This advice is in response to request: Provide an interim report to the IAC to be tabled at the commencement of the Hearing on Thursday 25 July 2019 which sets out, within my area of expertise:

a. The matters required by the PPV Practice Note – Expert Evidence including all facts matters and assumptions upon which I have proceeded;

b. The key issues, including whether the key issues I identified prior to the circulation of evidence have changed, and if so, how;

c. My expert view on the matters raised by paragraph 31 of the Terms of Reference in so far as they relate to the key issues you have identified;

d. Any areas in which I consider that there is insufficient information, having regard to the current and proposed future stages of the project (e.g. detailed design); and

e. Recommended changes to the approval documentation including the EPRs (if any).

Where referring to evidence, the EES or submissions please provide specific references.

List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DPO</td>
<td>Development Plan Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Planning Scheme Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAA</td>
<td>Works Approval Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Environmental Effects Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMF</td>
<td>Environmental Management Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPR</td>
<td>Environmental Performance Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWCHAC</td>
<td>Wurundjeri Woi-wurrung Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Corporation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Response to Practice Note Information

(i) Author:

Stephen Axford

(ii) Expert’s qualifications and experience:

Associateship in Architecture (WAIT) Bachelor of Psychology (UWA) (Environmental Psychology). I have twenty years experience practising as a registered architect, and twenty years experience practising as a specialist in urban design.

Further details are provided at Appendix 1

(iii) Expertise to make this report:

I have had extensive experience in major urban design projects including major road projects, in both government and the private sector.

From 1989 through to 2001 I was Manager and then Director of Urban Design for the State Government of Victoria. In this role I assessed a wide range of major projects and was responsible for developing the urban design brief for the City Link project, and providing input into the project implementation on behalf of the Ministry of Planning. I also played similar roles for other major state projects including the Melbourne Casino and the Melbourne Docklands project.

From 2001 to 2007 I was Director of Urban Futures Consulting within the Virtual Reality Centre of RMIT University. In this role I undertook large-scale 3D modelling projects applying emerging VR technologies, including visualisation studies for the Mullen Mullen Tunnel portals and vent stacks. These real time models were later modified to run on laptops and were used in consultation workshops with residents and stakeholders. Later we carried out visualisation studies on signage along the Eastlink project.

In 2007 Urban Futures Consulting became part of Urbis Pty Ltd and I joined Urbis as Director of Urban Design. In this role I provided design advice for major road systems in Dubai and was part of the successful Peninsula Link project team. My role included developing concepts for gateway treatments and art installations.

In 2011 I formed AXOS Urban Pty Ltd, a specialist Urban Design consultancy that has continued to carry out urban design projects mostly in China and the Middle East.

(iv) Any other significant contributors to the report and where necessary outlining their expertise.

Stephen Axford is the sole author of this report.
(v) All instructions that define the scope of the report (original and supplementary and whether in writing or oral).

I was appointed in May 2019 to prepare an independent peer review of the North East Link Urban Design Strategy April 2019 including the background studies; any relevant aspects of the Environmental Effects Statement.

I am also to review the Terms of Reference for the review Panel, and to review and comment upon the expert witness reports that will be provided to the Panel.

My terms of Engagement are included in Appendix 2

(vi) The identity of the person who carried out any tests or experiments upon which the expert has relied on and the qualifications of that person.

Not applicable

(vii) The facts, matters and all assumptions upon which the report proceeds.

My review is based upon a full reading of the Urban Design Strategy, and references to the Environment Effects Statement Technical Reports, and public briefings and statements by the project team. I have also attended the site inspection carried out with then Panel on Friday 12 July 2019. By arrangement with the Panel, I met with the urban design expert from NELP Mr Kevin Begg at the offices of NELP on Thursday 18 July 2019.

This discussion was confined to the following topics:
  - My background and role
  - The background to the development of the Urban Design Strategy
  - The involvement of the urban design team in the development of the reference design
  - The involvement of the Urban Design Advisory Panel
  - What resources in terms of modelling or visualisation were available
  - The participation of the urban designers in the community consultation process
  - The answers provided to my questions listed in my previous report.

