



Community Submissions on the Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area  
C/- Places Victoria  
GPO Box 2428, Melbourne 3001.

**By email to to [fishermansbend@places.vic.gov.au](mailto:fishermansbend@places.vic.gov.au)**

Friday, 22 November 2013

RE: Community Submissions on the Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area Draft Vision

To whom it may concern,

Please find attached a submission from the Community Alliance of Port Phillip, an incorporated association in Victoria, registration number A0039171K. The Community Alliance of Port Phillip (CAPP) was formed in 1998 and is a City of Port Phillip wide network of hundreds of residents campaigning for a strong, democratic and progressive local government and community.

CAPP Executive formed a sub-committee earlier in the year to facilitate discussion around the issues and opportunities presented by the proposed Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area. CAPP organised a very successful 'Fishermans Bend Community Forum' on 7 July 2013 at the former South Melbourne Commons. You can read the report on the forum at [http://www.capp.org.au/library/FB\\_Forum\\_Summary\\_Report.pdf](http://www.capp.org.au/library/FB_Forum_Summary_Report.pdf)

Moving forward from the forum, the sub-committee worked on a number of projects including forming the 'Fishermans Bend Network'. This network is a collaboration of various community groups in a broad based alliance to keep the community informed of developments, and to respond to issues as they arise,.

Encapsulating many of the issues that have been raised by the community in consultation, CAPP and the Fishermans Bend Network prepared a 'Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area Community Response Tool-Kit' which can be downloaded from <http://www.capp.org.au/library/FBURACommunityResponseToolKitv1.pdf>

The attached submission is a product of several months work by CAPP, many other local community groups and individual members of the local community. It reflects community discussion and analysis of the issues surrounding the Urban Renewal Area, as well as being a direct response to the Victorian State Government's Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area Draft Vision and Interim Guidelines.

Please accept this submission for inclusion in further discussion on the future of this important urban development in our own inner suburban community.

Yours Sincerely

**Brenda Forbath**

Convenor

**Community Alliance of Port Phillip**

**Community Alliance of Port Phillip** Incorporated Association (Victoria) A0039171K

**REGISTERED ADDRESS** Post Office Box 593 Elwood Victoria AUSTRALIA 3184 **EMAIL** [info@capp.org.au](mailto:info@capp.org.au) **WEB** [www.capp.org.au](http://www.capp.org.au) **FACEBOOK** [CommunityAlliancePP](https://www.facebook.com/CommunityAlliancePP)

# Fishermans Bend

URBAN RENEWAL AREA



## Submission on the Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area

by the Community Alliance of Port Phillip  
22 Nov 2013

# SUBMISSION ON THE

# FISHERMANS BEND URBAN RENEWAL AREA

BY THE **COMMUNITY ALLIANCE OF PORT PHILLIP**

22 NOV 2013

---

## INTRODUCTION

This submission has been prepared by the Community Alliance of Port Phillip in response to the Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area Draft Vision. Its aim is to articulate the concerns and expectations of the Port Phillip community; convey its objection or support (wherever due) for the visions and approaches presented; provide constructive criticism and insight; and, in particular, bring to the table a range of directed questions we hope will help bring the issues surrounding the future development of the area into sharper focus.

The Fishermans Bend Draft Vision document released on 16 September 2013 sets out a vision to guide a 50 year plan for the Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area. This, along with the Government's *PLAN MELBOURNE* strategy, will set a framework for massive change to enable our city to meet its projected population growth and future economic objectives. It is anticipated that Fishermans Bend will contribute a community of 80,000 people to Melbourne's projected population of 8 million by 2050.

As Australia's largest single urban renewal project, Fishermans Bend will define the nature and character of future 'inner Melbourne', and have many more immediate impacts on the amenity and urban environment of the surrounding communities.

We note that the Fishermans Bend urban renewal scheme is directly impacted by two other broader State Government planning programs:

- the newly established **Capital City Zone**, which encompasses most of Melbourne's inner ring of older industrial suburbs and is largely directed at their future transformation into new high density residential and commercial precincts. (Under this zone, the Minister for Planning becomes the responsible Authority for all developments over 4 storeys )
- the massive expansion of **Webb Dock**, which will generate a huge increase in entirely road-based freight transport, and whose implications we are already seeing in the

planning for the Westgate Freeway and the East-West Link road tunnel (together, these will condemn Melbourne to a road based - rather than rail-based transport future).

Equally we note that the two major documents driving the transport infrastructure agenda, **VICTORIA: The Freight State** and **LINKING MELBOURNE**, have not been put out for general public consultation.

