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The Victorian Government is preparing a refresh of Plan Melbourne 2014. A refresh discussion paper was prepared to guide a targeted conversation with local government, industry stakeholders and the community.

The engagement process ran from 22 October to 18 December 2015 when the Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper was available for comment. It involved six workshops with local government, two industry stakeholder workshops, six community discussion groups with ‘hard to reach’ members of the community and an online engagement hub.

During this time, 266 participants representing 99 organisations contributed to the discussion about the Plan Melbourne refresh. Through the engagement activities 3292 individual comments were collected about the discussion paper. Each comment has been coded to form an analysis of the key discussion areas for each chapter of the discussion paper.

The engagement findings can be summarised by the following frequently provided messages to the Minister for Planning:

- Plan Melbourne 2016 should be adopted as a whole-of-government document that guides land-use planning across all portfolios and departments. It should be used as a tool to prioritise Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) funding for infrastructure and its delivery.

- Local government and industry stakeholders should be involved in the preparation of the implementation plan. There should be stronger sub-regional partnerships between local and state government with local government playing a role in the decision making process.

- Housing affordability needs to be addressed through a holistic approach that includes both the private, public and not for profit sectors.

- A metropolitan housing strategy should be developed that provides an integrated approach for identifying where new housing should be located. There should be a range of housing choices built using environmentally sustainable design (ESD) as well as being adaptable to change with people as they move through different stages of their lives. The strategy should set mandatory minimum requirements about quality, density and choice.

Capire observed high levels of support for the inclusion of climate change and resilience within the discussion paper. However, participants frequently requested that resilience should be a common thread throughout the whole document to ensure Melbourne and Victoria is prepared for climate change. There was overwhelming support for government’s commitment to refresh Plan Melbourne to include additional consideration of climate change, housing and a stronger focus on implementation.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT CONTEXT

The Victorian Government is refreshing Plan Melbourne 2014 - the strategic planning document that provides a blueprint for planning the next 30 years. It is an integrated land use plan for Melbourne’s future that considers housing, employment and transport. The government recognises that there was extensive stakeholder and community consultation undertaken to inform the development of Plan Melbourne 2014, and that around 75% of the final document has bipartisan support. The refresh is focused on housing affordability and diversity, climate change and energy efficiency as well as the fundamental concepts included in Plan Melbourne 2014.

A Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper (discussion paper) was prepared to outline what would remain in the refresh document and the key concepts and initiatives the government was seeking feedback on.

Capire Consulting Group was contracted by the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) to undertake a targeted community and stakeholder engagement process. It ran between 22 October and 18 December 2015 on the discussion paper through a range of face to face and online engagement activities with local government, industry stakeholders and community groups.

1.2 PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report describes the engagement process and provides an analysis of the key discussion areas using participant feedback for each chapter of the discussion paper to support DELWP to prepare Plan Melbourne 2016. Capire would like to thank the participants who generously shared their ideas, feedback and energy through the engagement activities.

1.1 READING THIS REPORT

To assist general interpretation and use by DELWP policy officers, this report has been purposefully structured to align with the Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper chapter outline. Each report chapter provides a snapshot of the most discussed items per discussion paper chapter, what participant groups discussed most for that chapter, as well as an analysis of the most discussed points.
1.3 LIMITATIONS

There are a number of limitations regarding the engagement methodology and analysis of the findings that should be acknowledged. These are outlined below.

- Capire worked with DELWP to determine the focus of the engagement activity for each of the different participant groups which resulted in variances in the agenda questions.

- The Community Discussion Groups were not intended to be a representative sample of Melbourne; rather an opportunity to discuss and test the discussion paper with community cohorts who may not always have an opportunity to participate in a discussion about strategic planning.

- Participants’ comments were classified according to a data tagging code that best described them. Some comments could have been described by more than one code but this was not done as this would have led to a double handling and a misrepresentation of the data. A very small number of comments could not be coded because they were not related to the core themes.

- The total number of comments were not adjusted by the number of participants per participant group. Therefore there will be some bias arising from meetings where there were a large number of participants.

- Detailed participant demographic data (for example, gender) was not always available (for example, on online surveys) or collected so data was aggregated at the level of participant type (for example, local government, industry stakeholder, community discussion group).
2. HOW WE ENGAGED

2.1 ENGAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

The engagement activities undertaken for the Plan Melbourne refresh have been oriented on the International Association of Public Participation’s (IAP2) Public Participation Spectrum (see Table 1 below). The spectrum is based on the premise that different stakeholders have different levels of involvement in decision making.

The engagement intent for the refresh has been on the ‘Inform & educate’ and ‘Consult’ end of the spectrum. It is intended that at the end of the project participants will be informed about how their involvement has or has not influenced the refreshed Plan Melbourne.

Due to the intent of the Plan Melbourne refresh, it should also be noted that ‘Inform’ has been expanded to ‘Inform & educate.’ The rationale is that not all participants have a technical planning background and have been provided with materials to understand the project’s key concepts, planning rationale and related government policies.

The Victorian Auditor-General’s Office (VAGO) public participation in government decision-making guidelines were also referenced in designing the engagement approach for the refresh.

2.2 PLAN MELBOURNE REFRESH ENGAGEMENT PURPOSE

The purpose of the engagement was to:

- provide information about the scope of the refresh
- use the discussion paper as a resource/educative tool about the refresh changes and options
- seek feedback from the community on the changes and options outlined in the discussion paper.

2.3 ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Engagement on the Plan Melbourne refresh primarily occurred through face to face engagement activities that were either a discussion group or workshop through invitation. A list of event dates is provided at Appendix 1. An online engagement hub was specifically developed for the Plan Melbourne refresh and included two different engagement modules to seek participation from the broader community. The engagement activities for each participant group are outlined in the Table 2 overleaf. More detail about the participants, engagement purpose, session design, engagement questions, feedback collection and supporting communications materials is at Appendix 2.
### Table 1
IAP2 Engagement Spectrum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal:</th>
<th>Promise to Stakeholders:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORM &amp; EDUCATE</strong></td>
<td>To provide stakeholders with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the issues, alternatives and opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSULT</strong></td>
<td>To obtain stakeholder feedback on options and/or decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVOLVE</strong></td>
<td>To work directly with stakeholders throughout the process to ensure that their concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLABORATE</strong></td>
<td>To partner with stakeholders in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPOWER</strong></td>
<td>To place final decision making in the hands of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANT GROUP AND ENGAGEMENT INTENT</td>
<td>ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three-hour workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General community</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek ideas in response to brainstormer questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hard to reach community groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build capacity about strategic planning to seek feedback on refresh discussion paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local government</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information about refresh, seek feedback on the discussion paper and provide opportunities for participants to ask questions to assist in council’s submission preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry stakeholders</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information about refresh, seek feedback on the discussion paper and provide opportunities for participants to ask questions to assist in their organisation’s submission preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DISCUSSION TOPICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20-minute neighbourhood</th>
<th>A resilient Melbourne</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Jobs and employment</th>
<th>Planning tools &amp; implementation</th>
<th>Power Point presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### COMMUNICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper</th>
<th>Plan Melbourne refresh at a glance</th>
<th>Plan Melbourne refresh information sheets</th>
<th>20-minute neighbourhood diagram</th>
<th>Strategic environmental principles</th>
<th>Power Point presentation</th>
<th>Print out of how to get involved from Power Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of engagement activities
3. WHO WE ENGAGED

There were 266 participants representing 170 organisations who participated in the face-to-face and online engagement activities. Further information about each participant group is provided below.

3.1 LOCAL GOVERNMENT

There were the six workshops with 141 participants in total who represented 41 councils.

The map below shows the spread of local governments engaged across metropolitan Melbourne and Victoria.
3.2 INDUSTRY STAKEHOLDERS

There were 49 participants representing 29 organisations who attended the two industry stakeholders workshops.

City West Water
South East Water
Transforming Housing: Housing for All
Property Council of Australia
Victoria Walks
The Australian Institute of Landscape Architects (AILA)
Urban Development Institute of Australia (Victoria)
Planning Institute of Australia
Engineers Australia
Dennis Family Corporation
Public Transport Users Association
Victorian Chamber of Commerce and Industry

Urban Communities
RMIT University
National Trust of Australia
Port of Melbourne Corporation
La Trobe University
Common Equity Housing Limited
Australian Sustainable Built Environment Council
Victorian Planning and Environmental Law Association
Victorian Farmers Federation
Housing Institute of Australia
Climate Works Australia

RACV
Port Phillip and Westernport
Catchment Management Authority
JAC Land
Wintringham Housing Ltd.

3.3 COMMUNITY DISCUSSION GROUPS

There were 52 participants in the seven community discussion groups. The table below shows the breakdown of the attendees for the different groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally and linguistically diverse</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageing</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living with a disability</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 ONLINE PARTICIPANTS

During the engagement period around 10,600 people visited the site. Of these, 328 engaged with the site by completing an online submission, asking a question through the brainstormer tool and posing a question using the Questions and Answers tool.

1081 were informed by the project site by downloading a document, viewing the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) page and visiting multiple project pages.

69,582 people became aware of the project through the site visiting at least one project page.

