

# Manningham City Council

## Plan Melbourne Refresh Submission Form

---

### 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?*

- Infrastructure tends to 'catch up' with population growth. It's important that essential **infrastructure be delivered prior to significant population growth**, and not, as noted in the Discussion Paper "as early as possible."
- Plan Melbourne 2014 refers to harmonising public transport services. Although this is supported, it should be revised to refer to **'harmonising and better integrating' public transport services**, to ensure that people can easily move through sustainable modes such as public transport, walking and cycling.
- Affordable housing will be critical into the future. Mechanisms/initiatives currently in place and those required to facilitate the **provision of affordable housing in the future** need to be explored further in Plan Melbourne 2016.
- Creating a socially inclusive city, with appropriate design styles, street layouts, scale of buildings, landmarks, meeting places, open spaces, community safety, is a challenge. The role of housing and site design in **enabling socially connected and healthy neighborhoods** and communities is important and guidance should be provided to improve this.
- Promoting community inclusion and harmony at a local, regional and State level is both an opportunity and challenge. It is important that **Councils are enabled to support local communities** to develop and foster their own identity, as well promote harmony across the city.  
Higher density development and transient populations can make this even more challenging. The provision and funding of public art, community spaces, historical sites, and high quality attractive public spaces to enhance community pride and enjoyment etc., would all have a positive impact on community feel.
- **Planning for future service needs** of an ageing population in terms of accessibility, public safety and connectedness, is also a significant challenge that the State Government and local Councils will need to address.

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  
 Strongly Agree

*Please explain your response:*

- Although there are 17 goals, a number of them refer to social equity principles. Where they are useful is in the wider conceptualisation of environmental impact than that envisioned by Plan Melbourne. Environmental impact is much more than just climate change and biodiversity. The Sustainable Development Goals touch on environmental issues relating to fresh water, seas, sustainable agriculture and food security; however the goals do not adequately address waste. It is important that waste be appropriately addressed in Plan Melbourne even though it may not be in the Sustainable Development Goals.  
Melbourne has and will have a profound impact on all of the matters raised in the Sustainable Development goals. Its 'resource' hinterland is far bigger than just its built form. The Goals could either be addressed clearly in Plan Melbourne 2016, or form part of the Strategic Environmental Principles mentioned later in the Discussion Paper. Either way, it is important that the word '*sustainable*' isn't tokenistic or a catchphrase in Plan Melbourne 2016.

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  
 Agree  
 Strongly Agree

***Please explain your response:***

- Council supports the creation of a permanent boundary around Melbourne. The permanent boundary will assist in protecting the agricultural values of land, the broad range of environmental and lifestyle values of the green wedge within Manningham and for the whole of Melbourne. The community's effort to continue to reinforce these values is a major consideration for ***maintaining Manningham's existing green wedge boundary***. The Strategy also needs to recognise the importance of areas such as the Low Density Residential Zone in forming a buffer between the green wedge and urban residential areas. (This was taken from page 4 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).

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?*

- Council encourages and supports implementation of measures that seeks to ***protect high-quality agricultural land*** in Melbourne.
- Plan Melbourne 2016 can better articulate the values of green wedge and peri-urban areas by making it clear that these themes are ***central to Melbourne's identity***, sense of place and quality of life.
- From a local perspective, Council would also like to encourage the State Government to consider ***revising the Rural Conservation Zone*** to enable the sale of manufactured / processed foods grown on the land, which is an issue in Manningham for ensuring ancillary uses to assist

farmers to stay on the land. (This was taken from page 14 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).

- However, recent changes to the Rural Conservation Zone as part of the reformed zones has also opened up the green wedge to inappropriate development. The changes eroded the **underlying rationale of applying the zone** to green wedge land in order to protect environmental and landscape value. Plan Melbourne 2016 also needs to recognise the importance of the role areas such as the Low Density Residential Zone play in forming a buffer between the green wedge and urban residential areas. (This was taken from pages 15/16 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).

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 elements identified in this question should be included in the 2050 concept map.
- **Doncaster Hill** needs to be identified as a **Metropolitan Activity Centre** (MAC) on the 2050 concept map for Melbourne to reflect its current and future role.
- The concept map should also **identify current and future rail and road connections**, which should include a rail line to Doncaster Hill, an extension of tram route 48 from the Doncaster Road/ Balwyn Road intersection through to Doncaster Hill (and possibly through to Tunstall Square), and the North East Link Freeway.

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 of a 20-minute city is consistent with established planning principles of urban consolidation, good design and sustainable living, and which emphasises the **clustering of services and facilities close to residential areas** which can be easily accessed by walking and cycling.  
It is important that the definition of the **20-minute city concept be clarified** so that it refers to the local neighbourhood being accessible to meet everyday needs within a 20-minute walk.
- The concept of **creating a network of vibrant neighbourhood centres** is supported and encouraged by Council. Neighbourhood centres will continue to have an important role in the shaping of Melbourne, particularly for established suburbs. Activity centres will continue to be important in helping achieve a 20-minute city through the expansion of their role in providing for a diversity of uses, including higher density residential development. Planned

infrastructure investment, particularly public transport, cycling and pedestrian infrastructure will be critical to making activity centres work. (This was taken from page 11 from our initial Plan Melbourne discussion).

- The daily needs (as quoted in 2.5 (10) on page 18) should be amended to include work needs. Further to this, Plan Melbourne 2016 should provide **direction on creating employment opportunities** locally as part of the 20-minute city concept.
- The 20-minute city should also draw a clear **link with community infrastructure** (other than just community centres), kindergartens, green space, and adequate transport options. The 20-minute city concept should be improved to articulate that:
  - a clear transport framework is needed;
  - there should be a focus on people movement (and not private vehicle movement);
  - there is a clear direction to improve the capacity, frequency and level of service of the current public transport system;
  - there will be Government commitment to financially invest in the required infrastructure;
  - prioritisation measures such as right-of-way to sustainable transport modes in terms of allocating time, space, facilities and funding are required;
  - shared road or path spaces don't always function well given user conflicts and a major financial investment is required to provide a feasible expansion of this transport mode;
  - reduced maximum car-parking rates for locations well-served by public transport are supported; and
  - an increase in the minimum parking requirements for bicycles in urban and built form are encouraged.

**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:**

- These are important concepts that have not been addressed adequately in previous metropolitan strategies. Their inclusion in Plan Melbourne 2016 is supported, as climate change and access to affordable housing will be **key issues facing future generations**.
- The concept of **'placemaking' has evolved significantly** in recent years and will continue to develop as an effective people-centred approach to the planning, design and management of public spaces. The nexus between placemaking and planning as a way to create prosperous, liveable, healthy and green suburbs needs to be explored further in Plan Melbourne 2016.

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

- No comments provided.

### 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?*

- No comments provided.

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:***

- No comments provided.

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?***

- No comments provided.

**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?**

- No comments provided.

