



Respondent No: 47

Login:

Email:

Responded At: Dec 14, 2015 09:35:53 am

Last Seen: Dec 17, 2015 00:20:01 am

IP Address: 115.70.201.250

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 Victorian Health Promotion Foundation (VicHealth)

Q4. Please select from one of the options below I am making this submission on behalf of an organisation. Submissions by organisations will be published including the name of the organisation.

Q5. Contact email

Q6. Name of person making submission on behalf of organisation

Q7. Contact phone number

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?

Urban planning decisions can have unintended negative impacts on the health of communities. VicHealth advocates for placing health at the centre of all planning decisions to ensure all urban planning decisions have a positive impact on the health and well being of individuals and communities. While health equity is noted in relation to the key opportunity and challenge of 'Housing Affordability', VicHealth recommends that health equity is an integrated theme across all Plan Melbourne strategic principles. Health equity is the notion that everyone should have a fair opportunity to attain their full health potential and that no one should be disadvantaged from achieving this potential if it can be avoided. A dedicated focus on health equity in urban planning decisions across each of the 7 key opportunities and challenges presented as part of Plan Melbourne 2016 will assist in ensuring planning and design decisions do not increase existing inequalities in Melbourne (<https://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/search/the-vichealth-framework-for-health-equity>). VicHealth recommends that the key opportunity and challenge listed as 'Moving People and Goods' has an increased focus on creating and improving walking and cycling infrastructure as a means of providing healthy, sustainable transport options across Melbourne. The World Health Organisation (WHO) Healthy Cities program suggests the successful development of healthy cities rests on partnerships. These include partnerships within the health sector, within the public sector, between cities and across sectors including participation from health, environment, economy, ecology, education, and urban planning fields (http://www.who.int/healthpromotion/conferences/previous/jakarta/statements/healthy_cities/en/). VicHealth supports the key opportunity of 'Providing Services and Infrastructure for Communities' as early as possible. VicHealth's work in planning healthy communities, particularly our work with developers and local government in the new community of Selandra Rise, supports the principle that community infrastructure such as parks, open space corridors, walking and cycling paths and public transport connections must be established early if they are to be fully realised in new communities.

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?

Agree

Q12. Please explain your response

The key elements of the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals should be incorporated into Plan Melbourne 2016. All existing and new strategic principles of Plan Melbourne 2016 should contribute to the success of the UN Sustainable Development Goals and include measures of success reviewed on an annual basis. The opportunity to link Plan Melbourne 2016 outcomes to the UN Sustainable Development Goals has the potential to ensure Plan Melbourne is guided by these goals and is working to, and measured by, delivery on all relevant components.

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?

Agree

Q14. Please explain your response

Clear, consistent direction relating to the urban growth boundary is needed to provide greater certainty for decision-makers, investors and the community. Locking down the existing urban growth boundary results in a formal acknowledgement of the different planning needs and requirements of communities inside and outside of the urban growth boundary. These different needs and requirements relate to provision of local infrastructure and services including local employment opportunities, local services including retail, access to fresh food outlets and local health providers, the provision of diverse transport options including providing connectivity between public and private transport and provision of meeting and gathering places to increase social inclusion and community gatherings.

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?

Food production in green wedge and peri-urban areas generates approximately 6,000 jobs in Victoria and is worth millions to local and State economies. Some peri-urban locations are highly significant production areas in terms of the national fruit and vegetable supply because they provide the ideal soil and climate conditions for particular crops (<http://www.foodalliance.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/A-Resilient-Fruit-and-Vegetable-Supply-for-a-Healthy-Victoria.pdf>). Close to 50% of Victoria's total vegetable production comes from Melbourne's fringe, which includes green wedge and peri-urban areas making this area an important source of fresh, local produce, a provider of employment opportunities and a source of revenue for State and local governments. If the value of green wedges and peri-urban areas are not articulated clearly, Victoria risks the loss of productive agricultural land. On this basis, articulating the value of these areas should include their economic and employment return to Victoria and their vital role in the provision of local, affordable, healthy food for all Victorians.

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?

Participation in regular physical activity is one of the most important factors in promoting good health and preventing chronic disease in Australia. Less than a third of Australians are getting enough physical activity to benefit their health. This can lead to an increased risk of chronic disease and has been estimated to cost the Australian economy over \$13b each year (<https://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/search/action-agenda-for-health-promotion>). A concept map for Melbourne should include representation of open space precincts, cycling and walking routes, significant parks and playgrounds and any other significant physical activity precincts to encourage Victorians to stay active, encourage wellbeing and social connection.

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?

