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Executive Summary

Context

The Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area (FBUURA) is the largest urban renewal area in Australia’s history, offering over 240 hectares of Capital City zoned land within close proximity to Melbourne’s CBD and Port Phillip Bay. FBUURA is expected to play a key role in accommodating Melbourne’s growing population. With unprecedented densities of around 83,000 new residents, 42,000 workers and 42,000 dwellings by 2050 proposed under the ‘Discussion Scenario’ for FBUURA, the way community infrastructure is planned and delivered needs to be looked at in a new and innovative way to meet the needs of the people who will live, work and visit Fishermans Bend.

Community facilities are central in creating healthy communities. Communities with access to high quality social infrastructure have better access to services and enhanced opportunities to participate in community life. Community infrastructure provides space for cultural expression, events and for people of all abilities allowing for a more inclusive community. They should create a ‘community heart’ and provide indoor and outdoor space and informal and formal activities.

The presence of essential community infrastructure including schools, healthcare, meeting spaces and other facilities will be a vital consideration for prospective residents and workers. Integrated community facilities are essential to encourage healthy communities, improve wellbeing and develop social networks.
Executive Summary

Challenges

FBURA faces a number of challenges in delivering its goal of achieving a vibrant, accessible and cohesive network of places, which takes advantage of their strategic location, history and natural assets to offer:
- Lifestyle choices for all ages and households
- A sustainable mix of uses
- Flexible infrastructure and services to meet changing needs over time
- A sense of destination and excitement for Melbourne and beyond

These challenges include the following aspects:

The high development densities proposed limit the opportunity for community infrastructure and open space to occupy significant land areas, resulting in different expectations for effective community infrastructure provision, and a shift towards more integrated and ‘vertical’ configurations of infrastructure.

The fragmented land ownership and reliance on the private sector to deliver development, requiring the implementation of the CIP to be both flexible to respond to opportunities that come up, and robust to ensure implementation of the CIP to be both flexible to respond

Significant demand and limited capacity in existing infrastructure close to FBURA constrain any potential for new development to rely on existing facilities.

Issues and Opportunities

The significant potential population of the area presents greater demand for community facilities and services. The ‘traditional model’ for planning community infrastructure is clearly not applicable in this high-density urban renewal context. New ways of delivering community infrastructure and public open space within private and public sector developments will need to be developed and implemented.

FBURA encompasses land in both Melbourne and Port Phillip Council Areas, while the Capital City zoning involves the Victorian government in the planning process. The various levels of government will need to work in partnership with each other and with the private sector to deliver an integrated solution that serves the needs of the community.

The CIP identifies several high-level issues and opportunities for community infrastructure planning and delivery in FBURA, including:

Transition: Planning, monitoring and delivering Community Infrastructure as the area transitions from an industrial/employment precinct to a diverse, mixed use ‘extension’ to the Melbourne CBD.

Filling the gaps and responding to increasing demand: Community infrastructure planning for FBURA needs to consider existing deficits in addition to responding to the needs of the growing population.

Role and provision of open space: The provision of open space requires an innovative approach that capitalises on opportunities, making best use of the limited available space, through a range of design and programming strategies.

Creating a connected community: The provision of a high quality public realm and relevant community facilities will support social interaction, an active community and enhance the amenity and identity of neighbourhoods.

Building on local history and culture: FBURA can retain and build on the history and cultural value from its indigenous, early residential and industrial pasts.

Role and provision of community facilities: Community facilities and services need to respond to current community needs and aspirations, as well as the needs and aspirations of future residents and workers both within the urban renewal area and the surrounding areas. Consideration must be given to the diverse needs of children, young people and their families, older adults and the diverse worker population.

A flexible approach: Planning for community infrastructure must be flexible to respond to changing population needs over time, whilst ensuring essential facilities and services are provided from the commencement of residential development.

Thinking vertically: Developers, planners and service providers will be required to work collaboratively; to deliver infrastructure in more efficient, innovative and vertically layered configurations.

Clustering, Co-location and integration of facilities: Shared community facilities generally provide the best value for money and community outcomes, building on a collaborative approach to service delivery, but relying on a more detailed service planning process.

A range of stakeholders in the provision of community infrastructure: Community infrastructure facilities will be delivered by a range of different service providers, including the public, private, community and not-for-profit sectors.

Temporary (pop-up) spaces and facilities: Innovative and flexible approaches towards community facilities and services provision can ensure community needs are met from the outset. Temporary and adaptable spaces will help deliver essential services to the new community as it grows.

Open space and community facilities in the private realm: There are opportunities for private developments to provide additional on-site community infrastructure and open space, to support and supplement public spaces and facilities.
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The Community Infrastructure Plan (CIP)

This Community Infrastructure Plan (CIP) seeks to address the opportunities and challenges of delivering community infrastructure and open space in an urban infill setting by recommending a new approach that departs from a traditional ‘Growths Areas’ model of provision.

One of the key strategic directions of the FBURA project is to provide a place for all people and all ages through the creation of diverse, liveable and family friendly communities. The early provision of key community infrastructure has the potential to attract and support this diversity.

The CIP is based on the ‘Discussion Scenario’ projections of future population growth (residents and workers), across short, medium and long terms. This Scenario provides the basis for the planned allocation and distribution of community infrastructure.

Structure of the CIP

A Community Infrastructure Working Group (Working Group) was formed to help guide the development of the community infrastructure planning for FBURA. This guidance was provided through an intensive series of workshops with the consultant team and Places Victoria officers, and through direct commentary and feedback on the draft documentation.

Structure: Precincts and Neighbourhoods

FBURA is divided into four identified Precincts. The Precincts are described as follows, based on an understanding of the Discussion Scenario’s distribution of future residential and employment development, in various densities accommodating various demographic profiles, across the area. Each Precinct presents specific demographic profiles, and so encompasses particular implications for the planning and delivery of community infrastructure.

Montague: Projected to have the highest residential density, as well as a high worker population, and will be the fastest-growing Precinct in FBURA.

Sandridge: Will have the highest worker density of all the Precincts, as well as a significant residential density, but with a higher proportion of larger dwellings (3-4 bedrooms) than Montague.

Lorimer: Is also expected to accommodate high residential and employment densities, but with a slower development process.

Wirraway: Will have lower residential densities than the other Precincts, but the largest average dwelling size. It will also have a significantly smaller worker density.

This Community Infrastructure Plan begins from an understanding of the potential future urban structure in FBURA. This layout identifies neighbourhoods based on walking catchments and existing boundaries, activity centres and transport corridors and linkages.

Each neighbourhood contains one or more Activity Centres of various types and sizes, projected to contain an appropriate, location-specific allocation of community infrastructure, as well as providing commercial, retail, civic and residential uses.

Places: Activity Centres and Clusters

The planning approach within this CIP proposes a hierarchy of activity centres and public open space within the existing precinct structure of Montague, Sandridge, Lorimer and Wirraway. These centres; Local, Neighbourhood, Secondary and Primary, have been defined according to their catchment size, activities taking place within them and their role in supporting the local community. Each centre responds to the needs and likely aspirations of residents and workers who will live and work in the area.

Various clusterings and quantities of community infrastructure and open space have been recommended depending on the activity centre classification. The clusterings are based on the understanding of logical relationships between services and spaces through co-location principles, which promote accessibility and efficient use of space.

Each Precinct is allocated in this CIP a number of Activity Centres and Open Spaces, of various types and sizes, according to its projected development and demographic outcomes.

Each Activity Centre type encompasses certain activities and configurations of community infrastructure, based on the identified role, characteristics and locations of each Centre type.
Executive Summary

Timing and Staging
The CIP also investigates the staging of development according to the Discussion Scenario projections and suggests a timed roll-out of community infrastructure across FBURA. The proposed staging has been informed by market analysis and consideration of the role of catalyst and influential infrastructure as well as infrastructure opportunities that must be safeguarded for future delivery.

The projected long-term development of the area, and the requirement to provide community infrastructure and open space for early residents, with increasing provision in line with population growth, makes the timing and managed delivery of community infrastructure a key objective for the area. Further, the early delivery of community infrastructure is expected to be an essential catalyst in attracting the diverse residential population and commercial development envisaged for FBURA.

There are a number of actions that have the potential to increase the likelihood of delivering community infrastructure in a timely way including:

- Identifying open spaces and locations for centres early in the project
- Allocating the land and/or floorspace for community infrastructure as early as possible
- Building partnerships with developers and landowners
- Maximising the ability for integrated multi-purpose spaces and the clustering of activities
- Ensuring the infrastructure provides flexibility to adapt to changes in community needs over time

In line with the Discussion Scenario staging, the three stages of activity centre development and community infrastructure provision are summarised as follows:

Stage 1:
2 neighbourhood centres will be delivered and land for public open space will be acquired or reserved. Other actions include identifying:

- Key catalyst/influential community infrastructure
- Land reservations for future open space and key community infrastructure
- Opportunity sites
- Heritage Buildings/sites
- Temporary and pop-up projects

Stage 2:
An additional 2 neighbourhood centres, 1 secondary and 1 primary centre will be developed. As previously discussed, ongoing monitoring will be required both to ensure that community infrastructure is meeting the needs of the existing and projected populations and that the development is delivering the vision. The success of the delivery and its positive impact on community development will rely on the ongoing monitoring of the local population and activities to track the changing demand for various types of community infrastructure.

Stage 3:
An additional 2-4 neighbourhood centres, 2 secondary and 1 primary centre will be developed.

Open Space Network
The provision of open space in FBURA is also categorised through a hierarchy of types, with particular catchments, as follows:

- **Pocket Park** (local catchment);
- **Small Spaces** (neighbourhood catchment), including neighbourhood square, small park and linear park;
- **Large Spaces** (secondary catchment), including secondary square and large park;
- **Major Spaces** (primary catchment), including primary square and city/sports park;
- **Semi-public open space typologies**, including Shared Boulevard and Living Streets Zones;
- **Privately owned publicly accessible open space**; and
- **Urban Spaces**, including new and upgraded laneways, forecourts and pedestrian access ways within developments.
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Delivery Strategy

The delivery of community infrastructure in a timely manner must be considered as an essential element in the creation of a successful new residential and employment area in Melbourne. Community spaces, which can grow and evolve as communities mature and change, should be a key outcome for FBURA. The CIP should act as a functional tool to guide the type, location, timing and delivery models for community infrastructure that will positively contribute to a vibrant, accessible and cohesive place. This should all be incorporated in the planning and assessment controls for FBURA and be addressed by every application and proposal for the area.

Delivery Models for Community Infrastructure

New models for the delivery model of community infrastructure must be explored and implemented to deliver the vision for FBURA and is expected to comprise a variety of different mechanisms. There is a growing trend towards ‘mixed models’ of community infrastructure. These models are a combination of government, community and private sector delivery and may provide the required flexibility for community infrastructure provision within FBURA. In order to secure delivery of appropriate community infrastructure and public open space within FBURA, partnerships between all sectors; government, community and private should be considered a priority.

Role of the Private Sector in Delivering Community Infrastructure

The private sector will have a role in delivering facilities and open space and may also provide ‘other’ amenities that have the potential to positively contribute to the level of publicly accessible infrastructure on offer in FBURA.

Delivering Community Infrastructure within Private Sector developments

The development industry recognises that certain elements of community infrastructure are beneficial to attracting demand from purchasers, so it is expected that the delivery of selected infrastructure directly by the development industry would be acceptable. In many instances where a podium is activated by ground floor retail uses, there is likely to be a beneficial opportunity to the developer to co-locate some forms of community infrastructure into their development.

Development of a Place Management Framework

This CIP identifies the formation of a Place Management Framework as a tool with the potential to help deliver on the project’s strategic directions, including a strong community that is environmentally and economically resilient.

This will create a Framework for a new paradigm in governance, and will establish local community ‘ownership’ or stewardship of the planning, monitoring and delivery of community infrastructure, through a variety of governance and financial mechanisms. The Place Management Framework is based on effective, long-term partnership between State and local government, and the emerging Fishermans Bend community.
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Risks

Failure to effectively plan, monitor and deliver appropriate and adequate community infrastructure as FBURA develops over time presents significant risks to this emerging urban community:

The implications of neglecting to provide adequate community infrastructure can be observed in new communities throughout Victoria, wider Australia and internationally. The result is often disconnected communities, built form that does not respond to the unique needs and interests of the aspirinign community, and neighbourhoods that are unsuitable for families and children.

There are additional risks associated with community infrastructure provision in FBURA including:

- The lack of publicly owned land and a high reliance on the private sector to deliver the required facilities, and services may not deliver infrastructure of a sufficient quality or quantity
- This may also lead to a piecemeal approach with infrastructure delivery tied to development parcels rather than the neighbourhood in which it is located
- Without community infrastructure there will be few places to meet, learn, care and engage with others locally, increasing social isolation
- Opportunities for integrating community infrastructure with other forms and methods of development and delivery might be missed
- The cost and logistics of retrofitting community infrastructure at a later date will be prohibitive.

Recommended Quantities of Community Infrastructure and Public Open Space

The CIP makes recommendations on the quantity and physical distribution of community infrastructure and public open space throughout FBURA. As listed under the five key objectives for FBURA, the quantity and location will provide for ‘An area of public open space within 300 metres and a community facility within 500 metres of every dwelling and work place’. This results in approximately:

- 15 local centres and 12 pocket parks
- 8 neighbourhood centres: 8 neighbourhood squares, 3 small parks
- 3 secondary centres: 3 secondary squares, 4 large parks
- 2 primary centres: 2 primary squares, 2 major city/sports parks

Each centre contains various configurations of community infrastructure. The surrounding neighbourhoods are connected by shared boulevards, living streets zones and linear parks. A table outlining the entire recommended community infrastructure and open space provision can be found in the Appendix.

Recommendations and Next Steps

The CIP recommends actioning the elements listed below in the immediate future:

- Securing the land for public open space network
- Delivering the linear linkages
- Identifying and securing land that will provide for well-located community infrastructure, in particular local, neighbourhood and secondary centres to guide private sector development
- Ensuring the early delivery of community infrastructure is embedded in the planning mechanisms
- Encouraging innovation and incorporating new ways of delivering community infrastructure
- Developing and implementing a Place Management Strategy for FBURA.

Beyond this CIP, to ensure the delivery is always ahead both in time and in innovation, further and ongoing work must be undertaken:

Consultation: ongoing engagement with stakeholders and interested parties.

Additional Research: to gain a greater understanding of the implications of providing community infrastructure differently. There is a knowledge gap around providing community infrastructure at higher densities and a gap in our understanding of the issues for implementation.

Guidelines: based on new research and knowledge, to inform the delivery process and outcomes.

Mapping and Master Planning: to ensure the CIP is properly incorporated into the future of FBURA, a series of detailed urban design studies is recommended, to address each precinct in detail.

Prioritising Developments: The master plans and further work will lead to a more accurate understanding of the order of delivery for the activity centres. The prioritising of centre delivery is considered a crucial part of delivering a sustainable place.

Ongoing Monitoring: The ongoing monitoring and tracking of population growth, demographies, community needs and community infrastructure provision and capacity is essential for maintaining an effective and timely implementation process over the long term.
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History of the FBURA Project

In July 2012, the Minister for Planning rezoned approximately 248 hectares of land in Port Melbourne and South Melbourne to Capital City Zone. This area is known as the Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area (FBURA).

FBURA is bound by Lorimer Street and the West Gate Freeway (east of the Bolte Bridge) to the north, Williamstown Road to the south, Todd Road to the west and City Road to the east. The site comprises 4 precincts, known as Lorimer, Montague, Sandridge and Wirraway. The Lorimer precinct is located to the north of the West Gate Freeway within the City of Melbourne Council area. Montague, Sandridge and Wirraway precincts are located south of the West Gate Freeway within the City of Port Phillip Council area.

FBURA is currently utilised for light industry and logistics related businesses, but offers a strategically important urban renewal opportunity in close proximity to the centre of Melbourne. The area is almost wholly owned by the private sector, with only small parcels owned by the State and Local Government.

Places Victoria was appointed by the Minister for Planning to coordinate the preparation of a Strategic Framework Plan and Development Contributions Plan to guide future development in FBURA.

The Strategic Framework Plan sets the direction for future urban development in FBURA and identifies:

a) The strategic directions and shared vision for FBURA,

b) Areas suitable for urban development and the broad form of development that is appropriate.

c) The strategic infrastructure (physical and social) required to support urban development.

Vision and Strategic Directions

As part of the initial stages of developing the Strategic Framework Plan, a vision and ten Strategic Directions for FBURA were produced through the Strategic Directions Workshop. The ten Strategic Directions have underpinned the development of the CIP to ensure it contributes to and informs the delivery of the vision.

1. Fishermans Bend enhances its competitive economy through creation of additional jobs and businesses by capitalising on its strategic location between the CBD and the Port.

2. Fishermans Bend provides a funding model that promotes early delivery of catalyst infrastructure and balances transitioning of existing industries.

3. Fishermans Bend is a place for all people and ages through the creation of diverse, liveable and family friendly communities.

4. Fishermans Bend has a unique public realm situated between the Yarra and the Bay with diverse and distinctive neighbourhoods that foster a sense of place through their safe, legible and inviting streets.

5. Fishermans Bend supports a vibrant mix of uses by providing a balance of employment generation, housing choice and community facilities accessible to residents and their surrounding neighbours.

6. The neighbourhoods of Fishermans Bend have high quality built environment that promotes best practice ESD and compact, high-density urban form at a human scale.

7. Fishermans Bend is a connected and legible precinct where people’s preference for getting around is by walking, cycling and public transport networks that are integrated to the CBD and surrounding suburbs.

8. Fishermans Bend delivers integrated and efficient energy, water and water infrastructure through cost effective, modern and sustainable environment solutions.

9. Fishermans Bend allows for the early consideration of precinct-scale environmental constraints with cost effective, collaborative solutions to achieve a more efficient development outcome.

10. Fishermans Bend provides a governance structure and supporting approval process that promotes best-practice design and construction methods and gives planning certainty to the development industry.

Vision

Fishermans Bend is a vibrant, accessible and cohesive network of places, which takes advantage of their strategic location, history and natural assets to offer:

- Lifestyle choices for all ages and households
- A sustainable mix of uses
- Flexible infrastructure and services to meet changing needs over time
- A sense of destination and excitement for Melbourne and beyond.

(Statutory Directions Report, October 2012 Places Victoria)

Part B
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Purpose of the Community Infrastructure Plan (CIP)

There is recognition that the Growth Areas model for community infrastructure planning is not appropriate for high-density inner city urban renewal sites such as FBURA, highlighting the need to reassess the way community infrastructure is planned in these areas. The high projected population densities coupled with limited land availability has emphasised the need for a new approach to be developed.

This report proposes a new approach to community infrastructure planning, specific to the opportunities and challenges of FBURA.

FBURA is at the beginning of its planned process of redevelopment and urban renewal, which is expected to take place over 40 years. A core part of the vision for FBURA is to provide a place for all people and ages through the creation of diverse, liveable and family friendly communities. The early provision of key community infrastructure has the potential to attract and support this diversity and as such should be considered vital to the project.

The Victorian Government is currently in the process of developing a new Metropolitan Planning Strategy for Melbourne. Part of this work has looked at different ways community infrastructure planning may be approached in the context of an expanded central city. This discussion paper outlines the key issues for planning community infrastructure in inner city areas including:

- High cost of land
- Existing legacy infrastructure- some of which serves a regional/metropolitan catchment (e.g. hospitals) though may no longer be fit for purpose or in the right location, while others may have capacity for increased use
- High density urban form requiring new models of provision (e.g. vertical schools)
- Fragmented land ownership
- Varied provision of government owned land
- Existing transport network, making some areas highly accessible and other areas less so, and
- The unknown demographic profile of future population

Developing Methodologies for a Community Infrastructure Framework – Expanded Central City Framework (Public Place, 2013)

The population densities proposed for FBURA also present a distinct set of challenges to the delivery of community infrastructure. High density populations create the need for a higher concentration of community infrastructure; whereby the Growth Areas model of provision based on population catchments may be less efficient than providing larger facilities with greater capacity. The spatial constraints also reinforce the imperative for compact, flexible community spaces, capable of accommodating multiple, overlapping activities throughout the day and evening, and changing activities over time.

To achieve a high level of amenity from the outset, community infrastructure will need to be provided in a timely and coordinated manner. It is critical that services, facilities and public open spaces are provided early and in a flexible and adaptable way to meet the needs of future communities, both within the site and those living and working nearby. Demand for community infrastructure is partly a function of population size and structure, as the future size and structure of FBURA remains uncertain, provision must be made for potential changing lifestyle preferences and expectations of future communities.

The CIP has focused on planning for the short, medium and long term to 2050 based on the ‘Discussion Scenario’ profiling information outlined in Part D.
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**Definition of Community Infrastructure**

A Guide to Delivering Community Precincts (DPCD and Growth Areas Authority, September 2010) defines ‘community infrastructure’ as infrastructure provided by government or non-government organisations for accommodating a range of community support services, programs and activities. This includes facilities for education and learning (examples include government and non-government schools, universities and adult learning centres), early years (maternal and child health centres, preschool and childcare), health and community services (hospitals, aged care, family and youth services, doctors, dentists and specialist health services), community (civic centres, libraries and neighbourhood houses), arts and culture (galleries, museums and performance space), sport, recreation and leisure (swimming pools), justice (law courts), voluntary and faith (places of worship) and emergency services (police, fire and ambulance stations).

Public open space is also addressed in the Community Infrastructure Plan as an integral part of the community infrastructure offering in FBURA. Public open space is defined as a series of spaces available to the public that includes a range of scale, character and functions. It is used for purposes such as recreation, nature conservation, passive outdoor enjoyment and public events and gatherings.

The central purpose of community infrastructure is to facilitate access to social services and networks to support and enhance a vibrant, diverse and resilient community.

The scope of services outlined in the brief is:

**a)** Early years (also referred to as Early Childhood Care and Education) and other components of a typical council community centre
- Four-year-old and three-year-old kindergartens
- Maternal & child health
- Playgroup venues
- Long day child-care

**b)** Multi-purpose community facilities
- Council community centres
- Planned activity group facilities
- Neighbourhood house functions
- Public venues for hire.

**c)** Educational facilities
- Neighbourhood house/adult education/U3A
- Primary schools
- Secondary schools
- Special education schools.

**d)** Libraries

**e)** Residential and aged care services
- Planned activity group facilities
- Residential aged care
- Home and community care.

**f)** Police and emergency services
- Police
- Metropolitan Fire Brigade
- Ambulance Victoria
- State Emergency Services (SES).

**g)** Health services
- Community health
- Hospitals and day procedure facilities.

**h)** Open space
- Passive open space
- Active open space.

**i)** Recreation
- Playgrounds
- Public aquatic leisure centres
- Private gymnasiums
- Hard court facilities.

**j)** Other community infrastructure
- Services/facilities for young people such as youth centre, TAFE, VET
- Facilities for community building activities, such as volunteering, NGO’s
- Places of worship
- Doctor’s surgeries and one-stop medical centres
- Cultural venues including galleries, performance space, theatres, cinemas, museums and music venues.

This study has focussed on planning for the short, medium and long term to 2050. Our advice is a staged approach reflective of the anticipated residential and worker growth in the growth scenario prepared by Places Victoria.
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Methodology

The CIP was formulated by a multi-disciplinary team of specialists including:

SJB Urban: an urban design practice recognised for work for State and Local government bodies (strategic plans, frameworks and master plans) and for private sector development companies (urban design guidance for individual developments).

Capire Consulting Group: a specialist social sustainability consultancy who works with organisations in the private and public sector to ensure project and investment decisions have lasting positive outcomes for the communities in which they operate or govern.

GlasUrban: a landscape architecture consultancy that combines international experience with local knowledge to offer strategic master planning, public space design and creative ecology in Melbourne.

Charter Keck Cramer: a consultancy that analyses priority and risk in the property sector using independent research to examine and assess the variables that can impact on the viability of a project ensuring that the desired business objectives are achieved for all parties involved.

Hemisphere: a practice which encompasses place shaping and place management. Holistic visions are crafted through collaboration with the local community, business leaders, traders and local and state government.

The methodology was structured for delivery in three parts:

- Phase A: Background and Research
- Phase B: Community Infrastructure Strategy
- Phase C: Community Infrastructure Plan

Part B

Stakeholder Consultation

A Community Infrastructure Working Group (Working Group) was formed to help guide the development of the community infrastructure planning of FBURA. Five other working groups were also formed to develop other key components required for the input into the Strategic Framework Plan.

The membership of the Community Infrastructure Working Group included officers from the following key stakeholder agencies:

- Places Victoria
- City of Melbourne
- City of Port Phillip
- Department of Planning and Community Development
- Department of Education and Early Childhood Development
- Port of Melbourne Corporation
- Office of Victorian Government Architects

The Community Infrastructure Working Group along with the Planning and Design Working Group worked in conjunction with the consultant team over a number of intensive workshops to develop this CIP.
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Concurrent Projects

A number of government agencies are currently reviewing their community infrastructure provisioning standards. Because these reviews are happening concurrently to the development of the Community Infrastructure Plan for FBURA, it is important that as new standards and benchmarks are developed and as our knowledge about the opportunities for FBURA are refined, that these inputs are reviewed and incorporated into the advice and findings contained in this report.

A brief description of these research projects is outlined below:

**Department of Planning and Community Development (DPCD)**
- DPCD commissioned Public Place to prepare a report titled Developing Methodologies For a Community Infrastructure Framework – Expanded Central City (April 2013) which assessed available methodologies for community infrastructure planning in urban renewal areas. The report proposed a ‘tool box’ approach to planning by posing a number of questions, challenges and research methods that could be applied in developing a preferred approach. Many of the stakeholders on the FBURA Community Infrastructure Working Group were also consulted in preparation of this report to ensure that learnings were shared between the two projects.