Visitors generally came to the refresh engagement hub via the Plan Melbourne page and Google.
4. WHAT WE FOUND

Through the face-to-face and online engagement activities 3292 individual comments were collected from participants. Each comment has been coded to align with a chapter of the discussion paper. The feedback for each chapter is discussed in the following section of the report.
4.1 CHAPTER 1: SCOPE OF OPTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

Chapter 1 of the refresh discussion paper describes the scope of the refresh. It outlines what is and is not changing from Plan Melbourne 2014, the role of the MAC as well as how Plan Melbourne 2016 will align with other Victorian Government strategies and policy reviews.

4.1.1 KEY DISCUSSION POINTS – OVERVIEW

There were 309 participant comments for this chapter of the discussion paper, which accounts for 9 per cent of all participant comments captured through the engagement activities.

4.1.1.1 INTEGRATING PLAN MELBOURNE

Integrating Plan Melbourne with other government departments and agencies was a consistent discussion theme amongst the participant groups. Participants queried the role that Plan Melbourne plays in guiding the policy direction and projects for other state government departments and agencies. In some instances, participants thought Plan Melbourne was at odds with other departments, particularly in terms of infrastructure provision and delivery such as schools, hospitals and transport projects.

Participants queried the timing and linkages of Plan Melbourne to other significant state government projects such as the establishment of Infrastructure Victoria, the Better Apartments Review, New Residential Zones Review and The Victorian Water Plan. Participants also wanted to better understand the relationship between Plan Melbourne and the building code and if Plan Melbourne will influence the building code.

Further information was consistently sought about the role of the Metropolitan Planning Authority (MPA) in the implementation plan. It was also suggested that there should be better coordination across government and stronger partnerships with local government to implement Plan Melbourne 2016. Participants also suggested that there should be a shift from the traditional ‘thematic’ approach towards an integrated place focus.

Participants overwhelmingly would like to see Plan Melbourne holistically implemented by the state government. Some participants described Plan Melbourne as the collective vision to guide the design and delivery of policy and projects across all government departments and agencies, as well as a mechanism for the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) to allocate funding.
In terms of the housing discussion, participants thought mechanisms to support flexibility and adaptability of new dwellings were absent from the document. Participants from both local government and industry agreed that common definitions about affordable and social housing should be included in Plan Melbourne 2016 to ensure there is clarity and a shared understanding of what they both mean as the current definitions are considered difficult to implement from a statutory perspective.

Social cohesion was also raised as being absent from the discussion paper. It was suggested that it should be included as a key focus area to make the city more equitable and build greater resilience.

Whilst discussing resilience, participants from local government asserted that Integrated Water Cycle Management (IWCM) must be the focus as it is essential in securing water supply as well as enhancing resilience. They felt that IWCM should be included in Plan Melbourne 2016. Participants also suggested that there should be a stronger emphasis on metropolitan waste in the document particularly in terms of strengthening resilience.

It was also suggested that the general statements about protecting food security should be strengthened with a supporting map that shows important food bowl areas that need to be protected. Urban food production and agriculture were also identified as gaps in the discussion paper and something that should be considered for future food security.

Participants described current planning tools as not doing enough to achieve resilience, or provide quality housing, or building outcomes and suggested that performance based design outcomes could be achieved through a mandated architect or an ESD Specialist.

Peri-urban councils were in strong agreement that a peri-urban statement should be included in Plan Melbourne 2016 as the peri-urban regions are different to metropolitan and regional settings. Participants stated that the peri-urban region faces challenges in terms of infrastructure and housing provision as well as balancing the protection of agricultural land with development. Councils articulated the need for greater integration between peri-urban and growth areas to sequence development. Tourism was identified as a key economic generator for the peri-urban region and participants highlighted that it is not mentioned in the discussion paper.

Digital change was cited by local government participants as a key future focus that was missing from the discussion paper. It was noted that there are opportunities to leverage the digital change by providing more information to the general community through existing tools such as the Myclimate tool or Powershop to encourage individuals to make more informed choices which in turn will assist with climate resilience.

Digital technology and sharing information was also raised in terms of driverless cars, electric cars and car sharing as another mechanism to assist people to make more sustainable transport choices. Private vehicle dependency of Melburnians was also identified as a gap in the discussion paper particularly in terms of encouraging more sustainable transport options.
### 4.2 CHAPTER 2: GROWTH CHALLENGES, FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES AND KEY CONCEPTS

Chapter 2 of the refresh discussion paper describes the fundamental principles and key concepts of the Plan Melbourne refresh within the context of Melbourne’s growth challenges.

This chapter also includes discussions on housing, a more resilient and environmentally sustainable Melbourne and associated implementation. Participant feedback on these areas is not included in this section of the report. A dedicated section for each area is provided in Chapter 4: A more connected Melbourne, Chapter 6: A more resilient and environmentally sustainable Melbourne and Chapter 8: Implementation respectively.

#### 4.2.1 KEY DISCUSSION POINTS – OVERVIEW

There were 438 participant comments for this chapter of the paper, which accounts for 10% of all participant comments captured through the engagement activities. The key points of discussion are represented in Figure 1 and are analysed in detail below.

**FIG. 1**

Key discussion points discussed in Chapter 2 by all participants

Each of the participant groups provided different levels of feedback on each of the key discussion points for Chapter 2.

The 20-minute neighbourhood was discussed by all stakeholder groups, and a key discussion point for three. Other themes that were key discussion points for specific participant groups were:

- The importance of people, place and identity (Community)
- Greater partnerships with local government (Local Council)
- Locking in the Urban Growth Boundary (Industry Stakeholders).

Each of these discussion points is analysed below.
4.2.1.1 20-MINUTE NEIGHBOURHOOD

The 20-minute neighbourhood was overwhelmingly supported by participants across all participant groups. Participants frequently highlighted the benefits that a 20-minute neighbourhood would have, including encouraging physical activity, increasing access to services and fostering a sense of community. It was agreed that while some suburbs in Metropolitan Melbourne are currently 20-minute neighbourhoods, many are not, particularly the outer suburbs.

The key points raised by participants in their discussion about the 20-minute neighbourhood were:

- There is a lack of synergy between the Neighbourhood Residential Zone (NRZ) introduced in Plan Melbourne 2014 and the focus on 20-minute neighbourhoods in the discussion paper. Applying the NRZ to 50 per cent or more of a municipality directly impedes the creation of a 20-minute neighbourhood as it restricts housing growth to maintaining the existing neighbourhood character.
- Local governments in particular discussed the importance of creating an integrated transport system to achieve the 20-minute neighbourhood. It was argued that without a range of transport choices including active transport, the 20-minute neighbourhood would be difficult to achieve.
- Community members expressed concern that a 20-minute walk would be too far for many people with a disability and the aged. It was also highlighted that the current concept diagram in the refresh discussion paper does not include any aged persons or persons with a disability. The figures depict the young and active and do not currently represent the diversity of individuals that make up a community.
- Some participants, particularly from local government, felt that the 20-minute neighbourhood concept needed to include access to jobs. This was also discussed in terms of the range of services on offer in a 20-minute neighbourhood and the types of jobs and skills needed to provide these. The types of jobs ranged from health services to retail.
- There were in-depth discussions in some of the community discussion groups about how the 20-minute neighbourhood would strengthen or weaken a sense of community. Some youth participants expressed concern about the possibility of neighbourhoods becoming segregated by this concept as it could further the divide between different socioeconomic groups. They suggested there may be a difference in the range of services on offer depending on the location of the 20-minute neighbourhood particularly if it is in the outer suburbs. Conversely the CALD and ageing discussion groups felt it would create more inclusive neighbourhoods with stronger connections between neighbours as there would be more shared community spaces and people shopping within their own neighbourhood. They asserted that this would lead to people getting to know each other and increase an individual’s sense of being able to seek help from their neighbours.
4.2.1.2 PEOPLE PLACE AND IDENTITY

People place and identity was discussed by local government, community and industry stakeholder participant groups however, the community groups discussed it more frequently. Local government and industry stakeholders both reiterated the importance of place making and creating community benefits in planning. Local government in particular felt that the discussion paper did not provide sufficient discussion or options in relation to people, place and identity for them to respond to this theme in their submissions.

The key points raised by community discussion group participants in their discussion on people, place and identity were:

- Both housing and neighbourhoods should be designed to create connections between people. Shared spaces such as community gardens, town squares and shared apartment balconies are integral to breaking down barriers between neighbours and community members. CALD and ageing community members in particular emphasised the importance of having neighbours that look after one another and act as a support system. Participants felt that these connections create a strong sense of community and belonging.

- Walkable communities build connected communities. Participants in the ageing community discussion group felt that neighbourhoods in Melbourne had lost their village feel. Participants strongly believed that walkable neighbourhoods are essential as this creates better health outcomes for individuals, which in turn could reduce pressure on the health system.

- The Aboriginal participants talked in depth about the importance of a strong connection to place and country. They felt that more could be done to tell the local Aboriginal history of areas as well as identifying what country that area is a part of through symbolic gestures such as signage.

- The CALD groups also discussed walkability of neighbourhoods and how this can contribute to having a strong sense of belonging. The participants were in agreement that having a strong connection to place has positive mental health outcomes.

- Youth participants highlighted that ‘commerce follows culture’ and believed that to build neighbourhoods planning must build for art, entertainment and culture which in turn will attract people to move to that neighbourhood.
4.2.1.3 PARTNERSHIPS WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Local Government and Industry Stakeholder groups discussed both the role and structure of the sub-regional council groups, and how local government will be involved in the development and implementation of Plan Melbourne 2016.