Other than meeting with Panels Victoria to define my role and discuss procedural arrangements, and the meeting with Kevin Begg cited above, I have had no discussions about the project with either the project team or members of the Panel. All views provided in my reports are my own views and are not informed by any external inputs. My appointment details are provided at Appendix 1.
(viii) Reference to those documents and other materials the expert has been instructed to consider or take into account in preparing his or her report, and the literature or other material used in making the report.

EES Chapter 06 Project Development
EES Chapter 07 Urban Design
EES Chapter 08 Project Description
The Urban Design Strategy April 2019
Landscape and Visual Assessment Report
Early Design Schematics September 2018

(ix) A summary of the opinion or opinions of the expert.

In summary, I find that the appointment of an Urban Design Advisory Panel provides a sound basis for assessing the implementation of the Urban Design Strategy.

I also find that the involvement of the Wurundjeri Woi-wurrung Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Corporation is a particularly notable initiative. In my opinion, these two aspects are consistent with international best practice in urban design.

I find that the Urban Design Strategy sets an appropriately high standard of design objectives. However, I note that it is set at a very high level with effectively no place-based design studies, goals or examples.

I would normally expect an Urban design Strategy to provide specific design directions at least for key locations or opportunities.

This is mitigated to a large extent by two factors:

• The involvement of the Urban Designers including the Urban Design Advisory Panel in the project development, with an expectation that this involvement will continue through to a competitive selection process

And

• The identification of a number of major elements such as land bridges, shared pathways and major sound walls in the Reference Design.

I understand the intention in adopting this broad approach is to encourage project teams bidding for the delivery of this project to compete on design excellence and not be limited by a set of conceptual designs.

While I accept this is a legitimate goal, to be confident that an acceptably high standard of urban design will be achieved the Panel may wish to inform itself about the details of the delivery process. At this point I do not have sufficient information to assess this, however I raise a number of questions that should assist the Panel to reach a level confidence.

A difficulty in the proposed approach is that much of the design development will occur within the bid stage of the project. The need to formalise and control communications during this phase and ensure the bid consortia have equal access to information could
make the exchange between the NELP design team / UDAP and the bid teams difficult. This is in a situation where the NELP team have the benefit of two plus years of engagement with the challenges faced location by location.

The alternative approach that I favour would be for the Urban Design Team with the assistance of the Urban Design Advisory Panel to prepare more detailed studies that illustrate by way of either examples, what it would see as an appropriate outcome at least for key locations. This could derive from the reference design, and provide cross-references to the detailed example provided in the Urban Design Strategy.

This point reinforces my earlier observation that the examples provided in the Urban Design Strategy could in some cases be broadened, and it would assist if they were tied to specific locations and opportunities.

Land bridges are one area where I feel further examples could be provided. In my experience this technique can serve multiple roles, such as providing continuity for landscape and habitat, providing recreational links, and providing urban connections. They can also be places of activity in themselves, for example by providing viewing points taking advantage of the fact that there will be little obstruction to long distance views along the road corridor.

I have previously identified there is an opportunity to provide a recreational / habitat link where an extended pedestrian bridge is shown over the widened M80. The present pedestrian bridge links Macorna Street to the Darebin Creek trail. A land bridge in this vicinity could more effectively link the Plenty Gorge Parklands to the residential areas of Watsonia North that include significant open spaces such as Binnark Park and the Maroondah Aqueduct reserve.

(x) A statement identifying any provisional opinions that are not fully researched for any reason (identifying the reason why such opinions have not been or cannot be fully researched).

In my opinion there is a reasonable case to make that the road interchange into Manningham Road has excessive costs in terms of the land uses lost to the long term; or the potential restrictions on future uses, caused by the extent of the interchange.

I query if the on and off ramps could be tightened in their layout to maximise the opportunities to redevelop the land in and around the interchange. The character of Manningham Road is clearly not that of a freeway; in principle I would expect that the transition from freeway to local arterial should mostly occur within the freeway corridor allowing the local road to be accessed via urban road layouts. For example, I think the reference design achieves this quite effectively at Grimshaw Street.

However, it is difficult to evaluate the net community benefit at this interchange in the absence of studies that examine how the land could be best used, including the possible return of light industry.