**Sport and Recreation Victoria (SRV)**
- SRV are currently researching new models for providing sports and recreational opportunities in urban infill settings, specifically indoor recreational opportunities.

**Department Education and Early Years (DEECD)**
- DEECD are currently developing a new education provision model which will assist in determining the number of government students generated from large scale urban development projects. Places Victoria has shared the Discussion Scenario profiling information with DEECD to assist in the schools planning for FBURA. This piece of work is still continuing and on completion, the findings and recommendations for school provision numbers should be incorporated into the FBURA CIP.

Assumptions

The demand and supply data is primarily based on the following background reports:
- Fishermans Bend Discussion Scenario Population Profile (Dec 2012) report by Places Victoria
- Fishermans Bend Preliminary Community Infrastructure Needs Assessment (Dec 2012) report by ASR Consultants.

It should be noted that the Fishermans Bend Preliminary Community Infrastructure Needs Assessment (Dec 2012) report by ASR Consultants is not based on the Discussion Scenario population profiles and additional work was undertaken to reflect the new population profile.

Limitations

The development of the Community Infrastructure Plan was completed within an eight-week work timeframe and is primarily based on the background reports noted within the Assumptions. Information gaps have been filled where possible but no further surveys or primary research was undertaken.

The consultant team and the Working Group recognise that the Growth Areas model for community infrastructure provision is not appropriate to be used as a provision model for FBURA. The new approach proposed in this report is untested and the findings of concurrent projects investigating new delivery models should be regularly assessed and incorporated into this CIP where appropriate.

The new approach presented in the CIP shows suggested locations of activity centres and public open space based on sets of principles and locational attributes. The actual location of community infrastructure may differ from these locations in future depending on factors such as the population take-up and opportunity sites that may become available for community infrastructure.
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Existing Conditions

Introduction

This chapter outlines the policy documents reviewed that have influenced the CIP, discusses the process of arriving at the population numbers used to determine the required community infrastructure provision, including a review of the Fishermans Bend Preliminary Community Infrastructure Needs Assessment document and the ‘Discussion Scenario’ which has informed the population data used for the CIP. The capacity of existing community infrastructure in and around FBURA is also assessed. A series of maps showing the existing community infrastructure within a 2km radius of FBURA is included in the Appendix.

Policy Context and Documents Reviewed

A number of relevant policies relate to community infrastructure planning in Fishermans Bend. Policies reviewed to inform this study include:

Documents provided by Places Victoria
- Fishermans Bend Strategic Directions Report (Places Victoria, 2012)
- Fishermans Bend Discussion Scenario Population Profile (Places Victoria December 2012)
- Fishermans Bend Preliminary Community Infrastructure Needs Assessment (Dec 2012) report by ASR Consultants (including the detailed policy review within).

Documents provided by Department of Planning and Community Development
- A Guide to Delivering Community Precincts (DPCD and Growth Areas Authority, September 2010)
- A Guide to Governing Shared Community Facilities (DPCD, September 2010)
- Developing Methodologies for a Community Infrastructure Framework - Expanded Central City Framework (Public Place, 2013)
- Planning for Open Space at Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area, Scoping Paper, version 3 (DPCD, March 2013).

Documents provided by City of Port Phillip
- JL Murphy Reserve Structure Plan 2011
- Montague Structure Plan 2012.

Documents provided by City of Melbourne
- Open Space Strategy (June 2012)
- Southbank Structure Plan (October 2011).

Preliminary Community Infrastructure Needs Assessment (PCINA)

As part of the due diligence work undertaken for the FBURA project in 2012, ASR Consultants were commissioned to undertake a report titled Fishermans Bend Preliminary Community Infrastructure Needs Assessment (Dec 2012). This report was based on three preliminary development scenarios.

Following completion of the PCINA, the preliminary development scenarios were evaluated and a single ‘Discussion Scenario’ was developed as a result of the evaluation process. The Discussion Scenario assumptions have been used to inform the Community Infrastructure Plan.

The report has been reviewed and the following comments are provided:

Components of the PCINA relevant to this report
- Policy Context
- Assumptions and standards around the rates of provision for community services and facilities (and the best available)
- Current rate of supply of existing services and facilities in the study area
- 2011 demographic profile, based on the 2011 census data.

Limitations of the PCINA
The ASR report encompasses significant limitations in terms of its application to FBURA, as follows:
- The community infrastructure provision requirements only consider residents’ needs, and does not include the needs generated by worker population.
- The recommendations assume land availability in line with a Growth Areas model of provision, which is not appropriate due to the land constraints within FBURA.
- The recommendations do not address or reflect the high-density, mixed context planned for FBURA.

New Work
In response to these limitations Capire Consultants have new calculations to determine the projected likely population for services and facilities based on the population numbers outlined in the Discussion Scenario profiling information.

The existing provision of services and facilities is based on the PCINA and added to with more recent information received from the City of Port Phillip and City of Melbourne Councils. The new population projections have then been considered against the standards and triggers developed in the PCINA.

Part C
Assessment of Supply and Demand against PCINA

The current provision of community infrastructure within FBURA is limited as a result of its history as an industrial precinct. However, the existing recreational open spaces of FBURA including JL Murphy Reserve and the Port Melbourne Cricket Oval are significant assets that are integral to the existing community and surrounding areas. FBURA’s strategic location close to Port Phillip Bay, Albert Park and the Yarra River, also provides opportunities to connect to extensive beaches, paths and outdoor activities.

The audit of community infrastructure surrounding FBURA, conducted by ASR and added to by the consultant team, showed that the majority of existing facilities are either approaching or operating at capacity. This is driven predominantly by a high demand from the Port Melbourne and South Melbourne areas which have experienced significant residential development in recent years and will continue to do so in the future. The City of Port Phillip has noted that it is likely that any potential increase in capacity through investment in existing facilities will be taken up by the existing excess demand and increased local demand from future development. Therefore, the new residential and worker population of FBURA will require additional community infrastructure to be delivered in order to satisfy the demand.

A summary of the relevant findings follows:

**Open Space and Recreation**
Currently, open space and recreational facilities in the area surrounding FBURA are either at or are nearing capacity. In particular, there is no capacity in the South Melbourne area facilities to accommodate any population increase. There is some capacity in the Port Melbourne area to accommodate some short-term growth, provided that existing facilities are updated and investment is made in local parks and play areas.

Melbourne Sports and Aquatic Centre and the Albert Park sporting precinct are operating at capacity and currently serve a catchment area much broader than their immediate areas.

**Family and Children’s Services**
The family and children’s infrastructure and services currently available within and surrounding FBURA are already operating at or over capacity. It is likely that any potential increase in capacity will be taken up by high demand within the Port Melbourne and South Melbourne areas, as well as by families outside the City of Port Phillip.

**Education**
Demand for education services within and surrounding FBURA is currently high. Assessment indicates that within 3km of the study area, there is little to no capacity to meet any increase in demand for primary or secondary school education.

The new primary school planned for the Montague neighbourhood has been generated to respond to the lack of primary school capacity in Port Melbourne and South Melbourne. It was not derived from need for a new school to service Fishermans Bend and it is unlikely to provide enough capacity to respond to all anticipated demand over time.

There is high demand for primary and secondary education facilities within the precinct and opportunities exist to build a partnership with a private educator. A high need has also been identified for library services across the study area.

Further research needs to be undertaken to existing and likely demand for TAFE, vocational and University facilities and services.

**Emergency Services**
Provision of emergency services to the FBURA precinct requires further planning. It is important that emergency services planning is integrated with transport, facilities and utilities planning for the area.

**Health Services**
Provision of health services within and surrounding FBURA is generally operating at capacity. In particular, community health is operating at capacity and most general practitioners are also operating at capacity.

The anticipated population increase within the precinct does not justify a need for a new public hospital. However, there is significant potential to explore opportunities of a public/private health service to meet the demand of the community as it grows. In addition to basic health services, a significant need has also been identified for a community health service.

**Residential and Aged Care**
The City of Port Phillip has an existing high demand for residential and aged care services and there is an opportunity to provide these services and facilities in FBURA.
Case Study

Community infrastructure in mixed-use buildings: mechanisms

Green Square Urban Renewal Area, Sydney NSW
The Green Square Urban Renewal project is similar to Fishermans Bend, in that it involves the large-scale regeneration of former industrial land in a strategically located area. Another document states the area as being approximately 370ha, so larger than the FBURA, but the projected development to 2030 is expected to accommodate approximately 50,000 residents and 22,000 workers, so somewhat smaller than the Fishermans Bend Discussion Scenario.

This document explains an interesting mechanism for incentivising the delivery of community infrastructure within commercial/mixed-use developments, by developers. The system provides the potential for additional allowable development (floor space) if community infrastructure is provided. It utilises a monetary valuing process to establish the value of the community infrastructure proposed, to ensure a fair and equitable approach.

This is of relevance to Fishermans Bend, where the absence of government/Council-owned land may require the provision of some community infrastructure within other buildings, rather than or in addition to standalone community buildings.

This type of mechanism, however, appears to require rigorous development controls on a site-by-site basis, in order for allowances for ‘additional’ development yield to be meaningful. This outcome may require detailed master planning for the FBURA.

- Green Square URA:
  - strategically located between the City, Sydney Airport and Port Botany
  - large scale regeneration of former industrial lands
  - 2030: Approximately 50,000 residents and 22,000 workers
  - Green Square Town Centre is located in the centre of the Urban Renewal Area, and is excluded from Sydney LEP 2012 and Sydney DCP 2012. Separate planning controls address the development and provision of community and sustainable infrastructure
- City of Sydney established the Development Guidelines for the provision of Community Infrastructure to offer an incentive for the private sector to contribute through cash or works in kind.
- The guidelines encourage developers to take up additional floor space in return for providing community infrastructure identified through a needs basis.
- FSR Map under Sydney LEP 2012 identifies the maximum FSR permissible for each site, and additional FSR that sites are potentially capable of achieving if Community Infrastructure is provided.
- City will seek as far as practicable that Community Infrastructure works (rather than monetary contributions) are undertaken.
- To ensure an equitable and transparent assessment of the public benefits, the City uses a dollar rate to establish the value of the additional floor space and the Community Infrastructure.
- Six-step process for planning and delivery of Community Infrastructure within a development.
Rhodes Peninsula, Canada Bay City Council, NSW

This project, also in Sydney, utilises similar mechanisms as those identified for Green Square, but within a redevelopment process that is more advanced, and with the extent of development much greater than originally planned.

This has resulted in the need to plan for and provide increased community infrastructure, to address significant shortfalls currently being experienced.

Developers are being encouraged to provide for community infrastructure within developments, through similar mechanisms as those described for Green Square.

Context
- Identified as a major regeneration zone in the late 1990s
- Master plan and associated development controls
- Major transition from industrial wasteland to high-density residential precinct
- Scale and density of development has expanded over and above the levels outlined in the original masterplan
- Initial 8-storey height limit has been re-established at 20+ storeys due to growing demand and housing pressure

Community infrastructure
- Issues with increased levels of planned residential development failing to be matched by provision of community and social infrastructure
- Demand for child care, leisure, education and social services several times over current supply.
- Council is now negotiating with developers to provide community infrastructure as part of existing development approvals in exchange for increased floor space.

Current planning and provision
- Rhodes Peninsula Place Plan (Nov 2012) outlines existing and projected community profile, the aspirations and vision from the community, program of the delivery of individual projects (physical and social), and detailed breakdown of strategic and short-term initiatives at a precinct level.
- Council are relying on Section 94 contributions and Voluntary Planning Agreements (VPA) on a site-by-site basis
- Process relies on an open and transparent relationship between the Council and the development sector
Projected Infrastructure Demands
The Discussion Scenario describes a build-out scenario for FBURA to the year 2050. The profile describes the projected number of residents, workers and dwellings across each of the four precincts and is broken down into three stages of delivery.

The Discussion Scenario outlines the anticipated population growth within FBURA for residents and workers as well as the projected number of dwellings to be delivered. The profiling information is based around three stages of development which are outlined below:

- **Stage 1 - 2015 - 2020**
- **Stage 2 - 2020 - 2025**
- **Stage 3 - 2025 - 2030+**

It should be noted that the staging information presented in this report is consistent with the Discussion Scenario and has been adapted accordingly to align with the staging proposed in the Development Contributions Planning work being prepared by Places Victoria.

Table 5 outlines the overall anticipated residential and worker populations within Fishermans Bend.

Table 5: Anticipated population growth at Fishermans Bend from 2015-30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Stage 1.2 &amp; 3</th>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Dwellings</th>
<th>Worker population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>2015-2020</td>
<td>2020-2025</td>
<td>2025-2030+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague</td>
<td>3067</td>
<td>11647</td>
<td>20900</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>7920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorimer</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>4068</td>
<td>13500</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6750</td>
<td>5062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandridge</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>8913</td>
<td>27530</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>13075</td>
<td>21210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wirraway</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>7919</td>
<td>13536</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>8093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6686</td>
<td>32888</td>
<td>84084</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>40225</td>
<td>42286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Discussion Scenario Profiling Information, Places Victoria December 2012

Table 5 shows that by the year 2050:
- The residential population for Fishermans Bend is likely to reach around 84000 people
- The worker population for Fishermans Bend is likely to reach around 42000 people
- The Sandridge area is likely to have the greatest population across the largest area
- The Montague precinct is likely to have the highest density of population.

These population numbers are significantly high. Table 6 provides some comparison locations.

Table 6: A comparison of population densities in nearby development areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (km²)</th>
<th>Hectares</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Density per hectare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBURA</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>84064 (by 2050)</td>
<td>347 people/hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docklands</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>26,000 (As of 2012, likely to increase over time)</td>
<td>100 people/hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbank</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>11,235 (as of 2012, likely to increase over time)</td>
<td>66 people/hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Port Phillip</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>91,373 (as of 2012, likely to increase over time)</td>
<td>43 people/hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Melbourne</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>100,611 (as of 2012, likely to increase over time)</td>
<td>26 people/hectare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABS. Census Data 2011

Table 6 illustrates that by the year 2050:
- The likely residential population is anticipated to be four times the density of Docklands and almost eight times the density of Southbank
- The likely population of FBURA is equivalent to the size of the population of Port Phillip but is to be located within one tenth of land size.
Projected Infrastructure Demands Part D

Montague
Population projections for Montague precinct show a significantly higher dwelling density (250 dwellings per hectare) and higher resident density (568 people per hectare) when compared to other neighbourhoods in FBURA. The area is also expected to attract a relatively high worker population of 253 workers per hectare, resulting in a combined resident and worker density of 921 people per hectare.

Housing stock in Montague is expected to be 25% studio or one bedroom dwellings and 50% two bedroom dwellings. As a result of the relatively high proportion of one bedroom dwellings, Montague is likely to have the smallest household size of all precincts at 1.9 people per dwelling. It is anticipated that Montague will attract predominately singles and couples, aged between 25 to 34 years old.

The Montague neighbourhood is expected to be the fastest growing area in FBURA, with approximately 15 per cent of dwellings anticipated in Stage 1, 41 per cent for Stage 2 and the remainder occurring in Stage 3 of development. In turn, this will support an initial population for Stage 2 and the remainder occurring in Stage 3 of development. Projections indicate the majority of development in Montague will attract more couples and couples with children.

Population projections for Montague illustrate the community are likely to be characterised by the following:
- An equal proportion of babies and pre-schoolers (2 per cent) compared to other precincts in FBURA (4 per cent)
- A slightly smaller proportion of primary school aged children (6 per cent) and secondary school aged children (3 per cent) compared to other precincts in FBURA (3 per cent and 4 per cent, respectively)
- A much smaller proportion of seniors compared to other precincts in FBURA
- An equal proportion of babies and pre-schoolers (2 per cent) compared to other precincts in FBURA (4 per cent)
- A slightly lower proportion (30 per cent) of a young workforce (aged 25 to 34 years) compared to other precincts in FBURA
- An equal proportion of primary school aged children (3 per cent) and secondary school aged children (4 per cent) compared to other precincts in FBURA
- An equal proportion of seniors (4 per cent) compared to other precincts in FBURA

Impacts for Community Infrastructure Provision
The projections for Montague, including the anticipated fast growth, will require immediate action for the delivery of community infrastructure. Access to open space and facilities for physical activity such as indoor courts and outdoor recreation opportunities will be essential for the high density residential and worker population very early on. Maximising the opportunity to layer infrastructure in multi-storey buildings will also be vital in this high-density environment.

Sandridge
The neighbourhood of Sandridge includes both north and south areas. Projections show a dwelling density of 190 dwellings per hectare, similar to the density expected for the wider FBURA. These figures are expected to generate a total resident density ranging from 348 to 445 residents per hectare, again comparable to the resident density anticipated for the wider precinct.

Projections indicate the majority of development in Sandridge will occur during Stages 2 and 3, with approximately 5 per cent of development scheduled for Stage 1, 27 per cent scheduled for Stage 2 and 68 per cent of development scheduled for Stage 3. As such, only 5 per cent (1,509 people) of Sandridge’s total estimated population will reside within the neighbourhood at the end of Stage 1.

Discussion scenarios indicate that Sandridge will have the highest worker density of all neighbourhoods, estimated at 308 workers per hectare, compared to an average of 207 for the wider area. This, combined with the anticipated resident density, will result in an average total density of 704 people per hectare.

With a household size range from 2.1 - 2.2, housing stock in Sandridge is expected to comprise a larger proportion of two (38 per cent) and three bedroom apartments (35 per cent), and a smaller proportion of one bedroom apartments. As such, it is anticipated the area will attract more couples and couples with children.

Population projections for the Sandridge neighbourhood indicate that by 2050, the area will have a total population of 27,530 residents, the largest neighbourhood population within FBURA.

It is anticipated the Sandridge community is likely to be characterised by the following:
- An equal proportion of babies and pre-schoolers compared to other precincts in FBURA (4 per cent)
- An equal proportion of primary school aged children (3 per cent) and secondary school aged children (4 per cent) compared to other precincts in FBURA
- A slightly lower proportion (30 per cent) of a young workforce (aged 25 to 34 years) compared to other precincts in FBURA
- An equal proportion of seniors (4 per cent) compared to other precincts in FBURA

Impacts for Community Infrastructure Provision
The projections for Sandridge indicate the early provision of a community and early years facilities including day care, kindergarten, maternal and child health and spaces for community meetings/classrooms and playgroups. It is also centrally located within FBURA and will have a significant number of transport links including pedestrian and cycle links, which should be incorporated as part of the wider network.
Projected Infrastructure Demands

Lorimer

Projections for Lorimer indicate a higher dwelling density (270 dwellings per hectare) and higher resident density (538 people per hectare) when compared to other precincts in FBURA. The anticipated worker density is expected to be slightly lower than that of the wider area at 201 workers per hectare, compared to 207 workers. In total, Lorimer is expected to have a combined resident and worker density of 739 people per hectare.

Projections of future housing stock indicate a high proportion of up to one bedroom dwellings (25 per cent), and a lower proportion of dwellings with four or more bedrooms, with an average household size of 2.0 people per dwelling. Relative to the housing stock, it is anticipated that Lorimer will attract a similar cohort to Montague, being singles and couples aged between 25–34 years old.

Development in the Lorimer neighbourhood is likely to be slower in Stages 1 and 2, with the majority of development not expected until Stage 3.

By 2050, Lorimer is expected to have a total population of 13,500 residents, making it the smallest neighbourhood population in FBURA.

The Lorimer community is likely to be characterised by the following:
- An equal proportion of babies and pre-schoolers compared to other precincts in FBURA (4 per cent)
- An equal proportion of primary school aged children (3 per cent) and secondary school aged children (4 per cent) compared to other precincts in FBURA
- A slightly younger workforce with 32 per cent aged 25 to 34 years compared to other precincts in FBURA (31 per cent)
- A slightly lower proportion of seniors (5 per cent) compared to other precincts in FBURA (4 per cent).

Impacts for Community Infrastructure Provision

The projections for Lorimer indicate a slower initial growth however the early provision of recreation facilities and a neighbourhood centre providing a health and well-being cluster will support the residential and worker populations. Lorimer’s location between the river and the freeway also isolates it from neighbouring facilities. The provision of community infrastructure should be strongly linked to public transport infrastructure and physical connections such as bridges.

Wirraway

The Wirraway neighbourhood includes both east and west areas. Discussion scenarios indicate the smallest dwelling density in FBURA, estimated at 125 dwellings per hectare. It is also anticipated that the area will have a significantly lower resident density than the other precincts of FBURA, at 282 residents per hectare, compared to 403 residents in FBURA. In addition, it is anticipated Wirraway will have the largest household size of all FBURA neighbourhoods, ranging from 2.2 to 2.4.

Wirraway will have a significantly smaller worker density, estimated at 106 workers per hectare, compared to an average 207 workers for the wider area. Wirraway is anticipated to have in total a density of 704 people per hectare.

Projections of future housing stock indicate a lower proportion of up to one bedroom dwellings (10 to 15 per cent) and a higher proportion of three and four bedroom dwellings (40 per cent and 15 per cent, respectively). As such, it is expected Wirraway will attract more couples with children than other FBURA neighbourhoods.

By 2050, Wirraway is likely to have a total population of 21,515 residents, which will be characterised by the following:
- A slightly larger proportion of babies and pre-schoolers (5 per cent) compared to other precincts in FBURA (4 per cent)
- A slightly larger proportion of primary school aged children (4 per cent) and secondary school aged children (5 per cent), compared to other precincts in FBURA (3 per cent and 4 per cent respectively).
- A lower proportion (27 per cent) of a younger workforce aged 25 to 34 years compared to other precincts in FBURA (31 per cent)
- A higher proportion of seniors (6 per cent) compared to other precincts in FBURA (4 per cent).

Impacts for Community Infrastructure Provision

The projections for Wirraway indicate a greater need for facilities supporting a larger number of families including children and older people. Early access to day care, kindergartens, primary and secondary schools and age specific facilities will be needed.
Case Study

Schools as catalysts: UK experience with academy schools

Bridge Academy, Hackney, London
This UK example is focused on the provision of new schools within housing regeneration projects, to help to shift the image and perception of these places, and to attract families. In this way, community infrastructure becomes a catalyst for market interest and development.

In this case, the schools are ‘sponsored’ by external bodies, but the principle of providing high-quality and prominent community infrastructure to (re-)establish community and sense of place, and to attract families to urban areas, remains relevant and applicable to Fishermans Bend.

- Ageing housing stock in UK’s extensive housing estates has been falling into a state of disrepair and requires major investment and often redevelopment
- Where government funding isn’t available the Councils and development sector have relied on catalyst projects that seek to attract investment, change perceptions, increase property values and enable further development to occur.
- In London’s Boroughs, following the down-turn in the housing market in 2008 and the reduction in residential values, an alternative built outcome was identified as a potential driver for urban regeneration.
- Academy Schools are generally set up to replace underperforming schools and are funded either primarily or in partnership with a sponsor.
- In Hackney, the development of the Bridge Academy in 2007 was aligned with the planned redevelopment of the Haggerston West and Kingsland Housing Estates, which is currently underway and on completion will replace 400 dwellings with 761 new homes.
- The Academy will serve as a major attractor for new families to move into the local area, either as housing tenants or private property owners. The quality of education and facilities offered by the Academy makes it very desirable to live within the local catchment.
The typology and scale of these catalytic projects vary according to the urban context and community need. In London’s Boroughs’, following the down-turn in the housing market in 2008 as a result of the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) and the reduction in residential values, an alternative built outcome was identified as a potential driver for urban regeneration.

Academy Schools are generally set up to replace underperforming schools and are funded either primarily or in partnership with a sponsor. The sponsors come from a wide range of backgrounds including successful schools, businesses, universities, charities and faith bodies. ‘Sponsors are held accountable for improving the performance of their schools. They do this by challenging traditional thinking on how schools are run and what they should be like for students. They seek to make a complete break with cultures of low aspiration and achievement. The sponsor’s vision and leadership are vital to each project.’

In the London Borough of Hackney, the development of the Bridge Academy in 2007 was aligned with the planned redevelopment of the Haggerston West and Kingsland Housing Estates, which is currently underway and on completion will replace 400 dwellings with 761 new homes. Some of the local residents have been campaigning for improvements to the estates since the late 1980’s.

The Academy will serve as a major attractor for new families to move into the local area, either as housing tenants or private property owners. The quality of education and facilities offered by the Academy makes it very desirable to live within the local catchment.

Source:
http://www.bridgeacademy.hackney.sch.uk/

Urban regeneration can be triggered by a wide range of development projects, planning policies, branding and marketing campaigns. There are endless examples of successful and failed outcomes, and instances where the most benign initiatives have sparked considerable urban and social change.

One of the most high-profile and interrogated examples is the ‘Guggenheim Effect’ in Bilbao, Spain, where the development of an iconic art gallery by architect Frank Gehry was coupled with ambitious plans (including a masterplan by Zaha Hadid) and urban policies that sought to capture the regenerative benefits flowing from the initial capital investment.

Since the development of the Guggenheim in the late 1990’s the city has undertaken an extensive development program that includes upgrades to the public transport network, public realm improvements, new housing and commercial precincts and considerable investment in the cities ports.

Not every community can have a ‘Guggenheim’, nor do they need one. . .

Over the past 20 years the aging housing stock found across the UK’s extensive housing estates, most of which were developed in the post war boom (1950’s and 60’s), has been falling into a state of disrepair and requires major investment and often redevelopment. A range of urban drivers and funding sources have been investigated and implemented to address this growing housing issue with mixed success.