While this submission focuses entirely on the Fishermans Bend draft Vision document, it should be remembered that there are three draft documents directly relating to Fishermans Bend that are currently under review:

- The **Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area Draft Vision**, released 16 Sept 2013
- The **Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area Interim Design Guidelines**, 16 Sept 2013
- The **PLAN Melbourne** metropolitan planning strategy for the whole of Melbourne, released 13 Oct 2013

The two Fishermans bend documents are the result of a year-long process led by Places Victoria and the Planning Minister in collaboration with the Melbourne City Council and the City of Port Phillip. The process has been conducted behind closed doors. The inclusion of our City Councillors and staff has been the only form of community consultation undertaken in these formative stages.

A further influence on the *Vision* has been the **Montague Area Structure Plan** which is an excellent, fully detailed plan commissioned by the City of Port Phillip for the future redevelopment of the Montague area. This plan was rendered redundant when the Minister rezoned the area late last year. While some of its recommendations may have been incorporated into the *Vision*, we believe that this plan should be re-visited and its ideas and recommendations for the Montague area further investigated.

The consultation process, we believe, has been deeply flawed (see Section 14 Community Consultation, below) but we are nonetheless please to present this submission to the process, and look forward to a productive future engagement.

**Contacts:**

**Brenda Forbath**, Convenor, CAPP:

[ourballantrae@gmail.com](mailto:ourballantrae@gmail.com) 03 9029 8888

**Helen Halliday**, CAPP, Convenor Fishermans Bend Working Group

[jahel@bigpond.net.au](mailto:jahel@bigpond.net.au) 0448 422 002

**David Brand**, CAPP, Co-author, CAPP FBURA submission

[davidbrand@dezzanet.net.au](mailto:davidbrand@dezzanet.net.au) 0413 334 520

## OUR GENERAL VIEW OF THE FBURA VISION

The Minister for Planning Matthew Guy has made clear public commitment to “a **livable, sustainable, diverse and vibrant city**” which we fully support and which should, we believe, establish the benchmark for the future of inner Melbourne.

In particular we support the following aspirations expressed in the Draft Visions:

- the civic spine along Plummer Street.
- integrated transport including a Yarra River tram bridge linking with Collins Street Tram networks, two metro underground train stations, bike and pedestrian linkages and connecting up two existing tram routes of Park St to complete the ‘loop’
- lower density housing proposed along the interfaces with Port Melbourne
- extending Melbourne Parks to the Bay
- new Boulevards along Williamstown Road, Lorimer Street and Plummer Street

We note though, that this vision is so far

- entirely unfunded,
- yet to be articulated in a structure plan,
- lacking any implementation plan,
- lacking mechanisms for the Identification and protection of land for public purposes
- and without any indication that its eventual realisation will not just be left to the imagination of the developers themselves.

Our concern is not so much with the content of the vision itself, but with the disparity between the vision as stated and the actual planning outcomes the Government has delivered so far. To date the Government has shown a clear tendency:

- to allow skyscraper development without apparent planning justification;
- to let developer-defined market forces largely dictate planning outcomes,
- and to exclude the public from meaningful or constructive early engagement in the planning processes.

As a community organization we are committed to a productive and constructive approach to planning the future of Fishermans Bend. However we believe there is a credibility gap between the ideals for FBURA and the likelihood of their delivery.

In our engagement with the FBURA process, our aim is to

- pursue the *Vision* as broadly stated, and hold the Minister to his word,
- offer constructive suggestions as to how these aims might be better achieved,

- issue timely warnings of any mistakes, omissions or consequences we believe will work against the achievement of our common goals
- object to decisions or measures introduced by the Government when we believe they are contrary to the achievement of the common goals

In the process we need to ensure that all relevant Government policies, plans, decisions + outcomes are measured against

- The new Metropolitan Strategy ***PLAN Melbourne***
- The Fishermans Bend *Vision* document
- The Minister's own rhetoric, as contained in the Vision Statement, and in his various pronouncements and speeches.

Our detailed response to the FBURA vision that follows below, is broken down into key questions. In each section we have identified contradictions, gaps and 'unintended consequences' as they relate to specific issues. We believe these questions MUST be answered if the overall project is to result in any success.

Our coverage of the issues is not comprehensive nor strictly systematic. We believe, though, that the questions we raise here are – at the least – emblematic of the issues and challenges that must be addressed – comprehensively – for a new city worthy of greater Melbourne to successfully emerge.

