



Respondent No: 38

Login:

Email:

Responded At: Dec 16, 2015 13:30:44 pm

Last Seen: Dec 16, 2015 02:29:27 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

Cardinia Shire Council

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?

No

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 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?

Disagree

Q14. Please explain your response

In relation to the urban growth boundary, Council supports the urban growth boundary for metropolitan urban area being locked down. However Council does not believe that this should apply to townships within the green wedge areas. The growth of townships within the green wedge areas should be allowed based on a town strategy developed in consultation with DELWP and the local community. Such strategies need to address green wedge values in the areas surrounding the town to ensure that they are protected and the level of growth appropriate to support the ongoing sustainability of the town. Such towns provide an important alternative lifestyle choice for people which is part of the housing diversity that makes Melbourne a more liveable city.?

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?

not answered

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

not answered

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

not answered

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

Council acknowledges that the majority of Plan Melbourne remains in place and enjoys bipartisan support. In particular, Council welcomes a stronger position on environmental resilience and sustainability, as it had previously raised concerns in its submission to Plan Melbourne in relation to the failure of the plan to address climate change impacts.

Q22. Climate change comments

not answered

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

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?

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?

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?

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?

Council supports initiatives in Plan Melbourne Refresh to protect strategic agricultural land around Melbourne and to evaluate the range of planning mechanisms to support this outcome. As noted in Council's submission to Plan Melbourne: "Council supports the directions in relation to enhancing the food production capability of Melbourne and its non urban areas including protecting high quality agricultural land for food production. This element of the strategy supports plans for the Bunyip Food Belt which requires planning protection from future urban encroachment to warrant the necessary investment required in water infrastructure to bring this food production project to fruition. Projects such as the Bunyip Food Belt should be a critical part of securing agricultural production in the peri urban areas for Melbourne's future." In addition to planning mechanisms, the state government should consider what other actions and infrastructure investments it can make to support food production capability in Melbourne's green wedge and peri urban areas.

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.

There has been little information or consultation in relation to the workings of the taskforce, and Council is concerned that the taskforces recommendation may be implemented without a more holistic view of the impact of extractive industry operations. Council is supportive of the protection of extractive industry resources, but notes that these resources are often in locations which contain other green wedge values (eg: biodiversity, landscape, agriculture). Therefore it should be acknowledged in Plan Melbourne that extraction operations should only occur where environmental, social and economic impacts can be appropriately managed.?

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

Council is significantly concerned at the removal of the commitment to the Port of Hastings and the downplaying of the importance of the South East Airport in the Plan Melbourne Refresh Discussion Paper. The Port of Hastings and South East Airport are critical long term drivers of economic development in Melbourne's south east and need to be included in Plan Melbourne.

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?

not answered

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?

not answered

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

Council notes the changes proposed in Plan Melbourne Refresh to include the Melbourne Metro Rail Tunnel Project and the upgrading of the rail line between Dandenong and Caulfield to remove all level crossings. Council is supportive of these projects as major catalyst projects for how the city operates. This is supported by Council's previous submission to Plan Melbourne which acknowledged: "Given congestion on our transport infrastructure is a major pressure for future growth and that transport underpins the liveability, economic prosperity, efficiency and success of cities, it is critical that a strong commitment is given to transport projects to transform Melbourne. The delivery of the Melbourne Metro Project will unlock significant capacity increases in the metropolitan rail system, particularly on the Dandenong line (which services Cardinia) for passenger, regional rail and freight services, and Council submits it should be given a high priority. Delivery of this project should be completed in the medium term rather than the longer term as a catalyst project. Projects such as the removal of level crossings need to be planned more strategically, such as the removal of all level crossings on the Dandenong line between Caulfield and Oakleigh (x4) rather than just focusing on the Murumbeena Road crossing." The priority for the development of a second container port in Melbourne has been down played in Plan Melbourne Refresh with the recommendation of seeking independent advice on a second container port for Melbourne including Hastings and Bay West. Significant population growth within the Casey Cardinia Region needs to be supported by jobs growth which is greater than the jobs created as a direct result of servicing population growth. Previous work undertaken by the City of Casey and Shire of Cardinia identified the Port of Hastings as a critical project to deliver economic development in Melbourne's South East to support job creation over and above just servicing population growth. Council strongly submits that a container port at the Port of Hastings should be an integral part of a metropolitan strategy for Melbourne. Council is extremely disappointed that an airport for Melbourne's south east has not been identified as a priority for Melbourne due to capacity at Tullamarine and Avalon. This issue is not just about capacity at Tullamarine and Avalon, but the ability of businesses and people in Melbourne's south and east to access the airport in an efficient and timely manner. The projected growth of Melbourne and associated increases in transport congestion over the next 30 years suggest that this is not achievable. As with the Port of Hastings, the south east airport is a critical project to deliver economic development in Melbourne's South East to support job creation. Council submits that the actions currently contained in Plan Melbourne should be retained and implemented as follows:

- A short term action (within 4 years) to confirm a preferred site for the airport
- A medium term action (within the next 11 years) to investigate a process for private sector investment in the development of the airport and examine land transport needs for a future airport.

Council previously submitted to Plan Melbourne that the Thompsons Road Corridor between Carrum and Pakenham needs to be recognised as a priority strategic project for the south east of Melbourne given the limited east west connectivity within the region, the capacity to significantly improve access to the Dandenong South Employment Cluster and Cardinia Employment Corridor, and the capacity to link Eastlink to the Westernport Highway (Port of Hastings Corridor) and Kooweerup Road Corridor. Council is pleased to see that the state government has committed significant funds to the development of this corridor between Frankston Dandenong Road and Clyde Rd. Council reaffirms its position that the Thompsons Road Corridor should be recognised as a strategic transport corridor in Plan Melbourne to facilitate its ongoing development.?

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?

Agree

Q39. Why?

The target is considered to be a sound aspiration for a metropolitan strategy which seeks to limit outward urban growth and consolidate growth in established urban areas. The current rate of growth in growth areas needs to be acknowledged, particularly given that it is concentrated development in an area with limited infrastructure and services as opposed to a “salt and pepper” approach to new development in established areas. Plan Melbourne Refresh needs to acknowledge the need for appropriate investment in infrastructure and services to support development within growth areas.

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?	Agree
---	-------

Q42. Why?

Council notes within the recommendations of the Ministerial Advisory Committee appended to the Plan Melbourne Refresh Discussion Paper a recommendation for a minimum of 25 dwellings per hectare in growth areas. A blanket increase to 25 dwellings per hectare is not supported in the context of:

- The ability of the market to deliver appropriate housing products.
- The need to adequately address transport congestion on both the road and public transport network.
- Adequate accessibility to services and jobs.
- The need to achieve improved urban design outcomes within growth areas.

Opportunities for increases in housing density should be clearly identified in appropriate locations in precinct structure plans to achieve sustainable outcomes. Council notes within the recommendations of the Ministerial Advisory Committee appended to the Plan Melbourne Refresh Discussion Paper a recommendation for the preparation of a list of basic community services and facilities to be delivered in first stage of development and caps on further development until services and facilities delivered. The recommendation is a nice idea, but displays a lack of understanding about urban development processes within growth areas, and is impractical particularly in terms of delivering meaningful services and facilities within the first stage of development. It would be more logical to require a staging plan which identifies the triggers for the delivery of community services and infrastructure to ensure the timely delivery of services and infrastructure. This should also apply to state infrastructure such as schools, as the current delivery approach is based on a year by year annual budgeting process rather than a meaningful delivery plan over a period of time.

Q43. The discussion paper includes the option (option 36C, page 46) to focus metropolitan planning on unlocking housing supply in established areas, particularly within areas specifically targeted for growth and intensification. Do you agree with this idea?	not answered
--	--------------

Q44. Why?

not answered

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?

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?

not answered

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?

not answered

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?

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)?

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?

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 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?

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?**

not answered

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'.**

Council notes that the Plan Melbourne Refresh Discussion paper contains a number of new planning tools to give effect to strategic actions and to improve the efficiency of planning schemes. Council is generally supportive of the new planning tools proposed, and would welcome the opportunity to be involved in further consultation on the development and implementation of these provisions.

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