Where government funding isn’t available the Councils and development sector have relied on catalyst projects that seek to attract investment, change perceptions, increase property values and enable further development to occur.
Key Issues and Opportunities
Key Issues and Opportunities

A Changing Environment

The research has highlighted a range of issues, challenges and strategic opportunities that will guide and inform the approach for delivering community infrastructure in FBURA. These issues have been grouped under the three main themes relating to:

- A changing environment
- Creating a sense of place and community
- Flexible, adaptable and integrated design.

Limitations of the Growth Areas Community Planning Approach

The recommendations within the Preliminary Community Infrastructure Needs Assessment (PCINA) highlight a significant need for a range of different community services and facilities. This need has been determined through a traditional community infrastructure planning approach more suited to greenfield sites, where land is available and land ownership is consolidated. For example, facility recommendations for school provision are based around single level schools with a certain number of students and do not contemplate vertical (multi-storey) schools with shared outdoor facilities.

Table 7 shows that within FBURA there is simply not enough land to respond to the community infrastructure requirements if provided in the traditional way and as detailed in the ASR report. As such, a new model to respond to the unique attributes of higher density living is needed. This model will take time to develop and will rely on a coordinated approach across a range of services and stakeholders, including decision-makers, developers, councils, private service providers and funding bodies.

From an Inner City Industrial Estate to a High-density Residential Area

Recent zoning changes allowing for the transformation of the area, from an industrial precinct to an expanded central city area, has changed the role of FBURA from an inner city industrial estate to a high density urban renewal location. This transformation will have significant implications on the population and demographic context. It is likely to enhance community expectations regarding the provision, standard and delivery of community services and facilities across FBURA. It also increases the opportunities for commercial offering to meet service need.

In anticipation that FBURA will be an extension of the inner city, the role of Docklands, the CBD and the surrounding area is important to consider in the process. The supply and demand of community infrastructure in these areas, and the movement to and from these locations needs to be continuously strengthened and incorporated into this plan.

While the site is considered an extension of the inner city it will also border existing residential areas in South Melbourne and Port Melbourne. The existing urban fabric in these areas is predominately medium to low rise residential including townhouses, workers cottages and more recent medium density apartments. The relationship between the existing built form and new development in FBURA should be considered and addressed in more detail in the urban design strategy for FBURA.

Table 7: Examples of facility recommendations for Fishermans Bend (based on ASR Work) and generally suggesting single level built form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Number of Facilities</th>
<th>Land required per facility (ha)</th>
<th>Total land requirements (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>38.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Centre</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Aquatic Centre</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>9000m²</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Ovals</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Number of hectares required for a traditional delivery of community infrastructure | 183.3

Table: Number of hectares in total in FBURA | 248

Source: Fishermans Bend Preliminary Community Infrastructure Needs Assessment (Dec 2012) report by ASR Consultants

Filling the Gaps and Responding to Increasing Demand

The FBURA population is predicted to grow to 84,000 people and 42,000 workers. Initial investigations have identified significant gaps in existing community infrastructure within the area, particularly in regard to family and children services, health services, education and active recreation and public open space.

The dwelling type and mix within FBURA

Community infrastructure planning for FBURA needs to consider existing deficits in addition to responding to the needs of the growing population. It must respond to a whole-of-life approach, for example, from young children through to older adults and responding to different life stages of the community and all abilities.

Role and Provision of Open Space

The provision of open space across FBURA needs to be delivered through an innovative approach that capitalises on opportunities, making best use of available space through a range of programming strategies to maximise utilisation rates.

Design and delivery of open space needs to be efficient and flexible. The function of open space will need to respond to changing community needs. Open space will play a key role within FBURA and planning should seek to create a network of open space both within and outside the precinct.
Creating a Sense of Place and Community

Creating a Connected Community
It is important that FBUURA creates a connected community in terms of providing a high quality public realm and community infrastructure to support social interaction, an active community and the amenity/identity of neighbourhoods. A road hierarchy that supports and prioritises the role of the pedestrian, and pedestrian and cycle connections should be considered in partnership with a system of linear parks and active street/home zones to enable safe, attractive connections throughout the site and into neighbouring areas.

Building on Local History and Culture
There is an opportunity for FBUURA to retain and build on the history and cultural value from its indigenous, early residential and industrial past. Development and community infrastructure provision should aim to create a unique sense of place and local identity for its residents to relate to and build on. This provides community development opportunities regarding the design, scale, development and landscaping of each precinct.

Quality of Life
Quality of life in higher density environments relies on a number of aspects. Some of which include the design, privacy requirements and provision of communal space in residential developments. Other aspects include the level and design of surrounding buildings, access and connectivity to well-located and safe open space, proximity to community, health and education services, and availability of spaces for informal socialisation opportunities. Such considerations will need to be integrated early in the design process to be effective.

The provision of community facilities which offer places for both formal activities and informal social gatherings plays a particularly important role for people living in higher densities.

A Place for Everyone

Role and Provision of Community Facilities
Community facilities and services need to respond to current community needs and aspirations, as well as the needs and aspirations of future residents and workers both within the urban renewal area and the surrounding areas. They need to be delivered early, in a timely, well-considered and sustained manner.

All communities have differing needs, and a one-size-fits-all approach is inappropriate towards community infrastructure.

Community facilities are central in creating healthy communities. Communities with access to high quality social infrastructure have better access to services and enhanced opportunities to participate in community life. Community infrastructure provides space for cultural expression and events and for people of all abilities allowing for a more inclusive community. They should create a ‘community heart’ and provide indoor and outdoor space and informal and formal activities.

The presence of essential community infrastructure including schools, healthcare, meeting spaces and other facilities will be a vital consideration for prospective residents and workers. Integrated community facilities are essential to encourage healthy communities, improve wellbeing and develop social networks.

Children, Young People and their Families
The vision for FBUURA supports and encourages families and children to live in the area and research indicates that housing affordability and location to work, schools and supporting services are often triggers for families to move from more traditional suburban living, to a higher density apartment style family living1.

Crowding and a lack of privacy, especially for teenagers, are also identified as common issues often leading to emotional stress and strained family relationships2. Impacts on child health from a general lack of exercise and limited opportunities for explorative and independent play have also emerged as a concern3. Therefore, higher density environments must encourage and support the needs of children and families through the family friendly design; for example three bedroom homes, local play spaces in easy walking distance from housing, good safe and natural surveillance so children can play safely nearby and provision of education and family and children’s services locally.

Our research shows that the move of families into higher density environments is resulting in a number of issues affecting the quality of life of families, and in particular children. These include a lack of appropriate spaces and facilities for children and expectations of other residents.

Older Adults
The capacity of higher density areas to accommodate residents as they age is often overlooked. As residents age, their needs and interests may change. Access to respite care and home assistance will be important. Accommodation may need to provide for residents with restricted mobility. The walkability of neighbourhoods and rest stops along pedestrian linkages will deliver ongoing independence. There will be a need to ensure public transport stops are well located near to key services and facilities. As support networks change, older residents may require more opportunities for social interaction in both formalised and informal settings.

As identified by the City of Port Phillip, this site also provides the opportunities to ‘build in’ an age friendly place to FBUURA – consistent with the World Health organisation - Age Friendly Cities Framework (i.e. 8 domains - housing, outdoor space and buildings, transport, social participation, civic involvement and employment, communication and technology, respect and social inclusion and community support and health services).

Worker Population
The redevelopment of FBUURA will result in a worker increase of around 42,000 people each day. The impacts on service provision and retail have the potential to be significant. Often workers prefer to visit health services close to their place of work. For example, working parents sometimes enrol their children in childcare and schools nearby to allow for ease of drop-offs and pick-ups.

The ASR report did not quantify the likely demand from the worker population and this remains a significant gap in the background work. Where appropriate this report highlights when additional demand is likely to be generated by the worker population. This report also acknowledges that the time constraints for this project (eight weeks) did not allow sufficient time to undertake an understanding of the worker demand to the level of detail required and therefore remains an outstanding gap in analysis.

---


2 Easthope, H. and Judd, S. 2010, Living Well in Greater Density, City Futures, UNSW

Key Issues and Opportunities

Flexible, Adaptable and Integrated Design

A Flexible Approach
Planning for community infrastructure must be flexible enough to be refined in response to changing population needs and wants, whilst also ensuring essential facilities and services are provided from the start of residential development. It is critical to continue to refine community facility needs once there is a better understanding of future local lifestyle preferences and to adapt to new uses and trends over the life of the development.

It is important FBURA provides passive and active open space that reflects the need for diversity (e.g. community gardens through to sports grounds) and the potential for the public realm/streets to form a crucial component of the public space network (i.e. home zones/green street as connections).

Thinking Vertically
A lack of available space for community infrastructure does not translate into a lesser need for community services and facilities in higher density communities. It can be suggested that people residing in areas of higher densities may require more open space and community infrastructure than individuals residing in areas where private open space is more readily available.

Planning for community infrastructure in high-density areas requires a vertical approach. Developers, planners and service providers are required to work collaboratively; to deliver traditionally horizontally designed infrastructure (such as a primary school), in more efficient, innovative and vertically layered designs.

Clustered, Co-location and Integration of Facilities
There are different ways to deliver services to the community, and different definitions and terms used to define each approach.

Generally;
• Clustering is the term used when services are proximate to each other, operate independently and generally have formal or informal links between them
• Co-location is the term used when services operate independently, but are co-located and collaborate to provide multi-agency services
• Integration is the term used when services combine to form a single entity and provide integrated interdisciplinary services from a single location.

All of these approaches acknowledge there are benefits of locating complementary services near each other. The clustering, co-location and integration of facilities can be a cost effective solution for service providers and can be a more efficient use of land, particularly when considering vertical layouts. It also provides benefits from multipurpose trips and additional synergies from providing services within easy reach of each other. There is a range of other factors that impact the way services are provided, including the governance structure, service provider, management and structure, service philosophy, operational structure and practice and the type of services.

Shared community facilities generally provide the best value for money and community outcomes for funding partners (including maximizing shared use, capitalising on land ownership opportunities and enduring community support). They should also build on a collaborative approach to service delivery making cross referral easier.

The way services are delivered relies on a more detailed service planning process. When this more detailed process has been undertaken, the benefits and risks associated with each approach listed above should be considered for FBURA. There is not a best-fit approach for all, however, the benefits for integrated models for family and children service are well documented and have been recommended for this site.

A Range of Stakeholders in the Provision of Community Infrastructure
There are a range of different community infrastructure facilities and a range of different service providers. This includes the public (local, state and federal level) providers, private sector, community sector and not-for-profit sector. Within each facility type there is a range of different models and ways to deliver the same service. For example, a maternal and childcare service can be provided as a stand-alone facility, as part of an integrated family and children service model, or provided as a sessional service in a multi-use sessional service space used by different practitioners throughout the week.

Land Use and Connectivity
The approach taken for community infrastructure planning in the expanded central city area must recognise the unique characteristics and different developmental contexts of an area and respond to these. It must address the interface and connection between land uses during community infrastructure planning and the role of the open space network both within the site and how it relates to the surrounding area.

Planning should seek opportunities for synergies between community facilities, including schools, community hubs, open space networks, as well as retail clusters. This can deliver greater ease of access to a range of services for the community and maximises opportunities across the site.
Key Issues and Opportunities

**Built Form Implications**
The urban design of the site needs to create a network between home, school and recreational areas. Well-connected and safe routes between apartment buildings, schools and nearby recreation areas benefit all of the community by providing opportunities for independent neighbourhood travel and explorative play. It is also critical to create a pedestrian friendly environment by limiting the amount of through traffic on local roads, within the precinct, across the study area and into the surrounding neighbourhoods.

**The Role of Temporary (Pop-up) Spaces**
Due to the staging of the population growth, it is important that innovative and flexible approaches towards community facilities and services provision are considered to ensure community needs are met from the outset. Temporary and adaptable spaces will help deliver essential services to the new community as it grows. Temporary and pop-up projects have a number of benefits that are particularly relevant in the creation of new and evolving communities.

**Affordability**
Significantly lower rents allow for small, start-up and/or local businesses to engage in the commercial market.

**Short-term**
Commitment allows for flexibility for the developer and for the tenant. It poses less risk for both parties in exploring new relationships.

**Generate buzz and community capital**
Pop-up projects can generate a buzz and help people to see the space and each other in different ways. They have the potential to build capacity and change from within existing and developing communities. Participants in the pop-ups can benefit from the relationship with other tenants including resource and knowledge sharing and can complement other activities/products.

**Allow for testing and experimentation**
This is applicable to both the tenants who can test their product in the market and to the space in which the pop-ups are situated. For instance different spatial arrangements can be tried to determine the effects on public space and pedestrian flows while tenants can test out new ideas, innovations or projects which supports the cultural and creative energy of a community in a low-risk environment.

**Activation**
Pop-up and temporary projects can be used to activate ‘dead’ and underutilised areas before and during the development of FBURA. This has the potential to kick-start the creation of neighbourhood centres and enhances familiarisation of the precinct. Small interventions can promote activities for all age groups and user types.

**Incorporating Existing Activities**
There are some existing activities that utilise FBURA for community events. These activities should be taken into account during the development process and accommodated where possible. As an example, a regular road bicycle criterium circuit held on the streets of Fishermans Bend is an important part of local life and needs to be investigated for ways to retain and promote it as the area changes from industrial into high density residential.

**The Role of the Private Realm**
The recommendations in this report focus on public open space, space that is not owned and managed by the private sector. This does not limit the opportunities for private developers providing additional on-site community infrastructure within private buildings. The private realm plays an important role in supporting public places but should not be relied on as the primary provider.

There are a number of ways “commercial offerings” meet community needs – e.g. indoor play centres, cafes, bookshop/cafes, gyms etc. – understanding how these commercial offerings can make a contribution to the community infrastructure in FBURA will be critical in financially constrained environment.

For example, as raised by the Working Group, a key lesson from Docklands has been around the contribution of a significant number of private pools but no public ones. The private sector should be encouraged to take a coordinated approach to providing community infrastructure on-site that is accessible by all.

Outdoor spaces that are incorporated within private developments should also make a substantial contribution to the open space offering in FBURA. Places such as courtyards, forecourts, squares and links between buildings will contribute to the diversity of experiences on offer and should be considered an integral part of the private sectors deliverables.
Recommended Approach
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Objectives and Performance Criteria

Objective 1: To provide residents, workers and visitors with a high level of quality, relevant community infrastructure and public open space.

Performance Criteria
1.1 The clustering, co-location and integration of services is prioritised in the delivery of community infrastructure and public open space.
1.2 Community infrastructure and public open space provision is factored into decision making regarding planning and development outcomes and budgetary allocations.
1.3 Community infrastructure and public open space planning and provision is reviewed every two years to ensure it meets the demands of the changing population over time.

Objective 2: To ensure Community Infrastructure and public open space is located in the best locations for public benefit.

Performance Criteria
2.1 Community infrastructure and public open space is delivered in highly accessible locations and adjoins complementary land uses.
2.2 Community infrastructure and public open spaces are the centre and hearts of each neighbourhood.
2.3 An area of public open space is within 300 metres and a community facility within 500 metres of every dwelling and work place.

Objective 3: To create community infrastructure and public open space that is flexible and adaptable.

Performance Criteria
3.1 The design of community infrastructure and public open space provides for a variety of multipurpose, multi-generational, formal and informal uses by the community.
3.2 Innovative delivery models are used to deliver community infrastructure and public open space relevant to the high density environment.
3.3 Buildings and spaces are adapted for the delivery of temporary (pop-up) and smaller scale community facilities by year three of the project and are continually updated.

Objective 4: To create a sense of place through community infrastructure and public spaces.

Performance Criteria
4.1 The indigenous, industrial and residential history is documented and incorporated into development outcomes.
4.2 Community infrastructure and public open space is designed to promote active, healthy communities and maximise social connections.
4.3 A Place Management Framework or similar is in place by year two of the project to ensure community development opportunities support the creation of places, not just spaces.

Objective 5: To deliver community infrastructure in a timely and coordinated manner through a variety of development models.

Performance Criteria
5.1 The provision of community infrastructure will be government led, and will provide opportunities for partnerships with public, private and not for profit sectors, including social enterprise opportunities.
5.2 Models of community infrastructure provision are developed that incentivise the delivery by the private sector of high quality, fit-for-purpose community infrastructure.
5.3 Catalyst items of community infrastructure are delivered upfront to attract a diverse group of households and promote community connections from the outset.
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Guiding Principles

The community infrastructure planning has been based on seven guiding principles. These principles have provided check-points for the analysis of community infrastructure provision and ensure they are tied to the ten identified strategic directions and to specific requirements of FBURA:

- **Spatial**: Embedded in and responsive to the physical urban structure and development patterns
- **Dynamic and responsive**: Time-based, adaptive to changing conditions over time
- **Place-based**: Locality-focused, context responsive, public realm integrated, urban renewal focused
- **Coordinated**: With other ‘layers’ and considerations – transport, employment, retail, housing
- **Integrated**: Exploring opportunities to build on existing infrastructure in/around the area
- **Social Sustainability**: Framework for planning community infrastructure for community capacity and resilience
- **Contemporary/Best Practice/Informed**: Drawing on local and global examples for specific elements of a future strategy/plans for FBURA.

Safety and perceptions of safety within urban areas has a high impact on the liveability of the area. The planning for community infrastructure should incorporate best practice design principles to ensure they are safe and inviting. These include: Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED), Healthy by Design Guidelines, Supportive Environments for Physical Activity (SEPA) and Environmentally Sustainable Design. Future guidelines on the subject should be incorporated as required to ensure design and management of community infrastructure meets best practice.

Rationale for the New Approach

The complexity of the site and the complexities of delivering community infrastructure required a structured approach to analysis and to the allocating of community infrastructure.

The process was broken up into a number of key elements that are explored further in the following sections, including: Structure, Places, Activities, Timing and Delivery. Open space has also been considered as a vital part of community infrastructure delivery and has been incorporated into the process.

From the analysis, background work and workshops, a hierarchy of centres and a hierarchy of open spaces have been determined as a logical and adaptable way of planning for community infrastructure in FBURA. The following outlines the framework of the CIP and provides the delivery team with some guidelines to help inform the location, size and nature of community infrastructure as the development process continues.

**Departure from PCINA**

The calculated differences between the PCINA (ASR) recommendations for community infrastructure and those outlined in this report are due to a variety of factors including:

- The shift in delivery models for community infrastructure towards ‘shared’ facilities (i.e. schools sharing meeting rooms, kindergartens sharing open space)
- The unknown impact of the high number of workers within the precinct putting extra demand on services
- The high demand being experienced in the neighbourhoods surrounding FBURA
- The lack of available/acquirable open space will require a new model for the provision of active sports and a reliance on public realm to provide high quality space.

Ongoing monitoring of development growth and the community infrastructure and the incorporation of ongoing research into new models, will have an important role in ensuring the provision of community infrastructure is in line with the changing needs of the FBURA community.
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Framework for the Community Infrastructure Plan

Structure
Defining a physical structure for FBURA provides the skeleton around which to organise the location and hierarchy of centres and community infrastructure. Defining precincts and preliminary neighbourhoods early in the process helped to understand the number of residents and staging based on the Discussion Scenario predictions. The precinct and neighbourhood catchments were based primarily on existing road networks, public transport corridors and physical barriers (e.g. freeways). These areas can be further refined and adapted as required in the next stages of analysis.

FBURA has been arranged into:
- Precincts – large areas, often defined by physical barriers such as large roads
- Neighbourhoods – medium areas defined by public transport corridors, roads and population
- Centres – a hierarchy of activity centres containing community infrastructure.

Places
Understanding the types of spaces and places within the study area allows us to determine the network and associated relationships of community infrastructure. Linkages, open space hierarchy, availability of spaces within buildings, infrastructure interdependencies and the nature of temporary solutions are layered to provide the following descriptions:
- Role: what does this place contribute to the neighbourhood and precincts?
- Character: what is the place like?
- Principles: What elements should the place have to be able to perform its role effectively and efficiently?

Activities
Understanding the types of activities that will occur within FBURA provides the data required to plot the types of facilities and interrelationships needed to accommodate these activities including:
- Floor space: How much floor space is required?
- Clustering: What are the requirements for co-location of facilities?
- Location: Do certain activities need to be in specific locations?

Further work, as outlined in Next Steps, includes consultation and research on the vertical format of community infrastructure including which facilities require street frontage at ground level and how much.

Timing
The timing of community infrastructure will be based on the other themes and on development roll-out, priority projects and logical sequencing, and includes:
- Catalyst projects: projects that will stimulate development
- Influencing projects: projects that will guide development to the desired outcomes.

Delivery
The delivery of community infrastructure in FBURA will require a number of different, complementing and innovative delivery strategies and models. These models may include:
- Delivery by government, federal, state and local
- Delivery by private development
- Partnerships between government, private entities, non-government organisations and not-for-profit organisations
- Implementing Place Management Frameworks
- Temporary, pop-up and flexible spaces.

Timely delivery will also rely on careful monitoring as the project progresses to ensure adequate community infrastructure is being delivered at the right time for the developing neighbourhoods. Refer to the Appendix for a case study showing how a neighbourhood centre may be delivered within FBURA.
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Activity Clustering: Configuration and Integration of Activities

Activities and services within each centre will be clustered according to activity type, creating clustering and hubs. The clustering of services is envisaged to:

- Build social connections
- Include information points (such as notice boards, Internet and council offices), multipurpose spaces for community groups to meet and a range of organised and incidental/self-managed activities that respond to different life stages
- Be a mix of types of spaces, including indoor and outdoor spaces that are multifunctional and purpose-built for multigenerational and age-specific activities
- Build on what we know about good synergies of activities. For example, between primary schools and open spaces and the grouping of early years activities together
- Be driven by catalyst infrastructure
- Be flexible, allowing for the addition of complementary activities as required
- Respond to the consideration that some services may be offered across a number of different locations and to different scales. For example, primary education may be in a family and child services cluster in addition to the education and training cluster
- Allow for different scales of activities to be provided across the hierarchy of centres. For example, a half-basketball court, seating, trees and rainwater garden at a local centre and an indoor stadium, gymnasium, wellness centre and large meeting space with kitchen facilities at the secondary level
- Consider and integrate the role of social enterprise, retail and business uses.

Connections between clusters

The network of clusters and centres should be carefully considered to ensure a range of facilities is available across neighbourhoods and precincts. Walkability and easy linkages through streets and open spaces will connect these places and strengthen the network, creating a liveable and resilient environment.

Local/neighbourhood multi-purpose hub

Catalyst may be an integrated family services hub consisting of Maternal and Child health services, playgroup spaces, multipurpose rooms, plus:

- Access to nature/playspace
- Additional multi-purpose spaces for social and leisure/arts purposes (meeting spaces/studio and workshops spaces)
- Information point.

Education, training and lifelong learning cluster

Catalyst may be library services or a primary school, plus:

- Multi-purpose arts/cultural spaces (studio, workshop and exhibition space)
- Classroom, informal meeting space, student lounge
- Low cost community office space
- Multi-purpose meeting spaces
- Potential to co-locate with:
  - Primary school
  - Secondary school
  - TAFE/vocational training
  - Open and recreational space.

Family and Children’s Services cluster

Catalyst may build on an integrated model at the local level or a private/Council childcare centre, plus:

- Kindergarten
- Playgroups
- Family support services
- Maternal and child health services
- Potential to co-locate with:
  - Primary school
  - Open space.

Social and recreational cluster

Catalyst may be indoor recreation centre/multi-purpose courts, plus:

- Multipurpose meeting spaces (formal and informal)
- Gym & wellness facilities
- Cafes or kitchen facilities
- Potential to co-locate with:
  - Open space
  - Outdoor recreation.

Health and wellbeing cluster

Catalyst may start with an aged care facility/respite, plus:

- Consulting rooms (general and specialist)
- Allied health and well-being services
- One Medicare
- Co-locate with private/public hospital
- Potential to co-locate with:
  - Open space
  - Religious and spiritual activities.
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Precinct Guidelines

Based on the structure, places, activities, timing and delivery discussed previously in the Framework for Community Infrastructure, Fishermans Bend has been divided into four precincts, with the consultant team identifying a network of neighbourhoods within the precincts and a network of centres and open spaces with the neighbourhoods in order to provide a framework for the location and distribution of community infrastructure.

Precincts
- Montague
- Sandridge – North & South
- Lorimer
- Wirraway – East & West.

Neighbourhoods
- Montague Neighbourhoods 1, 2, 3 and 4
- Sandridge Neighbourhoods 1, 2, 3 and 4
- Lorimer Neighbourhoods 1 and 2
- Wirraway Neighbourhoods 1, 2, 3 and 4

Centres
- Local: small centres providing for informal interaction
- Neighbourhood: small/medium centres providing local services and social and leisure activities
- Secondary: medium/large centres providing larger community services and significant public space
- Primary: large centres with a regional catchment, based around major public transport infrastructure.

