



**Respondent No:** 60

**Login:**

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Dec 17, 2015 19:07:45 pm

**Last Seen:** Dec 17, 2015 08:06:58 am

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

- 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 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?**

Other opportunities for sustainable developments in Nillumbik are along the Eltham-Diamond Creek-Wattle Glen-Hurstbridge rail corridor, all services electricity, gas, sewer, phone are available. The rail corridor, whilst some portions may be outside the current UGB, provides a unique opportunity for development as all services, are currently available, are mostly underutilised and the area is undeveloped. NB. The Planning & Environment Act 1987 4. Objectives (1) (a) P&E Act 1987 "to provide the fair orderly, economic & sustainable development of land".

---

**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?** Strongly Disagree

**Q12. Please explain your response**

This would increase the complexity of an already complex system in Victoria. Would greatly lessen "economic prosperity Do little or nothing for social inclusion The words environmentally sustainable has been in use in Nillumbik as a tool to restrict development. As Nillumbik is not environmentally sensitive, with adequate vegetation reserves elsewhere therefore we say development on the above mentioned rail corridor would be sustainable using your criteria.

---

**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**

No research was done on where/why the boundaries were placed other than where development had already occurred or where development was designated at the time. Nillumbik is a Metropolitan Shire and should be viewed as a Metropolitan Shire. The UGB forces land and house prices up Land capability study has not been done The UGB is not sustainable and only serves as land banking which eventually only benefits developers. It is contrary to the The Planning & Environment Act 1987 4. Objectives (1) (a)P & E Act 1987 "to provide for the fair orderly, economic and sustainable use, and development of land". The current growth corridor of Whittlesea is testament to this as it is on one of the most endangered ecosystems in Victoria with less than 5% remaining.

---

**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?**

Nillumbik is a Metropolitan Shire. All the talk about Green Wedges over the past few years has been about, in this document, how to 'articulate' their values, in other words a 'sales pitch' that they (GW) need protection. As in Q3 above the answer the Nillumbik Green Wedge is not environmentally sensitive or endangered. We expect the same applies to other Green Wedges.

---

**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?**

This is very vague, but a full answer would be complex and very long. One issue that is obvious is the need to have road transport corridors to service the city, activity centres, and industrial centres where there is minimum need for delivery vehicles to use local roads and the completion of the ring road from Greensborough to Ringwood should be the priority. The proposed link Greensborough through Banyule is ludicrous and will exacerbate traffic and stress residents.

---

**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?**

not answered

---

**Q18. Please explain your response**

The NRA support the concept of a 'polycentric' city' which in many areas already exists due to years of private sector investment. Nillumbik has a unique opportunity for the 'polycentric' concept to adapt the green belt land between Eltham (Allendale Road new station) Diamond Creek, Wattle-glen and Hurstbridge. A polycentric grid network particularly from Diamond Creek – Wattle Glen – Hurstbridge could be a model of 'worlds best practice' with trails linking centres, this would require planning on concentric rings (of approximately 3 Ks) radiating out from rail stations/activity centres and neighbourhood places. Much of the trail network/neighbourhood places would be funded by developer contributions. This would also eliminate the current private rail crossings.

---

**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**

Local Government should be there to implement State Government planning policies. Currently each local government area has differing views (policies, planning requirements) which only adds to the cost of any development. The State must plan for the state and local government should only ever play an advisory role to the state in regard to overlays and planning restrictions.

---

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

Nillumbik is a Metropolitan Shire and should be viewed and developed as a metropolitan shire. There is no reason not to develop Nillumbik as it is not environmentally sensitive and already has all services available in the Eltham to Hurstbridge rail corridor including main trunk-line sewer. Basic infrastructure should be installed prior to commencement of development. Areas like Doreen/Laurimar should not have commenced until a complete operating main sewer was provided. The current rising main, for liquid waste and solid waste removal by truck is highly inappropriate in this day and age.

---

**Q22. Climate change comments**

NO COMMENT

---

**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?**

NO COMMENT

---

**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**

NO COMMENT

---

**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?**

This is not relevant as a name changes nothing and only serves to confuse everyone.

---

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 yet relevant as is only a name change see answer to question 11.

---

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?**

no comment.