An option would be to make this a priority issue for exploration by the competing bidders.
I also query if the long exit ramp to Plenty Road at the M80 interchange is an ideal solution. On the same principle of the freeway absorbing transition, I suggest it may be preferable to keep drivers heading to Plenty Road within the freeway corridor until closer to the junction point, where a normal length off ramp and deceleration to a local road environment could occur.

I would expect that an early junction as presently shown in the reference design will not be intuitive for drivers and there would be an expectation of maintaining freeway speeds as close as possible to the junction with Plenty Road. The urban design implication is reduced the opportunity for landscape buffers between the freeway and housing.

The Urban Design Strategy does identify minimising the footprints of road infrastructure as a general goal; my preference is that specific locations could be identified where this should be achieved.

(xii) Declaration

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

Stephen Axford
24 07 2019
2 Further Information

(i) Question

In my previous report I listed a number of questions. Answers in brief were provided in the written evidence of Mr Begg; these answers were expanded upon in the meeting discussed above. In the following section I list the questions and discuss the response.

What technical support will be available to the Wurundjeri Woi-wurrung Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Corporation?

RESPONSE: NELP has entered into an agreement with WWCHAC that includes technical support for technical advisors and elder involvement in the project to date. Activities that have been addressed under this agreement include the EES review through the Technical Reference Group, development of the UDS, Cultural Values Mapping and development of a Cultural Heritage Management Plan. NELP is working with WWCHAC on establishing WWCHAC’s role through the procurement process.

Discussion
I believe the Panel can be confident that the WWCHAC will be provided with appropriate support to be able to input into with project. I think this is important, as this initiative is a key opportunity to achieve unique urban design outcomes that have authentic cultural content.

What will be the involvement of the Wurundjeri Woi-wurrung Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Corporation with the Urban Design Advisory Panel?

RESPONSE: It is expected that WWCHAC would participate in UDAP workshops, where issues relating to Wurundjeri cultural values and representation are addressed. NELP is working with WWCHAC on establishing WWCHAC’s role through the procurement process.

Discussion
I accept it is reasonable that the ongoing role of the WWCHAC is an evolving process.

Have any specific opportunities or locations for expressing indigenous culture been identified?

RESPONSE: No specific opportunities or locations for expressing indigenous culture have been identified. Traditional Owner values and culture should be considered across the entire extent of the project, in accordance with Key Direction 3 on pages 17 and 18 of the Urban Design Strategy. This would include opportunities and initiatives beyond decorative art.

Discussion
I accept it is reasonable that specific opportunities have not yet been identified. I believe it is important to allow the WWCHAC to consider opportunities in their own time, and to be able to limit the use of their cultural content if they are not confident that it will be used in an appropriate way. However I think it is important to aim for widespread involvement. I think there will be particular opportunities where the freeway passes through or under areas sensitive...
to the WWCHAC, so that road users could be exposed to appropriate cultural messages or themes.

Equally there will be opportunities at the small scale in areas outside the freeway experience, such as along trails or on land bridges where installations such as artworks and indigenous planting could be incorporated.

What are the details of the curatorial process described in Key Direction 3?

RESPONSE: WWCHAC and NELP are developing a process where WWCHAC is involved throughout the project to guide the development of design initiatives and ensure they best represent and celebrate the culture and values of the Wurundjeri Woi-wurrung people. It is expected that this process would involve UDAP workshops.

Discussion
I believe the Panel can be confident that an effective process is being applied that will avoid a major error such as tokenism or cultural misappropriation.

Are there national or international examples that could assist in identifying opportunities for expressing indigenous and local community sense of place?

RESPONSE: Contractors would be provided with possible themes and precedent examples identified by WWCHAC. Design initiatives and opportunities would be identified and developed by contractors, with positive guidance provided by WWCHAC and UDAP.

Discussion
I noted that there were no such examples in the Urban Design Strategy as published. However I believe the Panel can be confident that with the support of the UDAP an appropriate range of examples will be provided to contractors.

Are the locations visualised within Appendix H considered sufficiently extensive by the Urban Design Advisory Panel?