**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?**

- **Doncaster Hill**, previously a Principal Activity Centre under Melbourne 2030, should be included as a Metropolitan Activity Centre (MAC) to **reflect its current and future role** in Melbourne. As Manningham does not have an identified MAC and is not included within a National Employment Cluster, identification of Doncaster Hill as a MAC provides greater opportunity/incentive to attract other government and/or private institutions to locate in Manningham to contribute towards job creation e.g. major health service, regional education facility, government departments. A key aspiration for Doncaster Hill is to enable its residents to age in place, and to do so it is important to have these key facilities available locally. (This was taken from the Executive Summary from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- Doncaster Hill is well positioned as a Metropolitan Activity Centre, especially with the potential public transport infrastructure investment identified in Plan Melbourne 2014. Further investment from private enterprise and the continued implementation of the Doncaster Hill Strategy for the area will create an opportunity to highlight this region as a **major centre of growth for Melbourne's north east**. (This was taken from Page 5 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- **Doncaster Hill meets all seven of the Plan Melbourne objectives** and its development potential is now being realised, both on a local and international scale, with endorsed and pending planning permits, a new 385 apartment mixed use Bunnings project and the redevelopment of Westfield's national flagship site in Doncaster.
- In Doncaster Hill, over **8,000 new residents** will live in one of the 4000 apartments to be built by 2031. Fourteen developments comprising 845 apartments have already been completed and a further 825 apartments are under construction. An additional eight approved planning permits comprising an additional 1300 apartments are awaiting construction.
- Doncaster Hill is uniquely positioned in Melbourne's east in close proximity to major employment generators. It is **unlocking and complementing regional opportunities** for improved access to jobs, educational and health facilities and other community and social services.
- Within Doncaster Hill, there is a high level of public transport usage (16.8% compared to 10.9% for rest of Manningham), the **population is forecast to increase 8.74% annually**, there is a high

level of professionals in the workforce (top 3 occupations include Professional, Managers and Clerical and Administrative Workers). Importantly, there is also low car ownership (85.5% compared to 92.4% for Manningham City).

- Doncaster Hill can relieve pressure from neighbouring Metropolitan Activity Centres, especially with respect to public transport and road infrastructure that is currently at capacity. However, its real potential to **take pressure off regional capacity constraints** can only be realised through being identified as a future MAC.
- To date, Doncaster Hill has **contributed \$1.175 billion investment** into the State's economy.
- As part of this, and with assistance from development contributions, Council has **delivered over \$30 million** of community and streetscape infrastructure in Doncaster Hill, to support its growth and development.
- It is anticipated that over the next 20 years, Doncaster Hill will contribute a **further \$2.5 billion investment** into the State's economy.
- It is important to note that in a forward thinking metropolitan strategy, activity centres should not just be designated on their current use, function or built form. Doncaster Hill will eventually be serviced by a heavy rail line, and coupled with the significant growth and expansion of commercial, retail and housing developments now and into the future, it should be redesignated as a Metropolitan Activity Centre to **reflect both its current and future role and function**.
- A **review of parking rates** should also be considered in activity centres in close proximity to public transport services.

**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?**

- Food production land in close proximity to Melbourne should to be protected. This can be achieved by ensuring that the permissible uses in current zoning of peri-urban and green wedge **land reflect the purpose of each zone**. Planning scheme controls should be revised and strengthened to ensure the impacts of a planning permit application on land that could be used for food production can be assessed.

**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?**

- No comments provided.

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

- There is currently a significant amount of economic development work being undertaken by the regions, i.e. Regional Development Australia and the Melbourne East Regional Economic Development Group. This **regional approach to jobs and investment** is important, and as such,

these partnerships should be acknowledged in Plan Melbourne. Further to this, the formulation of further partnerships to enhance jobs and investment should be emphasised. An example of this is provided below.

- Council has recently signed a Memorandum of Understanding between seven eastern metropolitan councils and the State Government. The Memorandum covers economic development opportunities and follows on from the Regional Investment Attraction Strategy developed in collaboration with Melbourne East Regional Development Australia Committee. The Melbourne East Regional Economic Development Group (MEREDG) has been formed with representatives from the Economic Development teams of all seven councils, Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources and Melbourne East Regional Development Australia.  
Amongst the objectives of the MEREDG is the identification of **key regional infrastructure** priorities and targeted advocacy of these projects for the further development of the region. This platform provides Council with an unprecedented opportunity to work directly with State Government to develop projects to deliver the actions of the Regional Investment Attraction Strategy. Examples of these projects include, Box Hill Central and MAC, Monash NEC, Ringwood MAC, Bayswater Precinct, Doncaster Hill and Wantirna Health Precinct. MEREDG report directly to the East Melbourne CEO forum, and projects and initiatives will be advocated via MEREDG including actions within Plan Melbourne and any submissions from Council.
- Warrandyte, the Middle Yarra corridor and other locations in Manningham should be **identified as tourism locations** in Melbourne and marketed as a visitor destination. Protection of these tourism assets should be included in Plan Melbourne with suitable development being encouraged. It is important; however that reference is made to the appropriate scale of development in sensitive areas and potential impact on environmental and landscape values. There needs to be a balance between economic outcomes and environmental impacts. (This was taken from page 7 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- Manningham's location also creates opportunity for professional service industries to provide support for the operations in the major industrial nodes. Virtual and physical links between Manningham business and surrounding industrial nodes are paramount to the success of these opportunities. It is proposed that these areas continue to provide opportunity for industrial activities to **encourage local employment opportunities**. (This was taken from page 5 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- Mixed use development, including retail, office and residential accommodation will continue to be the clear focus for new development, allowing for **economic growth alongside residential development**. Local neighborhood centres also need to have sites identified and **public transport improvement**, which can accommodate similar suitable developments into the future. Encouraging mixed use development and activating local neighbourhood centres will **enhance the local economy**. They also are in accordance with the higher level economic initiatives of the Plan, which is crucial to ensuring the economic life of the City is felt at a local level. (This was taken from page 6 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).



## 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  
 Strongly Agree

**Why?**

- Council acknowledges that the Plan includes the long-term delivery of Doncaster Rail sometime between 2025 and 2050. However, Council seeks to ensure that public transport is improved including the ***Doncaster Rail link being completed within the next 15 years*** (by 2029), consistent with the objective in Public Transport Victoria's (PTV) 'Network Development Plan - Metropolitan Rail'.  
Council is concerned that the Plan indicates that a rail link to Doncaster will only extend as far as the Doncaster Park & Ride, and not to Doncaster Hill. The population of Doncaster Hill is anticipated to increase by more than 8000 people over the next 20 years and the proposed ***rail line needs to be extended to Doncaster Hill*** to directly service this growing population. The Plan needs to be amended to reflect this very important factor. (This was taken from page 10 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- More generally, the ***Principal Public Transport Network***, which includes the Smartbus, should be used to inform land use choices. These other services provide a high level of frequency and connectivity. Significant urban renewal areas, such as Doncaster Hill, are a good example of where an intensification of land uses has been supported based on proximity to the Principal Public Transport Network and not just heavy rail.

