Discussion Paper Submission

Submission to Plan Melbourne Refresh by MacroPlan on behalf of Riverlee

Reference should also be made to the Appendix to this submission

Introduction

Please find following key information about making a submission.

Who can make a submission?

Anyone is able to comment and make submissions on the Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper.

How will submissions be used?

We want a Plan Melbourne to reflect the community’s views, particularly in relation to housing affordability and diversity, energy efficiency and climate change. All submissions received will be reviewed and inform Plan Melbourne 2016.

Will submissions be publicly available?

Written submissions will be publicly available and will be able to be read by others, unless you have requested and been granted confidentiality status.

Why do I have to register to make a submission or comment online?

The information provided in the registration form will help us analyse the responses and help us know which issues are of concern to residents in which areas of Melbourne or to particular community groups.

Can I provide a submission in another format?

Given the high volume of submissions anticipated it is strongly preferred that the online form or the downloadable template be used. This will ensure the most effective evaluation of the issues raised in submissions.
How do I make a submission?

You will need to register to make a submission. Submissions and comments will close at 5.00pm AEDST Friday 18 December 2015. Once registered, there are two ways to make a submission:

- Complete the [online submission form](#)
- [Upload](#) your submission using this submission template. Note that the preferred format is MS Word,

As part of making a submission, you will need to agree to the privacy collection notice and statement of confidentiality. These are outlined in both the online submission and upload forms.

**Do I have to respond to all of the questions in the submission form for my views to be heard?**

Not at all. You are welcome to respond to as many, or as few, of the questions on the Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper as you would like.

**Can I comment on other areas not addressed in the Plan Melbourne refresh discussion Paper?**

This refresh is not intended to comprehensively revise Plan Melbourne 2014. It builds on the extensive work and consultation underpinning Plan Melbourne 2014. Much of Plan Melbourne 2014 enjoys bi-partisan support and will not change.

The Plan Melbourne refresh discussion paper and consultation process is asking Melburnians to take another look at particular aspects of Plan Melbourne 2014 that need revision such as the key issues of housing supply, diversity and affordability, and climate change and will reflect the Government’s transport network priorities.
Submission:

Chapter 2: Growth, challenges, fundamental principles and key concepts

1. The discussion paper includes the option (option 5, page 16) that Plan Melbourne better define the key opportunities and challenges for developing Melbourne and outlines some key points for considerations in Box 1. Are there any other opportunities or challenges that we should be aware of?

An enhancement of key opportunities and challenges for a developing Melbourne is strongly supported. The following key opportunities and challenges are of particular relevance to this submission:

- **Growth and changing demographics:** Capitalise on existing infrastructure and increase access to the opportunities Melbourne offers;
- **A changing economy:** Support growth and innovation;
- **Housing affordability:** The provision of affordable housing is vital to achieving equality and maintaining Melbourne’s livability and productivity.
- **Providing services and infrastructure for communities:** Access to a range of physical and community infrastructure is important and must be established as early as possible.
- **Low suburban density:** The significant population growth forecast for Melbourne must be accommodated through a range of urban densities.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

As part of the provision of a range of opportunities, economic growth, housing affordability and services, specific mention should be provided in PMR to the activation of underutilized ‘in-fill’ sites within Metropolitan Melbourne to assist in providing of a range of housing options, including affordable housing.

2. The discussion paper includes the option (option 6, page 18) that the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals be included in Plan Melbourne 2016. Do you agree with this idea? If so, how should the goals be incorporated into Plan Melbourne 2016? Choose one option:

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [x] Strongly Agree

**Please explain your response:**

Sustainable development goals (economic, social and environmental sustainability) are key parameters for the future land use and livability of metropolitan Melbourne and are strongly supported.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

The provision of lifestyle options in PMR, such as Rural Residential living enhances the sustainability and livability of metropolitan Melbourne.
3. The discussion paper includes the option (option 7, page 18) to lock down the existing urban growth boundary and modify the action (i.e. the action under Initiative 6.1.1.1 in Plan Melbourne 2014) to reflect this. Do you agree that there should be a permanent urban growth boundary based on the existing boundary? Choose one option:

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [x] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

**Please explain your response:**

The use of an urban growth boundary is an integral tool in providing certainty for decision makers and landowners on the future spatial extent of the metropolitan area and in creating a more compact, contained and sustainable Melbourne.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

Land Use Measures to provide alternative living options outside the fringe of the UGB be implemented to ensure that UGB is ‘locked down’ indefinitely. Encouraging the use of the rural living zone for sites just outside the UGB will provide a physical buffer zone between urban growth and Victoria’s fertile farming zones. Encouragement of this buffer will also ensure a diversity of housing options within reasonable proximity to services provided by the Urban Growth areas. Finally, use of rural living zone will ensure that the UGB is ‘locked down’ indefinitely.

4. The discussion paper includes the option (option 8, page 18) that Plan Melbourne 2016 should more clearly articulate the values of green wedge and peri-urban areas to be protected and safeguarded. How can Plan Melbourne 2016 better articulate the values of green wedge and peri-urban areas?

Agree. Refer to discussion under question 3 above.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

As outlined in Plan Melbourne 2014, to emphasise the value to Melbourne’s non-urban areas the strategy “will define a permanent boundary for metropolitan (urban) Melbourne. This will allow the protection of key assets and economic opportunities in non-urban areas (often referred to as the peri-urban regions)” (Plan Melbourne pg159). As discussed above this can be achieved through encouraging the use of the Rural Living Zone within our peri-urban areas. Encouraging the application of the rural living zone will ensure that these area’s are indefinitely protected from the outward expansion of Melbourne.

5. The discussion paper includes the option (option 9, page 18) to remove the concept of an Integrated Economic Triangle and replace it with a high-level 2050 concept map for Melbourne (i.e. a map that shows the Expanded Central City, National Employment Clusters, Metropolitan Activity Centres, State-Significant Industrial Precincts, Transport Gateways, Health and Education Precincts and Urban Renewal Precincts). What elements should be included in a 2050 concept map for Melbourne?