Local government made the case that they play one of the biggest roles in delivering Plan Melbourne 2016 and should therefore have significant input into its development. Participants would like local government to have a stronger role in decision making. Particular suggestions put forward were that local government should decide how housing targets are achieved and that they should also have an opportunity to provide feedback on the draft Plan Melbourne 2016. Some participants referred to examples where the state government established a Memorandum of Understanding with sub-regional council groups for the delivery of infrastructure or strategy implementation.

There were varied views on the role and structure of sub-regional council groups:

- Several participants felt that a local government can lose its local focus when operating at a sub-regional level.
- Sub-regional council groups were described as very effective for advocacy purposes.
- While many participants agreed with having sub-regional local government groups a small number of participants felt that in some cases the current groups were not always well aligned.

4.2.1.4 URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY

There was significant debate among both the local government and industry stakeholder participant groups about ‘locking down’ a permanent Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Participants from both groups were predominantly in support of permanently fixing the UGB because they believed it would provide certainty for local government and create a more resilient and sustainable Melbourne.

There were several concerns expressed by both those in support and opposed to a permanent UGB about the possible impacts on land use and housing supply:

- A small number of participants questioned whether a permanent UGB would increase house prices within the UGB. Participants highlighted that housing takes significantly longer to build in the middle ring suburbs because of greater planning restrictions which can increase costs. Some of these participants from both local government and the development industry also discussed the expectation that the middle suburbs will need to do more of the heavy lifting of accommodating more housing despite the constraints placed on them by statutory planning controls.
- Participants suggested that a fixed UGB could potentially alleviate pressure currently experienced in agricultural areas, as it clearly defines the edge of the city and reinforces the agricultural setting on the other side of it. Conversely participants also discussed how existing agricultural areas within the UGB that play an important role in feeding Melbourne need to be protected.
- London was referenced by participants as an existing precedent of a major city having a fixed boundary to the city and that Melbourne should do the same.
- Some participants supported fixing the UGB as a tool to create greater density, but this also requires the sequencing of Precinct Structure Plans (PSPs) to occur in growth areas to ensure there is the right supporting infrastructure.
- Participants who did not support fixing the UGB asserted that the housing market should determine density and that the sequencing of PSPs would detrimentally affect the housing market and affordability by increasing house prices.
- The peri-urban region of councils expressed concern about the interface between regional areas and the UGB. In particular, participants suggested developers would jump the UGB by building in regional towns in the peri-urban region where there may not be the right supporting infrastructure.
Chapter 3 of the refresh discussion paper describes how Plan Melbourne 2016 will plan for future jobs in Melbourne through activity centre planning and National Employment Clusters (NEC).

It also describes how it will support and protect commercial opportunities through land-use planning, as well as tools to protect strategic agricultural land use and extractive resources industries.

### 4.3.1 Key Discussion Points – Overview

There were 115 participant comments for this chapter of the discussion paper, which accounts for 3.5 per cent of all participant comments captured through the engagement activities. The key points of discussion are represented in Figure 2 and are analysed in detail below.

**FIG. 2**

Key discussion points discussed in Chapter 3 by all participants

Each of the participant groups provided different levels of feedback on each of the key discussion points for Chapter 3.

The most commonly discussed points by the stakeholder groups were:

- National Employment Clusters
- Activity centre criteria
- Employment infrastructure
- Protecting strategic agriculture

Each of these were key discussion points for two or more of the stakeholder groups. They are analysed in more detail below.
4.3.1.1 NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT CLUSTERS

NECs were raised by all participant groups apart from online participants. There was a high level of support for the NECs as a mechanism to create jobs closer to people’s homes however participants raised the following points:

- More information was sought from local government participants about the NECs particularly in terms of how they are designated, what determines the boundary of a NEC, their relationship to a 20-minute neighbourhood and the planning tools required to formalise the NEC such as a structure plan.
- Participants were in general agreement that the NECs are a positive mechanism for job creation, particularly at a sub-regional level, but queried how to attract more ‘high productivity’ jobs that are typically based in the city. Creating jobs outside the central core of the cluster was also raised by participants as a potential challenge.
- Participants questioned how government was seeking interest from businesses to invest or buy into an area within a cluster.
- There was strong agreement amongst participants that good public transport to support a cluster would be important to its success, particularly as some clusters are geographically large.

4.3.1.2 ACTIVITY CENTRE CRITERIA

Activity centre criteria was discussed primarily by local governments, as well as a small amount of discussion from the community discussion groups.

The main areas of discussion are outlined below:

- Local government discussed the hierarchy of activity centres and would like further information on the criteria of how activity centres are designated.
- Local government and the community discussion group were interested to understand the relationship between activity centres and housing and queried the role of housing in activity centres.

‘Protection of productive agricultural land in the peri-urban and green wedge areas needs to be strengthened.’
4.3.1.3 EMPLOYMENT INFRASTRUCTURE

Employment infrastructure was discussed by the Community Discussion Group, Industry Stakeholders and Local Government participants.

The key points are detailed below:

- Across all participant groups the internet and the National Broadband Network (NBN) was repeatedly cited as an important piece of infrastructure. The NBN will allow for more flexible working environments that would allow employees to work from home or enable small operators to run their business from home.
- The peri-urban councils discussed the vital connections between farms and the market to sell their produce and described the locations of sale yards as being vital to support farmers.
- Access to key infrastructure such as transport links, including airports, was also raised as being important in supporting industry.

4.3.1.4 PROTECTING STRATEGIC AGRICULTURE

Industry stakeholders and local government participants, particularly councils from the peri-urban area, spoke about the importance of protecting strategic agricultural land as it serves an important role in feeding Melbourne and the state, as well as being a key contributor to local and international markets.

The key discussion points are outlined below:

- Participants agreed that the protection of productive agricultural land in the peri-urban and green wedge areas needs to be strengthened. Participants suggested more specific criteria to define productive agricultural land that takes account of physical and climactic features and external features such as irrigation networks, transport networks and agricultural infrastructure (for example glass houses, distribution markets and freight nodes).
- Participants identified that climate change will impact the viability of some current farming areas but enhance others such as southern areas in Melbourne. These areas need to be protected and are currently under pressure from housing growth.
- The protection of existing farms from land-use conflicts to ensure their viability was raised by participants as an area of focus.
- Participants from the peri-urban councils would like to see a stronger definition of ‘strategic agricultural land’ that is supported by a map identifying locations of strategic agricultural land.
Chapter 4 of the refresh discussion paper outlined how Plan Melbourne 2016 will be updated to reflect the Victorian Government’s revised and new transport commitments.

In addition to new transport projects, the chapter also discusses re-introducing the Principal Public Transport Network (PPTN) and including a ‘transit corridors’ approach, and an Active Transport Victoria unit to increase participation and safety among cyclists and pedestrians.

### 4.4.1 KEY DISCUSSION POINTS – OVERVIEW

There were 156 participant comments for this chapter of the paper, which accounts for 5 per cent of all participant comments captured through the engagement activities. The key points of discussion are represented in Figure 3 and are analysed in detail below.

**FIG. 3**
Key discussion points discussed in Chapter 4 by all participants

Each of the participant groups provided different levels of feedback on each of the key discussion points for Chapter 4.

**The most commonly discussed points by the stakeholder groups were:**

- Improving access to public transport for all of Melbourne.
- Facilitating active transport.
- New transport projects and integrating transport and land use across Melbourne.
- The impact of car parking in creating a connected Melbourne.

Each of these were key discussion points for two or more of the stakeholder groups. They are analysed in more detail below.
### 4.4.1.1 PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Discussion about public transport primarily occurred when participants were asked to give feedback on Chapter 6: A more resilient and environmentally sustainable Melbourne. Participants frequently described the link between improving public transport provision and reducing carbon emissions, there is no point having an energy efficient home if you have to drive to work every day. Some participants felt that there was a lack of recognition of the relationship between transport modes and environmental sustainability and would like to see greater integration between Chapter 4: A more connected Melbourne and Chapter 6: A more resilient and environmentally sustainable Melbourne.

A common concern expressed by participants, particularly local government was the lack of definitive public transport commitments included in the discussion paper. Participants wanted to see some commitment from the Victorian Government about the ultimate direction of public transport to inform planning in growth areas.

**Key suggestions made by participants about improving public transport in Melbourne were:**

- Improving the bus network in all areas of Melbourne. Participants felt that all bus services should operate at a 15 to 20-minute service minimum. A more regular service would build community trust in local bus services, which are often thought to be too unreliable for daily use.

- Greater integration is needed between bus, train and tram timetables so that people can plan and use the three modes for a journey with minimal wait time between changing services.

- Some participants felt that public transport commitments are focused on the urban areas and that there should be improved public transport connections for rural and peri-urban communities.

- Participants in the Aboriginal and CALD discussion groups raised the current challenge of public transport infrastructure and services not keeping pace with housing and growth in the growth areas.

- Participants living with a disability emphasised improving accessibility on all forms of public transport, but particularly buses. Suggestions for improving accessibility included not only doorways and access ramps, but the ability to be able to manoeuvre a wheelchair or scooter within a train, tram or bus. These participants discussed how these improvements would also benefit parents with prams.

