



Respondent No: 7

Login:

Email:

Responded At: Nov 30, 2015 12:32:56 pm

Last Seen: Nov 30, 2015 01:28:24 am

IP Address:

Q1. I am entitled to deal with the intellectual property rights (including copyright) of all material (and third party's) in my submission and have obtained the necessary consent(s) from any and all third parties.

I agree

Q2. Where personal information about other people (including photos) is included in my submission, I have notified them of the contents of the Privacy Collection Notice and obtained their consent to their personal information being disclosed to the Plan Melbourne refresh and published.

I agree

Q3. Name of organisation

not answered

Q4. Please select from one of the options below

I am making this submission as an individual. I request my submission be published anonymously with my postcode but with no other details.

Q5. Contact email

Q6. Name of person making submission on behalf of organisation

not answered

Q7. Contact phone number

not answered

Q8. I have read the relevant terms of use and consent to the conditions outlined within these.

Yes

Q9. Please note that submissions where the relevant terms of use have not been agreed to may not be considered as part of the Plan Melbourne Refresh. Please describe below your reasons for submitting despite together with any specific reasons for not agreeing to the terms outlined above.

not answered

Q10. The discussion paper includes the option (option 5, page16) that Plan Melbourne better define the key opportunities and challenges for developing Melbourne and outlines some key points for considerations in Box 1. Are there any other opportunities or challenges that we should be aware of?

(your page number is wrong for the Word version) 1. The blanket statement about increasing urban density is a blank cheque for inappropriate overdevelopment. Much clearer rules are required to plan where increased density will occur and how this is balanced against the need for green, open spaces. The unique feel of Melbourne's suburbs is being destroyed by greed and indifference. 2. One Key Opportunity that is not included is the need to recognise the factors that makes Melbourne's suburbs unique and to ensure that there is legislative protection of these factors. Neighbourhood Character and streetscape must be the starting point for all development, not an afterthought in a VCAT hearing. Growth without an overall plan - as is happening now - leads to inappropriate developments and a complete loss of character. Slum like developments will be the consequence without a change in thinking. This makes a mockery of Principle 4: Strong Communities. 3. A Key Opportunity not shown is the need to ensure open space, especially green, leafy spaces on private land is maintained. This means there must be a plan to do this. At the moment, even in outer suburbs like Croydon, wall to wall unit developments are destroying all green open space and also wipe out all mature canopy trees. This has ramifications for flora and fauna, puts more stress on resources as the climate is changing and reduces the standard of living for residents in the area. With suitable controls on the greed of developers (and the apathy of local Council planning departments) a balance can be struck to allow more houses and maintain open spaces. This makes a mockery of Principle 5: Environmental Resilience. 4. The current Residential Zoning is a disaster and must change. Having NRZ and GRZ creates a form of 'planning apartheid' whereby NRZ areas are relatively unscathed but GRZ areas are flooded by greedy developers with ridiculous developments, completely out of character with the neighbourhood. Council Planning Officers do not then enforce even the minimal protections that exist for GRZ area. In short, one part of a suburb is being preferential destroyed while another part is being maintained. It is a silly, short-sighted and in the long term, detrimental approach to planning.

Q11. The discussion paper includes the option (option 6, page 18) that the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals be included in Plan Melbourne 2016. Do you agree with this idea? If so, how should the goals be incorporated into Plan Melbourne 2016? Strongly Agree

Q12. Please explain your response

Goals 9, 11 and 13 are directly relevant to this plan.

Q13. The discussion paper includes the option (option 7, page 18) to lock down the existing urban growth boundary and modify the action (i.e. the action under Initiative 6.1.1.1 in Plan Melbourne 2014) to reflect this. Do you agree that there should be a permanent urban growth boundary based on the existing boundary? Disagree

Q14. Please explain your response

Locking the boundaries doesn't make sense. What does make sense is outlined in your report: - protecting the suburbs (maybe too late in some areas) - limiting growth to specified hubs and major arterial roads - Greatly increasing the amount of green space that must be maintained in normal suburban street blocks

Q15. The discussion paper includes the option (option 8, page 18) that Plan Melbourne 2016 should more clearly articulate the values of green wedge and peri-urban areas to be protected and safeguarded. How can Plan Melbourne 2016 better articulate the values of green wedges and peri-urban areas?

