

## ARDEN MACAULAY STRUCTURE PLAN – REPORT ON THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

---

### THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

#### Abstract

1. This report summarises the extensive stakeholder and community engagement process undertaken to inform the Arden Macaulay Structure Plan (the plan). The consultation process aimed to inform, raise awareness, work collaboratively with key stakeholders, build and strengthen relationships, encourage dialogue and seek feedback to inform the plan.
2. A diverse range of opportunities were provided to our stakeholders for their engagement in the plan. This led to individuals and organisations providing feedback on the proposals contained within the plan. Approximately 96 people attended the workshop and information session and across the consultation process, approximately 158 submissions received.
3. The findings following consultation are listed at Attachment 4 (Summary of Submissions).

#### Process

4. This structure plan is part of the “Planning for Future Growth” process. The process began with the Future Melbourne Community Plan (2008) (FMCP) that established a vision, goals and targets for the City that underpin the work currently underway. Future Melbourne identified future growth areas which led to a review of the Melbourne Planning Scheme including the preparation of a new draft Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS).
5. Both the FMCP and the MSS were prepared with extensive community engagement and input through both informal and formal consultation processes.
6. Community and stakeholder forums were held over a 12 month period to inform the vision, goals and outcomes in the Future Melbourne Community Plan. It was developed via an on-line Wiki, a much heralded innovative and inclusive approach, whereby all could contribute directly during the development of the plan and edit it as it evolved. During this process areas of future growth were identified.
7. The MSS draws from the FMCP and sets out a vision for the City and a strategy to manage and target projected future growth. The areas identified in the FMCP for future growth, and the additional industrial areas of Arden Macaulay, were included in the Draft Municipal Strategic Statement as Urban Renewal Areas. The MSS, as required by legislation, has undergone a formal public exhibition process and submissions received are currently being reviewed by an independent panel.
8. Consultation regarding the drafting of the Arden Macaulay Structure Plan was conducted in two phases, commencing in September 2010, as discussed below. If the structure plan is endorsed by City of Melbourne a rezoning and master planning process will be carried out; each phase will involve its own consultation process to seek stakeholder and community input.
9. The consultation process undertaken was consistent with the Department of Planning and Community Development’s Structure Plans – Advisory Note and Council’s Community Engagement Plan. It ensured a formal and effective process for lodging submissions and the opportunity for detailed assessment thereof.

10. Consultation for the City North Structure Plan and the Transport Strategy Update was also conducted over this time. In addition, Council has recently exhibited an Open Space Strategy and work is underway on civil and community infrastructure and developer contributions plans. All of this has informed the Structure Plan.

### **Project Management**

11. Officers from the Planning and Infrastructure, City Design, Community Development and City Business divisions of the City of Melbourne have participated in the development of the Structure Plan.

### **Expert Advice**

12. Advice from the following consultants has been used to inform the plan:
  - Structure Plan Consultation City North and Arden Macaulay September 2010 – Collaborations
  - Arden Macaulay Population and Dwellings – Serryn Eagleson (EDG Research)
  - Demographic Profile – Serryn Eagleson (EDG Research)
  - Employment Land Study: Kensington and North Melbourne – SGS Economics and Planning
  - Arden Macaulay Retail and Commercial Floorspace Requirements (Draft) – Essential Economics
  - Arden Metro Station Access and Mobility Plan – AECOM for Department of Transport
  - Heritage Assessment Arden Macaulay Structure Plan Area – Meredith Gould Architects
  - Utility Services Analysis and Environmentally Sustainable Development for North Melbourne Precinct – AECOM
  - Transport System Review – Urban Trans
  - City North and Arden Macaulay Structure Plan Review: Property and Development Assessment – Deep End Services

### **Background**

13. Key milestones in the consultation process prior to the September consultation included:
  - 13.1. Preparation of a background report to provide an analysis of existing activities, population and development trends, community values and stakeholder inputs to inform the development of the structure plan – May 2010.
  - 13.2. Briefings and orientation with stakeholders who would be involved with the plan – July & August 2010
  - 13.3. Consultation on the Municipal Strategic Statement. The MSS provides the strategic framework for the plan. The community was informed through this process that more detailed structure planning work was being carried out – July 2010.
  - 13.4. Research and analysis with technical stakeholders to provide information on the study area – August 2010.
  - 13.5. Council officers were invited to contribute to the State Government's Melbourne Metro Rail project work in the early stages of the development of a business case for the project and keenly advocated for the inclusion of a rail station in the Arden Macaulay study area. Work undertaken by and for this project informed the development of the structure plan and vice versa.

### **Phase 1 – Consultation September 2010**

14. The Phase 1 consultation period involved seeking the community's values and identification of issues and opportunities including priorities for the study area. To inform the draft Plan the City of Melbourne ran a month long consultation program. Members of the community were encouraged to provide input regarding their key values, issues, and opportunities for the Arden Macaulay area.
15. On 15 September 2010 the community and stakeholders (62) participated in a consultation workshop to determine their key values for the revitalisation of the Arden Macaulay and identify a range of issues and opportunities they felt should be addressed.
16. The community and stakeholders were notified and invited to attend by way of:
  - Mail (sent to 3800 property owners in the subject area);
  - Notice in the Moonee Valley Community News, The Melbourne Times and City Weekly between 31 August and 2 September 2010;
  - The City of Melbourne web site;
  - Direct liaison with resident groups and other key stakeholders.
17. The community were also invited to participate in a moderated forum through the City of Melbourne website. The website replicated the themes from the community consultation and was available to the public for one month from Wednesday 15 September 2011 to Friday 15 October. 16 people provided feedback via the web site.
18. The 5 key themes that emerged from this first phase of consultation as priorities for the Structure Plan to deliver included:
  - A sustainable mix of uses
  - Getting around – easily and safely
  - Moonee Ponds Creek – a valuable asset
  - A diverse and cohesive community
  - History, culture and character.

### **Subsequent work following Phase 1**

19. Following the Phase 1 additional work was undertaken to develop the Draft Arden Macaulay Structure Plan.
  - 19.1. This involved research and analysis of information provided by the community and stakeholders. Internal workshops and design charettes were carried out based on innovative ideas for the study area – October 2010.
  - 19.2. Using the outcomes of the previous processes a series of scenarios were developed through internal workshops and design charettes, this included exploration of potential implementation – October – November 2010.
  - 19.3. Internal workshops and meetings were carried out to identify the proposed scenario for consultation from December 2010 to April 2011. This included an intensive stakeholder workshop held on 7 December 2010 with state government agencies, service authorities and internal staff.
  - 19.4. A preliminary Draft Structure Plan was circulated to relevant internal staff and key government stakeholders in April 2011 for input.

- 19.5. On 10 May 2011, the Draft Plan was endorsed by the Future Melbourne Committee for public consultation.
- 19.6. Both pre and post the consultation period several meetings have been held with interested landowners and/or their representatives regarding future land use change in the area including The Lost Dogs Home, City Wide, Vision Australia, Allied Mills, EG Funds Management (Elizabeth St Kensington), 59 – 101 Alfred Street North Melbourne and several properties in Stubbs Street.

## **Phase 2 – Consultation May - June 2011**

20. The Phase 2 consultation period was carried out between 11 May 2011 and 30 June 2011. This was extended from 23 June 2011 in response to requests from the community.
21. The following initiatives were undertaken to inform our community and stakeholders that the Draft Structure Plan was prepared and available for public consultation:
  - 21.1. The ‘Have your say’ City of Melbourne corporate website ([www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/futuregrowth](http://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/futuregrowth)) was updated to incorporate information relating to the Draft Plan including a full copy of the Draft Plan that was available for downloading.
  - 21.2. The email address [structureplans@melbourne.vic.gov.au](mailto:structureplans@melbourne.vic.gov.au) was maintained for the community to engage with the Strategic Planning Team. Questions relating to the plan were welcomed through this measure.
  - 21.3. Social networking sites including the “City of Melbourne” Facebook account were used to inform a broader catchment of the plan and consultation process. A Twitter account, #ardenmacsp, was created for the structure plan.
  - 21.4. A corporate advertisement was published on page 1 of the Melbourne Leader on 23/05/2011.
  - 21.5. Hard copies of the Draft Plans were available for viewing at the following locations:
    - Melbourne Town Hall
    - Council House 2, Level 3 reception
    - City Library;
    - North Melbourne Library; and,
    - Flemington Library.
  - 21.6. Flyers were mailed to all land owners throughout the study area advising of the draft plan and the consultation process, including an information session (1188 mailed). An email was sent to members of the community who had registered their interest or attended a previous consultation session. Key residents associations were also emailed and requested to inform their members.
  - 21.7. Flyers promoting the draft plan and consultation process were displayed at the following locations:
    - North and West Melbourne Neighbourhood Centre
    - The Hub @ Docklands
    - Kensington Community Centre
    - Kensington Neighbourhood House
    - Dousta Galla Community Health Centre
    - City Library
    - North Melbourne Library

- North Melbourne Recreation Centre
- Jean McKendry Neighbourhood Centre
- Kensington Senior Citizens
- Flemington Library
- North Melbourne Community Centre
- Kensington Primary School

21.8. Upon request hard copies of the Draft Plan and Background Report were provided to individuals and organisations.

22. An information session regarding the draft Arden Macaulay Structure Plan was held on 6 June 2011 at The North Melbourne Town Hall. Ninety six people attended. The forum was facilitated by an external mediator from Collaborations Planning with Your Local Community Pty Ltd. The information session included an introduction by Councillor Clarke, a presentation by David Mayes, Manager Strategic Planning; and a question and feedback opportunity on the key elements of the Plan.

23. The project team presented at targeted stakeholder briefings including:

23.1. The Kensington Association – 16 June 2011

23.2. North and West Melbourne Residents Association – 21 June 2011

23.3. Presidents of the Residents Associations - 15 June 2011. The following organisations were invited to attend:

- Carlton Residents Association
- EastEnders
- Hardware Precinct Residents and Tenants Group
- Kensington Association
- Kensington Public Tenants Association
- North and West Melbourne Association
- Parkville Association
- Parkville Gardens Resident Association
- Residents 3000
- The Coalition of Residents and Business Associations (CoRBA)
- Flemington Association

24. A letter was sent to relevant members of parliament, state government ministers and the executives of relevant industry groups and institutions advising of the draft structure plan and consultation process.

25. City of Melbourne held an information session with key government organisations and stakeholders on 3 June 2011. Representatives from the following government departments, agencies and organisations and individuals were formally invited to attend:

- Department of Transport
- Department of Business and Innovation
- Department of Planning and Community Development
- Melbourne Health

- Moonee Valley City Council
- Melbourne Water
- Department of Health
- Department Premier and Cabinet
- Vic Roads
- Sustainability Victoria
- Department of Human Services
- University of Melbourne
- CitiPower
- Major Projects Victoria
- Vic Track
- Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology
- Vic Urban
- Port of Melbourne
- National Trust
- The Honourable Bronwyn Pike, MLA
- The Honourable Terry Mulder (Minister for Transport)
- Mr. Adam Bandt MP
- The Honourable Matthew Guy MLA (Minister for Planning)
- The Property Council of Australia – Victorian Division
- Urban Development Institute of Australia – Victoria Division
- Walter and Eliza Hall Institute
- The Royal Children’s Hospital
- The Royal Melbourne Hospital
- The South Parkville Working Group

26. Targeted meetings were carried out with the following organisations to discuss specific aspects of the structure plan:

- Allied Mills
- City Wide
- The Lost Dogs Home
- Vic Track
- The Victorian Public Archives
- Land owner/representatives of 59-101 Alfred Street, North Melbourne
- Land owner/representatives of 302 Arden Street, North Melbourne
- Land owner/representatives of 2 - 50 Elizabeth St, Kensington (C177) - EG Funds
- The Department of Transport
- The Office of Housing

- Melbourne Water
- The City of Moonee Valley

### **Media Coverage**

27. The Plan gained additional coverage through the media, public events, industry associations and local groups. This included but was not limited to the following:
- Herald Sun, “Things are looking up in the North”, 7/5/2011, page 15
  - Kensington Association, <http://www.kensingtonassociation.org.au/minutes/201-june-2011>
  - Urban Analyst, <http://www.urbanalyst.com/in-the-news/victoria/585-city-of-melbourne-releases-draft-transport-strategy-update-and-structure-plans.html>
  - North and West Melbourne Association, <http://www.nwma.org.au/news/topics/planning>
  - The Fifth Estate, <http://www.thefifthestate.com.au/archives/22885>
  - Melbourne Conversation Series, “Urban Renewal, Urban Growth and Creative Opportunities”, 23/3/2011

### **Submissions**

28. Submissions on the Draft Structure Plan were encouraged. As a result of consultation 178 submissions were received. Of the 178 submissions:
- 145 were from individuals;
  - 16 were from businesses and organisations;
  - 8 were from government.

### **Conclusion**

29. The consultation was widely promoted and comprehensive. The public consultation process lead to a diverse stakeholder base providing valuable feedback and input. The City of Melbourne received 178 submissions that have shaped and informed the final version.
30. The findings from the consultation process are listed at Attachment 4.





## SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

---

### Content

The consultation was widely promoted and comprehensive. There were residents, businesses and representatives of the planning and development industry. Officers from various departments of Government including Dept of Transport and Dept of Planning and Community Development were individually consulted with. The public consultation process lead to a diverse stakeholder base providing feedback on the proposals contained in the Plan.

The written submissions raised 8 thematic responses and informed the finalisation of the Draft Plan. A summary of the key amendments to the Draft Plan are contained in Attachment 5. The 8 themes and the frequency of which they were addressed is outlined below:

- Built Form
- Activities and Land Use
- Infrastructure Services
- Open Space
- Structure Plan Process
- Transport
- Values and Identity
- Site Specific Comments

Of the submissions received the most commonly occurring matters are summarised as follows:

- Provide more information about car parking and traffic management and encourage alternative modes of transport
- Provide for enhanced community facilities.
- Lower the proposed building heights;
- Reduce building heights adjoining heritage areas;
- Provide diversity in density and housing stock.

### Summary of Submissions

*Car parking, traffic management and alternative modes of transport.*

The key arguments included:

- The additional population will increase the probability of the area being used for rat runs;
- The area already accommodates excessive congestion particularly during peak hour along Macaulay Road and Arden Street. These routes are used by commuters trying to avoid City Link tolls. Any measure to mitigate this traffic will be met by additional traffic avoiding tolls.
- Parking is already at capacity.
- The existing public transport is at capacity and existing residents are unable to board trains during peak hour at Kensington. Upgrades are needed to the Craigieburn and Upfield Line trains as well as Flemington Bridge, South Kensington Station and Macaulay Stations.
- The bus routes should be extended including an extension along Buncle Street and Boundary Road.
- The 57 tram route's frequency should be enhanced.
- Provide upgrades to alternative modes of transport such as walking paths, cycling paths, car share, etc.

- Place significant pressure on the state government in a manner that indicates that for any addition people that are expected to be housed on this municipality, that the public transport will be improved (significantly) to cope with any additional people before any further development gets approved.

The Structure Plan recommends the development of traffic and parking management plans. The City of Melbourne will continue to advocate for sustainable transportation through the Transport Strategy and Arden Macaulay Structure Plan.

Council's Transport Strategy advocates for enhanced frequency of services, including longer operating hours. The Structure Plan provides recommendations for enhancements to streetscapes including improved pedestrian and cycling pathways. Prior to any capital works enhancements to streetscapes or road reconfiguration detailed design will consider the impact of any proposal on traffic and parking and any potential conflict between users.

The City of Melbourne will continue to advocate to the State Government for sustainable transportation provision through the Transport Strategy and Arden Macaulay Structure Plan. This includes the provision of additional services on existing lines and the commencement of the Metro project. The Transport Strategy advocates for enhanced frequency of services, including longer operating hours. The Structure Plan enhances and encourages the upgrade and enhances activities around the existing railway stations as well as improved walking and bicycle connections.

The City of Melbourne focuses on providing for sustainable modes rather than utilising on road space and parking facilities for private cars as this is land intensive.

#### *Enhanced Community Facilities*

The key arguments included:

- Social infrastructure is needed to respond to the needs of the significantly increased population and people with particular needs.
- Developers are unlikely to be concerned with provision of community facilities and will not be around to deal with the dysfunctional communities that will result due to a lack of these facilities.
- Existing schools servicing the area are at capacity.
- New sites may need to be purchased or compulsorily acquired.
- Children will increasingly access open space at school due to higher density living.

It is agreed that improvements to existing (and identification of additional) community infrastructure are needed to respond to the needs of the growing community. The Structure Plan provides an opportunity for a holistic approach to managing change. Additional community infrastructure opportunities and principles have been identified and integrated into the area.

In the process of developing the Structure Plan, the City of Melbourne has had discussions with the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) who have responsibility for managing existing schools and the delivery of new schools.

The Structure Plan recommends that the City of Melbourne prepare a Development Contributions Plan to be integrated into the Melbourne Planning Scheme to contribute funds for the development of these community hubs. Local and State Governments are responsible for the delivery of essential community services, with some services provided by the private sector. Therefore the Structure Plan recommends the development of partnerships for the ongoing delivery of community infrastructure. The City of Melbourne will continue to work with service providers and the State Government to provide and operate services to meet community needs. Council will continue to advocate for and work closely with the State Government and private sector to ensure community infrastructure provision is aligned with population needs as the area develops.

#### *Lower the proposed building heights*

The key arguments included:

- The City of Melbourne should be promoting growth in the urban renewal areas but at the same time should be implementing strategies to protect and maintain the existing stable areas.
- Protect character and the village feel.

- This could be a repeat of the social, architectural and planning problems associated with the 1960's and 70's commission housing estates.
- Too much reliance has been placed upon the Metro project to justify the heights.
- Protection from loss of light, noise, shadows, loss of parking, ambience, views privacy.
- Wind tunnelling affect from tall buildings.
- Impacts upon sea breezes.
- Consider the needs of all residents of different ages and backgrounds.

In response to this feedback, the structure plan has developed clear performance based criteria for design and built form outcomes to complement existing neighbourhood character. Building heights have been lowered or a podium setback required where there is an interface with existing lower residential character and heritage buildings. Building heights have not been lowered in areas within proximity to the proposed Metro station, existing high frequency public transport corridors and clusters of higher buildings/research institutions, as these areas are appropriate to support increased density.

Clause 22.01 - Urban Design Within the Capital City Zone provides direction regarding built form in order to protect neighbourhood character. Overshadowing upon existing residences will be protected under the existing planning scheme provisions which allows for 5 hours of sunlight. Clause 22.02 (Sunlight to Public Places) will prevent overshadowing public open space between 11am and 2pm.

The Mixed Use Zone will ensure that the standard amenity tests apply for new residential development applications. Planning applications for tall buildings which may cause wind affects typically require expert wind tunnel testing at a planning permit stage to determine their impact. The recommendations of the testing may include alterations to the podium, canopy or height.

*Reduce building heights adjoining heritage areas:*

The key arguments include:

- Buildings adjacent to heritage buildings should not be taller or provide an appropriate transition.
- Protect heritage buildings - any upgrades should not impact heritage fabric.
- Buildings surrounding the meat market should be of an appropriate scale.

In response to this feedback, the Structure Plan has developed clear performance based criteria for design and built form outcomes to complement existing heritage buildings. In addition, the City of Melbourne has commissioned a review of the Heritage Overlay in Arden Macaulay to identify additional sites which should be protected.

Clause 22.05 Heritage outside the Capital City Zone provides direction regarding the treatment of heritage places. Amongst other design requirements Council's heritage policy requires that the height of a new building not dominate an outstanding heritage building.

*Provide diversity in density and housing stock*

The key arguments include:

- The focus on units in a high rise context is too lop-sided.
- To achieve a more balanced population plans need to be a mixed housing area that incorporates some units, some free standing residents and some public housing.
- Flats are without charm. Flats around the station may be appropriate with lower built form elsewhere. Areas such as Kensington Banks and Port Melbourne provide a variety of housing styles. 3-4 bedroom dwellings will provide for families.
- Poor impacts upon public health - can create social problems when too little consideration is made of community, open space, social interaction, and isolation from excessive noise, etc.
- Higher density is not only achieved by high rise.

The plan endeavours to balance development requirements and respond appropriately to development pressures and values of existing communities (ie/ managing growth and change) by taking a proactive approach to managing change.

The plan focuses on siting increased density in appropriate, well serviced locations such as near public transport infrastructure and activity areas to ensure access to facilities services. The plan takes a holistic approach to urban renewal by aiming to provide for a well serviced community with adequate community infrastructure, and open space.

The Structure Plan recommends a provision of 20% affordable housing and provides for varying heights throughout the Arden Macaulay. It recommends the preparation of a Housing Policy that will ensure housing quality and diversity.