The general initiative for a high level concept map identifying major employment nodes for metropolitan Melbourne is supported.
6. The discussion paper includes the option (option 10, page 18) that the concept of Melbourne as a polycentric city (i.e. a city with many centres) with 20-minute neighbourhoods (i.e. the ability to meet your everyday (non-work) needs locally, primarily within a 20-minute walk) be better defined. Do the definitions adequately clarify the concepts? Choose one option:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Please explain your response:
The concept for a polycentric city with 20-minute neighbourhoods is supported.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:
Riverlee supports a better defined polycentric city and 20-minute neighbourhood concept. Greater emphasis is needed within the Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Strategy on the supporting rationale and the planning and development principles of the polycentric city. These principles should be at the heart of Local Government strategic planning for growth centres to ensure all land within the 20-minute neighbourhood is included, no matter its current status, in the long-term strategic plan. Two particular landholdings within Riverlee’s portfolio (The Former Lilydale Quarry and Cooper Street, Epping) have been excluded from the relevant Activity Centre Planning although they represent major landholdings that clearly demonstrate the abilities to meet the concepts of the polycentric city and 20-minute neighbourhoods.

7. The discussion paper includes options (options 11-17, pages 23 to 27) that identify housing, climate change, people place and identity and partnerships with local government as key concepts that need to be incorporated into Plan Melbourne 2016. Do you support the inclusion of these as key concepts in Plan Melbourne 2016?

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Please explain your response:
The advancement of housing affordability and choice, the challenge and active consideration of climate change, the importance of identity and place and partnership with local government is strongly supported.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:
Additional considerations and range of choice for housing provision is supported.

Local government plays a major role in the delivery of land use planning outcomes identified in the PMR, primarily through the implementation of new strategic directions and changes to controls under the relevant planning schemes and the administration of the schemes. This role is assisted by the MPA. This submission urges support for the provision of additional and varied housing choices in planning schemes. Local government plays an important advocacy role, in partnership with landowners, in developing and delivering new planning scheme direction and developments, including those for the housing sector.
8. *Any other comments about chapter 2 (growth, challenges, fundamental principles and key concepts)?*

Nil.

**Chapter 3: Delivering jobs and investment**

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

Not of direct relevance to this submission.

10. The discussion paper includes two options (page 30) relating to National Employment Clusters, being:

   Option 21A: Focus planning for National Employment Clusters on core institutions and businesses

   Option 21B: Take a broader approach to planning for National Employment Clusters that looks beyond the core institutions and businesses

   **Which option do you prefer?**

  ☐ Option 21A
   ☐ Option 21B

   **Please explain why you have chosen your preferred option:**

   Not of direct relevance to this submission.

11. The discussion paper includes the option (option 22, page 30) to broaden the East Werribee National Employment Cluster to call it the Werribee National Employment Cluster in order to encompass the full range of activities and employment activities that make up Werribee. This could include the Werribee Activity Centre and the Werribee Park Tourism Precinct. *Do you agree with broadening the East Werribee Cluster? Choose one option:*

   ☐ Strongly Disagree
   ☐ Disagree
   ☐ Agree
   ☐ Strongly Agree

   **Why?**

   Not of direct relevance to this submission.
12. The discussion paper includes the option (option 23, page 30) to broaden the Dandenong South National Employment Cluster to call it the Dandenong National Employment Cluster in order to encompass the full range of activities and employment activities that make up Dandenong. This could include the Dandenong Metropolitan Activity Centre and Chisholm Institute of TAFE. Do you agree with broadening the Dandenong South National Employment Cluster? Choose one option:

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

**Why?**

Not of direct relevance to this submission.

13. The discussion paper includes options (options 24 to 30, pages 33 and 34) that consider the designation of activity centres and criteria for new activity centres. Do you have any comments on the designation of activity centres or the criteria for new activity centres as outlined in the discussion paper?

Riverlee commends the State Governments approach of enabling 20-minute neighbourhoods by providing access to a wide range of goods and services in centres that are planned and coordinated by local governments. It is considered there is also opportunity to revise the strategic direction for Activity Centres to be inclusive of urban renewal precincts and brownfield sites where possible. The strategic direction for Activity Centres should be inclusive of sites like Cooper Street, Epping and the Former Lilydale Quarry where it is evident that the objectives and principles of the ‘Polycentric City’ and ‘20-minute neighbourhood’ can be achieved. These sites should be ear marked as having the potential for future growth and development.

14. The discussion paper includes the option (option 31, page 35) to evaluate the range of planning mechanisms available to protect strategic agricultural land. What types of agricultural land and agricultural activities need to be protected and how could the planning system better protect them?

As discussed above, encouraging the use of the Rural Living Zone within our peri-urban areas could be used as a mechanism to ensure the Urban Growth Boundary does not spread out further into strategic agricultural land.

15. The discussion paper includes the option (option 32, page 36) to implement the outcomes of the Extractive Industries Taskforce through the planning scheme, including Regional Growth Plans, to affirm that extractive industries resources are protected to provide an economic supply of materials for construction and road industries. Do you have any comments in relation to extractive industries?

Not of direct relevance to this submission.

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

Nil.
## Chapter 4: A more connected Melbourne

17. The discussion paper includes the option (option 34, page 42) to include the Principal Public Transport Network in Plan Melbourne 2016. **Do you agree that the Principal Public Transport Network should inform land use choices and decisions? Choose one option:**

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [x] Strongly Agree

**Why?**

Use of a Principal Public Transport Network and accommodation of enhanced activities on the public transport network is supported.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

The inclusion of the PPTN within Plan Melbourne 2016 is supported by Riverlee. A noted advantage of the PPTN is the clarity it provides for local governments and communities about key public transport routes to guide local development decisions. It is envisaged that the PPTN would be used to inform the location for future investment and development. Riverlee has interest in a number of landholdings along the PPTN that will benefit from its inclusion in Plan Melbourne 2016. The former Lilydale Quarry, Cooper Street, Epping and Swan Street, Richmond are clear examples of large development parcels along the PPTN which can contribute significantly to the growth of the 20-minute neighbourhood and the Polycentric City.

18. The discussion paper includes the option (option 35, page 43) to incorporate references to Active Transport Victoria (which aims to increase participation and safety among cyclists and pedestrians) in Plan Melbourne 2016. **How should walking and cycling networks influence and integrate with land use?**

Incorporation of references to Active Transport Victoria and any enhancement of cyclist and pedestrian usage and safety are supported.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

Any improvement to cyclist and pedestrian usage and safety that will enhance options for commercial and housing uses and developments and is supported.