RESPONSE: The NELP LVIA team has used a recognised methodology to identify sensitive receptors and appropriate locations for visualisations. UDAP is not part of the review process of the LVIA methodology.

Discussion
I understand that the Urban Design team including the Landscape and Visual Impact assessment team have had access to extensive 3D modelling from early in the process. This has included LIDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) based models of the existing terrain and progressive 3D models of options under consideration. I believe the Panel can be confident that the design teams had access to accurate site data in order to assess sensitive viewing positions.

Should the Urban Design Strategy provide guidance to bidders about the extent of visual communication that will be required in order to communicate project proposals to the stakeholders and the broader community?

RESPONSE: The Urban Design Strategy describes project requirements for design content and not design deliverables. Technical documents for the Request for Proposal process will set out
the format of key documents and deliverables. These design deliverables would be developed to ensure that the community receives sufficient information about the final design. A public display of the Urban Design Landscape Plans is a requirement of the Secondary Consent process.

Discussion
I believe that the complexities and scale of a major road project means it will not be sufficient to rely on traditional plans, elevations and static model views. This is particularly important for communicating with stakeholders and the community.

In my view the optimum modelling format for a major road project at this scale would be a real time model that allows viewers to select a wide range of viewing positions rather than relying on pre-selected static viewpoints. I acknowledge that such a model could have a lower resolution than possible with photomontages but has the advantage of providing a realistic experience particularly for community consultation. An option is to have a combination of basic real time modelling and more detailed static views or pre-selected animations.

I think this is particularly important since much of the detailed design resolution is expected to occur by the project bidders in the procurement stage.

Would it assist readers if the physical vision described in Section 3.2 was summarised within a paragraph or two within the summary at Page 4?
RESPONSE: The physical vision of the project would be generated by the contractors and not prescribed in the Urban Design Strategy. Section 1.4 on page 4 provides a high level vision in “A legacy for Melbourne” and defines the role of urban design. Section 3.2 on pages 14 to 26 outlines key design directions and does not describe an overall vision.

Discussion
I agree that within the Urban Design Strategy there are directions that together make up a vision. However, I find that the Introduction which is labelled “Urban design vision” fails to articulate any design vision.

Given the intention to run a competitive design process as part of the procurement process, I think it is important to set a high-level design vision early in the strategy.

From my reading of the strategy I suggest this could include:

- Recognition of the design heritage of major road projects in Victoria from City Link forward
- An intention to add to this heritage with a world standard road experience
- A freeway experience that reflects the environments and places the system moves through to provide an engaging experience for freeway users
- An enhanced experience for individual localities that minimises local impacts, enhances local amenity and provides improved connectivity across the system for local road users, pedestrians and cyclists.

Could the examples that show integrated art be identified and discussed (for example, Figure 83 page 105, Urban Design Strategy)?
RESPONSE: Integrated art would be proposed by contractors.

Could examples of individual artwork as placemaking at various scales be provided?
RESPONSE: Scale and extent of integrated art would be proposed by contractors.

**Could a commentary on public art be included in the Urban Design Strategy to address items such as appropriate collaborative processes, selection of artists, artists’ rights, etc.?**

RESPONSE: Nature and procurement of integrated art would be proposed by contractors.

**Discussion:**
I believe the Urban Design Strategy does not adequately present the heritage of public art in previous road projects, such as curated individual pieces such as in Eastlink and integrated art in sound walls or landscape art in the Peninsula Link project.

I believe the experience in these projects shows that there are different roles for integrated art and procured artworks, with each having advantages for different contexts. Examples of integrated art include artist / designer input into structures such as bridges and sound walls; while procured artworks have provided landmarks and gateways along Eastlink and Peninsula Link.

I feel the Urban Design Strategy would be improved by a discussion of these examples and the situations where artwork may be the appropriate response.

I also suggest the Strategy would be improved with a discussion on opportunities for community art projects particularly at the local level. I would define a community art project as a suitably qualified artist working with community members such as local schools or community groups, to develop a concept. I think community art projects could be particularly applicable to decorate the local side of infrastructure such as sound walls where they may be at risk of vandalism or there is an opportunity to enhance local identity.