<b>ARDEN MACAULAY STRUCTURE PLAN - LIST OF SUBMITTERS</b>			
<b>Submissions received in response to the draft Arden Macaulay Structure Plan from individual interested parties</b>			
<b>SUBMITTER</b>		<b>KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION</b>	
<b>Surname</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>See discussion in submission analysis</b>	
<b>Surname</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Key Issues</b>	
<b>Allied Mills</b>		2.2 8.1 2.4 2.5 3.1 1.0	Industry Process and implementation Land use transition Residential Amenity General Comment
<b>Alomes</b>	<b>Stephen</b>	4.6 4.6 4.8 4.13 1.0	Speed limit Cars, Roads and Traffic Bicycles Walking General Comment

<b>Ashley</b>	<b>Alan</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.2 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Policy and government Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road
<b>Barberis-Page</b>	<b>Irene</b>	6.1 2.6	Community facilities Retail/commercial
<b>Bartlet</b>	<b>Dustin</b>	2.4 1.0 4.4 4.6 4.9 4.11	Land use transition General Comment Melbourne Metro Roads Public transport Trains
<b>Bateman</b>	<b>Gary &amp; Julie</b>	7.3 1.0 3.2 4.6 8.1	Climate change adaptation General Comment Building heights Traffic issues Process and implementation

<b>Bazzani Scully Brand</b>		3.2	Building heights
		2.1	Activity centres
		6.1	Community facilities
		2.5	Residential
		2.6	Retail/commercial
		3.3	Density
		9.1	Arden Central
		4.9	Public transport
		3.4	Heritage
		8.1	Process and implementation
		4.8	Public Transport
		2.0	Activities and land use
		5.0	Open space
<b>Benincasa</b>	<b>Joseph</b>	2.2	General Comment
		2.5	Industry
		2.6	Residential
		4.9	Retail/commercial
		4.8	Public transport
		4.11	Stops and stations
		3.2	Trains
		4.6	Building heights
		5.1	Cars
		7.1	Parks
		7.1	Infrastructure services

<p><b>Bennett</b></p>	<p><b>Veronica</b></p>	<p>3.2 5.0 6.1 3.4 8.1 4.6 4.5 9.1 4.4 4.11 3.3 4.9 4.6</p>	<p>Building heights Open space Community facilities Heritage Process and implementation Cars, roads and traffic Car parking Arden Central Melbourne Metro Trains Density Public transportation Traffic issues</p>
<p><b>Berriman</b></p>	<p><b>Shara</b></p>	<p>3.3 8.3 1.0 8.1</p>	<p>Density Feedback on the consultation process General Comment Process and implementation</p>
<p><b>Bicycle Victoria</b></p>		<p>4.8</p>	<p>Bicycles</p>



<p><b>Bishop</b></p>	<p><b>John</b></p>	<p>2.2 2.6 3.2 3.3 5.0 8.1 6.1 3.4 4.8 4.5 4.4 7.7 9.2 8.3</p>	<p>Industry Retail/commercial Building heights Density Open space Process and implementation Community facilities Heritage Public Transport - Congestion Parking Melbourne Metro Water Boundary Road Feedback on the consultation process</p>
<p><b>Bishop</b></p>	<p><b>Helena</b></p>	<p>2.2 2.6 3.2 3.3 5.0 8.1 6.1 3.4 4.6 4.5 4.4 7.7 9.2 8.3</p>	<p>Industry Retail/commercial Building heights Density Open space Process and implementation Community facilities Heritage Cars, Roads and Traffic Parking Melbourne Metro Water Boundary Road Feedback on the consultation process</p>

<p><b>Boardman</b></p>	<p><b>Cory</b></p>	<p>8.3 3.2 6.1 5.0 9.10 4.8 4.6 4.9 4.13</p>	<p>Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Community facilities Open space Moonee Ponds Creek Bicycles Cars Public transport Walking</p>
<p><b>Boin</b></p>	<p><b>Kathryn</b></p>	<p>3.1 5.0 9.10 4.6 4.8 4.9 4.13 1.0 6.1 3.3 8.1 4.6 4.9 3.2 2.6</p>	<p>Amenity Open Space Moonee Ponds Creek Traffic issues Bicycles Public transport Walking General Comment Community facilities Density Process and implementation Cars, Roads and Traffic Public transport Building heights Retail/commercial</p>

<b>Bourke</b>	<b>Steve</b>	2.4 2.5 9.1 4.4 3.1 3.2 4.0 5.0 6.1 7.1	Land use transition Residential Arden Central Melbourne Metro Amenity Building heights Transport Open Space Community facilities Infrastructure services
<b>Broadie</b>	<b>Kelly</b>	1.0 8.3 8.1 3.2 3.5 9.9 4.6 4.6 4.8 9.1 4.4 4.8	General Comment Feedback on the consultation process Process and implementation Building heights Neighbourhood character Macaulay Road Cars, Roads and Traffic Traffic issues Public Transport - Stops and stations Arden Central Melbourne Metro Public transport - Capacity
<b>Bulten</b>	<b>Jude</b>	3.3 4.6 3.1 3.2 3.5	Density Cars, Roads and Traffic Amenity Building heights Neighbourhood character
<b>BurnsBridge Sweet Pty Ltd</b>		2.6 3.2	Retail/commercial Building heights

<p><b>Cebokli</b></p>	<p><b>Magda</b></p>	<p>8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.2 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2</p>	<p>Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Policy and Government Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public Transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/Commercial Boundary Road</p>
<p><b>Chala</b></p>	<p><b>Teresa</b></p>	<p>3.2 6.1 2.4 1.0 5.0 5.1 3.3 3.0 3.5 7.1 8.3</p>	<p>Building heights Community facilities Land use transition general comment and identity Open space Parks Density Built form Neighbourhood character Infrastructure services Feedback on the consultation process</p>
<p><b>Chan</b></p>	<p>S</p>	<p>3.1 3.2</p>	<p>Amenity Building heights</p>

<b>Chemke</b>	<b>Deborah</b>	8.1 8.2 2.0 2.4 4.9 4.13 4.8 9.5 4.11 4.1 4.6 4.12 9.10 3.1 4.0 4.10 4.8 4.6	Process and implementation Policy and government Activities and land uses Land use transition Public transport Walking Bicycles E-Gate Trains Freight Roads Trams Moonee Ponds Creek Amenity Transport Buses Public Transport Traffic issues
<b>City West Water</b>		7.7 8.1	Water Process and implementation
<b>Cocks</b>	<b>Adam</b>	3.2 3.4 9.1 8.1 3.0	Building heights Heritage Arden Central Process and implementation Built form

<b>Cole</b>	<b>Deb</b>	<p>1.0 8.1 3.2 3.1 3.3 7.7 5.0 5.1 9.10 4.6 4.9</p>	<p>general comment Process and implementation Building heights Amenity Density Water Open Space Parks Moonee Ponds Creek Traffic issues Public transport</p>
<b>Colman</b>	<b>Andrew</b>	<p>8.3 5.0 9.10 4.6 4.9 6.1 4.5 9.1 4.6 4.8</p>	<p>Feedback on the consultation process Open space Moonee Ponds Creek Cars Public transport Community facilities Parks Arden Central Roads Public Transport</p>

<b>Cook</b>	<b>Bill</b>	8.3 3.2 1.0 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.2 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights general comment Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Policy and government Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road
-------------	-------------	--	---

<b>Cowling</b>	<b>Ray</b>	7.1 2.3 2.4 8.1 5.0 3.0 3.2 3.4 8.3 3.3 5.1 8.2 4.5 4.6 4.9 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2	Community facilities Institutional uses Land use transition Process and implementation Open space Built form Building heights Heritage Feedback on the consultation process Density Parks Policy and government Parking Traffic issues Public transport Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road
<b>Cox</b>	<b>Geoffrey</b>	3.4 3.2 5.0 4.6 4.4 4.5 4.8 6.1 3.3 8.1	Heritage Building heights Open space Cars, Roads and Traffic Melbourne Metro Parking Public transport Community facilities Density Process and implementation



<b>Cubitt</b>	<b>Fiona</b>	3.2 4.6 9.1 4.4 4.8 4.11 7.7 5.0 9.10 3.4 8.1	Building heights Cars, Roads and Traffic Arden Central Melbourne Metro Public Transport Trains Water Open Space Moonee Ponds Creek Heritage Process and implementation
<b>Cusack</b>	<b>Megan</b>	1.0 3.5 3.2 3.4 9.2 9.9 4.5 4.6 4.6 4.9 6.1 3.1 2.5 2.6 8.3 8.1	general comment Neighbourhood character Building heights Heritage Boundary Road Macaulay Road Parking Cars, Roads and Traffic Traffic issues Public transport Community facilities Amenity Residential Retail/commercial Feedback on the consultation process Process and implementation
<b>Dancuk</b>	<b>Maria</b>	3.1 3.2 2.5	Amenity Building heights Residential

<b>Dare</b>	<b>Anthony</b>	1.0 8.1 3.2 3.1 3.5 9.9 4.6 4.6 4.9 4.8 6.1	general comment Process and implementation Building heights Amenity Neighbourhood character Macaulay Road Cars, Roads and Traffic Traffic issues Public transport Public Transport - Capacity Community facilities
<b>Dare</b>	<b>Anna</b>	3.2 3.4 3.5 9.9 9.13 4.8 6.1	Building heights Heritage Neighbourhood character Macaulay Road Racecourse Road Public Transport - Congestion Community facilities
<b>Darrigrand</b>	<b>Olivier</b>	3.3 6.1 3.4 3.5 3.1 3.2 8.3	Density Congestion Community facilities Heritage Neighbourhood character Amenity Building heights Feedback on the consultation process
<b>Darrigrand</b>	<b>Matthieu</b>	3.3 4.6 6.1 3.4 3.5 3.1 3.2 8.3	Density Cars, Roads and Traffic Community facilities Heritage Neighbourhood character Amenity Building heights Feedback on the consultation process

<b>Darrigrand</b>	<b>Cyrille</b>	4.6 3.2 3.1 5.1 6.1 3.4	Cars, Roads and Traffic Building heights Amenity Parks Community facilities Heritage
<b>Darrigrand</b>	<b>Audrie</b>	3.3 4.6 6.1 5.1 3.4 3.5 3.1 3.2 8.3	Density Cars, Roads and Traffic Community facilities Parks Heritage Neighbourhood character Amenity Building heights Feedback on the consultation process
<b>Davies</b>	<b>Huw</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.2 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Policy and government Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road

<b>Davies</b>	<b>Helen</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.2 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Policy and government Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road
<b>Delbridge</b>	<b>Chris</b>	4.8 4.6 4.9 4.13 4.6 4.8 3.2 3.3 7.3 8.1 5.0 9.10 8.3	Bicycles Cars Public transport Walking Cars, Roads and Traffic Public Transport Building heights Density Climate change adaptation Process and implementation Open space Moonee Ponds Creek Feedback on the consultation

<b>Demediuk</b>	<b>Therese</b>	8.3 8.1 3.2 3.5 6.1 2.5 1.0	Feedback on the consultation process Process and implementation Building heights Neighbourhood character Community facilities Residential general comment
<b>Department of Business &amp; Innovation</b>		8.1 2.2	Process and implementation Industry
<b>Department of Human Services</b>		1.0 2.5 9.1 2.1 4.5 9.10 4.9 7.3 8.1	general comment Residential Arden Central Activity Centres Parks Moonee Ponds Creek Public transport Climate change adaptation Process and implementation

<b>Department of Planning and Community Development</b>	2.0	Activities and land use
	2.1	Activity centres
	2.6	Retail/commercial
	3.2	Building heights
	5.0	Open space
	4.8	Bicycles
	4.13	Walking
	7.6	Waste and recycling
	5.1	Parks
	9.10	Moonee Ponds Creek
	3.1	Amenity
	4.9	Public transport
	3.0	Built form
	4.6	Roads
	2.2	Industry
	2.4	Land use transition
	1.0	general comment
	7.7	Water
	6.1	Community facilities
	2.3	Institutional uses
2.5	Residential	
7.1	Infrastructure Services	
2.4	Land use transition	
8.1	Process and implementation	
4.0	Transport	
9.1	Arden Central	
4.4	Melbourne Metro	

<b>Department of Transport</b>		8.1 8.2 2.0 2.4 4.9 4.13 4.8 8.2 9.5 4.11 4.1 4.6 9.10 3.1 4.0 4.10 4.12 4.6	Process and implementation Policy and government Activities and land use Land use transition Public transport Walking Bicycles Policy and government E-Gate Trains Freight – Deliveries & Last km Roads Moonee Ponds Creek Amenity Transport Buses Trams Traffic issues
<b>Deveraux</b>	<b>Paul</b>	6.1 2.3 2.5 3.0	Community facilities Institutional uses Residential Built form
<b>Devlin</b>	<b>Finn</b>	9.10 5.1 5.0	Moonee Ponds Creek Parks Open Space
<b>Duell-Piening</b>	<b>Philippa</b>	4.4 4.9 4.7 4.10 3.4 3.5	Melbourne Metro Public transport Bicycles Trains Heritage Neighbourhood character

<b>Dwerryhouse</b>	<b>Sylvia</b>	5.0 3.4 4.6 9.1 4.4 4.9	Open space Heritage Traffic issues Arden Central Melbourne Metro Public transport
<b>Dwyer</b>	<b>Chris</b>	8.3 3.3 6.1 8.1 2.3 4.8 4.11 3.2 3.5 4.6 8.2	Feedback on the consultation process Density Community facilities Process and implementation Institutional uses Public Transport Trains Building heights Neighbourhood character Cars, Roads and Traffic Policy and government – other



<b>Ettershank</b>	<b>David</b>	3.3 8.2 8.3 8.1 2.3 2.5 3.2 3.5 3.1 3.4 4.6 4.9 4.4 4.5 4.6 4.8 4.11 7.7 9.10 5.1 6.1 6.1	Density Policy and government – other Feedback on the consultation process Process and implementation Institutional uses Residential Building heights Neighbourhood character Amenity Heritage Cars, Roads and Traffic Car Parking Public transport Melbourne Metro Transport – safety Public Transport Stops and stations Trains Water Moonee Ponds Creek Parks Community facilities
<b>Evans</b>	<b>Mark</b>	1.0 4.9 4.6 3.2 3.4 9.9	general comment Public transport Traffic issues Building heights Heritage Macaulay Road

<p><b>Ewing</b></p>	<p><b>Rowan</b></p>	<p>3.3 4.9 5.1 8.1 9.10 4.4 4.6 4.6 1.0</p>	<p>Density Transport Parks Process and implementation Moonee Ponds Creek Melbourne Metro Traffic issues Roads general comment</p>
<p><b>Farinaccio</b></p>	<p><b>Christian</b></p>	<p>3.2 2.1 6.1 2.5 2.6 3.3 9.1 4.9 3.4 8.1 4.8 2.0</p>	<p>Building heights Activity centres Community facilities Residential Retail/commercial Density Arden Central Public transport Heritage Process and implementation Public Transport - Stops and stations Activities and land use</p>

<b>Farrell</b>	<b>Stephen</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.2 4.5 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2 2.5 2.0 3.4 3.5 3.0	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Policy and government Parking Traffic issues Public transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road Residential Activities and land uses Heritage Neighbourhood character Built form
<b>Fennell</b>	<b>Naomi</b>	1.0 3.2 5.0 6.1 3.4 8.1 9.1 4.6 4.4 4.6 4.9	general comment Building heights Open space Community facilities Heritage Process and implementation Arden Central Cars, Roads and Traffic Melbourne Metro Traffic issues Public transport

<b>Firth</b>	<b>Lucy</b>	1.0 6.1 3.2 3.3 7.3 7.7 5.0 8.3 6.1 8.1 4.4 4.8 5.3 2.4 2.6 2.2 3.4 3.1 2.5 4.6	general comment Community facilities Building heights Density Climate change adaptation Water Open Space Feedback on the consultation process Community facilities Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Public transport – stops and stations Streetscape design Land use transition Retail/commercial Industry Heritage Amenity Residential Cars
--------------	-------------	--	--

<b>Fitzgerald</b>	<b>Therese</b>	3.4 4.4 4.9 7.7 4.0 5.1 8.0 4.12 6.1 2.5 7.7 3.0 3.4 3.2 7.3 5.3	Heritage Melbourne Metro Public transport Water Open space Parks Process and implementation Trams Community Facilities Residential Water Built form Heritage Building heights Climate change adaptation Streetscape design
<b>Flemington Association</b>		1.0 3.2 3.3 4.4 9.2 8.1 5.1 9.10 3.4 4.6 9.13 3.1 5.0 4.5 4.6 4.9	general comment Building heights Density Melbourne Metro Boundary Road Process and implementation Parks Moonee Ponds Creek Heritage Cars, Roads and Traffic Racecourse Road Amenity Open space Parking Cars Public transport

<b>Friends of Moonee Ponds Creek Inc.</b>		8.2 5.0 9.10 3.1 3.2 3.5 6.1 5.1 4.7	Policy and government Open space Moonee Ponds creek Amenity Building heights Neighbourhood character Community facilities Parks Bicycles
<b>Fyfe</b>	<b>Carolyn</b>	8.1 8.1 3.2 3.3 6.1 5.1 3.4 4.5 4.4 7.7 2.2 4.6 8.3	Process and implementation Building heights Density Community facilities Parks Heritage Parking Melbourne Metro Water Industry Traffic issues Feedback on the consultation process
<b>Gallivan</b>	<b>Jennifer</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 3.1 6.1 4.9 9.9 9.13 5.0 8.1	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Amenity Community facilities Public transport Macaulay Road Racecourse Road Congestion Open space Process and implantation

<b>Gannon</b>	<b>Melita</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.5 2.6 9.2	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Process and implementation Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Melbourne Metro Water Industry Residential Retail/commercial Boundary Road
---------------	---------------	---	--

<b>Gaskell</b>	<b>Nikki</b>	5.0 8.3 4.6 4.9 1.0 3.1 3.2 3.5 7.7 5.1 9.10 6.1 3.4 8.1 9.1 4.6 4.4 4.6	Open space Feedback on the consultation process Cars Public transport general comment Amenity Building heights Neighbourhood character Water Parks Moonee Ponds Creek Community facilities Heritage Process and implementation Arden Central Cars, Roads and Traffic Melbourne Metro Traffic issues
----------------	--------------	---	--



Gatto	Alba		
		8.3	Feedback on the consultation process
		3.2	Building heights
		3.3	Density
		6.1	Community facilities
		2.3	Institutional uses
		5.1	Parks
		8.2	Policy and government
		3.4	Heritage
		4.5	Parking
		4.6	Traffic issues
		4.9	Public transport
		8.1	Process and implementation
		4.4	Melbourne Metro
		4.9	Public transport
		7.7	Water
		2.2	Industry
		2.6	Retail/commercial
		9.2	Boundary Road

<b>Gerrand</b>	<b>Valerie</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.2 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2 2.4 3.5 1.0	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Policy and government Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road Land use transition Neighbourhood character general comment
<b>Gilfedder</b>	<b>Gerard</b>	2.6 3.2	Retail/commercial Building heights
<b>George Weston Foods Ltd</b>		8.1 9.1 4.4 2.2 2.4 2.1 2.5 3.1 3.4 8.3	Process and implementation Arden Central Melbourne Metro Industry Land use transition Activity centres Residential Amenity Heritage Feedback on the consultation process

<p><b>Gould</b></p>	<p><b>Richard</b></p>	<p>8.3 3.2 3.3 7.1 2.3 5.1 8.2 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2</p>	<p>Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Policy and government Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road</p>
<p><b>Graham</b></p>	<p><b>Janet</b></p>	<p>8.1 3.4 8.2 3.3 3.2 6.1 5.1 4.5 4.6 4.4 7.7 2.2 8.3 5.0 3.0</p>	<p>Process and implementation Heritage Policy and government Density Building heights Community facilities Parks Parking Traffic issues Melbourne Metro Water Industry Feedback on the consultation process Open space Built form</p>

<b>Graves</b>	<b>Kynan</b>	8.3 1.0 5.1 8.1 3.1 5.3 9.9 9.13 4.13 2.5 8.1 4.6 7.3 9.1 4.4 4.6 4.8 3.4 2.0 3.3 3.5 4.9	Feedback on the consultation process general comment Parks Process and implementation Amenity Streetscape design Macaulay Road Racecourse Road Walking Residential Process and implementation Cars Climate change adaptation Arden Central Melbourne Metro Traffic issues Public Transport Heritage Activities and land uses Density Neighbourhood character Public transport
---------------	--------------	--	--

