102.	The lack of a Development Contributions Plan (DCP) and Development Contributions Plan Overlay (DCPO) in the planning scheme.	66, 148, 188, 220	Refer to the Fishermans Bend Taskforce Statement “Fishermans Bend Options for Funding of Open Space”, 14 March 2018 tabled with the Part B Submission.	N/A
103.	The 8% open space contribution in Lorimer and 5% in Employment precinct is not sufficient to deliver the quantity and quality of open space required.	118, 139, 153	<p>Funding sources, including any changes to the open space contributions, are to be considered as part of the Funding and Finance Plan.</p> <p>It is noted that both the MAC and City of Port Phillip have recommended a 10% open space contribution.</p>	N/A
104.	Submitters have concerns that significant increase in land value and subsequently land tax would have considerable impact on the small businesses.	40, 209, 232	Land tax is an issue beyond the scope of the draft Amendment and Framework.	N/A

Community engagement				
105.	Requests to be involved in on going engagement for the renewal of Fishermans Bend.	20, 21, 22, 73, 110, 176, 190, 247	<p>The Fishermans Bend Framework is a long term strategic plan for the development of Fishermans Bend out to 2050.</p> <p>The Fishermans Bend Taskforce will continue to engage with the local and wider community on the development of the Precinct Plans and would expect that there are ongoing opportunities for engagement are the renewal progresses.</p> <p>The Taskforce will continue to consult and connect with new and existing residents as the project evolves. Welcome packs have been distributed to new residents with information about the Fishermans Bend project and also key contact information for the local council.</p>	N/A
Background reports				
106.	Life on the Bend has led to damage of the memory of the Port of Melbourne due to the overemphasis on illicit activities	234	Life on the Bend was developed based on the available archives and evidence. As stated in the report, "the social history is deliberately concise. It is like a sketch of possibilities that might be explored by others in the future.	N/A
107.	The Community Infrastructure Plan should be adjusted to reflect projected demographic, spatial and social needs.	153	Draft Fishermans Bend Community Infrastructure Plan is a living document and will be updated to align with the population growth. It is anticipated it will be refreshed every 5 years.	N/A

Catalysts Projects				
108.	General Motors Holden site should foster interactions between start-ups and emerging/creative businesses, showcase innovation in building materials and have a considered infrastructure roll out.	40, 116, 232	As planning work progresses for the Employment Precinct the appropriateness and growth potential of various economic sectors will be further developed.	N/A
Panel Process				
109.	Timing of the Fishermans Bend Planning Review Panel hearing processed were raised.	68, 64, 95, 123, 130, 131, 135, 137, 141, 156, 162, 175, 207	Issues regarding the time available for submitters to prepare for hearing and engage experts were examined at the directions hearing on 20 December 2017.	N/A
Site specific/precinct specific concerns				
110.	A number of submitters raised site/precinct specific concerns.	Various	These will be addressed in evidence and through Part C submissions.	Various
Waste management				
111.	Whether existing transfer station will remain and if a new recycling resource centre is required. Higher levels of resource recovery of commercial waste should occur.	23, 153, 171	DELWP has been working with the MMRWG and councils to determine future approaches to waste and recycling within Fishermans Bend and the wider inner metropolitan area – work so far is outlined in the Waste Strategy and is ongoing.	LPP
112.	Changes to planning controls to strengthen the Waste Management of the planning controls, including the Resource Recovery Strategy being a reference document within the local planning policy.	92, 125, 139, 153, 188	The inclusion of the strategy is not required as the strategy already has sufficient strength as part of the draft Framework documentation.	LPP/DDO
113.	Support for the 8 sustainability goals and the Waste strategies.	92, 224	We welcome the ongoing support to drive better waste and recycling outcomes for Fishermans Bend and for inner metropolitan Melbourne.	LPP

114.	Sufficient waste disposal and collection schedules should be provided including private buildings and public realm bins.	23, 177	<p>The draft Framework does not address operational matters such as bin locations, however we would expect this to be part of a future waste and recycling operational strategy for open space and the public realm.</p> <p>Ensuring that space allocated for waste and recycling storage in developments is sufficient for the proposed collection timetable is already a component of mandatory Waste Management Plans, required as part of the development application process.</p>	LPP
Land acquisition				
115.	Detail and timing required regarding the mechanisms proposed for acquisition of land nominated for new streets, laneways infrastructure, and public open space.	37, 58, 64, 76, 80, 89, 98, 94, 95, 96, 116, 125, 130, 131, 141, 143, 145, 150, 153, 157, 163, 165, 167, 172, 173, 180, 182, 184, 188, 203, 205, 206, 208, 217, 220, 222, 238, 240, 242	Refer to the Fishermans Bend Taskforce Statement “Fishermans Bend Options for Funding of Open Space”, 14 March 2018 tabled with the Part B Submission.	CCZ