## QUESTIONS THAT NEED TO BE ANSWERED

### 1. WEBB DOCK

***Q: How will expanded Webb Dock truck transport be excluded from the FBURA precinct, particularly the Plummer Street “public transport + community spine”?***

- Webb Dock is about to undergo a massive \$1.6 billion upgrade, with all freight movement to + from the dock entirely dependent on road transport. (2 million extra truck journeys by 2050)
- Plummer Street is currently designated a preferred secondary truck route (Todd Road is the designated principal truck route; trucks were shifted off Williamstown Rd and onto Plummer St.)
- The FBURA Vision is built around Plummer St as its “civic spine” – pictured as a thriving, community-centred residential and retail boulevard, of public spaces, kerbside dining and with a new “prioritized tram service” running its length and on to the city – no place at all for a dedicated truck route.
- Could an east-west rail tunnel be built to serve both the promised FB metro line *and* rail freight from the dock”? (See *Question 2: Early Provision of Infrastructure* below.) If underground public transport is deliverable then a short rail-freight link should be too. Engineering costs could be shared between ports and public transport funding. Early delivery, though, would be essential.
- We believe that heavy road freight transport must be excluded from the FBURA area – not just from Plummer Street ( its exclusion is a prerequisite for Plummer St’s development as the civic and commercial spine of the precinct) but also from all residential areas of the new city.
- The port expansion and transport logistics of Webb Dock needs to be redesigned now to ensure that the exclusion of truck routes through FBURA can be sustained in the future. (We believe in an ideal world, the best solution for this is underground rail freight.)
- See further discussion under *13: Consistency with PLAN Melbourne*, below

## 2 EARLY DELIVERY OF INFRASTRUCTURE

**Q: What is the infrastructure the Government is committed to “providing early”, as the basis for growing the proposed new sustainable community around? Public transport, schools, parkland ?**

### **SCHOOLS + ‘soft’ infrastructure:**

- Schools need to be planned and delivered from the beginning of redevelopment (in contrast to the non-delivery of schools at Docklands).
- The FBURA Vision makes mention only of private / commercial supply of schools / no public schools, and makes no mention of publicly funded child care / maternal health care / aged care / social housing in the document.
- Families living in the CBD, Docklands and Southbank are in crisis, with no local public schools serving their area. The non-provision of publicly funded schools in FB will be catastrophic, not only to Fishermans Bend families, but also to existing school communities nearby.

### **PUBLIC TRANSPORT + ‘hard’ infrastructure:**

- Public transport needs to be the seed-line around which the residential, retail and employment “spine” will grow. Fishermans Bend must not be allowed to grow as a car-dependent city, and then retro-fitted with public transport later.
- Two metro train stops are nominated along Plummer Street as well as a tram bridge over the Yarra River which requires substantial Government commitment to realise. When will the government lock these critical projects in? How will it mitigate the conflict with the Docklands boating community’s need for up-river access for its boats?
- One simple and essential project mooted over many years has been the connection of the two trams routes on Park Street to cross-link the southern suburbs’ two hitherto tram networks. The government must commit to this project at an early date.

### **Both:**

- If FBURA is to deliver the “20 minute city” accessibility promised in *PLAN Melbourne*, soft and hard infrastructure both have to be delivered comprehensively and early. Everyday destinations – like schools, healthcare, playgrounds and parks, shops and light industrial services, etc – need to be in place before the need for higher rates of car ownership become locked into the market.
- See discussion under *6: Parking Policy*, below.



### 3. CAPTURING VALUE FOR COMMUNITY BENEFIT

***Q: By what mechanisms (and when) will the government capture value from the increase in development value and land prices in the FBURA precinct – to provide the non-commercial / less profitable environmental, social and cultural infrastructure the city will require?***

- ‘Developer contribution’ schemes need to be established before developers purchase their sites. Developer contribution schemes currently provide only for some aspects of public open space, and for public art. There are many more environmental, social and cultural initiatives that need funding through ‘value capture’ from the developer dollar (if the government is not going to fund them itself).
- In particular, the obligation on the developer to provide social housing, and affordable housing, needs to be established before the final market value of the development land is locked in. The developer needs to fully allow for this cost before the land is purchased. Without government directives and incentives, developers will not provide the affordable housing or the diversity in housing choices that a real city and a ‘whole community’ needs.
- If FBURA is to deliver the “20 minute city” accessibility promised in *PLAN Melbourne*, mechanisms must be established at the outset to ensure affordable housing close to the new jobs market will be available.
- Land speculation following the Minister’s rezoning of FBURA has already rendered this impossible in some areas – especially in the Montague precinct. We believe that Developers’ Contributions should not be seen as the only source of funding for these essential aspects of social and environmental infrastructure. Developers’ Contributions should play a substantial part, but should not limit the obligations of the state Government to provide such facilities.