**Could the overall footprints of the proposed portals (including ventilation buildings and structures) in the reference design be included in the Urban Design Strategy?**

RESPONSE: The reference design has not been included in the Urban Design Strategy, as the reference design is a functional design that illustrates certain technical requirements. Any inclusion of the reference design in the Urban Design Strategy, including the footprints of the portals, would be too prescriptive, inferring a pre-determined outcome and restricting innovation and flexibility of design options.

**Discussion**
Generally, I would expect an Urban Design Strategy to identify key challenges and opportunities such as ventilation structures and tunnel portals. I understand that the intention of the Urban Design Strategy is to avoid prescription and to encourage an element of design competition within the procurement stage.

I accept that the involvement of the UDAP will assist this process.

However, I note that the reference design illustrates items such as ventilation structures, tunnel portals and major sound walls across the entire system; I still feel that the Strategy would be improved by cross retrenching to the reference design, which will be available to the bidders in any case.
(ii) **Question**

Please list any further requests for information that have arisen from your further review of the documents

(iii) **Response**
3 Key Issues

(i) Question
Please list the issues that you consider to be the key issues arising from the proposed project relevant to your expertise and falling within the scope of the IAC’s Terms of Reference.

(ii) Response
1. The proposed involvement of the Wurundjeri Woi-wurrung Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Corporation.
2. The role of the Urban Design Advisory Panel.
3. The reliance on the project bidders to develop detailed urban design responses, which I suggest leads to a need to define the procurement process and ensure a competitive design process, is achieved.
4. The need to differentiate the design challenge between the high speed and low speed experience.
5. Providing an engaging user experience for users of the freeway that reflects the environments through which the freeways move.
6. Mitigating the barrier to movement caused by road in trench with effective use of land bridges and other links.
7. Ensuring the procurement process provides for an effective way to allow design development including the ongoing role of the urban design team including the Urban Design Advisory Panel and the Wurundjeri Woi-wurrung Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Corporation.
8. Consideration for how engagement with stakeholders and community can take place within a competitive process.
9. Ensuring project bidders and ultimately the selected contractor provide a range of visualisation products that will facilitate stakeholder engagement.

(iii) Question
In a document dated 17 June 2019, you identified a number of issues which you considered to be the key issues arising from the proposed project relevant to your expertise and falling within the scope of the IAC’s Terms of Reference.

If your list above differs from the list previously provided, please provide a brief explanation for the change.

(iv) Response
As I have been informed that much of the design development will be expected to be carried out by the contract team it places added importance on ensuring that there is an effective Public Private Partnership
4 Precincts

4.1 Are the three precincts identified in the Urban Design Strategy sufficient?

(i) Question
Submitter 30(b) suggest the three precincts identified in Key Direction 5 – Ridgeline; Yarra River Valley and Koonung Creek Valley; are descriptive of the areas but are too high level to provide effective guidance for an Urban Design Strategy.

(ii) Response
I note that each of these precincts would account for an approximate twenty-minute experience for the freeway user. I think this is an appropriate duration to present a consistent character response for the driver, considering the speeds involved.
I agree at the local level, for local drivers, cyclists and pedestrians, this level of analysis is too broad.
However, I find this is addressed to a large extent in the Place Specific requirements that with a series of maps identify local opportunities and features.
As I have noted elsewhere, I think this would be improved by cross-referencing to the reference design to locate the opportunities within a 3D visualisation.
I am confident that bidders understand the role of a reference design and will not feel constrained by the examples illustrated in the reference design.

(iii) Question
Submitter 30(b) also suggests that the reference design is “land hungry”. This suggests the footprint of the new roads, new off ramps and interchanges are excessive and as a result the proposed project fails to achieve its urban design objectives.

(iv) Response
I agree that the reference design illustrates that the project would involve some large footprints.

For example, the Bulleen Road / Eastern Freeway / North East Link interchange involves the loss of parkland and sporting facilities.

The section north of Lower Plenty Road alongside Simpson Barracks to Blamey Road involves a section of open trench that potentially divides the Barracks and its associated treed environment from Greensborough Road and the residential area to the west.

