



Respondent No: 52

Login:

Email:

Responded At: Dec 17, 2015 14:52:14 pm

Last Seen: Dec 17, 2015 03:51:45 am

IP Address:

Q1. I am entitled to deal with the intellectual property rights (including copyright) of all material (and third party's) in my submission and have obtained the necessary consent(s) from any and all third parties.

I agree

Q2. Where personal information about other people (including photos) is included in my submission, I have notified them of the contents of the Privacy Collection Notice and obtained their consent to their personal information being disclosed to the Plan Melbourne refresh and published.

I agree

Q3. Name of organisation

not answered

Q4. Please select from one of the options below

I am making this submission as an individual. I request my submission be published anonymously with my postcode but with no other details.

Q5. Contact email

Q6. Name of person making submission on behalf of organisation

not answered

Q7. Contact phone number

not answered

Q8. I have read the relevant terms of use and consent to the conditions outlined within these.

Yes

Q9. Please note that submissions where the relevant terms of use have not been agreed to may not be considered as part of the Plan Melbourne Refresh. Please describe below your reasons for submitting despite together with any specific reasons for not agreeing to the terms outlined above.

not answered

Q10. The discussion paper includes the option (option 5, page16) that Plan Melbourne better define the key opportunities and challenges for developing Melbourne and outlines some key points for considerations in Box 1. Are there any other opportunities or challenges that we should be aware of?

not answered

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?

not answered

Q12. Please explain your response

not answered

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

As long as the boundary is actually locked down, this is a good thing. It has been moved many times over the years.

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?

Green wedges and peri-urban areas must be protected. They are not just important for maintaining biodiversity and habitat, but also in making Melbourne better able to deal with climate change.

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?

not answered

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

I agree with the concept of a 20-minute neighbourhood, but for this to be achieved more investment in public transport needs to be made, and people's habits need to change, otherwise people will continue to use their cars. They do this already, even if they already live in a 20-minute neighbourhood. I am also concerned that the concept may just lead to increased development (as the MAC report notes, the concept "requires moderately higher densities in neighbourhoods to support viable local services"). I do not agree with the concept of Melbourne as a polycentric city. I am concerned that this will also give a green light for inappropriate development (and associated loss of natural and built heritage) without the necessary infrastructure (including public transport). I would like more details on this.

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

Climate change in particular should be given more prominence, but if the concept of more 'affordable housing' equates to increased densification (and associated loss of green space, and increase in hard surfaces), then it's difficult to reconcile the two.

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

The discussion paper assumes that population growth is inevitable. If climate change policy is to be incorporated, then the issue of over-population must be addressed. [REDACTED], says "It's hard to reduce your carbon footprint when you keep adding more feet." What is the point of allowing (even encouraging) population growth, if the infrastructure is not there to support that population? How does that improve people's 'liveability'? Over-population and over-consumption of resources are two of the biggest problems facing Australia and the world. Melbourne (and Australia) must play its part in tackling these.

Q22. Climate change comments

Trying to incorporate a meaningful climate change policy whilst accepting population growth as inevitable, and encouraging increased densification, is a large contradiction in the discussion paper.

Q23. The discussion paper includes the option (option 20, page 30) to revise the Delivering Jobs and Investment chapter in Plan Melbourne 2014 to ensure the significance and roles of the National Employment Clusters as places of innovation and knowledge-based employment are clear. How can Plan Melbourne 2016 better articulate the significance and roles of the National Employment Clusters as places of innovation and knowledge-based employment?

not answered

Q24. **The discussion paper includes two options (page 30) relating to National Employment Clusters, being: Option 21A: Focus planning for National Employment Clusters on core institutions and businesses. Option 21B: Take a broader approach to planning for National Employment Clusters that looks beyond the core institutions and businesses. Which option do you prefer?**

not answered

Q25. **Please explain why you have chosen your preferred option**

not answered

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?**

not answered

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?**

not answered

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?**

not answered

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?

not answered

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.

not answered

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

not answered

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?

I agree, but care needs to be taken that natural and built heritage, and amenity, are not compromised in the process.

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?

The promotion of walking and cycling has obvious health and environmental benefits, but I think care needs to be taken with creating cycling paths, especially 'shared' cycling paths, as there can be dangers when pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles are combined, due to their different speeds.

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

I am a little concerned about the proposal to place training airports in Melbourne's green wedges. Whilst the green wedges already contain such facilities as Melbourne Airport, I think any further encroachment needs to be treated with caution.

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?

Disagree

Q39. Why?

I oppose the plan to require established areas to provide 70% of the new housing supply. Densification is already compromising the 'liveability' of our suburbs, with loss of amenity, vegetation cover, natural and built heritage, and exacerbation of the 'heat island' effect. A plan to further increase this would be unacceptable. Further, where does the densification stop? What level is deemed acceptable? If population growth is not tackled (by all levels of government), where will you put all the extra people once all the established areas are full? Will parks and gardens be built on? Will the urban growth boundary be extended again?

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

not answered

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?

not answered

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?

Housing supply has already been 'unlocked' at unacceptable levels, in my view. Older single-dwellings with large established gardens are being demolished to make way for large houses and multi-unit developments with minimal vegetation cover. To unlock any more would have a detrimental affect on health and amenity. Trees take up greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide, provide shade, minimize reliance on greenhouse-gas producing temperature control appliances, reduce the 'heat island' effect, and sustain biodiversity. You simply can't reduce this contribution without compromising any attempt at a climate change policy.

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?

I understood that this had already been done in the creation of the Residential Zones, after consultation with public and local councils.

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?

