

Introduction

Please find following key information about making a submission.

Who can make a submission?

Anyone is able to comment and make submissions on the Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper.

How will submissions be used?

We want a Plan Melbourne to reflect the community's views, particularly in relation to housing affordability and diversity, energy efficiency and climate change. All submissions received will be reviewed and inform Plan Melbourne 2016.

Will submissions be publicly available?

Written submissions will be publicly available and will be able to be read by others, unless you have requested and been granted confidentiality status.

Why do I have to register to make a submission or comment online?

The information provided in the registration form will help us analyse the responses and help us know which issues are of concern to residents in which areas of Melbourne or to particular community groups.

Can I provide a submission in another format?

Given the high volume of submissions anticipated it is strongly preferred that the online form or the downloadable template be used. This will ensure the most effective evaluation of the issues raised in submissions.

How do I make a submission?

You will need to register to make a submission. Submissions and comments will close at 5.00pm AEDST Friday 18 December 2015. Once registered, there are two ways to make a submission:

- Complete the [online submission form](#)
- [Upload](#) your submission using this submission template. Note that the preferred format is MS Word,

As part of making a submission, you will need to agree to the privacy collection notice and statement of confidentiality. These are outlined in both the online submission and upload forms.

Do I have to respond to all of the questions in the submission form for my views to be heard?

Not at all. You are welcome to respond to as many, or as few, of the questions on the Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper as you would like.

Can I comment on other areas not addressed in the Plan Melbourne refresh discussion Paper?

This refresh is not intended to comprehensively revise Plan Melbourne 2014. It builds on the extensive work and consultation underpinning Plan Melbourne 2014. Much of Plan Melbourne 2014 enjoys bi-partisan support and will not change.

The Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper and consultation process is asking Melburnians to take another look at particular aspects of Plan Melbourne 2014 that need revision such as the key issues of housing supply, diversity and affordability, and climate change and will reflect the Government's transport network priorities.

Submission Template

Chapter 2: Growth, challenges, fundamental principles and key concepts

1. The discussion paper includes the option (option 5, page 16) 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?*

We note that Plan Melbourne (2014) contained Direction 6.2 (p175) which includes: “govt. will optimize the potential for regional areas to attract new investment and population growth” We’d hope that Federal money could resource this direction, and that targets for diverting some population growth away from Melbourne could be annually set. While a challenge, decentralization will need to be implemented seriously.

2. 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? Choose one option:*

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Please explain your response:

Strongly agree: There should be reference that it will be incorporated into the Planning and Environment Act so it goes into the State section of planning schemes.

3. 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? Choose one option:*

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Please explain your response:

Strongly agree: This is the only way to help ensure that solutions are found to the problem of infill redevelopment in current suburbs. There will be resistance of course, but if our landscape and agriculturally significant Green Wedges are to be saved for future generations, then a permanent UGB is essential.

4. 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 wedge and peri-urban areas?*

One urgent way this must be done is to revisit minister Guy's ministerial decision to modify the schedule to the Rural Conservation Zone which allowed a range of non-agricultural and non-conservation uses (with a council permit) in that zone. This political decision, made against advice from local government and planners, has seriously weakened that zone and potentially opening it up to commercial uses which will undermine environmental values. Tourist operators should set up their buildings in nearby townships rather than locating them in the RCZ. It was a "sledge hammer" solution to a minor issue. A better way of dealing with these developments (if a case can be made that their location needs to be in the RCZ) is a site-specific amendment?

5. 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 elements should be included in a 2050 concept map for Melbourne?*

Unsure about this

6. The discussion paper includes the option (option 10, page 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 definitions adequately clarify the concepts? Choose one option:*

- Strongly Disagree
 Disagree
 Agree
 Strongly Agree

Please explain your response:

Disagree: "Polycentric" is an awkward expression; we should have a more familiar term. If "20 minute neighborhoods" are defined to include time taken to get to work, then it will remain an aspiration; if its unmotorised travel then it will be much more easily realized and will encourage local jobs in any case, so will facilitate the eventual realization of 20 minutes to get to work.

7. 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 Disagree
 Disagree
 Agree
 Strongly Agree

Please explain your response:

Strongly agree.

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

None

Chapter 3: Delivering jobs and investment

9. 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

10. The discussion paper includes two options (page 30) relating to National Employment Clusters, being:

Option 21A: Focus planning for National Employment Clusters on core institutions and businesses

Option 21B: Take a broader approach to planning for National Employment Clusters that looks beyond the core institutions and businesses

Which option do you prefer?