- Improving the direction of public transport in Melbourne so that people can move in an east-west and north-south direction from all suburbs. Participants described how it is easy to move between their suburb and the city but that it can be challenging to move across suburbs.
4.4.1.2 ACTIVE TRANSPORT

Participants were consistently supportive of including active transport in Plan Melbourne 2016. The benefits to health and community connection were repeatedly mentioned. Participants highlighted the importance of creating 20-minute neighbourhoods and an integrated public transport network for facilitating active transport.

Key points raised by participants were:

- When considering both walking and cycling, it is important to recognise that walking is a lower cost mode of transport and therefore more accessible for all community members.

- The use of shared paths needs to be reconsidered as many existing shared paths are too narrow to safely service pedestrian and commuter cyclists.

- Participants from the People Living with a Disability Community Discussion Group described some of their challenges moving around their neighbourhood particularly in terms of the quality of footpaths. This sometimes influences their decisions not to go to certain areas because the footpaths are of low quality, making it difficult for them to travel within that area.

4.4.1.3 NEW TRANSPORT PROJECTS

The consistent feedback provided by participants on the new and revised transport projects in the discussion paper was that they are a series of individual projects, not an integrated land use and transport strategy. Participants wanted to see more information on the overall direction of transport connections in Melbourne and how they will integrate with housing supply. There were also questions about how the government will prioritise transport projects in the future.

There was limited discussion specifically on the new transport projects introduced in the discussion paper however there were several questions raised about the possibility of utilising Port Phillip Bay for connecting communities in Melbourne.

4.4.1.4 CAR PARKING

Car parking was discussed specifically by local government, as an integral element in connecting Melbourne. Participants pointed out the impact that car parking requirements have on housing affordability, planning for transport corridors and creating 20-minute neighbourhoods. The majority of the discussion on car parking provided support for having greater flexibility in minimum requirements to reflect density targets and a transit corridors approach.

Participants felt that Plan Melbourne 2016 should firstly address car parking and its relationship to other strategic directions and also improve planning tools that control car parking. Several participants also believed that the government has an important role to play in educating the community about its direction for car parking provision in transit corridors.
Chapter 5 of the refresh discussion paper describes the challenges of maintaining housing supply, providing housing choices and ensuring housing affordability. It describes initiatives to tackle these challenges as well as how to increase social and affordable housing.

### 4.5.1 KEY DISCUSSION POINTS – OVERVIEW

There were 929 participant comments for this chapter of the paper, which accounts for 28 per cent of all participant comments captured through the engagement activities. The key points of discussion are represented in Figure 4 and are further analysed in detail below.

**FIG. 4**
Key discussion points discussed in Chapter 5 by all participants

Participants suggested that current housing challenges could be addressed through a metropolitan housing strategy that goes beyond the planning system to ensure a more coordinated approach. Participants cited the current uneven application of the NRZ across metropolitan Melbourne as a key example as an area that requires a more coordinated approach.

**The most commonly discussed points by the stakeholder groups were:**
- Affordable housing
- Housing diversity
- 70/30 housing target
- Infrastructure to support growth

These discussion points are analysed in detail below.
4.5.1.1 HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Housing affordability was raised as a key area of concern for participants and was discussed in terms of affordable housing as well as housing prices. Below are the concerns and challenges described by the participants:

- The definition of ‘affordable housing’ needs to separate different factors such as design, pricing and public housing. There is no single definition, and affordability changes depending on location and circumstances.
- Social and public housing are not the only types of housing that can deliver affordable housing. These are inefficient tools if they are solely relied upon. A clearer understanding of what drives affordability is needed that is accompanied by a set of criteria for its delivery.
- Stronger policy interventions are required to achieve housing affordability that require developers to contribute to affordable land, open space and public infrastructure. Mandatory inclusionary zoning could be included to incentivise and facilitate the delivery of new affordable and social housing. There is potential to have sub-regional social housing targets.
- The Aboriginal community discussion group participants suggested more could be done to assist new home buyers to enter into the housing market. Indigenous Business Australia was cited as an example of a third party providing assistance with potential buyers through assisting them with the deposit payment.
- The location of affordable and social housing was also discussed. Participants agreed that it should not be in isolated pockets, but dispersed in areas that have good connections to public transport and services.
- Covenants in titles were suggested by some participants as a mechanism to keep housing affordable by stipulating that it can only be sold at the median house price for that area. Conversely other participants thought that title covenants would be challenging to enforce and a gold mine for lawyers.
- Housing affordability needs to be balanced with the cost of living, particularly transport costs. This will push people to live in fringe areas where they will experience higher transport costs as there are fewer public transport options.
- Housing affordability needs to be addressed in terms of buying a house, as well as rental pricing.
- Current approval mechanisms for social and affordable housing are considered lengthy and there is an opportunity for the Minister for Planning to expedite these approval processes.
- Housing affordability is having an impact on people’s everyday lives. It is causing financial and emotional stress on individuals and families as a large majority of income is spent on rent or mortgage payments. This reduces the amount of money left over that can be spent on entertainment or recreational activities.

4.5.1.2 HOUSING DIVERSITY

Housing diversity was discussed frequently by local government and community participants. There was a clear message from participants that there needs to be a greater range of houses and apartments that have adaptable designs to meet the needs of individuals and families as they move through different stages of their lives.

Participants’ key ideas and concerns are described below:

- “We live in a market economy that is market driven around the market forces; market intervention is needed and the government could invest in land and housing but isn’t. So how do we offer up different types of housing for people to access? We need to shape the perception of what good housing is - co-housing with shared spaces for example lounge, kitchen, garden. The state should provide more flexibility for this to happen and provide the spaces for this to happen” Local government workshop participant, northern sub-region.
- The state government needs to lead a conversation with the community about what housing diversity is, why it is important and what is considered good design.
- Participants commented that at present, ResCode is the only planning tool that has a standard about diversity. A standard about housing diversity should be included in other planning tools, policies and provisions.
Housing diversity needs to go beyond the different styles of houses available and look at how housing types are designed to encourage greater adaptability and flexibility to meet the needs of people in different stages of their lives, particularly to assist people to age in place - “It is important to be able to stay in the same neighbourhood but not necessarily the same large family house” (ageing community discussion group participant). Design should also include Environmentally Sustainable Design principles to reduce the costs and environmental impacts of heating and cooling homes.

Housing diversity also needs to include shared and communal spaces in both high and low density developments to encourage more interactions and connections to develop between neighbours and residents.

4.5.1.3 70/30 HOUSING TARGET

There was mixed feedback from participants about the split of 70 per cent of new housing located in infill areas and the remaining 30 per cent in greenfield areas as well as how it should be applied. Some participants thought it would encourage more infill development. Others queried how it would be applied in relation to sub-regional housing targets. Generally, participants would like more information about the 70/30 target in terms of its origin, rationale and how it would be implemented.

The key discussion points and participant questions are described below:

- Growth should be slowed in the outer areas to encourage more growth in infill and urban renewal sites.
- How will the 70/30 target be mandated and enforced? Does this require housing targets for local government to ensure there is an equitable distribution across established areas? There should be regular reporting to show where it is and is not occurring.
- Participants asked to see what research has been undertaken to understand the capacity of the metropolitan area to absorb more housing as there will be areas that have greater capacity than others.

- Increased density in the middle ring suburbs using the 70/30 target could be useful in creating more compact NECs.
- Participants called for clarity about sequencing Precinct Structure Plans (PSPs) as a mechanism to achieve the 30 per cent target in the growth areas to ensure staged delivery of housing as well as the supporting infrastructure required.

4.5.1.4 INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT GROWTH

Infrastructure to support growth was a key area of discussion for participants. It was linked to people’s connection to their neighbourhood and a key requirement in achieving 20-minute neighbourhoods across Melbourne that have equitable levels of service and infrastructure provision.

Participant views are outlined below:

- The timing of infrastructure delivery, particularly transport and services including education and health, need to be linked to housing growth to ensure people can access services locally within their neighbourhood and region.
- Public realm and urban amenity are key components of infrastructure delivery. Participants argued that provision of these should not lag behind housing delivery, particularly in terms of open space and greenery.
- Housing targets should be linked with areas that already have a good level of infrastructure, as well as areas where there are infrastructure projects to ensure that the infrastructure can service the density of population in that area.
4.6 

**CHAPTER 6: A MORE RESILIENT AND ENVIRONMENTALLY SUSTAINABLE MELBOURNE**

Chapter 6 of the refresh discussion paper recognises how Plan Melbourne 2016 will address the specific challenges presented by climate change.

There are planning tools that can reduce Melbourne’s greenhouse gas emissions and build resilience to the impacts of climate change which are outlined. The chapter introduces new strategic environmental principles and specifically addresses improving hazard assessment, recognising climate change risks to infrastructure, strengthening high priority habitat corridors and cooling a hot city through planning. Chapter 6 also discusses supporting the uptake of renewable energy and Environmentally Sustainable Design through planning.

Chapter 6 was discussed at all engagement activities with the exception of the peri-urban local government workshop.

4.6.1 KEY DISCUSSION POINTS – OVERVIEW

There were 578 participant comments for this chapter of the paper, which accounts for 18 per cent of all participant comments captured through the engagement activities. The key points of discussion are represented in Figure 5 and are analysed in detail below.

FIG. 5
**Key discussion points discussed in Chapter 6 by all participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Point</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally sustainable design</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling the city</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic environmental principles</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable energy</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying risk and climate hazards</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat corridors</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate resilient structure</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green buildings and surfaces</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the participant groups provided different levels of feedback on each of the key discussion points for Chapter 6.

