



Respondent No: 42

Login:

Email:

Responded At: Dec 16, 2015 19:49:31 pm

Last Seen: Dec 16, 2015 03:52:02 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?

The most important challenge is to find out what the current residents value and protect that as a primary goal as that is what has made us the most liveable city.; I believe it is heritage homes and neighbourhood character and therefore low density and in the middle suburbs the charm of the streets cape with its many period homes .this conflicts with with plans desire to higher urban densities .The focus should not be on the prospective future residents but you should focus on what the current residents want . The other challenge is to maintain faith in planning ; many of your suburbs targeted for densification were created as suburbs for residential habitation and the current residents made serious and sizeable purchase decisions based on this fact and the zoning protecting them from the type of developments you appear to be now proposing. These middle suburbs are essentially different from those closer to the city which began as industrial suburbs and are well suited to providing previously large industrial sites for infill development .

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 Disagree

Q12. Please explain your response

Because the primary goal is to represent the current residents in their housing preferences not the future residents and the United Nations goals may conflict with the desired outcomes of the current residents.

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? Strongly disagree

Q14. Please explain your response

if you lock down the boundaries and continue to support high immigration you by logical definition have to develop a policy to accommodate the increase. State Governments have decided the cheapest solution is make the existing residents pay the price for population densification without even any guarantees of the necessary infrastructure upgrades .The present plan melbourne chooses to do this by decreasing the liveability and amenity and the cherished neighbourhood character of the middle suburbs as its primary target . The entire plan seeks to sell the message that consolidation is good e.g. it claims housing diversity is a positive for the elderly the singles the entry level penetration of the housing market the plan even claims it helps right some inequality which negatively impacts melbournes liveability. These are motherhood untested and spurious arguments,trying to find a positives to offset one huge negative the inevitable slow and steady destruction of our low density neighbourhood character with all its tree lined period style charm.

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?

This becomes a moot point if by protecting the values of the green wedge and peri urban areas it leads to the destruction of whats valued in the middle suburbs then we protect what we rarely see at the cost of the amenity of where we live every day.

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?

if any of these goals lead to loss of protection for our suburbs then I oppose their introduction however if these goal can be achieved without loss of neighbourhood character I am unable to adequately judge which is the better .

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

I fear this is a further construct to justify the densification of the middle suburbs .the rapidly changing digital world will make such goals as a 20 minute neighbourhood irrelevant, services may be delivered over the internet, deliveries by drones more work from home and solutions not yet thought of but are coming nevertheless.. Cars will eventually be virtually pollutant free .Apartment blocks do not produce better community than our highly prized and liveable suburbs characterised by low density housing. the 20 minute suburb while making attractive concept is only going to result in loss not gain in amenity.

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?

Agree

Q20. Please explain your response

Affordability ,climate change sense of identity .make our city greener ,place and identity, partnership with local government .all these lofty ideals do not of themselves end with densification and destruction of our middle suburbs amenity as a logical conclusion to their inclusion in plan of Melbourne refresh . e.g. sense of identity is embedded in every survey done on what we value ,our homes, back yards and gardens give expression of ourselves .and neighbourhood character.Climate change heating cities benefit from low density garden housing with gardens and canopy trees ,the only threat is the rapidly growing popularity of boundary to boundary tree less faux French mansions often relaxing high quality period homes controls at council level needs to be introduced to protect our suburbs from this new threat.

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

With fixed growth boundaries high immigration you produce the problem and try without success to convince us that the inevitable densification solution is a plus.The mathematics determine that either the boundaries change otherwise densification will continue well beyond the scope of this plan .I believe densification should primarily be close to the city and to a much lesser extent in all suburbs not just the middle suburbs and only immediately adjacent to or within large existing commercial centers and or large industrial or retail in fill sites no longer in use , and they should result in maximum 3 or 4 storey medium density .

Q22. Climate change comments

sustainability and climate change must be addressed within the confines of the current residents desires to maintain the the charm of neighbourhood character which current residents clearly pride

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?

not sufficiently informed to comment

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?

not answered

Q25. Please explain why you have chosen your preferred option

Not sufficiently informed to comment

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?**

Q27. **Why?**

Not sufficiently informed to comment

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?**

Q29. **Why?**

Not sufficiently informed to comment

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?**

This appears to be another reason given for attempting to justify a policy to increase the density and diversity of Read apartment blocks in a walkable catchment I oppose this on the same basis as I did the 20 minute precinct as it represents further dilution of low density suburban life with loss of heritage and neighbourhood character, an outcome that will with the passage of time become unnecessary.

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?**

With my limited knowledge of agricultural industry I am unable to make an informed comment

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.**

With my limited knowledge of agricultural industry I am unable to make an informed comment

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

Do not diminish our our suburbs for some generalised attempt to artificially encourage economic activity where non existed before with the view of producing more activity both commercial and apartment construction . Protect whats attractive to the residents now not in the future.

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 Disagree

Q35. Why?

they should reflect the choices made by the residents not drive spatial change resulting concentrated jobs and housing

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?

continue to encourage both walking and cycling and the use of public transport .Major urban renewal must be within or immediately adjacent to existing not proposed but existing large commercial centres

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

Better transport linkages can only benefit all of melbourne

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?

