



Respondent No: 57

Login:

Email:

Responded At: Dec 17, 2015 17:41:02 pm

Last Seen: Dec 17, 2015 06:40:25 am

IP Address:

Q1. I am entitled to deal with the intellectual property rights (including copyright) of all material (and third party's) in my submission and have obtained the necessary consent(s) from any and all third parties.

I agree

Q2. Where personal information about other people (including photos) is included in my submission, I have notified them of the contents of the Privacy Collection Notice and obtained their consent to their personal information being disclosed to the Plan Melbourne refresh and published.

I agree

Q3. Name of organisation

not answered

Q4. Please select from one of the options below

I am making this submission as an individual. I request my submission be published anonymously with my postcode but with no other details.

Q5. Contact email

Q6. Name of person making submission on behalf of organisation

not answered

Q7. Contact phone number

██████████

Q8. I have read the relevant terms of use and consent to the conditions outlined within these.

Yes

Q9. Please note that submissions where the relevant terms of use have not been agreed to may not be considered as part of the Plan Melbourne Refresh. Please describe below your reasons for submitting despite together with any specific reasons for not agreeing to the terms outlined above.

not answered

Q10. The discussion paper includes the option (option 5, page16) that Plan Melbourne better define the key opportunities and challenges for developing Melbourne and outlines some key points for considerations in Box 1. Are there any other opportunities or challenges that we should be aware of?

no

Q11. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 6, page 18) that the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals be included in Plan Melbourne 2016. Do you agree with this idea? If so, how should the goals be incorporated into Plan Melbourne 2016?** Strongly Agree

Q12. **Please explain your response**

Melbourne is on the move and change. Change Processes need to be relevant and effective to have long term relevance. The 3 dot points on Economy, Social, and Sustainability are key accountability factors. This hinders better usage of private & public transport and has created congested narrow corridors.

Q13. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 7, page 18) to lock down the existing urban growth boundary and modify the action (i.e. the action under Initiative 6.1.1.1 in Plan Melbourne 2014) to reflect this. Do you agree that there should be a permanent urban growth boundary based on the existing boundary?** Strongly Agree

Q14. **Please explain your response**

Expanding boundaries are inefficient, costly and reduce economic viability. Like those overseas buy a farm if you want space! There is plenty of scope in Melbourne! Look around the area at South Yarra Station and many other Activity (& potential) areas.

Q15. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 8, page 18) that Plan Melbourne 2016 should more clearly articulate the values of green wedge and peri-urban areas to be protected and safeguarded. How can Plan Melbourne 2016 better articulate the values of green wedges and peri-urban areas?**

Green wedges (urban space) provide lungs and spaces for 'all locals' to live. The larger rivers could have done with more space from roads as has been shown by costly flooding. Peri-urban areas closer to Melbourne need to contain development to provide a more feel.

Q16. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 9, page 18) to remove the concept of an Integrated Economic Triangle and replace it with a high-level 2050 concept map for Melbourne (i.e. a map that shows the Expanded Central City, National Employment Clusters, Metropolitan Activity Centres, State-Significant Industrial Precincts, Transport Gateways, Health and Education Precincts and Urban Renewal Precincts). What other elements should be included in a 2050 concept map for Melbourne?**

The 2050 map needs to have a combination of high speed linkages align but limited with local services. HL corporate in the CBD and operations in key activity centres. Ownership should be more local or be restricted global. The Integrated Economic Triangle is too restrictive and a mid-bay crossing linked with port facilities. It is ok for Primary key corridors but there is a need for greater secondary major corridors, even if some duplication occurs. A refocus is needed on building up current major arterial's to a higher level. Removal of the increasing number of traffic lights needs review.. (more bridges.. grade separation) to remove local traffic from cross-city, distant users.