**Supporting ESD was a key discussion point for all participant groups.**

**Discussion points that were key for two or more of the participant groups were:**

- Cooling a hot city through planning.
- Introducing new strategic environmental principles.
- Supporting the uptake of renewable energy.

These discussion points are analysed in detail below.
4.6.1.1 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUSTAINABLE DESIGN

Participants consistently supported strengthening ESD through planning and building. The leadership local government has shown in adopting ESD design was frequently referenced by participants. Local government participants shared in their experience of these strategies having been well received by industry as they provide clarity and certainty about what is required.

Participants from both government and industry would like to see these ESD strategies adopted statewide with a clear minimum baseline. Some participants expressed concern that the ESD policies would be ‘watered down’ if universally adopted.

Additional key points raised by participants in their discussion on ESD were:

- ESD needs to be integrated with statutory planning and the building code. Participants felt that there needed to be triggers and requirements placed within the planning system and not just a motherhood statement to ensure ESD is properly adopted.
- ESD requirements need to be scalable for different types of development, from single detached dwellings to 30-storey towers.
- ESD should include Water Sensitive Urban Design principles.
- Some participants expressed concern that ESD requirements could have an impact on housing affordability if individual properties were overloaded with requirements.

4.6.1.2 COOLING A HOT CITY

‘Cooling a hot city’ was primarily discussed by local government, industry and community participants who were very supportive of this idea as a way to plan for and mitigate climate change. Participants cited many opportunities within small and large scale developments to increase greenery such as atriums, living walls and green roofs as well as at a local neighbourhood level by planting in median and nature strips.

Participants queried if it is possible to achieve increased greenery particularly through canopy trees as current high density developments have led to decreases in the amount of vegetation.

Participants raised the following points through their discussions:

- Urban greening is occurring in some local government areas to mitigate climate change - how can we encourage or incentivise this to occur in the market? How do we encourage more trees in the growth areas particularly as there is less open space?
- How do we have increased greener and tree planting with high density developments that have significant site coverage?
- How will this align with the sequencing of PSPs particularly in the growth areas?
4.6.1.3 STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL PRINCIPLES

Participants were highly supportive of the inclusion of the Strategic Environment Principles in the discussion paper as participants thought it was a missing element of Plan Melbourne 2014. Participants want to see ‘resilience’ embedded throughout the whole document as an overarching principle of Plan Melbourne 2016 and not contained to a chapter as they considered it to underpin each component of the chapters in the discussion paper.

Participants discussed the following key points:

- There needs to be targets and benchmarks for these principles as well as minimum standards embedded in the building code that developers must meet to ensure they are delivered across the whole city. Incentives and trade-offs were suggested by participants as a mechanism to ensure the standards are delivered.

- Participants were pleased to see ‘environmental justice principles of equity and inclusion’ included as part of the principles to ensure disadvantaged and vulnerable people are supported.

- Participants were strongly of the view that it is now time to take real measures and actions as this has been talked about repeatedly but not followed by strong implementation policy measures or action by government.

4.6.1.4 RENEWABLE ENERGY

Participants are strongly supportive to shift to more renewable energy sources and were in agreement that it requires leadership from government and mechanisms to incentivise developers for this transition to occur. Participants cited examples of success that ranged from small scale single household interventions to co-generation at a network level. Participants in the community discussion groups provided examples of where they had worked together with their neighbours to seek a grant from the Department of Housing and Human Services (DHHS) for a shared solar system for their building. The participants were quite clear in their message to government that we need to start taking action in this area at a household, neighbourhood, city and state level.

While participants are supportive of the shift to renewable energy, they raised the following challenges:

- There is reluctance by developers to incorporate energy efficiency into their developments such as solar panels and solar hot water because it is more expensive in the initial construction costs. Mechanisms or incentives are needed to encourage use of solar panels.

- “We talk about having a structure in our city that encourages emissions minimisation but there needs to be greater recognition of co-generation, and distributed energy. Energy generation and embedded networks need to be explored and facilitated by the planning system” industry workshop participant.

- How can government protect the interests of individual citizens over large energy companies? – It is becoming less and less viable for individuals to generate the energy as it is not rewarded appropriately.
Chapter 7 of the refresh discussion paper outlines the new planning tools that are described in the discussion paper.

4.7 CHAPTER 7: NEW PLANNING TOOLS

4.7.1 KEY DISCUSSION POINTS – OVERVIEW

There were 231 participant comments for this chapter of the paper, which accounts for 7 per cent of all participant comments captured through the engagement activities. The key points of discussion are represented in Figure 6 and are analysed in detail below.

FIG. 6
Key discussion points discussed in Chapter 7 by all participants

Local government and industry stakeholders were the only participants to provide comment about this chapter of the discussion paper. Their views and feedback about a code assess approach and new zones are described below.
4.7.1.1 A CODE ASSESS APPROACH

There was overall support for a code assess approach for medium to larger developments however many participants did have queries about its application. Some participants did query the need for a code assess approach as they thought ResCode is an appropriate tool to achieve the right level of diversity, density as well as quality of housing.

Participants’ key discussion points are summarised below:

- Code assess should be applied as a medium density planning tool. A code assess approach cannot be responsive to specific local constraints and opportunities. Instead it would need to mandate minimum standards for all developments as a base starting point for acceptable living conditions. In addition, the development form must respond to local planning requirements based on context: non-access to daylight, maximum room depths for single aspect rooms, provisions of external shading and natural ventilation.

- Code assess could be applied to medium and large developments to expedite the planning and construction process as there is an agreed baseline of performance and third party objector rights have been removed.

- There needs to be a better conversation on what ‘medium density’ looks like and the potential for its diversity. International examples of where this has been achieved should be drawn upon as examples of low-rise, high density houses (for example Terrace dwellings in London - turned into flats but look like houses).

- Code assess could be rolled out in NRZ areas first as a tool to increase density.

4.7.1.2 NEW ZONES

Participants were generally in support of new zones for the NECS and urban renewal precincts to formalise their designation as well as to assist in the planning and approvals process. There were a small number of participants who queried the need for new zones and suggested greater flexibility in the application of existing zones and overlays in different combinations.

When discussing urban renewal precincts, participants suggested that there needed to be different approaches undertaken for each area as at present there is not enough clarity or guidance provided from the state government.
Chapter 8 of the refresh discussion paper describes the approach that will be taken to develop the implementation plan and monitoring framework for Plan Melbourne 2016.

### 4.8.1 Key Discussion Points – Overview

There were 631 participant comments for this chapter of the paper, which accounts for 19 per cent of all participant comments captured through the engagement activities. The key points of discussion are represented in Figure 7 and are further analysed in detail below.

Implementation tools and roles were common features of the feedback from the local government, industry stakeholders and community participants. The rolling implementation plan was raised by all participant groups with the exception of the community. Monitoring the implementation plan was raised by the community. The discussion and questions from participants have been reviewed against other ideas and suggestions that have been described in the other chapters and as such that commentary has not been repeated in this section.

The overarching questions and comments relating to the implementation are summarised in the following questions:

- Does the State Government have resources and funding to deliver this new strategy?
- Will local government and stakeholders have a role in developing the implementation plan?
- What role will the MPA play in implementing Plan Melbourne 2016?
- Will the five-year review just become an opportunity for a ‘new’ government to fundamentally change the document?
5. EVALUATION

5.1 WERE THE ENGAGEMENT OBJECTIVES MET?

The purpose of the engagement was to:

- Provide information about the scope of the refresh.
- Use the discussion paper as a resource/educative tool for stakeholders and the community to understand what will be included as part of the refresh.
- Seek feedback on the changes and options outlined in the discussion paper.

Capire is confident that this has been achieved through the design of the engagement activities which were balanced to provide as much information about the refresh with many opportunities for participants to ask questions as well as share their ideas and feedback.

Typically, each session was designed with equal amounts of information sharing from the project team or Capire consultants and time from group discussion as well as opportunities to ask questions and provide feedback. This approach reflects the goals and promises of the inform & educate and consult levels of engagement on the IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation described in Chapter 2.1 Engagement Framework of this report.

5.2 PARTICIPANT EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK

Participants who attended a face-to-face activity were invited to provide their feedback about their experience through an evaluation form. All participants completed the same form and this has been analysed. Table 3 below is a summary of all the participant evaluation forms that were completed. Note not every form was always fully completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3 participant evaluation forms</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of information</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well did we describe what we needed to do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well did we use our time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well did we do on making sure everyone was involved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well was the workshop managed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well was the workshop run?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below is a reflection of the key sentiments expressed by participants.

- Plan Melbourne 2016 should be adopted as a whole-of-government document that guides land-use planning across all portfolios and departments. It should be used as a tool to prioritise DTF funding for infrastructure and its delivery.
- Local government and industry stakeholders should be involved in the preparation of the implementation plan. There should be stronger sub-regional partnerships between local and state government with local government playing a role in the decision making process.
- Housing affordability needs to be addressed through a holistic approach that includes the private, public and not-for-profit sectors.
- A metropolitan housing strategy should be developed that provides an integrated approach for identifying where new housing be located. There should be a range of housing choices built using ESD as well as being adaptable to change with people as they move through different stages of their lives. The strategy should set mandatory minimum requirements about quality, density and choice.