## 4 CREATIVE APPROACHES TO ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGES

**Q: If “smart environmental solutions” is one of the Government’s key strategies, how are these going to be developed and integrated before the first wave of building development is unleashed?**

- Many environmental solutions can be addressed through performance standards applied to the building stock as it is planned and constructed. But for many solutions, systems must be put in place *before* development begins. They cannot, by their very nature, be retro-fitted, or just applied along the way.
- For example, “Early identification of innovative precinct-scale storm water solutions to manage the impacts of flooding and enhance biodiversity and water quality” (FBURA Vision, p27) must surely imply systems or infrastructure initiated before development begins. Consider the following:
  - Rising sea levels might require levy banks along the Yarra River, and buildings may need to be elevated.
  - Flooding and pollution from run-off will require extended areas of open space for active Water-Sensitive Urban Design solutions.
  - A fully integrated water cycle strategy across Fishermans Bend (Vision, p27)
  - Local, decentralized energy systems providing heat and power (Vision, p27)
- It takes more than a few months to build in systems of “future-proofed” water management and energy management for high density urban development. The Minister needs to make a clear undertaking that no major developments will be approved without them.
- At its 278 hectare Green Square urban renewal project, the City of Sydney has commissioned AECOM, a “global professional technical services provider [in] a \$3.8M six-year contract to undertake the consultancy services for design and delivery of the Essential Infrastructure & Public Domain for the Town Centre. When complete, this infrastructure will set new standards in inner-city green living. Residents will benefit from green infrastructure including recycled water and enjoy easy access to shops, parks, gardens, entertainment, public transport and both bike and walking routes.” There is no hint yet of a similar long-sighted approach at FBURA.  
<http://www.aecom.com/Where+We+Are/Australia+-+New+Zealand/+carousel/Green+Square+precinct+to+contribute+to+more+liveable+Sydney>

### **Water:**

- Fundamental to planning FBURA for the environmental challenges of the future is the issue of water – in all its manifestations. An environmental history of the whole of FBURA needs to be written, and projections into its environmental future must be explored and the consequences fully understood. *Fundamental to placemaking is a deep understanding of a particular place.* The Fishermans Bend Vision reveals little understanding of the place which is to be transformed. Without knowing the place, the foundations of the Vision are not well grounded.\*

- ‘Water Sensitive Urban Design’ itself seems not to have been integrated into the current planning. The history of cyclical flooding of Fishermans Bend will not stop, and is likely to worsen. Urban and landscape design opportunities must be created for the beneficial use of flood and stormwater. In its urban design and architecture we must plan and build for a flooded city – a city which copes with flood as part of its life cycle – one that is not ruined or damaged each time, but finds functional and aesthetic benefit in its environmental destiny.
- The cheapest climate adaptation is that which is planned ahead of time. Retrospective action is much more expensive.\*
- On the subject of water (and other related topics) we commend you to the submission made to the FBURA process by “Port Places” -- from which some of the material here has been taken. We support its insights, and endorse its recommendations. The submission can also be found on the CAPP website.

## 5 SECURING KEY SITES AND EXTRA OPEN SPACE

**Q: *By what mechanism (and when) will the government secure key sites for essential public facilities – the proposed metro stations, schools, parks, public spaces and “connectivity” routes?***

**Q: *By what mechanism (and where) will the government secure land for the recreational and green open spaces it has promised to provide the new communities of Fishermans Bend – noting that the existing recreational parklands in FBURA are already fully utilized by the communities of the neighbouring areas?***

- Most land in FBURA – except for existing parkland – is privately owned.
- Sites for metro stations, schools, etc need to be secured at the outset – before development puts them beyond reach.
- The Minister says that they have chosen FB for urban renewal in part because it is already so well provided with open space. But this space is already committed to existing communities in the region. Where will the *additional* requirements of 80,000 more people be found?
- For creating new open space on industrial sites refer Jason Dowling article: <http://www.theage.com.au/victoria/call-to-transform-city-eyesores-into-open-spaces-20131029-2wcsu.html>
- New open space needs to be found not only for recreation but also for environmental purposes such as flood mitigation. We estimate that an area at least the size of Murphy Reserve needs to be found and allocated to this.
- Several large consolidated parcels of land are controlled by large individual owners opening up possibilities of open space and environmental projects. These spaces would be able to be designed more effectively and efficiently than those won from competing small landowners. This opportunity for procuring quality public open space should not be squandered.
- The question of open space, how it should be provided and its links with the Westgate Park and the general network of parks in Melbourne, have all been covered in detail in the submission for the Friends of Westgate Park to FBURA Consultation. We support their knowledgeable contributions on the best means of achieving good open space outcomes. See Friends of Westgate Park submission. On CAPP Web site