Q17. The discussion paper includes the option (option 10, pages 18) that the concept of Melbourne as a polycentric city (i.e. a city with many centres) with 20-minute neighbourhoods (i.e. the ability to meet your everyday (non-work) needs locally, primarily within a 20-minute walk) be better defined. Do the proposed definitions adequately clarify the concepts?

Strongly Agree

Q18. Please explain your response

Fits in as discussed above to create a more efficient urban environment in bringing corporations closer to the community.

Q19. The discussion paper includes options (options 11-17, pages 23 to 27) that identify housing, climate change, people place and identity and partnerships with local government as key concepts that need to be incorporated into Plan Melbourne 2016. Do you support the inclusion of these as key concepts in Plan Melbourne 2016?

Agree

Q20. Please explain your response

Go further & relevant! Yesterday & Today's Housing is totally inappropriate, costly and comes at greater wastage to fit in the moving economy tomorrow. Is ownership be a future key, local ownership is still important to maintain control and too regenerate the economy. The digital economy only streamline services while taking away key components for economic liveability. Working from home will remain a myth for many as social inclusion is important today & tomorrow. All the factors above are linked as people will always be people!

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

Principles thinking maybe to limited and restricted but is heading towards improved pathways, Local governance is good and improving. The greatest issue is cost, but is driven to much on increased property prices but makes the overall economy inefficient and reduces general governance.

Q22. Climate change comments

The global climate and environment change is increasing in focus and in Melbourne seems to be creating a drier environment.

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

Jobs need to be in a regeneration environment with the key on local focus than to be exported elsewhere to enable the community to continue to grow and prosper. Localize than Nationalize or Globalize is key to be viable. The CBD has shown this as being to concentrated while being restrictive and expensive.

Q24. **The discussion paper includes two options (page 30) relating to National Employment Clusters, being: Option 21A: Focus planning for National Employment Clusters on core institutions and businesses. Option 21B: Take a broader approach to planning for National Employment Clusters that looks beyond the core institutions and businesses. Which option do you prefer?** Option 21B

Q25. **Please explain why you have chosen your preferred option**

The day of the focus of the bigger business seems limited and greater exposure for takeover. The larger business is subject to inefficient and less relevant practices while taking increasing greater risks in a variety of areas to maintain value. The local business is of greater value including local economic regeneration.

Q26. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 22, pages 30) to broaden the East Werribee National Employment Cluster to call it the Werribee National Employment Cluster in order to encompass the full range of activities and employment activities that make up Werribee. This could include the Werribee Activity Centre and the Werribee Park Tourism Precinct. Do you agree with broadening the East Werribee Cluster?** Disagree

Q27. **Why?**

While agreeing with the basic concept, see what is on offer as already outdated. Regeneration of existing areas like Dandenong, Ringwood, Box Hill and even St Kilda and South Yarra would provide greater return, these are the real greenfield sites with loads of potential. Footscray, Sunshine and Melton also offer even greater scope. Look how long it has taken Knox City (Southland, etc..) and surrounds!

Q28. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 23, pages 30) to broaden the Dandenong South National Employment Cluster to call it the Dandenong National Employment Cluster in order to encompass the full range of activities and employment activities that make up Dandenong. This could include the Dandenong Metropolitan Activity Centre and Chisholm Institute of TAFE. Do you agree with broadening the Dandenong South National Employment Cluster?** Disagree

Q29. Why?

I see Berwick and Narre Warren (Twin Cities) as a better return as it current, relevant to existing services. There is scope for improvement but seems too limited and not so cost effective. It is a longer term outcome to see if it can be relevant to society. Large Corridor clearways need to be maintain to avoid future chokepoints. Dandenong & local rounds still offers itself still offers greater potential as it consolidates.

Q30. The discussion paper includes options (options 24 to 30, pages 34-35) that consider the designation of Activity Centres and criteria for new Activity Centres. Do you have any comments on the designation of Activity Centres or the criteria for new Activity Centres as outlined in the discussion paper?