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

Nil.
Chapter 5: Housing

20. The discussion paper includes the option (option 36A, page 46) to establish a 70/30 target where established areas provide 70 per cent of Melbourne’s new housing supply and greenfield growth areas provide 30 per cent. Do you agree with establishing a 70/30 target for housing supply? Choose one option:

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [x] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

Why?
The establishment of a 70/30 target where established areas provide 70 per cent of Melbourne’s new housing supply and greenfield growth areas provide 30 per cent is supported. This target will assist in achieving greater access to employment, maximising infrastructure and reducing demands for infrastructure in outer locations and extending the supply of other developable land.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

To assist in achieving 70 per cent of Melbourne’s new housing in established areas Metropolitan planning should focus on unlocking housing supply in underutilised established areas. These areas should include land where the potential to achieve the goals of the ‘Polycentric City’ and the ‘20-minute neighbourhood’ are clear. An example of two of the properties within the Riverlee portfolio that can assist with achieving this are the Former Lilydale Quarry and Cooper Street, Epping.

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

No specific reforms identified. See response to question 20 above.

22. The discussion paper includes the option (option 36B, page 46) to investigate a mechanism to manage the sequence and density of the remaining Precinct Structure Plans based on land supply needs. Do you agree with this idea? Choose one option:

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [x] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

Why?
The principle of managing the sequence and density of residential land supply in Precinct Structure Plans is supported.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

Precinct Structure Plans are an appropriate mechanism to identify commercial and housing options and locations. Focus should be placed on developed underutilized serviced land like the Former Lilydale Quarry and 215 Cooper Street, Epping before additional residential land in PSP areas is released for residential development.
23. The discussion paper includes the option (option 36C, page 46) to focus metropolitan planning on unlocking housing supply in established areas, particularly within areas specifically targeted for growth and intensification. Do you agree with this idea? Choose one option:

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [x] Strongly Agree

Why?

The option of unlocking housing supply in established areas is supported, particularly within areas specifically targeted for growth and intensification.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

As discussed previously Metropolitan planning should focus on unlocking housing supply in established areas. These areas should include underutilised land (sometimes outside an Activity Centre) where the potential to achieve the goals of the ‘Polycentric City’ and the ‘20- minute neighbourhood’ are clear. Examples of landholdings that Riverlee have an interest in is the Former Lilydale Quarry and 215 Cooper Street, Epping. These two sites sit adjacent to Activity Centres and have the clear capability of meeting the ‘Polycentric City’ Concept.

24. The discussion paper includes options (option 37, page 50) to better define and communicate Melbourne’s housing needs by either:

- Option 37A: Setting housing targets for metropolitan Melbourne and each sub-region relating to housing diversity, supply and affordability.
- Option 37B: Developing a metropolitan Housing Strategy that includes a Housing Plan.

Which option do you prefer? Choose one option:

- [ ] Option 37A
- [x] Option 37B
- [ ] Other

Why?

The development of an overall strategy with housing outcomes and preferred housing scenarios for sub-regions appears to be a more sound approach than setting hard targets for each sub-region.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

Provision of additional supply and range of housing is strongly supported. It is useful to have some flexibility in the actual provision and choice of housing provision and options within each geographical area (sub-region) of metropolitan Melbourne.

25. The discussion paper includes the option (option 38, page 52) to introduce a policy statement in Plan Melbourne 2016 to support population and housing growth in defined locations and acknowledge that some areas within defined locations will require planning protection based on their valued character. How could Plan Melbourne 2016 clarify those locations in which higher scales of change are supported?

Support for population and housing growth in defined locations and recognition of valued character
is generally supported.
Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:
While population and housing growth in defined locations is generally supported, it is useful to have some flexibility in the actual provision and choice of housing provision and options within each geographical area (sub-region) of metropolitan Melbourne.

26. The discussion paper includes the option (option 39, page 52) to clarify the direction to ‘protect the suburbs’. How could Plan Melbourne 2016 clarify the direction to protect Melbourne and its suburbs from inappropriate development?

See response to question 25 above.

27. The discussion paper includes the option (option 40, page 56) to clarify the action to apply the Neighbourhood Residential Zone to at least 50 per cent of residential land by:

Option 40A: Deleting the action and replacing it with a direction that clarifies how the residential zones should be applied to respect valued character and deliver housing diversity.

Option 40B: Retain at least 50 per cent as a guide but expand the criteria to enable variations between municipalities.

Which option do you prefer? Choose one option:

☑ Option 40A
☐ Option 40B
☐ Other

Why?

While protection of valued residential character is generally supported, the potential application of the Neighbourhood Residential Zone to a defined percentage of total area is arbitrary and may not be capable of justification. Additional measures to protect character should only be used when full assessment and justification has been provided.

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

The principle of facilitating housing that readily adapts to the changing needs of households over the life of a dwelling is strongly supported.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:
Housing options that promote diversity in the range of type and location of housing are supported. Flexibility in the use of existing and future housing is an important component of this diversity.
29. A number of options are outlined in the discussion paper (page 58) to improve housing affordability, including:

Option 45A: Consider introducing planning tools that mandate or facilitate or provide incentives to increase social and affordable housing supply.

Option 45B: Evaluate the affordable housing initiative pilot for land sold by government to determine whether to extend this to other suitable land sold by government.

Option 45C: Identify planning scheme requirements that could be waived or reduced without compromising the amenity of social and affordable housing or neighbouring properties.

What other ideas do you have for how Plan Melbourne 2016 can improve housing affordability?

Various options to improve housing affordability are strongly supported.
Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:
Flexibility in housing approval and provision is an important component of housing affordability and should be strongly promoted.

