



**Respondent No:** 41

**Login:**

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Dec 16, 2015 21:22:50 pm

**Last Seen:** Dec 16, 2015 10:21:46 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?

Keeping Melbourne as Melbourne as it's becoming more like Sydney & any other ugly cities around the World.

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

NOT destroy some of our beautiful areas for the sake of squeezing as many people in as possible - that's not 'sustainable' for any one who moves to Melbourne.

---

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

There should be a boundary, but you have already gone over it. It should be a radius of 30 km out from the GPO, with a 10 - 15km Green Belt, then start again for another 20 - 30 kms, etc, etc. Metropolitan Melbourne must immediately stop at Eastlink, after which the whole area up to the Dandenongs must be protected as 'Bush Suburban' - even around railways stations, activity centres.

---

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?

Name all places you class as green wedges & listen to the public about whether they think their areas deserve this classification. You're losing current beautiful areas - forever!

---

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?

More green areas in established areas - you don't like what you have, build what you want elsewhere!

---

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**

Only if you don't put big ugly buildings where they don't belong. In this digital age, people can & do live 20 minutes away from everything they need, without destroying those amenities with big, ugly buildings!

---

**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**

Of course, you have to identify all of your plans. What people don't want is any bad plans for their area.

---

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

not answered

---

**Q22. Climate change comments**

The whole east of Eastlink must be reversed back, to as much bush & much smaller buildings ASAP. It is the lungs of Melbourne, where all the pollution in Melbourne ends up, & settles at the foot of the Dandenongs. Inviting more people, to this side of Melbourne is making it worse, with less permeable land. It's the dumping ground for the worst of Melbourne, not the beautiful Dandenong's district it needs to be. Let this part of Melbourne 'breathe' for everyone.

---

**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?**

I only know out here in the East which has way too many industrial areas, with lots of empty factories, which is the only place where any type of apartment should be - in converted factories like closer to the City. All sorts of research type jobs, digital type jobs can be done in all sorts of places without valuable space being taken up with fields of grey roofs - just look at Google Earth - terrible for the foot of the Dandenongs.

---

**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?** Option 21B

---

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

As I previously said we need a reduction in large expanses of grey roofs for all types of industries, and there needs to be all types of industries for all education and ability levels.

---

**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?** Agree

---

**Q27. Why?**

Werribee is in a good place in Victoria and should be much higher density with higher buildings and more of the grey roofs. In the east you are taking away trees, our lungs, for grey roofs. In the west there isn't much difference between the colour of the ground and the colour of the roofs.

---

**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?** Agree

---

**Q29. Why?**

Same as above. Protect the east of Eastlink up until Dandenong, which doesn't have the same green need as the Mt Dandenong district.

---

**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?**

Calling the towns in Knox, Activity Centres is destroying them. They are villages, have only ever worked as villages, and are only an asset to the whole area as villages. Keep them low level (2 storeys) NO apartments, and lots of permeable land around all buildings.

---

**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?**

As previously said - a very wide green belt at a 30km radius around the City. It would be able to incorporate agricultural market garden type land, with larger farms even further out with better roads to get goods where they need to be.

---

**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.**

Mining is the way of the past. All we need, needs to come from the land, recycling & be sustainable - how do you score on that now & in your future plans???

---

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

Look back at the good times & put better policies in place to protect what needs protecting - don't destroy to look of our City & state with ugly buildings which take away everyone's amenity.

---

**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?**

Don't make bad choices about what to put above railway stations going underground. Some IDIOTS took away a beautiful, well used park from us, for yet more ugly shops, when it could have been a town centre with park. Rather than uniting Boronia - they further divided it - MORONS!!!!

---

**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?**

Less buildings, more greenery. Cyclists and pedestrians demand better amenity to do what they need to do. Roads and yet more buildings can create 'road blocks/block bikes.' Think about it - where would you like to walk or ride, even to and from work, school, etc.?

---

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

See above.