The engagement observed high levels of support for the inclusion of climate change and resilience within the discussion paper however participants frequently requested that resilience should be a common thread throughout the whole document to ensure we are prepared for climate change. There was overwhelming support for government’s commitment to refresh Plan Melbourne to include additional consideration of climate change, housing and a stronger focus on implementation.
7. INSIGHTS AND FACILITATOR OBSERVATIONS

In addition to the analysis of participants’ feedback, there are insights and observations from the Capire facilitators that should be acknowledged as part of the engagement process. These are described on the right.

- The engagement process on the discussion paper was welcomed but participants are wanting to understand what the implementation plan will mean for them.
- Participants did not challenge DELWP’s assertion that 75 per cent of the existing Plan Melbourne has bipartisan support but were interested to understand how bipartisan support would be maintained and achieved for the remaining 25 per cent.
- Typically the community discussion group participants did not have a high level of planning knowledge. However, when provided with information about the context and background of Plan Melbourne, they provided relevant and insightful feedback on the key discussion areas.
- At times there was confusion amongst participants about whether the discussion paper was a draft of Plan Melbourne 2016.
- The community discussion group participants were appreciative of having been included as part of the engagement as they are not typically involved in discussions about strategic planning for the future of Melbourne.

8. CONCLUSION

Engagement on the discussion paper was well received by the participants. The engagement activities elicited detailed and informed feedback that directly relates to the options in the discussion paper. It is expected this report will be valuable for DELWP in understanding feedback ideas and concerns when preparing Plan Melbourne 2016.
9. APPENDICES
### LOCAL GOVERNMENT WORKSHOPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peri-urban group of Councils</td>
<td>9.30 am – 12.30pm, Monday 16 November 2015</td>
<td>Level 27, 121 Exhibition Street, Melbourne CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern sub-region</td>
<td>9.30 am – 12.30pm, Tuesday 17 November 2015</td>
<td>The Centre Ivanhoe, 275 Heidelberg Road, Ivanhoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western sub-region</td>
<td>9.30 am – 12.30pm, Friday 20 November 2015</td>
<td>Visy Carers Hub, 80B Harvest Road, Sunshine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern sub-region</td>
<td>9.30 am – 12.30pm, Tuesday 24 November 2015</td>
<td>City of greater Dandenong Chambers, 225 Lonsdale Street, Dandenong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central sub-region</td>
<td>9.30 am – 12.30pm, Thursday 26 November 2015</td>
<td>Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, 250-290 Spring Street, East Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern sub-region</td>
<td>9.30 am – 12.30pm, Friday 27 November 2015</td>
<td>The Civic Centre, 293 Springvale Road, Glen Waverley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMUNITY DISCUSSION GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>5.30 – 7.30pm, Monday 23 November 2015</td>
<td>Melbourne Multicultural Hub, 506 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageing</td>
<td>10am – 12pm, Monday 30 November 2015</td>
<td>Melbourne Multicultural Hub, 506 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALD</td>
<td>10am – 12pm, Thursday 10 December 2015</td>
<td>Melbourne Multicultural Hub, 506 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALD</td>
<td>2 – 4pm, Monday 14 December 2015</td>
<td>Melbourne Multicultural Hub, 506 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living with a disability</td>
<td>2 – 4pm, Wednesday 16 December 2015</td>
<td>Melbourne Multicultural Hub, 506 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>5.30 – 6.30pm, Thursday 18 February 2016</td>
<td>Edge Youth Services, Westfield Plenty Valley, Mill Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INDUSTRY WORKSHOPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 1</td>
<td>9.30am – 12.30pm, Thursday 3 December 2015</td>
<td>Mercure Melbourne, Treasury Gardens, 13 Spring Street, Melbourne CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 2</td>
<td>9.30am – 12.30pm, Friday 4 December 2015</td>
<td>Mercure Melbourne, Treasury Gardens, 13 Spring Street, Melbourne CBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2 ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES DESCRIPTION

9.2.1 COMMUNITY DISCUSSION GROUPS

9.2.1.1 PARTICIPANTS

Capire facilitated seven community Discussion Groups with cohorts of the community that are considered ‘hard to reach’ as they may have barriers to participating in broader engagement activities. For the Plan Melbourne refresh, specific efforts were made to hold discussions with youth, the ageing, people living with a disability, Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CALD) and Aboriginal representatives. No DELWP officers were present at any of the sessions.

The Aboriginal discussion group was held in a different format as Capire attended a regular meeting of the Whittlesea Local Aboriginal Network that is facilitated by the Aboriginal Affairs Victoria, Department of Premier and Cabinet.

Participants were recruited by Capire through a range of different organisations and known networks as opposed to market research firms. The following organisations outlined in Table 5 assisted in the recruitment of participants:

Table 5 Organisations contacted to recruit Community Discussion Group participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Migrant Education Service (AMES)</td>
<td>Ethnic Communities Council Victoria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE AGEING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councils Positive Ageing Reference Group</td>
<td>University of the 3rd Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder Rights Advocacy</td>
<td>Council of the Ageing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohealth</td>
<td>Municipal Association of Victoria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YOUTH (PARTICIPANTS WERE BETWEEN 14 – 20 YEARS OLD)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Geography Teachers Association</td>
<td>Melbourne University Planning Students Society (MUPSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Environment RMIT Student Society (PERMITSS)</td>
<td>Youth Affairs Council of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Student Representative Council</td>
<td>Australian Youth Climate Coalition/SEED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>Foundation for Young Australians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Young Planners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEOPLE LIVING WITH A DISABILITY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Disability Network</td>
<td>Public Transport Victoria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABORIGINAL REPRESENTATIVES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Aboriginal Networks, Aboriginal Affairs Victoria, Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2 ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES DESCRIPTION

9.2.1.2 ENGAGEMENT PURPOSE

The focus of each session was to build community capacity about the challenges and opportunities faced in strategic planning and the challenges facing Melbourne’s future as well as to seek feedback on the 20-minute neighbourhood, housing and climate change.

9.2.1.3 SESSION DESIGN

Each session ran for two hours with a short break halfway. Using a PowerPoint presentation participants were provided information about the Plan Melbourne project including its background, context and timing. Participants were also provided information about urban planning, what it can and can’t influence in the built and natural environment as well as how it relates to their community and metropolitan Melbourne.

Prior to each group discussion about the 20-minute neighbourhood, housing and climate change, participants were provided with information from the discussion paper and asked to reflect and write down their own views on the provided worksheet prior to a group discussion to talk about the theme. Participants were also asked to write down any messages they may have to the Minister in their worksheet.

At the end of the session participants were asked to complete a workshop evaluation form that was also included in the worksheet.

A copy of the Community Discussion Group agenda is at Appendix 3.

9.2.1.4 ENGAGEMENT QUESTIONS AND FEEDBACK COLLECTION

For each of the three discussion areas participants were asked to provide their ‘initial reactions’ and ‘my key message to the Minister’ using a worksheet (Appendix 4).

A scribe was also present to record the group discussion to capture any additional information that participants may not have included in their worksheet.

9.2.1.5 SUPPORTING COMMUNICATIONS MATERIALS

The communications materials were prepared using content from the discussion paper. The materials used for this session were:

- Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper
- Plan Melbourne refresh at a glance
- 20-minute neighbourhood diagram from Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper
- Strategic environmental principles from Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper
- PowerPoint presentation (content described above)
- Print out of ‘how to get involved’ slide from PowerPoint
9.2.2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT WORKSHOPS

9.2.2.1 PARTICIPANTS

DELWP issued invitations to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and Planning Director of each local government in metropolitan Melbourne as well as selected peri-urban and regional councils. Councils were invited to bring up to six representatives to attend a workshop. There were six workshops held based on the five metropolitan sub-regional groups of councils from Plan Melbourne 2014 as well as a specific peri-urban councils workshop. Members of the Plan Melbourne refresh project team, DELWP officers and the Ministerial Advisory Committee (MAC) were present at each session.

9.2.2.2 ENGAGEMENT PURPOSE

The intention of the local government workshops was to provide information about the scope of the refresh, seek their feedback primarily on the Fundamental Concepts, Housing, A more resilient Melbourne and the Implementation and Planning Tools Chapters of the discussion paper. The workshop was also designed to provide councils with multiple opportunities to ask questions directly to the project and MAC to assist with the preparation of their Council’s formal submission on the discussion paper.

9.2.2.3 SESSION DESIGN

Each three-hour workshop was facilitated by a lead facilitator with participants seated around tables with a dedicated table facilitator who was either a DELWP representative or Capire consultant. At each session participants were given information about the scope of the refresh, project timing as well as the key areas of discussion for the workshop. The presenters sat at a panel at the front of the room with a member of the MAC. At the end of each presentation, participants were given the opportunity to ask the panel members questions. A workshop agenda is at Appendix C. Prior to each table discussion about the Fundamental Concepts, Housing and A more resilient and environmentally sustainable Melbourne, participants were given a presentation by a member of the project team. The table facilitator’s role was to keep the discussion relevant to the theme, ensure each participant at the table had an opportunity to participate as well as direct any Plan Melbourne refresh questions to the relevant project team member.

9.2.2.4 ENGAGEMENT QUESTIONS AND FEEDBACK COLLECTION

For each of the three discussion areas participants were asked to provide their ‘initial reactions’ and ‘my key message to the Minister’ using a worksheet (Appendix 4).

