



Respondent No: 5

Login:

Email:

Responded At: Nov 15, 2015 13:24:08 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2015 02:21:25 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

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?

Existing infrastructure is Melbourne Airport and the Outer Metro Ring Road (due to be built around 2030) It is on many maps. There is land north west of the Airport and north of the proposed Outer Western Ring Road. This land has not proposals for future industry or housing. The airport has concerns over complaints noise but most of this land is not under the noise overlay and industry really does not bother with airport noise. There are small rural properties 6 hectare in this area which could go down to 1 hectare lots and therefor housing more people whilst keeping it rural. There is a shortage and need for such properties closer to Melbourne and to have people living on larger acreages and not utilising the land which in 90%of cases they are not is not good housing and land management.

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

Some areas need closer scrutiny. Councils can easily let this idea down because it seems to be all about rates. With this idea we need existing communities involved.

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

I would never agree to locking down areas. Very short sighted especially with Freeways like the Outer Western Ring Road on maps to be built and nothing about planning and industry around it. Some land in the Green Wedge is not Green by any sense of the imagination. Dry dusty spring and summer fire hazards waiting to ignite. Lots of old cars and rubbish on them. People not being able to afford to keep the properties clean.

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?

The original Green Wedge concept took private land into the Green Wedge. That was a dreadful thing to do on so many levels. It is as bad as taking a home for a freeway. There is so much land that is not privately owned that could be Green Wedge so why pick private land? If these areas are to be valued, pick land of value and not waste land. At the moment I think most is privately owned. That is a mistake for starters. The owners do not get compensated. The general public cannot use the land. Make our national parks, Waterways, forests, productive farms, golf courses, Zoos, Botanical Gardens Universities, public parks etc, the Green Wedges. Even land beside rail lines. If private land is Green Wedged pay the owners to look after the land. Have another look at the Green Wedges and maybe they need to be further out where land is actually green and not a fire hazard to new housing estates. What we have now does not work well for all of Melbourne. I can remember a [REDACTED] Councillor commenting to me about being on a train traveling through Diggers Rest at spring time and enjoying the green paddocks. He was looking at the Tussock noxious weeds. Message is just know the land and values of the land you put in a green wedge.

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?

I think we have to be very careful about urban renewal. What was on the land before? Where are the amenities for people's recreation. Are we overcrowding existing urban infrastructure and not respecting the existing residents needs and bringing on changes that change the character of suburbs.

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?

Agree

Q18. Please explain your response

This would work if councils, Plan Melbourne and Vic Roads worked together. Go back to Vineyard Road Sunbury up at the point where the Calder meets Vineyard Road and that is a fine example of absolute non co-operation by Melton, Hume, Vic Roads and Plan Melbourne. Bike lane and footpath end no where. People cannot walk or ride OVER the Calder Freeway. Vic Roads cutting off a whole area from the Diggers Rest train station is another example in this area. They ran a freeway through the walking path. So now residents have to rely totally on the car. Also there is a review of cutting off the south access link to Diggers Rest which is a real no no as far as residents are concerned. Safety concerns regarding ambulance and police access. Certainly wouldn't be a 20minute commute at peak. I am sure this goes on all over Melbourne.

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

Affordable housing is wonderful but not all in the same suburbs and streets where you create Ghettos. Affordable should not mean tiny tiny house block. People who cannot afford a large house certainly need a backyard especially on urban fringe. There has to be some compensation for living away from city amenities and the bay. No one is putting in enough parkland or building housing for hotter weather.

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

Conventional housing for starters that is mentioned in the PSPs. What is that? People in outer areas on the fringe should not be forced into living on tiny blocks. They need space because they are on the fringe without all the amenities that inner Melbourne has. You can put in a shopping strip but that does not compensate for what inner Melbourne has. Larger house blocks should be the norm. People need to love to come to home to their house on the Melbourne fringe. They do not want to be listening to their neighbours TV and conversations. They do not want their solar panels overshadowed. They want their space. They want wider roads. They need parklands not a little park. They need their cycle and walking tracks.

Q22. Climate change comments

This is a very good reason not to lock down UGB and Green Wedge. We do not know what is coming. Not knowing really restricts what we can do with planning. Be flexible and think big. Wider Roads and better drains. Water storage on houses means larger lots of land not the tiny ones being built. We need our trees and these small blocks estates don't allow for this in the density we need.

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?

Good idea. But cutting off areas that would be suitable for employment and putting them in the Green Wedge or locking them out for future development really does not help. Some of these areas are close to significant infrastructure. All this needs reviewing. Opportunities for future clusters has to be expanded. We have Melbourne Airport and easy access from the north and north west. Areas lends itself for this type of investment. Even and major educational facility.

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

We have to be open to more ideas as the world is changing and Australia is changing.

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?