---

**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?**

LEAVE ESTABLISHED AREAS ALONE!!! Especially the ones that identified themselves as green & leafy like Knox & many other parts of Melbourne. They had steadily been increasing their populations, but in a way that didn't harm their suburbs much. Now you're bad planning has come along & is absolutely destroying places that should be classed as Tourism areas - beautiful parts of Melbourne people want to see, to go drive around & see the classic style of housing Melbourne should be famous for!

---

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

Scrap it! Put 100,000's more people in the areas you're opening up in the west & north. Leave the green, leafy parts of Melbourne alone. Once they're gone - they're gone forever & you are the idiot architects of that!

---

**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?** Disagree

---

**Q42. Why?**

You can & do open up new land, yet you are not making the most of it. Put the exorbitant number of people you're welcoming to Melbourne, in the places that are screaming out for them! Don't continue to ruin what we have.

---

**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?**

See above & below in other comments.

---

**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?**

Do just that clarify the locations. You need to better protect the traditionally green & leafy parts of Melbourne, like east of Eastlink, not just with low level, 2 storey, classic-styled buildings, but keeping the villages small & low too. Tourism, tourism, tourism! Just when are you going to start valuing suburbs like Boronia & Bayswater, that are looking more like inner city suburbs everyday.

---

**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?**

There are certain places that need more protection than others. Instead of telling us what we have to have, how about listening to what we need. You've treated the towns in Knox as dumping grounds for shoving as many people in as you can, rather than beautifying our areas for Tourism. We want this for all the world's visitors to our area, not just ourselves. Just ask the rest of Melbourne, they all say they don't want to come out here & see more of the same out here.

---

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

not answered

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

Townhouses that are community housing, not housing commission. That way they appreciate their home more. Could even have elevators & have 1 up, 1 down units.

---

**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?**

Stop international students buying housing here, and the international students families AND any other overseas buyers, including companies. This is totally distorting the housing market. Leave our housing and land for our residents and their families. My kids are in their 30's and will never have their own homes. & all of my family - both sides - have been in Australia since the 1850's. How would you feel? If they can't afford to buy, rent goes up, then they need public housing - are all you in power idiots!!!!

---



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

IF YOU DON'T LIKE MELBOURNE THE WAY IT IS – BUILD ANOTHER ONE BESIDE IT! DON'T DESTROY WHAT WE HAVE. It's really sad for Melbourne & Victoria & Australia & the rest of the world that all Victorian Governments think what they're doing is alright. It's clearly not working when you are taking some of the best parts of Melbourne & plonking ugly buildings in them, just to squeeze in as many people as possible. & the excuse that you have to fit more people into the areas with the most amenities is just rubbish. Plenty of areas close to Melbourne & in the Dandenongs have protection from terrible development, so why are you intent on destroying other areas of beauty, when with the stroke of a pen you can protect them? There's plenty of room to the west & north of the City, as well as regional Victoria, that are SCREAMING OUT for lots of buildings, including very tall buildings for lots more people. Put the people where they're wanted before you even think about putting them where they're not wanted! THINK Tourism & all those people coming in from cruise ships & those staying in the City. All the main roads – Maroondah Hwy, Canterbury Rd, Mountain Hwy, Burwood Hwy should all be like wide tree-lined avenues that take them all to the Dandenongs. This is most often the way they'll travel there. Also the railway lines to Lilydale & Belgrave which joins up with Puffing Billy, all the way along should look beautiful on both sides, especially after Ringwood, so if nothing else all they see is beauty around them – not just buildings!!! Even Melbournians want this – ask them! Where are all the Green Belts, Green wedges & Green zones???????? Suburban Melbourne needs to stop at Eastlink. Everything past that should be 'Bush Suburban' and protected. You desperately have to make a 15km Green Belt around Mt Dandenong, keeping the whole area, not just the East side of Dorset Rd, no more than 2 storeys & NO APARTMENTS, just row upon rows of townhouses similar to inner city Melbourne. Apartments can be award winning, but are butt ugly when built out here. They do not fit in. They are too bulky & only suitable for closer to the City. Just because there are railway stations out here, don't destroy these beautiful areas. Make towns like Bayswater, Boronia, Ferntree Gully, Scoresby, Wantirna & Rowville into villages with townhouses around them. When a tourist bus comes here they should be picking which village they'd like to stop at, either on the way to the Dandenongs for morning tea, or on the way back for afternoon tea. Instead of these places being so ugly no one even knows they're passing through them. All of Knox & a lot of Maroondah should be geared towards Tourism. They should be part of the district of Mount Dandenong, similar to the 'Peak district' & the 'Lakes district' in England. They make buildings fit in with the areas. They make the architects go back to the drawing board many times if their buildings don't fit in with the surrounds, why is Melbourne so far behind England???? And there are many other beautiful parts of Melbourne that must stay green & low level with lots of permeable land for gardens, to give this city a chance to breath. That's what Melbourne isn't doing at the moment – given a chance to breath. We are being crowded in & looking like any other city anywhere else, not our lovely Melbourne. In fact we're looking more like Sydney every day!!!! Except more miserable in winter. East of Eastlink should be geared towards Tourism – don't build more buildings for people to live here, but beautify what we have to attract Tourists who visit then leave. Leave some of our beautiful older homes for Guest Houses. Lend the owners the money to do this & put a caveat on the properties to get your money back. We are the lungs of Melbourne, where all the pollution from Melbourne drifts over to, only to settle at the foot of the Dandenongs & give us all asthma. We need more trees & lots & lots of permeable land for more gardens. & classic styles of homes, townhouses. We need Traditional styled homes & shops, as modern just looks butt ugly out here. You have one chance to get it right & currently you are getting it so wrong!