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

Nil.
Chapter 6: A more resilient and environmentally sustainable Melbourne

31. The discussion paper includes the option (option 46, page 69) to introduce Strategic Environmental Principles in Plan Melbourne 2016 to guide implementation of environment, climate change and water initiatives. *Do you agree with the inclusion of Strategic Environmental Principles in Plan Melbourne 2016? Choose one option:*

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [x] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

**Why?**

Land use planning should implement initiatives for the environment, climate change and water. The introduction of Strategic Environmental Principles to implement these initiatives is supported.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

Future commercial and residential development proposals must fully consider and implement initiatives for the environment, climate change and water. These initiatives may be adequately considered through future rezoning, structure planning and planning permits processes, as relevant.

32. The discussion paper includes the option (option 47, page 72) to review policy and hazard management planning tools (such as overlays) to ensure the planning system responds to climate change challenges. *Do you agree with this idea? Choose one option:*

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [x] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

**Why?**

Land use planning should fully consider and provide initiative to address climate change challenges. The use of policy hazard and management tools to respond to these challenges is strongly supported.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

Future commercial and residential development proposals must fully consider and provide initiatives to address climate change challenges. These initiatives may be adequately considered through future rezoning, structure planning and planning permits processes, as relevant.

33. The discussion paper includes options (options 48 and 49, page 72) to update hazard mapping to promote resilience and avoid unacceptable risk, and update periodically the planning system and supporting legislative and policy frameworks to reflect best available climate change science and data. *Do you have any comments on these options?*

Land use planning should fully consider hazard mapping to promote resilience and avoid unacceptable risk.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

Future commercial and residential development proposals must fully consider hazard mapping and provide outcomes that promote community resilience and avoid unacceptable risk, for example
avoiding areas of high bushfire risk. These considerations may be adequately addressed through future rezoning, structure planning and planning permits processes, as relevant.

34. The discussion paper includes the option (option 50, page 73) to incorporate natural hazard management criteria into Victorian planning schemes to improve planning in areas exposed to climate change and environmental risks. Do you agree with this idea? Choose one option:

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [X] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

**Why?**

Land use planning should fully consider and incorporate natural hazard to improve planning in areas exposed to climate change and environmental risks.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

Future commercial and residential development proposals must fully consider and integrate natural hazard considerations in areas exposed to climate change and environmental risks. These considerations may be adequately addressed through future rezoning, structure planning and planning permits processes, as relevant.

35. The discussion paper includes the option (option 51, page 75) to investigate consideration of climate change risks in infrastructure planning in the land use planning system, including consideration of an ‘infrastructure resilience test’. Do you agree that a more structured approach to consideration of climate change risks in infrastructure planning has merit? Choose one option:

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [X] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

**Why?**

Refer to discussion under question 32 above.

36. The discussion paper includes the option (option 52, page 76) to strengthen high-priority habitat corridors throughout Melbourne and its peri-urban areas to improve long-term health of key flora and fauna habitat. Do you agree with this idea? Choose one option:

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [X] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

**Why?**

Land use planning must fully consider and protect identified environmental values and assets.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

Future commercial and residential development proposals must fully assess and protect environmental values. These values may be adequately considered through future rezoning,
structure planning and planning permits processes, as relevant.

37. The discussion paper includes options (options 53 and 54, pages 78 and 79) to introduce strategies to cool our city including: increasing tree canopy, vegetated ground cover and permeable surfaces; use of Water Sensitive Urban Design and irrigation; and encouraging the uptake of green roofs, facades and walls, as appropriate materials used for pavements and buildings with low heat-absorption properties. What other strategies could be beneficial for cooling our built environment?

Land use planning must fully consider and provide sustainable environmental design and infrastructure provision.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

Future commercial and residential development proposals must fully assess and provide sustainable environmental design and infrastructure provision. This design may be adequately considered and provided through future rezoning, structure planning and planning permits processes, as relevant.

38. The discussion paper includes the option (option 56A, page 80) to investigate opportunities in the land use planning system, such as strong supporting planning policy, to facilitate the increased uptake of renewable and low-emission energy in Melbourne and its peri-urban areas. Do you agree that stronger land use planning policies are needed to facilitate the uptake of renewable and low-emission energy? Choose one option:

☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Disagree
☒ Agree
☐ Strongly Agree

Why?

Land use planning must fully consider low-energy emissions and provide renewable energy usage.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

Future commercial and residential development proposals must fully consider low-energy emission and provide renewable energy usage. These considerations may be adequately provided through future rezoning, structure planning and planning permits processes, as relevant.

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

☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Disagree
☒ Agree
☐ Strongly Agree

Why?

Refer to discussion under question 38 above.
40.  The discussion paper includes the option (option 57, page 81) to take an integrated approach to planning and building to strengthen Environmentally Sustainable Design, including consideration of costs and benefits. **Do you agree that an integrated planning and building approach would strengthen Environmentally Sustainable Design? Choose one option:**

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [x] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

**Why?**

Land use planning must fully consider and provide environmentally sustainable environmental design, including costs and benefits.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

Future commercial and residential development proposals must fully assess and provide environmentally sustainable environmental design. This design may be adequately considered and provided through future rezoning, structure planning and planning permits processes, as relevant.

41. **Any other comments about chapter 6 (a more resilient and environment ally sustainable Melbourne)?**

Nil.
Chapter 7: New planning tools

42. The discussion paper includes options (options 58A and 58B, page 84) to evaluate whether new or existing planning tools (zones and overlays) could be applied to National Employment Clusters and urban renewal areas. Do you have any comments on the planning tools (zones and overlays) needed for National Employment Clusters and urban renewal areas?

No particular comment.

43. The discussion paper includes options (options 59A and 59B, page 84) to evaluate the merits of code assessment for multi-unit development, taking into account the findings from the ‘Better Apartments’ process, to either replace ResCode with a codified process for multi-unit development or identify ResCode standards that can be codified. Do you have any comments on the merits of code assessment for multi-unit development?

A performance based code is desirable to guide future residential design and development, including multi-unit proposals.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

A performance based approach, rather than overly prescriptive approach, allows merits based system for residential design and development. Future proposals may be adequately addressed on their merits through the planning permit process.

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

Nil.
Chapter 8: Implementation

45. The discussion paper includes the option (options 1 and 61, pages 14 and 90) of Plan Melbourne being an enduring strategy with a long-term focus supported by a ‘rolling’ implementation plan. Do you agree that separating the long-term strategy from a shorter-term supporting implementation plan is a good idea?

