



Respondent No: 13

Login:

Email:

Responded At: Dec 09, 2015 13:34:30 pm

Last Seen: Dec 09, 2015 02:34:05 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 Reopen Our Schools

Q4. Please select from one of the options below I am making this submission on behalf of an organisation. Submissions by organisations will be published including the name of the organisation.

Q5. Contact email

Q6. Name of person making submission on behalf of organisation

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?

Yes. There appears to be very little consideration to the building and re-establishment of Government schools as part of the the creation of the concept of the polycentric 20 minute city. Many communities have had these community facilities removed. Planning must include access for families to government schools. This is consistent with the concept of people, place identify being given greater prominence. Children must be given the opportunity to walk to school to help stave off problems with obesity and to combat an otherwise sedentary lifestyle that is car dependent.

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

The synopsis provided sounds good, but without being able to read the full explanation of what those terms mean, it is a bit hard to give anything other than a qualified opinion. Economic prosperity, Social inclusion and Environmental sustainability sound great. But these concepts must be balanced against each other. Government schools are important hubs and provide an important aspect of social inclusion and cohesion. Yet Plan Melbourne barely if at all mentions public schools. More needs to be done to include the rebuilding and development of government primary and secondary schools to any polycentric city.

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?

Disagree

Q14. Please explain your response

By locking down the growth boundary does this mean that where houses used to have one house, they will now be bought by property developers and replaced with 4 houses? This places extreme pressures on existing infrastructure. I don't think it is responsible or sustainable to lock down growth boundaries without having a discussion in tandem about how services and public infrastructure like roads, public transport., hospitals and schools are going to built or supported to take the increased demand in population increase brought on by the increased number of dwellings and population. This would be counter to the principles discussed of having better local communities as this would not be sustainable, responsible or balanced.

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?

These important areas need to be protected from property developers and over-development. These concepts need to be embedded in long term planning around the safeguarding of existing green wedges and Peri-urban areas. Legislating the protection of the existing green wedges/peri-urban areas would be a good start with the development of a government authority to protect and manage these areas would be appropriate. Or responsibility be given to Parks Victoria to manage. These areas should be listed in legislation, with any changes for de-listing requiring bi-partisan support to be changed in the parliament.

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?

You must include the provision of government public schools are part of education precincts, but you should also include cultural and/or artistic precincts as well. Also Open space and sporting precincts need to be shown as well.

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?

Disagree

Q18. Please explain your response

No because I can't see how public schools fit into that concept.

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?

Strongly Disagree

Q20. Please explain your response

Livability and use and enjoyment of the neighbourhood must be paramount. Reliance on cars must be reduced. We have to be smarter about how neighbourhoods are developed these days and balance the responsible and sustainable growth with out and out developer greed with no responsibility after housing is built.

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

No

Q22. Climate change comments

We must take action on climate change. Conservative politics are beholden to coal based and property developer based lobby group interests. We must make sure that we leave the planet in a good state for the next generation (our kids). To do otherwise is irresponsible. We live in country with an abundance of natural, renewable resources. We should capitalise on that.

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?**

Public Transport must aid people getting around. It has to be accessible, functional and centrally available to access. We just can't keep stacking more and more cars on the road. Gridlock is already apparent in many places in Melbourne. It will only get worse, not better.

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?

We must embrace a cycling culture like is the case in Europe and parts of Asia. We used to have a walking culture in Australia. The removal of public schools in many suburbs has had a big impact on that. Most kids used to walk to schools in the 1970, or ride their bikes.

and riding again to schools, and out of mum and dad's car!!

Get kids out walking

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

not answered

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?

There is too much pressure on existing infrastructure. I live in the suburbs because I didn't want to live in a crowded inner city space. On the one hand Plan Melbourne talks about lockign down urban sprawl, but then you talk about intensifying suburban living spaces without matching infrastructure or improving services. That is a recipe for disaster, as increasing business and population in suburban areas will only increase travel times to work in the city. Unless and until actiivty centres are defined better, adn more and more workplaces go out to suburban areas, this is just a pipe dream. There has been a loss of traditional manufacturing jobs that used to be in suburban areas. There was a sudden shift in the 80's to services based jobs as part of the shift in the economy and most of these jobs are in city areas, not suburban. Unless job creation occurs at the same rate in suburban areas, this idea will fail.

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

None, because this idea is a bad idea.

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?

Agree

Q42. Why?

It would be good to manage any demands on land supply needs as things may rapidly change and things may need to be re-assessed.

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?**

Things are already busy and overcrowded. This just detracts from livability. Also because of the lack of public schools, it actually artificially pushes up the cost of housing in and around so called 'desirable' public schools. You have to carefully manage this and take into account local issues, such as access to local government schools .

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 37A

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?**

Develop some kind of protection index that rates areas needing protection as low, medium or high depending on the character of the area, which might include areas such as aboriginal or other cultural or historical factors that include history or architectural significance to Melbourne.

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?**

See above. But you must have a balanced and sustainable approach to development. The property developers are rampant at the moment. Again, another index could be developed to look at overall development applications, introduction of plot ratios on sites for eg like has occurred in the city. Many developments over-capitalize on the site, and build on 90%+ leaving very little land. This creates other problems and also contributes to loss of valuable vegetation and grass which absorbs rain water run off. Unless rainwater is harvested, this also puts more pressure on urban drainage systems. Stronger penalties must also be developed and enforcement mechanisms to deal with people who break by laws or thumb their nose at development controls.

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

Option 40B

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?

I'm not sure that relaxing planning controls around renovations/redevelopments are a good idea, because this would allow the changing of neighbourhood character by stealth. Changes should be allowed, but only within the existing footprint of the building on the land and/or building envelope.

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?

I think you have to bite the bullet and go with option 45A. You have to provide social and affordable housing to people in affluent and desirable areas. This increases social cohesion and access things like education resources in higher SES areas, will improve the life chances of people from a low SES background.

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

not answered

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?

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?

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 answered

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?** Strongly agree

Q65. Why?

Because we can't keep stinking up our planet without dire consequences!

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

Q67. Why?

See 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?**

See above.

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

not answered

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?**

Replace res-code. It is out of date. A more up to date approach is required.

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?**

Disagree. What happens if a conservative government gets in and changes tact? You would be better served to implement it over the short term.

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

Unsure

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

No