Activity Centres should be surrounding existing infrastructure like South Morang and Epping is and will show. Rail lines need to be extended and upgraded and local arterial roads need to widen and improve to reduce strain on existing freeways. Placing this in undeveloped greenfield sites needs to encompass great areas like Latrobe University as it continues to expand and link towards Bundoora and Greensborough as part of very long term 50-100 year plans and linked to all infrastructure and the ability to provide corridors to be separate to reduce the effects of the existing community.

Q31. The discussion paper includes the option (option 31, page 35) to evaluate the range of planning mechanisms available to protect strategic agricultural land. What types of agricultural land and agricultural activities need to be protected and how could the planning system better protect them?

The food bowls are like key reservoirs and need large buffers as in the future as the carbon footprint of products will increasing be accountable. This also provides short-term work to those interested or in need. Opening these areas to recreation also provides avenues to rest and play (eg. Channels). This provides an amount of environmental checking to be attractive to users. Small community farms are also popular in Europe and could be valuable alternative in areas designated in the Dandenong cluster above.

Q32. The discussion paper includes the option (option 32, page 36) to implement the outcomes of the Extractive Industries Taskforce through the planning scheme, including Regional Growth Plans, to affirm that extractive industries resources are protected to provide an economic supply of materials for construction and road industries. Do you have any comments in relation to extractive industries? Reference page 36.

Construction material needs to remain near urban interfaces like Lysterfield to reduce the need to seek resources from distant places.

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

As I commented above, local activity is more important economic driver than a centralized CBD like location, national or globalized location. Where and what is Wall Street anyway? Is it a large underground nightclub? A distributed structure provides more efficient usage of built resources than a one way peak hour service. Then only three tracks or three lanes or less alone are not productive.

Q34. The discussion paper includes the option (option 34, page 42) to include the Principal Public Transport Network in Plan Melbourne 2016. Do you agree that the Principal Public Transport Network should inform land use choices and decisions?

Strongly Agree

Q35. Why?

The problem is the PPTN itself, lacks innovation and a restrictive barrier to drive growth. Congestion and our major connections and express cross-city linkages are important as is the connectivity to the surrounding nearby intercity four! (Geelong, Ballarat, Bendigo and Traralgon). The same applies to have (limited!) express connections between activity centres. Who likes stoppers when travelling for 30min or more! A little more comfort over greater distances is appreciated as shown with the Vlocity trains and the growth generated. Bring on the U.K. Javelin NOW.

Q36. The discussion paper includes the option (option 35, page 43) to incorporate references to Active Transport Victoria (which aims to increase participation and safety among cyclists and pedestrians) in Plan Melbourne 2016. How should walking and cycling networks influence and integrate with land use?

Urban Traffic should be local than as a thoroughfare. Proper segregation shows flexibility with the option to cover greater distances and reduced times. This can easily beat other existing options as Railtrails and Streamtrail tracks have shown.

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

Better communication is needed for those interested. Group Forums is still too limited to those (vested!) selected and offers only a fix solution. Maybe also bring communication to later school years to increase and improve the thinking and thought processes.

Q38. The discussion paper includes the option (option 36A, pages 46) to establish a 70/30 target where established areas provide 70 per cent of Melbourne's new housing supply and greenfield growth areas provide 30 per cent. Do you agree with establishing a 70/30 target for housing supply? Strongly Disagree

Q39. Why?

It should be 90/10 or more towards 99.9/1. Outer areas are only long term and still creates greater focus to expand boundaries. Urban renewal offers greater value as infrastructure exists.

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

It is happening, development needs to be in greater size (like the large shoppingtowns!) and ownership needs to change with greater options used (shareholding).

Q41. The discussion paper includes the option (option 36B, page 46) to investigate a mechanism to manage the sequence and density of the remaining Precinct Structure Plans based on land supply needs. Do you agree with this idea? not answered

Q42. Why?

The concept in place seems to idealistic and offers limited value.

