

## Speaking notes

**Kate Searle on behalf of CentrePort Ltd**

### Hearing Stream 6: Port Zone

CentrePort made submissions on a number of objectives, policies and rules in the Port Zone, generally in support of the draft provisions. These were generally accepted in Ms van Haren-Giles' s42A report and not addressed further in my primary evidence. My evidence addressed three specific issues:

- Sought clarity on how the provisions apply to passenger port facilities in the Inner Harbour Port Precinct, and suggested amendments to more accurately reflect the way the provisions for 'passenger port facilities' are drafted
- Related to this, ensuring that the provisions do not pre-empt re-development of the site, and continue to provide for operational port activities and passenger port facilities
- Sought the removal of the notification requirement from Rule PORTZ-PREC01-R7.

### Rule and policy framework for passenger port facilities

CentrePort made a number of submission points that sought an enabling framework for operational port activities and passenger port facilities, including to ensure that existing service providers can continue to operate effectively within the Inner Harbour Port Precinct (IHPP) for Bluebridge. My primary statement sought clarity on how the provisions apply to passenger port facilities in the Inner Harbour Port Precinct and suggested amendments to provide for this.

I have reviewed Ms van Haren-Giles rebuttal evidence and it appears that 'passenger port facilities' is being used to mean passenger port operators. While this might be the intent, in my opinion it is not how the definition reads. I agree with Ms van Haren-Giles' assessment of this issue otherwise, but suggest some minor amendments to the new rules proposed in paragraph 23 of my primary evidence to better reflect the intent of the provisions – that buildings and land use for existing operators is permitted, and buildings and land use for new operators is not:

#### *PORTZ-PREC01-RX – Passenger port facilities **for existing operators***

##### *1. Activity status: Permitted*

I also suggested amendments to PORTZ-PREC01-P4 so that amenity and design requirements do not apply to operational port activities and passenger port facilities. I agree with Ms van Haren-Giles' statement in her rebuttal evidence that it is not necessary to refer to operational port activities because they are a permitted activity. The same would be true for passenger port activities if the amendments suggested above are incorporated into the plan.

### **Notification requirement for Rule PORTZ-PREC01-R7**

Ms van Haren-Giles' rebuttal evidence recommends that the notification requirement for Rule PORTZ-PREC01-R7 is removed, as requested in CentrePort's submission and addressed in my primary evidence. I support Ms van Haren-Giles' conclusion on this matter.

### **Request from panel at hearing – total area of IHPP**

At the hearing on 22 February 2024, the hearing panel questioned whether PORTZ-PREC01-R7-1(b)(ii) to refer to the precinct area in square metres, rather than as a percentage of the total site area. I agreed that this would be a more useful reference.

The panel requested the total area of the precinct. Council officers have advised that the total area of the IHPP is **52,628m<sup>2</sup>**.