<p><b>Green</b></p>	<p><b>Kate</b></p>	<p>8.1 3.2 3.3 6.1 5.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.4 7.7 2.2 8.3 2.3 5.0</p>	<p>Process and implementation Building heights Density Community facilities Parks Heritage Parking Traffic issues Melbourne Metro Water Industry Feedback on the consultation process Institutional uses Open space</p>
<p><b>Griffiths</b></p>	<p><b>J</b></p>	<p>8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2</p>	<p>Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Process and implementation Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road</p>

<b>Hannan</b>	<b>Mairead</b>	1.0 6.1 5.0 2.3 3.3 3.2 9.1 9.2 4.4 4.9 2.1 9.9 7.1	general comment Community facilities Open space Institutional uses Density Building heights Arden Central Boundary Road Melbourne Metro Public transport Activity centres Macaulay Road Infrastructure services
<b>Hannan</b>	<b>Lorna</b>	6.1 3.1 3.2 1.0 3.3 3.4 3.5 5.1 8.1	Community facilities Amenity Building heights general comment Density Heritage Neighbourhood character Parks Process and implementation
<b>Harlock Jackson (representing Lost Dogs Home)</b>		8.1 9.2 6.1 2.4 2.2 3.3 4.11	Process and implementation Boundary Road Community facilities Land use transition Industry Density Trains
<b>Harper</b>	<b>Heather</b>	6.1	Community facilities

<b>Harrington</b>	<b>Duncan</b>	1.0 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5 8.1	general comment Building heights Density Heritage Neighbourhood character Process and implementation
<b>Harvey</b>	<b>Simon</b>	6.1 3.3 5.0	Community facilities Density Open space
<b>Hassell</b>	<b>Jennifer</b>	5.1 9.1	Parks Arden Central
<b>Hoatson</b>	<b>Lesley</b>	3.3 1.0 4.6 4.9 3.2 3.1 6.1 8.1	Density general comment Cars, Roads and Traffic Public transport Building heights Amenity Community facilities Process and implementation
<b>Holland</b>	<b>David</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 3.4 4.6 4.5 4.9 4.4 7.7 4.6 5.0	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Heritage Cars, Roads and Traffic Parking Public transport Melbourne Metro Water Roads Open space

<b>Hookey</b>	<b>Enid</b>	8.3	Feedback on the consultation process
<b>Hooper</b>	<b>Nick</b>	3.0 2.1 9.1 4.4 4.10 8.1	Built form Activity centres Arden Central Melbourne Metro Trains Process and implementation
<b>Hotham History Project</b>		8.3 6.1 2.3 3.4 3.2	Feedback on the consultation process Community facilities Institutional uses Heritage Building heights
<b>Hunter Block</b>	<b>Matthew and Annie</b>	8.3 3.3 7.3 2.6 9.9 4.6 4.6 4.11 3.1 5.0 9.9 9.10 3.2 7.7 6.1 3.5 4.6	Feedback on the consultation process Density Climate change adaptation Retail/commercial Macaulay Road Traffic issues Cars Trains Amenity Open space Macaulay Road Moonee Ponds Creek Building heights Water Community facilities Neighbourhood character Cars, Roads and Traffic



<b>Jones</b>	<b>Kate</b>	6.1 3.5 5.3 9.9 4.7 4.13 4.8	Community facilities Neighbourhood character Streetscape design Macaulay Road Bicycles Walking Bicycles
<b>Kajkic</b>	<b>Natalia</b>	6.1 4.5	Community facilities Parking
<b>Kane</b>	<b>Graeme</b>	1.0 2.4 3.2 4.0	general comment Land use transition Building heights Transport
<b>Keating</b>	<b>Mary</b>	1.0 3.2 9.9 8.1 4.6 4.9	general comment Building heights Macaulay Road Process and implementation Traffic issues Public transport

<p><b>Kehoe</b></p>	<p><b>Mary</b></p>	<p>8.3 1.0 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.2 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 2.2 2.6 9.2</p>	<p>Feedback on the consultation process general comment Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Policy and government Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public Transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road</p>
<p><b>Keily</b></p>	<p><b>Ruth</b></p>	<p>4.6 4.5 4.6 5.0 3.2 6.1 3.4 4.9 1.0</p>	<p>Cars, roads and traffic Parking Traffic issues Open space Building heights Community facilities Heritage Public transport general comment</p>

<p><b>Kelleher</b></p>	<p><b>Margaret</b></p>	<p>3.2 3.5 8.3 1.0 3.3 6.1 3.4 4.6 4.5 4.6 4.8 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.4 9.2</p>	<p>Building heights Neighbourhood character Feedback on the consultation process general comment Density Community facilities Heritage Cars, Roads and Traffic Parking Traffic issues Public transport – capacity Melbourne Metro Water Industry Land use transition Boundary Road</p>
------------------------	------------------------	--	--

<b>Kensington Association</b>	3.3	Density
	8.4	Structure Plan Process
	8.3	Feedback on the consultation process
	8.1	Process and implementation
	2.3	Institutional uses
	2.5	Residential
	3.2	Building heights
	3.5	Neighbourhood character
	3.1	Amenity
	3.4	Heritage
	4.8	Public Transport
	4.5	Car Parking
	4.9	Public transport
	4.4	Melbourne Metro
	4.5	Parking
	4.8	Public Transport – safety
	4.6	Cars
4.8	Public Transport - Capacity	
4.11	Trains	
7.7	Water	
9.10	Moonee Ponds Creek	
5.1	Parks	
6.1	Community facilities	

<p><b>Kidby</b></p>	<p><b>Meredith</b></p>	<p>8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2</p>	<p>Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Process and implementation Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road</p>
<p><b>Kippin</b></p>	<p><b>Paul</b></p>	<p>3.2 5.0 9.10 6.1 3.4 8.1 4.6 4.6 4.9</p>	<p>Building heights Open space Moonee Ponds Creek Community facilities Heritage Process and implementation Cars, roads and traffic Traffic issues Public transport</p>

<b>Kippin</b>	<b>Justin</b>	3.1 3.2 7.5 5.0 9.10 6.1 3.4 8.1 4.6 4.6 9.1 4.4 4.9 1.0	Amenity Building heights Energy Open space Moonee Ponds Creek Community facilities Heritage Process and implementation Cars, Roads and Traffic Traffic issues Arden Central Melbourne Metro Public transport general comment
<b>Kneebone</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	2.1 2.4 9.1 4.4 2.5 3.0	Activity centres Land use transition Arden Central Melbourne Metro Residential Built form
<b>Koetsier</b>	<b>David</b>	3.2 3.3 9.1 8.1 8.3 3.1 6.1 2.3 5.0 5.1	Building heights Density Arden Central Process and implementation Feedback on the consultation process Amenity Community facilities Institutional uses Open space Parks

<b>Kohne</b>	<b>Mark</b>	3.2 5.0 9.10 6.1 3.4 8.1 4.6 9.1 4.9	Building heights Open space Moonee Ponds Creek Community facilities Heritage Process and implementation Cars, Roads and Traffic Arden Central Public transport
<b>Kong</b>	<b>Teng</b>	2.2 2.5 3.5 5.1 2.4 2.6 4.10 4.11 4.12 4.6 4.6 4.7 4.13	Industry Residential Neighbourhood character Parks Land use transition Retail/commercial Buses Trains Trams Cars, roads and traffic Roads Bicycles Walking
<b>Koo</b>	<b>Airlie</b>	6.1 4.11	Community facilities Congestion Trains

<b>Kraft</b>	<b>Kate</b>	9.1 4.9 1.0 5.1 5.0 8.1 4.8 3.1	Arden Central Public transport general comment Parks Open space Process and implementation Public Transport - Stops and stations Amenity
<b>Lacey</b>	<b>Jan</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 8.2 4.9 2.4 6.1	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Policy and government Public transport Land use transition Community facilities
<b>Lane</b>	<b>Jill</b>	1.0 3.2 7.7 5.1 9.10 6.1 3.3 4.8 4.4 4.6 4.9 3.4 8.1	general comment Building heights Water Parks Moonee Ponds Creek Community facilities Density Public Transport - Congestion Melbourne Metro Traffic issues Public transport Heritage Process and implementation



<b>Liefman</b>	<b>Jane</b>	3.2 3.4 3.1 4.5 3.5 8.1 3.3	Building Heights Heritage Amenity Car Parking Neighbourhood Character Implementation Density
<b>Little</b>	<b>Paul</b>	3.4 3.2	Heritage Building heights
<b>Macfarlane</b>	<b>Deborah</b>	8.3 8.1 3.2 9.9 4.6 4.9	Feedback on the consultation process Process and implementation Building heights Macaulay Road Cars, Roads and Traffic Public transport
<b>Martinuzzo</b>	<b>Steve</b>	3.2 4.6 4.9 5.0 3.4 8.1	Building heights Traffic issues Public transport Open space Heritage Process and implementation
<b>Mason</b>	<b>John</b>	8.1 3.2 3.4 4.6 4.6 9.9 4.9 9.1 4.4 4.8	Process and implementation Building heights Heritage Cars, Roads and Traffic Traffic issues Macaulay Road Public transport Arden Central Melbourne Metro Public Transport

<b>McCarthy</b>	<b>John</b>	2.4 2.5 9.1 4.4 3.1 3.2 4.0 5.0 6.1 7.1	Land use transition Residential Arden Central Melbourne Metro Amenity Building heights Transport Open space Community facilities Infrastructure services
<b>McCarthy</b>	<b>Brenda</b>	3.3 4.6 6.1 5.1 3.4 3.5 3.1 3.2 8.3	Density Cars, Roads and Traffic Community facilities Parks Heritage Neighbourhood character Amenity Building heights Feedback on the consultation process
<b>Melbourne Bike Polo</b>		5.0 6.1	Open space Community facilities
<b>Melbourne Water</b>			
<b>Mercuri</b>		9.10 7.7 5.1 5.0 9.5	Moonee Ponds Creek Water Parks Open space E-Gate

<b>Moonee Valley City Council</b>	<b>Santino</b>	4.8 4.9 4.13 3.0 2.1 2.4 2.5 2.6 2.2 7.1 4.10 4.11 4.13 8.3 8.1 2.1 9.1 4.4 3.2 3.3 5.0 9.10 9.9 4.6 4.5 3.1	Bicycles Public transport Walking Built form Activity centres Land use transition Residential Retail/commercial Industry Infrastructure Services Trains Trains Walking Feedback on the consultation process Process and implementation Activity Centres Arden Central Melbourne Metro Building heights Density Open space Moonee Ponds Creek Macaulay Road Roads Parking Amenity
-----------------------------------	----------------	---	---

<b>Muir</b>		1.0 3.2 2.6 5.0 6.1 3.4 8.1 5.1 9.10 4.8 4.13 4.0 4.11 4.12	general comment Retail/commercial use Flemington Road Racecourse Road Community facilities Density Process and implementation Parks Moonee Ponds Creek Bicycles Walking Access Trains Trams
<b>Murphy</b>	<b>David &amp; Rilke</b>	7.7 6.1 3.5 5.1 3.1 3.2	Water Community facilities Neighbourhood character Parks Amenity Building heights
<b>Murray</b>	<b>Karen</b>	6.1 3.2 3.4 3.0 7.3 4.5 5.3	Community facilities Building heights Heritage Built form Climate change adaptation Energy Streetscape design

<b>Nairn</b>	<b>Stevie</b>	8.1 3.2 3.5 5.0 3.1 3.4 2.4 3.3 1.0 4.6 4.9	Process and implementation Building heights Neighbourhood character Open space Amenity Heritage Land use transition Density general comment Traffic issues Public transport
<b>Nairn</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.2 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 2.2 2.6 9.2	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Policy and government Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road
<b>Nicholson</b>	<b>Rogie</b>	5.1 9.10	Parks Moonee Ponds Creek

<p><b>Niggl</b></p>	<p><b>Mary</b></p>	<p>8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2</p>	<p>Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Process and implementation Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road</p>
<p><b>North and West Melbourne Association</b></p>	<p><b>Jennifer</b></p>	<p>3.4 3.0</p>	<p>Heritage Built form</p>

<b>O'Brien</b>		8.2 8.3 3.2 3.3 8.1 6.1 2.3 5.0 3.4 4.6 4.6 4.9 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.4 4.6	Policy and government Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Process and implementation Community facilities Institutional uses Open space Heritage Cars, roads and traffic Traffic issues Public transport Melbourne Metro Water Industry Land use transition Roads
<b>Oke</b>	<b>Darragh</b>	3.2 6.1 3.3	Building heights Community facilities Density
<b>O'Keeffe</b>	<b>Rob</b>	7.1 2.3 2.5	Community facilities Institutional uses Residential
<b>Parkville Association Inc</b>	<b>Carmel</b>	3.2 3.4 3.5 3.3 5.0 4.5 4.6 4.9	Building heights Heritage Neighbourhood character Density Open space Parking Traffic issues Public transport

<b>Paszylka</b>		2.3 4.5 4.6 2.1 2.5 2.6 3.4 3.5 4.9 5.1	Institutional uses Parking Traffic issues Activity centres Residential Retail/commercial Heritage Neighbourhood character Public transport Parks
<b>Paszylka</b>	<b>Michael</b>	3.0 3.2 3.5 4.8 4.6 4.9 6.1 2.3 8.1	Built form Building heights Neighbourhood character Public Transport Cars Public transport Community facilities Institutional uses Process and implementation
<b>Pauwels</b>	<b>Jane</b>	1.0 2.4 4.6 4.11 3.2 3.5 6.1 2.3	general comment Land use transition Roads Trains Building heights Neighbourhood character Community facilities Institutional uses



<b>Phefley</b>	<b>Brooke</b>	8.3 4.6 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5 6.1 4.11 4.5 2.4 3.1	Feedback on the consultation process Cars, Roads and Traffic Building heights Density Heritage Neighbourhood character Community facilities Trains Parks Land use transition Amenity
<b>Prentice</b>	<b>Anne</b>	5.0 9.10	Open space Moonee Ponds Creek
<b>Pretto</b>	<b>Mark</b>	2.5 3.2 3.3 3.5 4.5 4.6 4.8	Residential Building heights Density Neighbourhood character Parks Cars, Roads and Traffic Public transport - capacity
<b>Prue</b>	<b>Gab</b>	5.0 9.10 3.2 4.5 3.1 4.9	Open space Moonee Ponds Creek Building heights Parking Amenity Public transport

<p><b>Ralph</b></p>	<p><b>Kelly</b></p>	<p>8.3 1.0 8.1 3.2 3.5 9.9 4.6 4.6 4.8 9.1 4.4 4.8</p>	<p>Feedback on the consultation process general comment Process and implementation Building heights Neighbourhood character Macaulay Road Cars, Roads and Traffic Traffic issues Public Transport - Stops and stations Arden Central Melbourne Metro Public transport – capacity</p>
<p><b>Rao</b></p>	<p><b>Anthula</b></p>	<p>8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.2 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2 2.5 2.0 3.5 3.0</p>	<p>Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Policy and government Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road Residential Activities and land use Neighbourhood character Built form</p>

<p><b>Raverty</b></p>	<p><b>Asha</b></p>	<p>8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.5 2.6 9.2</p>	<p>Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Process and implementation Heritage Parking Traffic issues Melbourne Metro Water Industry Residential Retail/commercial Boundary Road</p>
<p><b>Read</b></p>	<p><b>Kymaree</b></p>	<p>8.1 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.5</p>	<p>Process and implementation Amenity Building heights Density Neighbourhood character</p>

<p><b>Reeve</b></p>	<p><b>Fiona</b></p>	<p>8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 5.1 3.4 4.6 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 7.7 2.4 9.2 2.3 5.0</p>	<p>Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Parks Heritage Cars, Roads and Traffic Traffic issues Public transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Water Land use transition Boundary Road Institutional uses Open space</p>
<p><b>Rhodes</b></p>	<p><b>Joel</b></p>	<p>3.2 3.3 4.8 4.11 5.0 5.0 8.3</p>	<p>Building heights Density Public Transport - Congestion Trains Community facilities Open space Feedback on the consultation process</p>

<b>Riley</b>	<b>Lachlan</b>	8.3 1.0 5.1 8.1 3.1 5.3 9.9 9.13 4.13 2.5 8.1 4.6	Feedback on the consultation process general comment Parks Process and implementation Amenity Streetscape design Macaulay Road Racecourse Road Walking Residential Process and implementation Cars
<b>Roberts</b>	<b>Deborah</b>	9.10 7.7 5.1 5.0 9.5	Moonee Ponds Creek Water Parks Open Space E-Gate
<b>Robinson</b>	<b>Ann</b>	6.1 2.3 5.0 2.5 3.2 3.4 1.0 3.1	Community facilities Institutional uses Open space Residential Building heights Heritage general comment Amenity
<b>Rodan</b>	<b>Olivia</b>	2.6 9.9	Retail/commercial Macaulay Road

<b>Roy</b>	<b>Beverley-Anne</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 3.4 4.8 4.4 7.7 2.2 4.6	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Heritage Public Transport - Capacity Melbourne Metro Water Industry Traffic issues
<b>Sage</b>	<b>Sukanya</b>	4.6 4.6 4.9 5.0 5.1 6.1 3.0	Cars, roads and traffic Traffic issues Public transport Open space Parks Community facilities Built form
<b>Salem</b>	<b>Cathy</b>	3.1 3.3 9.1 4.6 4.5 4.9 6.1 7.7 5.1 8.1	Amenity Density Arden Central Cars, roads and traffic Parking Public transport Community facilities Water Parks Process and implementation
<b>Sciarretta</b>	<b>Sarah</b>	5.0 3.2	Open space Building heights

<p><b>Scully</b></p>	<p><b>Fran</b></p>	<p>3.2 5.0 6.1 3.4 8.1 4.6 9.1 4.4 2.5</p>	<p>Building heights Open space Community facilities Heritage Process and implementation Cars, Roads and Traffic Arden Central Melbourne Metro Residential</p>
<p><b>Scully</b></p>	<p><b>Colm</b></p>	<p>8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.2 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2</p>	<p>Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Policy and government Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road</p>

<p><b>Sheko</b></p>	<p><b>Bobby</b></p>	<p>8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.2 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 7.7 2.2 4.6 9.2</p>	<p>Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Policy and government Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road</p>
<p><b>Simondson</b></p>	<p><b>Alexander</b></p>	<p>1.0 2.0 8.2 4.4 4.9</p>	<p>general comment Activities and land use Policy and government Melbourne Metro Public transport</p>
<p><b>Siska</b></p>	<p><b>Helen</b></p>	<p>3.2 5.1 6.1 3.4 8.1 4.6 4.4 4.9</p>	<p>Building heights Parks Community facilities Heritage Process and implementation Cars, Roads and Traffic Melbourne Metro Public transport</p>



<b>Smith</b>	<b>Lorraine</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.2 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Policy and government Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial
<b>Stuart</b>	<b>Jillian</b>	8.1 2.2	Process and implementation Industry
<b>Stubbs</b>	<b>Kerry</b>	1.0 3.2 4.8 4.6 4.9 6.1 7.1 2.3 5.0 9.10 3.4 8.1	general comment Building heights Public Transport Traffic issues Public transport Community facilities Infrastructure Services Institutional uses Open space Moonee Ponds Creek Heritage Process and implementation

<b>Sullivan</b>	<b>Traci</b>	2.1 4.9 1.0	Activity centres Public transport general comment
<b>Suter</b>	<b>A</b>	2.2 2.5 3.5 6.1 3.1 3.3 1.0	Industry Residential Neighbourhood character Community facilities Amenity Density general comment
<b>Tait</b>	<b>David &amp; Geraldine</b>	8.1 3.2 3.3 6.1 3.4 4.5 4.9 4.8 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2 4.6 8.3	Process and implementation Building heights Density Community facilities Heritage Parking Public transport Public Transport - Capacity Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road Traffic issues Feedback on the consultation process
<b>Tan</b>	<b>Stuart</b>	3.2 3.4 3.1 4.5 3.5 8.1 3.3	Building Heights Heritage Amenity Car Parking Neighbourhood Character Implementation Density

<b>Turner</b>	<b>Frances</b>	2.5 2.6 4.10 6.1	Residential Retail/commercial Buses Community facilities
<b>Twinning</b>	<b>Annie</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 2.3 5.1 8.2 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Policy and government Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road
<b>Twyford</b>	<b>J</b>	3.1 3.2	Amenity Building heights
<b>VicRoads</b>	<b>Michelle</b>	3.2 6.1 3.3 4.6 4.9 5.0	Building heights Community facilities Density Traffic issues Public transport Open space
<b>Webb</b>		4.6 8.1 4.6	Roads Process and implementation Cars, roads and traffic