Open Spaces
- Pocket parks
- Small Parks
- Neighbourhood Squares
- Large Parks
- Secondary Squares
- City/Sports Parks
- Primary Squares

The following precinct maps and descriptions show the potential urban development configuration throughout FBURA. The locations of the neighbourhood boundaries, the hierarchy of centres and open spaces as shown on the maps are illustrative only and the scale of the infrastructure markers/circles is indicative. These locations should be considered in detail in future studies and in parallel with the public transport network, opportunistic development sites and development staging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct Level</th>
<th>Catchment</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Examples of Community Infrastructure at this Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL</td>
<td>5,000 residents, 300m catchment</td>
<td>Building a sense of place and local connections</td>
<td>Pocket parks: Pocket Parks between 0.03 and 0.10 ha distributed throughout the local catchment, for example every 300m around the study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBOURHOOD</td>
<td>10,000 residents, 5,000 workers, 500m catchment</td>
<td>Focus on building local community resilience and support</td>
<td>Maternal Child Health Services, Childcare, Formal and informal meeting spaces, Integrated service model for family services, Open Space: Small Parks up to 1 ha distributed throughout the neighbourhood. Neighbourhood Squares located near the middle of the centres. Linear parks provide high quality shared path routes connecting neighbourhoods to each other and the Bay, the River and the City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY</td>
<td>24,000 residents, 14,000 workers, 800m catchment</td>
<td>Focus on accessing well located family and children services, health service and education and learning activities</td>
<td>Primary schools, Secondary schools, Community health, Open Space: Large Parks between 1 and 3 ha are located within each precinct. Secondary Squares are located within the Secondary centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY</td>
<td>42,000 residents, 21,285 workers</td>
<td>Acts as a destination and plays a key role to the surrounding communities and workers by providing specialised activities</td>
<td>Art centre, Tertiary and vocational services, Specialist Health Services, Open Space: Two Sports Parks providing spaces for passive and organised recreation of between 3 to 5 ha will be located within FBURA, A City Park of between 3 to 5 ha will be located within the eastern part of the study area providing an intensive mix of passive recreation and informal sports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All population numbers and community infrastructure examples are indicative only.
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Combined Activity Centre and Open Space Map

Illustrative Community Infrastructure
- notional neighbourhood boundary
- linear park and cycle network
- on street shared boulevard
- city / sports park 5ha
- large park 2ha
- small park 1ha
- pocket park 0.2ha
- primary square 1ha
- secondary square 0.5ha
- neighbourhood square 0.25ha

The locations of open space and community infrastructure are indicative only.
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Montague

Projections for Montague show a significantly higher density compared to other neighbourhoods in FBURA with a dwelling density of 350 dwellings per hectare and a combined residential and worker density of 921 people per hectare. The housing stock is expected to be predominately studio, one bedroom (25%) and two bedroom (50%) dwellings and is therefore expected to attract predominately singles and couples.

Structure
Neighbourhoods
Montague has been notionally divided into four neighbourhoods: MN1, MN2, MN3, MN4

Centres
3 local centres
2 neighbourhood centres
1 secondary centre

Open space
2 pocket parks
2 neighbourhood squares
1 large park
1 secondary square
1 city/sports park
Living streets zones, urban space zones, shared boulevard
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Sandridge

Projections for Sandridge show a dwelling density of 190 per hectare and a combined residential and worker density of 704 people per hectare. The worker population is expected to be the highest of all precincts estimated at 308 workers per hectare. The housing stock is expected to have around 38% of two bedrooms and 35% of three bedrooms and is therefore expected to attract more couples and couples with children.

Structure

Neighbourhoods
Sandridge (north and south) has been notionally divided into four neighbourhoods: SN1, SN2, SN3, SN4

Centres
6 local centres (1 shares a boundary with a neighbouring precinct)
2 neighbourhood centres (1 shares a boundary with neighbouring precinct)
1 secondary centre
1 primary centre

Open space
5 pocket parks
2 neighbourhood squares (1 shares a boundary with a neighbouring precinct)
2 small parks
1 secondary square
1 large park
1 primary square
Living streets zones, urban space zones, shared boulevard
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**Lorimer**

Projections for Lorimer show a dwelling density of 270 per hectare with a comparatively high residential density of 538 people per hectare. The worker density is expected to be slightly lower than other precincts at 201 per hectare resulting in a combined density of 739 people. Housing stock is expected to attract a similar demographic to Montague of singles and couples.

**Structure**

**Neighbourhoods**

Lorimer has been notionally divided into two neighbourhoods: LN1, LN2

**Centres**

- 2 local centres
- 2 neighbourhood centres

**Open space**

- 3 pocket parks
- 2 neighbourhood squares
- Living streets, urban space zones, shared boulevard
**Recommended Approach**

**Wirraway**

Projections for Wirraway show the lowest expected residential and worker density within FBURA with a dwelling density of 125 per hectare, a residential density of 282 per hectare and an expected worker density of 106 per hectare resulting in a combined density of 704 people. Housing stock is expected to contain a higher proportion of three and four bedroom dwellings (40% and 15%, respectively) and is predicted to attract more couples with children than other precincts in Fishermans Bend.

**Structure**

**Neighbourhoods**

Wirraway has notionally been divided into four neighbourhoods: WN1, WN2, WN3, WN4

**Centres**

5 local centres (1 shares a boundary with a neighbouring precinct)
3 neighbourhood centres (1 shares a boundary with neighbouring precinct)
1 secondary centre
1 primary centre

**Open space**

2 pocket parks
3 neighbourhood squares (1 shares a boundary with a neighbouring precinct)
1 small park
1 secondary square
2 large parks
1 primary square
1 city/sports park
Living streets zones, urban space zones, shared boulevard
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Places: Activity Centres

Local
The local centres have a population catchment of around 5,000 residents and a walkable catchment area of approximately 300 metres.

Role
The local centres help build and support a sense of place, access to nature and to build informal local connections.

Character
Local centres can be made up of a variety of spaces and places. They may be a row of shops with a small local park; a place where you see the same faces every day. They may be a square with a café on the edge and seating under the shade of a tree. They are always easy to access on foot and by bike.

Principles
- Access to sunlight, shade, shelter and seating
- Connected by safe pedestrian and bicycle paths
- Containing multi-purpose/flexible spaces
- Containing integrated/shared use facilities
- Connected indoor/outdoor spaces
- Providing human scale environments within the open space and the building forms
- Reflecting local history and contextual elements to assist place making including the retention and use of heritage buildings where possible
- Accessible to all abilities, cultures and ages
- Universally accessible and safe
- Incorporating ESD principles and practice
- Local meeting spaces – formal and informal.

Locational attributes
- Located within neighbourhoods as a place to gather and/or access nature
- They will be linked to bikeways and footpaths
- Located on local roads
- Linked to primary centres
- Green spaces minimum access within 300 metres from residents.

Activities
The local centres will support the following:
- Neighbourhood notice board, formal and informal meeting spaces, seating in green spaces, seating along streetscapes, access to nature and play spaces for young children.

Clustering
On a case by case basis, there may be the potential for some local centres to contain a local/neighbourhood multipurpose cluster.

Floor Space
On a case by case basis, a small multipurpose multipurpose cluster = starts at approximately 340 m².

NOTE: The floor spaces are based on the area data in table A in the appendix and on the clustering data in ‘Activity Clustering’. This data, where possible, applies best practice ‘clustering’ of services and input from service providers however it remains an indicative number and each application of the clusters will require individual assessment based on the given circumstances.

Open Space
Pocket park, living streets zones.
Recommended Approach

Neighbourhood
The neighbourhood centres have a catchment population of around 10,000 residents and 5,000 workers and a walkable catchment area of approximately 500 metres.

Role
The neighbourhood centres build community resilience, provide access to local services and facilities and provide opportunities for informal and social activity and leisure activities.

Character
Neighbourhood centres are like small town centres. You can do the weekly food shopping here; it’s where the maternal and child health care centre is and the local dentist. It’s linked to everywhere with a linear park running through it and it’s quick to hop on a bike to get to the beach, the river or Melbourne CBD. The public square has a food market on weekends, workers enjoying the sun and a quick game of volleyball at lunch time and it gets decorated with celebratory lights during cultural festivals.

Principles
• Access to sunlight, shade, shelter and seating
• Connected by safe pedestrian and bicycle paths
• Containing multi-purpose/flexible spaces
• Containing integrated/shared use facilities
• Connected indoor/outdoor spaces
• Providing human scale environments within the open space and the building forms
• Reflecting local history and contextual elements to assist place making including the retention and use of heritage buildings where possible
• Accessible to all abilities, cultures and ages
• Universally accessible and safe
• Incorporating ESD principles and practice
• Capacity for community stewardship/governance/management

Locational attributes
• Centrally located within neighbourhoods
• On highly visible sites and in dedicated buildings (or building elements) that are easily identifiable
• Within (or adjacent to) an activity centre/retail cluster or other major community space or facility
• Accessible via public transport
• On sites located on the priority pedestrian and cycle network
• In close proximity to public open space
• Green spaces a minimum of 300 metres from residents
• In areas which minimise the potential for amenity conflicts with residential activity (noise/traffic)

Activities
The neighbourhood centres will support the following: Access to free internet, formal and informal meeting spaces in a range of sizes for use by the community, community gardens, picnic and barbeque facilities, play spaces for all ages, medium grassed area for unstructured activities and sports, childcare, youth specific facilities and activities, older adults specific facilities and activities, informal spaces for meditation and prayer, kindergarten, community education, potential primary school, access to community, private and public health services, arts/cultural focused spaces such as small scale community space and arts/artist’s studio space.

Clustering
Neighbourhood centres may contain:
• Education, training and lifelong learning cluster
• Family and children’s services cluster
• Social, cultural and recreational cluster
• Health and wellbeing cluster
• Multipurpose community hub

Floor Space
Education, training and lifelong learning cluster = starts at approximately 3720 m² (plus a school)
Family and children’s services cluster = starts at approximately 2900 m²
Social, cultural and recreational cluster = starts at approximately 4750 m²
Health and wellbeing cluster = starts at approximately 4500 m²
Multipurpose community hub = starts at approximately 700 m²

NOTE: The floor spaces are based on the area data in table A in the appendix and on the clustering data in ‘Activity Clustering’. This data, where possible, applies best practice ‘clustering’ of services and input from service providers, however, it remains an indicative number and each application of the cluster formula will require individual assessment based on the given circumstances.

Open Space
Neighbourhood Square, small park, linear park, living streets zones, urban spaces zone.
Recommended Approach

Secondary
The secondary centres have a population catchment of around 24,000 residents and 14,000 workers with a walkable catchment area of approximately 800 metres.

Role
The secondary centres provide well-located age specific and family services for formal and incidental activity.

Character
The secondary centres are vibrant community hubs where residents can find just about everything they are looking for. With the potential to contain a wide variety of medium to large community infrastructure items across the three secondary centres within FBURA, they will service the full diversity of the community.

Principles
- Access to sunlight, shade, shelter and seating
- Connected by safe pedestrian and bicycle paths
- Containing multi-purpose/flexible spaces
- Containing integrated/shared use facilities
- Connected indoor/outdoor spaces
- Providing human scale environments within the open space and the building forms
- Reflecting local history and contextual elements to assist place making including the retention and use of heritage buildings where possible
- Accessible to all abilities, cultures and ages
- Universally accessible and safe
- Incorporating ESD principles and practice

Locational attributes
- Distributed evenly across FBURA
- On highly visible sites and in dedicated buildings (or building elements) that are easily identifiable as publicly accessible community facilities and has a street frontage
- Within (or adjacent to) an activity centre/retail cluster or other major community space or facility
- Accessible via public transport
- On sites located on the priority pedestrian and cycle network, to maximise connections to and between various activities and destinations
- In areas which minimise the potential for amenity conflicts with residential activity (noise/traffic)
- Green spaces a minimum of 500 metres from residents
- Open spaces located in heart of the centre

Activities
The secondary centres will support the following: Civic office, access to spaces that suit a range of meeting space needs, an urban park, play spaces for all ages, an adventure play space, indoor courts and recreation facilities, grassed areas for unstructured activities, childcare, youth specific facilities and activities, older adults specific facilities and activities, spiritual and worship activities, primary school, secondary school, respite care, medium events space for cultural and spiritual activities, access to emergency activities.

Clustering
Secondary centres may contain a:
- Education, training and lifelong learning cluster
- Family and children’s services cluster
- Social, Cultural and recreational cluster
- Health and wellbeing cluster

Floor Space
Education, training and lifelong learning cluster = starts at approximately 3720 m² (plus a school)
Family and children’s services cluster =
starts at approximately 2900 m²
Social, cultural and recreational cluster =
starts at approximately 4750 m²
Health and wellbeing cluster =
starts at approximately 4500 m²

NOTE: The floor spaces are based on the area data in table A in the appendix and on the clustering data in ‘Activity Clustering’. This data, where possible, applies best practice ‘clustering’ of services and input from service providers, however, it remains an indicative number and each application of the cluster formula will require individual assessment based on the given circumstances.

Open Space
Secondary square, large park, linear park, living streets zones, urban spaces zones, shared boulevards.
Recommended Approach

Primary
There is the potential for two primary centres within FBURA. The catchment will be both within and outside of Fishermans Bend.

Role
The primary centres will act as a destination both within and outside of Fishermans Bend. They will play a key role for the surrounding communities and workers and provide for specialised activities and programs that attract visitors from outside the area.

Centre one: focused on higher level education
Centre two: focused on arts/culture

Character
The Primary centres are the place where everything and everyone connects. They are bustling transport hubs with rail and trams providing easy and efficient links to other neighbourhoods and other suburbs. It is full of people working, shopping and socialising.

Locational attributes
• Providing access to metro stations/major public transport routes
• Central location to all surrounding neighbourhoods
• On highly visible sites and in dedicated buildings (or building elements) that are easily identifiable as publicly accessible community facilities and has a street frontage
• Within (or adjacent to) an activity centre/retail cluster or other major community space or facility
• Accessible via public transport
• On sites located on the priority pedestrian and cycle network, to maximise connections to and between various activities and destinations
• Open spaces located in heart of the centre

Activities
Likely to contain the following:
• Council offices, large events spaces, civic parkland with play spaces throughout (Birrarung Marr), opportunities for spiritual and worship activities, public borrowing library, e.g. vocational activities, public or private hospital, space for cultural expression and performance activity.

Clustering
Primary centres may contain a:
• Education, training and lifelong learning cluster
• Social, cultural and recreational cluster

Floor space
Education, training and lifelong learning cluster = starts at approximately 3720 m² (plus a school)
Social, cultural and recreational cluster = starts at approximately 4750 m².

NOTE: The floor spaces are based on the area data in table A in the appendix and on the clustering data in ‘Activity Clustering’. This data, where possible, applies best practice ‘clustering’ of services and input from service providers, however, it remains an indicative number and each application of the cluster formula will require individual assessment based on the given circumstances.

Open Space
Primary square, major sports park, major city park, linear park, living streets zones, urban spaces zones, shared boulevards.
Recommended Approach

Open Space Network

The open space network will help to define the character and sense of place of the emerging neighbourhood. It will be an essential part of the community infrastructure providing places, connections, activities and amenities to support the evolving community. The open space network will be provided through a combination of public, semi-public and privately owned open spaces.

Similar to other community infrastructure, the open spaces will need to accommodate a range of functions and be flexible and adaptable. The network will be responsive to environmental pressures such as stormwater treatment and flooding and play a key role in reducing the heat island effect experienced in heavily built up areas. The open spaces will also form an important part of the ecological system and the relationship between spaces including habitat corridors should be considered.

Open spaces will also be an integral part of the co-location strategy for Community Infrastructure. Some spaces will serve a number of roles; for instance a children’s playground may be used by a school during school hours and the community at other times. Transport networks, in particular pedestrian and bicycle, are also likely to be located in and along the public open space network connecting FBURA internally and to the surrounding areas with green corridors.

To ensure the greatest benefit from the open space network, the locations and solar orientations of open spaces and the buildings that surround them should be carefully considered to ensure the maximum amount of sunlight at key times of the day.

Open Space Provision

Consultants, GlasUrban Design and Landscape Architecture, used local and international benchmarks to determine the appropriate open space provision for FBURA. This data, found in more detail in the Appendix, discusses the provision of open space by area and the provision of open space by population density with the suggested provision within the Community Infrastructure Plan being a combination of both. For instance, if the area model were used, a medium open space provision, based on international cities and Melbourne Municipalities, would be 14% of the precinct. Based on population density, again using the same international cities and Melbourne Municipalities, a medium open space provision would be 7m² per person. The Discussion Scenario data at 2051 shows FBURA providing 18% of the precinct as open space or 5m² per person.

Open Space Hierarchy

The open space typologies described below are based on strategies produced by Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) Open Space Strategies, Best Practice Guidance, September 2008, CABE/Mayor of London, and the City of Melbourne Open Space Strategy, June 2012, City of Melbourne/Thompson Berrill Landscape Design P/L.

The typologies form a hierarchy of spaces and places that when considered as an entire network, provide for a diverse range of activities to occur within FBURA. It is crucial to the success of open space provision that each space is considered as part of this greater network and that safe and logical connections between spaces are provided at an early stage of the development.
Recommended Approach

**Open Space Typologies**

Public open space is defined as external areas that are fully open to the public at all times. They will be zoned for public open space, owned and managed by state or local government. This forms the most important part of any community open space infrastructure because it will be permanent and fully publicly accessible. It cannot be removed and provides certainty for the community and for investors.

Public open space will need to be acquired by the state or local authorities and the sites rezoned to ensure the long-term existence and maintenance of the site as public open space.

**Local Catchment**

**Pocket Park**

A pocket park is defined as a small local open space of between 0.03 and 0.26 ha that will serve a population of up to 5,000. Comprising mainly green space and large trees providing shade, it may include a small play area and areas of seating, e.g. Canning Street Reserve, Carlton.
Recommended Approach

**Neighbourhood Catchment**

**Neighbourhood Square**
A neighbourhood square is defined as a small open space of up to 0.25 ha located within the neighbourhood centre. It will serve a population of up to 10,000. Consisting of predominantly hard spaces with large trees, garden beds and rain gardens; it will provide seating, flexible event space and may include facilities for urban sports, e.g. Northcote Town Hall, Northcote. Malvern City Square, Malvern.

**Small Park**
A small park is defined as a small open space of up to 1 ha. These small parks should be distributed evenly throughout the neighbourhood, ideally less than 500m from any home. Comprising predominantly green space with pathways, including large trees, garden beds and rain gardens; it will provide areas of seating, a large play area, space for local events and small-scale flexible open space for informal sports, e.g. Village Green, Docklands.

**Linear Park**
A linear park primarily has a minimum width of 8 metres. It is predominantly soft and provides enough space for a shared pedestrian and cycling path and associated planted buffer strip. The primary role of the linear park is to provide recreational and ecological links. It can also be used for storm water collection and filtration. Lighting should be provided for night-time use.

**Secondary Catchment**

**Secondary Square**
A secondary square is an urban open space of up to 0.5 ha located within the Secondary centre. It will serve a population of 24,000 residents and 14,000 workers. It will be a predominantly hard space providing seating, medium sized flexible event space and urban sports including large trees, garden beds, rain gardens and water storage, e.g. City Square, Melbourne.

**Large Park**
A large park is a medium sized open space between 1 and 2 ha. Large parks will be distributed evenly throughout the precinct and linked by bike paths and footpaths. Comprising predominantly green space with pathways, including a variety of large trees, garden beds, and rain gardens, it will provide space for walking and dog walking, large play areas, areas of seating and medium sized flexible open space that can be used for practice areas for organised sports such as Auskick and soccer, e.g. Point Park, Yarra’s edge.
Recommended Approach

Primary Catchment

Primary Square
A primary square is a prominent urban open space of up to 1 ha located within the Primary Centre and close to the main circulation hub. It will serve a population of 42,000 residents and 21,000 workers. It will be a predominantly hard space providing seating, major event space and urban sports including large trees, garden beds, rain gardens and water storage, e.g. Federation Square, Melbourne.

Major Park 1: Sports
A large sized open space of 3 to 5 ha (SRV require a range of 5-8 ha, however for the purposes of the CIP, 5 ha was agreed). A total of two Sports Parks should be located within the study area to serve the projected population of 42,000 residents and 21,000 workers. The Sports Park will comprise of predominantly green space with pathways, including a variety of large trees, garden beds and rain gardens. It will provide space for a variety of organised and passive recreation including walking and dog walking, large play area, areas of seating and a minimum of two sports pitches that can provide facilities to support a community AFL, cricket or soccer team, e.g. JL Murphy Reserve, Port Phillip.

Major Park 2: City
A large sized open space of 3 to 5 ha located within the precinct providing an iconic link to the other city spaces of Melbourne’s inner green ring (as defined by Grids and Greenery, City of Melbourne 1987), comprising predominantly green space with pathways, including a variety of large trees, garden beds and rain gardens. It provides space for high intensity and a variety of passive recreation within a designed naturalistic setting, e.g. Edinburgh Gardens, Fitzroy.

Semi-public Open Space Typologies

Semi-public open space is defined as external areas that are accessible to the community for the majority of the time and provide some benefit to the community. These areas are owned and managed by local government, state government or statutory authorities such as VicRoads or Melbourne Water. These spaces provide additional facilities to support the Public Open Space network, but cannot provide any major infrastructure for the community and may include green links and spines achieved by reducing existing road widths and changing kerb alignments. Initiatives at planning stage to identify open space opportunities and to liaise with statutory authorities can help to encourage the development of a complementary network of these spaces.

Shared Boulevard
Shared boulevards are a wide streetscape containing a high level of amenity for pedestrian and cyclists. They are part of the existing identity of urban Melbourne providing a network of grand civic boulevards. They are designed to provide high quality avenues of large shade trees, separated off road cycle lanes and pedestrian and cyclist priority crossings. Shared boulevards are developed and maintained as part of the existing street infrastructure.

Living Streets Zone
Living streets are streetscapes within predominantly residential neighbourhoods that are designed to reduce traffic speed and increase the street life. Tree planting, shared surface, seating and, where possible, nature strip parks will be provided to enhance the amenity of the street. Living streets will be developed and maintained as part of the existing street infrastructure. Initiatives can encourage developers or residents to contribute or construct the living streets infrastructure.
Recommended Approach

Privately Owned Publicly Accessible Open Space Typologies

This is defined as privately owned space that is accessible to the public under an agreed management structure. Access may be restricted to certain times of the day. These spaces provide additional recreational facilities in support of the public open space network but are subject to change and provide little certainty for the community. Strategic planning and developer engagement at an early stage can identify potential opportunities and promote the development of a layer of privately owned publicly accessible open space. Design criteria for these spaces should be developed as part of the FBUORA Design Guidelines.

Urban Spaces Zone

The urban spaces zones surround the Primary, Secondary and Neighbourhood centres. Urban spaces are those created in and around buildings including laneways created by subdividing existing superlots, upgrading existing laneways and the forecourts, corner treatments and pedestrian access ways through buildings. The urban spaces zone will be a planning initiative to encourage developers to build and maintain publicly accessible private open spaces as part of the built open space network. (i.e. Media House, Melbourne, QV laneways and internal square, Melbourne)

Privately Owned Open Spaces

Privately owned open space includes any open space that is privately owned by individuals or organisations and includes private gardens, club sports grounds, school grounds. These spaces can provide views of nature, opportunities for health and fitness, improve natural drainage and reduce the urban heat island effect. Although these spaces provide a useful role in support of public open space, these types of open space are excluded from the public open space network, as they cannot be singularly relied upon to provide accessible community infrastructure.
Case Study

‘Can I play out...?’ - Lessons from London Play’s Home Zones project, 2007

This document is an evaluation of some of London’s Home Zones, with a focus on children’s play activity in urban areas.

Home Zones are demarcated areas of residential development where vehicles are encouraged or required to move at very low speeds, and where the street spaces are available for play, social activity, walking etc. as much as for driving. That is, vehicles share the space with other users.

In this way, streetscapes can become useable public realm or public open space.

This potential is very important for Fishermans Bend, where new types and configurations of open space are likely to be required, because of a current lack of open space, and the prevalence of private land ownership.

This approach also presents the opportunity for streetscapes to become community infrastructure, or spaces for outdoor community activities, such as meetings, activity classes (tai chi, yoga, fitness), parents’ groups, performances and other potentials.

Home Zones and Shared Space are seen as potentially exciting opportunities for Fishermans Bend.
Case Study

Six key findings from the Home Zones for London project and the other schemes that were examined in this evaluation:

1. Home zones make a real difference to children’s outdoor play
   Children play in the street more, and adults say streets are safer for children’s play. What is more, levels of contact and interaction between adults increase, creating a stronger sense of community and making it more likely that parents will feel happy about giving their children greater freedom outside the home as they grow up.

2. The home zone vision is very popular amongst the public - but not universally so

3. Prospects for taking forward retrofit home zone schemes are limited
   However, schemes in regeneration and renewal contexts have shown measurable and sometimes striking impacts.

4. Policy support for home zones is adequate, but more research and good practice support is needed on effective designs.

5. Children’s policy and public health policy are not yet major influences on activity

6. The impact of involving children is not yet clear, but there are clear benefits when adults act effectively on their behalf

The home zone model is also a proven tool for tackling neighbourhood blight, building cohesive communities and making housing estates into places where families want to live.

New developments show that the vision of more child-friendly streets is attractive enough to survive market pressures.
Timing and Staging
Timing and Staging

Introduction and Rationale

The timing of delivery of community infrastructure in FBURA is crucial to the development of a vibrant, accessible and cohesive place that supports and nurtures the growing community. There are a number of actions that have the potential to increase the likelihood of delivering community infrastructure in a timely way including:

- **Identifying** open spaces and location for centres early in the project to encourage the integration of the existing population and those living around the study area
- **Allocating** the land and/or floorspace for community infrastructure as soon as possible
- **Building partnerships** with developers and the not-for-profit sector as well as councils and state government agencies to encourage a range of activities in each centre
- **Focussing** on providing local and neighbourhood activities first, ensuring the spaces for the primary and secondary centres are allocated and delivered over time
- **Supporting** the sense of place by providing temporary (pop-up) and smaller scale community facilities and open spaces early in the project
- **Maximising** the ability for integrated multi-purpose spaces and the clustering of activities around the identified centres
- **Ensuring** there are a range of activities that provide social connections and are inclusive of the needs of intergenerational, multi-cultural and people with disabilities
- **Ensuring** the infrastructure provides flexibility to adapt to change and the needs of the community in the future
- **Identifying** the potential for adapting existing buildings and space for community purposes
- **Exploring** the opportunities for providing free or low cost festivals and activities (such as markets) within existing streets to encourage community identity and ownership of the space

The early delivery of local and neighbourhood centres is considered to be a more viable option than attempting to deliver the primary and secondary centres at the beginning of the development. These larger centres will require factors such as a critical mass of residents and workers and the provision of major public transport infrastructure to be economically viable. The location and land required for these centres, however, should be identified and protected from development that will prevent their future provision, early in the development process.