This then extends as cut and cover tunnel towards Grimshaw Street, involving the need to resume some housing and loss of habitat.
Examination of the EES Chapter 6 (Project Development) shows that alternatives were explored, and I am confident that the reference design illustrates a reasonable footprint to meet the project objectives.

I note that the interchange at Bullen Road is a freeway-to-freeway transition; as such it would be expected that access ramps would require a relatively large radius. There may be some scope for tightening the layout in design development, however unless the road is downgraded by its nature the interchange will require a large space.

I am satisfied that the section of road in trench and cut and cover tunnel has been chosen for sound reasons, given the need to maintain reasonable grades to Grimshaw Street. I note that the reference design indicates a series of land bridges in this location that I am satisfied will mitigate the impacts of the road in open trench.

However, I agree it is important that the objective of minimising the impact of the road infrastructure is emphasised throughout the delivery stage.

I note that minimising the impacts of the road is an objective in the Urban Design Strategy and I would expect the UDAP will pursue this objective. I also think that effective urban design measures such as screen planting and well designed sound walls can assist mitigate the broader impacts of the road footprint.
Appendix 1

EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS
STEPHEN AXFORD FRAIA

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

SUMMARY

Qualifications and Affiliations

Associateship in Architecture, Western Australian Institute of Technology (WAIT), 1974

Registered, Architects Board of Western Australia 1976-1983 (transferred to Architects Registration Board of Victoria)

Bachelor of Psychology, University of Western Australia, 1980

Fellow, Australian Institute of Architects

Foundation Member, Urban Design Forum

Member, Victorian Planning and Environmental Law Association

Former Committee Member, Inner Melbourne Planning Alliance

Board member, the Habitat Trust, Melbourne.

Foundation Member, Australian Urban Systems (AUS)
STEPHEN AXFORD FAIA

Professional Experience

Selected projects with significant heritage components:

SESSIONAL MEMBER, VCAT
Planning and Environment List; Urban Design
June 2016-ongoing

Summary:
40 plus cases in the previous 36 months; sitting as a specialist member in architecture and design; The majority have been Major Cases and mostly mid to high density residential or mixed-use developments within established areas. This requires a careful assessment of both context and planning policy. I have had to become familiar with the operation of planning tools such as Structure Plans, Design and Development Overlays, Development Plan Overlays and related strategy plans.

I have also sat on several major sign cases, including the application of electronic signs to buildings and structures, and in one case the use of projections systems across the airspace of unrelated buildings. This raised complex questions of planning policy and law.

Several of the cases involved heritage matters and I am required to assess expert witness evidence from Heritage experts and balance this evidence across the requirements of the planning framework.

This has enhanced my understanding of heritage policy and its application in practical environments.

DIRECTOR,
AXOS Urban Pty Ltd
2011 – on-going

Managing Director responsible for all professional activities;
Project leader for major urban design projects;
Expert input for urban design, visual impact assessment, Heritage Impact Assessments (HIS); urban context analysis; site analysis; community consultation and engagement.
University of the UAE Al Ain: Library Renewal and Extensions

In 2017-2018 I was engaged to review the planning for a new library at the University of the UAE, and prepare a design brief and concept plan that would form a reference design for subsequent tenders. The UAEU is the leading government university in the Emirate of Abu Dhabi.

The project required a comprehensive assessment of the site and context, and lead to a review of the University Masterplan as it affected the library. The project then developed into a first stage that identified short-term works to the existing library to modernise the interior design and introduce missing elements such as meeting rooms, study hubs, cafes, and indoor-outdoor space. The second stage saw the development of a concept design for a major new wing and landscaped garden setting.

This project required the careful assessment of context including engaging with the local culture and the specific goals of the University. As of June 2019 the stage one works are well under way and AXOS is continuing to provide advice to the University as it prepares to commence Stage 2.

Client:
University of the UAEU
Dean of Libraries Ms Janette Wright

103 Beach Street, Port Melbourne: multi-level mixed use development opposite Station Pier, Port Melbourne.

Responsible for concept design, urban design and planning report; obtaining the heritage approval including liaison with Heritage Victoria, preparation of the Heritage Impact Assessment in accordance with the Heritage Act (Victoria); and management of the town planning permit process.