The principle of the revised PM being an enduring strategy with a long-term focus supported by a ‘rolling’ implementation plan is supported.

Additional comment to support the Riverlee submission:

It is important to have active monitoring and amendment of implementation measures, when required. This monitoring and review may include provision of revised housing options that may be periodically identified and strategically supported.

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

No particular comment. See response to question 45 above.

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

Nil.

Reference should also be made to the Appendix to this submission.
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1. Introduction
1. Introduction

1.1 Scope of this Submission

The following submission was prepared by MacroPlan Dimasi for Riverlee in response to the October 2015 Plan Melbourne Refresh discussion paper.

This paper outlines the existing contribution made by Riverlee to the Victorian economy and the strategic alignment of its projects with high level policy directions for metropolitan Melbourne. Land use planning directions will contribute to and support the development of a Polycentric City as outlined in the updated Metropolitan Planning Framework. In particular, Riverlee projects will directly implement the following key directions of Plan Melbourne Refresh:

1. Growth Challenges, Fundamental Principles and Key Concepts;
2. Delivering Jobs and Investment;
3. A More Connected Melbourne;
4. Housing.

1.2 About Riverlee

Riverlee is a Melbourne based private property development and investment group specialising in commercial, residential, and retail projects.

Founder, Clement Lee, is an architect and town planner by qualification with over forty years’ experience in property development in Malaysia and Australia. Since 1993, the Australian operations have grown to encompass Riverlee, Riverside Group, Asset 1 and WTC Group of companies.

Riverlee undertakes projects across Victoria and Australia, drawing on its expertise and experience in property development, construction, investment and asset management.

Riverlee has a focused approach, integrity and a keen attitude to deliver projects that build on place.

Riverlee is a family business. The second generation play key roles across the firm, adding complimentary expertise and ensuring continuity of Riverlee’s passion and vision.

Riverlee has a passion for Melbourne as it is the city it commenced operation in. It congratulates the State Government on the opportunity to revisit the role Plan Melbourne will play in growing this great city. Riverlee welcomes the opportunity to articulate some of its ideas to address key pillars and directions outlined in Plan Melbourne.
1. Introduction

1.4 Riverlee Projects subject to this Submission

From the outset it is noted that Riverlee widely support the findings and the directions of Plan Melbourne Refresh. In addition to Riverlee having a keen interest in the vision for Melbourne’s growth to the year 2050, Riverlee have a number of projects which can make a positive contribution to the directions contained within Plan Melbourne and Plan Melbourne Refresh. The land holdings and projects of significance which Riverlee would like to highlight to State Government are as follows:

1.4.1 Doolins Rd, Darraweit Guim/Mickleham

Doolins Road, Darraweit Guim and Doolins Road Mickleham is a combination of two landholdings comprising approximately 40km north of central Melbourne. The land is currently located within a Farming Zone. Located just outside the Urban Growth Boundary, sites like this have the potential to be used and developed for purposes that will provide a buffer between urban sprawl and Victoria’s fertile farm lands. In this submission, Riverlee suggest that the use of the rural living zone could be an identified tool to ensure that the Urban Growth Boundary is ‘locked in’ indefinitely.

1.4.2 Swan Street, Richmond

462-486 Swan Street, Richmond is a 6,900sqm block of consolidated land within a Commercial 2 Zone. The land is also located within the Swan Street Structure Plan area and is identified as a strategic development site which has the potential for increased intensity. The site is located within close proximity to a range of services including Burnley train station. The site is capable of meeting central Melbourne.
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1.4.3 The Former Lilydale Quarry
(Better define the concepts of the polycentric city and 20-minute neighbourhoods / Revise the strategic direction for Activity Centres / Principal Public Transport Network / unlocking housing supply in established areas)

Lilydale Quarry has operated for approximately 135 years and was once the largest employer in Lilydale. The site encompasses an area of 162.7 hectares.

A draft master plan for the entire site was prepared following community consultation in June 2013. The master plan envisages a 15 to 20 year redevelopment program which will ultimately support approximately 2,500 new residential dwellings across a diverse range of densities and housing types.

The Lilydale Major Activity Centre Structure Plan was developed by the Shire of Yarra Ranges in June 2006 and fails to include the land known as Lilydale Quarry. Lilydale Quarry is a major infill site within an area well serviced by public transport and a wide range of commercial services. This landholding is currently underutilised and should be highlighted for inclusion within the existing Activity Centre. Lilydale Quarry and similar sites of underutilised land should be earmarked for inclusion in relevant strategic plans given the potential to achieve the ‘Polycentric City’ and ‘20-minute neighbourhood’ concepts, these being some of the key principles of Plan Melbourne 2014 and Plan Melbourne Refresh 2015.

1.4.4 Cooper Street Epping
(Better define the concepts of the polycentric city and 20-minute neighbourhoods / Revise the strategic direction for Activity Centres / unlocking housing supply in established areas)

Riverlee jointly acquired 215 Cooper St Epping, a 46-hectare former quarry in 2015. The site is approximately 19km north of Melbourne’s CBD. The site has remained vacant for the past 17 years and is one of the last remaining links in the Epping Central Activity Centre.

The Epping Central Metropolitan Activity Centre was approved by the Minister of Planning in March 2015. The former Epping Quarry site sits directly outside the Activity Centre boundary. As discussed within this submission, Riverlee suggests that ‘in-fill’ sites like 215 Cooper Street, Epping should not be excluded from the key areas highlighted for growth within Metropolitan Melbourne. The location and size of 215 Cooper Street, Epping ensures that it has all the attributes to achieve the ‘Polycentric City’ concept.

Riverlee submits that ‘in-fill’ sites with clear locational qualities to meet the objectives and goals of Plan Melbourne and Plan Melbourne Refresh should be highlighted for inclusion within consolidated Activity Centres. These sites are often located along the PPTN and are excluded from Activity Centre planning due to uncertainty of investigation and clean-up requirements.
2. Plan Melbourne Refresh - Key Points

Challenges and Opportunities for Melbourne

**People**
- Melbourne's population is expected to increase from 4.6 million to 7.9 million by 2051.

**Homes**
- There is expected to be an extra 1.5 million homes by 2051.
- In 1996, 29% of low-income households renting privately paid more than half their income in rent. By 2011, this had increased to 39%.