Werribee needs this and so do other areas that are remote from Melbourne. I think it is short sighted just looking after Werribee. Werribee is not far from the beach whilst other areas which are land locked need these things as well. Turning prime market gardens and good rainfall farming areas into housing in and near Werribee was not a good idea

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 the ideal place. We are putting too much into the east and not enough into the North and North West where these things are urgent.

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?

An activity centre should have opportunities for youth, young families and older people. Yes they should be vibrant Hubs. Activity being the key word. Cinemas, Ten pin bowling, skating ,clubs, cafes, restaurants, P.O. shops. Swimming pools(especially in fringe areas) Each area should have a major draw card. Melton has the Trotting facility and Waves pool. Sunbury Diggers Rest is theme park territory as the land is flat and easy accessible from all over Melbourne due the Calder and Met train and the Airport. University and private school should be looking at the area. Nursing homes and retirement village opportunities right at Diggers Rest Station.

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?

I really wonder if the planners know what good agricultural land is. There are still areas south of Sunbury in Green Wedge when there is no agricultural value because it is in Rain shadow area and full of tussock and other noxious weeds. These properties rely on expensive drinking water for stock as their water tanks don't fill enough. People just live on a 2 acre part of their land and forget the rest.

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.

This has been ignored along Sunbury Road. Why would anyone put a housing estate so close to 2 tips. The smell on some days is sickening to residents who live further away than the planned subdivisions. No one listens. Really obvious problems ahead. The tips will have to go and then the compensation for their expenses.

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

Listen to the locals and stop messing people around then industry will invest.

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?

Public Transport important as people get older and kids travelling to school. We are not utilising opportunities for passengers. We need wider roads for this and connections that people will use. The concept that people don't always want to go down to the city.

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?

Put a Buffer between pedestrian and cyclists and road when building new networks. What we have now is dangerous.

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

Community and Vic Roads should work together to provide safety in transport corridors. Early stages now and time to move on this concept. Cars, cycles and people do not have to be on the same road.

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?

We are destroying Melbourne with the intense housing that is happening. Pulling down established housing and putting in town houses. Loosing the leafy streets. Not enough parking. Older children living at home need their parking. Visitors need parking. It looks awful and will end up like inner areas of Sydney which I know well. People in some areas eastern suburbs of Sydney can only have one guest at a time because of parking and space issues. It will end up inn tears

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

I do no agree with 70/30. it should be 50/50 We have the land within 40km of Melbourne. Just use it.

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 Agree

Q42. Why?

This should be investigated. I live on a rural lot and have issues with people from the suburbs thinking my land is open slather for them to come and shoot rabbits without telling me. I can imagine there will be more of this with houses very close to rural properties There should be a graduation of lot sizes and more mixed sizes. Very large acreages of 10 acres or more along side suburbs will cause issues and I worry about it. Traffic issues with cars coming down roads that were once quiet places to ride horses, walk and cycle will be rat runs and people will get hurt or even die because of this type of planning which is happening now without any consultation with the residents on the rural land.

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?

you have this wrong. It should be a last resort. Once it is gone its gone. You are turning Melbourne into concrete which effects climate and peoples lives. Over crowded amenities and parks. Awful when everyone wants to use the same hospitals, use the same public transport and facilities. Crowding which is not necessary with so much land within 30km of Melbourne

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?

Option 37B

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?

Again talk to people who live in and around locations for future development.

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?

Work thoroughly on this and stop rushing it. It is happening too fast and carelessly. It can be done in 20 years. Why so urgent? It looks to me as an outsider that there are developers running the show.

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?

Option 40A

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?

Agree with diversity of housing. Over 50's don't like stairs but like a garden. Security is important and with vandalism in the suburbs we need lock up garages and secure off street parking. Bring back front verandas so older people can sit out the front of their homes and be engaged with community instead of being shut in behind a curtain. We need rules about backyards for houses of 3 bedrooms or more that require space for children to play and exercise. Room for basketball hoops that are now not allowed in front driveways because the drives are too small. Room for a trampoline and small lap pools. We complain that kids don't exercise and then allow absurd back and front yard sizes that add nothing to leisure time.

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?

Social housing and affordable housing should not be all in the one street or suburb. It should be spread through all communities. If the housing is government funded it should be well maintained and if tenants are damaging government housing the tenants should be removed. This abuse of housing destroys communities. Happy communities liveable areas.

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

When planning a new suburb I think it is important to understand that a sports oval is not only for families leisure and should not be included as parkland in any plans. These ovals are for clubs and they are used by clubs who rotate time on the ovals. When a family would like to use the open space for ball games and running there is organised sport and practices happening on the ovals. It can actually be dangerous for little children. Families who are not involved need their place for picnics, bike play and running around. I am very concerned about the style of homes going in as affordable housing. Stand alone housing with no eaves and windows facing windows does not add anything to liveable housing in fact is an awful concept. This new housing style is less private than the old single story townhouse which at had no windows facing windows. Little children don't mind a 3 metre length backyard but a 10 year old and older will. They need space. It is all about people's space. If you put people in outer suburbs they need a big back yard because councils are not putting in pools or facilities for young children to cool off in summer. The parks are not big enough for the population that is being squeezed into these new suburbs.