I also managed a cultural impact assessment in association with a qualified archaeologist, to assess potential impacts on indigenous heritage. We were successful in obtaining both heritage and planning permits in 2016.

Client:
Key Infrastructure Pty Ltd
Contact: Bruno Gatsby

Ballarat West Employment Zone:
Planning framework and Urban Design Framework

Project involved the preparation of an overall masterplan and Design Guidelines for the development of an industrial estate on the former World War II airfield site, Ballarat. This site was a significant location for both RAAF and USAF bomber training during the war, with a number of important buildings to be retained and a
former runway alignment to be preserved and retained with appropriate landscape and architectural guidelines for new development.

Involved assessment of the sensitive heritage fabric, development of a masterplan framework to provide for new access roads, open space and industrial development sites. A key goal was to recognise and preserve the historic structure, and development of design guidelines to guide new development to respond in a creative way to the historic fabric.

The guidelines also proposed public art projects to assist to identify different precinct and assist in wayfinding.

Client: City of Ballarat and State Government of Victoria via Echelon Planning Pty Ltd.
Contact: Sarah Ancell

Other major projects that involved significant heritage components include:

- **Corowa Town Centre Revitalisation project 2016**
- **Guandong China, Masterplan for a new city centre. 2014**
- **Shire of Baw Baw Settlement Strategy 2012**

**DIRECTOR, URBIS Pty Ltd**

2005-2007

Project leader, urban design. Responsible for preparation of Urban Context Reports and planning report applications; Urban Design Frameworks; Master planning projects; Urban Design Guidelines

Design team leader, **Dubai Urban Development Framework**, 2007-2008

2007- 2011

**OFFICE MANAGER, URBAN DESIGN, URBIS PTY LTD** (Part time- sub contracted from Urban Futures Consulting.)

Management of International Urban design team; key input into project reports, design studies and design analysis.

On-site project delivery for projects in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia and various projects in China.

Key contributor to the **Umm Al Quwain Urban Design Framework** project, for which I developed a local heritage policy and framework to recognise the early earth structure buildings, and develop planning controls to provide for the retention of identified heritage assets and the

**DIRECTOR, URBAN FUTURES PTY LTD and the Urban Futures Laboratory, RMIT**

2001-2007
Responsible for overall business development and management; Research and Development in conjunction with RMIT’s Virtual Reality Centre; development of protocols for developing 3D City Models; Liaison with clients and authorities; leading the implementation of 3D digital design in numerous projects with significant heritage impacts, including Eastlink: Tunnel portals and ventilation stacks; Tunnel lighting and freeway signage. City of Melbourne Bourke Street Mall project; Victoria Markets Height Studies; City of Manningham Height Studies; Cities of Parramatta and Blacktown strategic planning studies; City of Dandenong City Centre planning, arts and railway bridge projects;

DIRECTOR, URBAN DESIGN, DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE STATE GOVERNMENT OF VICTORIA 1997-2001

Overall direction of the Urban Design Unit; Responsibility for design assessment and advice to the Minister and Department; Development of Projects and Programs including design guidelines; urban design planning notes; urban design policy; and the development and implementation of the urban design programme “Pride of Place”: a grants programme that funded both urban design studies and frameworks as well as capital works across Victoria, running over four years and across two governments.

Responsible for liaison with Heritage Victoria to coordinate the assessment of all major projects in the State and the development of appropriate urban design policy.

Melbourne Docklands: prepared the first urban design guidelines for the Docklands area and later represented the Department on project assessment panels.

City Link: Developed the Urban Design brief for the first City Link project, introducing the concept of public art to be integrated with the design of sound walls, infrastructure and gateways/landmarks.

Represented the Department for several planning panels and on the Architects Registration Board of Victoria and the Architects’ Disputes Tribunal; Represented the Department on the State Public Arts committee and the Melbourne City Council Public Art committee.

Prepared by Stephen Axford
July 2019
Appendix 2

Terms of Appointment
14 May 2019

Mr Stephen Axford

Via e-mail

Dear Stephen

North East Link Project: Provision of Expert Advice to Inquiry and Advisory Committee

The Inquiry and Advisory Committee (IAC) for the North East Link Project appoints you to advise in the area of Urban Design in accordance with clause 4 of the IAC’s Terms of Reference.