## 6 PARKING POLICY

**Q: *By what mechanisms will the government control the provision of car parking in the FBURA city, and at what models and ideals of future urban character, accessibility and transport systems will its approach to parking control be aimed?***

- The provision of car parking space translates a city's transport behavior systems into permanent built form. Planning control over the provision of parking can have a profound and beneficial influence over a city's transport future.
- Fisherman's Bend provides the opportunity to creatively make real headway on the issue of car dependency. This will be a precinct where a car should generally not be essential. Significant employment opportunities will exist close by, as should be most of the important recreational and sporting venues. We also expect that essential services and facilities such as schools, retail and public transport will be within walking distance.
- There are many different approaches to beneficially rebalancing car parking equation. Reducing the rate of car park provision in residential developments has been tried in inner Melbourne and been shown to work well. Replacing a portion of private car parking space with car share systems is a useful step towards reducing private car and carpark ownership and thus the cost of housing too. The City of Port Phillip has successful examples of housing developments where the developer was successfully encouraged to provide no car parking at all. Any such scheme, though must be supported by the compulsory provision of bike and scooter parking, visitor parking, on-street parking controls, and a dense network of public transport and walkable services.
- One possible radical approach – which we believe is worth considering, even just for the picture of the transformed city that it paints – could be to remove all car parking from new development and eliminate long term street parking. This would have a profound impact on the character and livability of the city. It would completely change the general expectation that a car is needed for every trip. Instead, parking would be located on the edge of the precinct close to the freeway entrances or arterial roads. People would have to walk to retrieve their cars, passing local retailers and possibly neighbours. Such an initiative would have positive impact on the amenity of the local environment, enabling the streets and lanes to be more than transport infrastructure. Services would evolve to cater for a walking population and would be a valuable marketing tool for selling a unique living environment. This is already a way of life in many European cities.
- Such an approach would significantly reduce the cost of apartments. The cost of parking would be pay-as-you-use and not part of housing costs.
- The few great world cities in which skyscraper development seems to promote social and cultural vitality ( think Manhattan or Hong Kong) have very high levels of public transport and very low levels of private car ownership. At the very least, we call for apartment tower developers to be required to reduce their provision of private car parking and increase their contribution to public transport infrastructure.
- Efficient, effective public transport *requires* a market as much as it creates a market.

## **7 KEEPING INDUSTRY IN THE INNER CITY**

***Q: Does the Government have a policy on future industrial uses in the inner city – the high tech and low tech industries of the future, close to the CBD, the ports, and population densities? How will the FB redevelopment program protect and enhance the advantages of future inner urban industry?***

- As a land use, industry usually cannot compete with retail, commercial or residential development without protection from the market, by mechanisms such as zoning and special incentives.
- The FB Vision foresees vast new employment opportunities throughout FB. But the opportunities appear to be confined to retail and commercial sectors – with almost no mention of new employment in the industry that already surrounds it.
- High tech industries close to the city centre might provide Melbourne with huge advantages into the future – but these must be planned for and protected. FB and Melbourne should be a clean + green industry state of the art leader in this regard.
- ‘Creative industries’ offer another possible major advantage of close-to-the-centre industrial culture. Creative industries need low tech cheap creative spaces. More often than not, these are expunged by new development.
- And what will become of all the light industry services we currently rely on in the inner suburbs? – car mechanics, wholesale outlets, garden supplies, self-storage, car rentals, carpet suppliers, recycling centres, pet hotels, etc, etc. Most of the service industries areas reasonably within our reach have now been slated for redevelopment.
- If the government is serious about its “20 minute city” concept, it needs to ensure that industry will not be entirely banished to Melbourne’s outer rings. We need inner city industry for the employment, cultural and service-convenience needs of our new and existing communities.
- If we leave it to the property market to decide, industry will be swept out of FBURA before we know it.

## 8 DEVELOPMENT SCALE + DENSITY

***Q: A blanket of high-rise towers appears to be the high-density development model least likely to achieve a “livable, sustainable, diverse and vibrant” urban outcome. But if the target densities can be met with low- to medium-rise development, why is the high-rise tower model being persisted with?***