<p><b>Williams</b></p>	<p><b>David</b></p>	<p>3.3 3.5 3.2 3.4 7.7 5.0 6.1 4.6 8.1</p>	<p>Density Neighbourhood character Building heights Heritage Water Open space Community facilities Congestion Traffic issues Stops and stations Process and implementation</p>
<p><b>Wilson</b></p>	<p><b>Angela</b></p>	<p>8.3 8.1 3.3 4.4 7.7 9.13 3.1 3.2 3.5 2.5 6.1 5.0 7.3 2.4 3.4 5.1 9.10 4.6 4.8 4.5</p>	<p>Feedback on the consultation process Process and implementation Density Melbourne Metro Water Racecourse Road Amenity Building heights Neighbourhood character Residential Community facilities Open space Climate change adaptation Land use transition Heritage Parks Moonee Ponds Creek Roads Public Transport - Congestion Parking</p>

<p><b>Wooley</b></p>	<p><b>Roger</b></p>	<p>8.3 3.2 3.3 7.1 2.3 5.1 8.2 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.9 8.1 4.4 7.7 2.2 2.6 9.2 5.1</p>	<p>Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Institutional uses Parks Policy and government Heritage Parking Traffic issues Public transport Process and implementation Melbourne Metro Water Industry Retail/commercial Boundary Road Parks</p>
<p><b>Woolworths</b></p>	<p><b>Mark</b></p>	<p>2.2 8.1 2.4 2.5 3.1 1.0</p>	<p>Industry Process and implementation Land use transition Residential Amenity general comment</p>

<b>Yffer</b>		2.0 2.4 8.2 1.0 2.1 2.6 9.1 7.1 2.5 3.2	Activities and land uses Land use transition Policy and government general comments Activity centres Retail/commercial Arden Central Infrastructure services Residential Building heights
<b>Young</b>	<b>Moira</b>	3.2 8.1 9.9 4.6 9.1 4.4 4.9 5.0 6.1	Building heights Process and implementation Macaulay Road Traffic issues Arden Central Melbourne Metro Public transport Open space Community facilities
<b>Young</b>	<b>Ian</b>	8.1 3.1 3.2 3.4 3.5 4.8 4.5	Process and implementation Amenity Building heights Heritage Neighbourhood character Public Transport - Congestion Car Parking

	<b>Denise</b>	1.0 3.3 3.2 5.0 4.9 9.10 3.1 7.2 3.4 8.1 4.6 4.4 4.6 9.1 4.6 2.5 7.3 6.1 2.2 2.3 2.6 4.8	general comment Building heights Open space Public transport Moonee Ponds Creek Amenity Air quality Heritage Process and implementation Cars, Roads and Traffic Melbourne Metro Traffic issues Arden Central Cars Residential Climate change adaptation Community facilities Industry Institutional uses Retail/commercial Bicycles
	<b>George</b>	1	general comment





**ARDEN MACAULAY NORTH STRUCTURE PLAN - RESPONSE TO ISSUES****1.0 General comments about the Structure Plan**

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	City of Melbourne response
Low	1.1 - Positive Feedback	<p>All sounds good. I am pleased to read the AMSP which I feel is a great example of forward thinking and integrated planning.</p> <p>I commend the City of Melbourne for taking a long-term view of changes in the area in question.</p> <p>It is likely that the areas identified will eventually become residential, due to their proximity to the City.</p> <p>By enforcing controls on development and planning open space pro-actively the City of Melbourne has a chance to create a positive outcome, a liveable precinct in one of the world's most liveable cities.</p> <p>I feel positive about the future of the area and welcome many of the exciting changes outlined.</p> <p>I say bring on the changes as soon a possible! After all, change is part of life and any residents that think its not going to happen are deluded!</p> <p>I think it is a wise decision to have a Plan: The City of Melbourne is to be commended on taking this long-term view. It is seizing the initiative in guiding developments which are almost certain to occur in any case, that is, increased density on industrial land in the inner suburbs, with the intention of producing the very best outcomes</p> <p>I welcome the considered thought that has obviously been put to developing the plan and the desire to appropriately develop Melbourne for its future needs.</p> <p>I would like to commend the City of Melbourne on the vision and initiative that is evident in this plan.</p> <p>I support the development of post-industrial land and recognise the need to plan for high-density living in the</p> <p>I am excited by the novel proposals for sustainability which have been included throughout the plan.</p> <p>I also appreciate the council officers' efforts in communicating the plan to concerned residents, particularly making arrangements for a second consultation in Kensington and an extended submissions deadline.</p> <p>As a long term resident, I have long supported the development of this part of Melbourne. Now that we are ready for it, let us put the land and its people above all else and have a city that people will be proud of in the</p> <p>As a Kensington resident I am supportive of this plan in concept as the area is currently underdeveloped considering its proximity to the city.</p> <p>I welcome the economic and social benefits outlined in this plan.</p> <p>I am pleased that the Council has seen fit to develop a long term plan rather than taking an ad hoc approach to issues that will inevitably need to be dealt with.</p>	Noted

1.0 General comments about the Structure Plan			
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	City of Melbourne response
		<p>Generally we are supportive of the vision set out in the draft Structure Plan, and agree with Council that there is significant potential for urban renewal in the area. The area has experienced a decline in its historical industrial land use. The close proximity of the area to the CBD, and existing and proposed public transport offers excellent opportunities for urban renewal, and to bring new vibrancy to employment functions, as well as deliver mixed use communities that include new accommodation for a growing city. I am very happy that much of the industrially zoned land in North Melbourne is likely to undergo changes. A few years ago I tried to apply for re-zoning of the property from Industrial to Mixed Use, and this change was denied by Melbourne City Council.</p> <p>I congratulate the council on making a draft plan and seeking consultation, it is very difficult to review a blank page so having something to start with is important.</p> <p>The priority placed on liveability, desire for public transport and other non car options and increasing open space is welcomed. We generally like and support the plan; it could be a great thing for the suburb if executed</p> <p>As a long term resident, I have long supported the development of this part of Melbourne. Now that we are ready for it, let us put the land and it's people above all else and have a city that people will be proud of in the</p> <p>We moved to the neighbourhood and sold our car to live inner city and live more sustainably.</p> <p>The environmental consideration is especially positive. This is a fantastic opportunity to create a model, green precinct for CoM. Balances the needs of development while retaining and respecting current environments.</p> <p>So we would appreciate less cars/busy streets - it is quiet in our neighbourhood, which is part of the reason we chose to live here. We think the future plan should cater to this.</p> <p>The built form proposal is very exciting.</p> <p>Overall, I believe this plan is a good move for us, and would like these changes implemented as soon as</p> <p>I would like Laurens Street and most importantly the land on my property, to be re-zoned as mixed use. I would have liked this to have been done yesterday, so for me, the sooner the better!</p>	
Low	1.2 - Negative Feedback	<p>Maintain and encourage the unique inner city country town feel of North Melbourne and the community feel.</p> <p>I am very disappointed in the Arden Macaulay Structure Plan as it stands.</p> <p>I believe the Arden Macaulay Structure Plan presents us with a great opportunity to renew a largely neglected environment which provides for quality living and community interaction. This is a Golden Opportunity to enrich our lives. Please do not trash our City for now and the Future. Again, please, no to the present truly awful and dull scheme.</p> <p>We must be able to do better than this in Victoria. Think again. From a very concerned resident.</p> <p>Overall, a very disappointing plan indeed. We wish to emphasise that we consider the outcome of these proposals will be to destroy Melbourne's reputation as a most liveable city and certainly North Melbourne's vision of being an urban village.</p>	Noted

1.0 General comments about the Structure Plan			
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	City of Melbourne response
		<p>All in all, the plan lacks a human scale &amp; a vision of how one can use the built environment to nurture &amp; develop a new community with links to the existing neighbourhoods in North Melbourne &amp; Kensington.</p>	
		<p>Kensington it is an existing community and a successful and highly valued community to those of us who are part of it. It is not a blank sheet to be redeveloped according to the pressures of developers or the ideals of planners.</p>	
		<p>We residents are currently rate-payers to the City of Melbourne: our needs should be respected above those of "potential" residents, developers, or considerations of greater revenues from increased population.</p>	
		<p>The Arden Macaulay Structure Plan proposes changes that will impact on the area in a long-lasting and significant way. Changes to the area such as the demolition of the gasometer and the construction of the high rise flats which once seem significant, did not impact on the area as much as the proposed development envisaged for the industrial areas near the creek.</p>	
		<p>What a great opportunity we have to do something future generations will be proud of. What exactly are we trying to create here? There seems to be no clear direction as to what the vision for the sites are other than getting the maximum number of people housed, but people do want something to be proud of and that they <u>can envisage themselves living happily in.</u></p>	
		<p>We are mix of long term older North Melbourne residents and new young families and a blend of cultures, and despite our differences in age or religion we all care for each other - we get the mail when one is on holidays, we spend Friday night's playing in Gardiner Reserve, we share meals together, we celebrate our successes and losses (particularly when it is the death of a neighbour or one of their family members) and in general just look out for each other. It is really rare to have this sort of connection with your neighbours in this day and age, which is why we urge you to carefully consider this development and its impacts on the existing community.</p>	
		<p>As you are probably aware, the residents in North Melbourne are very proud of their homes, their streetscape and their neighbours. We already have the relationships with our neighbours that you are striving to achieve in <u>your redevelopment.</u></p>	
		<p>Flemington is the immediate neighbour to North Melbourne and Kensington. Parts of Flemington, including those in the City of Moonee Valley, are likely to be affected by the proposals as much as parts of those two suburbs.</p>	

1.0 General comments about the Structure Plan			
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	City of Melbourne response
Low	1.3 General Comment	<p>MCC and the State Government have a chance to create an area which is appropriate to the existing community and is creative and forward thinking for the future. It could be something of which the MCC, the state and the people are proud. Redevelopment is not just zones and population projections. It is people, impacts on people: environmental and social impacts that will stretch far into the future. The new community could be just that - a community. It could fit in easily with the existing community as well as provide new avenues for expanding population, green and recreational spaces, creative hubs and a strong environmental character. <u>But decisions need to be made on grounds that are not driven by profit</u></p> <p>I am happy the the areas in the proposed plan are to be redeveloped. However, there are already problems in the area that may be exacerbated, if planning is not thorough and well planned. Kensington has a thriving community and is a great place to live...and care needs to be taken that it remains so. Overall I believe the proposal has a very strong direction which is required for the area. But it does need to take into account the people that live in the area, the amenity they currently have, and to set a goal to enhance that while accommodating a larger population. We must not lose the qualities that make Kensington a wonderful place</p> <p>Overall, the plan should create a vision for the area where community and business can flourish and interact.</p> <p>The Arden- Macaulay Structure Plan must be reworked in order to ensure that the distribution of these good and bad outcomes that may be expected from the raised population of this neighbourhood is equitable and balanced. ...[If] the size of a city doubles, then, on average, wages, wealth, the number of patents, and the number of educational and research institutions all increase by approximately the same degree, about 15 percent...The bigger the city, the more the average citizen owns, produces, and consumes, whether it's goods, resources, or ideas. "However, the dark side of urban life manifests an analogous "superlinear" behavior. Doubling the size of a city increases wealth and innovation by about 15 percent, but it also increases the amount of crime, pollution, and disease by roughly the same amount." Geoffrey West, Santa Fe Institute.</p> <p>How the development of the precinct is managed will have a huge impact on our neighbourhood close by. Whilst it is commendable that Council is taking the initiative in guiding development rather than a reactive response - we have had a couple of precedents in Kensington which in themselves cause concern for this development.</p> <p>I am a committed and positive long-term resident of North Melbourne with a family history of residency in the family property covering four generations. I have lived through the acquisition of sub-standard accommodation in the 1960s resulting in the tower block in Canning Street, NM.</p> <p>As history has shown us not only was there a marginal gain in accommodation from what was replaced a range of social issues - already recognised in other countries prior to the completion of these towers - owning / renting a patch of land was lost. Do not let another mistake be made of such magnitude. There are other options that can thoughtfully and successfully address the growth projections - and satisfy developers - that must be considered.</p>	Noted

<b>2.0 Activities and Land Use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Low	<b>2.4 Land Use Transition</b>	Avoid the loss of commercial, industrial and employment areas that are linked to the central business area of Melbourne and surrounding areas.	Short trips to work, environmental and social benefits. Meet the needs of the new population.	Change made to the structure plan.	<p>The Melbourne Planning Scheme protects existing use rights of land uses that have been in operation within the last 2 years prior to a rezoning of land.</p> <p>As such, these provisions will enable existing industrial land uses to remain within the Mixed Use Zone though not further expand and thus not directing a loss of the industrial land uses or jobs. Key industrial sites in the southern section of Arden Macaulay are to remain. The staged implementation of recommendations in the final Structure Plan provide for no change to the land south of Macaulay Road.</p> <p>The Mixed Use and Business Zones will encourage new employment opportunities that are more in keeping with current job trends than the previous industrial uses.</p>

2.0 Activities and Land Use					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Low	2.4 Land Use Transition	Support the development of future communities, integrating residential accommodation and commercial offices together with educational facilities, retail and entertainment outlets. Support the zoning changes.	<p>The area is underutilised and the industrial use is not the highest and best use of the land. Mixed Use will allow employment uses to continue in the area.</p> <p>It's a shame that there are so many under utilised sites so close to the city and existing, vibrant neighbourhoods.</p> <p>The role of targeted urban renewal is clearly important. There is an opportunity of AM to utilise urban renewal to contribute to the supply of inner city land for new economic activity and housing supply, thus creating a stronger land use connection between the growing west, the central city and the future urban renewal of the Dynon precinct.</p> <p>Rebalancing social equity towards Melbourne's west, providing jobs to boost Melbourne's competitive economic advantage, and optimising public investment in significant scale infrastructure could be listed as objectives.</p>	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Noted.

2.0 Activities and Land Use					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
			<p>There is significant potential for urban renewal in the area. The area has experienced a decline in its historical industrial land use. The close proximity of the area to the CBD and existing and proposed public transport offers excellent opportunities for urban renewal and to bring new vibrancy to employment functions as well as to deliver mixed use communities that include new accommodation for a growing city.</p>		

2.0 Activities and Land Use					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Low	2.4 Land Use Transition	Reserve zoning decisions on this area until a decision is made on the Melbourne Metro rail project.	<p>The plan hinges on the mooted improvements to transport infrastructure. Not a sod should be turned until building of the infrastructure has actually commenced otherwise London to a brick you will end up with a miserable area without railways, schools, childcare, health, education and other facilities.</p> <p>A new railway station is only one dependency for the Arden Central Area to function as a CBD type area.</p> <p>The viability of Arden Central is dependant upon the commercial property market perceptions that high density office is viable in the area. Building a high quality rail service is significant in creating accessibility but will not on its own create the exposure necessary to fulfil the stated outcome.</p> <p>The rezoning boundary for AC would appear appropriate as it covers the Government and Council owned land as well as the two key entry points from Victoria St and Boundary Rd. However it does not reach as far as North Melbourne Station and the proposed EGate and as this area provides some potential development opportunities the AC boundary might logically be extended further south.</p>	Change the Structure Plan.	<p>The structure plan proposes a 2 staged rezoning of the land with Stage 1 being the northern section and Stage 2 the southern section. Stage 2 will occur once a position on the Metro has been determined. The Metro station will be a significant trigger for change. The Structure Plan will provide a framework to manage growth and change. As such, it is vital that the City of Melbourne advocate to the State Government for investment in the Metro, in addition to other public transport proposals.</p> <p>Arden Macaulay provides an appropriate context for renewal as it can potentially accomodate a large number of jobs in the area and is located in proximity to city enabling opportunities for walking and cycling. The Structure Plan also makes recommendations for alternative transport options (which will complement the Melbourne Metro). The land south of Macaulay Road will not be rezoned in Stage 1 implementation of the Structure Plan.</p> <p>Council will advocate to State Government for upgrades within the study area including the Macaulay and Flemington Bridge stations and increased service frequency; Integration of Melbourne Transport Strategy 2011 which will be used as an advocacy tool; other capital works (ie cycling / walking paths), etc.</p>



2.0 Activities and Land Use					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
			The use of the MUZ will result in a loss of residential and heritage character.		Council will work with the State Government to ensure strong links are provided from Arden Central to E-Gate and North Melbourne Station and to the south with cycle path upgrades to other areas.
Low	<b>2.2 Industry</b>	Retain the industrial land	<p>The SP will essentially result in a decline of the industrial area by earmarking the area for future rezoning that would see the introduction of incompatible and sensitive land uses in proximity to well established industrial land uses.</p> <p>The assumption that industrial uses in the area are in decline or not viable is dismissive of the value and extensive capital investment in industrial uses throughout the municipality.</p> <p>Recognise the value of the industrial area and protecting it was a goal of the recent MSS. The industrial area provides for important roles and purposes such as Lost Dogs Home, Vision Australia, working mills, etc. Instead AM seeks to eliminate industrial uses as being incompatible with mixed use zones.</p> <p>To protect the existing industrial land uses and ensure their continued viability and operating capacity.</p>	Change the Structure Plan.	<p>The revised plan retains key industrial sites south of Macaulay Road.</p> <p>The Business 3 Zone has been introduced in the south eastern quadrant to allow for uses such as manufacturing to be retained. A Mixed Use Zone enables new uses compatible with dwellings to also accommodate a range of commercial, industrial and other uses including offices which complement the mixed-use function of the locality.</p> <p>The existing use rights provisions of the Melbourne Planning Scheme will enable the existing industrial land uses to remain within the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) but not further expand.</p> <p>The land south of Macaulay Road will remain industrial and is therefore not affected; this allows the precinct's primary industrial land uses to maintain their operation. Furthermore the inclusion of activity/business areas along Racecourse Road and Macaulay Road provide new opportunities for business/convenience services which will provide job opportunities.</p>

<b>2.0 Activities and Land Use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Low	<b>2.4 Industry</b>	Consider buffer zones to established industrial land uses. Require ameliorative measures upon the agent of change such as Section 173 agreements.	Requirements to protect ongoing industrial uses and to enable the area to transition without causing problems to the ongoing operation of industry. In particular the traffic issues and ability of vehicles to access the site and noise from plant and equipment need to be factored into land use planning. A DDO26 (noise attenuation) requirement on new sensitive developments may be appropriate.	Change the Structure Plan.	<p>The Business 3 Zone in the south eastern quadrant will act as a buffer zone between the Mixed Use Land and the key industrial sites. The Business 1, Parks and Roads Zones do the same in the south western quadrant.</p> <p>Design outcomes and Melbourne Planning Scheme controls are required to support the ongoing operation of viable industrial uses.</p> <p>The existing and additional Planning Scheme controls should be considered in the Planning Scheme Amendment accompanying the Structure Plan. Consideration of the C177 Planning Scheme Amendment (former Young Husband wool stores site amendment) will inform this work.</p>
			They provide important employment and economic opportunities. Sustainable populations require economic activity nearby.		
Low	<b>2.6 Retail/ Commercial</b>	Provide more retail/commercial uses including small local businesses	The area would benefit from a butcher, deli, market, fruit and veg, second hardware, antique shop, health food store, art galleries, book stores, cafes, bars, restaurants, entrepreneurial businesses, etc.	Change the Structure Plan.	<p>The inclusion of activity / business areas along Racecourse Road and Macaulay Road provide new opportunities for business and convenience services which will also provide job opportunities.</p> <p>A Mixed Use Zone and will enable new uses compatible with dwellings to establish in the area and the Business 3 Zone will also cater for a mix of offices, manufacturing and associated commercial and industrial uses thus offering additional employment opportunities.</p>
			The addition of office and commercial development will support and strengthen the retail role of the Racecourse Road Activity Centre.		

<b>2.0 Activities and Land Use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
			Land should be set aside for commercial or small workshop development, shopping precincts, medical precincts or entertainment precincts.		