**Jobs**
- By 2031, there is expected to be another 1.7 million jobs.
- One third of these additional jobs will be in Melbourne's central region.

**Trips**
- 7 million extra road, public transport, cycling and pedestrian trips per day on Melbourne's transport network by 2040.

**Weather Extremes**
- 13 days per year over 35°C by 2030
- The Garnaut Review found that the costs of unmitigated climate change are expected to reduce Victoria's Gross State Product by approximately 2% by 2050.

Riverlee Submission to Plan Melbourne Refresh
2. Plan Melbourne Refresh - Key Points

2.1 Overview - Scope of Proposed Changes

Much of Plan Melbourne has bipartisan support, with Plan Melbourne 201 not proposing a comprehensive revision. Plan Melbourne Refresh aims to promote discussion of options with stakeholders, experts and the community with regards to pathways for facing challenges with significant planning implications.

Plan Melbourne 2016 will maintain focus on its key priorities and also strengthen some key areas. Plan Melbourne 2016 will maintain the focus on the following areas that Riverlee have a keen interest in:

- Transforming the transport system to support a more efficient, productive city with improved travel options to increase social and economic participation.
- Directing growth and increased development intensity to strategic locations.
- Achieving a city of ‘20-minute neighbourhoods’.
- Delivering a compact urban form with a fixed urban growth boundary.
- Supporting growth in regional Victoria.

Plan Melbourne 2016 also intends to align with other strategies and policy reviews as it contributes to advancing the government’s broader economic, social and environmental policy. This integrated approach across government is intended to deliver overarching policy goals, such as delivering jobs and securing economic prosperity. Complementary action is required on issues such as transport planning to serve key land uses. (Page 9 of Discussion Paper)

2.2 Growth challenges, fundamental principles and key concepts

Plan Melbourne 2016 intends to better define the key opportunities and challenges for developing Melbourne.

Those that Riverlee can play a role in are as follows:

- Growth & changing demographics
  Melbourne’s strong population growth is projected to continue and Plan Melbourne Refresh needs to direct the way the city grows to create great places that capitalise on existing infrastructure and increase Melburnian’s access to opportunities the city offers.
- A changing economy
  The economy is changing, manufacturing has been in decline and business services has grown substantially to become a large contributor to Victoria’s economy. A key challenge of Plan Melbourne 2016 is to support growth and innovation.
- Moving people and goods
  As the city grows, Melbourne’s transport network will be under increasing pressure which will impact on productivity and the city’s liveability. Building new transport infrastructure will be a key part of responding to increased, particularly in the fast growing parts of the city, but we will also need to respond by using our existing network more efficiently and ensuring the transport network supports the key land use directions in Plan Melbourne 2016.
- Housing affordability
  House prices and rents have increased, particularly in well serviced inner and middle suburbs with good access to jobs. This is generating inequality and will negatively impact on Melbourne’s liveability and productivity. We need to ensure there is more affordable housing.
- Providing services and infrastructure for communities
  New communities take time to form and it is important for all Melburnians to have access to health, education, public transport, retail and community facilities and services. These must be established for urban renewal and greenfield growth areas, as early as possible.
- Low suburban density
  Melbourne’s urban footprint is one of the largest in the world. To accommodate the significant population growth forecast for the years ahead, Melbourne’s strategy needs to encourage higher urban densities and foster more diversity and choice in the housing sector, closer proximity to public transport and jobs.

(Page 16 of Discussion Paper)
2 Plan Melbourne Refresh - Key Points

2.3 Delivering Jobs & Investment

Plan Melbourne 2014 supported a new geography for jobs and productivity. It focused on the importance of suburban centres to provide a range of service jobs that would be supported by public assets such as health and education facilities. The goal was to increase access to work in middle and outer Melbourne, minimise travel to work and help grow diverse skills across Melbourne.

Plan Melbourne 2016 will continue to drive the expansion of the central city and support growth of significant employment across the metropolitan areas, in national employment clusters, metropolitan activity centres and state significant industrial precincts.

The planning and transport systems will support Melbourne’s productive employment centres. An enhanced transport network will link an expanded central city, National Employment Clusters, state significant industrial precincts and gateway locations.

The Metropolitan Melbourne Structure Plan included in Plan Melbourne 2014 defined a hierarchy of centres – including metropolitan activity centres (of state significance), activity centres and neighbourhood centres. These activity centres are acknowledged as vibrant areas and are usually well served by public transport.

There is the potential to revisit the designation of some centres in the refreshed Plan Melbourne, with potential of some centres to be better placed to play a more key role.

(Page 30-33 of Discussion Paper)

2.4 A More Connected Melbourne

Adaptive transport planning is vital to respond to Melbourne’s growth patterns as they emerge and change over time. The detail and timing of transport initiatives demand assessment and analysis so the right transport network investments are made at the right time. Infrastructure Victoria had been established to advise on infrastructure investments and policy directions. Plan Melbourne 2016 will identify committed transport projects and future options for strategic linkages.

(Page 40 of Discussion Paper)

2.5 Housing

Plan Melbourne 2016 needs to articulate long-term land use policies and reforms to meet forecast housing needs and expand housing choice and affordability. The Ministerial Advisory Committee (MAC 2015) report proposes a significant number of initiatives relating to housing supply, diversity and affordability.

As a growing city Melbourne needs to facilitate the mobility, education and economic opportunities of its households. Boosting housing choice for all households will have significant social and economic benefits for individuals and all Victorians.

Options canvass actions that will establish new housing development goals, increase certainty for housing development, facilitate housing supply in Melbourne’s established areas and develop comprehensive data and strategies to better guide housing planning.

(Page 45 of Discussion Paper)
3_ Discussion Areas of Interest to Riverlee

3.1_Overview

As acknowledged in the commencement of this document, Plan Melbourne Refresh does not propose a rewrite or a comprehensive revision, rather the objective is for the plan to be revisited in light of new information and to incorporate what we have learnt since the inception of Plan Melbourne 2014.

Riverlee as stakeholder with keen interest in the future development of Melbourne, considers that it has a role to play in shaping a refreshed Plan Melbourne. Plan Melbourne 2016 vision (as outlined on page 19 of the discussion paper) consists of Melbourne being a global city of opportunity and choice.