Current land costs are being estimated by Places Victoria at $3000 per square metre for the Montague Precinct and $1000 per square metre for Sandridge, Lorimer and Wirraway precincts. These are estimates only however they do reflect the importance of securing land early before the value increases significantly due to market interest.

As the development of FBURA is expected to occur over time, the hierarchy of centres should be expected to change with it. Some smaller, neighbourhood centres may be located on the site of future primary or secondary centres in order to secure the land and to start the process of place making. The use of temporary and pop-up events and infrastructure can also help build connections with the new locations prior to full build out.

### Public Open Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Parks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Square</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Parks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Square</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Sports Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Square</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Community Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Childrens services hub</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose community hub</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large multi-purpose community hub</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Courts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Courts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Venue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed staging of community infrastructure and public open space.
Timing and Staging

Attracting Residential and Commercial Development

Charter Keck Cramer consultants (Charter) were, as part of providing a CIP, instructed to provide development and market advice regarding:

- The priority of community infrastructure that will be required as a condition for any development within FBURA with a focus on medium and higher density residential development and to a lesser extent, commercial office and retail development.

The following summarises their findings with the full report available in the Appendix.

Currently the Melbourne private sector development markets are fundamentally driven by demand for tenants, in the form of residential apartments, offices, large format retail, specialty shops, showrooms and light industrial facilities. In the initial stages of FBURA young residents and young office and retail workers (20 to 35 years) will tend to be the main day and night time occupants with the demand for community infrastructure reflecting this demographic.

As the community diversifies and the population matures the demand for community infrastructure will change to include facilities for children, such as kindergartens and schools, and facilities for the retired and elderly, such as local area amenity. The development industry recognises that such forms of community infrastructure are beneficial to attracting purchaser (i.e. primarily investors) and occupier demand (i.e. tenants) and as such, support the provision of these forms of infrastructure given their correlation with saleability of their product offerings.

The community infrastructure that the initial population (and all future populations) will crave will be high quality parks, gardens, plazas, streetscapes, indoor sporting and community centres and libraries that encourage community building, physical exercise and relaxation, and are generally considered as important determinants of local area amenity.

The development industry recognises that such forms of community infrastructure are beneficial to attracting purchaser (i.e. primarily investors) and occupier demand (i.e. tenants) and as such, support the provision of these forms of infrastructure given their correlation with saleability of their product offerings.

Acquisition of Public Open Space

Public open space provides essential community building locations, services and character that cannot be achieved with semi public or private open space. To achieve the aspirations of the community infrastructure framework it will be necessary to acquire areas of open space for public use. In some cases the locations of the public open space is key to its success as a community resource and in these locations it is recommended that these sites be acquired early in the development. In other cases the locations for the open space should be identified and protected to ensure future acquisition is not compromised.

The following types of open space are seen as important parcels to be acquired early in the development process:

**Linear Parkland**
Linear parks are located to provide strategic long distance shared path connections across the precinct. They will have a major impact on the connectivity of the public realm and the liveability and value of the adjacent neighbourhoods. In most cases the linear parks need to be located along specific routes to provide the ideal connectivity. Early acquisition or reservation and protection will ensure that the land is reserved for this use, provide good connectivity within the precinct and to the wider recreational resources, improve the perception of the proximity of the precinct to the city and the beach, illustrate the importance of sustainability to the precinct and be attractive to local businesses. The location of the linear parks should be defined and safeguarded either through direct acquisition or development overlay at the earliest stage in the development process.

**Primary Square, Secondary Squares and Neighbourhood Squares**
The urban squares will be located within the centres, providing high quality urban space at the heart of the community. The locations of these are centrally located adjacent to the major transport hubs. Early acquisition will enable the reservation of the appropriate sites as well as providing an opportunity to lead the standard for the development and character of the area. Once the location of the centre has been identified, space for the appropriately scaled square should be acquired.

**City Park**
The ring of city parks around the CBD currently stops at docklands to the north and the Botanic Gardens to the east. A new city park within the eastern part of the precinct would add a western city park to the ring. This park will provide an exciting catalyst to the development of FBURA. Early acquisition of this park would ensure the land was reserved and provide an exciting catalyst to the development of FBURA. The urban squares will be located within the centres, providing high quality urban space at the heart of the community. The locations of these are centrally located adjacent to the major transport hubs. Early acquisition will enable the reservation of the appropriate sites as well as providing an opportunity to lead the standard for the development and character of the area. Once the location of the centre has been identified, space for the appropriately scaled square should be acquired.

**Sports Park**
The precinct is currently under-resourced for sporting parks. A new large sports park of 3-5 ha is proposed. It will provide a balance of passive and organised sport and could provide the home for a local community football or soccer club. This element will provide a catalyst for development and community building. This park would be in addition to existing J. Murphy reserve and in addition to any sports pitches associated with existing clubs or schools. This park should be located within the western portion of the study area to provide amenity closer to the more family oriented residential neighbourhoods. Early acquisition is essential to ensure availability of sufficient land.

The development and character of the area. Once the location of the centre has been identified, space for the appropriately scaled square should be acquired.
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Staging

The following diagrams show the possible staged delivery of community infrastructure including public open space. The calculations are based on the catchment for the centres types and the projected total population at each stage under the Discussion Scenario. The locations are illustrative and based around predicted locations of public transport infrastructure and expected population roll out.

In summary:
- **Stage 1**: 2 neighbourhood centres will be delivered and land for public open space will be acquired or reserved.
- **Stage 2**: An additional 2 neighbourhood centres, 1 secondary and 1 primary centre will be delivered and any further public open space.
- **Stage 3**: An additional 2-4 neighbourhood centres, 2 secondary centres and 1 primary centre will be delivered and any further public open space.

Stage 1

**Key Catalyst/Influential Community Infrastructure**
The delivery of the open space network has been identified as the first priority in the delivery of community infrastructure for FBURA. As described previously, the connectedness of the precinct, the promotion of sustainable and safe modes of transport and the access for residents and workers to quality public open space rely on this early delivery.

Catalyst infrastructure that will drive development includes public transport and retail centres. Development will likely begin to occur within easy walking distance of the existing public transport. To encourage a spread of development the public transport infrastructure should be delivered as soon as possible.

Influential infrastructure is considered to be that which encourages the type of development set out in the vision. In the case of FBURA, influential infrastructure will be those facilities that provide for a mix of residents, in particular families. For example, doctors, long-day childcare centres, community health centres, libraries, cultural venues, playgrounds, maternal and child health centres and kindergartens, all have the potential to act as influential infrastructure.

**Land Reservations for Future Open Space**
The major public open spaces including secondary squares, large parks and linear connections should be safeguarded along with the locations for the primary and secondary centres.
Timing and Staging

Opportunity Sites
Opportunity sites should be explored in Stage 1. A continual process of evaluating land ownerships, exploring potential partnerships, recommending short term interventions, considering innovative ways of delivering development will make the most of the dynamic ownerships across the site and capture community infrastructure development potential.

Some of these opportunities may include installing temporary infrastructure in and on empty buildings and lots, and the following:

- **Montague Continuing Education Centre** may be further developed, retaining the heritage structure. Working with the existing owners and operators, this building may be utilised for shared community use including shared kitchen facilities and meeting rooms.

- **Westgate Freeway**, while acting as a major barrier to movement from north to south also has the potential to contribute to the open space and linkages within FBURA. The area under the freeway is unsuitable for residential and commercial development but may be ideally suited to a cycling and pedestrian link, recreation facilities such as climbing walls, skate parks and hard courts.

- **Council Depot and Transfer Station** on the corner of White and Boundary Streets has the potential to have a significant contribution to infrastructure provision. Melbourne Grammar School, for instance, has an existing complex of sports fields (Edwin Flack Park) on Todd Road in the Wirraway precinct. Containing 9 tennis courts, an AFL/cricket ground, hockey field and soccer ground, a partnership may allow these facilities to be open to the public during times when they are not being utilised by the school.

- **Ferras Street School**, proposed development, has the opportunity to contain co-located community facilities including the provision of meeting rooms, adult education, family and children services and the shared use of outdoor spaces and hardcourts.

- **Open Space Links** can be created on the generous existing road reserves. Rationalising road widths and considering the potential for a ‘highline’ type structure which allows for some links to be elevated, will provide some of the essential open space and pedestrian and cycle network to be created. As much of this land is government land, this may be achieved through coordination from government departments including VicRoads.

- Investigating the potential for the green buffer between FBURA and the Port land to the west of the development to contribute significantly to the provision of ‘nature’ and ecological link.

- Partnerships with existing landowners have the potential to have a significant contribution to infrastructure provision.

- **Heritage Buildings/Sites**
  The retention of heritage buildings and significant landscape elements will be particularly important in acknowledging and celebrating past and future development. These buildings, trees and green places have the potential to provide a richness of texture, both from their built form and their social context. The re-use of heritage buildings for public use allows them to be accessed by all, however, it should be noted that not all structures may be ‘fit-for-purpose’ and detailed assessment of their re-use should be undertaken.

- **Temporary and Pop-up Projects**
  Temporary and pop-up projects should be considered and prioritised in locations where future neighbourhood and secondary centres are likely to be delivered. These interventions will aid in the establishment of new communities and should be considered by developers as valuable tools.

  - **Mikado Square in Orestad, Copenhagen** is an example of the transformation of a building site into a vibrant, economically viable public space.

    An empty building site was transformed into a public square featuring roll-out artificial grass, outdoor furniture, trees in planter pots, basketball hoops and blue gravel pavement.

    During the building stages of sites around the square, construction fences were replaced by a row of shipping containers that formed a streetscape of small temporary shops. These were occupied by a range of small businesses including artists, fashion designers and a coffee shop. The spaces were provided by the developer for nominal rents to encourage their occupation by local business.
Timing and Staging

Stage 2
Stage 2 builds on the development in Stage 1 and includes one of the primary centres. The primary centre is located on the site of the major public transport interchange, which will be a key destination both within and outside of FBURA. The plans show the opportunities for temporary projects located strategically around FBURA near the anticipated future centres.

As previously discussed, ongoing monitoring will be required both to ensure that community infrastructure is meeting the needs of the existing and projected populations and that the development is delivering the vision.

Stage 3
Stage 3 builds on the previous stages and delivers the other primary centre.
Delivery Strategy
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Delivery Models for Community Infrastructure

The established delivery model of community infrastructure and public open space in Victoria is not appropriate for FBURA, as discussed previously in this report. New models must be explored and implemented to deliver the vision. These new models are expected to be made up of a variety of different mechanisms with no ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach appropriate for across the site.

One move towards a different delivery model is the growing trend towards ‘mixed models’ of community infrastructure. These models are a combination of government, community and private sector delivery and may provide the required flexibility for community infrastructure provision within FBURA. An example of this mixed model may be the provision of long day care by the private sector with publicly accessible community spaces or the provision of aged care services by the community sector.

In order to secure delivery of appropriate community infrastructure and public open space within FBURA, partnerships between all sectors; government, community and private should be considered a priority. The following discusses some of these mechanisms in detail.

Development of a Place Management Framework for FBURA

As part of investigating new ways of delivering Community Infrastructure in Fishermans Bend, Hemisphere Design have identified the formation of a Place Management Framework as a tool with the potential to help deliver on the project’s strategic directions, including a strong community that is environmentally and economically resilient and creating ‘Place Capital’.

Detailed in the appendix, the development of a Place Management Framework, when integrated with current planning interventions, has the potential to create environmental, economic, social and cultural ‘wealth’, underpinning the delivery of Place Capital. Some best practice objectives include:

**Governance**
- Establish performance indicators to monitor and measure socio-economic benefit in the Place Management Framework review process
- Create framework for a new paradigm in governance and establish local ownership
- Embed a resilience approach into all council activity and educate and up-skill stakeholders and project partners. Create a ‘co-creation’ within local government
- Involve public, private and voluntary sectors in creating a shared long-term economic vision with socio-economic objectives

**Social Strength**
- Knit the local social fabric back together – a movement focused on reconnecting and restoring social bonds to bring people together in mutual support and social action, creating a community that will work together to protect the present, and plan for the future of Fishermans Bend
- Identify local individuals with a commitment to the local economy and social inclusions, and locally-based businesses
- Assess and develop the strength of local networks between the commercial, social and public sectors. These relationships and connections help to generate resilience within an area and that stronger mutual relationships allows a locality to be more flexible and to react better if faced with an economic or environmental change
- Identify the challenges to help places prepare better for global scale changes through workshops, research programs and networking facilities to help communities and local stakeholders understand and respond to change

**Built Environment**
- Create neighbourhoods with a high quality built environment that promote best practice ESD and compact, high-density urban form at a human scale
- Create the conditions for the city as an ‘urban workshop’ or cultural hub, allowing artists to flourish – creating vibrant neighbourhoods and attracting/ retaining talent within the region

**Economic Approach**
- Develop community supported industries where local citizen support and partner with local businesses, contributing to the local economy
- Develop mechanisms to ‘incentivise’ purchasers/renters to participate in the Place Management Framework
- Focus economic development on relationships, partnerships and networks, maximising local power rather than absentee landlords
- Localise for growth and keep the profits within the region. It is estimated that just 10% of food, energy and home efficiency sectors would bring in over $7.4 million to the local economy
- Create a ‘fund of funds’, bringing together different pots of public money to maximise the coverage and leverage of Urban Development Funds and be more appealing to institutional investors
- Develop and partner with financial co-operatives as they have proven to be more resilient through the recent economic turmoil than big banks. Investigate how a community development trust can be implemented
- Identify priorities based on seeing the economy as an ecosystem, placing importance on a balance of sectors, business types and functioning networks
- Form close ties between economic development and public procurement to achieve more within limited budgets
- Identify and pursue the specific conditions needed for inward investment to bring long-term benefits
- Use planning, regeneration, funding and support services in locally responsive ways and access regeneration proposals for their impact on existing supply networks
Role of the Private Sector in Delivering Community Infrastructure

The private sector will have a role in delivering facilities and open space and may also provide ‘other’ amenities that have the potential to positively contribute to the level of publicly accessible infrastructure on offer in FBURA. These other ‘offers’ may include, private open space that is publicly accessible, privately run education such as music schools and dance schools, private health care facilities and private aged care facilities.

Charter highlights that current market dynamics are not conducive to families settling into FBURA unless Places Victoria can facilitate a significant shift in how private sector developers are able to secure purchaser demand. This would require a shift away from small apartments that are attractive to investors (and more transient tenant occupants) to larger more expensive dwellings that are more attractive to families and owner-occupiers (who do not like the existing “off the plan” market mechanism).

The high densities proposed for FBURA mean that community infrastructure will not be able to be delivered ‘in isolation’ of private development. The spatial constraints make it unlikely that one site will contain only community infrastructure, it is much more likely to be delivered as part of a mixed-use approach. It will be essential to develop partnerships with the private sector to ensure adequate community infrastructure is delivered.

Delivering the Community Infrastructure within Private Sector Developments

The development industry recognises that certain elements of community infrastructure are beneficial to attracting demand from purchasers (i.e. primarily investors) and occupiers (i.e. tenants). Accordingly, Charter expects that the delivery of selected infrastructure directly by the development industry would be acceptable, given its potential to improve the salability of the private sector’s product offerings.

In many instances a podium is activated by ground floor retail uses, there is likely to be a beneficial opportunity to the developer to co-locate some forms of community infrastructure into their development. This may only be on a secondary frontage or at the end of a retail strip, as high rent paying retail tenants will tend to command the higher traffic premium frontages. The community infrastructure design layout could include a main ground floor component that extends upwards (via stairs and a passenger lift) to the first floor.

For example, a Library, Community Hub or Community Health Centre could have its main entrance, lobby, service desk and seating area on the ground floor. The first floor could then include meeting rooms, consulting rooms, offices, book storage and displays, bathroom amenities and back of house areas. This is explored further in the Case Study in the Appendix.

In order for a private sector developer to be attracted to include such a component of community infrastructure in their development, there would need to be an “off the plan” sale to Council prior to commencing construction. The high level commercial terms of the sale to Council would need to be negotiated, preferably, prior to any planning permit application being made for the parent development. This would be to give comfort to the developer that Council is committed to the community infrastructure prior to preparing and submitting a planning application for the parent project, as car parking and floor space for the community infrastructure would be committed, which affects the overall development layout, revenue stream and therefore viability.

In order to satisfy its financier, the developer would be required to make a profit on the “off the plan” sale to Council. Albeit, the profit margin would likely be smaller than for the balance of the development, as car parking and floor space for the community infrastructure would be committed, which affects the overall development layout, revenue stream and therefore viability.

In order for a private sector developer to be attracted to include such a component of community infrastructure in their development, there would need to be an “off the plan” sale to Council prior to commencing construction. The high level commercial terms of the sale to Council would need to be negotiated, preferably, prior to any planning permit application being made for the parent development. This would be to give comfort to the developer that Council is committed to the community infrastructure prior to preparing and submitting a planning application for the parent project, as car parking and floor space for the community infrastructure would be committed, which affects the overall development layout, revenue stream and therefore viability.

The Parent Project Fails to Achieve Pre-Commitments: In order to satisfy financiers’ risk-mitigation requirements, the developer will mainly focus on achieving a sale pre-commitment of the entire development prior to commencing construction. This will include pre-sales of at least 85% of the “off the plan” apartments and “agreements to lease” for at least 70% of any retail and office floor space. If these pre-commitments cannot be achieved for any reason and the developer is not able to reconfigure the development to achieve greater pre-commitment, then the whole project could be abandoned.

Development Costs Rise and the Parent Project is no longer Viable: Once the community infrastructure pre-commitment is made with Council, the developer still needs to pre-sell the balance of the development and then document and tender the whole project. If the tender prices are too high and the developer cannot negotiate a lower price, then the development becomes unviable and the project could be abandoned.

The Developer Suffers Financial Hardship: Developers often have many projects underway at any one time. If they become over committed or incur any risks during the course of their business, they may choose to abandon one or more projects and sell their land to stabilise their situation.

There are methods to reduce these risks to Council but they typically result in the developer taking on more cost and therefore risk, which eventually has the effect of increasing the overall cost to Council for the community infrastructure. The net effect of which is for Council to likely prefer to deliver the community infrastructure themselves, on land they already own or acquire.
The Importance of Community Infrastructure to the Four Key Property Markets

Charter Keck Cramer consultants analysed the importance of community infrastructure to the four key property markets in FBURA: residential, office, retail and industrial. This analysis was undertaken to ensure the provision of community infrastructure and open space is tied to the markets capacity to deliver it. This information has then been incorporated into the Recommended Approach and Staging.

The initial analysis identified the priorities of different types of community infrastructure for each of the four property markets. As an example; what is the importance of primary schools to the residential market, the office market, the retail market and the industrial market. The final analysis as shown in the table, weighted the percentages towards delivering the residential product (over the industrial, retail and commercial) and the vision for FBURA. The table outlines the prioritisation with 1 = critically important and 10 = not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Community Infrastructure</th>
<th>Weighted Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Passive open space</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Active open space</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Private gymnasiums</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Doctors surgeries and one stop medical centres</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Long day child care</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hard court facilities</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Community health</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cultural venues including galleries, theatres, cinemas, museums and music venues</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Maternal &amp; child health</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Services/facilities for young people (e.g. youth centre, TAFE, VET)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4 &amp; 3 year old kindergartens</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Places of worship</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hospitals and day procedure facilities</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Playgroup venues</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sites for use in response to a major disaster</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Public venues for hire</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Planned activity group facilities</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Council community centres</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Special education schools</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Neighbourhood house / adult education / U3A</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ambulance Victoria</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Facilities for community building activities such as volunteering, NGO's</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Residential care or overnight respite for young people</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Community transport</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Residential aged care</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Public aquatic leisure centres</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Metropolitan Fire Brigade</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Home and community care</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>State Emergency Services (SES)</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Delivery Models

The provision of community infrastructure within FBURA is expected to have to come from a wide variety of sources.

Commercial operations can help meet community needs. Well located and publicly accessible facilities such as indoor sports centres, indoor play centres, cafes, gymnasiaums, child care centres, music schools and other privately operated ‘schools’ have the potential to significantly contribute to the variety of activities on offer. Development models that reward the inclusion of these facilities within a development may encourage their delivery.

Not-for-profit organisations can also contribute to the provision of community infrastructure. Consultation with these organisations may lead to partnerships with the private sector to help deliver diverse liveable and family friendly communities.

Development models that should be investigated include:

- Purchasing land specifically to deliver community infrastructure
- Think vertically with the delivery of community infrastructure and incorporate the required floor space in mixed use buildings
- Investigating the use of crown land for community infrastructure
- Land swapping - government buys land that is more desirable to the market and swaps it with privately owned land in positions ideally located for community infrastructure
- Ensuring space is adaptable and flexible to maximise uses throughout the day
- Ensuring space is adaptable and flexible to maximise uses throughout its life and the changing community
- Use temporary buildings on vacant sites and vacant buildings on temporary sites
- Build on existing ‘place’ and infrastructure
- Develop partnerships with the private sector to deliver community infrastructure
- Create developer incentives/penalties around the successful delivery of community infrastructure
- Provide the planning structure to allow for flexible use and adaptability such as zoning

The provision of community infrastructure within FBURA is expected to have to come from a wide variety of sources. Commercial operations can help meet community needs. Well located and publicly accessible facilities such as indoor sports centres, indoor play centres, cafes, gymnasiaums, child care centres, music schools and other privately operated ‘schools’ have the potential to significantly contribute to the variety of activities on offer. Development models that reward the inclusion of these facilities within a development may encourage their delivery.

Not-for-profit organisations can also contribute to the provision of community infrastructure. Consultation with these organisations may lead to partnerships with the private sector to help deliver diverse liveable and family friendly communities.

Development models that should be investigated include:

- Purchasing land specifically to deliver community infrastructure
- Think vertically with the delivery of community infrastructure and incorporate the required floor space in mixed use buildings
- Investigating the use of crown land for community infrastructure
- Land swapping - government buys land that is more desirable to the market and swaps it with privately owned land in positions ideally located for community infrastructure
- Ensuring space is adaptable and flexible to maximise uses throughout the day
- Ensuring space is adaptable and flexible to maximise uses throughout its life and the changing community
- Use temporary buildings on vacant sites and vacant buildings on temporary sites
- Build on existing ‘place’ and infrastructure
- Develop partnerships with the private sector to deliver community infrastructure
- Create developer incentives/penalties around the successful delivery of community infrastructure
- Provide the planning structure to allow for flexible use and adaptability such as zoning
Case Study

Place Management Framework

The following group of four (4) case studies from Europe and the UK demonstrate best practice in Place Management, and strategies and mechanisms for community stewardship and ‘ownership’ of community development and urban renewal processes.

These projects demonstrate the potential for community members themselves to be given responsibility and support to monitor, plan and deliver community infrastructure through localised initiatives (as well as Council and government support).

This type of initiative is an emerging potential in Australia, but presents interesting opportunities for a new residential community in a new suburb, and where the provision and allocation of community infrastructure will need to be monitored and managed on an ongoing basis over the long term.

These projects also encompass financial mechanisms and initiatives which allow the delivery of projects without necessarily relying on government funding, through partnerships, local expenditure incentives and other initiatives. These potential are also worthy of exploration for Fishermans Bend.

1.03: RESEARCH & METHODOLOGY:
CASE STUDIES

Extensive research was conducted through the Institute of Place Management. The following tables are a summary of some of those studies and although the list is not exhaustive, it does give an insightful and considered appreciation of initiatives relevant to this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Management Framework Case Study</th>
<th>Place Management Framework Case Study</th>
<th>Place Management Framework Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Improvement</td>
<td>Social Improvement</td>
<td>Social Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation and Funding</td>
<td>Organisation and Funding</td>
<td>Organisation and Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Impact of Not Delivering Community Infrastructure

The implications of neglecting to provide adequate community infrastructure can be observed in new communities throughout Victoria, wider Australia and internationally. The result is often disconnected communities, neighbourhoods that are spaces rather than places, built form that does not respond to the unique needs and interests of the aspiring community and neighbourhoods that are unsuitable for families and young children.

Residents go without access to basic services and facilities and neighbourhoods are often characterised by little sense of community, resulting from a lack of opportunities to build community cohesiveness and connectedness.

This lack of community infrastructure can result from a number of issues including:

- Lack of integrated planning early in the development process
- Lack of understanding and communication of community needs, issues and opportunities early in the development process
- Delay in identifying and securing key sites for community infrastructure
- Lack of regulation for developers and proposed designs
- Little housing choice and a lack of mixed-use planning leading to unbalanced communities (e.g. lack of diversity in ethnicity, lifestyle, age and socio-economic background)
- Poor engagement and collaboration between decision-makers, local government, developers and service providers
- Size restrictions on allocated land and a lack of suitable, well-connected, well-located land

There are additional risks of not providing adequate community infrastructure for FBURA including:

- There is little publicly owned land and a high reliance on the private sector to deliver the required services, which, without robust regulations may not deliver infrastructure of a sufficient quality or quantity
- The lack of publicly owned land may lead to a piecemeal approach to the delivery of infrastructure with delivery tied to development parcels rather than the neighbourhood in which it is located
- Without community infrastructure within the high density, apartment typology there will be few places to meet, learn, care and engage with others locally, increasing social isolation. A lack of community infrastructure within FBURA will increase the pressure on the services in surrounding areas such as those in South Melbourne and Port Melbourne
- Opportunities for integrating community infrastructure with other forms and methods of development and delivery might be missed
- The cost and logistics of retrofitting community infrastructure at a later date will be prohibitive

Additional issues highlighted in the DPCD inner renewal area methodology work include:

- High land and development costs will necessitate more compact and innovative built form solutions, and require each infrastructure item to deliver maximum utility – these ‘models’ are not yet well-established
- Demand for community infrastructure is partly a function of population size and structure. Future size and structure of FBURA (despite development scenarios) remains uncertain. Lifestyle preferences and expectations of future community are likely to differ from existing communities
- Higher population density creates need for higher concentration of community infrastructure – traditional provision of facilities based on population catchments may be less efficient than providing larger facilities with greater capacity
- An appropriate hierarchy of provision requires integration of community infrastructure planning and retail planning

Ultimately, without community infrastructure, the project will be unable to achieve the FBURA vision that seeks to encourage families and a range of household types to live, work and recreate locally.
Issues and Risks

Constraints in Providing Community Infrastructure in FBURA
There are a number of constraints to delivering community infrastructure in FBURA. These constraints, listed below, will require a variety of approaches to be applied to overcome any negative impacts. Some of these approaches are discussed in further detail in Recommendations and Next Steps.