Q43. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 36C, page 46) to focus metropolitan planning on unlocking housing supply in established areas, particularly within areas specifically targeted for growth and intensification. Do you agree with this idea?**

Disagree

Q44. **Why?**

Urban renewal needs to be in greater size (stages!) with current strata subdivisions on single house blocks are too limited and is generating greater congestion and restricting space, tomorrows unattractive environment! Large Housing itself is too last century, unproductive and costly!

Q45. **The discussion paper includes options (option 37, page 50) to better define and communicate Melbourne's housing needs by either: Option 37A: Setting housing targets for metropolitan Melbourne and each sub-region relating to housing diversity, supply and affordability Option 37B: Developing a metropolitan Housing Strategy that includes a Housing Plan Which option do you prefer?**

Option 37A

Q46. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 38, page 52) to introduce a policy statement in Plan Melbourne 2016 to support population and housing growth in defined locations and acknowledge that some areas within defined locations will require planning protection based on their valued character. How could Plan Melbourne 2016 clarify those locations in which higher scales of change are supported?**

Space is wasted in an era in seeking greater efficiencies and to offer cost effective value. Change is Regeneration as is Relevance is to be Practical and 'fit for purpose'. Planning Protection should only be based on High State Significance or offer multi-value high-value outcomes. Documentation is increasing as is the use of iphone or iphoto capability thus reducing the need to maintain lower value locations.

Q47. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 39, page 52) to clarify the direction to 'protect the suburbs'. How could Plan Melbourne 2016 clarify the direction to protect Melbourne and its suburbs from inappropriate development?**

The suburbs are changing and people are moving. Corridors are of greater importance and connectivity than does detached dwellings alone! The newer generation don't like to be a stick stuck in mud and want to create their own dynamic and connected environment.

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

Option 40B

Q49. The discussion paper includes the option (option 42, page 58) to include an action in Plan Melbourne 2016 to investigate how the building and planning system can facilitate housing that readily adapts to the changing needs of households over the life of a dwelling. In what other ways can Plan Melbourne 2016 support greater housing diversity?

The greatest improvement to house design is the wasted roof area. Offers limited access but is useful in some power generation and water collection. Housing generally seems to be poor quality and have a limited lifespan while it getting smaller increasing suitability only for the single person.

Q50. A number of options are outlined in the discussion paper (page 58) to improve housing affordability, including: Option 45A: Consider introducing planning tools that mandate or facilitate or provide incentives to increase social and affordable housing supply. Option 45B: Evaluate the affordable housing initiative pilot for land sold by government to determine whether to extend this to other suitable land sold by government. Option 45C: Identify planning scheme requirements that could be waived or reduced without compromising the amenity of social and affordable housing or neighbouring properties. What other ideas do you have for how Plan Melbourne 2016 can improve housing affordability?

Producing greater urban clusters than as single lots to generate greater efficiency based on the large shopping town principle with easy and private access.

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

It needs to assimilate with the local environment.

Q52. The discussion paper includes the option (option 46, page 69) to introduce Strategic Environmental Principles in Plan Melbourne 2016 to guide implementation of environment, climate change and water initiatives. Do you agree with the inclusion of Strategic Environmental Principles in Plan Melbourne 2016?

Agree

Q53. Why?

Planning needs to be practical and offer long term value and return in terms of lifestyle.

Q54. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 47, page 72) proposes to review policy and hazard management planning tools (such as overlays) to ensure the planning system responds to climate change challenges. Do you agree with this proposal?** Strongly agree

Q55. **Why?**

Issues like in recent decades in placing retirement villages adjacent stream areas. Building closer to these also generates pollution and reduces the effectiveness of the environment to absorb population growth, than be used as expanded reserves. Issues have increased public safety. Building close to stream reserves should be also seen as an environmental and safety hazard.