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?**

- Active travel options, (especially walking and cycling) help reinforce health and social objectives. In supporting the concept of the 20- minute city consideration needs to be given to ***not just prioritising*** State cycling and pedestrian ***initiatives within 10 kilometres of the CBD***. (This was taken from the Executive Summary from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- Cycling and walking objectives should be included in Plan Melbourne by similarly referencing the Principal Pedestrian Network (PPN) and Principal Bicycle Network (PBN). Although the PBN requires a review, identification and funding of priority projects should be firstly aimed at ***completing 'missing links' in the bicycle network***. These will help underpin the 20-minute city objective identified in the Strategy.
- Initiative 3.1.5 in Plan Melbourne needs to ***cross reference the concept of the 20-minute city*** and support walking and cycling in areas demonstrating commitment to the concept. (This was taken from Page 10 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- In addition to ***prioritising and funding the strategic cycling corridor network***, Initiative 3.4.2 of Plan Melbourne needs to specifically acknowledge the objective to complete the Principle Bicycle Network (PBN). (This was taken from page 11 from our initial Plan Melbourne

submission).

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

- Public transport is an essential element to servicing the needs of employment growth in the inner city and the middle and outer ring suburbs. Greater emphasis needs to be placed on its important role in shaping Melbourne and improving Melbourne's liveability into the future. In particular giving greater status/prominence in the Plan to the implementation of the **PTV Network Development Plan will provide greater certainty and confidence for private investment**. (This was taken from the Executive Summary from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- For Manningham, significant improvements to public transport infrastructure (through new infrastructure, such as Doncaster Rail, and the provision of more efficient bus services and associated infrastructure) are essential to the success of Doncaster Hill and the ongoing viability of Manningham's **activity centres which continue to be a focus of local job creation**. (This was taken from the Executive Summary from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- Increasing the employment potential for the inner city will require an equal investment in transport infrastructure to service existing and future residential nodes, particularly future growth areas such as Doncaster Hill. (This was taken from Page 6 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- Transportation infrastructure must remain a high priority to support the increased employment opportunities. Unlocking the spare capacity of existing infrastructure should be a focus of the Strategy. (This was taken from Page 6 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- Plan Melbourne 2014 makes reference under initiative 3.1.2 "to complete planning for a metro system, including ...Doncaster." This should be retained as a short term objective, and the desired delivery date of 2029 should be referenced in line with PTV's Network Development Plan. It should also be specifically referred to as a rail link to Doncaster Hill, and not just Doncaster.
- The Plan needs to include an action to ensure that the median strip of the Eastern Freeway and land to be developed for future stations and associated infrastructure along the proposed **Doncaster Rail line is suitably identified and reserved for this purpose**. (This was taken from the Executive Summary from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- The median strip should not be utilised as part of the any proposed widening of the Eastern Freeway. (This was taken from Page 10 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- The 2030 SmartBus Network Map should also be included on the PPTN.
- Initiative 3.1.4 of Plan Melbourne needs to acknowledge that the completion of the **bus network should also occur in the middle and outer suburbs**, not just the inner city as is currently stated. Enhancement of the DART bus services should include consideration of the completion of bus lanes and priority treatments on Hoddle Street, and investigations of full grade separation of buses through Doncaster Hill (Williamsons/Doncaster Road). (This was taken from Page 10 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- Initiative 3.1.3-1 of Plan Melbourne 2014 discusses the preparation of a Road Use Strategy aimed at ensuring buses and trams can operate efficiently alongside other vehicles. This needs to be expanded to ensure that the Road Use Strategy takes into consideration the Network Operating Plans designation of particular routes as **priority bus routes** and the need for adequate infrastructure (i.e. bus lanes) to implement an **efficient bus network** (particularly through Doncaster Hill).
- If reference to the **East West Link** is to be retained in Plan Melbourne, it should be clarified that it will form part of the **regional highway network/system** as a long-term objective that supports freight movement and passenger movement across Melbourne.

- In relation to the Ministerial Advisory Committee recommendations:
  - Recommendation 41 – Council supports this, however objective 3.1.4-5 should remain to ensure bus services provide for cross-town travel.
  - Proposed action 3.1.4-3 (Enhance Doncaster **DART** bus services in Melbourne) should become a **short-term objective** (currently identified as a medium-term objective in Plan Melbourne 2014), and some DART services should be upgraded to a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) standard.
  - Recommendation 42 – Council supports these recommendations. However, proposed action 3.2.2-1 does not highlight that the Manningham area (middle north-east) is identified for a **transformation of its local bus network**. This area should be identified as a **priority** area to be considered in the short-term.
  - Recommendation 43 – This is supported.
  - Recommendation 45 – Council recommends that specific reference is made to reserving the rail reservation along the Eastern Freeway for a future Doncaster Rail Link, as similar reference has been made to other areas around Melbourne.

## 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  
 Agree  
 Strongly Agree

**Why?**

- The underlying principle of directing a higher proportion of housing supply and growth into established suburbs is understood, as these are locations that typically have better access to public transport, schools and services.
- Although the rationale behind a 70/30 target is understood, there are implications with this approach. Manningham City Council has undertaken significant strategic work to guide its housing supply and growth, and our planning scheme has been updated to facilitate this direction and growth. An aspirational target is supported, as is the need to **review each municipality's housing supply** in a regional and metropolitan context. However, a 70/30 target which would result in each Council being advised of a mandatory supply of housing is not supported.
- If the 70/30 target was implemented, Manningham and other middle ring suburbs may be forced to revise their Residential Strategies and **accommodate additional residential development** without having specific regard to local conditions.
- It is important that councils can **continue to direct and influence housing supply and growth**, with assistance from the state government.

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

- It is important that there is a greater understanding of current and forecast population growth at the state, regional and municipal level, in order to **consistently guide targets** across Melbourne.
- In order to achieve targets, the state government should gain **commitment from councils** in relation to the forecast population growth, and then work together to discuss opportunities for supply.
- It is important that councils and the state government agree to a **housing supply figure**, and that it not be imposed.
- The **State Planning Policy Framework** could be updated to reference housing supply targets that have been agreed to.
- It is anticipated that the existing allocation/distribution of the **Neighbourhood Residential Zone will need to be revisited** if housing targets are going to be equitably applied across metropolitan Melbourne.
- If targets are to be introduced, councils will **require financial support** to either update, or prepare for the first time, a residential strategy.

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
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**Why?**

- No comments provided.