Green wedges and peri-urban areas should of course be protected but THEY ARE NOT THE MAIN ISSUE. The main issue is the destruction of the canopy trees and green and leafy open spaces in private land within existing suburbs. For a liveable environment, given the future issues of climate change, requires more canopy trees and green space, not less. The current planning laws, which allow wall to wall unit developments in quiet leafy streets leads to concrete jungles, even in outer suburbs and the urban heat island effect is dramatically increased. As mentioned above the answer is simple but is not palatable to greedy developers: - limiting growth to specified hubs and major arterial roads - Greatly increasing the amount of green space that must be maintained in normal suburban street blocks - protecting the suburbs (maybe too late in some areas) - limiting growth to specified hubs and major arterial roads - Greatly increasing the amount of green space that must be maintained in normal suburban street blocks

Q16. The discussion paper includes the option (option 9, page 18) to remove the concept of an Integrated Economic Triangle and replace it with a high-level 2050 concept map for Melbourne (i.e. a map that shows the Expanded Central City, National Employment Clusters, Metropolitan Activity Centres, State-Significant Industrial Precincts, Transport Gateways, Health and Education Precincts and Urban Renewal Precincts). What other elements should be included in a 2050 concept map for Melbourne?

Seems to make sense but an example map would be useful.

Q17. The discussion paper includes the option (option 10, pages 18) that the concept of Melbourne as a polycentric city (i.e. a city with many centres) with 20-minute neighbourhoods (i.e. the ability to meet your everyday (non-work) needs locally, primarily within a 20-minute walk) be better defined. Do the proposed definitions adequately clarify the concepts? Strongly Disagree

Q18. Please explain your response

Basically this is a pipe-dream. Only somebody living close to the CBD could have promoted this concept for all of Melbourne because it does not make sense in all suburbs. Different parts of Melbourne will evolve different solutions.

Q19. The discussion paper includes options (options 11-17, pages 23 to 27) that identify housing, climate change, people place and identity and partnerships with local government as key concepts that need to be incorporated into Plan Melbourne 2016. Do you support the inclusion of these as key concepts in Plan Melbourne 2016? Strongly Agree

Q20. Please explain your response

Not sure why you had to lump them all together as they are different things. People place and identity is vital. It goes to the heart of the current planning systems failures. Destroying existing neighbourhood character for a quick buck eventually leads to loss of identity and residents who are disconnected from their place. We are seeing such an issue in Croydon, where crazy developments are destroying local character, private green space and the lived environment. Many residents have given up and just assume that greed will always win and the suburb will end up as a ghetto.

Q21. Any other comments about chapter 2 (growth, challenges, fundamental principles and key concepts)?

not answered

Q22. Climate change comments

Melbourne could take the lead on this issue. More incentives are required to (a) use renewable energy (b) reuse and recycle water and (c) maintain shade trees and green open space on private land.

Q23. The discussion paper includes the option (option 20, page 30) to revise the Delivering Jobs and Investment chapter in Plan Melbourne 2014 to ensure the significance and roles of the National Employment Clusters as places of innovation and knowledge-based employment are clear. How can Plan Melbourne 2016 better articulate the significance and roles of the National Employment Clusters as places of innovation and knowledge-based employment?

I doubt that Melbourne can do much in this area. Centralised planning for such things rarely works.

Q24. The discussion paper includes two options (page 30) relating to National Employment Clusters, being: Option 21A: Focus planning for National Employment Clusters on core institutions and businesses. Option 21B: Take a broader approach to planning for National Employment Clusters that looks beyond the core institutions and businesses. Which option do you prefer?

Option 21A

Q25. Please explain why you have chosen your preferred option

Which one involves the least cost and the least intervention by state government? I choose that one because, frankly, I don't state government will make a hash of it.

Q26. The discussion paper includes the option (option 22, pages 30) to broaden the East Werribee National Employment Cluster to call it the Werribee National Employment Cluster in order to encompass the full range of activities and employment activities that make up Werribee. This could include the Werribee Activity Centre and the Werribee Park Tourism Precinct. Do you agree with broadening the East Werribee Cluster?

Strongly Agree

Q27. Why?

You already have the cluster. Just do it. It is not such a big issue is it?