- Studies show that the proposed density targets for FB can be reached with mainly 8 storey urban development. (Melbourne University Architecture Design Studio Research findings)
- No clear case has been made to justify adopting the ‘high rise apartment tower on podium’ as the principle building form. It is the form of development reflected in Southbank and Docklands and is generally perceived as the most unpopular part of the Fisherman’s Bend proposal.
- In densely packed high-rise precincts, solar access and wind effects present huge challenges to the micro-climates and livability of the surrounding streets and the apartment towers themselves.
- The relative yield efficiency of tower blocks on podiums by comparison to traditional 6-8 storey apartment buildings must be carefully assessed. An investigation by Melbourne University Architecture Design Studio Research found no advantage. The cost differential between the two models needs to be re-analysed, and the fundamental need for flexible, family-friendly affordable housing factored in.
- Towers tend to focus on a narrow demographic, which is not a good catalyst for the evolution of a sustainable community. Medium rise buildings enable smaller projects and thus a more diverse group of participants in the process, leading to greater architectural diversity and a greater variety of accommodation.
- For apartment living in a city to be truly successful, the public realm must become a more important marketing feature of an apartment than the views to be had from
- Developers clearly prefer the high-rise tower-on-podium model. Refer The Age, <http://www.theage.com.au/business/property/goodman-in-height-lift-on-the-bend-20131022-2vz6j.html>
- Actual residents, however, do not seem to prefer the Southbank style high-rise. Currently, Southbank apartments have a vacancy rate of about 22% -- far higher than any other precinct in Melbourne. Fishermans bend housing should be targeted at a far higher occupancy rate than this. (Perhaps Southbank’s low occupancy rate is partly due just to the more transient nature of apartment dwelling -- even so, it is still no model for building stronger communities.)
- Kim Dovey and David Yenken’s recent Age article “When and Where to Go Tall is No Small Matter” (The Age, 7 Nov ’13) we believe is an excellent starting point for the reconsideration of density and height. We urge the government to heed its warnings and to embrace its clear and constructive approaches to the competing issues. It’s characterization of Southbank a “Density without Intensity” is piercingly accurate.

- On density and occupancy rates see FBURA submission by Helen Halliday.
- On density and building typology see FBURA submission by David Rayson .
- Both submissions can also be found on the CAPP website.



## 9 URBAN “GRAIN SIZE”, PERMEABILITY, +”ACCIDENTS OF HISTORY”

**Q: *These are some of the qualities, and characteristic patterns, that make a city feel and function like a real city: how will these qualities be incorporated and created in the FB urban renewal program?***

- “Grain size” is essentially the size of operational units of city – the size of its development projects, street blocks, properties and tenancies. Beautiful cities often have a small grain size, or a mixture of small and medium. Exciting cities often have a wide mixture of grain sizes, from large to small, but always plenty of small. Boring cities have only large and medium grain size.
- “Permeability” is the pattern of access ways between these units. It can be likened to the network of arteries and capillaries of a city. Large blocks served only by arteries make for a dull and alienating environment. Urban precincts served by finer veins and capillaries become endlessly engaging and livable.
- When a city grows out of the traces and imprints of its past history (natural and constructed) it grows with character, uniqueness and a sense of identity. Urban renewal projects that bulldoze their sites clean, lose this precious resource forever – but it is the vital ingredient that makes the difference between a city feeling like a real living city and a cold and artificial one. Just as in natural ecology, the accidents of history become a vital factor in the successful evolution of the organism.
- In all the most livable cities, these qualities can be seen not only in the richness and diversity of their physical urban forms, but also in their economic and cultural vitality, and in the richness and diversity of their communities.
- They are qualities conspicuously lacking in Docklands and Southbank, and conspicuously present in much of our CBD.
- Cities with fine grain-size, high permeability and a clear respect for their contextual roots are not, initially, efficient to develop. Typically, these qualities are not generated in urban projects developed for shorter term profit.
- None of these qualities are achievable without sophisticated and far-sighted planning and urban design provisions, a development model aimed at the long-term sustainability of the city-building program, and a government and a development community willing to participate in that.
- Ultimately, the development model itself needs to be changed and channeled towards a model more likely to generate fine-grained, context-responsive development.
- A new development paradigm is needed which encourages many more participants, a much greater number and wide range of developers, designers, builders, suppliers, finance providers and encourages alternative equity arrangements. Encouraging small scale, local players may well achieve more than instituting an even greater level of regulation and planning, no matter how sophisticated.
- Over the past 20 years planners, developers, builders and the marketers of residential apartments have established a quite rigid development template. These templates sell

units but have failed to deliver sustainable, high density communities or vibrant urban environments. The government, as the chief proponent and planner of this vast, city-changing project, needs to change this template to one that will work – to one that will actually achieve the government’s own stated aims.

- On these issues of the ‘development template’ we commend you to the FBURA submission by David Rayson, which we also strongly endorse, and from which we have drawn material here.