Attached is Planning Panels Victoria’s Practice Note on Expert Evidence. Please read and familiarise yourself with this practice note, even if you have read it many times before. You will need to ensure that you comply with the requirements of the Practice Note at all times, with any necessary adjustments required as a result of any directions issued by the IAC. Any report you issue should make the declaration outlined in the Practice Note.

Scope of Task

There will need to be some flexibility in the task to account for material that comes forward in evidence and the Hearing but the scope is anticipated to be as follows.

1. Review the IAC’s Terms of Reference.
2. Review relevant (to your area of expert advice) parts of the Environment Effects Statement (including EMF and EPRs), Planning Scheme Amendment and Works Approval Application.
3. Provide a brief written statement to the IAC (a template will be provided) by noon on Monday 17 June 2019 which addresses, in dot point form, those matters relevant to your expertise and within the scope of the IAC’s Terms of Reference as follows:
   a. Identification of critical issues; and
   b. Requests for information from the Proponent, including points of clarification arising from your review of the EES material, which are necessary to inform your expert opinion on the key issues that you have identified.

Requests for information should be made in respect of key issues only and should be referable to the IAC’s Terms of Reference.

Your request will be attached to the IAC’s request for information to the Proponent to be tabled at the Directions Hearing on 21 June 2019.

4. Review the expert evidence filed by other parties in so far as it relates to your area of expertise.

5. Provide an interim report to the IAC (a template will be provided) to be tabled at the commencement of the Hearing on Thursday 25 July 2019 which sets out, within your area of expertise:
   a. The matters required by the PPV Practice Note – Expert Evidence including all facts matters and assumptions upon which you have proceeded;
   b. The key issues, including whether the key issues you identified prior to the circulation of evidence have changed, and if so, how;
c. Your expert view on the matters raised by paragraph 31 of the Terms of Reference in so far as they relate to the key issues you have identified;
d. Any areas in which you consider that there is insufficient information, having regard to the current and proposed future stages of the project (eg detailed design); and
e. Recommended changes to the approval documentation including the EPRs (if any).

6. Review any technical responses provided by the Proponent to the IAC’s requests for information in so far as they fall within your area of expertise, as and when required, and provide a written response, if requested to do so.

7. Provide written responses to any questions that the IAC asks of you during the Hearing.

8. Provide counsel assisting with any questions you have of the expert witnesses called by the parties. Depending upon time availability, this may be done orally or in writing.

9. Attend the Hearing, by agreement with the IAC, and particularly the relevant expert session(s).

10. Review the Proponent’s proposed changes to the approval documents (if any) and any other party’s suggested changes to the approval documents referred to you by the IAC.

11. Following the completion of expert evidence in your area of expertise, provide a brief final report to the IAC no later than five days before closing of the Hearing which complies with the PPV Practice Note – Expert Evidence and sets out:
   a. any changes of opinion since your interim report (if any) and the reason for that change in opinion; and
   b. your opinion on the latest version of the Proponent’s proposed approval documents (if any) and any other party’s suggested changes to the approval documents.

12. Other activities by agreement.

Project Management

13. Day to day liaison will be through the project team in the Planning Panels office on planning.panels@delwp.vic.gov.au or (03) 8392 5120.

14. The IAC’s legal counsel will assist in any Hearing preparation required.

15. If you have any questions about the terms of your engagement, or any questions about the facts and assumptions upon which you are to proceed, this should be done formally and in writing. If possible, please make this request in one email, rather than in multiple emails.

16. All of your written advice to the IAC will be placed in the public domain. All other formal communications with the IAC may be placed in the public domain including this commissioning letter.

17. As per usual for this type of appointment remuneration will be at normal Panel rates.

If you have any queries please contact Amy Selvaraj at Planning Panels Victoria on (03) 8392 5120 or planning.panels@delwp.vic.gov.au. Can you please confirm via e-mail or correspondence your acceptance of this brief and the scope of the task as outlined.

Yours sincerely

Nick Wimbush
Inquiry and Advisory Committee Chair