Key objectives that are relevant to Riverlee in supporting this vision include;

• For Melbourne to be a global city we need to develop in defined areas near services and infrastructure.

• To be a globally connected and competitive city we need to provide a diversity of housing in defined locations that cater for different households and are close to jobs and services.

• To be a distinctive Melbourne, so to deliver jobs and investment, we need to create a city structure that drives productivity and supports private investment.

• For greater social and economic participation we need a more connected Melbourne through the provision of an integrated transport system connecting people to jobs, services and goods to markets.

• To provide a city where living locally within a “20-minute” city is the norm, we need to achieve clear results and deliver outcomes through better governance, planning, regulation and funding mechanisms.

3.2_Shaping the City

Options for discussion within section 2.5 of Plan Melbourne Refresh include the following:

• 7_ Lock down the existing urban growth boundary and modify the action to do this.

Riverlee support the concept of ‘locking down’ the urban growth boundary (UGB) and establishing certainty in creating a more compact, contained and sustainable Melbourne. It is considered that this should be done by adopting a measured approach to Urban Planning rather than implementing a hard edge to the cities urban growth. Measures to provide alternative living options outside the fringe of the UGB such as the encouragement of the rural living zone around the boundary of the UGB should be investigated. Encouraging the use of the rural living zone for sites like Doolins Road, Darraweit Guim and Doolins Road, Mickleham will provide a physical buffer zone between urban growth and Victoria’s fertile farming zones. Encouragement of this buffer will also ensure a diversity of housing options within reasonable proximity to services provided by the Urban Growth areas. Finally, use of rural living zone will ensure that the UGB is ‘locked down’ indefinitely.

• 8_ More clearly articulate the values of green wedge and peri-urban areas to be protected and safeguarded.

In addition to the above, Riverlee supports clearer articulation of the green wedge and peri-urban values to be protected. As outlined in Plan Melbourne 2014, to emphasise the value to Melbourne’s non-urban areas the strategy “will define a permanent boundary for metropolitan (urban) Melbourne. This will allow the protection of key assets and economic opportunities in non-urban areas (often referred to as the peri-urban regions)” (Plan Melbourne pg159). As discussed above this can be achieved through encouraging the use of the Rural Living Zone within our peri-urban areas. Encouraging the application of the rural living zone will ensure that these areas are indefinitely protected from the outward expansion of Melbourne.
3.2 Shaping the City (cont.)

- Better define the concepts of the polycentric city and 20-minute neighbourhoods—particularly the ability to meet daily (non-work) needs locally, primarily within a 20-minute walk—and include the polycentric city as a key concept.

Riverlee supports a better defined polycentric city and 20-minute neighbourhood concept. Greater emphasis is needed within the Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Strategy on the supporting rationale and the planning and development principles of the polycentric city. These principles should be at the heart of Local Government strategic planning for growth centres to ensure all land within the 20-minute neighbourhood is included, no matter its current status, in the long-term strategic plan. Two particular landholdings within Riverlee’s portfolio (The Former Lilydale Quarry and Cooper Street, Epping) have been excluded from the relevant Activity Centre Planning although they represent major landholdings that clearly demonstrate the abilities to meet the concepts of the polycentric city and 20-minute neighbourhoods.

3.3 Partnership with Local Government

Section 2.9 of Plan Melbourne Refresh outlines the following option for discussion:

- Recognise and reinforce the importance of partnership with local government in sub-regional planning and the implementation of Plan Melbourne 2016.

Riverlee supports greater recognition at high level the key role and responsibility which local government has in the implementation of Plan Melbourne 2016. Riverlee suggests greater emphasis on the responsibility of local government to implement the strategic principles of Plan Melbourne through its Local Planning Policy Framework and for this to be done in a timely manner. Greater emphasis could be placed on local government acting as a cabalist in encouraging urban consolidation in achieving the objectives of Plan Melbourne 2016. Riverlee has interest in a number of sites that are strategically located and supported for re-development by both Plan Melbourne and ‘in principle’ by local government but the elongated process to bring the site to the market is delaying the objectives of Plan Melbourne 2014 being realised. A streamlined approach should be nominated to ensure the objectives of Plan Melbourne 2016 are implemented in a timely manner with greater emphasis placed on local government in achieving this.
3. Discussion Areas of Interest to Riverlee

3.4 Designation of Activity Centres

Section 3.2 of Plan Melbourne Refresh notes the following option for discussion:

• Revise the strategic direction for Activity Centres to remove reference to growth associated with the removal of floorspace caps for retail and office development.

Riverlee commends the State Government’s approach of enabling 20-minute neighbourhoods by providing access to a wide range of goods and services in centres that are planned and coordinated by local governments. The removal of the reference to growth associated with the removal of floorspace caps for retail and office development is noted, however it is considered there is also opportunity to revise the strategic direction for Activity Centres to be inclusive of urban renewal precincts and brownfield sites where possible. The strategic direction for Activity Centres should be inclusive of sites like Cooper Street, Epping and the Former Lilydale Quarry where it is evident that the objectives and principles of the ‘Polycentric City’ and ‘20-minute neighbourhood’ can be achieved. These sites should be earmarked as having the potential for future growth and development.

3.5 Transit Corridors and the Principal Public Transport Network

Section 4.2 of Plan Melbourne Refresh acknowledges the following option for discussion:

• Include the Principal Public Transport Network (PPTN) in Plan Melbourne 2016.

The inclusion of the PPTN within Plan Melbourne 2016 is supported by Riverlee. A noted advantage of the PPTN is the clarity it provides for local governments and communities about key public transport routes to guide local development decisions. It is envisaged that the PPTN would be used to inform the location for future investment and development. Riverlee has interest in a number of landholdings along the PPTN that will benefit from its inclusion in Plan Melbourne 2016. The former Lilydale Quarry, Cooper Street, Epping and Swan Street, Richmond are clear examples of large development parcels along the PPTN which can contribute significantly to the growth of the 20-minute neighbourhood and the Polycentric City.
3.6 The balance between established and growth area development

Section 5.1 of Plan Melbourne Refresh outlines the following option for discussion:

- **36C** Focus metropolitan planning on unlocking housing supply in established areas, particularly within areas specifically targeted for growth and intensification.