## 10 MODELS OF “INTERNATIONAL BEST PRACTICE”

***Q: If, as promised, the planning and development of FBURA will be carried out at the standard of “international best practice”, what are the exemplary models of urban renewal from around the world we are following at Fishermans Bend?***

- There are so far no “best practice” reference points provided to help us envisage how the FBURA redevelopment will be designed, or against which we can benchmark its strategies and processes.
- Vancouver is often referred to as a model for inner city industrial urban renewal. But the credibility of much of Vancouver’s “tower-block in parkland” development model is increasingly being questioned, and would seem a depressingly unsuitable response for the urban opportunities we have here in Melbourne.
- Starting with Barcelona and Berlin, there are countless models for urban renewal and city development that can be successfully applied to our own conditions and aspirations here. We just need to see them, and have a conversation about them.
- Even in Sydney, in its vast Green Square urban renewal project, models for innovative best practice in the “design and delivery of the essential infrastructure and public domain” appears to be “setting new standards in inner-city green living -- protecting the area’s natural environment, existing character, and industrial past” while reviving and rebuilding it as a new community. [http://www.aecom.com/Where+We+Are/Australia+-+New+Zealand/\\_carousel/Green+Square+precinct+to+contribute+to+more+liveable+Sydney](http://www.aecom.com/Where+We+Are/Australia+-+New+Zealand/_carousel/Green+Square+precinct+to+contribute+to+more+liveable+Sydney) and
- <http://www.governmentnews.com.au/2013/05/21/article/AECOM-wins-deal-to-shape-Green-Square/GHKSIGZDDL>
- International best practice examples in the areas of renewal in area of housing, open space, activity area, transport, economic vitality and sustainability need to be sourced and discussed in open processes with the community.
- An exhibition of best practice examples from around the world – explaining how and why they worked so well – would be an excellent starting point for bringing the public along on the FBURA process, rebuilding the community’s trust, and , at the same time, testing the government’s own thinking.
- David Rayson’s second FBURA submission provides an excellent list of state-of-the-art urban renewal projects. We commend this list to you as a starting point. It can also be found on the CAPP website.

## **11 DOCKLANDS AND SOUTHBANK AS MODELS FOR DEVELOPMENT**

***Q: If the redevelopment of FBURA is going to generate a “livable, sustainable, diverse and vibrant city”, which aspects of the Docklands and Southbank development models have been corrected or rejected?***

- In Docklands it was left to the developers to do the planning + urban design of their own precincts. This, essentially, allowed them to build an office-park and apartment-tower city, of notably low social diversity and cultural vibrancy.
- In Southbank, developers were left to develop their individual properties for the ‘highest and best’ return. The result is an urban precinct almost devoid of street life, and offering almost zero diversity in the type and affordability of the housing stock it has provided.
- In both cases the market has been distorted by delivery systems which support large scale developers. Small developers and small buildings have been excluded from the process. Planning and the political system have also abrogated responsibility to provide a framework which delivers good quality urban design.
- In both cases, over-reliance on ‘the market’ appears to be a common factor. While we acknowledge that nothing will be achieved without the resources and enthusiasm of the development community – we demand assurance that the provision of the planning framework, the selection of the development models, and all the ingredients required in the long-term to generate a “livable, sustainable, diverse and vibrant city” will be put in place *before* the short-term profit driven machine is brought in to start work.

## 12 CONSIDERATION OF CURRENT PLANNING APPLICATIONS

***Q: Will the minister stand by his undertaking not to approve any planning applications in FB currently before him until a detailed structure plan is in place for them to be assessed against?***

- The Minister already has before him at least 17 planning applications for major new development projects in the FB area – most of them in the Montague area – most of them high-rise tower development – a number of them around 50 storeys high.
- Having rezoned the entire FB area as a Capital City Zone, the Minister now holds complete planning authority for these sites, with no obligation to consult the public or explain his decisions
- Most of these development proposals would breach even the interim guidelines for the area were they approved as they are now, and would certainly work against the published ideals of the FBURA Vision document.
- In September, the Minister made a public declaration that nothing would be approved until the full Structure Plan for the area was complete.
- It is unclear whether this was actually the Minister’s original intention (why, after all, did he issue “interim planning guidelines” for the area?), but we believe the Minister must hold to this undertaking, for the sake of better, and more informed development outcomes.
- We therefore request that the Minister delays decisions on the various applications before him so that the groundwork can be done, the information accumulated, and the details thought through so that we might preserve the chance of a truly clever urban development that lives up to the expectations and aspirations of the *FBRUA Vision* itself.

