

Minutes

South-Port Community Support Group Thursday 30th July, 2015 North Port Oval New Social Rooms

Meeting Opened: 7:10pm

Convenor: Rowan Groves

Present:

Rowan Groves	Port People Inc
Tony Flude	Friends of Westgate Park
Peter Bromley	Port Melbourne Football Club
Kerry Warszewski	Port Colts Junior Football Club
Maurice Mottal	Port Melbourne Soccer Club
Priscilla Mottal	
Linda Norman	Fishermans Bend Gymnastics Club
Bill Fisher	Beacon Cove Neighbourhood Association
Clare Jordan-Whillans	VICT

Apologies:

Anita Horvath	Emerald Hill Ward Councillor
Bernadene Voss	Sandridge Ward Councillor
Yvonne Goudie	Port to Port
Nick Veitch	Port Melbourne Cricket Club
Trisha Avery	Montague Community Alliance
Dave Roberts	Port Melbourne Junior Cricket Club
Pat Grainger	Port Melbourne Historical and Preservation Society
Rohan Cresp	Ring Road Round Port
Neil Blake	Eco Centre

Order of Business

1. **Welcome, objective and brief introductions**

RG welcomed everyone and thanked PB for making the rooms available for the meeting.

The objective of the meeting was to canvass the concerns of the various community groups in regard to the Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal project, form a consensus of the most pressing issue(s) and advise the community representatives on the new Ministerial Advisory Committee (MAC) accordingly.

Attendees were invited to briefly introduce themselves and nominate their interest in the project. These are-

Friends of Westgate Park – the need for green spaces and the opportunity to link the spaces from Westgate Park through FBURA back towards the Montague and Lorimer precincts.

Port Melbourne Soccer Club – seeking further information about the project and the prospect of additional soccer pitches to relieve the current shortage of grounds. Also concerned about congestion on the M1 and access roads and out-of-area traffic since PMSC has joined the National League and are a feeder club for the western suburbs.

Fishermans Bend Gymnastics Club – the need for additional parks and reserves since existing open space is already at capacity. Particularly concerned for school playground space. FBGC is trying to find alternate venue in local area since they have to move from their current community centre during refurbishment, and have no long term venue.

VICT – seeking information on the project and trying to get a feel for community concerns as management and start-up workforce is mainly international. Are concerned about the effect of congestion on the operation of Webb Dock. Also wary of the potential for FBURA to become a ghost town.

Beacon Cove Neighbourhood Association – concerned about lack of transport corridors and resulting congestion. Also concerned about the impact of FBURA on liveability in the area more generally.

PM – provision of schools is insufficient for existing population, play space is at a premium. Traffic is also a major concern.

Port Colts Football Club – have the same issues as other groups, and added the issue of safety for junior members crossing Williamstown Rd. Provision of infrastructure before population increases further is a must.

Port Melbourne Football Club – have long experience with planning at State and Local Government level. See FBURA as opportunity and threat. Opportunity is to expand membership. Most concerned with the haste of the project, the lack of sensible planning and the lack of community infrastructure.

Port People – height of buildings likely to create issues of overshadowing, access to natural light, impinge on privacy of existing neighbourhoods. Delays in finalising developer contributions makes it unlikely sufficient funds will be available for infrastructure. This is compounded by capital city zoning raising land values before land could be reserved for public use. No planning for transitional phases of project, or how to retain existing businesses. Treatment of contaminated land approved for development will be key community health issue.

2. *State of Play – brief history of key decisions*

Meeting considered timeline of major events in the evolution of the project circulated with the agenda. Discussion of what agency is responsible for making approvals in the different precincts. City of Port Phillip website has good information about the status of the planning scheme, the review process and individual applications – see <http://www.portphillip.vic.gov.au/fishermans-bend.htm>

Meeting was advised of the large number of apartments already approved, and the number of applications under assessment, which amount to a population increase of some 20,000 if applications proceed to building completion. There have been a number of properties on-sold once a permit has been given, and this type of speculation may not result in construction in the short term.

3. *Discussion of possible solutions*

TF asked whether other groups such as the Fishermans Bend Network (FBN) might already be advocating on the community's behalf. RG said he thought the FBN had done some good

work in getting the review process into the ALP pre-election platform, is excellent at providing information through its facebook page, but had struggled to re-focus its strategy in the post-election environment. It is also resistant to becoming a community advocacy group, preferring to use the expertise of individual participants as part of a think-tank. RG thought the MAC would be a better vehicle for getting the views of the community to influence the Minister.

Meeting considered the number of decision-makers from local councils to Minister and the potential for each plus VCAT and the Supreme Court to put their own interpretation on the Strategic Framework Plan in making decisions. There was concern at the lack of certainty this causes to the larger developers, which is seen as a possible reason for their absence from the market.

The meeting discussed means of raising investment funds for community infrastructure. The options noted were Developer Contributions, Open Space contributions, levies, borrowings, State grants and treasury bonds. Re-zoning was also mentioned as a possibility, but it was thought property owners would have to be compensated.

The likelihood of a changing demographic was discussed as the number of school-age children has been predicted to fall over the next 5 years, possibly lessening the need for schools. It was noted that the ageing population would still require other community infrastructure such as aged care facilities.

The EPA is currently determining the direction of flow of aquifers in the area to help determine the risk of contamination from development of high risk sites.

4. ***Discussion of priorities***

The meeting resolved that **the priority for the community is the acquisition of enough land in suitable locations to allow early provision of community infrastructure - particularly transport corridors, open space, parkland and sporting facilities.**

The meeting left the method of funding the acquisition to experts in Government and on the MAC.

5. ***Next steps***

The meeting agreed **RG would advise the community representatives and the chair of the MAC of the meeting's outcomes.** Another meeting would be held once the MAC had responded, or otherwise communicated its community engagement plan.

The participants agreed to forward further information about the review to their respective memberships to facilitate exchange of ideas between the community and the MAC.

6. ***Other issues***

CJW suggested a possible name for the group is the Community Support Group.

Meeting Close 8:40 pm