Riverlee supports the concept of focusing metropolitan planning on unlocking housing supply in established areas. It is also supported that this should be focused on areas specially targeted for growth and intensification like areas in and around Activity Centres and those areas within close proximity to public transport and a range of services. Riverlee considers that it is vital for State Government to highlight the need to identify underutilised land with development potential, particularly former commercial and industrial sites. A number of these sites exist across metropolitan Melbourne and focus should be on utilising these sites rather than further spread of development to greenfield growth areas. Prime examples of these landholdings are the Former Lilydale Quarry and Cooper Street, Epping. These sites are clear examples of underutilised land with the potential to achieve the goals of the ‘Polycentric City’ and the ‘20-minute neighbourhood’. These sites can assist in achieving the objective of providing 70% of Melbourne’s new housing supply within established areas.
4. The MAC Recommendations

4.1. Overview
The Plan Melbourne Refresh discussion paper was informed by the Plan Melbourne 2015 Ministerial Advisory Committee (MAC) Report. The MAC report sets out 93 recommendations to be included in Plan Melbourne 2016. The majority of the outlined recommendations will either be included in Plan Melbourne 2016, will be addressed through the more comprehensive 5-year review of Plan Melbourne 2016, are being progressed through the ongoing work programs of responsible departments and agencies or will be referred for consideration to other government strategy or policy reviews currently underway. The MAC recommendation which is of particular interest to Riverlee is discussed below.

4.2. Recommendations of Interest to Riverlee
Recommendation 20 of the MAC report 2015 proposes to replace initiatives 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 and accompanying actions in Plan Melbourne 2014 with a number of initiatives which seek to establish the governance, funding, planning and development structures for urban renewal precincts. These initiatives include but are not limited to the following:

- Identify and designate urban renewal precincts of metropolitan significance and establish a policy and new zone for such precincts.
- Reduce the uncertainty of investigation and clean-up requirements, streamline the regulatory process, and bring the land to market sooner.
- Establish a Brownfield Clean-up Program which reduces the uncertainty of investigation and clean-up requirements, streamlines the regulatory process, provides access to funds to undertake the clean-up and brings the land to market sooner.

Riverlee supports the MAC Recommendation 20 and suggests that this recommendation could also be applied to medium size urban renewal areas already adjacent to or surrounded by existing well-serviced Activity Centres. Many of these areas are located throughout metropolitan Melbourne and are waiting for strategic guidance from State Government that will encourage private investment. Examples of these sites that Riverlee have a keen interest in are the former Lilydale Quarry and Cooper Street, Epping. It is noted that these sites will require substantial clean-up measures before sensitive uses can occur on the land. Given the location of these sites in highly accessible and well-serviced areas Riverlee supports a streamlined approach to ensure that these sites are brought to the market sooner.
5_Conclusion & Recommendations

5.1_Recommendations

It is submitted that the key directions contained within Plan Melbourne Refresh are supported and will be a key influence on the development of a number of landholdings in the Riverlee portfolio.

Accordingly, Riverlee submits the following in maintaining Melbourne’s globally-recognised livability:

• Land Use Measures to provide alternative living options outside the fringe of the UGB be implemented to ensure that UGB is ‘locked down’ indefinitely.

• The concepts of the polycentric city and 20-minute neighbourhoods, to be better defined. These concepts should be at the heart of Local Government strategic planning for growth centres to ensure all land within the 20-minute neighbourhood, no matter its current status, is included in the long-term strategic plan.

• The strategic directions for Activity Centres should include the consolidation of land within and adjoining defined Activity Centres where it is evident that the objectives and principles of the ‘Polycentric City’ and ‘20-minute neighbourhood’ can be achieved. These sites should be earmarked as having the potential for future growth and development.

• The PPTN should be used to inform and guide future development, especially in areas earmarked for greater intensity.

• Metropolitan planning should focus on unlocking housing supply in established areas. These areas should include underutilised land where the potential to achieve the goals of the ‘Polycentric City’ and the ‘20-minute neighbourhood’ are clear.

5.2_Next Step

It is requested that Riverlee (or its representatives) meet with the Metropolitan Planning Authority to discuss the findings of this study and to explore planning pathways for its landholdings and the alignment of this land with the principles contained within Plan Melbourne 2014 and Plan Melbourne 2016.
Appendix 1 - Riverlee

Existing Riverlee Projects of Note

Riverlee has a track record of contributing to the economic growth of Victoria through the successful delivery of projects across the State. Riverlee’s reputation has been built on its integrity and determination to achieve great things with every project.

A snapshot of some of these recent projects follows:

• 370 Docklands Drive, Docklands:

370 Docklands Drive was the first speculative development in the Docklands precinct. The seven-storey A-grade building features 7,150sqm of office space and 140 car parks.

Built to the highest environmental and efficiency standards, the property was awarded a 5 Green Star Rating—one of only a handful of commercial buildings in Melbourne to achieve such a rating.

• Jaques, Richmond:

Nestled in a vibrant part of Richmond with excellent amenities, Jaques Richmond is supported by mature urban infrastructure with public transport, recreation and sporting facilities, cafes and retail shops. Bridge Road and the Richmond Town Hall are only metres away.

Bordered by Coppin, Hightett, Griffiths and Palmer Streets, the island development site consists of 380 apartments over 3 stages.
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Existing Riverlee Projects of Note (Cond)

• The Heartlands, Tarneit:

The Heartlands is a residential estate in the suburb of Tarneit, just 29 kilometres from Melbourne, comprising around 1,000 residential lots ranging in size from approximately 300sqm to 650sqm.

The site has been designed with community spaces and natural landscapes, offering a series of reserves and major wetlands. ‘Club Heartlands’ also offers a pool and gym for residents.

• 108 Flinders

108 Flinders is situated on the eastern end of Flinders Street on the edge of Melbourne’s CBD.

Completed in 2014 the Fender Katsalidis designed building comprises of 190 apartments featuring a sculptural façade, porte cochere, rooftop terrace, tranquil internal courtyard, gymnasium, lounge and two retail spaces.