---

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?**

High quality agricultural land must be protected and used for agriculture. Much quality agricultural land has been developed for housing as it is the easy option as the land is generally flat and cleared. Werribee, Cranbourne, Narre Warren, Berwick ect. Only a very small portion of Nillumbik can be classified as quality agricultural land. Most of Nillumbik is rocky and has shallow soils and Nillumbik is better suited to housing. The vegetation is largely scrubby regrowth.

---

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.**

We agree in principle, provided extractive industries not allowed on quality agricultural land, or within 2ks of urban areas. The CSG industries, wind turbines industry need much further investigation.

---

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

The completion of the M80 ring road Greensborough – Ringwood missing link section is the only real option as it will help keep heavy vehicles off urban roads and be beneficial for the environment by cutting carbon emissions. It will also cut the cost of deliveries and assist job growth.

---

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?** Strongly Agree

---

**Q35. Why?**

Strongly agree Land use and transport networks are inextricably linked. This is why the Eltham to Hurstbridge rail corridor with all services available should be fully developed.

---

**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?**

See question 6. Development along the Eltham Hurstbridge rail corridor (with other services available) could be planned as a model polycentric area where trails are already planned and could be further developed if the area was released for housing. Developer contributions could fund most, if not all of this and would be worlds best practice and possibly carbon neutral if properly designed.

---

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

Completing the M80 ring road (Greensborough to Ringwood) missing link in Melbourne connected. This incomplete transport route around Melbourne is a stifling development and jobs and is a major contributor to Melbourne's green house gas contribution.

---

<b>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?</b>	Strongly Disagree
--	-------------------

---

**Q39. Why?**

strongly disagree The Planning & Environment Act 1987 4. Objectives (1) (a) "to provide the fair orderly, economic & sustainable development of land". Whilst the rail corridor between Eltham and Hurstbridge with all services available remains undeveloped it makes a mockery of the above objective under the Act.

---

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

Review the UGB so it is in line with the stated objective of housing along existing transport corridors with all services available. eg. Eltham – Hurstbridge.

---

<b>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?</b>	not answered
---	--------------

---

**Q42. Why?**

In principle agree Development established should not be forced to redevelop. New area developments eg. growth corridors should have high rise (as in major European cities) near transport links rail stations and major activity centres. Eg South Morang.

---

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?

Growth Corridors are a major influence in raising land and house prices. Also see Q20, 21, 22

---

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?

---

Other

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?

State Government should survey 'Heritage' for protection. Value Character' is an undefined term and open to interpretation by any person, particularly planners, at any given time to obtain any outcome.

---

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?

"Inappropriate development" is the most overused and abused term now used in planning, it is an imprecise term used by local government and local pressure groups to stifle development. The term 'inappropriate development' should be banned from use in planning.

---

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?

---

Other

**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?**

The current planning schemes are too complex, too restrictive, contradictory and conflicting and are in the most part indecipherable by the average person. In evidence to the Victorian Bushfire Royal Commission (VBRC) [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said 'planning schemes are so complicated even planners have difficulty interpreting them'. Make the planning schemes usable by all. This would necessitate using the VPP's and SPPF and severely restricting local government input.

**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?**

Affordable housing Remove the UGB, restriction is the greatest impediment to affordable housing. Remove local government input/authority in planning. It is not the private sector's job to provide social housing, this is the responsibility of the state and federal governments.

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

It is the responsibility of the federal and state governments to supply public and social housing. Limit bureaucratic participation in planning.

**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?** Strongly Disagree

**Q53. Why?**

strongly disagree. The only thing these initiatives will achieve is an increase in the level of bureaucracy and the number of bureaucrats. It is contrary to all previous questions on housing affordability, and will make everything more complex and more costly,

**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?** not answered

**Q55. Why?**

There is a need for accountability in planning. Local government in Nillumbik use overlays and policy to restrict development. A bushfire management overlay (BMO) should be applied to the whole of Nillumbik, and some adjoining shires to protect human life, property and the environment. This overlay would need to be part of the VPP's so that it can be enforced, so that local government (Nillumbik) are forced to clean up (modify fire fuel) to protect their residents and visitors. Where a local overlay may be detrimental to the safety of people, property or the environment it must be removed. Many overlays in Nillumbik, in our opinion, are putting residents in danger. Refer the Packham and Incoll Reports 2003 (previously presented to Victorian Governments on numerous occasions).