The table facilitator also recorded the group discussion to capture any additional information that participants may not have included in their worksheet. The table facilitators also recorded the questions posed to the panel by participants.

9.2.2.5 SUPPORTING COMMUNICATIONS MATERIALS

The communications materials were prepared using content from the discussion paper. The materials used for the workshops were:

- Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper
- Plan Melbourne refresh at a glance document
- Plan Melbourne refresh information sheets
9.2 ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES DESCRIPTION

9.2.3 INDUSTRY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS

9.2.3.1 PARTICIPANTS

DELWP issued invitations to key representatives of stakeholder organisations who were involved in the engagement process for Plan Melbourne 2014 and have a high interest in the refresh. Invitees were asked to choose from two workshop days. Members of the Plan Melbourne refresh project team, DELWP officers and the Ministerial Advisory Committee (MAC) were present at each session.

9.2.3.2 ENGAGEMENT PURPOSE

The intention of the workshops was to provide information about the scope of the refresh, seek participants’ feedback primarily on the Fundamental Concepts, Housing, A more resilient Melbourne and the Implementation and Planning Tools Chapters of the refresh discussion paper. The workshop was also designed to provide participants with multiple opportunities to ask questions directly to the project and MAC to assist with the preparation of their organisation’s formal submission on the Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper.

9.2.3.3 SESSION DESIGN

Each three-hour workshop was facilitated by a lead facilitator with participants seated at round tables with a dedicated table facilitator who was either a DELWP representative or Capire consultant. At each session participants were given information about the scope of the refresh, project timing as well as the key areas of discussion for the workshop. The presenters sat at a panel at the front of the room with a member of the MAC. At the end of each presentation, participants were given the opportunity to ask the panel members questions. A workshop agenda is at Appendix 3. Prior to each table discussion about the Fundamental Concepts, Housing and a Resilient Melbourne participants were given a presentation by a member of the project team. The table facilitator’s role was to keep the discussion relevant to the theme, ensure each participant at the table had an opportunity to participate as well as direct any Plan Melbourne refresh questions to the relevant project team member.

9.2.3.4 ENGAGEMENT QUESTIONS AND FEEDBACK COLLECTION

For each of the three discussion areas participants were asked to provide their ‘initial reactions’ and ‘my key message to the Minister’ using a worksheet (Appendix 4).

The table facilitator also noted the group discussion on a facilitator worksheet to capture any additional information that participants may not have included in their worksheet. The table facilitators also recorded the questions posed to the panel by participants.

9.2.3.5 SUPPORTING COMMUNICATIONS MATERIALS

The communications materials were prepared using content from the discussion paper. The materials used for the workshops were:

- Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper
- Plan Melbourne refresh at a glance document
- Plan Melbourne refresh information sheets
9.2.4 ONLINE ENGAGEMENT

A dedicated online engagement hub was established to support the engagement for the refresh in addition to the Plan Melbourne website. It housed the Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper, at a glance document, eight information sheets as well as the review of Plan Melbourne 2014 report prepared by the MAC.

9.2.4.1 PARTICIPANTS

The broader community was invited to participate in the online engagement which was promoted by the government through media releases from DELWP and the Metropolitan Planning Authority (MPA).

9.2.4.2 ENGAGEMENT PURPOSE

Two online engagement modules were used to generate discussion about the refresh among the wider community and provide an opportunity for the community to directly ask the Plan Melbourne refresh team questions.

9.2.4.3 MODULE DESIGN

The Brainstormer tool invited participants to share their idea in response to the engagement question. Other participants could vote to show their support for that idea as well as provide their own idea. The Q&A tool enabled participants to pose a question to the project team for response. Once the response was provided, the question and the response were made public on the page if the participant wanted their response made public. The participant also received a notification email to acknowledge when their question had been received and responded to.

9.2.4.4 ENGAGEMENT QUESTIONS AND FEEDBACK COLLECTION

The online tools were the mechanism to collect feedback to the following questions prepared by DELWP:

**Delivering jobs and investment**
Plan Melbourne 2016 will ensure the significance and roles of the National Employment Clusters as places of innovation and knowledge-based employment are clear. How can planning support innovation?

**A more connected Melbourne**
Adaptive transport planning is vital to respond to Melbourne’s growth patterns as they emerge and change over time. What do you think of including future transport options in Plan Melbourne 2016 as areas for further development and assessment through transport planning?

**New planning tools**
Replacement of ResCode with a new code assess approach for new multi-unit development, that embraces good building design and urban design, is one of the options for new planning tools to improve planning for residential development. What do you think of this option?

**Implementation**
Separating the long-term land use strategy in Plan Melbourne 2016 from its implementation plan with a shorter time frame could create a more enduring strategy. What do you think of this idea?

**Climate Change http://engage2act.com/**
Better integrating climate change planning responses into land use planning and the natural and built environment is a clear challenge. How can we make Melbourne a more resilient city prepared for climate change?

**Housing affordability**
To meet forecast housing needs for Melbourne we need to consider whether to introduce a target to deliver a greater proportion of new housing within Melbourne’s established areas. What do you think of introducing a target to deliver 70 per cent of new housing in Melbourne’s established areas and 30 per cent in greenfield growth areas?

9.2.4.5 SUPPORTING COMMUNICATIONS MATERIALS

The communications materials were prepared using content from the discussion paper. The materials used for this session were:
- Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper
- Plan Melbourne refresh at a glance document
- Plan Melbourne refresh information sheets
### 9.3.1 COMMUNITY DISCUSSION GROUPS

#### PLAN MELBOURNE REFRESH

**AGENDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.30pm</td>
<td>Welcome and introductions</td>
<td>Capire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.40pm</td>
<td>Plan Melbourne</td>
<td>Capire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.50pm</td>
<td>20 minute neighbourhood</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion 1:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What do you think about this as an idea?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do you already live in a 20 minute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What do you think are the benefits of a 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minute neighbourhood?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.20pm</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.40pm</td>
<td>Short break (10mins)</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.50pm</td>
<td>A resilient Melbourne</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion 3:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How should we respond to and plan for climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.20pm</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
<td>Capire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.30pm</td>
<td>Meeting close</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Community discussion group agenda

www.planmelbourne.vic.gov.au
### Local government workshop agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.30</td>
<td>Welcome and introductions</td>
<td>Capire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.35</td>
<td>Plan Melbourne Refresh</td>
<td>DELWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.55</td>
<td>Q&amp;A from floor</td>
<td>Capire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh – Housing</td>
<td>DELWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table Discussion # 1 – Housing</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion Q1: What are your initial reactions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion Q2: Questions for the panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>Q&amp;A with Panel</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>Short break (10mins)</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh – A more resilient Melbourne</td>
<td>DELWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table Discussion # 2 – A more resilient Melbourne</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion Q1: What are your initial reactions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion Q2: Questions for the panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>Q&amp;A with Panel</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh – Implementation and Planning Tools</td>
<td>DELWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table Discussion # 3 – Implementation and Planning Tools</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion Q1: What are your initial reactions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion Q2: Questions for the panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>Q&amp;A with Panel</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>Final ‘plenary’ discussion</td>
<td>DELWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have we missed anything?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key messages to the Minister for Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>Project next steps</td>
<td>DELWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>Formal close and lunch</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Industry Stakeholders Workshop Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.30</td>
<td>Welcome and introductions</td>
<td>Capire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.35</td>
<td>Plan Melbourne Refresh</td>
<td>DELWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background and context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refresh scope and timelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>Q&amp;A from floor</td>
<td>Capire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh — Housing</td>
<td>DELWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context, challenges and opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table Discussion # 1 — Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion Q1: What are your initial reactions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion Q2: Questions for the panel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>Q&amp;A with Panel</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Short break (10mins)</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh — A more resilient Melbourne</td>
<td>DELWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context, challenges and opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table Discussion # 2 — A more resilient Melbourne</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion Q1: What are your initial reactions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion Q2: Questions for the panel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>Q&amp;A with Panel</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh — Implementation and Planning Tools</td>
<td>DELWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context, challenges and opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table Discussion # 3 — Implementation and Planning Tools</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion Q1: What are your initial reactions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion Q2: Questions for the panel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>Q&amp;A with Panel</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>Wrap up</td>
<td>Capire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>Project next steps</td>
<td>DELWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>Formal close and lunch</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To evaluate the success of this workshop and to improve future sessions, we invite you to complete this evaluation form. Please use the following ratings and indicate the most appropriate response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Information: How well did we describe what we wanted to?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Time: How well did we use our time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation: How well did we do in making sure everyone was involved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation: How well was the workshop managed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation: How well was the workshop run?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will your organisation be making a submission to Plan Melbourne refresh?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Please provide your contact email if you would like to receive further information about the project.

Name: …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
Organisation: ……………………………………………………………………………………………
Email: …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Capire Consulting Group and any person(s) acting on our behalf is committed to respecting privacy and protecting your personally identifiable information by meeting our responsibilities under the Victorian Privacy Act 1988 and the Australian Privacy Principles 2010 as well as relevant industry codes of ethics and conduct.

Discussion 1 – A 20 minute neighbourhood

My initial reactions: …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

My key message to the Minister: …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Workshop Evaluation

Discussion 3 – A resilient Melbourne

My initial reactions: …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

My key message to the Minister: …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Workshop Evaluation
Plan Melbourne refresh

Please use this workbook to record any specific feedback you would like to provide to the Plan Melbourne refresh project team.