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?

We are now building houses without eaves. We are now building houses on blocks that are too small to put a water tank or grow a tree. We are now building houses that are not placed on the block to take advantage of sun and shade options. We want trees growing on the housing estates but streets are too narrow, the land outside the houses is too narrow and the houses are too close to street to allow for a tree. You cannot have 3 metre street trees roots attacking the foundations of houses cracking paths. you cannot even have a tree in the new housing estates backyards because houses are too close and backyards too small. We need Greener suburbs but seem to be selective of where these suburbs are. It should be all areas.

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?

This needs to be fixed but how do you tell someone growing a crop feed for stock that it is a fire hazard to neighbouring houses. Out in the northwest we have very dry grass and crop areas that burn. We are bringing housing onto their doorsteps and ask them to stop doing what they have done for years in being self sufficient. This is where staged housing lots would most likely almost fix this issue. Graduating land sizes so there is not open grass land on the back fence of housing estates. 1/4 acre, 1/2 acre, 1acre, 2 acres, 5 acres, 10 acres, 15 acres, 20 acres. This way we have the land under control and also keep rural feel around new housing estates. This will actually green up any areas that are tree less now. Naturally farms that are productive and growing crops would stay as they are. The last thing one would do is destroy the food bowl.

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?**

I think covered above

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?** Agree

Q58. Why?

covered above

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?**

Agree

Q60. **Why?**

Rail and roads seem to be effected by heat and heavy rain. We need experts to solve this one

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?**

I am sick of seeing dead animals in suburbs and on our freeways and roads. Flora and Fauna Parks need kangaroo fencing. Our freeways need habitat tunnels and kangaroo fencing. On roads where there is wildlife crossing lower the speed limit and flashing warnings at dusk and dawn. Have buffer zones of 300 metres around Flora and Fauna parks. Don't build small housing near these parks as it cause so much distress for families and the animals. Animals do leave the parks and venture onto peoples properties and streets. If housing is tiny and properties of concrete forests injuries will occur. Horrible stuff. Ban dogs off leash and cats roaming free.

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?**

Yes please. Larger housing blocks can solve many of these issues. We do have the land close to Melbourne. Trees and more trees.

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?**

Agree

Q65. Why?

This would need to be government sponsored. Not up to the land holder. These land holders are up for Capital Gains tax if they sell. Obscene rates now. In areas of the north west of Melbourne the land that has no natural water supply and very little rain fall. This land has been left whilst the fertile productive land has now been zoned housing. Very bad planning. This land needs investigation as to what can be done. I would suggest smaller 2 acre lots. This would house more families and of course bring in more trees to areas that are barren.

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?

This would benefit all.

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? Agree

Q69. Why?

Totally agree. I actually live in a homestead style built in the early 80's that uses this concept. We have veranda facing north which brings in winter sun to all front rooms and we have shade all summer. Eaves all around. Deciduous trees along with natives. Clever planning can do this and bring back the Australian style homestead with the 2000 cm verandah facing north

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

We can improve the new suburbs on the fringe that are now being planned. I do not agree with selling backyards in Melbourne as it destroys the environment and trees. We end up with concrete jungles in the suburbs. Some areas you cannot even have a BBQ as people are too close. This is not looking after the natural environment and the human environment. It is interesting reading your Plan Melbourne Refresh that the photos and pictures of the older inner suburbs are full of green grass and trees. The newer pictures are of treeless landscapes and ugly buildings with no verandas or treed streets and parks. It does not look like any are planned not even a twig on the grass. Trees in a street keep the street cool in summer. We are in for some hot summers and the concrete everywhere will make it much hotter.

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'.

Every residence should have off street parking. So not make the same mistakes as we did in the 30's 40's and 50's by not having these spaces off the road. You cannot add them later but you can utilise them later for other activities if not needed. Older people live in units and they have family, friends and carers visiting and these people need to park. They cannot park streets away. Please ensure the safety of the elderly. I would never live in an apartment without parking and it could be a safety issue.

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?

Good idea but the people doing this would need community consultation.

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?

When building units, flats or townhouses they should have parking. It should be compulsory for all dwellings. Just because these apartments are near transport it does not mean car spaces are not needed. You cannot put them in later so do it when being built. As stated above these parking spaces are for visitors, doctors, nurses, home care, relatives. It is actually a safety issue not to have a car space for each unit in these developments. Isolation for the residents if there is no parking for family to visit. We do not know what is down the track and it would be foolish to cut back here.

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

People live in all directions and come long distances to visit family in Unit developments they need parking. Our public transport does not meet community needs.

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?

We need a review and it is over due. The Logical Inclusions review recommended bi annually.

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

Call it what you like just do bi annual reviews.

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

We need bi annual reviews. All options open. As stated before Melbourne is changing and it is very short sighted to lock up land for either UGB or Green Wedge.