- Option 21A
 Option 21B

Please explain why you have chosen your preferred option:

No comment

11. The discussion paper includes the option (option 22, page 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? Choose one option:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Why?

No comment

12. The discussion paper includes the option (option 23, page 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? Choose one option:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Why?

No comment

13. The discussion paper includes options (options 24 to 30, pages 33 and 34) 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?

Under Melbourne 2030 there was a hierarchy of Activity Centres (Principal, Mayor etc) There is a need to return to that terminology because otherwise those that derive local attractiveness by being like a village, will not lose their appeal by getting too big.

14. 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?

Food growing land relatively close to the city, needs to be protected. Putting them in the RCZ category (so long as the RCZ is returned to its former strength – see answer to question 4.)

15. 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?*

No comment

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

None

Chapter 4: A more connected Melbourne

17. 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? Choose one option:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Why?

This matter needs care because in Nillumbik's case the railway line (Hurstbridge line) passes through land zoned Rural Conservation with landscape and environmental values. There is a danger that this land will be under pressure for development if the transport network "informs land use choices".

18. 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?

Unsure

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

None

Chapter 5: Housing

20. The discussion paper includes the option (option 36A, page 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? Choose one option:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Why?

Strongly agree

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

Unsure

22. 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? Choose one option:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Why?

Unsure

23. 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? Choose one option:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Why?

Strongly agree because it will help contain the city's boundaries.

24. 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? Choose one option:

- Option 37A
- Option 37B
- Other

Why?

Prefer option 37B because this allows for the Govt. taking responsibility for the provision of social housing, and taking action to mandate housing diversity which will fill a growing gap in housing for senior citizens.

25. 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?

“Town Hall” type community meetings (professionally facilitated) where information and housing need is transparently available and residents know their recommendations will be acted upon (so long as it meets requirement for facilitating a certain quantity of “redevelopment space”) is worth trying. Residents if treated like intelligent adults can rise to the occasion.

26. 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?

This statement is clearly too sweeping. It reflects a legacy of powerlessness felt by neighbours affected by unit development in the past, also a lack of understanding of the planning process. Because of organized neighbourhood anger, the previous minister over reacted. “Inappropriate development” is undefined therefore likely to be interpreted broadly which may only lead to more anger and disputation.

27. 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? Choose one option:

- Option 40A
- Option 40B
- Other

Why?

Prefer option 40A because the guidelines will be clear and able to be interpreted correctly by VCAT.

28. 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?

Many more single-storey units will need to be provided and they're not being provided currently under existing circumstances. Double storey town houses are not generally suitable for the elderly. There will be a need for mandatory action on govt's part. Can there be an incentive for developers to include a certain number per development?

29. 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?

Can't think of any others

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

None

--

Chapter 6: A more resilient and environmentally sustainable Melbourne

31. 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? Choose one option:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Why?

Strongly agree: because these environment issues are pressing and will get strong popular support. The community wants to see their govt. caring seriously about the future.

32. The discussion paper includes the option (option 47, page 72) 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 idea? Choose one option:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Why?

Strongly agree.

33. 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?

Agree strongly. Given the science on these matters, it will be regarded as irresponsible if the govt does not take this action.

34. The discussion paper includes the option (option 50, page 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? Choose one option:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Why?

Strongly agree: Black Saturday comes to mind. Anything which will avoid tragic loss of life in bushfires should be pursued.

35. 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? Choose one option:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Why?

Strongly agree

36. 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 idea? Choose one option:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Why?

Strongly agree. Victoria's history of species loss and habitat fragmentation must be addressed.

37. 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?

Water sensitive urban design must include the capture and storage of water on public land in suitable places. If the Romans could do it, why not us? The stored water is going to be needed keeping street and park trees alive!

38. 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? Choose one option:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Why?

Agree – because it would take advantage of its popularity and underline importance of urgent necessity in this area.

39. 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? Choose one option:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Why?

Can't think of a reason why this shouldn't happen.

40. 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? Choose one option:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Why?

Agree

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

It's too easy for builders to manipulate the energy efficiency guidelines to minimize their costs etc. Local council building inspectors was a good system and could be returned?

--

Chapter 7: New planning tools

42. 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?*

Unsure

43. 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?*

Code assessment (if it reduces ability of community to be heard re objections) would be very unpopular in my community. Any benefits would need to be clearly set out and community debate facilitated.

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

Like to reiterate my answer to Q4. i.e. the need to return the Rural Conservation Zone to its former strength. Not really a new planning tool, but certainly a key planning tool!

Chapter 8: Implementation

45. 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?

Yes, a separate implementation plan a good idea

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

Unsure

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

None

removed