### 13 CONSISTENCY WITH *PLAN MELBOURNE*

**Q: How can the State Government justify the FBURA project as a validation of its *PLAN MELBOURNE* metropolitan strategy (whose release it in fact predated) when its *VICTORIA: THE FREIGHT STATE* and *LINKING MELBOURNE* documents – of which there has been no public review process – would appear to be far more influential in shaping the future of inner Melbourne?**

- The FBURA Vision Document should flow from the overarching Strategy of *PLAN Melbourne* for metropolitan Melbourne -- in how it goes about meeting the demands of population increase. These processes are in fact now running in parallel. In this situation of timing it is almost impossible for the public to test one against the other – to see the causalities and logical consequences flowing from one to the other.
- The Government has developed other major policy documents that have direct and significant influence on the future of all the inner city: They are the *VICTORIA: The Freight State* and *LINKING MELBOURNE* documents released end of October 2013. These documents reveal that the biggest commitment this government has is to increasing freight from the Port of Melbourne and meeting the road development needs to service the resultant road based freight traffic this will generate to inner Melbourne .
- There has been no public engagement with these two processes. Instead, discussion has been encouraged around the two vision documents *FBURA Vision* and *PLAN MELBOURNE* -- broad brush and value statements that can hardly be argued with, and which lack any mechanisms that lock the delivery of these values in. The infrastructure projects stemming from The Freight and Linking Melbourne documents, on the other hand, will deliver completely opposing outcomes to the vision statements : up to 2 million freight B-Double and B-triple truck trips on our inner city network by 2050, causing significant disruption to inner Melbourne with road based freight traffic on a 24/7 basis.
- *PLAN Melbourne* states that its first challenge (section 4 ‘A More Connected Melbourne’ Page 72) is to provide for commuter transport. The second challenge is to ensure the vitality of the state’s freight which is a major economic driver, in line with the state’s projected population growth. This is in fact driving road-based major infrastructure projects such as the E-W Tunnel. The community we represent is not convinced that these are the best long term solutions for inner Melbourne.
- *PLAN Melbourne* refers to the ‘20 minute’ city, which envisages public transport-rich neighbourhoods of bike paths and pedestrian-friendly boulevards. All of which would be highly desirable for FBURA. But with, in reality, no actual funding commitment to the delivery of public transport, we question whether it will actually be achieved. FBURA is under immediate threat of being overrun by the heavy road-freight truck routes emanating from the Webb Dock Upgrade project, due for completion in 2016.

## 14 THE PLANNING PROCESS AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

**Q: How is it that the community is so completely shut out of processes that have such radical significance to our city's future?**

- Documents like *PLAN Melbourne*, and projects such as FBURA, radically reshape the future of our city. Yet both have been shaped with almost no initial public engagement or input from the wider community. Where was the debate that might have started these balls rolling from a point of genuine public impetus?
- Instead, these vision statements have been essentially in secret, and then released to a mystified public for a mere eight weeks of consultation. While community reaction might be gauged to some degree within this timeframe, there is little room for genuine productive engagement, and little chance of significant change to the delivered formula.
- We call for a truly participatory community process. One that truly engages and explores options intelligently and reaches conclusions that truly serve our future sustainability and community life. We know there are many more imaginative solutions that will not be explored that would better meet long-term community needs and aspirations.
- City planning processes involving early, up front community engagement, have been used to great success overseas, and even here in Melbourne. A huge resource of insight, creativity is being neglected. A huge opportunity for real community ownership is being squandered.
- We note that the two major documents driving the transport infrastructure agenda, **VICTORIA: The Freight State** and **LINKING MELBOURNE**, have not been put out for general public consultation. If the State Government wants its communities to be engaged with shaping the future of our city, it should engage them in the engine room, not just the vision-making.
- The timing of the public consultations for the **FBURA Draft Vision**, the **FBURA Interim Design Guidelines**, and the **PLAN Melbourne** strategy for the whole of Melbourne, has also worked against a logical process. The *Interim Guidelines* seem altogether premature – how can credible rules for future-shaping development be written before a properly developed Structure Plan has been considered and put in place? *PLAN Melbourne*, on the other hand seems rather late – the shape of a city's largest urban renewal project should, logically, flow from a well considered Metropolitan Strategy, not be announced prior to the release of its first public draft, as was the case here.
- The process under which the Vision itself was developed has also been conducted behind closed doors. The inclusion of our City Councillors and staff has been the only form of community consultation undertaken in these formative stages.

- An engaged community can make a significant contribution to the planning and design of a city, and make the process a rich and enthusiastic one, rather than a long grind of resentment, distrust and disappointment.
- The community we represent is exceptionally capable and keen to participate in the FBURA planning process. It is ready to engage constructively, or confrontationally – depending very much on the government’s willingness to engage with the community, and on how it responds to this and the many other community submissions it receives.
- We look forward, with great hope, to creative and productive outcome.

prepared on behalf of CAPP by **David Brand** 22 Nov 2013