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
- Strongly Agree

**Why?**

- Council agrees that additional housing supply in areas targeted for growth and intensification is beneficial. However as noted above, each council should be able to guide the areas for growth and intensification, to **ensure that local conditions are considered** (such as areas of environmental sensitivity and neighbourhood character).
- The Plan would appear to promote and address increasing housing choice within walkable distances of railway stations. However, public transport comprises various modes other than train, including trams and buses, and these forms of **public transport need to be recognised** as areas where growth and intensification could occur.  
Manningham is currently serviced by a bus network; however the introduction of the SmartBus routes and the introduction of the DART service have improved public transport frequency and infrastructure, i.e. signage, bus design, which has resulted in improved patronage.  
Council is keen to work with DELWP to investigate mechanisms to facilitate a greater diversity of housing, including innovative and adaptive built form, to provide a range of opportunities for people, including those with limited mobility, to work from home and 'age in place'.  
Manningham Council is also interested in working with the government to look at possible mechanisms to encourage lot consolidation, which is a key aspect of Manningham's Residential Strategy. (This was taken from Page 8 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- Council endorses and encourages a range of housing options, including ongoing development of brownfield sites within the existing urban boundaries, and greyfield development within established inner and outer suburban areas; however it is important that **design guidelines be modernized**.
- An ad hoc approach to unlocking housing supply is not supported. As previously noted, Manningham Council has undertaken significant strategic work to guide future residential development and growth. It is important that this direction is not **compromised by a State wide push to unlock housing supply**.

**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  
 Option 37B  
 Other

**Why?**

- Whilst the development of housing strategies is supported and encouraged at a municipal level, it is also considered important that such work should have regard to **housing needs at a sub-regional level**.  
In 2005/2006 significant work was undertaken by Councils across Melbourne to develop regional housing statements. The Eastern Regional Housing Statement (2006) helped inform the development of planning controls to direct residential growth within Manningham. Council supports a regional approach and considers that such work should be undertaken as a priority and should inform future planning decisions. (Page 8 from initial submission).
- Setting housing targets at a sub-regional level for housing diversity and affordable housing is supported; however **mandatory housing supply targets are not supported**.
- Developing a metropolitan Housing Strategy that includes a **Housing Plan would enable a more collaborate and regional approach** to housing supply and development.
- Further to this, **LGAs should be better supported** in their preparation of local housing and residential strategies to ensure it meets the needs of the local community as well as meeting State wide objectives.

**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?**

- Plan Melbourne should make it clear that the residential zones can be used by Councils to **clarify where different levels of change are supported**. To this end, it should be made clear that zones such as the Residential Growth Zone and Activity Centre Zone are there to encourage higher scales of change. It should also be made clear that the Neighbourhood Residential Zone is there to discourage higher levels of change, based on character or environmental factors, but more importantly because it may be an area that can't accommodate higher levels of change due to poor proximity to public transport and services etc.
- Plan Melbourne 2016 could further emphasise that **higher scales of change will be supported** in MACs, activity centres and urban renewal areas, where a strategy or structure plan has been prepared and endorsed by councils.

**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?**

- Plan Melbourne could **reinforce that Councils can use the available zones** to protect Melbourne and its suburbs from inappropriate development.
- In addition to the Neighbourhood Residential Zone, the Low Density Residential Zone also ensures that the **scale of development is appropriate** having regard to its surroundings.
- The Low Density Residential Zone forms an important buffer at the interface with the green wedge. Plan Melbourne 2016 should **encourage its application** adjacent to the green wedge to protect the neighbourhood character of these areas, to protect the areas from inappropriate scales of development, and to appropriately transition the scale of development from suburban to rural.

**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?**

- Retaining at least 50 per cent of residential land in a Neighbourhood Residential Zone is difficult, as the suitability of its application will vary from council to council. If the requirement for 50 per cent is removed, it is critical that **other elements are also included as considerations** in the application of the Neighbourhood Residential Zone. For example, in addition to respecting valued character and delivering housing diversity, the poor proximity to public transport and service is another factor for the introduction of the Neighbourhood Residential Zone.

**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?**

- Council supports the proposed action 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. This is particularly important with regard to designing new dwellings so that they can readily accommodate or be easily adapted, should the need arise, to facilitate the needs of a mobility impaired person, including but not limited to the use of a wheelchair.

- Providing a **diversity of housing in identified locations** that caters for different households which are located in proximity to public transport and other services and facilities, is central to the success of many of the key aspects of Plan Melbourne. There is an opportunity to look at building and planning reforms to provide more accessible housing both for ageing communities and people with a disability. Council is keen to work with DELWP to investigate mechanisms to facilitate a greater diversity of housing, including innovative and adaptive built form, to provide a range of opportunities for people, including those with limited mobility, to work from home and 'age in place'. (This was taken from the Executive Summary from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- Council supports initiatives that **achieve and promote design excellence**, as this leads to varied design outcomes and more diverse styles of housing. (This was taken from page 14 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- Plan Melbourne 2016 could further support greater housing diversity by **addressing the housing needs of other segments** of the population, including those with intellectual or physical disabilities that require (differing degrees of) innovative supported housing options – in accessible locations, close to established support networks, that is affordable and of appropriate design.

**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?**

- Manningham supports housing affordability, affordable living options and social housing as they provide **housing choice and diversity**. Council supports **amending the Victoria Planning Provisions** to include a definition for social housing and affordable housing. The role of environmental sustainable design and servicing infrastructure is also promoted, as this can reduce the running costs of a home. (This was taken from page 9 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- Manningham has an endorsed Housing Affordability Policy 2010-2020 which sets affordable housing provision targets of 10% by 2020 in Doncaster Hill and 5% in the remainder of the municipality. Council would strongly support the **development of mechanisms and incentives** to facilitate the achievement of these targets. (This was taken from page 9 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- It is important to note that given Manningham's desirable location and its current level of land supply, encouraging **new housing to be 'affordable' will be a challenge** at a municipal level, even that which is of medium or higher density.
- To increase the level of affordable housing, a **state-wide planning scheme control** (potentially a Particular Provision) that requires the provision of affordable housing as part of new residential development would be beneficial. Alternatively local government areas, with support from the State Government, could prepare local planning policies to guide the future provision of affordable housing.



- Incentive mechanisms such as plot ratio bonuses, density bonuses, height bonuses and inclusionary zoning have in principle support, however it is important that the quality of the design and the strategic direction for a **local area is not compromised by these incentives**. To this end, if incentive based mechanisms were made available, it is important that Council continues to have the decision making ability to holistically assess the implications of the residential development that incorporates affordable housing.
- With financial support from the Federal Government, a residential development at 98 Tram Road, Doncaster, has contributed to 25 per cent of Doncaster Hill's commitment towards affordable housing, but the precinct **still requires 302 apartments to realise its ambition** of a ten per cent goal to support housing affordability.
- State Government assistance is required to **provide clear planning instruments** to both regulate and incentivise private sector contribution to affordable housing targets.
- The **ongoing management and certainty of affordable housing** is a significant challenge. It is also important that Council has the tools to ensure that affordable housing, whether it is in private ownership or the rental market, be maintained on an ongoing basis.
- **Increasing social and affordable housing** for rental supply, and the mechanisms to achieve this, is also encouraged.
- However, setting local affordable (rental) housing targets is a difficult aspiration. Federal and State financial incentives available for the construction of affordable rental housing have been reduced, and as a result it is difficult for LGAs to encourage developers to incorporate such housing into their developments. Therefore to increase the supply of affordable (rental) housing, a consistent approach that includes **financial incentives is required across all LGAs**.
- There is also a need for suitable and affordable housing options to allow people with an **intellectual disability to live independently**, i.e. group housing, supported accommodation or a number of apartments in a single building that are supported by a dedicated carer. (This was taken from page 8 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- Manningham supports extending the Vic Smart system to multi-unit development, and other initiatives to **accelerate investment in affordable housing**. Attention should be given to ensure that affordable housing incorporates high design standards and servicing equipment to ensure reasonable ongoing running costs. (This was taken from page 9 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).