- There is inadequate government owned land on which to deliver the required open space and community infrastructure.
- The high cost of land within FBURA, in particular Montague, is a significant barrier to State and Local Government acquisition of the best located land for community infrastructure.
- Fragment land ownership will require partnerships and other development models to ensure community infrastructure is not delivered in a piecemeal way.
- Delays in identifying the most suitable sites for community infrastructure and the continuing pressure from existing planning application may result in community infrastructure being delivered in sub-optimal locations.
- Access arrangements and other partnership models will be required early in the process to ensure proposed use of spaces such as Melbourne Grammar land is a viable option.
- The cost differences in buying land versus buying floor area in vertical model community infrastructure requires detailed analysis and partnership models to ensure infrastructure is delivered in the appropriate places both within buildings and within neighbourhoods.
Conclusion
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Recommendations

The Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area faces a number of challenges to deliver its goal of a vibrant, accessible and cohesive network of places, which takes advantage of their strategic location, history and natural assets, to offer:

- Lifestyle choices for all ages and households
- A sustainable mix of uses
- Flexible infrastructure and services to meet changing needs over time
- A sense of destination and excitement for Melbourne and beyond

The CIP recommends actioning those elements identified in Timing and Staging and listed below in the immediate future:

- Securing the land for public open space network and key community infrastructure
- Delivering the linear linkages
- Ensuring the early delivery of community infrastructure is embedded in the planning mechanisms
- Encouraging innovation and incorporating new ways of delivering community infrastructure
- Developing and implementing a Place Management Strategy for FBURA

Next Steps

This report provides a framework to guide the provision of community infrastructure and public open space across FBURA over the next 40 years. It details one way that the needs and aspirations of existing and future residents and workers frequenting FBURA can be met, in an environment promoting and supporting the development of a sustainable and prosperous community.

To ensure the delivery is always ahead, both in time and in innovation, further and ongoing work must be undertaken.

Consultation

It is recommended that given the limited consultation undertaken to date, additional consultation and inputs be sought from the following interested parties:

- Existing land owners and tenants, both workers and residents and those living and working nearby
- Local Indigenous groups
- State government agencies
- Property and development sector
- Relevant agencies from the City of Melbourne
- City of Port Phillip
- Local government councillors
- Local community groups, residents and interested parties
- Service providers

Additional research

Additional thought and rigorous research needs to be undertaken to gain a greater understanding of the implications of providing community infrastructure differently. There is a knowledge gap around providing community infrastructure at higher densities and a gap in understanding of the issues for implementation; for example market research and testing interest for new models.

The initial focus for additional work should be learning and innovation relating to urban renewal and high density communities and their requirements of:

- Community facilities, for example:
  - Findings from the work being undertaken by SRV and DPCD
  - A detailed understanding of Council’s preferred and anticipated service planning/needs/delivery process for FBURA
  - Better understanding of services, facilities and activities needed on the ground floor and where there is flexibility to provide them on any level of the building, i.e. meeting rooms may be provided at the upper levels of a building and other services such as children’s services may be better provider on the ground level to utilise local outdoor spaces
  - New models for innovation being developed by others in higher density environments, outlining new combinations of services/activities, different service providers and/or governance models

- Recreation and sporting activities, for example:
  - Findings from the work being undertaken by SRV and DPCD (referred to earlier in this report)
  - What opportunities are there to upgrade/improve existing facilities, i.e. add lights or artificial turf to existing facilities in or nearby FBURA
  - Findings from the Department of Planning and Community Development (DPCD 2013) Developing Methodologies for a Community Infrastructure Framework - Expanded Central City Framework and other related work for the Inner City
  - Findings from Sport and Recreation Victoria (SRV) which is currently researching new models for providing sports and recreational opportunities, specifically indoor recreational opportunities
  - New models for innovation being developed by others in higher density environments, outlining new combinations of services/activities, different service providers and/or governance models

Open space, for example:

- Findings from the work being undertaken by SRV and DPCD (referred to earlier in this report)
- A better understanding of what opportunities there are to upgrade/improve existing facilities, i.e. the adjoining Westgate Park
- A better understanding of the utilisation rates for open space and needs of high density communities
- New models for innovation being developed by others in higher density environments, outlining new combinations of services/activities, different service providers and/or governance models

Recreation and sporting activities, for example:

- Findings from the work being undertaken by SRV and DPCD (referred to earlier in this report)
- What opportunities are there to upgrade/improve existing facilities, i.e. add lights or artificial turf to existing facilities in or nearby FBURA
- Findings from the Department of Planning and Community Development (DPCD 2013) Developing Methodologies for a Community Infrastructure Framework - Expanded Central City Framework and other related work for the Inner City
- Findings from Sport and Recreation Victoria (SRV) which is currently researching new models for providing sports and recreational opportunities, specifically indoor recreational opportunities
- New models for innovation being developed by others in higher density environments, outlining new combinations of services/activities, different service providers and/or governance models

Additional thought and rigorous research needs to be undertaken to gain a greater understanding of the implications of providing community infrastructure differently. There is a knowledge gap around providing community infrastructure at higher densities and a gap in understanding of the issues for implementation; for example market research and testing interest for new models.

The initial focus for additional work should be learning and innovation relating to urban renewal and high density communities and their requirements of:

- Community facilities, for example:
  - Findings from the work being undertaken by SRV and DPCD
  - A detailed understanding of Council’s preferred and anticipated service planning/needs/delivery process for FBURA
  - Better understanding of services, facilities and activities needed on the ground floor and where there is flexibility to provide them on any level of the building, i.e. meeting rooms may be provided at the upper levels of a building and other services such as children’s services may be better provider on the ground level to utilise local outdoor spaces
  - New models for innovation being developed by others in higher density environments, outlining new combinations of services/activities, different service providers and/or governance models

- Recreation and sporting activities, for example:
  - Findings from the work being undertaken by SRV and DPCD (referred to earlier in this report)
  - What opportunities are there to upgrade/improve existing facilities, i.e. add lights or artificial turf to existing facilities in or nearby FBURA
  - Findings from the Department of Planning and Community Development (DPCD 2013) Developing Methodologies for a Community Infrastructure Framework - Expanded Central City Framework and other related work for the Inner City
  - Findings from Sport and Recreation Victoria (SRV) which is currently researching new models for providing sports and recreational opportunities, specifically indoor recreational opportunities
  - New models for innovation being developed by others in higher density environments, outlining new combinations of services/activities, different service providers and/or governance models

Open space, for example:

- Findings from the work being undertaken by SRV and DPCD (referred to earlier in this report)
- A better understanding of what opportunities there are to upgrade/improve existing facilities, i.e. the adjoining Westgate Park
- A better understanding of the utilisation rates for open space and needs of high density communities
- New models for innovation being developed by others in higher density environments, outlining new combinations of services/activities, different service providers and/or governance models
### Conclusion

**Schools and education**, for example:
- Further research needs to be undertaken to existing and likely demand for TAFE, vocational and University services.
- The Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) is developing a model to forecast the government school students in new development areas and additionally are exploring design options for vertical schools.

**Delivery models and costings**, for example:
- Investigation of incentives/planning requirements to support the delivery of community infrastructure as part of private developments.
- Investigation of possible delivery partnerships.
- Further research on the suitability of existing heritage buildings for community use.
- Investigation of the opportunities of government owned land.
- Review and refinement of blockspace allocations and costing in partnership with the infrastructure providers.

**Guidelines**
The knowledge gained from the additional research and contained within this report and the other work being conducted concurrently such as the Urban Design Guidelines, should inform a series of guidelines and criteria for the provision of community infrastructure and open space.

Recommended guidelines/criteria include:
- Guidelines for the provision of publicly accessible open space within private developments and a set of criteria to assess them.
- Guidelines for the provision of community infrastructure within mixed use buildings including criteria around street frontage, accessibility, visibility and signage.
- Guidelines for the ‘sharing’ of public open spaces including criteria for maintenance and management.
- Guidelines for the private sector regarding the provision of infrastructure that could be open for public use such as swimming pools, gymnasiums, small cinemas and roof top gardens.
- Guidelines for the configuration, proportions and required access for community infrastructure in private and public sector delivered developments.
- Guidelines for when public open space contributions are appropriate to be provided on-site (i.e. as land rather than cash contributions) to achieve the delivery of quality open spaces.

**Mapping and Masterplanning**
The background work to date and the information contained within the Strategic Framework Plan being prepared by Places Victoria will form a solid base for the detailed work still to come.

In order to ensure the CIP is properly incorporated into the future of FBURA a series of detailed urban design studies is recommended. These studies would address each precinct, in detail taking into account elements such as:
- Indigenous, industrial and residential history.
- Land ownership and opportunistic sites.
- Heritage buildings and landscapes.
- Transport networks and infrastructure.
- Existing ‘neighbourhood’ places.
- Existing view lines, and places of significance.
- Solar and wind studies.
- Proposed developments.

These urban design studies would then accurately inform masterplans for each precinct, starting with Montague, that include:
- Detailed community facilities and open space planning.
- Design of open space links and street networks.
- Identification of local, neighbourhood, secondary and primary centres to inform land acquisition by government and locational priorities for private sector delivery of community infrastructure and open space.
- Opportunities presented by specific heritage buildings for community use.
- Identified opportunities for government owned land.

**Prioritising developments**
The masterplans and further work will then lead to a more accurate understanding of the order of delivery for the activity centres and associated community infrastructure and public open space. The prioritising of centre delivery is considered a crucial part of delivering a sustainable place. It will help ensure new and existing communities have safe and convenient access to the necessary facilities from within FBURA without putting undue pressure on existing neighbouring facilities.

It will also be the beginning of the community network and placemaking. The governance of this delivery as outlined in ‘Development of a Place Management Framework’ has the potential to make this process one that is owned and managed by the local community.

**Ongoing Monitoring**
The ongoing monitoring and tracking of population growth, demographics, community infrastructure provision and capacity and community needs, is essential for maintaining an effective and timely implementation process over the long term.
Conclusion

Part J
### Local Parks

**Neighborhood:**

- **Libraries:**
  - User population: 5,000 people with a service area of 0.5 to 0.7 km. Comforting noisy parks and large town planning parks may include a small area with a semi-enclosed meeting area.
  - **Size:** 2,520 sq.m.
  - **Area per facility (sq.m):** 200
  - **Construction Cost ($):** (Excl. GST) 3,000
  - **Indicative Building Costs Calculations:** 3,500

- **Pocket Parks:**
  - User population: 1,000 to 10,000 people with a service area of 0.03 to 0.26 ha. Comprising mainly green space with pathways, including open space areas, garden beds, and rain gardens. It may include facilities for other activities.
  - **Size:** 1,000 sq.m.
  - **Area per facility (sq.m):** 120
  - **Construction Cost ($):** 12,000
  - **Indicative Building Costs Calculations:** 17,000

- **Neighborhood Squares:**
  - User population: 2,500 to 10,000 people with a service area of 0.145 ha average. Predominantly green space with pathways, including open space areas, garden beds, and rain gardens. Local parks will be located within the neighborhood center and will be used by playgrounds and large trees providing shade, it may include a small play area with semi-enclosed meeting areas.
  - **Size:** 2,500 sq.m.
  - **Area per facility (sq.m):** 250
  - **Construction Cost ($):** (Excl. GST) 3,250
  - **Indicative Building Costs Calculations:** 4,500

### Our Recommendations:

- **Worker population:** Likely to increase demand for this service.
- **Existing high demand:** In surrounding areas is likely to increase demand for this service.
- **Dual room kindergarten (excludes classrooms configurations):**
  - **Space:** 1,000 sq.m.
  - **Area per facility (sq.m):** 100
  - **Construction Cost ($):** (Excl. GST) 700
  - **Indicative Building Costs Calculations:** 1,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Cost per m²</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>2,520 sq.m</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$16,800,000</td>
<td>10,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>1,000 sq.m</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>2,500 sq.m</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>10,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>1,000 sq.m</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$4,350,000</td>
<td>4,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>2,500 sq.m</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>1,000 sq.m</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary Table A: Floor space requirements and delivery cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (sq.m)</th>
<th>Pop.</th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Total Number (FBURA)</th>
<th>Total Area (sq.m)</th>
<th>Indicative Building Costs Calculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Public Aquatic Centres
- Local Government

## Soccer Fields
- Local Government
- 2 x 8 multi use court models

## Outdoor Sports Facilities
- Local Government/community

## Indoor Sports Facilities
- Local Government

## Cricket Ovals
- Local Government

## People Services for young

## Information / facilities

## Planned activity group

## Facilities for community

## Football Park

## Horse Racing

## Tennis

## Basketball

## Futsal

## Netball

## Other

## Depot

## Community Health
- Secondary

## Community Park
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary

## Secondary Square
- Secondary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary

## Secondary Centre
- Secondary

## Primary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Responsibility</th>
<th>Capire SJB Response</th>
<th>Our recommendations:</th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Total Number (FBURA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>25,670</td>
<td>51,087</td>
<td>88,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Requires input from DEECD</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Square</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Primary squares</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police and Emergency services</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Fire services</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance Victoria</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Emergency services (SES)</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Centre</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>To indoor recreational models</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places for senior</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Neighbourhood/Be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Homecare</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Private provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health and aged care</td>
<td>Community Sector</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Private provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and road related needs</td>
<td>Community Sector</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Private provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary Table Aiii: floor space requirements and delivery cost**
# Indicative floor space requirement for Fishermans Bend CIP

## Version 8b (STAGE PRICED), 12 June 2013

### Summary Table A1v: staged delivery cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>ALL STAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 30,925,000</td>
<td>$ 107,670,000</td>
<td>$ 148,895,000</td>
<td><strong>TOTAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT CONSTRUCTION COST (EXCL. GST)</strong> $ 287,490,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 3,720,000</td>
<td>$ 12,930,000</td>
<td>$ 17,860,000</td>
<td><strong>PROFESSIONAL FEES (12.0% OF CONSTRUCTION COST)</strong> $ 34,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 930,000</td>
<td>$ 3,240,000</td>
<td>$ 4,460,000</td>
<td><strong>AUTHORITY /MANAGEMENT COSTS (3.0% OF CONSTRUCTION)</strong> $ 8,630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 3,560,000</td>
<td>$ 12,390,000</td>
<td>$ 17,120,000</td>
<td><strong>CONTINGENCY (10.0% OF ALL ABOVE COSTS)</strong> $ 33,070,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td><strong>COST ESCALATION BEYOND MAY 2013</strong> EXCLUDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td><strong>FINANCING COSTS</strong> EXCLUDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td><strong>LAND PURCHASE COSTS</strong> EXCLUDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td><strong>MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONAL EXPENDITURE (OPEX) COSTS</strong> EXCLUDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td><strong>SITE COSTS (CLEAN UP)</strong> EXCLUDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td><strong>SPECIALIST FIT OUT IN COMPUTERS, MEDICAL EQUIPMENT</strong> EXCLUDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$ 39,135,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 136,230,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 188,335,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROJECT COST (EXCL. GST)</strong> $ 363,690,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTAGUE</td>
<td>SANDRIDGE</td>
<td>LORIMER</td>
<td>WIRRAWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likely catchments:</strong></td>
<td>5,000 Workers 10,000 Residents</td>
<td>5,000 Residents</td>
<td>10,000 Residents and a size of up to 0.25 hectares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood activity centres</strong></td>
<td>2 x pocket parks between 0.03 and 0.26 ha distributed throughout the local catchment, for example every 300m around the study area.</td>
<td>5 x pocket parks between 0.03 and 0.26 ha distributed throughout the local catchment, for example every 300m around the study area.</td>
<td>2 x pocket parks between 0.03 and 0.26 ha distributed throughout the local catchment, for example every 300m around the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely catchments:</td>
<td>5,000 Workers 300m Catchment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likely catchments:</strong></td>
<td>10,000 Residents 300m Catchment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local activity centres</strong></td>
<td>What open space is in them 2 x Neighbourhood square: has a population catchment of 10,000 residents and a size of up to 0.25 hectares. It will be located within the neighbourhood centre and will predominantly consist of hard spaces with large trees, garden beds and rain gardens. It will provide seating, flexible event space and may include facilities for urban sports. 2 x Small park: has a population catchment of 10,000 residents and a size of up to 1 hectare. Small parks will be distributed evenly throughout the neighbourhood, ideally less than 500m from any home. They will comprise predominantly green space with pathways, including large trees, garden beds and rain gardens. Small parks will provide areas of seating, a large play area, space for local events and small-scale flexible open space for informal sports.</td>
<td>What open space is in them 2 x Neighbourhood square: has a population catchment of 10,000 residents and a size of up to 0.25 hectares. It will be located within the neighbourhood centre and will predominantly consist of hard spaces with large trees, garden beds and rain gardens. It will provide seating, flexible event space and may include facilities for urban sports. 2 x Small park: has a population catchment of 10,000 residents and a size of up to 1 hectare. Small parks will be distributed evenly throughout the neighbourhood, ideally less than 500m from any home. They will comprise predominantly green space with pathways, including large trees, garden beds and rain gardens. Small parks will provide areas of seating, a large play area, space for local events and small-scale flexible open space for informal sports.</td>
<td>What open space is in them 2 x Neighbourhood square: has a population catchment of 10,000 residents and a size of up to 0.25 hectares. It will be located within the neighbourhood centre and will predominantly consist of hard spaces with large trees, garden beds and rain gardens. It will provide seating, flexible event space and may include facilities for urban sports. 2 x Small park: has a population catchment of 10,000 residents and a size of up to 1 hectare. Small parks will be distributed evenly throughout the neighbourhood, ideally less than 500m from any home. They will comprise predominantly green space with pathways, including large trees, garden beds and rain gardens. Small parks will provide areas of seating, a large play area, space for local events and small-scale flexible open space for informal sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of activity clusters</strong></td>
<td>family and children cluster (+primary school)</td>
<td>family and children services cluster (+primary school)</td>
<td>social, cultural and recreational cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What types of activities is in them</strong></td>
<td>Information Informal social connections (meeting spaces sitting/resting) Formal and informal meeting spaces in a range of sizes Spaces for use by community groups and spaces for hire Shared spaces (kitchen, office and storage) Meeting space for small scale events and gatherings Seating along streetscapes picnic/barbeques Community gardens Play spaces Early childhood care and educational activities</td>
<td>Information Informal social connections (meeting spaces sitting/resting) Formal and informal meeting spaces in a range of sizes Spaces for use by community groups and spaces for hire Shared spaces (kitchen, office and storage) Meeting space for small scale events and gatherings Seating along streetscapes picnic/barbeques Community gardens Play spaces Physical activity Aged specific activities Early childhood care and educational activities Arts/cultural focused spaces (small scale community performance space) Arts/artists studio</td>
<td>Information Informal social connections (meeting spaces sitting/resting) Formal and informal meeting spaces in a range of sizes Spaces for use by community groups and spaces for hire Shared spaces (kitchen, office and storage) Meeting space for small scale events and gatherings Seating along streetscapes picnic/barbeques Community gardens Play spaces Physical activity Aged specific activities Early childhood care and educational activities Arts/cultural focused spaces (small scale community performance space) Arts/artists studio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary Table Bii: community infrastructure per precinct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTAGUE</th>
<th>SANDRIDGE</th>
<th>LORIMER</th>
<th>WIRRAWAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The number and type of facility that will go in them</strong></td>
<td><strong>The number and type of facility that will go in them</strong></td>
<td><strong>The number and type of facility that will go in them</strong></td>
<td><strong>The number and type of facility that will go in them</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Integrated community and early years facility.</td>
<td>- Integrated community and early years facility.</td>
<td>- Integrated community and early years facility.</td>
<td>- Access to nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Access to kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Maternal and Child Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Access to playgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Playgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Community Meeting Space/classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Long Day Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- General Community Meeting Space/classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Early years facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Access to nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Maternal and Child Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Playgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Community Meeting Space/classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Long Day Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Classrooms/community meeting spaces for youth, general public and older adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Artist Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Small performance/gallery spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Half basketball court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Tennis practice space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Medium grassed area for unstructured activities and training (eg children kicking a ball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Community gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Integrated community and early years facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Access to nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Maternal and Child Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Playgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Community Meeting Space/classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Playgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Community Meeting Space/classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Long Day Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Classrooms/community meeting spaces for youth, general public and older adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Artist Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Small performance/gallery spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Half basketball court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Tennis practice space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Medium grassed area for unstructured activities and training (eg children kicking a ball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Community gardens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Types of activity clusters

#### Education, training and lifelong learning cluster
- Information
- Informal social connections (meeting spaces sitting/resting)
- Play spaces
- Physical activity
- Library and learning activities

#### Social, cultural and recreational cluster
- Information
- Informal social connections (meeting spaces sitting/resting)
- Play spaces
- Physical activity
- Aged specific activities
- Arts and culture spaces and activities

#### Health and well-being cluster
- Information
- Informal social connections (meeting spaces sitting/resting)
- Play spaces
- Physical activity
- Health and wellbeing activities
- Arts and culture spaces and activities
- Emergency

#### Education, training and lifelong learning cluster
- Information
- Informal social connections (meeting spaces sitting/resting)
- Play spaces
- Physical activity
- Library and learning activities

### The number and type of facility that will go in them

#### MONTAGUE
- Access to nature
- Early years facility.
- Access to nature
- Kindergarten
- Maternal and Child Health
- Playgroup
- Multi-purpose Community Hub
- Neighbourhood House facilities
- Meetings rooms/classrooms
- Venues for hire
- Long day care
- General Community Meeting Space/classrooms
- Open Space
- Small performance/gallery spaces
- Half basketball court
- Tennis practice space
- Medium grassed area for unstructured activities and training (eg children kicking a ball.
- Community gardens

#### SANDRIDGE
- Early years facility.
- Access to nature
- Kindergarten
- Maternal and Child Health
- Playgroup
- Multi-purpose Community Hub
- Neighbourhood House facilities
- Meetings rooms/classrooms
- Venues for hire
- Classrooms/community meeting spaces for youth, general public and older adults.
- Artist Studio
- Small performance/gallery spaces
- Half basketball court
- Tennis practice space
- Medium grassed area for unstructured activities and training (eg children kicking a ball.
- Community gardens

#### LORIMER
- Early years facility.
- Access to nature
- Kindergarten
- Maternal and Child Health
- Playgroup
- Multi-purpose Community Hub
- Neighbourhood House facilities
- Meetings rooms/classrooms
- Venues for hire
- Classrooms/community meeting spaces for youth, general public and older adults.
- General Health services- community and private services
- Artist Studio
- Small performance/gallery spaces
- Half basketball court
- Tennis practice space
- Medium grassed area for unstructured activities and training (eg children kicking a ball.
- Community gardens

#### WIRRAWAY
- Integrated community and early years facility.
- Access to nature
- Kindergarten
- Maternal and Child Health
- Playgroup
- Multi-purpose Community Hub
- Neighbourhood House facilities
- Meetings rooms/classrooms
- Venues for hire
- General Community Meeting Space/classrooms
- Open Space
- Small performance/gallery spaces
- Half basketball court
- Tennis practice space
- Medium grassed area for unstructured activities and training (eg children kicking a ball.
- Community gardens
### Secondary activity centres

**Montague**
- 2 x Secondary squares: has a population catchment of 24,000 residents, 14,000 workers and a size of up to 0.5 hectares. Secondary squares will be located within the secondary centre serving residents and workers. It will be a predominantly hard space providing seating, medium sized flexible event space and urban sports and will include large trees, garden beds, rain gardens and water storage.
- 1 x Large park: has a population catchment of 24,000 residents and a size of between 1.2 hectares. Large scale parks will be distributed evenly throughout the precinct and will comprise green space with pathways, a variety of large trees, garden beds and rain gardens. Parks will provide space for a walking and dog walking, a large play area, seating and medium sized flexible open space for use for practice areas for organised sports.

**Sandridge**
- 1 x Secondary square: has a population catchment of 24,000 residents, 14,000 workers and a size of up to 0.5 hectares. Secondary squares will be located within the secondary centre serving residents and workers. It will be a predominantly hard space providing seating, medium sized flexible event space and urban sports and will include large trees, garden beds, rain gardens and water storage.
- 1 x Large park: has a population catchment of 24,000 residents and a size of between 1.2 hectares. Large scale parks will be distributed evenly throughout the precinct and will comprise green space with pathways, a variety of large trees, garden beds and rain gardens. Parks will provide space for a walking and dog walking, a large play area, seating and medium sized flexible open space for use for practice areas for organised sports.