<b>2.0 Activities and Land Use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Low	<b>2.5 Residential</b>	Clarify why the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) is appropriate for Kensington.	Capitalise upon the the important cultural attributes of the area, in particular the artists hubs at the wool stores.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	<p>Existing residential uses in residential zones and neighbourhood amenity will be protected. The Mixed Use Zone enables some compatible industrial uses to remain as well as providing for residential and a variety of other land uses which complement residences such as shops, cafes, offices etc.</p> <p>The Planning Scheme protects existing use rights for industrial sites that exist and wish to continue operation within the study area.</p> <p>Rezoning south of Macaulay Road will not occur at this stage, protecting major key industrial operations (in terms of site size and number of employees, and key industrial uses).</p> <p>The inclusion of activity/business areas along Racecourse Road and Macaulay Road will provide opportunities for business/convenience services to service the residential and visitor population and provide job opportunities; etc.</p>

<b>2.0 Activities and Land Use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Low	<b>2.0 Activities and Land Use</b>	Provide for a mixed demographic and carry out further demographic analysis	To limit urban sprawl and to encourage a mixed demographic including families into the area.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	<p>The Structure Plan endeavours to support increased density in appropriate locations, including areas in proximity to existing and proposed public transport infrastructure and activity areas, to ensure convenient access to facilities and services.</p> <p>The Structure Plan establishes a transition of building heights to existing development, enabling potential for a diversity of new development. Through the identification and provision of community infrastructure and open space to address the needs of the existing and future community, it is anticipated that a variety of people will be attracted to the area and this is likely to affect what the development sector provides in the area.</p> <p>The City of Melbourne will endeavour to work with individual developers to provide a diversity of dwellings in each new development, however, has limited control over who ultimately inhabits such spaces. In addition, the City of Melbourne (through the Inner Melbourne Action Plan) will continue to explore opportunities to enhance affordable housing in the area, and work with the Office of Housing on any</p> <p>The student housing policy in the Melbourne</p>

<b>2.0 Activities and Land Use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Low	<b>2.5 Residential</b>	Provide for a range of dwelling sizes/bedroom numbers per dwelling including 3-4 bedrooms	Support small diverse businesses in the neighbourhood. Avoid large chains, fast food, large grocery stores, petrol stations, etc.	Change made to the structure plan.	<p>The Structure Plan recommends the preparation of a Housing Policy which will address dwelling diversity. In the interim the market provides the most suitable housing options for the precinct.</p> <p>Developers tend to use non load bearing walls etc in parts of building layouts to allow for 1 or 2 bedroom apartments to be modified to 3-4+ bedroom dwellings should the market require it.</p>
Low	<b>2.6 Retail/ Commercial</b>	Recognise the significance of local centres such as Lygon, Errol and Melrose Village.		No Change to the Structure Plan.	Noted
Low	<b>2.5 Residential</b>	Do not support affordable housing	<p>Better architectural outcomes.</p> <p>There is an adequate supply of affordable housing in the study area.</p> <p>This can be adequately determined by the market without Council's intervention.</p> <p>Is the 20% net or gross, there is significant affordable housing existing in the study area.</p>	No Change to the Structure Plan.	20% affordable housing is proposed this figure is relative to the extent of population increase proposed.
Low	<b>2.5 Residential</b>	Support high quality affordable housing.	<p>What measures will be put in place to ensure delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>Developers argue that affordable housing can have limited amenity through borrowed light and inadequate ventilation.</p>	Change made to the structure plan.	20% affordable housing is proposed. Further more the Structure Plan recommends that a Housing Policy be prepared which will ensure quality housing.
Low	<b>2.2 Industry</b>	Support existing use rights for the current industrial areas of Kensington	Ensures no businesses will be forced out if they wish to remain	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Noted

<b>2.0 Activities and Land Use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Low	<b>2.2 Industry</b>	Whilst recognising that the figure 215 jobs per ha is accurate for the SP area, we would question whether this could be misleading in relation to the job densities predicted for Arden Central sub precinct.	Job density here will be significantly higher.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	To be re- addressed in stage 2.
Low	<b>2.2 Industry</b>	Consider the recommendations of the CoM Industrial Land Use Study.	The study was undertaken to review and make recommendations regarding the future use and development of industrial land. The study identifies that Allied Mills requires specific protection from sensitive land uses and retain the zoning.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Noted - Key industrial land uses are to remain.
Low	<b>2.6 Retail/ Commercial</b>	Woolworths will negatively impact upon the amenity of Shiel Street dwellings.	Light, noise traffic, deliveries, cooling systems, etc.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The Woolworths proposal (Canning Street) is subject to a separate planning process where the Minister for Planning is the Responsible Authority.
Single Comment	<b>2.4 Land Use Transition</b>	Remove the land north of Arden Street from the white dashed line and make it MUZ.	It is separate from the proposed Metro station being the north side of Arden St, when the proposed station will be on the south approx in line with Queensberry St. This land is sufficiently removed from the station that it neither has a positive or negative impact on the ability to develop and therefore should be seen as no different to other parcels that are proposed to be rezoned in the near future as part of the SP process.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The revised plan retains key industrial sites south of Macaulay Road.  The Business 3 Zone has been introduced in the south eastern quadrant to allow for uses such as manufacturing to be retained. A Mixed Use Zone enables new uses compatible with dwellings.
Single Comment	<b>2.1 Activity Centres</b>	Ensure flexibility in the planning controls for Arden Central .		No Change to the Structure Plan.	Arden Central will be completed in stage 2.

<b>2.0 Activities and Land Use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single Comment	<b>2.4 Land Use Transition</b>	The area would offer more potential for redevelopment if it were located within an area for urban renewal rather than ongoing change.	MSS review	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Council awaits the recommendation of Planning Panels Victoria regarding the MSS.
Single Comment	<b>2.2 Industry</b>	Amend the Structure Plan to further expand upon the implementation and rezoning to include a requirement for design and development overlays to protect ongoing industrial land uses and to enable the area to transition without causing problems to the ongoing operation of industry.		No Change to the Structure Plan.	The zones have been amended from the draft version to ensure the retention of key industrial land uses.
Single Comment	<b>2.4 Land Use Transition</b>	Construct a purpose built Arden Mac institution	To reflect the cultural past and achievements of the precinct taking advantage of institutions such as the Public Records Office. The thought bubble.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	This proposal falls outside of the realms of the structure planning.
Single Comment	<b>2.2 Industry</b>	Do not support rezoning parts of the area to IN3Z.		No Change to the Structure Plan.	No additional industrial zoning is proposed, some key sites are retained.
Single Comment	<b>2.2 Industry</b>	The land near Shiel St should not be referred to in the plan as industrial.	Fails to acknowledge its residential character.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Noted.
Single Comment	<b>2.5 Residential</b>	Resite the public housing in Buncle St.		No Change to the Structure Plan.	This proposal falls outside of the realms of the structure planning.
Single Comment	<b>2.6 Retail/ Commercial</b>	Less retail/commercial uses	The plan will raise property values and attract more lucrative business that will inevitably lead to the displacement of local service providers forced by market forces to more distant locations.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The extent of retail proposed together with the existing is adequate to service the significant increase in population



<b>2.0 Activities and Land Use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single Comment	<b>2.1 Residential</b>	Reconsider the Mixed Use Zone	Whilst the flexibility is noted it can lead to a loss of character and heritage values.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The zone relates to the proposed land uses. Character and heritage controls will remain unchanged.
<b>Organisations</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Single Comment	<b>2.4 Land Use Transition</b>	The Activity Centre Zone is the preferred tool to implement an activity centre structure plan which integrates the use and development provisions.		No Change to the Structure Plan.	This may be considered for stage 2.

3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
High	<b>3.2 Building Heights</b>	Lower building heights.	The City of Melbourne should be promoting growth in the urban renewal areas but at the same time should be implementing strategies to protect and maintain the existing stable areas.	Change made to the structure plan.	<p>In response to this feedback, the structure plan has developed clear performance based criteria for design and built form outcomes to complement existing neighbourhood character. Building heights have been lowered in areas where there is an interface with existing lower residential development and heritage buildings. Building heights have not been lowered in areas in proximity to the potential Metro station, existing high frequency public transport corridors, and clusters of higher buildings/research institutions, as the height limits proposed are considered appropriate to achieve increased density.</p> <p>In addition, Clause 22.17 - Urban Design Outside the Capital City Zone provides direction regarding built form in order to protect neighbourhood character. Overshadowing upon existing residents will be protected under the existing planning scheme provisions which allow for 5 hours of sunlight. Clause 22.02 (Sunlight to Public Places) will prevent overshadowing public open space between 11am and 2pm. The Mixed Use Zone will ensure that the standard amenity tests (Reseode) apply for</p>

3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
			<p>To protect the existing character with a sympathetic integration with the existing built form (gradual, rather than rapidly change in form).</p> <p>Protect character and amenity (in particular access to sunlight). Protect the existing village feel.</p> <p>Protect character and amenity (in particular access to sunlight).</p> <p>Will provide for an appropriate transition to existing residential precincts (transitioning from 9m to 20m).</p> <p>Impacts upon visual amenity. Impacts of views from Skinny Park, Dryburgh St, Munster Tce, Laurens St, Racecourse Rd (as per the Racecourse Rd Structure Plan 2-3s) Stubbs St (4-6s), Lambeth &amp; Robertson (2.3s)</p> <p>To make walking paths more attractive.</p> <p>Could be a repeat of the social, architectural and planning problems associated with the 1960's and 70's commission housing estates.</p> <p>To protect street trees</p> <p>Medium rise (4-10storey) achieves high density in a more compatible way with the existing built form and is more in accordance with community views.</p>		<p>Planning applications for tall buildings which may cause wind effects will require expert wind tunnel testing at a planning permit stage. The recommendations of the testing may include alterations to the podium, canopy or height. In the Planning Scheme, a right to a view from a property is not protected, and therefore this cannot be addressed in the structure plan.</p>

3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
			<p>Too much reliance has been placed upon the Metro project to justify the heights.</p> <p>Woolworths will impact the amenity of the precinct due to its height and intensity.</p> <p>Keep the local neighbourhood character and village feel of the area.</p> <p>Protection from loss of light, noise, shadows, loss of parking, ambience, views privacy.</p> <p>Wind tunnelling affect from tall buildings.</p> <p>Impacts upon sea breezes.</p> <p>Protect amenity not just in heritage areas.</p> <p>Construction disturbance.</p> <p>Consider the needs of all residents of different ages and backgrounds.</p>		

3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Medium	<b>3.0 Built form</b> <b>3.2 Building heights</b> <b>3.4 Heritage</b>	Have more regard for the built form and heritage of inner Melbourne with respect to the proposed building heights.	<p>Protect heritage buildings - any upgrades should not impact heritage fabric.</p> <p>Buildings adjacent to heritage buildings should not be taller or provide an appropriate transition.</p>	Change made to the structure plan.	In response to this feedback, the Structure Plan has developed clear performance based criteria for design and built form outcomes to complement existing heritage buildings. In addition, the City of Melbourne has conducted a review of the Heritage Overlay in Arden-Macaulay to identify additional sites which should be protected. Clause 22.05 Heritage Outside the Capital City Zone provides direction regarding the treatment of heritage places. Amongst other design requirements Council's heritage policy requires that the height of a new building not dominate an outstanding heritage building.
Medium	<b>3.3 Density</b>	Density doesn't mean high rise - Provide for a diverse housing stock in terms of scale, size, style and number of bedrooms.	<p>The focus on units in a high rise context is too lop sided.</p> <p>Using density as a primary goal will create an unbalanced population and risk urban problems and slum development.</p> <p>Such a population of units will change the mix of the population from the current family/older residents' profile.</p> <p>This need not happen if less dense redevelopment took place.</p> <p>The focus on high rise unit development needs to be replaced by a proper balance of mixed style of residences.</p> <p>Flats are without charm.</p>	No Change to the Structure Plan.	<p>Density does not mean high rise. The plan endeavours to balance development requirements and respond appropriately to development pressures and existing communities - ie a proactive approach to managing growth and change. Note concerns about density.</p> <p>The plan focuses on siting increased density in appropriate, well serviced locations such as near public transport infrastructure and activity areas to ensure access to existing or proposed new facilities and services. The plan takes a holistic approach to urban renewal by aiming to provide for a well serviced</p>

3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
			<p>To achieve a more balanced population plans need to be a mixed housing area that incorporates some units, some free standing residents and some public housing.</p> <p>Flats around the station may be appropriate with lower built form elsewhere.</p> <p>Areas such as Kensington Banks and Port Melbourne provide a variety of housing styles.</p> <p>3-4 bedroom dwellings will provide for families.</p> <p>Poor impacts upon public health - can create social problems when too little consideration is made of community, open space, social interaction, isolation from excessive noise, etc.</p> <p>The assumption is wrong that the only way ahead for the study areas to achieve increased population is by high rise development, that is completely out of scale with the existing built form of these communities.</p> <p>Higher density is not only achieved by high rise.</p> <p>We need nature and green nearby for our psychological and our physical health, high rise leaves us remote from our natural environment.</p> <p>High density transforms the ambience of an area from a tolerable and quite pleasant urban industrious to a feeling of being cramped, constricted, oppressed and overcrowded.</p>		<p>community with adequate community infrastructure, open space, etc.</p> <p>The Structure Plan recommends a provision of 20% affordable housing and provides for varying built form and heights throughout the Arden Macaulay area. It recommends the preparation of a housing policy or further investigation into mechanisms that will ensure housing quality and diversity of bedroom numbers, accessibility, etc.</p>

3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
			Existing services such as trains can't cope with the existing population.		
Low	<b>3.2 Building Heights</b>	Introduce mandatory height controls	<p>Provides certainty.</p> <p>Less matters going to VCAT.</p> <p>Avoid overdevelopment.</p> <p>Protect amenity.</p> <p>The building heights proposed are excessive and not mandatory.</p> <p>This is particularly dangerous given that the proposed discretionary height limits will result in significantly higher buildings.</p>	Change made to the structure plan.	<p>Mandatory height controls are recommended in the Structure Plan in response to this feedback. Heights have also been reviewed in some areas and reduced at residential interfaces.</p> <p>In addition to the mandatory height controls, the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan has developed clear performance based criteria for design and built form outcomes. All development proposals should be sympathetic, site specific, contextually appropriate and quality designs that are compatible with neighbouring heritage sites and precincts regardless of the height control. The structure plan does not propose to alter the existing provisions of the planning scheme that require high quality buildings.</p>
Low	<b>3.2 Building Heights</b>	Lower the 20m height control in Kensington (at the corner of Rankins and Macaulay Rds, Bruce St, Barnett St, Eastwood St).	<p>Provide a better transition from 9m to 20m, protect residential amenity and character.</p> <p>The height and density of the proposed development zone will impact adversely on our household due to (1) overshadowing of our home from tall buildings blocking the easterly sun. (2) encroachment on privacy with dwellings overseeing our backyard (3) increased noise (4) increased demand on limited street parking (5) impact on street amenities and ambience.</p>	Change made to the structure plan.	<p>Building heights have been lowered in areas where there is an interface with existing lower residential development and heritage buildings. Clear performance based criteria for design and built form outcomes which retain and complement the contributory elements of the neighbourhood character has been included in the structure plan.</p> <p>The combination of the zoning, the overlays (including the heritage overlay), local planning policies (including Heritage Places</p>

3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
			<p>The Bolte Bridge City Link fly over should not be used as the precedent.</p> <p>It is unclear if the site at the corner of Rankins and Mac Rd needs to be clarified (20m to 60m).</p> <p>The heights are inconsistent with the current planning scheme objectives.</p>		<p>Outside the Capital City Zone and Urban Design Outside the Capital City Zone) and particular provisions (such as ResCode) provides built form direction to protect neighbourhood character.</p>
Low	<b>3.3 Density</b>	Lower the density, proposed density is too high.	<p>To avoid further traffic problems.</p> <p>This is an enormous amount of new residents, compacting way too many people into small spaces and forcing buildings to reach higher upwards than an acceptable two or three stories.</p>	No Change to the Structure Plan.	<p>Concerns regarding density are noted, however, due to various factors, densification of Arden Macaulay is already occurring. AM can be expected to continue to change - and as such is suitable for urban renewal. The City of Melbourne has decided to take a proactive approach to managing this growth and change over a long term 30 year period. The Structure Plan provides a mechanism for the City of Melbourne to appropriately balance future development pressures and address the needs and protect the values of the existing communities in a wholistic manner.</p> <p>The City of Melbourne supports the State Government's investigation of the potential Metro Station as this would have a dramatic impact on the dense cluster of land uses proposed. If the Metro Station proceeds, it will be a catalyst for enhanced density.</p>



3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
			<p>This is overpopulation we should encourage a more diverse expansion of our city into the outer suburbs that are accessible by improved public transport.</p>		<p>As such, the plan focuses on getting density in appropriate locations. Locations which are most appropriate to accommodate increased density include areas with existing high frequency public transport infrastructure, such as the areas around the stations and main roads (Racecourse and Macaulay Roads).</p> <p>In order to respond to increased density and support the transition of this area, the Structure Plan identifies opportunities to enhance community infrastructure, open space, transport and sustainable infrastructure over a 30 year period.</p>
			<p>Keep Kensington and North Melbourne safe and amenable.</p>		
			<p>The population increase is vastly out of sync with the current population especially considering current infrastructure.</p>		
			<p>There is no justification for the increase in population.</p>		
			<p>High density will place a great deal of pressure upon an already overburdened community.</p>		
			<p>The increase in population will impact upon the community through traffic, congestion, amenity impacts. Council should revise the plan and introduce density targets that are reasonable and cater appropriately for transition zones between the existing residents and new developments that improve street amenity and the well being of the community.</p>		

3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
			<p>Docklands projection is 15790 by 2031 for 146ha compared to 13500 proposed in Arden Mac without the water front, city and public transport advantage.</p> <p>Carry out studies to compare the yield of housing density in high rise towers. Inadquate social facilities to accomodate the popoulation proposed.</p>		
Low		Ensure the medium and high density is of a reasonable standard. These areas are overdeveloped and of low amenity.	Avoid a repeat of Southbank or the Docklands.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	<p>The Structure Plan has developed clear performance design based criteria to achieve the best possible built form outcome. Docklands, Southbank and the Arden-Macaulay area have all undergone separate planning and design procedures with completely different intentions. Whilst the structure plan will allow for additional height, land use, population, housing diversity, community facilities, etc Arden-Macaulay will not ultimately exhibit the same character as the Docklands.</p> <p>It is proposed however that the Arden Central precinct will comprise a CBD type activity centre when fully developed. It should be noted Docklands was a large brown field redevelopment site with very few buildings and no existing community whereas the study area has an existing character, heritage buildings, population, etc all of which will be considered when deciding upon the appropriateness of new built form.</p>

<b>3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Low	<b>3.4 Heritage</b>	Undertake further heritage investigations of properties within the study area. Consider the heritage significance of industrial buildings and non heritage dwellings in Kensington and North Melbourne prior to the redevelopment of the precinct.	<p>Retain heritage features and significant heritage fabric.</p> <p>Heritage should be at the forefront of this plan to try to capture and build upon the heritage features of the area and preserve the inner north west identity.</p> <p>The plan does not recognise and celebrate the role this area has played in Melbourne's history.</p> <p>Doing so allows more organic growth, less likely to alienate existing residents.</p>	Change made to the structure plan.	A heritage study is currently being undertaken. The study will identify sites for heritage protection and appropriate measures to ensure retention of contributory and significant building fabric. Study recommendations where appropriate will be incorporated in the proposed Arden-Macaulay planning scheme amendment.

3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Low	<b>3.2 Building Heights</b>	Lower the building heights proposed around the Moonee Ponds Creek and public open space areas, providing a height buffer between the open space and the surrounding buildings.	<p>Amenity of the Creek, enhance visual amenity by lowering heights around the area and stepping down to the Creek.</p> <p>Maintain the amenity of the cycle paths including access to light.</p> <p>Allow for vegetation growth.</p> <p>Limit any increases in noise &amp; vibration from additional built form.</p> <p>Maintain views from Skinny Park.</p> <p>City Link will impact upon the amenity of the area.</p> <p>Vic Track land is not suitable.</p>	Change made to the structure plan.	Building setbacks for the taller heights have been introduced at the southern end of Arden-Macaulay. The height of the buildings either side of the Creek have been determined allowing for adequate sun and daylight to public open space taking into account the width of paths and roads between buildings and the Creek open space area.
Low	<b>3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form</b>	Encourage Environmentally Sustainable Design including green walls.	<p>Environmental benefits</p> <p>The lack of vision and detail in the architect's impressions of the Structure Plan sites suggests that development will proceed in the usual cost cutting way - that is, ignoring the exciting possibility of creating something of true architectural excellence with innovative, world leading sustainable design.</p>	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The SP encourages ESD and green walls, they are further mandated through the Building Control Act.
Low	<b>3.3 Density</b>	Support increased density around transport and services. I applaud the strategic planning approach to urban renewal and development over the destruction of remnant grasslands and high value agricultural areas of the peri urban fringe.	Tokyo has a density of 131 persons per ha, New York 112 per ha and London 72 per ha, Barcelona has 200 per ha & MalmoBoo 120 per ha. This is about 8 times the aust standard and accomodates highly sustainable buildings of two to five stories. Low rise high density disples the myth that high density requires high rise.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Noted.