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

- Higher density housing is supported in appropriate locations, however with this type of housing it difficult to ensure the necessary **provision of adequate green space**, as well as the greening of buildings and streetscapes.
- While the Guidelines for Higher Density Residential Development provide some direction for open space and 'greening' residential developments, it is recommended that greater direction be provided under Initiative 2.1.4 for the **provision of communal green space** to assist with improving the quality and amenity of residential apartments.
- It is important to note that an **increase in dwellings in established areas is supported**; however this will reduce, and not eliminate, any environmental impacts.

## 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  
 Agree  
 Strongly Agree

**Why?**

- The inclusion of these principles is supported, however questions are raised as to **how they will be used to impact on change**. How will they be incorporated? Will they actually challenge the growth/consumption paradigm and affect appropriate change and/ or protection?
- The **Council Alliance for a Sustainable Built Environment (CASBE) vision** for Melbourne is supported, and should be considered for inclusion as the vision in Plan Melbourne 2016.

Melbourne is:

*Self-sufficient, within its boundaries, for water and energy, grows a substantial proportion of its food requirements from urban agriculture, produces almost no 'waste' and has begun to restore the ecological value of its bioregion.*

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  
 Agree  
 Strongly Agree

**Why?**

- With regard to planning for non-urban and peri-urban areas, Council would like to encourage the State Government to finalise the mapping and planning provisions for areas of bushfire risk to assist local governments to **implement appropriate fire prevention measures**. (This was taken from page 14 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- Manningham Council is also in the process of undertaking overland flood mapping at a local level. Councils should be encouraged and supported in undertaking **further work to identify and plan for natural hazards** such as flooding and landslip where this has not yet been undertaken. (This was taken from page 14 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).

33. The discussion paper includes options (options 48 and 49, page72) 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?*

- Updating hazard mapping to promote resilience and avoid unacceptable risk is supported.

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
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

*Why?*

- It is important to be **proactive** rather than endlessly – and expensively – reactive.

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
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

*Why?*

- The consideration of climate change risks in infrastructure planning has merit and is supported by Council. It is important that **climate change be considered early on in the project planning process**, and more specifically it should be addressed in risk assessments. Considering climate change early on will ensure that outcomes can be achieved that are more cost and time efficient.
- It is also important that the procurement process for **infrastructure delivery addresses environmentally sustainable goals**, including how the project will address climate change.

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
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**Why?**

- The **protection and restoration of biodiversity** is important, especially with new buildings and infrastructure being constructed, population growth and reduced regulatory protection (e.g. the revised Native Vegetation Framework).

**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?**

- Density increases ultimately result in substantial increases in paved and covered surfaces. 'Greening' policies are largely a band-aid in response to this, and therefore their **implementation is pivotal**. The strategies proposed in this question are supported.

**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?**

- It is essential that renewable and low-emission energy is facilitated. Previously, Council has had to spend a significant amount of time and energy negotiating renewable and low-emission energy outcomes with Doncaster Hill. Although stronger land use policies would have assisted us in this process, the **uptake of renewable and low-emission energy needs to be addressed** at a State level. The example of Doncaster Hill is described below.
- Doncaster Hill is a leading example of best practice sustainable utilities with the implementation of 21st century, localised energy and water infrastructure. One of the most innovative sustainability projects recently undertaken was the installation of a tri-generation system within the \$38 million MC<sup>2</sup> Community Hub facility. All development sites are also required to **demonstrate best practice sustainability initiatives**. Doncaster Hill is the first Activities Area in Melbourne to introduce an innovative sustainability solution for apartments by mandating the installation of a third pipe for recycling water. The Doncaster Hill District Energy Services Project is based on decentralised energy systems to produce low and zero carbon energy and distribute this energy to locally connected customers. International services provider, GDF Suez is prepared to invest \$27 million to fund the thermal infrastructure associated with this project. State Government assistance is required with providing incentives to developers and utility agencies as well as removing regulatory barriers.

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?**

- This is largely an economic based discussion, however the **State should be guiding** where the uptake of renewable and low-emission technologies should be included in greenfield and urban renewal precincts.

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  
 Agree  
 Strongly Agree

**Why?**

- The State Government needs to take a leading role in encouraging more sustainable housing / built form and design outcomes including **revising the State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF)** to provide greater commitment to sustainability and provide direction on sustainability outcomes. Changes to SPPF and the Building Regulations are required to ensure **improved ecological sustainable design outcomes**. (This was taken from page 14 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- Council has recently prepared an Environmentally Sustainable Design policy, and will commence a planning scheme amendment to introduce it into the Manningham Planning Scheme. It is recommended that requirements for **Environmentally Sustainable Design be applied consistently in all planning schemes**.

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

- Significant work has been undertaken on the '100 Resilient Cities' project. The objectives and direction of this project should be reflected in Plan Melbourne 2016. It is also important that once finalised, Melbourne's first **Resilience Strategy should closely align with Plan Melbourne 2016**.
- Although **climate change is important**, it should not be used as a surrogate for 'the

environment'; as it is far broader than that.

## 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?**

- **Existing tools that can be tailored**, such as the Special Use Zone, the Comprehensive Development Zone and the Activity Centre Zone, can be used for National Employment Clusters and urban renewal areas, and additional planning tools are not considered necessary. Further, the Commercial 1 Zone has quite relaxed uses, and this can be utilised for employment areas.

**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?**

- No comments provided.

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

- No comments provided.

## 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?**

- Council recommends that the **role of the Metropolitan Planning Authority be clarified**. Participation in this body by Local Government representatives at a regional level is highly recommended. Implementation of such an ambitious work program is fundamental to the success of Plan Melbourne. Many of the actions are supported, including the creation of sub-regional groups of councils. Funding and resourcing of the actions, including a body such as the Metropolitan Planning Authority to oversee implementation and key infrastructure projects, will need to look towards innovative solutions. Its ability to direct and work in partnership with private investment efforts will also be crucial. (This was taken from page 16 from our initial Plan Melbourne submission).
- Therefore separating the long-term strategy from a shorter-term implementation plan is supported.