Q28. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 23, pages 30) to broaden the Dandenong South National Employment Cluster to call it the Dandenong National Employment Cluster in order to encompass the full range of activities and employment activities that make up Dandenong. This could include the Dandenong Metropolitan Activity Centre and Chisholm Institute of TAFE. Do you agree with broadening the Dandenong South National Employment Cluster?** Strongly Agree

Q29. Why?

You already have the cluster. Just do it. It is not such a big issue is it?

Q30. **The discussion paper includes options (options 24 to 30, pages 34-35) that consider the designation of Activity Centres and criteria for new Activity Centres. Do you have any comments on the designation of Activity Centres or the criteria for new Activity Centres as outlined in the discussion paper?**

The 20 minute neighbourhood is not appropriate in all parts of Melbourne but if you are persisting with this concept then make sure that these activity centres are the only locations in outer suburbs that allow high density living. That way the damage is limited to an already noisy and crowded area. More generally on activity centres - they sound good on paper but they also have a downside. Increased alcohol fuelled violence, drug trafficking and similar issues to name a few. The plan needs to ensure that a King St environment is not replicated in these activity centres.

Q31. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 31, page 35) to evaluate the range of planning mechanisms available to protect strategic agricultural land. What types of agricultural land and agricultural activities need to be protected and how could the planning system better protect them?**

All of them. Again you define the land use and let the farmers decide what to grow. Government trying to pick winners in this area is crazy.

Q32. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 32, page 36) to implement the outcomes of the Extractive Industries Taskforce through the planning scheme, including Regional Growth Plans, to affirm that extractive industries resources are protected to provide an economic supply of materials for construction and road industries. Do you have any comments in relation to extractive industries? Reference page 36.**

No

Q33. **Any other comments about chapter 3 (delivering jobs and investment)?**

No

Q34. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 34, page 42) to include the Principal Public Transport Network in Plan Melbourne 2016. Do you agree that the Principal Public Transport Network should inform land use choices and decisions?** Strongly Agree

Q35. **Why?**

Necessary part fo the overall plan.

Q36. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 35, page 43) to incorporate references to Active Transport Victoria (which aims to increase participation and safety among cyclists and pedestrians) in Plan Melbourne 2016. How should walking and cycling networks influence and integrate with land use?**

Preferably not on roads. Bike tracks are safer.

Q37. **Any other comments about chapter 4 (a more connected Melbourne)?**

not answered

Q38. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 36A, pages 46) to establish a 70/30 target where established areas provide 70 per cent of Melbourne's new housing supply and greenfield growth areas provide 30 per cent. Do you agree with establishing a 70/30 target for housing supply?** Strongly Disagree

Q39. **Why?**

This is silly. 1. By limiting urban boundaries you create an artificial constraint. That is plain dumb 2. Then, after setting such a limit, you want to create more constraints on where the developments should occur. 3. How about you simply define where the medium to high density development can occur (activity zones, CBD and major arterials). 4. The 70/30 edict will simply mean the ongoing destruction of existing suburban environments by inappropriate developments. It will further disempower existing residents and will mean Melbourne will not be worth living in, in another 20-30 years.

Q40. **What, if any, planning reforms are necessary to achieve a 70/30 target?**

Planning reforms are necessary to protect existing green space and canopy trees on private land. The 70/30 rule is a sure-fire means of destroying the suburban environment without planning rules that mandate - larger setbacks - more green open space per dwelling - more canopy trees required - medium and high density to much fewer areas than currently allowed

Q41. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 36B, page 46) to investigate a mechanism to manage the sequence and density of the remaining Precinct Structure Plans based on land supply needs. Do you agree with this idea?** Strongly disagree

Q42. Why?

I think you mean 37B in the Word Document The targets wont work and the strategy, while a good idea, needs much more detail. One thing is certain. The Reformed Residential Zones have been an abject failure, leading to open slather in some areas (GRZ) with little or no planning control from local Councils. Greed, apathy from council planning departments and a VCAT that is little more than a developer's rubber stamp have made planning a joke in the Croydon area. Suburbs are already being destroyed and how will a centralised housing strategy change that?

Q43. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 36C, page 46) to focus metropolitan planning on unlocking housing supply in established areas, particularly within areas specifically targeted for growth and intensification. Do you agree with this idea?** Strongly Disagree

Q44. Why?