3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
			<p>High density can provide a sustainable solution to population growth enabling people to live close to their workplace and educational institutions while being supported by various infrastructure and public transport, open space, community centres, health services and educational facilities.</p> <p>The response is reasonable and appropriate given the significant population growth predictions for Melbourne in the next few decades and the sustainable objective to place work and living environments close to each other and existing infrastructure and services.</p> <p>The general underutilization of some of the land nominated.</p> <p>Increases in height are necessary as some properties will not be developed and others will be developed to lower densities due to market conditions, developer preferences, viable businesses and the like.</p>		
Low	<b>3.1 Amenity</b>	Council should retain a site by site control over exactly what can and can't be built.	<p>I have no confidence in Council managing the planning process of developers.</p> <p>Future developers will exploit proposed planning regulations and develop taller buildings that will increase the density of the area, disregard privacy concerns of the existing residences and impact on the street amenities.</p> <p>Developers will push the boundaries to get more out of sites.</p>	Change made to the structure plan.	Mandatory height controls are recommended in the Structure Plan in response to this feedback. In addition to the mandatory height controls, the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan has developed clear performance based criteria for design and built form outcomes. Mandatory height controls can not be varied by the Responsible Authority (Council or VCAT).

<b>3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Low	<b>3.1 Amenity</b>	Noise, blocking of footpaths, construction vehicles during construction will be disturbing		No Change to the Structure Plan.	Construction Management Plans are required through the building permit process where there will be an off site amenity impact. The building regulations contain controls which limit hours of construction and other potential disturbances.

3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Low	<b>3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form</b>	Place high expectation upon design quality and offer incentives to developers to come up with original concepts for new or existing building stock.	<p>Property values.</p> <p>There is existing stock which could be upgraded rather than providing more.</p> <p>Enhance neighbourhood character and complement heritage buildings.</p> <p>We don't want to see all the building stock looking the same, retain the older interesting buildings.</p> <p>Apartment blocks can be boring.</p> <p>Diversity of housing stock is important.</p>	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The structure plan sets out the broad vision, a set of clear built form outcomes should be developed that encourages good design and provides certainty. This will be further developed as the project progresses to the planning scheme amendment stage. The plan will encourage a range of heights and a diversity in built form outcomes. Conversion of existing stock will be encouraged where appropriate.
Low	<b>3.4 Heritage</b>	No respect for heritage buildings and sites. Melbourne has a lot of wonderful heritage but we don't have so much that we can afford to just lose it through neglect.		Change made to the structure plan.	A heritage study is currently being undertaken. The study will identify sites for heritage protection and appropriate measures to ensure retention of contributory and significant building fabric.
Low	<b>3.1 Amenity</b>	Noise and pollution from City Link, the railway line and developer perception should be considered as issues.	There is potential for aesthetic upgrade to the concrete external walls of the roadway i.e. art architecture visual articulation, etc.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Further investigation and modelling is required to demonstrate how the areas of open space will be designed and used and existing infrastructure enhanced.
Low	<b>3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form</b>	Introduce guidance for high quality housing with high quality amenity following European models.	<p>Do not allow for borrowed light, poor ventilation and more than just minimum BCA requirements.</p> <p>Need good quality, sound proof, good sized, safe apartments for empty nesters, not shoe boxes aimed only at renters or students.</p>	Change made to the structure plan.	The Plan includes clear performance based criteria for design and built form outcomes. The structure plan does not propose to alter the existing provisions of the planning scheme that require high quality buildings. Council will work with the State Government in the development of the Metropolitan Strategy and investigate the development of improved mechanisms to deliver high quality diverse housing stock.

3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Low	<b>3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form</b>	Introduce guidance for high quality housing with high quality amenity following European models.	Need good quality, sound proof, good sized, safe apartments for empty nesters, not shoe boxes aimed only at renters or students. Do not allow for borrowed light, poor ventilation and more than just minimum BCA requirements.	Change made to the structure plan.	The Plan includes clear performance based criteria for design and built form outcomes. The structure plan does not propose to alter the existing provisions of the planning scheme that require high quality buildings. Council will work with the State Government in the development of the Metropolitan Strategy and investigate the development of improved mechanisms to deliver high quality diverse housing stock.
Low	<b>3.5 Neighbourhood Character</b>	Ensure adequate protection of the amenity of existing residents and preferred neighbourhood character.	Who will take responsibility to ensure the delivery of the mix of demographics, etc.	Change made to the structure plan.	Clear performance based criteria for design and built form outcomes which retain and complement the contributory elements of the neighbourhood character has been included in the structure plan. The 3D model and street scapes of building heights has been included in the structure plan and incorporates development potential and the existing preferred character traits. The combination of the zoning, the overlays (including the heritage overlay), local planning policies (including Heritage Places Outside the Capital City Zone and Urban Design Outside the Capital City Zone) and particular provisions (such as rescode) provides built form direction to protect neighbourhood character. Therefore, a mandatory height control would not affect the quality of the built form outcome.
Low	<b>3.2 Building Heights</b>	Introduce less restrictive height controls.	60m/15 storeys is too restrictive. Nearby buildings of a significant scale already exist in the form of public housing towers and the Weston Milling site. Built Form	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The built form controls in the Plan have been developed based on a number of characteristics including neighbourhood character, topography, impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties, impacts



3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
			<p>Sites within existing residential areas only to the north should be considered for higher limits as there will be no overshadowing and with appropriate articulation and upper storey setbacks whether the building is 6 or 8 or 10 storeys would not be discernable from across the street.</p> <p>Allow for creative solutions to ensure high quality private and public open spaces.</p> <p>Some areas may remain low rise to the north of such open spaces and allow for greater height elsewhere.</p> <p>To achieve the density proposed some increases to the proposed heights are required as some properties will not be developed and others will be developed to lower densities due to market conditions, developer preferences, viable businesses, etc.</p> <p>Boundary Road should have higher built form. Increase the height at Scarborough Lane and Stubbs St to 11.5m as the existing building already exceeds 9m, this will allow for greater flexibility for future use and provide for commercial uses at ground level and residential above.</p>		<p>upon heritage buildings, proximity to public transport and other land uses, etc. These factors have informed the proposed built form across the area.</p>

<b>3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Low	<b>3.2 Building Heights</b>	Support the heights proposed.	<p>Will provide greater opportunity for future flexibility, ensuring that Arden Central can provide the necessary residential developments, commercial offices, retail spaces, entertainment and community services and public spaces to cater and provide high levels of public and private amenity for workers and residents well into the future.</p> <p>The density is appropriate for the fringe regeneration area.</p> <p>Height in Arden Central is supported.</p>	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Noted.
Low	<b>3.3 Density</b>	Consider proposals for increased densities in the broader context of the whole of Melbourne, rather than adhoc Council by Council.	<p>If the vision is to create opportunities for the western suburbs of Melbourne, some other suburbs such as Footscray could consider further development instead of a steep increase of 300% at Arden Macaulay.</p> <p>The area already suffers from transport problems from increased development in the outer western suburbs.</p>	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Several strategic growth sites have been identified for urban renewal across the City of Melbourne. These sites were identified within the context of Melbourne at 5 Million and Melbourne 2030 (the State Government's strategic growth plans).
Low	<b>3.0 Built form</b>	Provide a rationale for built form recommendations in the structure plan.	The rationale for the height can only be justified once Arden Central is complete	Change made to the structure plan.	The proposal will be staged. If the Metro doesn't proceed the heights at Arden Central can be reconsidered.
Low	<b>3.1 Amenity</b>	Consider the built form implications upon existing	<p>Inability to expand.</p> <p>Limitations upon operations.</p>	Change made to the structure	Varying zones have been applied around key industrial sites to ensure an appropriate

<b>3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
		industry - maintain required buffer distances to the established industrial land uses. The agent of change should ameliorate measures associated with noise, odour, etc - this should be required by a Section 173 agreement. Maintain and expand upon the DDO26 (Noise Attenuation Control).	Ensure the long term protection of industry in the region.	plan.	transition to the Mixed Use Zone. Additional MPS local policies and controls will also be applied to manage potential interface issues.
Low	<b>3.2 Building Heights</b>	Visual modelling should accurately represent the Moonee Ponds Creek and tall buildings	Clarity for the community to aid the understanding and visualisation of the physical environment.	Change made to the structure plan.	3D modelling has been completed as part of the planning process.
Low	<b>3.1 Amenity</b>	Multi unit development in existing areas should no longer be supported.	Given the concentration of high and medium density and scale development that will occur in the study area,	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The Structure Plan addresses the areas within the plan boundaries and does not recommend changes in existing areas.
Low	<b>3.1 Amenity</b>	Support the redevelopment of Arden Central including 25000 residents and 30000 workers.	Provide quality of life for existing and future residents, workers, students and visitors. Opportunity to provide state of the art housing and commercial development in a seamless and efficient transport network.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Noted.
Single Comment	<b>3.0 Built Form</b>	Include a Quality Matrix for assessment to justify height.	Provide a measure for the relationship between height and quality. ie taller buildings would be permitted for developments that provide open space, visual amenity, contribute to the amenity of the area. Lower heights would be imposed upon poor quality buildings.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Quality buildings should be delivered regardless of their height. Height should not be bargained for quality.

<b>3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Single Comment	<b>3.2 Building Heights</b>	Locate high rise towers outside of flood prone areas such as Stubbs St.	The plan under estimates the impact of flooding on these developments given climate change and the impact on the frequency and intensity of floods.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The Land Subject to Inundation Overlay (LSIO) will be applied to sites within flood prone land. The LSIO triggers a requirement for Melbourne Water to consent to development applications for new buildings constructed in these areas. At this stage Melbourne Water ensure the proposal is constructed with consideration to flood mitigation.
Single Comment	<b>3.3 Density</b>	High density should commence from the football ground down to Kensington	This area doesn't have any residential housing	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The Structure Plan will provide a framework for the delivery of additional residential development in this precinct.
Single Comment	<b>3.5 Character</b>	Demonstrate a relationship between built form and commercial development exposure, specifically with regards to landmark buildings		No Change to the Structure Plan.	Active street frontages are proposed on primary streets to encourage the success of commercial land uses and provide an active pedestrian environment.
Single Comment	<b>3.2 Building Heights</b>	Provide setbacks at street level	Enhance pedestrian amenity.	Change made to the structure plan.	Additional building setbacks are required to achieve a high level of pedestrian amenity.
Single Comment	<b>3.1 Amenity</b>	Provide for disabled access	Improve accessibility for visitors to and from the site particularly to the Vision Australia sites.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The plan proposes enhancements to the street environs which will improve accessibility for persons with limited mobility. The Building Control Act ensures appropriate levels of accessibility are achieved for new developments.
Single Comment	<b>3.5 Neighbourhood Character</b>	We support active street frontages to enliven streets and provide passive surveillance.		No Change to the Structure Plan.	Noted.
Single Comment	<b>3.4 Heritage</b>	Don't place heritage controls on Weston Milling	Will limit redevelopment and operational works on the site.	No Change to the Structure	Heritage controls are not proposed on Weston Milling.
<b>Organisations</b>					

<b>3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Single Comment	<b>3.2 Building Heights</b>	Lying within a Mixed Use Zone (MUZ), properties where there is currently limited guidance on height, setbacks and built form controls that are not subject to heritage controls or further investigations, provide a good opportunity for development to high design standards. This will cater for the commercial and residential uses in the area.		No Change to the Structure Plan.	Noted.
Single Comment	<b>3.2 Building Heights</b>	Larger land holdings should be allowed to have more intense development	Some properties are only 300m2 to 500m2 and under fragmented ownership so their redevelopment to 20-30m is unlikely. This may challenge the viability of transport and cycling infrastructure, business, power water and other service infrastructure.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Quality design and development will be sought on a precinct and site specific basis. The Structure plan will provide a framework to achieve a high quality urban environment as development rolls out.

4.0 Transport					
Frequency of issue in received	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
High	<b>4.6 Cars, Roads and Traffic</b> <b>4.7 Car parking</b>	Provide more information about car parking and traffic management.	Allow the traffic to choke itself.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The Structure Plan recommends the development of traffic and parking management plans for the area, noting particular destinations. The City of Melbourne will continue to advocate for sustainable transportation through the Melbourne Transport Strategy and Arden Macaulay Structure Plan. The Transport Strategy advocates for enhanced frequency of services, including longer operating hours. The Structure Plan provides recommendations for enhancements to streetscapes to enhance pedestrian and cycling pathways. Prior to any capital works enhancements to streetscapes or road reconfiguration detailed design will consider the impact of any proposal on traffic and parking and any potential conflict between users. This will include consultation with stakeholders to ensure appropriate outcomes (ie/ with emergency vehicles) The City of Melbourne position focuses on enhancing sustainable modes rather than providing more road space and parking facilities for cars as this is land intensive.
			Reduce rat runs.		
			Macaulay Rd is at gridlock near the boomgates this will worsen.		
			Appose at grade seperations.		
			Roads are overburdened.		
			Any attempt to facilitate through traffic will simply result in increased traffic as drivers try to avoid City Link tolls. I consider grade		
			What changes will be made to the city loop to accommodate the capacity.		
			Additional traffic caused by the population would have disasterous implications.		
			A reduced rate is not appropriate, most people own two cars, reduce depend upon street parking. Public transport is		
Car share has never succeeded. People in Aust expect instant personal transport.					

4.0 Transport					
Frequency of issue in received	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
High	4.9 Public Transport	Provide more/improve PT & Encourage alternative modes of transport.	Existing PT is at capacity. Residents are unable to get on the train at Kensington during peak hours.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The City of Melbourne will continue to advocate for sustainable transportation through the Melbourne Transport Strategy and Arden Macaulay Structure Plan. The Transport Strategy advocates for enhanced frequency of services, including longer operating hours.
			Upgrades are needed to the Craigburn and Upfield line trains and Flemington Bridge and Macaulay Station.		
			Extend the bus route along Buncle St.		
			Advocate for improved frequency of the 57 tram route.		
			Support new bus along Boundary Road.		
			Light rail could be considered.		
			Melbourne City Council can place significant pressure on the state government in a manner that indicates		
			South Kensington Station is underutilised and needs upgrading.		
			The Structure Plan needs to acknowledge the need to protect land for the possible future upgrade of the Upfield rail line to including flexicar and car sharing.		

4.0 Transport					
Frequency of issue in received	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Medium	<b>4.4 Melbourne Metro</b>	Reduce reliance on the proposed Metro line to justify high rise development.	Its yet to be formally approved by the state.	Change made to the structure plan.	Development will be staged, Arden Central will not commence until the Metro project has been confirmed. The Metro station is not the only trigger for change in Arden Macaulay as this is already underway. the Structure Plan will assist to manage this growth and change. the City of Melbourne will use the Structure Plan to advocate to the State Government for investment in the Metro to serve the growing residential and worker community. In addition, the Structure Plan will be used to advocate to the State Government for other public transport proposals and improvements to complement the Metro or provide an alternative option for State Government investment. Arden Macaulay is an appropriate area to direct growth to as it accomodates a large number of jobs and is located in proximity to the City, enabling opportunities for walking and cycling.
			Plans for the metro may only be just that and we end up with an increased population and no increase in PT.		
			Ensure works on the Metro don't disturb residents.		
			The Plan depends on improvements in public transport for which the Council can advocate, but cannot control. We have been told that Arden Central cannot proceed unless there is a metro line with a station at Arden. The future of the metro line is unresolved. In the Plan, the viability of developments in Kensington depends on upgrades to the Craigieburn and Upfield lines. Currently, trains arriving at Kensington are so congested in the morning peak that passengers are frequently unable to board trains. The argument that people will not need cars because of the availability of public transport is conditional, and out of the control of the Council. It is essential that specific promises regarding upgrades in public transport be obtained before rezoning is commenced.		
			Council should advocate for upgraded PT including the Metro.		
Low	<b>4.8 Bicycles</b>	Improved pedestrian and cycle routes are supported.	Health benefits, accessibility, etc.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Noted



4.0 Transport					
Frequency of issue in received	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Low	<b>4.6 Cars, Roads and Traffic</b>	Encourage minimal car usage and Incorporate controls to support reduced/minimal car usage.	<p>Encourage behaviour change.</p> <p>The focus on cycling and walking will reduce car ownership.</p> <p>Existing congestion and grid lock will be worsened particularly on Macaulay Road.</p> <p>To improve pedestrian &amp; cycle safety.</p>	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The Structure Plan seeks to reduce car usage in the are by advocating for a range of alternative transport options and enhancing cycling and pedestrian amenity. Furthermore new residential developments will not be able to have more than 1 car parking space per new dwelling (rather than 2-3 spaces). This will reduce the number of cars within the precinct.
Low	<b>4.6 Cars Roads and Traffic</b>	Improve connectivity.	<p>Maximise the broader network operations of the road and rail and meet the finer grain needs of local connectivity, accessibility and liveable design</p> <p>The regional focus could look at connectivity of all modes (cycle links, pedestrian and local movements from E-W across the MPC.</p> <p>Provide pedestrian links to the Docklands.</p> <p>Provide links from the Capital City trail to the north.</p> <p>Consider connections to paths and roads within other municipalities.</p> <p>Improve cycle &amp; pedestrian connections to stations. Particularly to and from Macaulay and Arden to allow for easy interchange of passangers.</p> <p>The 401 is a valuable service to the uni with poor connectivity to other services and visibility of service to wider travel populations.</p>	Change made to the structure plan.	The plan seeks to provide upgrades to rail connectivity by advocating for the Metro. The Melbourne Metro will provide connections through to Parkville, the CBD and Caulfield. It seeks to enhance the road network, pedestrian and cycle connections.

4.0 Transport					
Frequency of issue in received	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Low	4.5 Parking	Provide more car parking	People will not use cars is a poor assumption.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The City of Melbourne position focuses on enhancing sustainable modes rather than providing more road space and parking facilities for cars as this is land intensive.
			Increased amenity through public transport.		
			Upgrades to cycling and pedestrian routes will support this.		
Low	4.6 Cars, Roads and Traffic	Make all of Kensington a 40km/hour zone.	There is a major high speed cycling route between Footscray Rd, Arden St and Macaulay Rd which is uncomfortable for pedestrians.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	This proposal falls outside the relams of the Structure Plan Process.
Low	4.13 Walking	Place equal emphasis upon walking as cycling. Provide dedicated paths.	Health benefits, accessibility, etc.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The plan advocates for shared zones for pedestrians and bikes and seeks to enhance the existing conditions.
Low	4.6 Cars, Roads and Traffic	Provide more journey to work data.	The journey to work section on page 34 should include more explanation/numbers.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Noted - Additional information is provided within the Transport Strategy.
			It is difficult to get to places of employment at night time.		
			Explain the broader relationship to the north and west include origin, destination data of where people will be travelling to and from the centres.		
Low	4.5 Parking	Encourage basement car parking	Minimise on street parking	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Minimal car parking is proposed by the Structure Plan. Public transport, cycling and walking trips will be encouraged and will increase as services and facilities are upgraded.
Low	4.9 Public Transport	Encourage travel behaviour change.	Sustainably manage the intended land use changes.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The plan provides for minimal car parking and aims to enhance the provisions of public transport and well as improving walking and cycling conditions.

<b>4.0 Transport</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Single Comment	<b>4.1 Freight</b>	All relevant figures in this structure plan should show the Dynon to Southern Cross Station rail precinct as this contains major interstate, regional and local passenger and freight services to the municipality.	The area also has many associated railway businesses which account for considerable employment. There are jobs in administration of stations, freight terminals, train cleaning, train repairs, train refuelling/services, signalling/right of way maintenance and refurbishment, new rail projects such as the Regional Rail Link. This special zone should be identified to show its economic significance and help prevent it being regarded as obsolete land-use and crowded out. The E-Gate site should be confined to its actual limits and shaded with the rail precinct where it may be developed above the rail infrastructure.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Noted.
Single Comment	<b>4.6 Cars, Roads and Traffic</b>	Introduce measures and route management options for vehicles recognising access for vehicles and freight.		No Change to the Structure Plan.	Noted.
<b>Organisations</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Single Comment	<b>4.0 Transport</b>	Make reference to the links with the Transport Strategy.	Integration of land use and transport.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The plan is consistent with the outcomes and objectives of the Transport Strategy.

5.0 Open Space					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Medium	<b>5.0 Open Space and public realm</b>	Provide more high quality open space	Consider a botanical garden for the west or a community garden. There are few opportunities for residents to do any gardening which has health benefits.	Change made to the Structure Plan.	Additional open space opportunities identified in the Melbourne Open Space Strategy have been integrated into the Structure Plan. Securing these spaces will be supported through the City of Melbourne requiring additional development contributions for open space through the Melbourne Planning Scheme. Council's Open Space Strategy includes requirements to ensure a variety of high quality spaces are provided.
			Provide active and passive outdoor areas that cater for a variety of age groups including families.		
			Redefining median strips as parks is not an adequate substitute for real parkland. Pretending that these will be provided by private development and that this is the equivalent is unacceptable.		
			To have a feeling of community dwellings should be low rise with plenty of open space.		
			Australians are increasingly suffering from lifestyle diseases such as diabetes and cardiovascular disease. To remain healthy people must have access to high quality open space.		
			Surrounding parks are at capacity and are frequently unavailable for public use.		