**Lorimer**
- 1 x Secondary square: has a population catchment of 24,000 residents, 14,000 workers and a size of up to 0.5 hectares. Secondary squares will be located within the secondary centre serving residents and workers. It will be a predominantly hard space providing seating, medium sized flexible event space and urban sports and will include large trees, garden beds, rain gardens and water storage.
- 2 x Large park: has a population catchment of 24,000 residents and a size of between 1.2 hectares. Large scale parks will be distributed evenly throughout the precinct and will comprise green space with pathways, a variety of large trees, garden beds and rain gardens. Parks will provide space for a walking and dog walking, a large play area, seating and medium sized flexible open space for use for practice areas for organised sports.

### Types of activity clusters

- **Social, cultural and recreational cluster**
  - Information
  - Informal social connections (meeting spaces sitting/resting)
  - Play spaces
  - Physical activity
  - Aged specific activities
  - Arts and culture spaces and activities
  - The number and type of facility that will go in them
  - Information
  - Access to free internet
  - Informal social connections (meeting spaces sitting/resting)
  - Neighbourhood House
  - Play spaces
  - Services for young people
  - Facilities for community building activities
  - Planned activity group facilities
  - Physical activity
  - Play spaces
  - Private Gymnasiums
  - Adventure play space
  - Skate/BMX facilities
  - Grasped areas for training and unstructured recreational activities (Auskik, AFL, soccer and locations for clubs)
  - 1 x 8 multi use court models
  - Aged specific activities
  - Secondary School
  - Residential aged care facilities
  - Arts and culture spaces and activities
  - Medium size events space/galleries and performance

- **Education, training and lifelong learning cluster**
  - Information
  - Informal social connections (meeting spaces sitting/resting)
  - Play spaces
  - Physical activity
  - Library and learning activities

- **Health and wellbeing cluster**
  - Information
  - Informal social connections (meeting spaces sitting/resting)
  - Play spaces
  - Physical activity
  - Aged specific activities
  - Religious and spiritual activities
  - Health and wellbeing activities
  - Arts and culture spaces and activities
  - Emergency

- **Physical Activities**
  - Private Gymnasium
  - Skate/BMX facilities
  - Open Space
  - 1 x 8 multi use court models

- **Emergency services**
  - Police and Emergency Services
  - Metropolitan Fire Services
  - State Emergency Services
  - Ambulance Victoria

- **Aged specific activities**
  - Play spaces for all
  - Youth Space
  - Older adults specific activities

- **Religious and Spiritual Activities**
  - Spaces for spiritual and worship opportunities
  - Informal spaces for meditation and prayer

- **Learning**
  - Neighbourhood House
  - Secondary School
  - Services for young people
  - Facilities for community building activities

- **Home and community care**
  - Planned activity group facilities

- **Health and well being**
  - Residential aged care facilities
  - Home and community care
  - Doctors surgeries and one stop
  - Planned activity group facilities

- **Medical centres**
  - Ambulance Victoria

- **Outdoor sports facilities**
  - Open Space
  - 1 x 8 multi use court models

- **Spaces for spiritual and worship opportunities**
  - Informal spaces for meditation and prayer

- **Emergency services**
  - Police and Emergency Services
  - Metropolitan Fire Services
  - State Emergency Services
  - Ambulance Victoria
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTAGUE</th>
<th>SANDRIDGE</th>
<th>LORIMER</th>
<th>WIRRAWAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary activity centres</strong></td>
<td><strong>Primary activity centres</strong></td>
<td><strong>Primary activity centres</strong></td>
<td><strong>Primary activity centres</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely catchments: 42,000 Residents 21,285 Workers</td>
<td>Likely catchments: 42,000 Residents 21,285 Workers</td>
<td>Likely catchments: 42,000 Residents 21,285 Workers</td>
<td>Likely catchments: 42,000 Residents 21,285 Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major City Park: will be used by all Fishermans Bend residents and workers, and surrounding users and residents. A large scale 3-5 hectares park will comprise of predominately green space with pathways, including a variety of trees, garden beds, and rain gardens. Providing space for high intensity and variety of passive recreation within a designed naturalistic setting.</td>
<td>1 x Primary Square: the major square is a prominent urban open space of up to 1 ha located within the Primary centre and close to the main circulation hub. It will be a predominately hard space providing seating, major event space and urban sports including large trees, garden beds, rain gardens and water storage.</td>
<td>1 x Primary Square: the major square is a prominent urban open space of up to 1 ha located within the Primary centre and close to the main circulation hub. It will be a predominately hard space providing seating, major event space and urban sports including large trees, garden beds, rain gardens and water storage.</td>
<td>Major Sport park: will be used by all Fishermans Bend residents and workers, and surrounding users and residents. A large scale 3-5 hectares sports parks will be located in the precinct. This would include the upgraded JL Murphy reserve plus one new location. The sports park will comprise of predominantly green space with pathways, including a variety of large trees, garden beds and rain gardens. It will provide space for a variety of organised and passive recreational activities including walking and dog walking, large play area, areas of seating and a minimum of two sports pitches that can provide facilities to support community AFL, cricket or soccer teams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of activity clusters</th>
<th>Social, cultural and recreational cluster</th>
<th>Education, training and lifelong learning cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What types of activities are in them</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal social connections (meeting spaces sitting/resting)</td>
<td>Informal social connections (meeting spaces sitting/resting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play spaces</td>
<td>Play spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical activity</td>
<td>Physical activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aged specific activities</td>
<td>Library and learning activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts and culture spaces and activities</td>
<td>Government owned and operated learning activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number and type of facility that will go in them</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council offices</td>
<td>Council offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site for use in response to a major disasters</td>
<td>Site for use in response to a major disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal social connections (meeting spaces sitting/resting)</td>
<td>Informal social connections (meeting spaces sitting/resting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spaces for spiritual and worship opportunities</td>
<td>Spaces for spiritual and worship opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal spaces for meditation and prayer</td>
<td>Informal spaces for meditation and prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Scale Meeting Space</td>
<td>Large Scale Meeting Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play spaces</td>
<td>Play spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical activity (refer to large scale sports park above)</td>
<td>Physical activity (refer to large scale sports park above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Aquatic Centre</td>
<td>Public Aquatic Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Specific Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Library and learning activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public or private hospital</td>
<td>Vocational activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital and day procedure facilities</td>
<td>Special education school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respite for young adults</td>
<td>Tertiary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respite for older adults</td>
<td>Public Borrowing Library space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>Public or private hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and cultural spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital and day procedure facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Venues includes galleries, theatres, cinemas, museums and music venues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Space indoor/outdoor spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Summary Table Biv: community infrastructure per precinct |
Neighbourhood Centre Case Study
Introduction

The case study looks at the provision of a neighbourhood centre, which contains a Family and Children Services cluster, a linear park and a neighbourhood square with a neighbourhood catchment. This centre would be part of the network of open spaces and community infrastructure and linked by linear parks, public transport and pedestrian networks. The case study is hypothetical only; there has, at this point been no research on ownership of the site and potential procurement, it is however a real site within the Montague Precinct.

It investigates the provision of community infrastructure in a vertical model including the use of roof space as open space as well as the relationship between community infrastructure, retail and residential or commercial space and proximity to public open spaces. It also explores the flexibility and adaptability of both built form community infrastructure and public open space community infrastructure and the relationship between the two.

Based on the Role, Character, Principles and Locational Attributes as outlined in the Recommended Approach chapter, the case study aims to provide a neighbourhood centre that ‘builds community resilience, provide access to local services and facilities and provides opportunities for informal and social activity and leisure activities’.

The principles followed include:

- Access to sunlight, shade, shelter and seating
  - The case study has orientated the open space to the north of the site
- Connected by safe pedestrian and bicycle paths
  - Linear parks on 3 sides of the development provide safe connections
- Containing multi-purpose/flexible spaces
  - Internal and external spaces are designed for a variety of uses
- Containing integrated/shared use facilities
  - The design of community infrastructure should allow for changing room configurations to suit different uses
- Connected indoor/outdoor spaces
  - Roof spaces are directly adjacent to community infrastructure and outdoor spaces are able to hold temporary structures
- Providing human scale environments within the open space and the building forms
  - The existing heritage structure provide a richness of materials and the architectural design guidelines for new buildings should incorporate human scale detailing at the ground, first and second floors
- Reflecting local history and contextual elements to assist place making including the retention and use of heritage buildings where possible
  - The case study uses the existing heritage buildings
- Accessible to all abilities, cultures and ages
- Universally accessible and safe
- Incorporating ESD principles and practice
  - Rain gardens and onsite water retention are part of the development and the built form should be designed to the highest ESD standards possible
- Capacity for community stewardship/governance/management

Description of Site/Existing Conditions

Within the Montague Precinct, it is located on the corner of Montague Street, Buckhurst Street and Gladstone Street and is approximately 200 metres from the Montague Street light rail stop. It is also the location of the existing heritage building containing the Montague Continuing Education Centre.
Proposed Activities and Configuration

The built form community infrastructure has been developed around a floor plate that maximises buildability including a ‘wrapped/active edge’ podium containing car parking and a tower. The tower allows for a 10 metre floor plate on each face (for apartments/offices) with a 2 metre circulation corridor in the middle resulting in a 22 metre deep tower.

The arrangement of the built forms and the allocation of the public square to the north east of the site maximise solar access to the public open spaces and to the roof spaces of the podium.

The neighbourhood centre consists of a maternal and child health care facility, a number of flexible community rooms that can be divided/joined to provide a variety of spaces, a childcare centre with an outdoor roof top open space and a neighbourhood info/hub centre.

The Family and Children Services cluster has:
- Maternal and Child Health (3 x 70 m² rooms)
- Multi-purpose neighbourhood centre, information, wi-fi (70 m² on ground floor)
- Childcare (480 m² plus 550 m² outdoor space on roof available for childcare and ‘after hours use’ by the community rooms)
- Multi-purpose community rooms including kitchen/catering facilities (4 x 70 m² or 210 m² + 70 m²) and access to 80 m² roof top outside child care hours.

The public square is, as described in the Open Space section of this report, a small open space located within the neighbourhood centre. It will serve a population of up to 10,000. Consisting of predominately hard spaces with large trees, gardens beds and rain gardens, it will provide seating, flexible event space and may include facilities for urban sports.

The neighbourhood square is 0.23 hectares and has:
- Grass space (200 m²)
- Existing mature trees x 2
- New shade trees x 21
- Urban sport court (210 m²)
- Productive garden beds (5 x approximately 10 m² beds)
- Provision for market stalls (around 620 m² of stalls)
- Public seating, including formalised seating on supplied chairs and incidental seating (edge of garden beds, grass, steps etc.)
- Rain gardens around the perimeter to help treat water

The linear park is, as described in the Open Space section of this report, a minimum width of 8 metres, predominately soft and provides enough space for a shared pedestrian and cycling path and associated planted buffer strip. The primary role of the linear park is to provide recreational and ecological links. It can also be used for storm water collection and filtration. The case study linear park is around 15 metres wide and shows the incorporation of play spaces and multi-purpose surfaces.

Programming would include timetabling of community rooms, co-ordination of outdoor events such as market days, lunchtime sports, and festivals and temporary and pop-up events.

The linear park is 15 metres wide and contains:
- 7 metre width of pedestrian/cycle path
- 9 metre width containing:
  - Urban skate (145 m²)
  - Kick about (90 m²)
  - Half-court basketball/handball (90 m²)
  - Playground (30 m²)
  - Junior playground (30 m²)
  - Productive gardens (90 m²)

It is envisioned that the maximum use of the open space and the community infrastructure would be gained through careful programming of the spaces. This may be tied into a governance model as described in Delivery Strategy chapter, Development of a Place Management Framework or in the more traditional way by local government.

It is envisioned that the maximum use of the open space and the community infrastructure would be gained through careful programming of the spaces. This may be tied into a governance model as described in Delivery Strategy chapter, Development of a Place Management Framework or in the more traditional way by local government.
Neighbourhood Centre Case Study: massing diagram
Delivery Opportunities

This case study has the potential to be delivered by the scenario outlined in Delivering the Community Infrastructure within Private Sector Developments, Part H. Namely a private developer would enter into negotiations with the community infrastructure provider, in this case Council and a private childcare operator, to deliver the required spaces as part of their development.

It also has the potential to be delivered by Government under the following circumstances.

The Government may purchase the whole block with the intention of utilising the heritage building for community infrastructure, delivering the neighbourhood square, securing the linear park connection and delivering the Family and Children Services Cluster. The remaining land, including the vertical floor area can be put out to market with the community infrastructure being delivered by government clearly outlined to prospective developers.

The location of the public open space, the linear link, the community infrastructure promised and also the potential ‘grit and grain’ offered by the heritage buildings may be considered as positive assets to the development industry. Government can then enter into an agreement with the chosen bidder to deliver the built form.

This model and other development models considered should prioritise the delivery of the open space to ensure it is located in the best location for connections, both to other areas and with the community infrastructure within buildings. Where possible, this open space can then be ‘occupied’ with temporary and pop-up uses while the larger structures containing community infrastructure are built.

Building Cost

Based on cost estimates from Charter Keck Cramer found in detail in Table A in the Appendix, the Neighbourhood Centre configuration in the case study, including basic fit out, would cost in the realm of the following amounts:

**Building**

11800m² @ $3000 per/m² = $3,540,000

**Square**

2500m² @ $650 per/m² = $1,625,000

**Linear Park**

525m² @ $650 per/m² = $341,250

**Land Purchase Price**

8750 m² @ $3000 per/m² = $26,250,000

NOTE: building costs range between $3000-$6000, the CIP has used an estimate of $3000m² (refer to exclusion in Appendix Summary table) for building and basic fit-out however these cost will require further review as models of provision are clarified.
**retail**
edge around buildings, particularly with good solar access, is ideal for retail uses eg. outdoor dining

**market stalls**
regular and once off markets can be set up around the square

**large public gathering space**
suitable for community events such as celebrations or community actions

**WSUD**
rain gardens to treat site water

**productive garden**
garden beds can be planted with edible plants

**passive**
plenty of public seating

**active play**
incidental games on the grass

**urban sport**
games like street hockey, handball, hard surface soccer
kick about
semi-enclosed area for a ball game

urban skate
landscape elements that are suitable for skating as well as other uses such as seating, garden beds

WSUD
rain gardens to treat site water

main cycle & pedestrian path
linking the open space networks

productive garden
garden beds creating a natural barrier between playgrounds and cycle path containing edible plants

passive
public seating along paths and around playgrounds

middle and junior playgrounds
includes play equipment for a range of ages

half-court basketball
for friendly neighbourhood pickup games or handball

existing street kerb

Linear Park
Existing Community Infrastructure Maps
Existing Community Infrastructure Maps: family and children’s services
Existing Community Infrastructure Maps: health services
FISHERMANS BEND URBAN REGENERATION
PLACE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK
JUNE 2013

Prepared by
Hemisphere Design (Aust) PTY LTD

CONTACT
Stuart Heselton R.I.A.M.I.P.M.
Principal Hemisphere Design (Aust) Pty Ltd
PO Box 854, Mitcham Centre, TORRENS PARK, SA 5062
T: (08) - 8277 7640
F: (08) - 8277 7641
t: stuart@hemispheredesign.com.au
W: www.hemispheredesign.com.au
Appended for consideration is a timeline of activities which demonstrates the sequential tasks required to deliver a successful place management outcome. The timeline has been established based on predicted population growth figures, as milestones for task implementation (See Appendix 1).

1.0 INCEPTION - RESEARCH

1.1 Background
Fishermans Bend is a site in Port Melbourne that is mostly privately owned, with scattered pockets of land under Crown ownership. The population of the region is minimal with few existing residential opportunities. The neighbouring suburb Port Phillip is at capacity with most services, therefore any development in Fishermans Bend will require the inclusion of their own community facilities. In addition, Fishermans Bend is poorly connected to the public transport network with Montague being the only precinct with an existing rail line.

1.2 The Role of Identity in Place Management
It is clear from the Fishermans Bend Strategic Directions Report that Places Victoria wish to create a place that has a strong community and is environmentally and economically resilient. A place that has social participation with a governance structure that gives planning certainty to the development industry. A Place Management Framework has the potential to assist in delivering these planning objectives.

Before a Place Management Framework can be developed, it is important to investigate whether the new proposed precincts have an existing identity which the adjacent communities associate with. Identity shapes association with place, engendering custodianship and stewardship. It is clear from best practice research that identity affords ‘wealth’ resulting in Place Capital.

An important consideration to resolve at earliest opportunity is whether the Fishermans Bend Urban Regeneration (FBUR) will embrace the existing identity owned by the local community or will a new distinct identity be developed?

1.0 INCEPTION - RESEARCH

EARLY INTERVENTION
DEVELOPING AN IDENTITY STATEMENT!

Analysis
- Site visit/contextual appreciation
- Background research
- Strategic planning considerations

Consultation
- Stakeholder meetings
- Community forums
- Council staff

Synthesis
- Practical Ideas
- Creative Ideas
- Suggestions

IDENTITY STATEMENT

2.0 PHASE ONE - PLANNING

2.1 ‘Building and Shaping Community’ Framework
A number of best practice objectives have been identified to be worthy of consideration in the future redevelopment of Fishermans Bend (these have been appended for consideration, please refer to Appendix 2 & 3). It is our opinion that, when cross referenced to, and integrated with current planning interventions (in particular the ‘Community Infrastructure Needs Analysis’), these objectives, through the future development of a Place Management Framework, can create environmental, economic, social and cultural ‘wealth’, underpinning the delivery of Place Capital. The following best practice objectives\(^1\), whilst not exhaustive, are offered for further consideration:

- Knit the local social fabric back together – a movement focused on re-connecting and restoring social bonds to bring people together in mutual support and social action, creating a community that will work together to protect the present, and plan for the future of Fishermans Bend.

- Create neighbourhoods with a high quality built environment that promote best practice ESD and compact, high-density urban form at a human scale.

- Identify local individuals with a commitment to the local economy and social inclusions, and locally-based businesses.

- Establish performance indicators to monitor and measure socio-economic benefit in the Place Management Framework review process.

- Create legislative framework for a new paradigm in governance and establish local ownership.

- Embed a resilience approach into all council activity and educate and upskill stakeholders and project partners. Create a ‘co-creation’ within local government.

- Develop community supported industries where local citizens support and partner with local businesses, contributing to the local economy.

---


2.0 PHASE ONE - PLANNING

- Develop mechanisms to ‘incentivise’ purchasers/renters to participate in the Place Management Framework.

- Focus economic development on relationships, partnerships and networks, maximising local power rather than absentee landlords.

- Involve public, private and voluntary sectors in creating a shared long-term economic vision with socio-economic objectives.

- Localise for growth and keep the profits within the region. It is estimated that just 10% of food, energy and home efficiency sectors would bring in over $7.4 million to the local economy.

- Create a ‘fund of funds’, bringing together different pots of public money to maximise the coverage and leverage of Urban Development Funds and be more appealing to institutional investors.

- Develop and partner with financial co-operatives as they have proven to be more resilient through the recent economic turmoil than big banks. Investigate how a community development trust can be implemented.

- Identify priorities based on seeing the economy as an ecosystem, placing importance on a balance of sectors, business types and functioning networks.

- Form close ties between economic development and public procurement to achieve more within limited budgets.

- Identify and pursue the specific conditions needed for inward investment to bring long-term benefits.

- Create the conditions for the city as an ‘urban workshop’ or cultural hub, allowing artists to flourish – creating vibrant neighbourhoods and attracting/retaining talent within the region.

2.2 Implementing the ‘Building and Shaping Community’ Framework

The ‘Building and Shaping Community’ strategy will not only:

Through community and council co-creation a model of ‘participatory governance’ will be established which adopts and shapes existing City of Melbourne and City of Port Phillip ‘Community Development Programs’.

Through community and council co-creation a model of ‘participatory governance’ will be established which shapes the place management process. ‘Participatory governance’ will underpin the creation of economic, environmental, social and cultural ‘wealth’ which delivers Place Capital.

The flowchart on the following page (Figure 1), outlines the potential to develop a ‘Building and Shaping Community’ Framework which underpins the implementation of a Place Management Framework.

The development of the ‘Building and Shaping Community Framework’ should commence as soon as practicable to enable the development of a Place Management Framework to begin within five years. Although the above objectives will need to be regularly reviewed and updated according to new best practice, a successful achievement of a majority of these objectives will create the foundation and a suitable environmental for the development of a Place Management Framework.

Project for Public Spaces | Place Capital: The Shared Wealth that Drives Thriving Communities. 2013.
3.0 PHASE TWO - DEVELOPING
THE PLACE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

3.1 Methodology

Drawing from the considered examples of international best practice, Hemisphere Design has developed an outline methodology for a place management pilot study suitable for the Fishermans Bend Urban Regeneration (Figure 2). The methodology suggests one approach to deliver Place Capital through the implementation of a Place Management Framework. The methodology highlights the potential to engender community stewardship which, through a structure and formal model of ‘participatory governance’, can deliver measurable place management outcomes. It comprises of four tasks to be implemented over two stages.

Stage one is a capacity building exercise - a process of capturing identity and instilling community ownership. Stage two outlines the tasks and actions required for defining, developing and implementing the vision and objectives endorsed and adopted in stage one.

In Summary:
Stage one
Task one is an awareness raising exercise setting out an agenda for acceptance of community stewardship. An initial ‘steering committee’ is appointed to assist in developing the ‘vision’ for the ‘place’.

The ‘vision’ will inform a summary report which should succinctly capture and document the objectives and strategies the ‘steering committee’ wishes to recommend, with consideration to ‘place, purpose and people’. Task one should be completed within three months. Elected member acceptance is required before proceeding to Stage two.

Stage two
The role of the ‘steering committee’ is fulfilled and a Management Partnership Team is appointed through a call for nomination and interview exercise. The management partnership adopts a formal role as a constituted association with clear terms of reference.

The management partnership is broad based and inclusive, typically comprising of 12 members of the community. The role of the management partnership is to take carriage of the vision, objectives and strategies outlined in the summary report and further define, detail and deliver them in consultation with and on behalf of the wider community.

The role of the management partnership requires dedication. Participants are expected to commit no less than two days per month for a period of no less than 24 months. They are to work collaboratively in identifying detailed strategies and actions which will create ‘wealth’, delivering Place Capital. Strategies and actions will be developed which are cognisant of Council’s corporate plan and strategic vision. Current best practice examples which are delivering social and cultural ‘wealth’ include the Totally Locally (UK) imitative and the Incredible Edible (UK) movement. It is anticipated that Task two should be completed within nine months.

Task three presents the strategies and actions through a business plan and public realm masterplan. Collectively these two documents are the foundations of the Place Management Framework. They support and are supported by the financial and administrative structures developed through the creation of the management partnership. Task three is expected to be completed in 12 months.

Task four commences the implementation of the business plan and masterplan, reviewing and refining when necessary and adjusting to reflect emerging trends. Task four is the journey along the path to building a resilient place. Whilst the timelines for implementing a Place Management Framework are specific to each locality, it is envisaged that it will require at least ten years to successfully implement the business plan and public realm masterplan.
Methodology for pilot study

A PLACE MANAGEMENT PILOT

STAGE 1

0

Task One: INITIATING Ownership and 'Identity'

- Raising whole of community awareness and acceptance of 'stewardship'
- Identifying advocates and champions to manage the process: residents, NFPs, traders.
- Appointing an initial Steering Committee (Interim Management Partnership Team) to assist in developing:

   The Vision

   Activities - Zx Workshops
   1) Defining 'place'
   2) Preparing an identity statement

OUTPUT

Summary Report - 'Place, Purpose, People'

Outlines draft vision, objectives and terms of reference for
1) The resilient 'place' - it's 'locale and identity'
2) The appointment of a 'Town Team' to deliver a place management framework

STAGE 2

3 months

Task Two: DEVELOPING

- Appointing the Management Partnership Team
- More detailed strategies and actions; for delivering the resilient 'place' / Place Capital

THROUGH CREATING WEALTH IN

Social/ Cultural Innovation
Community Economics
Environmental Enhancements
'Participatory Governance'

12 months

Task Three: DEFINING

'BUSINESS CASE' + 'The MASTERPLAN'

To deliver 'Place Capital'

The "Town Team" will be "delegated" decision making powers

24 Months

Task Four: IMPLEMENTING

THE PLACE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

Journey along the path to resilience and the growth of 'Place Capital'
- Capacity to be flexible responsive to emerging trends
- Resourceful, practical, achievable
- Reviewing, refining, re-energising
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Fishermans Bend - Final Report - Key Supporting Documents

Hemisphere Design: Fishermans Bend Urban Regeneration: Place Management Framework

**FISSERTMANS BEND URBAN REGENERATION (FBUR)**

**PLACE MANAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES: TIMELINES AND TASKS**

**PREDICTED POPULATION:**
- **YEAR 0:** 2013
- **2018:** 1,000

**PHASE 0 - BACKGROUND**

**PROJECT YR 0**

- **Year 0, 2013**
  - What currently exists:
    - Site: Fishermans Bend in Port Melbourne.
    - Population/identity: Relatively unknown, assumed to be minimal.
    - Local ownership: Mostly private with some crown assets.
    - Demographics: Mostly industrial workers with some residents in temporary accommodation.
    - Existing accommodation: Minimal with some residential in Montague Island.
    - Existing community facilities: Neighbouring suburbs of Port Phillip is at capacity with room for new developments. A number of the existing buildings have the potential to provide community spaces.
    - Existing transport/accessibility: Fishermans Bend has a low existing public transport network, however the reception has an existing rail transport.

**PHASE 1 - PLANNING**

**PROJECT YR 1**

- **Up to year 5, 2018**
  - Forecasted target population in 2018 is 2,000 to 3,000.