The answer is - it depends. If existing green, leafy suburbs, private green space and canopy trees are protected then building in established areas makes sense. Put another way, it cannot be any worse than the concrete dog boxes that are being built now. Limit medium and high density developments to activity zones, arterials and CBD. All other established suburban streets should allow dual occupancy ONLY, unless there is a minimum of 600 sqm for each dwelling afterwards. Open dual occupancy to ALL suburbs. Make it fair for all residents, not just the poor buggers who by chance have ended up in a GRZ (ie designated future ghetto).

Q45. **The discussion paper includes options (option 37, page 50) to better define and communicate Melbourne's housing needs by either: Option 37A: Setting housing targets for metropolitan Melbourne and each sub-region relating to housing diversity, supply and affordability Option 37B: Developing a metropolitan Housing Strategy that includes a Housing Plan Which option do you prefer?** Other

Q46. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 38, page 52) to introduce a policy statement in Plan Melbourne 2016 to support population and housing growth in defined locations and acknowledge that some areas within defined locations will require planning protection based on their valued character. How could Plan Melbourne 2016 clarify those locations in which higher scales of change are supported?**

The answer is - it depends. If existing green, leafy suburbs, private green space and canopy trees are protected then building in established areas makes sense. Put another way, it cannot be any worse than the concrete dog boxes that are being built now. Limit medium and high density developments to activity zones, arterials and CBD. All other established suburban streets should allow dual occupancy ONLY, unless there is a minimum of 600 sqm for each dwelling afterwards. Open dual occupancy to ALL suburbs. Make it fair for all residents, not just the poor buggers who by chance have ended up in a GRZ (ie designated future ghetto).

Q47. The discussion paper includes the option (option 39, page 52) to clarify the direction to 'protect the suburbs'.

How could Plan Melbourne 2016 clarify the direction to protect Melbourne and its suburbs from inappropriate development?

'Protect the Suburbs' is a cruel, cruel joke. Come to Croydon and have a look at how protecting the suburbs is working out. Wall to wall units in what were quite leafy streets. Developers submitting ambit claims with ridiculous numbers of units on a block, knowing that planning departments will sign off on these plans so long as local residents don't make a noise. And even if residents make an objection, they will still have approved far more units than any sane planning policy would suggest. How do you protect from inappropriate development: 1. Ban any private meetings between developers and state or local council officers 2. Make public transcripts of all meetings between officials and developers 3. Start with the same principle of a doctor. "First do no harm". Currently the first principle is "Squeeze as Many on the Block as Possible" 4. Limit medium and high density developments to activity zones, arterials and CBD. 5. All other established suburban streets should allow dual occupancy ONLY, unless there is a minimum of 600 sqm for each dwelling afterwards. 6. Open dual occupancy to ALL suburbs. Make it fair for all residents, not just the poor buggers who by chance have ended up in a GRZ (ie designated future ghetto).

Q48. The discussion paper includes the option (option 40, page 56) to clarify the action to apply the Neighbourhood Residential Zone to at least 50 per cent of residential land by: Option 40A: Deleting the action and replacing it with a direction that clarifies how the residential zones should be applied to respect valued character and deliver housing diversity Option 40B: Retain at least 50 per cent as a guide but expand the criteria to enable variations between municipalities Which option do you prefer?

Other

Q49. The discussion paper includes the option (option 42, page 58) to include an action in Plan Melbourne 2016 to investigate how the building and planning system can facilitate housing that readily adapts to the changing needs of households over the life of a dwelling. In what other ways can Plan Melbourne 2016 support greater housing diversity?

NRZ should be 100%. As mentioned above, GRZ is code for "Designated Future Ghetto". Get rid of this stupid planning apartheid and have one standard residential zone for all of Melbourne. That one residential zone should do the following: limit medium and high density developments to activity zones, arterials and CBD. Established suburban streets should allow dual occupancy ONLY, unless there is a minimum of 600 sqm for each dwelling afterwards. Open dual occupancy to ALL suburbs. Make it fair for all residents.

Q50. A number of options are outlined in the discussion paper (page 58) to improve housing affordability, including: Option 45A: Consider introducing planning tools that mandate or facilitate or provide incentives to increase social and affordable housing supply. Option 45B: Evaluate the affordable housing initiative pilot for land sold by government to determine whether to extend this to other suitable land sold by government. Option 45C: Identify planning scheme requirements that could be waived or reduced without compromising the amenity of social and affordable housing or neighbouring properties. What other ideas do you have for how Plan Melbourne 2016 can improve housing affordability?