Topic #1 – Housing

My initial reactions:

My questions to the panel:

1. How well did we describe what we needed to?
   - [ ] 1 
   - [ ] 2 
   - [ ] 3 
   - [ ] 4 
   - [ ] 5

2. Use of time: How well did we use our time?
   - [ ] 1 
   - [ ] 2 
   - [ ] 3 
   - [ ] 4 
   - [ ] 5

3. Participation: How well did we do on ensuring everyone was involved?
   - [ ] 1 
   - [ ] 2 
   - [ ] 3 
   - [ ] 4 
   - [ ] 5

4. Delivery: How well was the workshop managed?
   - [ ] 1 
   - [ ] 2 
   - [ ] 3 
   - [ ] 4 
   - [ ] 5

5. Organisation: How well was the workshop run?
   - [ ] 1 
   - [ ] 2 
   - [ ] 3 
   - [ ] 4 
   - [ ] 5

6. Will your organisation be making a submission to Plan Melbourne refresh?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

Please provide your contact email if you would like to receive further information about the project:

Name: ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Organisation: ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

Email: …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Capire Consulting Group and any person(s) acting on our behalf is committed to protecting privacy and personally identifiable information by meeting our responsibilities under the Victorian Privacy Act 1988 and the Australian Privacy Principles 2014 as well as relevant industry codes of ethics and conduct.

Topic #2 – A more resilient Melbourne

My initial reactions:

My questions to the panel:

Topic #3 – Implementation and planning tools

My initial reactions:

My questions to the panel:

Workshop Evaluation

To evaluate the success of this workshop and to improve future sessions, we invite you to complete this evaluation form. Please use the following ratings and choose the most appropriate response:

- [ ]G = Good
- [ ]E = Excellent
- [ ]S = Satisfactory
- [ ]F = Fair
- [ ]P = Poor

Inside spread
**9.4.3 INDUSTRY STAKEHOLDERS WORKSHOP**

**Plan Melbourne refresh**

Please use this workbook to record any specific feedback you would like to provide to the Plan Melbourne refresh project team.

**Topic #1 – Housing**

My initial reactions:

My questions to the panel:

![Evaluation Form]

**Topic #2 – A more resilient Melbourne**

My initial reactions:

My questions to the panel:

**Topic #3 – Implementation and planning tools**

My initial reactions:

My questions to the panel:

**Workshop Evaluation**

To evaluate the success of this workshop and to improve future sessions, we invite you to complete the evaluation form. Please use the following ratings and circled the most appropriate responses.

Q: How well did we describe what we needed to?

1 2 3 4 5

Q: How well did we use our time?

1 2 3 4 5

Q: How well did we do on making sure everyone was involved?

1 2 3 4 5

Q: How well was the workshop managed?

1 2 3 4 5

Q: How well was the workshop run?

1 2 3 4 5

Please provide your contact email if you would like to receive further information about the project:

Name: ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Organisation: ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

Email: ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Capire Consulting Group and any person(s) acting on our behalf is committed to protecting privacy and personally identifiable information by meeting our responsibilities under the [Victorian Privacy Act 1988](http://www.privacy.vic.gov.au) and the [Australian Privacy Principles 2014](http://www.privacy.gov.au) as well as relevant industry codes of ethics and conduct.
Summary of engagement activities

9.5 ONLINE ENGAGEMENT HUB REPORT

Summary Report
Date Range

Plan Melbourne Refresh

PROJECTS SELECTED: 8

About the Plan Melbourne refresh | Submissions to Plan Melbourne refresh have now closed | Internal Working | Have an idea? | Useful resources | Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper | Plan Melbourne refresh Local Government workshops

FULL LIST AT THE END OF THE REPORT

Visitors Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pageviews</th>
<th>Visitors</th>
<th>Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nov '15</td>
<td>1k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dec '15</td>
<td>2k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlights

- TOTAL VISITS: 10.6k
- MAXIMUM SINGLE DAY VISITORS: 1,273
- ENGAGED VISITORS: 328
- INFORMED VISITORS: 1.1k
- AWARE VISITORS: 7k
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGAGED</th>
<th>328 ENGAGED PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>INFORMED</th>
<th>1,081 INFORMED PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>AWARE</th>
<th>6,952 AWARE PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>Unverified</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Total Actions</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed on Forums</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to Newfeeds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Surveys</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to Stories</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Quick Polls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted on Guestbooks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to Newsfeeds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked Questions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed Pins on Maps</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to Brainstorms</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A single engaged participant can perform multiple actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP PROJECTS</th>
<th>Participants (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submissions to Plan Melbourne refresh</td>
<td>240 (17.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh Local Government workshops</td>
<td>40 (54.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh stakeholder engagement workshops</td>
<td>33 (48.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have an idea?</td>
<td>25 (6.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful resources</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Working</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the Plan Melbourne refresh</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Calculated as a percentage of total visits to the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP PROJECTS</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submissions to Plan Melbourne refresh</td>
<td>813 (59.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have an idea?</td>
<td>189 (46.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the Plan Melbourne refresh</td>
<td>122 (9.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh Local Government workshops</td>
<td>40 (54.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh stakeholder engagement workshops</td>
<td>33 (48.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Working</td>
<td>4 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper</td>
<td>1 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful resources</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Calculated as a percentage of total visits to the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP PROJECTS</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper</td>
<td>5,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissions to Plan Melbourne refresh</td>
<td>1,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the Plan Melbourne refresh</td>
<td>1,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful resources</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have an idea?</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh Local Government workshops</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh stakeholder engagement workshops</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Working</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Total list of unique visitors to the project

- Aware user could have also performed an Informed or Engaged Action

Summary of engagement activities

Page Number
### ENGAGEMENT TOOLS SUMMARY

#### SURVEYS SUMMARY
- **8** Surveys
- **314** Contributors
- **380** Submissions

#### TOP 3 SURVEYS BASED ON CONTRIBUTORS
- **168** Contributors to
  - Upload submission
- **91** Contributors to
  - Online submission form
- **40** Contributors to
  - Local Government Workshops Registration Form

#### NEWSFEEDS SUMMARY
- **2** NewsFeed
- **0** Visits
- **0** Visitors

#### TOP 3 NEWSFEEDS BASED ON VISITORS
- **0** Visitors to
  - Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper – Have your say on Plan Melbourne
- **0** Visitors to
  - Test video
- **0** Visitors to
  - Thanks for your submissions to the Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper

#### Q & A SUMMARY
- **1** Q&As
- **4** Contributors
- **4** Questions

#### TOP 3 Q & A BASED ON CONTRIBUTORS
- **4** Contributors to
  - Ask us a question

#### BRAINSTORMERS SUMMARY
- **7** Brainstormers
- **21** Contributors
- **77** Contributions

#### TOP 3 BRAINSTORMERS BASED ON CONTRIBUTORS
- **15** Contributed to
  - Growth challenges, fundamental principles and key concepts
- **8** Contributed to
  - A more connected Melbourne
- **2** Contributed to
  - Climate Change

---

**Summary of engagement activities**

---

Page Number
INFORMATION WIDGET SUMMARY

DOCUMENTS

- **Documents**: 28
- **Visitors**: 167
- **Downloads**: 192

PHOTOS

- **Photos**: 1
- **Visitors**: 0
- **Views**: 0

VIDEOS

- **Videos**: 1
- **Visitors**: 2
- **Views**: 2

FAQS

- **Faqs**: 1
- **Visitors**: 158
- **Views**: 166

TOP 3 DOCUMENTS BASED ON DOWNLOADS

- **183 Downloads**: Plan Melbourne Refresh Discussion Paper Submission Template
- **7 Downloads**: deleted_document
- **1 Downloads**: Chapter 4: A more connected Melbourne

TOP 3 PHOTOS BASED ON VIEWS

- **0 Views**: Ashes

TOP 3 VIDEOS BASED ON VIEWS

- **2 Views**: Plan Melbourne

TOP 3 FAQS BASED ON VIEWS

- **166 Views**: About the Plan Melbourne refresh
## Traffic Sources Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referrer URL</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.reddit.com/r/melbourne">http://www.reddit.com/r/melbourne</a></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.reddit.com/r/melbourne/news/Ministerial-Advisory-Committee-recommendations">https://www.reddit.com/r/melbourne/news/Ministerial-Advisory-Committee-recommendations</a></td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.reddit.com/r/melbourne/news/Ministerial-Advisory-Committee-recommendations">http://www.reddit.com/r/melbourne/news/Ministerial-Advisory-Committee-recommendations</a></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.reddit.com/r/melbourne/">https://www.reddit.com/r/melbourne/</a></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.facebook.com/">https://www.facebook.com/</a></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://architectureau.com/articles/curb-the-sprawl-melbourne-at-8-million/">http://architectureau.com/articles/curb-the-sprawl-melbourne-at-8-million/</a></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://m.facebook.com">http://m.facebook.com</a></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.reddit.com/">https://www.reddit.com/</a></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SELECTED PROJECTS - FULL LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>AWARE</th>
<th>INFORMED</th>
<th>ENGAGED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper</td>
<td>5987</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissions to Plan Melbourne refresh have now closed</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the Plan Melbourne refresh</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful resources</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have an idea?</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh Local Government workshops</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Melbourne refresh stakeholder engagement workshops</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Working</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>