5.0 Open Space					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
			<p>JJ Holland Park should serve as an example of the type (size and scale) that is required to provide adequate open space for a proposal of this size. JJ Holland will not be capable of accommodating the additional population.</p> <p>Both Parkville and East Melbourne are well serviced by public parks and gardens, Kensington has few parks for either passive recreation or physical exercise.</p> <p>To mitigate urban heat island and increase urban forests.</p> <p>Open areas are needed if high rise goes ahead and that can be achieved by having tall structures with ample open space around them.</p> <p>To include native flora from the area before it was developed.</p> <p>Potentially providing more open space around primary schools would cater for the diverse needs of the children and families.</p> <p>Open spaces should be well planned and plentiful.</p>		

5.0 Open Space					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Low	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Match the amount of public open space (including active and passive recreation spaces and facilities) with the proposed population increase.	Insufficient consideration has been given to the need for significantly improved and increased civil and public infrastructure such as parks, open space, etc and the future needs of the proposed significantly increases population.	Change made to the Structure Plan.	It is agreed that enhancements to existing open space and the identification of new open spaces are required to respond to the needs of the growing community. Additional open space opportunities identified in the Melbourne Open Space Strategy have been integrated into the Structure Plan. Securing these spaces will be supported through the City of Melbourne requiring additional development contributions for open space through the Melbourne Planning Scheme.
			The population projection increase for the study area is from 21 residents per ha in 2008 to 170 residents per ha in 2040 that is an 8 fold increase. It should be greater than 8 fold increase because the amenity of the area is already relatively low in the amount of POS.		
			By planning for adaptability and flexibility CoM will be creating a broader range of opportunities for informal yet active recreation in an increasingly fast paced world.		
			Such extensive redevelopment is in danger of becoming a concrete jungle without adequate open space. There is a point at which too high density transforms the ambience of an area from a tolerable and quite pleasant urban industriousness to a feeling of being cramped, constricted and over crowded - somewhat ghetto like.		

5.0 Open Space					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Low	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	The Moonee Ponds Creek is inadequate as an open space area.	Not against beautifying the Creek but it is not appropriate for recreation. Who wants to take their children and friends to relax under a noisy and polluted roadway. Unguarded water is not suitable for kids.	Change made to the Structure Plan.	Additional open space has been identified through the Open Space Strategy. The Structure Plan proposes upgrades to the amenity of the shared trail and the Creek's ecological function at a minimum; opportunities to extend the role of this space will be investigated to augment it's role as an open space, corridor, and link; explanation of process for exploring viability (ie Open Space Strategy criteria)
			The area has low amenity value as it is flood prone and beneath the imposing City Link overpass. It receives limited sunlight and at times is not accessible. It is not suitable for anything more than walking and cycling.		
			Does not provide for any active open space areas for soccer, football, etc.		
			Appears to be green washing of the SP.		
			The figure on page 35 is very misleading as it indicates broad swatches of open space that is really just beside the train line and would at best be a treed pathway. It is not a destination park.		

<b>5.0 Open Space</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
			The domineering and ugly presence of the concrete pylons and ramps have rendered difficult in previous attempts to better use MPC as a recreational space. Increased vegetation is difficult due to the lack of access to sunshine and natural rainfall.		
Low	<b>5.0 Open Space</b>	Establish open space requirements for each separate development including provision of private open space.	<p>Clearly defined criteria as to what portion of each block needs to be set aside as open space.</p> <p>To reduce urban heat island effects.</p> <p>We need developments with proper communal outdoor space and private yards and gardens to encourage a diversity in the population and reduce the risk of having a very dense population with social problems.</p> <p>The plan needs better definition to ensure certainty for developers of the land and residents alike. What constitutes private open space, what percentage of the land area must be set aside, what access to direct sunlight is required, must it be green, etc.</p>	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Design principles and provisions included in the Melbourne Planning Scheme seek to ensure adequate private open space is included in new developments



5.0 Open Space					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Low	5.0 Open Space	Support the open space initiatives.	<p>The open space section is adequately covered.</p> <p>Anything that makes Kensington and North Melbourne more pleasant and safer to walk or cycle through will be very much welcomed, particularly along the corridors that are currently light industrial and very deserted at night.</p> <p>I believe that the open space near the metro station is a positive move.</p> <p>Moonee Valley City Council (MVCC) supports the strategy to provide further open space to meet the needs of this future population, to upgrade the capital city trail to facilitate better bicycle and pedestrian movements within the area and for the purpose of commuting.</p> <p>The city farm and green roof scheme sounds good. Allocations for people to grow vegetables, etc would support community spirit and reduce the heat island effect. With all of the space that is opening up it would be great to see some serious effort put into these fields.</p>	Change made to the Structure Plan.	Noted

<b>5.0 Open Space</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
			Support the integration of public transport, recreation and lifestyle facilities including walking and cycling amenities.		
Low	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Improve the amenity of the existing cycle and walking trail along the MPC.	<p>The path along the Creek is used as a high speed cycling route and pedestrian amenity should be enhanced.</p> <p>High residential towers will diminish the recreational value due to overshadowing, overlooking, restriction of views and wind effects.</p> <p>Lighting is required. Additional high concrete walls and structures create noise reverberation issues.</p>	Change made to the Structure Plan.	The Structure Plan proposes upgrades to amenity of shared trail and ecological function of the area. Council's Open Space Strategy further identifies the treatment of this area.
Low	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Provide more information about the Moonee Ponds Creek (MPC)	<p>A master plan for the MPC is urgently required so that stakeholders can see how the proposed improvements will work in the broader context.</p> <p>Revegetation of the expanded creek corridor should be in keeping with the recommended plantings of indigenous species as set out in the document MPC Revegetation Guidelines by David Chynoweth (2000).</p>	Change made to the Structure Plan.	A Creek Master Plan will be prepared; this will address revegetation, waterway and flood management, opportunities for increased use for open space use and improved neighbourhood links.

5.0 Open Space					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
			<p>As the waterway corridor is constrained by size and flood risks, CoM will need to carefully consider how open space areas and recreation and infrastructure can be created along side ecological areas. There may be some limitations on the range of uses proposed in parts of the corridor.</p>		
			<p>Greater elaboration on the proposal to enhance the creek is required &amp; its suitability as open space given flooding and the linear nature of the space.</p>		

**5.0 Open Space**

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Low	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Support the initiatives to improve the amenity of the Moonee Ponds Creek and links to Royal Park.	<p>Applaud the beautification of the MPC and increases in pedestrian amenity.</p> <p>An increase in the environmental health and habitat value of Melbourne's section of the creek should be a high priority and the open space provisions should all contribute to this priority.</p> <p>The MPC clean up and possibly extended to be able to support recreational activities - canoeing, kayaking and non toxic fishing would be great.</p> <p>The <b>Department of Planning &amp; Community Development (DPCD)</b> supports the expansion and upgrade of the MPC parkland corridor as it provides local recreation opportunities and has potential as a significant commuter route between the western end of the City and the inner north eastern suburbs.</p> <p>To provide for a more meaningful and active and passive recreation area for current and future residents. We support additional space around the creek with additional pedestrian links across the Creek.</p>	Change made to the Structure Plan.	Noted.

5.0 Open Space					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Low	5.1 Parks	Provide localised open space that is intermingled with the living space of people in a way that is accessible including pocket parks.	Pocket parks and green pockets should be included see Farnham Street Flemington - highly used for community gatherings. Other meeting places should be included such as Fairfield amphitheatre and the Women's Peace park - these concepts make a community - a community where people meet, play, have weddings, children, etc. Laneways and pocket parks should lead to important venues.	Change made to the Structure Plan.	It is agreed that enhancements to existing open space and the identification of new open spaces are required to respond to the needs of the growing community. Additional open space opportunities identified in the Melbourne Open Space Strategy have been integrated into the Structure Plan. Securing these spaces will be supported through the City of Melbourne requiring additional development contributions for open space through the Melbourne Planning Scheme.
			Small parks rather than relying upon private open space which may or may not eventuate and each of which will be negotiable and likely to be deemed by the State rather than Council.		
			A corridor to the Royal Park gardens as a green space for the community is inappropriate as Royal Park is a long way away in terms of a local stroll. This does not meet the day to day recreation and green space requirements of the community.		
Low	5.1 Parks	The North Melbourne Football Ground should not be considered as open space.	It is not readily available to the public. This should not be shown in figure 5.1.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Although the Football Ground is largely occupied by private users it is zoned and considered Public Open Space. Its regular and structured use is noted and therefore additional areas of open space within the study area are being investigated.

<b>5.0 Open Space</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Low	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Provide parks and gardens that are close to community facilities such as aged care facilities, childcare, schools, shops.	To create hubs and encourage community interaction and ensure that children and students have access to outdoor areas.	No Change to the Structure Plan	The public open space is proposed in areas where it is amenable, accessible and near by proposed facilities and activity nodes.
Low	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Provide more trees	Use trees to cool down the area. This area is not particularly low and not particularly open to breezes and could be a real heat trap so future planning needs to consider this.  Shade planning - now is the opportunity to really use trees for cooling down areas of the city. This particular area is low and not particularly open to breezes and could be a real heat trap so future planning needs to consider this.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	The Structure Plan provides for additional landscaping in this precinct.
Low		Mandate minimum allocations for open space including green roofs.	To mitigate urban heat islands and increase urban forests.	No Change to the Structure Plan	The structure plan provides for additional public open spaces; in addition, the implementation of the CoM's draft Urban Forest Strategy will help mitigate the urban heat island effect by reducing inner city temperatures, create healthier ecosystems and become a water sensitive city by increasing canopy cover
Single Comment	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	The land bordering the creek from Arden Street to North Melbourne Station would be perfect for additional open space but instead it is planned for development.	Opportunity site Arden St Park not listed on the map.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted.

5.0 Open Space					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Single Comment	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Protect existing street trees.	Green Street has existing mature trees planted in the footpath and have wide crowns. Additional height of 30m may affect the trees.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted.
Single Comment	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Construct a new cycle route along the west side of the MPC not within the creek corridor.	<p>The western side of the creek should be human and dog free wildlife corridor/ refuge rather than a transport route. Then the strategic plan would have a real chance of creating real biodiversity.</p> <p>There is precious little usable public open space directly abutting the creek along its western bank between Racecourse Rd and Arden St. These passive recreational spaces, especially that between Macaulay Rd and Arden S, should not be compromised by having a cycle path carved out of them. Any new cycle path the western side of the creek should be constructed outside the flood walls/ embankments along existing roads of proposed roads.</p>	No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted for further investigation through the development of a master plan.

<b>5.0 Open Space</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Single Comment	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	The Structure Plan should ensure that public land be de-contaminated.	That it can be planted with trees, shrubs and grasses.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted for further investigation through the development of a master plan.
Single Comment	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Purchase the Kensington Nursery, horse yards and tips for parks.		No Change to the Structure Plan	This proposal goes beyond the realms of the structure planning process.
Single Comment	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	The Capital City Trail links to many places south of the precinct, but no destinations to the north are listed.		No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted
Single Comment	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Whilst widening of this open space network is positive, mechanisms for achieving this through the development contributions or planned setbacks needs to be pushed.	Not enough consideration is given to the raised City Link route which will be a severe dampener.	No Change to the Structure Plan	A developer contribution scheme has been developed commence this process.
Single Comment	<b>5.0 Open Space</b>	The plan shouldn't use private open space to mitigate high density and lack of public open space.	This is not acceptable, is elitist and not in keeping with the history of the suburb. Open space should be available for all people not just those who can afford it.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted
Single Comment	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Improve access to parkland west of the MPC.	Opportunity to improve existing conditions.		Additional parkland is proposed as part of the final version
Single Comment	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Clarify the land use to be applied to the land bounded by Dryburgh, Ireland and Railway Plc.	A park would be a tremendous asset.	No Change to the Structure Plan	A parks is not proposed in this location.



<b>5.0 Open Space</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Single Comment	<b>5.0 Open Space</b>	Map 5.1 Open Space is misleading	Shows private open space as open space and the archives centre as open space.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted and modified
Single Comment	<b>5.0 Open Space</b>	Have outdoor spaces readily available for schools	Provide for large schools without door spaces given the availability. Outdoor schools provide better health and climate responses than indoor schools.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Council will work with the DEECD to locate an appropriate site for a school within Arden Macaulay.
Single Comment		Use some of the flood prone land as a community garden or wetland.	There are limited opportunities for some residents to garden.	No Change to the Structure Plan	This falls beyond the relams of the structure plan.
<b>Organisations</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Single Comment	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Ensure planning is consistent with existing strategies and plans already in place for the MPC including: The MPC Strategic Plan - 2011, The MPC Concept Plan - 1992, The MPC Corridor Revegetation Guidelines - 2000.		No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted.
Single Comment	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Create a Design and Development Overlay for interface development to the parkland (MVCC).	To ensure a positive interface with parks and development.	No Change to the Structure Plan	The heights of building fronting the street provide for an appropriate transition to the parkland. Furthermore the lots are orientated to front the park.
			Open Space		

6.0 Community Infrastructure					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Medium	<b>6.1 Community Facilities</b>	Identify and provide civic and public infrastructure such as child and aged care, hospitals and schools with adequate open space, to meet the future needs of the proposed significantly increased population.	<p>Provision of community facilities should be linked to identified demographic trends and requirements by workers.</p> <p>Renovate the community club.</p> <p>The plan does not articulate a vision for how the community will interact where community hubs will be or where people will be able to access and enjoy outdoor spaces. In my opinion a healthy and happy community is one that provides space for relaxing, easy and local access to parks and gardens, schools and community facilities that are also localised and quality.</p>	Change made to the Structure Plan	It is agreed that improvements to existing and identification of additional community infrastructure are needed to respond to the needs of the growing community. The Structure Plan identifies the opportunity for the development of four community hubs. Additional detail regarding the opportunities to enhance the provision of community infrastructure has been integrated into the Structure Plan. The City of Melbourne's Community Infrastructure Framework is reviewed regularly to align infrastructure delivery with population growth (and increased demand). The Structure Plan recommends that the Community Infrastructure Plan consider the specific delivery of services within each hub. The

6.0 Community Infrastructure					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
			<p>Let's not have a repeat of the Docklands coming up again in this area. Schools, creches, kinders and passive outdoor areas and aged care facilities all need to be planned for in this area. One thing that we have learnt from the Docklands is that demographers don't always get it right. They said no families would live there but that isn't what happened! A lot of the baby boomer age group are coming into the inner city and if aging in place is to have any real meaning we have to plan now for this to happen. This may mean specifically planned apartment complexes for older residents.</p> <p>The plan seems to be about building residential density and employment rather than urban renewal. The plan must be reworked in order to ensure that the distribution of these good and bad outcomes that may be expected from population growth of this neighbourhood is equitable and balanced.</p>		<p>Structure Plan recommends that the City of Melbourne prepare a Development Contributions Plan to be integrated into the Melbourne Planning Scheme to contribute funds for the development of these community hubs.</p> <p>Local and State Governments are responsible for the delivery of essential community services, with some services provided by the private sector. Therefore the Structure Plan recommends the devel</p>

6.0 Community Infrastructure					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
			<p>Who will have the final say as to what facilities will be developed? The Council or State Government? Wouldn't we need firm commitment before we start bringing people in.</p> <p>We believe this should be considered up front in the strategic context of the project. Social and community planning should consider what is lacking in Kensington currently and build on that to determine what is required for future population expansion. Sustainable community development.</p> <p>The plan does not show any schools or community buildings, gym, childcare, library, etc. Does not help form a community.</p> <p>I have little faith that sufficient quality community infrastructure will be provided. Once developers get involved profit will be the motive and they will ask for more. They won't be around later to deal with the dysfunctional communities that would result.</p>		

6.0 Community Infrastructure					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
			<p>Council can advocate for but cannot control. Again it would seem that specific promises regarding upgrades in social infrastructure would need to be obtained before rezoning is commenced.</p> <p>It would appear that Council has in mind wealthy students or perhaps couples with no children who will all commute by bicycle to well paying jobs.</p> <p>A number of these services are provided by MVCC and are at capacity.</p> <p>An increase of 25,000 population will require appropriate provision of schools, health services, community centres. It is not clear how the City can ensure that these services are provided.</p>		

<b>6.0 Community Infrastructure</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Low	<b>6.1 Community Facilities</b>	The Structure Plan should not be signed off until primary and secondary school sites with adequate active open space and also additional public open space have been identified and secured (keeping in mind North and West Melbourne is recognised by Council as having the least open space within the City of Melbourne).	Existing are at capacity, including the Medical Centres, the North Melbourne Pool and Flemington Library.	Change made to the Structure Plan	In the process of developing the Structure Plan, the City of Melbourne has had several discussions with the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development who have responsibility for managing existing schools and the delivery of new schools. The City of Melbourne will continue to liaise with the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development and will advocate for appropriate provision of education facilities to service the region. As the Department of Education and Early Childhood is responsible for the delivery of new schools. The location and design of any future school will be determined by the Department.
Low	<b>6.1 Community Facilities</b>	Provide for more childcare and schools. Acquire land that is contamination free, appropriately sized and well located.	Health and child obesity. Council must plan with the State Government to either utilise Government or Council owned land or commit to purchase or acquire appropriately located, sized lots for schools. These schools must be provided with quality ground level outdoor space so vital to children's growth, health, learning, etc.	Change made to the Structure Plan	Additions to the community infrastructure chapter have been included within the plan to directly address these concerns. In the process of developing the Structure Plan, the City of Melbourne's officers are liaising with the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) officers regarding the identification of new school sites. The City of Melbourne will continue to liaise with the DEECD and advocate for appropriate provision of education

6.0 Community Infrastructure					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
			<p>Two schools are identified as being required for the area. These schools must be able to be provided with quality ground level outdoor space, vital for children's learning, growth, health and social development in particular when children are likely to be living in high density apartments without backyards. VCASS is a poor model for an inner city school as students have a dance and art focus and don't like not having open space.</p> <p>Given the proposal to accommodate 25,000 people within the suburb, it is not encouraging that the educational needs of households with children hasn't been accounted for. This absolutely must be considered as without additional schools and childcare available within the area this will mean increased loads on the roads and public transport.</p> <p>These are fundamental and should be the starting point of the planning process.</p> <p>There are waiting lists years long in the community (including wait lists for occasional care). Lack of facilities in the area.</p>		<p>facilities to service Arden Macaulay as the area is developed. The final location and design of any future school will be determined by the DEECD. Additional provision for childcare to service the projected population growth will be included in CoM's Community Infrastructure Plan with funding options and partnerships to be explored. Furthermore the Business Zone will allow for land to be utilised by childcare facilities provided by the private industry.</p>

6.0 Community Infrastructure					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Low	<b>6.1 Community Facilities</b>	The focus on aged care facilities (including nursing homes) should be just as great as the focus on affordable housing. Facilities should be close to parks and gardens.	Existing are at capacity, including the Medical Centres, the North Melbourne Pool and Flemington Library.	No Change to the Structure Plan	It is agreed that improvements to existing and identification of additional community infrastructure are needed to respond to the needs of the growing community. The Structure Plan provides an opportunity for a holistic approach to manage change. Additional community infrastructure opportunities and principles have been identified in the draft Community Infrastructure Plan and have been integrated into the Structure Plan . Partnerships for delivery of community infrastructure have been identified. The City of Melbourne will continue to work with service providers and relevant agencies to ensure appropriate provision of services to meet community needs.
Low		Provide more sporting facilities additional to existing passive areas. Provide more flexible, multi purpose paved court spaces that are free, easily accessible (to allow for informal inline skating, roller derby, bmx, skateboarding, futsal soccer, inline slalom, inline hockey & bike polo). The space should be a robust surface, enclosed by an edge, ledge, wall or fence, with shelter and light, rectangular in shape, free to	The City of Melbourne currently provides extensive amounts of grassed open space and provides excellent opportunities for field sports to be played informally. However the range of facilities provided for court sports are more formalised and generally provided for a fee, insurance and are mostly limited to the sport they were designed for. These spaces should function more like playgrounds.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	Upgrades are proposed to the North Community Centre to provide for community sport and recreation. The land between Clayton Reserve and the North Melbourne Recreation Reserve will be investigated to fulfill this and open space needs in the long term. The MPC near Langford Street is proposed as a suitable location for sports courts.