**PHASE 2 - DEVELOPING - 2 years**

- **Year 6-7, 2018-2020**
  - **A PLACE MANAGEMENT PILOT**
    - **CONFOIDENTIAL**

**Case Study - Eudunda, Australia**

- 1,000 People

- **Metroplitan Location:**
  - **Location:** 3km

- **Case Study - Hallett Cove, Australia**

- **Metroplitan Location:**
  - **Location:** 3km

**NEEDS TO BE REGULARLY REVIEWED & UPDATED ACCORDING TO NEW BEST PRACTICE DELIVERS**

**PLACE RESILIENCE**

**Journey along the path to resilience and the growth of Place Capital**

1. **DEFINING PLACE**
   - Idenifying place and work to stimulate integrated community engagement.
   - Creating and articulating a commitment to long-term resiliency.
   - Values and principles for making decisions for the benefit of the community.
   - Positive and shared long-term economic vision.
   - Incorporate community development trust can be implemented.
   - Invesigate how a community development trust can be implemented.

2. **DEVELOPING PLACE**
   - Meeings with local banks to develop a community trust fund.
   - Capacity to be flexible responsive to emerging trends.
   - Resourceful, practical, achievable.
   - Embed a resilience approach into all council activity.

3. **IMPLEMENTING PLACE**
   - Task: Defining ‘place’ - it’s ‘locale and identity’
   - TASK: Local ownership
   - TASK: The resilient ‘place’ - it’s ‘locale and identity’
   - TASK: Business case
   - TASK: Place Capital
   - TASK: Place Capital
   - TASK: Place Capital
   - TASK: Place Capital
   - TASK: Place Capital
   - TASK: Place Capital
   - TASK: Place Capital
   - TASK: Place Capital

**Footnotes:**
- [108] Fishermans Bend - Final Report - Key Supporting Documents

**References:**
- Stephenson, J. (2013), ‘Local ownership: a community development trust can be implemented.’
- Hemispheri Design: Fishermans Bend Urban Regeneration: Place Management Framework.
Case Study - Granoller's Gran Centre, Spain

- Have been operating for 18+ years.
- Regional township 25km northeast of Barcelona.
- A centre of regional trade and commerce in food produce and textiles since the Middle Ages.
- Suffering from the rapid changes in consumer habits and new retail formats and threatened by the suburban expansion of Barcelona.
- Partnership Team’s started by a small association of small and medium enterprise retailers and businesses of Gran Centre since 1994.
- Reclaimed the socio-economic role that trade and retail played in Granollers.
- Developed a vision of 'City, Culture and Commerce'.
- Rebuilt strong relationships across local, regional and national institutions.
- Pedestrianised 80% of the town centre to encourage people interaction.
- Econmically independent and resilient.
- Has over 75% of all independent retailers located in the city centre as members of the scheme.
- Management schemes have fired the imagination of the town’s residents.
- Built strong relationships across local, regional and national institutions.
- Pedestrianised 80% of the town centre to encourage people interaction.

Case Study - Darwen ,UK

- Regional town, 2 miles south of Blackburn.
- Affordable housing with excellent public transport links.
- Strong sense of community among its residents.
- Heavily influenced by the manufacturing sector.
- Darwen Town Centre Partnership (2004) is wholly devised, managed, funded and operated by the local authority, but its strategic decision making process is highly inclusive.
- Town centre strategy and masterplan are inspired by values and opinions of the local community and stakeholders.
- Has secured £3.35 million from external funding and has attracted private sector investments.

OPTION 1 - DIVIDE INTO NEIGHBOURHOOD MANAGEMENT PLANS (NMp)

- Build a 'Partnership Team' for each precinct to identify the specific objectives and strategies within each community.
- Have an overarching Fishermen’s Bend Place Management Framework that would be run by a committee with representatives from each precinct.

Fishermen’s Bend PMF

- Montague NMp
- Lorimer NMp
- Sandridge NMp
- Wirraway NMp

OPTION 2 - CONTINUE UNDER A SINGULAR PLACE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

- With sub-committees to develop the finer details.

Fishermen’s Bend PMF

- Social sub-group
- Heritage sub-group
- Environment sub-group
- Retail sub-group
- Funding sub-group
- etc...

Case Study - Granoller’s Gran Centre, Spain

- Built strong relationships across local, regional and national institutions.
- Pedestrianised 80% of the town centre to encourage people interaction.
- Econmically independent and resilient.
- Has over 75% of all independent retailers located in the city centre as members of the scheme.
- Management schemes have fired the imagination of the town’s residents.
### APPENDIX 2 - GRANOLLERS

#### 1.03. RESEARCH & METHODOLOGY: CASE STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Granollers</td>
<td>Urban Regeneration Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX 3 - DARWEN

#### 1.03. RESEARCH & METHODOLOGY: CASE STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darwen</td>
<td>Urban Regeneration Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FISHERMAN'S BEND URBAN RENEWAL AREA (FBURA)
Prioritising Community Infrastructure Delivery as a Development Catalyst
2 July 2013 (Final v3)

1) SCOPE OF SERVICES
Charter Keck Cramer (Charter) is part of the SJB Urban team advising Places Victoria (PV) in relation to the future Community Infrastructure (CI) needs within Fishermans Bend (FB). Charter was instructed to provide the following key outputs:

1. Prioritise the community infrastructure requirements that will be required as a pre-condition for any development within Fisherman’s Bend, with a focus on medium and higher density residential development and to a lesser extent, commercial office and retail development.
2. Prepare a high level issues paper summarising our findings including a timeline of when the various community infrastructure should be delivered for one of the neighbourhood case studies the balance of the team will prepare.

This is the high level issues paper and it includes discussion that seeks to explain the rationale for the prioritisation of when the CI should be delivered, based on a property development perspective and learnings from the delivery of CI in the Melbourne Docklands.

2) INTRODUCTION
The urban renewal that has occurred since the 1990s in Docklands and Southbank is perhaps the most relevant (as a Melbourne case study) to the future development of Fishermans Bend. Docklands is an example of State Government facilitating urban renewal where it owned most of the land for development, whilst much of Southbank was in private ownership over its development lifecycle. There can be no doubt that Docklands resident and worker population, since it was first mooted for redevelopment in the mid-1980s, has grown significantly. As we approach 30 years since the conception of Docklands currently lacks the following forms of CI:

- Large sporting fields (excluding Docklands Stadium)
- An indoor recreation centre (basketball, netball, badminton, etc.)
- An aquatic leisure centre
- A tennis facility
- Kindergarten
- Occasional child care centre
- Primary and secondary schools
- Planned activity group facilities
- Residential aged care facility
- Fire and ambulance stations
- Community health centre
- Hospital

It is understood that Places Victoria has recently called for EOI submissions to develop a school in the Digital Harbour precinct. There may also be potential opportunities for some of the missing Docklands CI to be located within the Lorimer or Montague Precincts at Fishermans Bend (which are closest to Docklands), in order to serve both Docklands and Fishermans Bend.

If Docklands has been able to successfully develop with the current provision of CI during its formative stages, then Fishermans Bend should be able to develop with a complementary range of CI. Fishermans Bend already has the following CI located within it, most of which Docklands does not comparatively have, thereby allowing potentially expanded catchments if cycling, road and tram links between the two adjoining suburbs can be improved:

- Port Melbourne Cricket Ground
- JL Murphy Reserve (Active Open Space & Playground)
- City Kids Early Learning Centre
- Fishermans Bend Community Centre
- Montague Continuing Education Centre
- Port Melbourne Fire Station 39
- South Melbourne Ambulance Station
- SES St Kilda Unit

3) ATTRACTING RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT
It is important to understand the likely demographic profile of the initial residents in Fishermans Bend, as they will have particular needs for CI. The Melbourne private sector development markets are fundamentally driven by demand for tenants, in the form of residential apartments, corporate offices, large format retail, specialty shops, showrooms and light industrial facilities. Young (20-35) residents and young office and retail workers will tend to be the main day and night time occupants of the initial development in Fishermans Bend. These occupants will not need facilities for children such as kindergartens and schools or for the retired and elderly such as adult education, senior citizen centres and aged care facilities. However, these facilities will be required if the residential population grows to the 80,000 as forecast by Places Victoria.

Docklands currently lacks the following forms of CI:
The CI that the initial population (and all future populations) will crave will be high quality parks, gardens, plazas, streetscapes, indoor sporting and community centres and libraries that encourage community building, physical exercise and relaxation and are generally considered as important determinants of local area amenity. The development industry recognises that such forms of CI are beneficial to attracting demand from purchasers (i.e. primarily investors) and occupants (i.e. tenants) and as such, supports the provision of these forms of CI given their correlation with saleability of their product offerings.

Presuming that the envisaged Places Victoria development scenario (80,000 residential population) does transpire, families will in due course settle into Fishermans Bend, then maternal and early childhood facilities will be required, followed by primary and secondary schools. However, Charter highlights that current market dynamics are not conducive to families settling into Fishermans Bend unless Places Victoria can facilitate a significant shift in how private sector developers are able to secure purchaser demand. This would require a shift away from small apartments that are attractive to investors (and more transient tenant occupants) to larger more expensive dwellings that are more attractive to families and owner occupiers (who do not like the existing "off the plan" market mechanism).

Eventually, if the residential population gets closer to the 80,000 forecast, a typical range of suburban CI will be required, including larger parks and more regional facilities such as an indoor aquatic centre, a hospital and facilities for the retired and elderly population.

Table 1 below lists the CI from Attachment 1 of the Places Victoria RFT Brief with Charter’s weighted ratings of importance as a development driver of the main property market sectors.

Table 1: The Importance of Community Infrastructure to the Four Key Property Markets in FB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community infrastructure to be considered:</th>
<th>Importance of Community Infrastructure to the each market sector (1 = Critically Important, 10 = Not Applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early years and other components of a special Council community centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) 0 &amp; 3 year old kindergartens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Maternal &amp; child health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Playgroup venues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Long day child care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Council community centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Public venues for hire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Neighbourhood house / adult education / USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Primary schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Secondary schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Special education schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Libraries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Residential &amp; Aged Care services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development industry recognises that such forms of CI are beneficial to attracting demand from purchasers (i.e. primarily investors) and occupants (i.e. tenants) and as such, supports the provision of these forms of CI given their correlation with saleability of their product offerings.

Table 1: The Importance of Community Infrastructure to the Four Key Property Markets in FB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Private Sector Property Markets</th>
<th>Apartments</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Weighted Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weighting</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community infrastructure to be considered:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Planned activity group facilities</td>
<td>4 7 4 8</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Residential aged care</td>
<td>7 9 4 8</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Child and community care</td>
<td>7 9 5 10</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI) Police &amp; Emergency services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Police</td>
<td>7 5 4 5</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Metropolitan Fire Brigade</td>
<td>8 8 6 4</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Ambulance Victoria</td>
<td>8 6 6 4</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) State Emergency Services (SES)</td>
<td>9 9 6 7</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII) Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Community health</td>
<td>4 5 4 4</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Hospitals and day procedure facilities</td>
<td>8 4 3 3</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII) Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Passive open space</td>
<td>3 3 3 7</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Active open space</td>
<td>2 5 3 8</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX) Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Vegetable parks</td>
<td>4 8 2 8</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Public aquatic leisure centres</td>
<td>7 7 6 8</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Private gyms</td>
<td>3 4 4 0</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Bond court facilities</td>
<td>3 5 5 5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The Importance of Community Infrastructure to the Four Key Property Markets in FB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Private Sector Property Markets</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Importance of Community Infrastructure to the each market sector (1 = Critically Important, 10 = Not Applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community infrastructure to be considered:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Planned activity group facilities</td>
<td>4 7 4 8</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Residential aged care</td>
<td>7 9 4 8</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Child and community care</td>
<td>7 9 5 10</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on this analysis, the CI across the weighted average of the key private sector property markets should be delivered in the priority as shown in Table 2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Community Infrastructure</th>
<th>Weighted Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fire open space</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Active open space</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Private gymnasiums</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Doctors surgeries and one stop medical centres</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Long day child care</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hard asset facilities</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Community health</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cultural venues including galleries, theatres, cinemas, museums and music venues</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Maternal &amp; child health</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Services/facilities for young people (e.g. youth centre, TAFE, VET)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>K &amp; 5 year old kindergartens</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Places of worship</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hospitals and day procedure facilities</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Playgroup venues</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sites for use in response to a major disaster</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Public venues for hire</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Planned activity group facilities</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Covered community centres</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Special education schools</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Neighborhood house / adult education / USA</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ambulance Victoria</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Facilities for community building activities such as volunteering, NGO’s</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Residential care or overnight respite for young people</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Community transport</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Residential aged care</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Public aquatic leisure centres</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Metropolitan Fire Brigade</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Home and community care</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>State Emergency Services (SES)</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) DELIVERING THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE WITHIN PRIVATE SECTOR DEVELOPMENTS

The development industry recognises that certain elements of Community Infrastructure are beneficial to attracting demand from purchasers (i.e. primarily investors) and occupiers (i.e. tenants). Accordingly, Charter expects that the delivery of selected CI directly by the development industry would be acceptable, given its potential to improve the salability of the private sector product offerings.

In many instances where a podium is activated by ground floor retail uses, there is likely to be a beneficial opportunity to the developer to co-locate some forms of CI into their development. This may only be on a secondary frontage or at the end of a retail strip, as high rent paying retail tenants will tend to command the higher traffic premium frontages. The CI design layout could include a main ground floor component that extends upwards (via stairs and a passenger lift) to the first floor.

For example, a Library, Community Hub or Community Health Centre could have its main entrance, lobby, service desk and seating area on the ground floor. The first floor could then include meeting rooms, consulting rooms, offices, book storage and displays, bathroom amenities and back of house areas.

In order for a private sector developer to be attracted to include such a component of CI in their development, there would need to be an “off the plan” sale to Council prior to commencing construction. The high level commercial terms of the sale to Council would need to be negotiated (preferably) prior to any planning permit application being made for the parent development. This would be to give comfort to the developer that Council is committed to the CI prior to preparing and submitting a planning application for the parent project, as carparking and floor space for the CI would be committed, which affects the overall development layout, revenue stream and therefore viability.

In order to satisfy its financier, the developer would be required to make a profit on the “off the plan” sale to Council. Albeit, the profit margin would likely be smaller than for the balance of the development, as it would ordinarily represent a lower risk activity (due to the pre-commitment prior to planning application).

The main risk under this scenario to Council is that the CI is never delivered, due to the failure of the parent project being abandoned for a range of reasons, such as:

- The Parent Project Fails to Achieve Pre-Commitments: In order to satisfy financiers’ risk-mitigation requirements, the developer will mainly focus on achieving a sale pre-commitment of the entire development prior to commencing construction. This will include pre-sales of at least 85% of the “off the plan” apartments and “agreements to lease” for at least 70% of any retail and office floor space. If these pre-commitments cannot be achieved for any reason and the developer is not able to reconfigure the development to achieve greater pre-commitment, then the whole project could be abandoned.

- Development Costs Rise and the Parent Project is no longer Viable: Once the CI-pre-commitment is made with Council, the developer will still need to pre-set the balance of the development and then document and tender the whole project. If the tender prices are too high and the developer cannot negotiate a lower price, then the development becomes unravelling and the project could be abandoned.

- The Developer Suffers Financial Hardship: Developers’ often have many projects underway at any one time. If they become over committed or incur any risks during the course of their business, they may choose to abandon one or more projects and sell their land to stabilise their situation.

There are methods to reduce these risks to Council but they typically result in the developer taking on more cost and therefore risk, which eventually has the effect of increasing the overall cost to Council for the CI.

The net effect of which is for Council to likely prefer to deliver the CI themselves, on land they already own or acquire.
Introduction

This report describes the work in progress to provide strategic guidance on the provision of open space as an integral part of the community infrastructure of Fishermans Bend.

Key reference documents:

- City of Melbourne Open Space Strategy, June 2012, City of Melbourne
- City of Melbourne Open Space Strategy, June 2012, City of Melbourne
Open Space Definition

Open space provides physical spaces within the urban realm that provide the armature for a wide variety of functions and activities as part of the Community Infrastructure strategy.

The term open space is defined within the City of Melbourne Open Space Strategy as follows: ‘All publicly owned land that is set aside primarily for recreation, nature conservation, passive outdoor enjoyment and public gatherings. This includes public ovals, parks, reserves, waterways, and other public spaces and areas’ (City of Melbourne/Thompson Berrill Landscape Design P/L, 2012). For the purposes of this study, these reserves are defined as public open space.

In the context of the Community Infrastructure Plan this definition of open space needs to be widened to include all open space that provides some form of community benefit. This includes public spaces but also semi-private spaces which are regularly used by the public such as café terraces, community gardens, sporting clubs, allotments. For the purposes of this study these areas will be defined as “semi public open space”.
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Open Space provides physical spaces within the urban realm that provide the armature for a wide variety of functions and activities as part of the Community Infrastructure strategy.

The term open space is defined within the City of Melbourne Open Space Strategy as follows: “All publicly owned land that is set aside primarily for recreation, nature conservation, passive outdoor enjoyment and public gatherings. This includes public ovals, parks, reserves, waterways, and other public spaces and areas” (City of Melbourne/Thompson Berrill Landscape Design P/L, 2012). For the purposes of this study, these reserves are defined as public open space.

In the context of the Community Infrastructure Plan this definition of open space needs to be widened to include all open space that provides some form of community benefit. This includes public spaces but also semi-private spaces which are regularly used by the public such as café terraces, community gardens, sporting clubs, allotments. For the purposes of this study these areas will be defined as “semi public open space”.

Private Open Space

(Privately owned open space sometimes open to the public or always open to members)

- Parks/Reserves
- Sporting reserves
- Urban plazas
- Linear spaces
- Playgrounds

Publicly owned land

- Forecourts
- Public gardens
- Public open spaces
- Open school/University grounds
- Wharves

Secondary (Ancillary) Open Space

(Privately owned land set aside for another use or privately owned open space allocated open to the public)

- Cafe terraces
- Private Gardens
- Private Roof Gardens
- Closed school grounds
- Private indoor sports facilities
- Wharves

Primary Open Space

(Privately owned land set aside for recreational nature use)

- Public open space
- Semi-public open space
- Ancillary open space

Publicly owned land

- Forecourts
- Public gardens
- Public open spaces
- Open school/University grounds
- Wharves

Primary Open Space

Quantifying Public Open Space Requirements

Local and internal international standards provide a background against which the appropriate open space provision for Fishermans Bend can be estimated. Open space can be measured against the area of the precinct or against the population density of the precinct.

By Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Total open space in ha</th>
<th>Total area of precinct in ha</th>
<th>Proportion of total open space to total area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>545.9</td>
<td>6,151.2</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geelong</td>
<td>377.7</td>
<td>2,808.8</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Population density:

- Melbourne: 178 per person
- Geelong: 213 per person

To establish a range of open space provision as a percentage of land area:

- Area scenarios
  - Scenario 1, High open space provision = 20% of precinct
  - Scenario 2, Medium open space provision = 14% of precinct
  - Scenario 3, Low open space provision = 7% of precinct

- Density scenarios
  - Scenario 1, High open space provision = 20m² per person
  - Scenario 2, Medium open space provision = 7m² per person
  - Scenario 3, Low open space provision = 1m² per person

Source: City of Melbourne Open Space Strategy, June 2012, City of Melbourne/Thompson Berrill Landscape Design P/L.
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Open space provision scenarios

Current estimate 'Green space' (from Places Victoria breakdown): 43.5 ha, 18% of land area, 5 m² per person of ultimate population

Note: Green space includes a number of areas that are currently Private Open space

Given the high density of the proposed development, it should be expected that a higher provision of open space would be preferable to provide amenity for those living in a dense urban condition.

Defining open space provision per person:

Scenario 1, High OS provision = 168 Ha (69% of area)
Scenario 2, Medium OS provision = 59 Ha (24% of area)
Scenario 3, Low OS provision = 8 Ha (3.5% of area)

Public open space provision per person:

Scenario 1: High OS provision = 49 Ha
Scenario 2: Medium OS provision = 34 Ha
Scenario 3: Low OS provision = 17 Ha

Proposed open space provision
Existing open space Provision (shown at same scale as plan below)

High 20% (49ha) Medium 14% (34ha) Low 7% (17ha) (less than existing)

Open space provision as a percentage of land area:

Scenario 1: High OS provision = 10000
Scenario 2: Medium OS provision = 10000
Scenario 3: Low OS provision = 10000

High20m²/pp (168ha) Medium7m²/pp (59ha) Low1m²/pp (8ha)

Public open space provision defined by area:

Scenario 1, High OS provision = 2433318.0 Ha (49.3% of area)
Scenario 2, Medium OS provision = 243.3 Ha (49.3% of area)
Scenario 3, Low OS provision = 243.3 Ha (49.3% of area)

Public open space provision per area:

Montague 8.7
Lorimer 5.4
Sandridge Nth 6.3
Sandridge Sth 10.4
Wirraway East 8.7
Wirraway West 9.2

Total 49 34 17

131800 651360 1681280 46130 227976 588448 6590 32568 84064

1296.6 767.1 289.9
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Primary Open Space

Open space categories

Source: City of Melbourne Open Space Strategy, June 2012.

**Regional Parks**
- Large areas, combine with nature of open space, the majority of which are accessible and provide a range of opportunities for urban landscape, cultural or environmental benefits. Offer a combination of built-up and natural areas that are well-connected to adjacent open areas.

**Neighbourhood Parks**
- Large area of open space that provide a smaller range of built-up and natural areas, as well as a combination of facilities and features at the sub-regional level, accessible to people from adjoining municipalities and may be of regional catchment importance and use.

**Local parks and Open spaces**
- Providing for the local community, children play, sitting-out areas, and recreation opportunities.

**Pocket Parks**
- Small area of open space that provide natural surfaces and shaded areas for informal play and passive recreation.

**Audits of quality of open spaces**
- Recommended: once every 5 years. Offer a combination of facilities and features that are unique within the local community at a neighborhood level. This means a family or groups of people can visit the park for an extended time, with a suitable range of facilities to meet their different needs.

**Small Open Spaces**
- Usually less than 0.03 hectares in size and only sometimes have seating and play equipment.

**Restricted Open Space**
- Not applicable. These areas of open space provide improved connections, cultural or green infrastructure benefits.

**Regional catchment**
- Generally these are easily accessible to people from adjoining municipalities and may be of regional catchment importance and use.

**Environm**
- Usually under 0.03 hectares in size and only sometimes have seating and play equipment.

**Local Link**
- Usually under 0.03 hectares in size and only sometimes have seating and play equipment.

**Small Open Sp**
- Usually under 0.03 hectares in size and only sometimes have seating and play equipment.

**TABLE 3(iii)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Purpose of open space</th>
<th>Location of open space</th>
<th>Functional or amenity benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
<td>&gt; 400 hectares</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>Wide distance from home and a diversity of character and setting</td>
<td>Open space should be positively perceived.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Parks</td>
<td>20-400 hectares</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>Long distance from home and a diversity of character and setting</td>
<td>Open space should be positively perceived.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local parks and Open spaces</td>
<td>&lt; 20 hectares</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>Medium distance from home and a diversity of character and setting</td>
<td>Open space should be positively perceived.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
<td>&lt; 0.5 hectares</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>Short distance from home and a diversity of character and setting</td>
<td>Open space should be positively perceived.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audits of quality of open spaces</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Open space should be positively perceived.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Open Spaces</td>
<td>&lt; 0.03 hectares</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Open space should be positively perceived.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4**

London’s Public Open Space Hierarchy

**Purpose of open space**

- Leisure and recreation
- Community interaction
- Education
- Conservation
- Environmental improvement
- Cultural
- Aesthetic
- Economic
- Health
- Safety
- Security
- Social interaction
- Educational
- Cultural
- Economic
- Environmental
- Conservation
- Safety
- Security
- Aesthetic
- Health

**Figure 5**

Open space hierarchy in the City of Melbourne

**Source:** Glass Landscape Architects - Fishermans Bend Community Infrastructure Plan: Open Space Studies

**Fishermans Bend Community Infrastructure: Open Space WORK IN PROGRESS**

**CITY OF MELBOURNE OPEN SPACE STRATEGY**

**DRAWING KEY**

- **CAPITAL CITY OPEN SPACE**
  - 360 m walking distance
  - Where there are no restricted access

- **STATE OPEN SPACE**
  - 360 m walking distance
  - Where there are no restricted access

- **REGIONAL OPEN SPACE**
  - 360 m walking distance
  - Where there are no restricted access

- **MUNICIPAL OPEN SPACE**
  - 360 m walking distance
  - Where there are no restricted access

- **MIDNEIGHBOURS OPEN SPACE**
  - 360 m walking distance
  - Where there are no restricted access

- **LOCAL OPEN SPACE**
  - 360 m walking distance
  - Without crossing significant roads

- **SMALL LOCAL OPEN SPACE**
  - 360 m walking distance
  - Without crossing significant roads

- **SMALL LOCAL LINK**
  - < 360 m walking distance
  - Where there are no specific walking distance is required

**OPEN SPACE HIERARCHY**

**CITY OF MELBOURNE OPEN SPACE STRATEGY**
Fishermans Bend Community Infrastructure Plan: Open Space Studies
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Open space requirements

Primary Open Space

Source: City of Port Phillip, Open Space Strategy, 2009.

Key:

- Municipal Open Space
  - Minimum size: 3 Ha
  - Maximum distance from homes: 2km
  - E.g. JL Murphy Reserve

- Neighbourhood Open Space
  - Minimum size: 1 Ha
  - Maximum distance from homes: 500m
  - E.g. Point Park

- Local Open Space
  - Minimum size: 0.26 Ha
  - Maximum distance from homes: 300m
  - E.g. McCarthur Square, Carlton

- Small Local Open Space
  - Minimum size: 0.03 Ha
  - Maximum distance from homes: 300m
  - E.g. Canning Street Reserve, Carlton

- Small Local Link
  - Minimum size: 5m wide
  - Maximum distance from homes: 300m
  - E.g. Park Street, Carlton

Strips:
- 30m

118