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

- Council agrees with the Ministerial Advisory Committee (as referenced on page 15) that the plan should be freed from the budgetary priorities and constraints of the government of the day. However, there needs to be a **stronger emphasis on the obligation to build key infrastructure projects**, i.e. Doncaster Rail, which are identified in the plan.
- A rolling implementation plan is supported, particularly for short term priorities. However, budget for the **short term priorities is essential** and the short term priorities should correlate and be supported by the State Government budget cycle.
- It is also important that the **rolling implementation plan is managed**, and not disrupted, through changes in government.
- The allocation of **short term priorities should also be equitable** across Melbourne. More specifically, the allocation of budget to undertake short term priorities should be based on merit and need. The short term priorities should be based on the overall impact they will have on the functionality of Melbourne; however it is also important that the budget allocation is transparent and that all municipalities receive infrastructure improvements as part of the short term priorities.

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

- Clearer direction is needed on **who will develop and monitor the implementation plan** and how it will be evaluated and reported to stakeholders. Opportunities should be provided for local government input.
- When Melbourne 2030 was released, **Councils were provided with a grant** to progress a project or piece of infrastructure that accorded with the metropolitan strategy. The grant that the City of Manningham received enabled us to undertake strategic background research for



Doncaster Hill, and ultimately led to the preparation and approval of the Activity Centre Zone for this significant area. A similar funding opportunity should be introduced with Plan Melbourne 2016.

# PLAN MELBOURNE REFRESH



Manningham City Council  
Submission Summary  
2 February 2016

# Executive Summary

Manningham City Council (Council) welcomes the opportunity to provide this submission to the Plan Melbourne Refresh.

This document focuses on the main elements that need to be addressed in Plan Melbourne 2016 to ensure that our municipality grows, develops and is enhanced in a way that accords with the overall objectives and principles of our metropolitan strategy. In addition to this document, Council has completed the Submission Form with specific comments/ information responding to the questions in the Discussion Paper.

A number of elements and issues that were identified in Council's submission to Plan Melbourne in 2013 have been included in the Plan Melbourne Refresh Discussion Paper. Some of the issues that we previously identified included:

- Improving references to necessary future public transport infrastructure
- Better addressing environmental climate change and affordable housing
- Better clarification on how Plan Melbourne will be implemented.

We commend the State Government for the Plan Melbourne Refresh, and in particular, for reviewing and including these initiatives. We understand that many councils similarly supported greater direction for these initiatives, and we believe that the revised Plan Melbourne 2016 will be more robust with their inclusion.



# Challenges and Opportunities for Manningham

The Plan Melbourne Refresh *At a Glance* document identifies the challenges and opportunities for Melbourne. Manningham is facing similar challenges and opportunities.

## People

- +20,000 over the next 20 years (.id forecast)
- By 2036, over 37% of Manningham residents will be 60 years or older (.id forecast)

## Homes

- In 2036, +10,000 additional homes (.id forecast) - this trend would see an additional 20,000 by 2051
- In 2036, decrease in household size – 2.79 to 2.65 per house (.id forecast)

## Jobs

- 57,000 employed residents – 53% of Manningham’s population (.id profile)
- 6.04% unemployment – slightly lower than Greater Melbourne, Victoria and Australia (.id profile)
- 30,203 jobs located in the City of Manningham in the year ending June 2014 (.id profile)
- Between 2006 and 2011, the health care sector and the professional services sector had the highest increase in employment numbers. As of 2011, retail and health care are the biggest employment generators (.id profile)

## Travel

- Manningham is the only municipality in Metropolitan Melbourne that does not have a train or tram service
- In 2011, 10.8% of (employed) Manningham residents travelled to work using public transport - this is an increase of 2.4% (or 1,300 people) from 2006
- In 2011, 19% of Doncaster Hill residents travelled to work using public transport (this includes by train from other areas)
- In 2011, 7.5% of residents travelled to work by bus (compared to 1.5% in Greater Melbourne)
- Between 2006 and 2011, travel to work by bus increased by 68% in Manningham
- Doncaster Area Rapid Transit (DART) Route 907 to Mitcham is the most patronised bus route from the CBD to the outer suburbs. Patronage on this route increased 57% between 2010/11 and 2011/12 and carried approximately 23,000 a week
- Currently, the four DART bus routes between the CBD and Manningham collectively transport 12,000 daily trips (on weekdays)

## Weather extremes

- Transport contributed 30% of total greenhouse gas emissions in Manningham in 2006/07 (equal to 350,000 tonnes) (Source: Making Manningham Mobile)

# Environmental Sustainability

- Although climate change is important, it should not be used as a surrogate for ‘the environment’, as it is far broader than that. To this end, greater emphasis should be placed on environmental sustainability.
- While delivering jobs and investment, providing housing choice and affordability, ensuring a more connected Melbourne and creating liveable communities and neighbourhoods are essential, these all relate to the broader environment. It is therefore recommended that Environmental Sustainability be addressed upfront in Plan Melbourne 2016.
- Melbourne’s green wedges are a significant and valuable part of its identity. Similarly, Manningham’s green wedge land contributes to our identity, and provides significant environmental, economic and lifestyle values and opportunities.
- A permanent Urban Growth Boundary will ensure that environmental, agricultural and lifestyle values in Manningham’s green wedge can be retained.
- 31 Melbourne metropolitan municipalities, including Manningham are part of the ‘100 Resilient Cities’ project. The objectives and direction of this project must be reflected in Plan Melbourne 2016, to ensure that the Resilience Strategy for Melbourne aligns with Melbourne’s metropolitan strategy.
- In light of climate change, Plan Melbourne 2016 should better recognise the increasing risks associated with natural hazards, and greater direction and support should be provided to councils to better understand, plan and manage to mitigate these risks. In addition, Plan Melbourne should align with all planning and mitigation strategies that have been developed at the state and regional level for flood, bushfire, storm events, heatwaves etc.
- With the expected population growth and intensification of development across Melbourne, the protection and restoration of biodiversity becomes paramount. Plan Melbourne 2016 should provide overarching support for the protection and restoration of biodiversity, and regulatory protection should be increased.
- While Doncaster Hill is a leading example of how an activity centre can incorporate sustainability initiatives (with localised recycled water infrastructure), greater direction and incentives are needed to facilitate the uptake of renewable and low-emission energy.
- Council has recently resolved to prepare and exhibit a planning scheme amendment to introduce an Environmentally Sustainable Design Policy as part of the second round of Melbourne councils. While Manningham Council commends the Minister for Planning for approving the Environmentally Sustainable Design Policy for the first round of Melbourne councils, a consistent state-wide approach on this matter would be beneficial.

What should change?

General Plan Melbourne comments:

- Environmental Sustainability should be addressed upfront in Plan Melbourne 2016.
- Acknowledgement of the value and protection of Melbourne’s green wedges should be increased.
- Greater overarching support for the protection and restoration of biodiversity is required.
- Melbourne’s Resilience Strategy should align with Plan Melbourne 2016.

Specific Plan Melbourne Refresh comments:

- A permanent Urban Growth Boundary should be reinforced.
- Greater direction and support is required in relation to natural hazards.
- The facilitation of renewable and low-emission energy outcomes is strongly encouraged.
- A state-wide approach to Environmentally Sustainable Design is recommended.