<b>6.0 Community Infrastructure</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
		use,.	A multi purpose space would complement the MPC and be suitable in the linear park. Promote a healthy and active lifestyle		
Low	<b>6.1 Community Facilities</b>	Provide a stronger focus on visual arts and musical services/facilities for the larger population. Develop a flourishing sporting and artistic future in our area.	Historically there is a strong sporting tradition associated with the area and a growing performing art focus (particularly associated with the town hall) and these should be maintained. It is important to explore the synergies that exist for accommodating education provision across the urban renewal areas that exist in close proximity to the SP area. E Gate will be particularly pertinent in this regard.	Change made to the Structure Plan	The zonings proposed within the Structure Plan allow for a variety of land uses to be supported including sports, music and arts related uses. Council's own programs provide support and opportunities for artists. Additional consideration has been given to support for art, and sporting facilities within the revised community infrastructure and open space chapters and the Council's Open Space Strategy further addresses this.
Low	<b>6.1 Community Facilities</b>	Place stronger rules on developers to ensure they include social, retail and communal and outdoor space in their developments. Demands not just encouragement.		Change made to the Structure Plan	Council is developing a Development Contribution Plan Scheme for potential incorporation into the Melbourne Planning Scheme to assist the funding and delivery of community infrastructure.
<b>Organisations</b>					

<b>6.0 Community Infrastructure</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Low	<b>6.1 Community Facilities</b>	The SP should provide some direction around the staging of facilities.	To ensure the early introduction of community services and facilities into the study area so as to minimise any disruptions to the services offered by MVCC.	Change made to the Structure Plan	The Structure Plan will be read in conjunction with the Community Infrastructure Plan which ensures the delivery of community services and facilities in a timely manner.
Single Comment	<b>6.1 Community Facilities</b>	Ground floor community uses should be provided.	To support the new population and encourage permeability within the buildings. In order to promote diversity and long term viability community varied dwelling types and sizes should be promoted.	No Change to the Structure Plan.	the structure plans proposes controls to ensure the delivery of active street frontages on primary streets.

<b>7.0 Infrastructure Services</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Low	<b>7.1 Infrastructure Services</b>	Reconsider risks and response to inundation.	Insufficient consideration has been given to the serious question of inundation in large parts of the study area, including the creek and open space.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Council will work with Melbourne Water (being the Flood Plain Authority) to determine appropriate flood mitigation measures which may include limitations to non permeable surfaces, requirements to build above the flood levels, etc (as per other land subject to inundation within the municipality). Flood mitigation requirements will be further detailed in Council's civil infrastructure plan currently underway, and will be comprehensively addressed in the planning and development of the Arden Central precinct.
			Flooding should be managed before the land is earmarked for high density development. Proper investigation of flooding and mitigation measures along the MPC must occur before growth.		
			Avoid floods like Brisbane		
Low	<b>7.1 Infrastructure Services</b>	Support the infrastructure services including highlighting funding opportunities for new infrastructure, environmental & water initiatives and upgrades to the sustainability of the public housing estate.	Innovative and cutting edge environmental components need to be the basis for the redevelopment.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted
Low	<b>7.1 Infrastructure Services</b>	Mandate ESD building requirements such as orientation controls to limit west and east facing windows, cross ventilation, open air clothes drying, avoid air con, etc.	ESD is not being delivered by developers.	No Change to the Structure Plan	The SP encourages ESD and Green walls, they are further mandated through the Building Control Act.
			The current planning system does not deliver on ESD.		
Low	<b>7.1 Infrastructure Services</b>	Clarify the differences between figure 1.6 and 1.8 in relation to flooding.	Clarity.	Change made to the Structure Plan	Addressed

<b>7.0 Infrastructure Services</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Single Comment	<b>7.1 Infrastructure Services</b>	Provide combined services beneath new roads such as the Boundary Road extension.	Opportunity.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted - for further investigation.
Single Comment	<b>7.1 Infrastructure Services</b>	Clarify how the distribution of electricity and hot and chilled water will affect individual properties over Laurens St.	Clarity.	No Change to the Structure Plan	The proposal is outside the realms of the Structure Plan
Single Comment	<b>7.1 Infrastructure Services</b>	Remove the trigeneration plan with closed loop system.	Current arrangements with energy providers present effective or efficient trigeneration systems, with full cost for technology to be able to supply back to the grid born by the land owner.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted - for further investigation.
Single Comment	<b>7.1 Infrastructure Services</b>	Reduce building heights so that they don't affect existing solar panels.	Reduce shadows, access to light, etc.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Loss of sunlight and shadowing is considered on a site by site basis as development occurs.
Single Comment	<b>7.1 Infrastructure Services</b>	Consider a BedZED development (Beddington Zero Energy Development).	Emphasis on social housing, roof gardens, passive thermal mass, solar energy, reduction in energy consumption and waste water recycling. Dwellings are 4-5 stories and incorporate live/work spaces. Roads and parking are at the edge of the development.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted - for further investigation.

7.0 Infrastructure Services					
Frequency of issue in received	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Single Comment		Develop details on how the precinct will reduce the overall carbon footprint of the city.	Environmental benefits.	No Change to the Structure Plan	The CoM has a range of sustainable initiatives and programs which currently address this issue. These include existing and proposed provisions in the Melbourne Planning Scheme including the proposed Amendment C187, which will provide a coordinated set of minimum performance standards and assessment methods for the energy, water and waste efficiency of new office, retail, education/research and accommodation (single and multi-unit dwellings and other residential) uses and developments.
Single Comment	7.2 Air Quality	Pollution evaluations prior to the construction of the freeway suggested there would be adverse environmental impacts (noise and air quality) on people living at the same height as the Freeway.		No Change to the Structure Plan	Best practice design treatment and international experience will be applied to ensure impacts are minimised.

7.0 Infrastructure Services					
Frequency of issue in received	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
<b>Organisations</b>					
Frequency of issue in received	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Single Comment	<b>7.7 Water</b>	Undertake further flood modelling, including detailed hydrology and hydraulic modelling required for the Moonee Ponds Creek (MPC) and any associated landscaping to demonstrate there's no impact on the 1 in 100 occurrence rate. Provide for flood storage within the open space or street network. Maintain road levels on flood prone roads. New development should incorporate WSUD. <b>(Melbourne Water)</b>	<p>Recalculate flood levels taking into account expected increased flows and effects of climate change necessary to inform development and landscaping.</p> <p>Storm water flows are expected to increase with development, changes in rain fall and sea level rise.</p> <p>To avoid further flood risk. Flood mitigation works may be required to avoid overland flow.</p> <p>To assist with flood mitigation &amp; for environmental benefits.</p>	No Change to the Structure Plan	Flood modelling and mitigation works will be considered when work is undertaken around Moonee Ponds Creek and in the Arden Macaulay area. WSUD will be required in new development and the CoM's proposed Amendment C187 to the Melbourne Planning Scheme will provide a coordinated set of minimum performance standards and assessment methods for the energy, water and waste efficiency of new office, retail, education/research and accommodation (single and multi-unit dwellings and other residential) uses and developments.

7.0 Infrastructure Services					
Frequency of issue in received	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Single Comment	7.7 Water	Future development should aim to provide for flood storage within open space or within the street network. Melbourne Water considers a recalculation of flood levels taking into account expected increased flows and effects of climate change is necessary to inform development and landscape planning. We strongly support the recommendation that further modelling be undertaken to provide the following advice on Melbourne Water's requirements and existing knowledge of flooding in the area to inform design of further modelling work: Detailed hydrology and hydraulic modelling will be required for the MPC and any associated park land and landscaping in Arden Main Street Drain to demonstrate there is no significant impact on 100 year average recurrence interval (ARI) flood levels.	Stormwater flows in the MPC are expected to increase due to local redevelopment and redevelopment upstream, and may also be affected by changes in rainfall due to climate change. Sea level rise is also expected to affect flood flows within the MPC and the Arden Street Main Drain. Widening the MPC and providing additional open space may increase available flood storage, lowering nearby 100 year flood levels. Further modelling should assume a 100 year ARI flow of 255m <sup>3</sup> /s to reflect expected increases due to development density upstream.		Noted, for further investigation
Single Comment	7.0 Sustainable Infrastructure	Identify where the automated waste reticulation system and central collection station be located.	Clarity.	No Change to the Structure Plan	The City of Melbourne is committed, through its Waste Management Strategy, to reducing the amount of waste going to landfill from all sectors and is investigating opportunities for automated waste reticulation in new developments.

8.0 Structure Plan Process					
Frequency of issue in received	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Low	<b>8.3 Feedback on consultation process</b>	Conduct a more detailed consultation process and extend the deadline for submissions to allow more important work to take place.	This is not consultation this is briefing the community on what is proposed, asking for and ignoring feedback. The community should have been given a range of options on how the area may be developed to give the community some role in deciding this direction.	No Change to the Structure Plan	The Consultation on the draft Structure Plan began in September 2010 with a stakeholder workshop, online forum and opportunities to provide written submissions.
			I feel no ownership of the plan. Without this there will be conflict and distress which you can avoid by putting the plans aside until the community has had a voice.		
			The extent of mail outs was inadequate.		
			The documents were difficult to access and too large to download.		
			GWF seeks greater consultation with CoM in developing the final SP. Involvement so far has been disappointing.		
			Should have consulted with the community from day 1 instead of involvement at the end.		
			The local paper does not reach all residents.		
			More needs to be done to incorporate the views of residents and small business.		
					The consultation phase in May – June 2011 offered the opportunity for comment on the development of the draft City North Structure Plan. This included a public information session, information available online and the opportunity to provide written submissions. The timeline for the Structure Plan was extended from the original September Future Melbourne Committee to December 2011 to provide more time for Council to consider all submissions and to undertake additional work, as required, to address specific feedback received on the plans. All submissions have been considered in the finalisation of the Structure Plan.



<b>8.0 Structure Plan Process</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
			<p>The deadline for public submissions should be extended until 30 November 2011 to allow for a more detailed consultation process and other important work to take place.</p> <p>Given the extent of change to the area the consultation should be extended so that the entire community can be invited to comment on the plans. This may give a more representative view than those expressed as present.</p> <p>The process has been too short and flawed.</p> <p>The scope of what is planned for the area is so great that there needs to be regular and real liasing with the community as the plans go through the stages of development. A one off meeting with the community presenting ideas that cannot be detailed is meaningless.</p>		<p>The consultation report, submitted to the Future Melbourne Committee, includes all submissions received, the City of Melbourne's response and an overview of changes made to the Structure Plan in response to the feedback. There will be more consultation opportunities over the next 18 months for feedback on the implementation of these Plans.</p>
Low	<b>8.1 Structure Plan Process and Implementation</b>	Reserve zoning and development decisions until the Metro has been confirmed.	Too much reliance has been placed upon the Metro. This has not been confirmed by the state.	Change made to the Structure Plan	Development will be staged. Arden Central will not occur until the Metro project has been confirmed. Council will continue to advocate for the Metro.

8.0 Structure Plan Process					
Frequency of issue in received	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion
Low	8.4 Other	Provide more information within the report.	<p>The exec summary needs to state why the study boundary was chosen and identify government land within it. The relationship between the study boundary to the 2 Activity Centres proposed and how will their ACZ be defined for their own SP's - for accessibility and mode choice.</p> <p>Identify any dependancies upon State investment (metro, etc) within the plan.</p> <p>All maps and diagrams require source, date information and colour coded as per the State requirements for the colour blind.</p> <p>Clarify discrepancies in the inundation maps.</p> <p>Correct the mapping errors of the bicycle paths.</p> <p>Prepare a Integrated Transport Plan.</p> <p>Provide details of how the new development will reduce the overall footprint of the city.</p> <p>Provide clarity about the decision making process. What will the report to Council contain. Councillors should be aware of residents views.</p> <p>Explain why the MUZ is an appropriate zone for the site.</p>	Change made to the Structure Plan	The report has been significantly revised since the draft version with built form controls, further traffic, land use and community infrastructure information included. The report has been reformatted to be easily read with clear objectives.

<b>8.0 Structure Plan Process</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
			A masterplan of the MPC.		
			It will need to be well coordinated to deliver desired planning outcomes.		
Low	<b>8.1 Structure Plan Process and Implementation</b>	Ensure there are strong planning controls	Provide clear regulations so residents are not having to constantly fight developers.	Change made to the Structure Plan	The Structure Plan provides strong justification for the implementation of zoning changes in the precinct. Including the addition of built form controls and land use zoning changes.
			The department can not be expected to be equipped with the knowledge of the area.		
			We have no confidence in Council managing the planning process.		
			Sites for schools, parks, community centres, childcare, etc should be provided before the area is populated.		

<b>8.0 Structure Plan Process</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Low	<b>8.1 Structure Plan Process and Implementation</b>	Support the structure plan and agree with Council that there is potential for renewal in this area.	<p>The Council should be commended for putting together a plan to guide the future development of the area and minimise what may otherwise become an adhoc approach to renewal. The plan has many good aspects and the intent to provide controlled renewal of the area over the long term with increased population is great.</p> <p>I congratulate Council on making a draft plan and seeking consultation, its very difficult to review a blank page so having something to start with is important. The priorities placed on liveability, desire for public transport and other non car options and increasing open space is welcomed.</p>	No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted
Low	<b>8.3 Feedback on consultation process</b>	Consultation was adequate.	<p>It is pleasing that residents and other interested parties are being given the opportunity to comment on the plan.</p> <p>In the past month I have attended two information sessions - one organised by CoM and the other second organised by NWMA. Both sessions includes presentations by CoM staff which was informative and much appreciated.</p>	No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted

<b>8.0 Structure Plan Process</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
			Thanks for running the public session in Kensington, it was most informative, even though I had seen much of it before in various other presentations. I applaud CoM's vision.		
			We support the time frames set by CoM and applaud the significant opportunities		
Low	<b>8.1 Structure Plan Process and Implementation</b>	Finalise the MSS before the Structure Plans.	Identifying land for rezoning in the draft MSS has increased developer led pressure on the area without due consideration of the issues. Identifying population growth goals has been put ahead of identifying the areas constraints and consideration of protecting amenity of existing residents.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Identification of potential rezoning opportunities in the SP has enabled informed and constructive debate about future growth and land use change in both the finalisation of the MSS and the SP thus informing the drafting of a Planning Scheme Amendment. The Structure Plan provides for the renewal of the precinct which is consistent with the draft MSS.
			The MSS (C162) sets out clause 21.04-5 in regard to the MPC as a recreational open space. These strategic directions have not been adopted by the SP and it is understood that the SP will implement the MSS.		

<b>8.0 Structure Plan Process</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Low	<b>8.1 Structure Plan Process and Implementation</b>	The actions of the plan may not be achieved.	<p>The State Govt strategic planning process should mean that this plan is either included in that exercise or at least deferred until after the tabling of that document (State Government preparation of the Metropolitan Planning Strategy).</p> <p>What happens if good intentions aren't realised.</p> <p>How can it be ensured that the plan will actually occur and not become subject to other regulations and interests.</p> <p>Clarity. Identify the short medium and long term priorities.</p> <p>Must not lose the qualities that make it a wonderful place to live.</p>	No Change to the Structure Plan	The Structure Plan identifies strategies and actions to achieve the desired outcomes. Some of these strategies and actions require the preparation of future plans and policies such as a housing policy, etc.
Low	<b>8.3 Feedback on consultation process</b>	As part of the consultation provide options for the community to comment on.	Detailed process.	No Change to the Structure Plan	The draft Structure Plan went through an extensive consultation process where the community were asked to comment on a single draft. for clarity CoM developed the optimal draft and then sought comments so that it could be further improved.

<b>8.0 Structure Plan Process</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Low	<b>8.3 Feedback on consultation process</b>	The plan should be considered in the context with its surrounding areas.	The plan is presented as a vacuum. The surrounding areas including the municipalities bordering the proposal are critical to the integration of a workable solution. Works with adjoining municipalities and acknowledge cross boundary constrains. Consider MVCC's plans and existing strategies including the creek strategies and the Racecourse Road Structure Plan.	No Change to the Structure Plan	The Plan has been prepared considering the neighbouring suburbs (including those not within CoM's boundaries) and the broader needs of metropolitan Melbourne. Consultation was also carried out with neighbouring municipalities including the City of Moonee Valley.
Low	<b>8.3 Feedback on consultation process</b>	Respond to my submission. Community feedback should be taken into account and the plans amended accordingly.	Previous correspondence with CoM has not been replied to this indicated that consultation falls upon deaf ears.	Change made to the Structure Plan	The draft plan has been significantly amended taking into consideration the matters raised by submitters. All submissions have been reviewed and have provided for the content of the final plan.
Low	<b>8.1 Process</b>	A residents reference group should have been established	To provide local input into the plan.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted - all residents groups were consulted with individually. Further consultation meetings were carried out with the presidents of each group.
Single Comm	<b>8.4 Other</b>	Reduce the length of the plan.	Too long.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted. The plan includes all necessary content.
Single Comm	<b>8.4 Other</b>	More Councillors should have attended the sessions and stayed back to hear the public's comments.		No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted.
<b>Organisations</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>

<b>8.0 Structure Plan Process</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Single Comment	<b>8.3 Consultation</b>	Consult with Vic Track & DOT about the potential purchase of their land.	The land is not publically zoned and its use and development is at the discretion of Vic Track. It must be purchased and clearance must be given from DOT that it is no longer required for transportation purposes. Some sites are well located for commercial or retail redevelopment and Vic Track is reviewing its options in relation to these sites.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted.



<b>9.0 Site Specific Comments</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Low	<b>9.2 Boundary Road</b>	Reconsider the proposal to link Boundary Road and Spencer St.	Both currently carry excessive traffic volumes and have an adverse impact on the adjoining areas.	No Change to the Structure Plan	CoM will work closely with the State Government in the development of the (Road) Network Operating Plan and the integration of land use and transport planning as the area develops; and will continue to advocate for improved road conditions and a variety of public transport options through the Transport Strategy.
Low	<b>9.1 Arden Central</b>	Arden Central is dependant upon the Melbourne Metro which should be secured prior to planning.	Major aspects of the plan depend upon the upgrades in public transport especially Arden Central which cannot proceed unless the Metro Line and Arden Station are built.	Change made to the Structure Plan	The development of the Arden Central precinct is now proposed as Stage 2 of the implementation of the Structure Plan and will occur once the Melbourne Metro project has been confirmed. Council will continue to advocate for the Melbourne Metro rail line which will bring significant benefits to the City of Melbourne and surrounds and the local rail network.
Low	<b>9.9 Macaulay Road</b>	Do not support grade separations at the Macaulay Road boom gates.	Manage greater vehicle traffic with minimal impact on travel times by removing delays at the crossings. Facilitates through traffic, attracting more of it.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Grade separation is not an option at this point; the CoM will continue to advocate for improved public transport services and options and improved traffic management throughout the area. The implementation of Council's Transport Strategy 2011 will facilitate this.
Low	<b>9.9 Macaulay Road</b>	Reduce the extent of development proposed and avoid greater traffic and parking problems on Macaulay Road.	What measures will be undertaken to improve congestion. Include measures to discourage traffic.	No Change to the Structure Plan	The City of Melbourne will continue to advocate for improved road conditions and a variety of public transport options through the Transport Strategy.
Low	<b>9.1 Arden Central</b>	Support Arden Central		Change made to the Structure Plan	Noted

<b>9.0 Site Specific Comments</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Low	<b>9.9 Macaulay Road</b>	Enhance pedestrian amenity of Macaulay Road and provide more pedestrian crossings.	Environmental, safety and health benefits. Provide better access for persons with limited mobility.	No Change to the Structure Plan	See transport chapter - the plan advocates for improved pedestrian connections and amenity.
Single Comment	<b>9.2 Boundary Road</b>	Maintain the historic value of Boundary Rd.	Rezoning and approval of new developments around Boundary Rd will compromise.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Individual development applications will ensure the preservation and retention of any significant urban fabric which contributes to the heritage place (Boundary Road).
<b>Organisations</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Single Comment	<b>9.13 Racecourse Road</b>	Support zoning the land behind Racecourse Road to MUZ	It allows for more residential uses that will support the centre and does not support any significant retail out of centre.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Noted
Low	<b>9.7 Flemington Road</b>	Lobby the State Govt to improve Flemington Bridge Station.	To support the SP area and increase amenity and safety.	No Change to the Structure Plan	Council will advocate for improved public transport conditions including upgrades to the existing railway stations.
Low	<b>9.13 Racecourse Road</b>	Persue a vision consistent with MVCC's Racecourse Road Structure Plan for Racecourse Road, specifically reduce the heights (2-4 stories).	Consistency with the outcomes determined after MVCC's community consultation. The RCRSP proposes 6-10 stories on large sites. The housing estate towers shouldn't be used as a reference. Many of the strategies within the SP will assist the RCRSP directions.	No Change to the Structure Plan	The proposal seeks the enhancement of activities along Racecourse Road.