The only way the affordable stock will increase is if (a) Governments build it (b) tax incentives for building social and low income housing are higher than the massive negative gearing tax incentives that currently exist. Changing planning schemes in special areas will lead to ghettos. Don't do it. Have affordable housing integrated in all suburbs including (shock horror - Brighton, Hawthorn, Toorak, Malvern, etc)

Q51. Any other comments about chapter 5 (housing)?

not answered

Q52. The discussion paper includes the option (option 46, page 69) to introduce Strategic Environmental Principles in Plan Melbourne 2016 to guide implementation of environment, climate change and water initiatives. Do you agree with the inclusion of Strategic Environmental Principles in Plan Melbourne 2016? Strongly Agree

Q53. Why?

All the principles listed make sense but they are incompatible with much of the wall to wall developments that current take place. 1. More green space and canopy trees per dwelling is required , not less. 2. Planning rules must enforce this as greedy developers will not. 3. Urgent protections must be put in place for ALL mature canopy trees. Look at the current planning register in Maroondah and you will see the canopy trees in the suburbs are being decimated. And usually replaced by shrubs at best. This relates primarily to this principle: "Through the planning system, identify opportunities to reduce the impacts of heatwaves across urban areas through water sensitive urban design, greening strategies, and urban development standards that increase soil moisture and promote selection of 'cool' surface materials to minimise heat absorption."

Q54. The discussion paper includes the option (option 47, page 72) proposes to review policy and hazard management planning tools (such as overlays) to ensure the planning system responds to climate change challenges. Do you agree with this proposal? Strongly agree

Q55. Why?

Current tools and planning laws are useless. Look at what is being built now and you will see wall to wall units with a large concrete driveway and little green space. Whatever trees are there are best described as medium shrubs and provide no natural heat abatement. All new buildings must be required to have 5kW solar panels on the roof, water recycling tanks (grey or roof) and 5 or 6 star energy efficiency rating for the building. Planning laws must encourage local renewable energy hubs and energy storage facilities. Recharging stations for electric vehicle must be expanded.

Q56. The discussion paper includes options (options 48 and 49, page 72) to update hazard mapping to promote resilience and avoid unacceptable risk, and update periodically the planning system and supporting legislative and policy frameworks to reflect best available climate change science and data. Do you have any comments on these options?

Makes sense.

Q57. The discussion paper includes the option (option 50, pages 73) to incorporate natural hazard management criteria into Victorian planning schemes to improve planning in areas exposed to climate change and environmental risks. Do you agree with this idea?

Strongly agree

Q58. Why?

Common sense.

Q59. The discussion paper includes the option (option 51, page 75) to investigate consideration of climate change risks in infrastructure planning in the land use planning system, including consideration of an 'infrastructure resilience test'. Do you agree that a more structured approach to consideration of climate change risks in infrastructure planning has merit?

Strongly agree

Q60. Why?

not answered

Q61. The discussion paper includes the option (option 52, page 76) to strengthen high-priority habitat corridors throughout Melbourne and its peri-urban areas to improve long-term health of key flora and fauna habitat. Do you agree with this proposal?

Strongly agree

Q62. Why?

Again, the lived suburban experience requires a natural environment. However do not just focus of corridors and peri-urban locales. The best way to improve the suburban environment is to ensure that there is room retained in the EXISTING suburbs for green open space in private gardens; that canopy trees are retained and that wall to wall units in quiet leafy streets are not allowed. Flora and fauna must be integrated with suburbs; not something separate.

Q63. The discussion paper includes options (options 53 and 54, pages 78 and 79) to introduce strategies to cool our city including: increasing tree canopy, vegetated ground cover and permeable surfaces; use of Water Sensitive Urban Design and irrigation; and encouraging the uptake of green roofs, facades and walls, as appropriate materials used for pavements and buildings with low heat-absorption properties. What other strategies could be beneficial for cooling our built environment?

1. See above. 2. Building wall to wall units as currently exists is stupid and just make the heat island effect even worse. 3. Canopy trees in all locations must be retained and this requires much tighter laws to protect vegetation. 4. Bigger green space requirements for ALL residential developments. Total built and hard covered area should not exceed 40-45% of the total size of the land. 5. Larger minimum block sizes for ALL residential developments. It doesn't take Einstein to work out that if the block size is only 300sqm, then you can forget about any effective green space or canopy trees. Minimum lot size should be 600 sqm.