The most important challenge is to find out what the current residents value and protect that as a primary goal as that is what has made us the most liveable city.; I believe it is heritage homes and neighbourhood character and therefore low density and in the middle suburbs the charm of the streets cape with its many period homes .this conflicts with with plans desire to higher urban densities .The focus should not be on the prospective future residents but you should focus on what the current residents want . The other challenge is to maintain faith in planning ; many of your suburbs targeted for densification were created as suburbs for residential habitation and the current residents made serious and sizeable purchase decisions based on this fact and the zoning protecting them from the type of developments you appear to be now proposing. These middle suburbs are essentially different from those closer to the city which began as industrial suburbs and are well suited to providing previously large industrial sites for infill development . Furthermore their is no evidence to suggest greater affordability would result as the costs of land purchase ,construction holding costs and profit .I believe densification should primarily close to the city and to a much lesser extent in all suburbs not just the middle suburbs and only immediately adjacent to or within large existing commercial centers and or large industrial or retail in fill sites no longer in use , and they should result in maximum 3 or 4 storey medium density .

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

I believe densification should primarily occur close to the city and to a much lesser extent in all suburbs not just the middle suburbs and only immediately adjacent to or within large existing commercial centers and or large industrial or retail in fill sites no longer in use , and they should result in maximum 3 or 4 storey medium density . Neighbourhood protection needs to extend to those streets / areas that have a dominant period style pre ww2 character with the provision of extra protection against the slow erosion and change in streets cape These goals we believe, conflict with the provision of a "diverse range of housing options "where this provision leads to blocks of flats or apartments being constructed anywhere else except within or immediately adjacent to substantial commercial centres and not activity centres with a few convenience shops and offices.

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? not answered

Q42. Why?

I am not sure what is meant by this however I believe my previous remarks make my position clear

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?

Neighborhood character is the key driver. This statement "reflects community's expectations to protect our valued residential areas,"refer boroondara survey results . this must remain the primary goal We object to the proposal to locate apartments in commercial corridors and associated public transport routes as this will likely lead to apartments constructed all along transport routes destroying what's left of neighborhoods character, with further dilution of the neighbourhood character precinct protections now running along these transport routes. We need to confine these developments to significant commercial centres, not the small activity centres dotted and certainly not strung along all main roads.

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?

our first objection is to the notion implicit in the plan , that the proposed plan should represent the needs of those prospective residents, namely the substantial increased population in the middle suburbs .My second objection is to the notion that we should be required to accommodate an increased population in our municipality per se, furthermore that we should be so required without any guarantees of provision of increased infrastructure spending from outside the resources of the current residents to offset the inevitable detrimental effects of said increase in population. We should protect the suburbs from housing diversity , the various dwelling types, density demographics and household sizes are analyzed with view to having a housing plan that matches future needs, thereby justifying the provision of a diversity of housing i.e. more high density apartments flats etc We again object. We do not require the plan melbourne to conform to this analysis but rather protect at all costs the neighbourhood character and if that suits those future needs excellent, if not, movement to another municipality is appropriate. Again, the housing plan should represent the views of the current residents not the future prospective residents.The current planning schemes are already under pressure for higher density with a consequent loss of heritage, tree cover ,neighbourhood character and if you sit through planning meetings of boroondara the views of the residents become clear they want more protection agains densification not less

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?

We object to the goal of balance between heritage and future needs. There should be no balance but heritage must remain pre-eminent over future needs where they conflict with the desire to modernize with population/resident compaction or densification via smaller dwellings flats and apartments except within closely confined commercial areas. We must have strategies that better protect the heritage places and maximize the distance from any new developments.

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 diversityOption 40B: Retain at least 50 per cent as a guide but expand the criteria to enable variations between municipalitiesWhich 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?

Neighborhood Character Precinct protection needs to extend to those streets /areas that have a dominant period style pre world war 2 character, with the provision of extra protection against the slow further erosion and change in streetscape. These goals we believe, conflict with the provision of a "diverse range of housing options "where this provision leads to blocks of apartments being constructed anywhere else except within or immediately adjacent to substantial commercial centres or defunct large industrial or retail infill sites and then only 3max 4 storey medium density and high quality 2or 3 bedroom apartments to be allowed.

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?

expedite planning approvals find and release more land i.e. increase supply of land dont undermine protections of our low density neighbourhood character and heritage rich suburbs, most especially the middle suburbs

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

A population of 8 million must not destroy the most liveable city by taking away our prized amenity and heritage and make no mistake that is what fixed growth boundaries and high population growth will do if the 70/30 rule is introduced. Represent the desires and aspirations of current residents not the future residents.

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?

not answered

Q53. Why?

not answered

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?

not answered

Q55. Why?

not answered

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?

not answered

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?

not answered

Q58. Why?

not answered

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?

not answered

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?

not answered

Q62. Why?

not answered

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?

not answered

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?**

not answered

Q65. **Why?**

not answered

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?**

not answered

Q67. **Why?**

not answered

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?**

not answered

Q69. **Why?**

not answered

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)?

Already it is apparent numerous tiny 1 bedroom apartments maximise financial return for the developer so that represents the most common outcome and what is being built is of low standard this is not a diversity of housing.

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?

not answered

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

not answered

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

not answered