## Doncaster Hill – Metropolitan Activity Centre

- Doncaster Hill was previously (and appropriately) identified as a Principal Activity Centre under *Melbourne 2030*.
- Doncaster Hill is uniquely positioned in Melbourne’s middle-ring east in close proximity to major employment generators. It is unlocking and complementing regional opportunities for improved access to jobs, educational and health facilities and other community and social services.
- Doncaster Hill can relieve pressure from neighbouring MACs, as public transport and road infrastructure are currently at capacity. However, its real potential will be to take pressure off regional capacity constraints that can only be realised through identification as a MAC.
- Doncaster Hill was a trailblazer with respect to activity centre planning. Council was the first to develop a strategy that proposed such a substantial change and renewal.
- Doncaster Hill meets all seven of the Plan Melbourne objectives and its development potential is now being realised, both on a local and international scale, with endorsed and pending planning permits, a new 385 apartment mixed use Bunnings project and the redevelopment and expansion of Westfield’s National flagship site in Doncaster.
- More than 8,000 new residents will live in one of the 4000 apartments to be built by 2031. At present, 14 developments, comprising 845 apartments, have been completed and a further 825 apartments are under construction. An additional eight approved planning permits, comprising an additional 1300 apartments, are in the pipeline. In the coming years, Council will review the Doncaster Hill Strategy to maximise and enhance the role and function of Doncaster Hill as a Metropolitan Activity Centre in (MAC) Melbourne’s east.
- Council has delivered over \$30 million of development contribution funding for community and streetscape infrastructure in Doncaster Hill to support its growth and development, including the \$38 million MC<sup>2</sup> community hub, which was completed in 2012.
- It is important to note that in a forward thinking metropolitan strategy, activity centres should not just be designated on their current use, function or built form. Doncaster Hill will eventually be serviced by improved public transport (including a heavy rail line), and will be coupled with the significant growth and expansion of commercial, retail and housing developments now and into the future. It should be redesignated as a MAC to reflect both its current, and future role and function.
- Identification of Doncaster Hill as a MAC provides greater opportunity/incentive to attract other government and/or private institutions to locate in Manningham to contribute towards job creation e.g. major health service, regional education facility, government departments. A key aspiration for Doncaster Hill is to enable its residents to age in place, and to do so it is important to have these key facilities available locally. In essence, Doncaster Hill demonstrates the 20-minute city concept and is a role model for improving liveability.
- Doncaster Hill is well positioned as a MAC, especially with the potential public transport infrastructure investment identified in Plan Melbourne 2014. Further investment from private enterprise and the continued implementation of the Doncaster Hill Strategy for the area will create an opportunity to highlight this region as a major centre of growth for Melbourne’s north east.

- Within Doncaster Hill:
  - there is a high level of public transport usage (19% compared to 10.8% for rest of Manningham)
  - the population is forecast to increase 8.74% annually
  - there is a high level of professionals in the workforce (the top three occupations include Professional, Managers and Clerical and Administrative Workers)
  - there is also low car ownership (85.5% compared to 92.4% for Manningham).

**What should change?**

- Reassessing the hierarchy of activity centres is required, especially in the middle ring suburbs, to ensure their designation can support and complement unlocking opportunities for job creation. This will ultimately assist by taking pressure off surrounding areas of congestion. As such, it is recommended that an additional level of activity centre status be introduced that accords with Plan Melbourne Refresh principles and objectives.
- Doncaster Hill should be redesignated as a Metropolitan Activity Centre to reflect its current and future role.

Specific changes:

Pages 12 & 13 – Maps 3 and 4 are to be updated reflect Doncaster Hill as a Metropolitan Activity Centre.

Page 24 – Map 8 to be updated reflect Doncaster Hill as a Metropolitan Activity Centre.

Page 27 – Table 1 to be updated to reflect Doncaster Hill as a Metropolitan Activity Centre.

Page 37 – As a short term objective, ensure that Doncaster Hill is also identified in the State Planning Policy Framework for its role as a Metropolitan Activity Centre.

Page 43 - Map 12 to be updated reflect Doncaster Hill as a Metropolitan Activity Centre.

Page 158 – Map 33 to be updated reflect Doncaster Hill as a Metropolitan Activity Centre.

Page 159 – Doncaster Hill Metropolitan Activity Centre to be listed as a place of State significance, and also noted as an area where future growth will be consolidated and targeted.



# Improving public transport including a heavy rail line extension to Manningham

- Public transport plays an important role in shaping and improving Melbourne's liveability into the future.
- An essential element to servicing the needs of employment growth in the inner city and other activity areas is an integrated public transport network in the middle and outer ring suburbs.
- The majority of Manningham's workforce travel out of Manningham to work. Latest figures from REMPLAN (August 2015) indicate up to 79% commute each day, and public transport only accounts for 12.3% of all travel to work.
- Direction 3.2 of Plan Melbourne seeks to strengthen transport networks in existing suburbs.
- The provision of new public transport infrastructure must remain a high priority if increased employment opportunities are to be realised. Unlocking the spare capacity of existing infrastructure needs to be addressed in Plan Melbourne.
- In a local context, significant improvements to public transport infrastructure are essential for the success of Doncaster Hill and the ongoing viability of Manningham's activity centres which continue to be a focus of local job creation.
- Planning for the metro system in the short term, and in particular the rail link to Doncaster Hill, is supported. Council acknowledges that Plan Melbourne includes the long-term delivery of Doncaster Rail sometime between 2025 and 2050. However, Council seeks to ensure that the Doncaster Rail link is completed within the next 15 years (by 2028), consistent with the objective in Public Transport Victoria's 'Network Development Plan - Metropolitan Rail'.
- Council is concerned that the Plan indicates that a rail link to Doncaster will only extend as far as the Doncaster Park & Ride, and not to Doncaster Hill. The population of Doncaster Hill is anticipated to increase by more than 8000 people over the next 20 years and the proposed rail line needs to be extended to Doncaster Hill (and potentially beyond) to directly service this growing population.
- The Plan needs to acknowledge the original purpose of the median strip of the Eastern Freeway as a preferred rail reservation, and include a direction to ensure the land is still reserved for the purpose of rail, and not utilised as part of the any proposed future widening of the Eastern Freeway.

## What should change?

- Plan Melbourne 2016 should more clearly articulate the importance of providing new public transport infrastructure to support increased employment opportunities. Unlocking the spare capacity of existing infrastructure also needs to be addressed in Plan Melbourne.
- Clarification and commitment is required throughout Plan Melbourne 2016 to ensure that Doncaster Rail extension is completed.
- As a minimum, the Plan needs to refer to the Doncaster Rail extension as a 'future rail extension' and not a 'potential rail extension', and the reserve along the freeway needs to be retained in perpetuity.
- The land required for the entire Doncaster Rail extension (past the freeway) needs to be reserved.