Q56. **The discussion paper includes options (options 48 and 49, page 72) to update hazard mapping to promote resilience and avoid unacceptable risk, and update periodically the planning system and supporting legislative and policy frameworks to reflect best available climate change science and data. Do you have any comments on these options?**

Maybe include LIDAR linked to historic uses to access landuse, then much of the urban environment has changed with little information on issues like contaminates with heavy and toxic metals and materials or pose other safety issues.

Q57. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 50, pages 73) to incorporate natural hazard management criteria into Victorian planning schemes to improve planning in areas exposed to climate change and environmental risks. Do you agree with this idea?** Strongly agree

Q58. **Why?**

Why say more!

Q59. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 51, page 75) to investigate consideration of climate change risks in infrastructure planning in the land use planning system, including consideration of an 'infrastructure resilience test'. Do you agree that a more structured approach to consideration of climate change risks in infrastructure planning has merit?** Agree

Q60. **Why?**

If better buffering system was in place initially, but then 'bracket creep' has imposed itself in local area development.

Q61. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 52, page 76) to strengthen high-priority habitat corridors throughout Melbourne and its peri-urban areas to improve long-term health of key flora and fauna habitat. Do you agree with this proposal?** Agree

Q62. **Why?**

Bio-diversity has high value environmental, sustainability attributes and general social values. If lacking these features it shows disorganization with poor time and mindfulness values.

Q63. **The discussion paper includes options (options 53 and 54, pages 78 and 79) to introduce strategies to cool our city including: increasing tree canopy, vegetated ground cover and permeable surfaces; use of Water Sensitive Urban Design and irrigation; and encouraging the uptake of green roofs, facades and walls, as appropriate materials used for pavements and buildings with low heat-absorption properties. What other strategies could be beneficial for cooling our built environment?**

Use Stealth like, sound, and energy producing technologies to reduce impacts of glare and heat. Materials maybe too thin to be effective to absorb heat.

Q64. **The discussion paper includes the option (option 56A, page 80) to investigate opportunities in the land use planning system, such as strong supporting planning policy, to facilitate the increased uptake of renewable and low-emission energy in Melbourne and its peri-urban areas. Do you agree that stronger land use planning policies are needed to facilitate the uptake of renewable and low-emission energy?** Agree

Q65. **Why?**

As a resource, the amount of untap roofs, shows a lack of productivity, innovation and creativity.

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

Q67. Why?

To facilitate global expectations with minimal local emissions.

Q68. The discussion paper includes the option (option 57, page 81) to take an integrated approach to planning and building to strengthen Environmentally Sustainable Design, including consideration of costs and benefits. Do you agree that an integrated planning and building approach would strengthen Environmentally Sustainable Design? Agree

Q69. Why?

Commonsense!

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

Government and governance needs to show strength to show relevance..

Q71. Please provide your feedback on 'Chapter 7. New planning tools' below. If you do not want to provide feedback on this chapter please selected 'save & continue'.

not answered

Q72. The discussion paper includes options (options 58A and 58B, page 84) to evaluate whether new or existing planning tools (zones and overlays) could be applied to National Employment Clusters and urban renewal areas. Do you have any comments on the planning tools (zones and overlays) needed for National Employment Clusters and urban renewal areas?

not answered

Q73. The discussion paper includes options (options 59A and 59B, page 84) to evaluate the merits of code assessment for multi-unit development, taking into account the findings from the 'Better Apartments' process, to either replace ResCode with a codified process for multi-unit development or identify ResCode standards that can be codified. Do you have any comments on the merits of code assessment for multi-unit development?

not answered

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

not answered

Q75. The discussion paper includes the option (options 1 and 61, pages 14 and 90) of Plan Melbourne being an enduring strategy with a long-term focus supported by a 'rolling' implementation plan. Do you agree that separating the long-term strategy from a shorter-term supporting implementation plan is a good idea?

Long term focus should govern to have effective short term planning.

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

not answered

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

not answered