By strengthening planning laws that protect our natural and built heritage. If increased densification is official policy, then developers will always appeal to VCAT to have local attempts to preserve heritage over-ruled, and often be successful. Heritage Overlays are already being compromised. Until protection of our natural and built heritage is given greater legislative protection, this will continue.

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

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?

not answered

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?

not answered

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

I am concerned by Section 5.3 39 - Clarify the direction to 'protect the suburbs' - how to resolve contradictions in Plan Melbourne 2014. In particular, 'identifying the rationale for protection .. and the circumstances where protection may not be warranted.' I am concerned that current Heritage Overlays, Residential Zones (especially Neighbourhood Residential), and other ways of protecting areas from inappropriate development, may be undermined. If increased densification is seen as a desirable outcome, heritage and amenity will always be under threat. I am also concerned about the section on Greyfield Renewal. Who determines whether a building is at the end of its physical life? Many older buildings are better constructed and designed than those of today, and may just require some rejuvenation. It seems that such an approach may give a green light to further destruction of our heritage.

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?

not answered

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

Agree

Q55. Why?

not answered

Q56. The discussion paper includes options (options 48 and 49, page 72) to update hazard mapping to promote resilience and avoid unacceptable risk, and update periodically the planning system and supporting legislative and policy frameworks to reflect best available climate change science and data. Do you have any comments on these options?

not answered

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

not answered

Q58. Why?

not answered

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

Q60. **Why?**

not answered

Q61. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 52, page 76) to strengthen high-priority habitat corridors throughout Melbourne and its peri-urban areas to improve long-term health of key flora and fauna habitat. Do you agree with this proposal?**

Q62. **Why?**

not answered

Q63. **The discussion paper includes options (options 53 and 54, pages 78 and 79) to introduce strategies to cool our city including: increasing tree canopy, vegetated ground cover and permeable surfaces; use of Water Sensitive Urban Design and irrigation; and encouraging the uptake of green roofs, facades and walls, as appropriate materials used for pavements and buildings with low heat-absorption properties. What other strategies could be beneficial for cooling our built environment?**

Not destroying natural and built heritage through inappropriate development and densification. Single dwelling houses with eaves, verandahs, thick walls and established large gardens already cool our cities. They are less reliant on greenhouse-gas producing air-conditioners due to their solid construction and shade-creating vegetation. They are the things to be protected (along with parks, gardens and street trees) if we are serious about keeping our built environment cool. Increasing the tree canopy through planting of new trees is an admirable goal, but is rendered meaningless if, at the same time, established gardens with large trees are being destroyed during the process of densification & inappropriate development.

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?

not answered

Q66. **The discussion paper includes options (options 56B and 56C page 80) to strengthen the structure planning process to facilitate future renewable and low emission energy generation technologies in greenfield and urban renewal precincts and require consideration of the costs and benefits of renewable or low-emission energy options across a precinct. Do you agree that the structure planning process should facilitate the uptake of renewable and low-emission technologies in greenfield and urban renewal precincts?**

Agree

Q67. Why?

not answered

Q68. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 57, page 81) to take an integrated approach to planning and building to strengthen Environmentally Sustainable Design, including consideration of costs and benefits. Do you agree that an integrated planning and building approach would strengthen Environmentally Sustainable Design?**

Agree

Q69. Why?

The design of most new developments appears to be done to maximise return for the developer, and hence 'shortcuts' can be taken with design. Lack of insulation, thick walls, eaves, verandahs and gardens create a 'box' structure with little environmental resilience. The installation of air-conditioners and heating appliances at the time of construction is testament to their poor environmental design. New buildings need to be made to conform more closely to the highest possible energy rating.

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

6.1 Challenges and opportunities - Flooding The statement 'as the city develops with more hard surfaces the effects of flooding are magnified' suggests that there is little the State Government can do to prevent the increase in hard surfaces, and hence flooding risks. There is. Stop increasing densification, and stop destroying established gardens. Established large gardens are the best way to absorb water and so reduce the risk of flooding. If you are serious about incorporating climate change into Plan Melbourne, then you need to change the planning laws so natural and built heritage is given more effective protection. 6.4 Melbourne - A Resilient City prepared for Climate Change - Climate Change & Water You can't have increased population & densification and not risk the health of our waterways. Both increase water consumption, and increase the need for water restrictions and/or expensive (greenhouse-gas producing) facilities such as the Desalination Plant, and contamination of our waterways through increased stormwater run-off (as a result of loss of vegetation cover). 6.5 Natural Habitats Again, increased population & densification are a threat to our natural habitats. Developers nearly always want a 'clean slate' to build, so established gardens are removed. Many species (including protected species) rely on established gardens with a diversity of vegetation size, shape and age, to provide shelter and food. Gardens also help create wildlife corridors, connecting parks & treed nature-strips. 'Boutique' gardens will never replace such habitat.

Q71. Please provide your feedback on 'Chapter 7. New planning tools' below. If you do not want to provide feedback on this chapter please selected 'save & continue'.

not answered

Q72. The discussion paper includes options (options 58A and 58B, page 84) to evaluate whether new or existing planning tools (zones and overlays) could be applied to National Employment Clusters and urban renewal areas. Do you have any comments on the planning tools (zones and overlays) needed for National Employment Clusters and urban renewal areas?

not answered

Q73. The discussion paper includes options (options 59A and 59B, page 84) to evaluate the merits of code assessment for multi-unit development, taking into account the findings from the 'Better Apartments' process, to either replace ResCode with a codified process for multi-unit development or identify ResCode standards that can be codified. Do you have any comments on the merits of code assessment for multi-unit development?

not answered

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

not answered

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