Disagree

Q18. Please explain your response

The new definition relating to '20 minute neighbourhoods' is clearly defined. The diagram attached in the discussion paper provides a useful and clear visual representation. The revised definition of 'a polycentric city' is an improvement, but is not particularly clear. To ensure clarity, VicHealth recommends splitting these two concepts into two distinct options. A clearer definition can then be described for each without confusion over issues relating to work eg. the non-work focus of 20 minute neighbourhoods can be separated out from the work focus of a polycentric city.

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

VicHealth strongly advocates for the role of the planning function in facilitating the supply of social and affordable housing. Plan Melbourne 2016 should provide a foundation that supports the development of affordable housing in each new development and redevelopment to contribute to reducing inequities in access to affordable housing. VicHealth supports the role of Plan Melbourne 2016 to address climate change. To further strengthen this, Plan Melbourne 2016 should also refer to the importance of parks, shade and trees in new developments to avoid the growing number of 'heat islands', particularly in the central business district of Melbourne. With regard to the concept of 'People, Place and Identity', VicHealth supports options 15B and 16. These relate to introducing a new 'Place and Identity' chapter and better recognising the contribution of Aboriginal values and perspectives in planning and design.

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

NA

Q22. Climate change comments

NA

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?

NA

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?

Q25. Please explain why you have chosen your preferred option

In 2015, opportunities for employment are far broader and in very different sectors from where they have traditionally been found. If Plan Melbourne 2016 is to cater for the future, it must support opportunities for employment in businesses and sectors far beyond what have been core institutions and businesses.

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?

NA

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?

NA

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?

A partnership approach to the development of new Activity Centres is crucial. Sectors including transport, health, planning, economic and business development, parks, open space and recreation and other community development functions across State and Local Government should be involved in the development of Activity Centres. As outlined in the discussion paper, clear criteria should be identified for establishing new Activity Centres to ensure consistent decision making and investment.

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?

NA

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.

NA

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

NA

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?

Agree

Q35. Why?

VicHealth supports the inclusion of the Principal Public Transport Network in Plan Melbourne 2016. This will encourage a focus on supporting the public transport network across greater Melbourne and in growth areas and will provide much needed transport options for communities on the edge of the urban growth boundary. VicHealth supports integrated and connected transport networks in Melbourne with a particular focus on active transport. It is therefore important to ensure the Principal Public Transport Network in Plan Melbourne 2016 includes infrastructure and facilities that support walking and cycling to and from transport connection points.

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?

VicHealth strongly supports any reference to Active Transport Victoria in the development and implementation of Plan Melbourne 2016. Walking and cycling networks should be integrated with land use planning through close partnership and cooperation with local government. VicHealth's work in creating healthier communities, including walking and cycling, incorporates partnerships with local Councils, urban planners and housing developers to ensure that opportunities for cycling and walking are included in the early stages of the design of growth areas and new suburbs. This includes the provision of wide footpaths, traffic calming measures, shared footpath markings and on-road cycling lanes. Prioritising the design and implementation of active transport options through making sure cycling and walking paths are connected to other communities, local destinations, public transport and other services will encourage participation in walking and cycling. To ensure a sustainable focus on cycling in new communities, VicHealth played a critical role, in partnership with Bicycle Victoria, in developing a practice note to urban planning guidelines to influence the quality of infrastructure for cycling in new housing developments (<https://www.bicyclenetwork.com.au/general/for-government-and-business/3372/>). For walking and cycling to be fully integrated with land use, it should be viewed as part of a system. This way there is potential for each component of the system, from starting point to destination, to flow safely and easily resulting in more Victorians walking and cycling regularly. This may include regular service points on major routes, hydration stops along paths and secure accessible storage facilities at major destinations or connection points.

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?

not answered

Q39. Why?

NA

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

NA

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?

NA

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?

not answered

Q44. Why?

NA

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?

not answered

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?

NA

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?

NA

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?

not answered

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?

NA

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?

NA

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

NA

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?

Agree

Q53. Why?

NA

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?

Agree

Q55. Why?

NA

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?

NA

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?

Q58. Why?

NA

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?

Q60. Why?

NA

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?

Q62. Why?

NA

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?

NA

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?

Q65. Why?

NA

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?

Q67. Why?

NA

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?

Q69. Why?

NA

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

VicHealth refers the developers of Plan Melbourne 2016 to the 100 Resilient Cities project, run by the Bloomberg Foundation, of which the City of Melbourne is a part (http://www.100resilientcities.org/cities/entry/melbournes-resilience-challenge#/-_/). There may be lessons and ideas within this worldwide project of relevance to the 'A more resilient and environmentally sustainable Melbourne' section of Plan Melbourne 2016.

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'.

NA

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?

NA

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?

NA

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

NA

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