Q64. The discussion paper includes the option (option 56A, page 80) to investigate opportunities in the land use planning system, such as strong supporting planning policy, to facilitate the increased uptake of renewable and low-emission energy in Melbourne and its peri-urban areas. Do you agree that stronger land use planning policies are needed to facilitate the uptake of renewable and low-emission energy? Strongly agree

Q65. Why?

Yes and the State and Local Governments should act as facilitators for local energy generation and storage. As well, they can ensure that entities under their financial control: - divest from all fossil fuel investments - provide seed funding for renewable energy projects

Q66. The discussion paper includes options (options 56B and 56C page 80) to strengthen the structure planning process to facilitate future renewable and low emission energy generation technologies in greenfield and urban renewal precincts and require consideration of the costs and benefits of renewable or low-emission energy options across a precinct. Do you agree that the structure planning process should facilitate the uptake of renewable and low-emission technologies in greenfield and urban renewal precincts? Strongly agree

Q67. Why?

Must be mandatory to have local energy generation and storage in all new greenfield sites and that all developments are carbon neutral.

Q68. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 57, page 81) to take an integrated approach to planning and building to strengthen Environmentally Sustainable Design, including consideration of costs and benefits. Do you agree that an integrated planning and building approach would strengthen Environmentally Sustainable Design?**

Strongly agree

Q69. **Why?**

All new buildings built in Melbourne must be 5 or 6 star energy efficiency. No excuse or exemptions. Melbourne should be more ambitious than NSW and should mandate all new buildings: - 50% reduction in GHG per dwelling - 50% reduction in potable water use

Q70. **Any other comments about chapter 6 (a more resilient and environmentally sustainable Melbourne)?**

not answered

Q71. **Please provide your feedback on 'Chapter 7. New planning tools' below. If you do not want to provide feedback on this chapter please selected 'save & continue'.**

not answered

Q72. **The discussion paper includes options (options 58A and 58B, page 84) to evaluate whether new or existing planning tools (zones and overlays) could be applied to National Employment Clusters and urban renewal areas. Do you have any comments on the planning tools (zones and overlays) needed for National Employment Clusters and urban renewal areas?**

not answered

Q73. **The discussion paper includes options (options 59A and 59B, page 84) to evaluate the merits of code assessment for multi-unit development, taking into account the findings from the 'Better Apartments' process, to either replace ResCode with a codified process for multi-unit development or identify ResCode standards that can be codified. Do you have any comments on the merits of code assessment for multi-unit development?**

not answered

Q74. **Any other comments about chapter 7 (new planning tools)?**

This chapter hides a multitude of sins. Medium and high density housing should be the exception, not the norm and it should be made harder, not easier for such developments to be approved in suburban locations. Much tighter controls around maintenance of the streetscape and residential character are required. More green space and canopy trees on private land must be guaranteed especially for multi unit developments, not less. The Small Lot Housing Code is a disaster waiting to happen and a sop to greedy developers. It should be scrapped.

Q75. **The discussion paper includes the option (options 1 and 61, pages 14 and 90) of Plan Melbourne being an enduring strategy with a long-term focus supported by a 'rolling' implementation plan. Do you agree that separating the long-term strategy from a shorter-term supporting implementation plan is a good idea?**

Long term strategic planning and shorter term implementation plans are not mutually exclusive. The main thing is to try to keep politicians as far away from the process as possible to avoid corrupting the process.

Q76. If a separate implementation plan is developed for Plan Melbourne 2016 what will make it effective?

Weird question. The strategic plan defines the overall direction. The implementation documents details the specific steps to achieve those goals.

Q77. Any other comments about chapter 8 (implementation)?

No disrespect but there seems to be a lot of groupthink about future trends. It is written almost in stone that Melbourne will continue to grow as proclaimed by demographers. Well, maybe yes and maybe know. With great uncertainty around climate change and immigration issues, it would make sense to look at a few possible future scenarios and try to take them into account. For example, what happens if Australia's economy slumps and unemployment increases? Another mining boom leads to negative growth in Melbourne's population? Interest rates double? Or triple? What happens if there is an oversupply of housing stock, like what happened in many parts of the USA post -GFC?
