



Respondent No: 61

Login:

Email:

Responded At: Dec 18, 2015 00:56:00 am

Last Seen: Dec 17, 2015 22:38:02 pm

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?

Don't forget the opportunity to develop land which has existing services and infrastructure but is currently outside the Urban Growth Boundary.

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**

The inclusion would increase complexity but with no added benefit.

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**

Land with access to existing services and infrastructure but currently outside the Urban Growth Boundary should be included and zoned for urban purposes. A permanent Urban Growth Boundary should not be included until a full Land Capability Study of land outside the Urban Growth Boundary has been completed. To do otherwise would not be proper planning but only blatant politics.

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?**

Great weight must be given to the control of levels of flammable fuel in any Green Wedge Area to ensure that, over time as is now happening, they do not become bushfire disaster areas which kill many people and destroy many houses as well as other infrastructure such as hay sheds, farm machinery, fences ect.

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?**

No comment

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

A polycentric city already exists based on many years of private sector investment.

Q19. The discussion paper includes options not answered

(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?

Q20. Please explain your response

Agree except that local government should have only a minor role, if any.

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

You cannot reasonably expect to ever again have housing affordability if you restrict supply. Simple supply and demand economics applies.

Q22. Climate change comments

not answered

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?

No Comment

Q24. The discussion paper includes two options not answered

(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

no 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?**

not answered

Q27. **Why?**

No 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?**

not answered

Q29. **Why?**

No 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?**

No Comment

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?**

High Quality agricultural land should be protected and not seen as the easy option for new growth being generally cleared land. Scrubby treed land with low aesthetic appeal would be a better option for urban development.

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.**

agree

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

No Comment

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

Q35. Why?

Land Use and Transport Networks are inextricably linked.

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?

no comment

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

No Comment

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?

How is this going to be enforced on the private sector?

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

See answer to question 20

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?

See answer to question 20

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?

See answer to question 20

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?

See answer to question 20

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?

"Inappropriate development" is an imprecise term and is used by Local Government Planners to cover anything they, or local pressure groups, don't like personally.

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

Other

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

Take complexity out of the system to enable ordinary people to understand the plethora of different and confusing controls.

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?

Take Local Government out of the loop.

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

Governments can never achieve innovation without the total and complete cooperation of the private sector including all individual land and house owners. They must participate in all discussions and not talked down to by a group of bureaucrats and academics.

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

Strongly Disagree

Q53. Why?

These principles are too complicated for ordinary people to understand and will achieve nothing other than work for the bureaucrats.

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

Strongly agree

Q55. Why?

The existing overlays in the Nillumbik Planning Scheme have led to a dangerous level of fuel which, one day, will explode into a dangerous and deadly bushfire.

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?

Strongly agree. Government Authorities have gone to sleep "at the wheel" on these matters over the last decade or so.

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

Strongly agree

Q58. Why?

A more common sense approach is required to bushfire hazards. Nillumbik Council lacks a "duty of care" to the safety of its citizens, particularly from Bushfire Hazards.

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

Strongly agree

Q60. Why?

More than "investigation" is required - the application of ordinary common sense is crucial.

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 disagree

Q62. Why?

The increase in bushfire risk is not compatible with the safety of citizens.

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?

Anything is worth considering provided it does not increase the bushfire risk after applying the common sense test.

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?**

But it must be with the cooperation of the private sector and individual householders.

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?**

See answer to question 38

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?**

See answer to question 38

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

None

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?

The objective must be to make planning controls more simple and more easily understood by the "man in the street."

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?

See answer to question 42

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

Simplify, shorten and reduce the waffle by 95 - 99%.

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?

What is a "rolling" implementation plan? The general public as a whole must be included and understand what this is all about.

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

Simplicity.

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

Implementation would be much better executed by a group of private sector individuals, rather than bureaucrats and academics.