---

**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?**

Only if they don't destroy the beautiful parts of Melbourne they are currently destroying

---

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?

---

Q55. Why?

Same as above

---

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?

Same as 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?

---

Q58. Why?

Same as 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?

---

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?

Same as above

---

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?**

Leave all the areas that identified as green & leafy, as green & leafy. Knox used to value it's permeable land. Your bad housing strategies have thrown this in the garbage. Permeable land is so important out here & keeping our activity centres as villages which also have lots of permeable land is just as important - stop the bad buildings!

---

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?

Same as all above

---

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?

Same as all above

---

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?**

Same as all above

---

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

If you don't destroy what you've got.

---

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?**

Everything about traditionally green & leafy areas should be kept including if they are classed as an NEC. These areas could have their industrial zones cleaned up a lot and 'greened' up a lot.

---

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?**

The traditionally green & leafy areas should be identified as not being suitable for multi-unit development. Would you cut down all the trees on Mount Dandenong & put 4 storey apartments all over it? You could with the stroke of a pen! Stop destroying the whole Knox area next to it. Protect us with the stroke of a pen!

---

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

ResCode and VCAT have made some really bad decisions all around Knox. Even going against local planning strategies and residents wishes. But they say they're allowable 'for these types of buildings'. We just can't have these types of buildings out here AT ALL!

---

**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?**

I strongly believe you should have a 30 year strategy. Where you tell residents what you're going to do in 30 years - no less. This way families can grow up in their own home, the elderly will naturally pass on to somewhere else, but everyone who buys a property will know exactly what is going to happen next door to them on a certain date. To wake up one morning to a monstrosity next door to you is totally unacceptable. Put more people where they are desperately wanted & stop imposing them on people already here!

---

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

See above

---

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

See above - STOP SCREWING IT UP FOR ALL OF US! WHEN I DO EVENTUALLY SELL, DON'T BUILD ANYTHING FOR ME - I'M NOT STAYING HERE. IT'S GETTING UGLIER & UGLIER WITH EVERY BAD BUILDING BUILT HERE. YOU'VE DESTROYED BORONIA & BAYSWATER WITH VERY BAD PLANNING DECISIONS - 99% OF RESIDENTS OUT HERE THINK THIS WAY TOO - & THEY ALL VOTE!

---