### Specific changes:

Page 42 – The rail initiative (Planned & Potential) along the Eastern Freeway as shown on the Map 12 needs to extend beyond the existing Park and Ride to Doncaster Hill.

Page 43 – The legend for Map 12 needs to be revised as follows: Rail Initiative (Planned & Potential) to become Rail Infrastructure (Future).

Page 71 – The future Doncaster Rail link is to be included as a Solution.

Page 77 – The legend for Map 20 needs to be revised from 'Potential Doncaster Rail Link' to 'Future Doncaster Rail Link'.

Page 79 - Initiative 3.1.4 – Needs to be revised to acknowledge that the completion of the bus network should also occur in the middle and outer suburbs, not just the inner city as is currently stated.

Enhancement of the DART bus services should include consideration of the completion of bus lanes and priority treatments on Hoddle Street, and investigations of full grade separation of buses through Doncaster Hill (Williamsons/Doncaster Road).

## Affordable housing (including for those with a physical or intellectual disability)

- Melbourne is increasingly becoming more expensive to live, because of continual increases in mortgage or rental payments. The provision and management of affordable housing is critical in ensuring that Melbourne continues to be recognised as one of the world's most liveable cities.
- Council has an endorsed Housing Affordability Policy (2010-2020) which sets affordable housing provision targets of 10% by 2020 for Doncaster Hill and 5% for the remainder of the municipality. However, these are aspirational targets and there is no mechanism to assist Council with achieving these targets.
- Council supports the introduction of planning mechanisms (either regulatory or incentive based), to increase the provision of affordable housing. In addition, Federal and State financial incentives would also assist with the provision of affordable housing.
- To increase the level of affordable housing, a state-wide planning scheme control (potentially a Particular Provision) that requires the provision of affordable housing as part of new residential development would be beneficial. Alternatively local government areas, with support from the State Government, could prepare local planning policies to guide the future provision of affordable housing.
- Incentive mechanisms such as plot ratio bonuses, density bonuses, height bonuses and inclusionary zoning have in principle support, however it is important that the quality of the design and the strategic direction for a local area is not compromised by these incentives. To this end, if incentive based mechanisms were made available, it is important that Council continues to have the decision making ability to holistically assess the implications of the residential development that incorporates affordable housing.
- Council supports and recommends amending the Victoria Planning Provisions to include a definition for social housing and affordable housing.
- The ongoing management of affordable housing is a challenge that needs to be addressed. Greater direction is therefore needed on management models to ensure that affordable housing, whether it be privately owned or rented, remains affordable.
- It is important that suitable affordable housing options are encouraged and provided to allow people with an intellectual or physical disability to live independently. As such, Plan Melbourne 2016 should be amended to provide direction on the provision of affordable housing for those living with a disability.
- Funding sources, such as the National Disability Insurance Scheme Funding, should be implemented to encourage innovative housing solutions for those living with a disability.

**What should change?**

- Under Initiative 2.4.3, it is noted that planning provision and mechanisms to deliver more affordable housing will be delivered. This should be amended to reflect that regulatory and incentive based mechanisms will be implemented.
- The affordable housing section needs to reflect the challenges associated with affordable housing management models, and accordingly provide appropriate direction.
- This chapter also needs to be revised to ensure that social and affordable housing for those living with a disability is addressed.

## Innovative Health Services Solutions

- Plan Melbourne 2014, at Initiative 4.4.1, proposes to create health precincts to meet the needs of residents across Melbourne. However, the associated actions appear to focus on outer suburban growth areas and identified urban renewal areas. Greater emphasis is required in Plan Melbourne 2016 for the provision of health precincts in established suburbs to reflect the anticipated population growth.
- Approximately 24,000 (20%) of Manningham residents are aged 65 years or older.
- The largest cohort of population growth within Manningham over the next 20 years will be in persons aged over 70 years.
- There are no acute hospitals situated in Manningham and as a consequence, there is minimal tertiary medical specialist presence within the municipality.
- Our residents are required to journey many kilometres beyond the municipality in order to obtain consultancy services at a tertiary level health hub across Melbourne.
- Additional health services would reduce travel distances and pressure on existing overloaded health hubs, and free up valuable infrastructure capacity.
- The existing health hubs are already overcrowded and heavily utilised with constant demand loads.
- Innovative health services solutions, and more specifically a clustered 'Multi-Medical Specialist Service' precinct is required within Manningham to assist with serving the needs of the municipality and the broader region.

What should change?

- Greater emphasis is required in Plan Melbourne 2016 for the provision of health precincts in established suburbs to reflect the anticipated population growth.
- Innovative health services solutions, and more specifically a 'Multi-Medical Specialist Service', should be identified in Plan Melbourne 2016 within Doncaster Hill, or in close proximity to Doncaster Hill.

# Implementation

- Implementation of such an ambitious work program is fundamental to the success of Plan Melbourne. Funding and resourcing of the actions, including a body such as the Metropolitan Planning Authority to oversee implementation and key infrastructure projects, will need to look towards innovative solutions and private investment partnerships.
- Council recommends that the role of the Metropolitan Planning Authority be clarified. Participation in this body by Local Government representatives at a regional level is highly recommended.
- Separating the long-term strategy from a shorter-term implementation plan (as part of a rolling implementation plan) is supported.
- Council agrees with the Ministerial Advisory Committee that the plan should be freed from the budgetary priorities and constraints of the government of the day.
- There needs to be a stronger commitment to build key infrastructure projects which are identified in the plan (i.e. Doncaster Rail).
- The allocation of short term priorities should be equitable across Melbourne. More specifically, the allocation of budget to undertake short term priorities should be based on merit, need and the overall impact they will have on the functionality of Melbourne. It is also important that the budget allocation is transparent and that all municipalities receive infrastructure improvements as part of the short term priorities.
- Clearer direction is needed on who will develop and monitor the implementation plan and how it will be evaluated and reported on to stakeholders. local government input in this process is also recommended.
- When Melbourne 2030 was released, councils were provided with a grant to progress a project or piece of infrastructure that accorded with the metropolitan strategy. Council received a grant enabled us to undertake strategic background research for Doncaster Hill, and ultimately led to the preparation and approval of the Activity Centre Zone for this significant area. A similar funding opportunity should be introduced with Plan Melbourne 2016.

What should change?

- The implementation of Plan Melbourne 2016 should be strengthened, and a partnership approach should be employed, particularly with local government.
- The Plan Melbourne Implementation Plan should be developed with an allocated budget that is supported by the State Government budget cycle.
- The allocation of short term priorities should also be equitable across Melbourne. More specifically, the allocation of budget to undertake short term priorities should be based on merit, need and the overall impact they will have on the functionality of Melbourne. It is also important that the budget allocation is transparent and that all municipalities receive infrastructure improvements as part of the short term priorities.
- In order to ensure effective implementation, the role of the Metropolitan Planning Authority and sub-regional groups of councils needs to be better defined, and a monitoring framework needs to be prepared and updated regularly.