---

**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?**

Climate science and bushfire management in Nillumbik. Few, if any properties in Nillumbik, with proper planning controls, hazard reduction as per the VBRC would be classified as posing an 'unacceptable risk'. The risk, which on Black Saturday killed 41 residents of Nillumbik, according to the VBRC was mainly due to the lack of fuel reduction within Nillumbik and surrounding areas. Updating 'hazard mapping' without strong and mandated ' fire hazard reduction policies' will only indicate how much more danger we are in in each successive year. While the state government has been lax in the area of fuel reduction, not meeting the VBRC recommendation to reduce fuel by 5 to 8% with a minimum of 5% per annum. Local government has made little effort in this area other than to make efforts to legislate for no build areas because of lack of fuel reduction. The current state government policy of ' asset protection' is undefined and the public have no idea of how 'assets ' are defined, or what priority is given to what or where.

---

**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?**

Natural hazard management criteria in Victoria. The state government and all councils have ' a duty of care ' for the safety of its citizens, in Nillumbik that ' duty of care ' relates mainly to the extreme bushfire risk to this area which still remains high to extreme even 6 years after Black Saturday. Hazard management has been lacking in Victoria particularly in the area of bushfire fuel mitigation. You, the state government, have been seriously lacking in your duty of care to the residents and beyond by not meeting the VBRC recommendations to reduce fuel loads by 5 to 8% pa with a minimum of 5% pa. Now changing to a ' asset protection ' system which has not been explained and not articulated as to what and how ' assets ' are assessed.

---

**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?** not answered

---

Q60. Why?

A structured approach for infrastructure planning is necessary as the risks with or without climate change are the same or similar.

---

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?** Strongly disagree

---

Q62. Why?

strongly disagree Habitat corridors particularly in the peri urban ( fringe ) areas of Melbourne should only be on Public Land and must be maintained in a bushfire safe manner. Currently these so called corridors particularly on public land are generally not managed in a bushfire safe manner, they should be accompanied by an appropriate ' bushfire management plan', which reduces the fuel loads. This management plan must be mandated and enforceable by the state government as local government have proven not to be trustworthy in this type of management.

---

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?**

Bushfires know no boundaries All peri urban residents and beyond should be horrified with options 53 and 54. Options 53 and 54 could only have been written by an inner city yuppie planner who did not experience Black Saturday. These options might be given some credence if it was stated that European trees were to be used. In Nillumbik, overlays, neighbourhood character statements and the proposed overlays of C81 and C101 and ' landscape values.' mean more and more eucalypt fire flora will be planted without an accompanying ' bushfire management plan '. Nillumbik currently has over 80% tree cover. One only wonders how many deaths will it take before the state government regulates to protect its citizens.

---

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?** not answered

---

**Q65. Why?**

Option for discussion 55. There is a unique opportunity in Nillumbik to ' facilitate an innovative demonstration project in greenfield ' development, along the Eltham Diamond Creek to Hurstbridge rail corridor. This rail corridor contains all services, including mains sewer and gas, would be classified as greenfield and is not in an environmentally endangered area as is the Laurimar Doreen development. Most if not all landowners in this area are amenable to some type of development. This could be done as a Public Private Partnership, to ensure development as a research project incorporating best practice in design and planning. Planting would need to be considerate of the bushfire risk perhaps by using European flora which has proven to more people friendly in a bushfire.

---

**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?**

---

not answered

**Q67. Why?**

see above option 55 discussion.

---

**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?**

---

not answered

**Q69. Why?**

? All buildings (houses) in Victoria should be built to the BAL 19 regulations as the standard building standard for all housing in Victoria other than those in the higher BAL zones.

---

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

see previous comments on this section including comments on option 55.

---

**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?**

NB. In evidence to the VBRC Margaret Abby for the MAV said 'planning schemes are so complicated even planners have difficulty interpreting them'. The VPP's and the SPPF should be simplified so they can be understood and interpreted by the average person. Local government should be restricted in their ability to add overlays, character assessments, ect to the planning process and changes should be restricted to two times a year.

---

**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 objective must be to make planning controls simple at all levels so they are easily understood by the average person.

---

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

simplify and shorten the VPP's, SPPF's and restrict local government input which is generally used as a tool to stop development.

---

**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?**

"a rolling implementation plan". This sounds like planning waffle that has been used by the group writing this document and not explained to the public. The public must be informed on how the system works, where it is going and how it will get there. If this is what is meant by a 'rolling implementation plan' then we agree.

---

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

Simplicity is the key to good planning with as few regulations and restrictions as possible.

---

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

As above.

---