

## **FINAL DRAFT ARDEN-MACAULAY STRUCTURE PLAN – REPORT ON THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**

6 Dec 2011 – 6 Jan 2012

---

### **Executive Summary**

1. On the 6 December, 2011 the Future Melbourne Committee requested a supplementary public consultation on the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan (final draft) from 6 December 2011 to 6 January 2012 with a view to considering the submissions and further changes to the final draft at its 7 February 2012 meeting.
2. The program of engagement included:
  - 2.1. inviting submitters to the previous consultation and individuals who had previously registered their interest in the project were to make a submission;
  - 2.2. advertising in local papers and on the City of Melbourne's website, and;
  - 2.3. a verbal briefing for members of the Resident's Associations on 20 December which was attended by 16 representatives from six associations.
3. In total, 67 submissions were received - 3 from government agencies, 6 from organisations/associations and 58 from individuals.
4. A summary of all submissions received and a City of Melbourne response is outlined in this report in Schedule 1. A full copy of all submissions is available online.
5. The key recommended changes to the Structure Plan are summarised in Attachment 2.

## **Notification of supplementary consultation period**

1. The following notifications were undertaken to inform the public that the Final Draft Structure Plan was prepared and available for public consultation:
  - the City of Melbourne website ([www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/futuregrowth](http://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/futuregrowth)) was updated with information on the consultation process, a download of the Final Draft Plan and advice on how to make a submission;
  - email or mail to individuals who submitted to the May-June consultation;
  - email to individuals who had already registered their interest in the project;
  - notification in the corporate advertisement on 27<sup>th</sup> December;
  - an advertisement in local newspapers;
  - 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;
  - the Final Draft Plan was available for viewing at the Council House 2, Level 3 reception;
  - hard copies of the Final Draft Plan were provided on request.
2. Targeted correspondence was directed to the following agencies via email and/or telephone to advise of the consultation process:
  - Department of Planning and Community Development;
  - Department of Transport;
  - Department of Education and Early Childhood Development.

## **Direct consultation activities**

3. On 20 December 2011 an information session regarding the City North and Arden-Macaulay Structure Plans was conducted for representatives of residents associations in or near the structure plan areas. This was conducted as a question and answer style forum. 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
- Residents About Integrated Development

The following people attended:

- Darragh O'Brien, Kensington Resident's Association
- Sharon Inkster, Kensington Resident's Association
- Geoff Cox, Kensington Resident's Association
- Bill Cook, NWMA
- Kevin Chamberlin, NWMA
- Geoff Lynch, NWMA
- Greta Bird, Carlton Resident's Association
- Ian Bird, Carlton Resident's Association
- Jennie Gallivan, Flemington Resident's Association
- Katie Miller, Flemington Resident's Association
- Marg L, RAID
- George Janko, Carlton Resident's Association
- Angela Williams, Resident, North Melbourne
- Lynn Cracknell, Carlton Resident's Association
- Warren Green, Carlton Resident's Association
- Tess Demediuk, RAID

### **Submissions on the Final Draft**

4. Submissions to December 6 Future Melbourne Committee.
  - 4.1. 19 individuals requested to present to a verbal submission to the FMC. Given the FMC's intention to defer the item, five individual declined to address the Committee. The verbal submissions and supporting documentation provided to the FMC by submitters were formally considered in the consultation process and are included in Schedule 1 below.
5. Submissions received on the Final Draft plan
  - 5.1. 67 submissions were received. A summary of all submissions received and a City of Melbourne response is included in Schedule 1 below. This included 9 submitters who presented to the December FMC who provided further content in addition to their FMC submission. A summary of proposed changes to the Final Draft are included in Attachment 2.

### **Conclusion**

6. The consultation allowed an additional opportunity for the public to provide input into the structure plan. The public consultation process lead to a diverse stakeholder base providing valuable feedback and input and further refinement of the structure plan.



**Schedule 1. Summary of Submissions to the Final Draft of the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan and City of Melbourne response**

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Cubitt, Fiona	Individual	<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Proposed building heights of 20m are too high in areas that adjoin existing residential areas. These should be reduced in the 'buffer' areas to protect existing amenity of residents. Stepping heights may be a good solution.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls at the interfaces with residential areas - include updated diagrams into Structure Plans as shown in Figure A and C (in attachment 2) to illustrate revised heights and setbacks in interface areas.</p>	<p>a. To ensure an appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character. At the interface areas, new buildings will be no more than 1 storey higher than existing structures.</p>
		<p>b. All height controls should be mandatory, not discretionary.</p>	<p>b. Incorporate additional sentence into Chapter 3, Strategy 4 as follows: 'The proposed height control at the street frontages, lane frontages and southern boundaries are mandatory. The heights across the remainder of the site are discretionary up to a maximum of +30% of the nominated height ( for 20m this would allow 26m). Beyond the street frontage or property boundary, the height limits proposed are discretionary. Any discretion to increase the height must comply with the setback conditions as outlined in Figures 3.12 to 3.16.' Update Figures 3.12 - 3.16 as per Figures B and C (in attachment 2).</p>	<p>b. The additional sentence and diagram provide clarity on the preferred future development outcomes.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Cubitt, Fiona		c. Industrial buildings with heritage features should be preserved prior to rezoning.	c. Action already underway - no change required.	c. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan includes an action to undertake a review of the existing heritage overlay and gradings. This review is currently underway and will include industrial buildings. This heritage review has commenced and is being conducted in parallel with the Structure Plan. It is anticipated that the Arden-Macaulay Heritage Review will be considered by the Future Melbourne Committee in mid-2012. The Heritage Review will make recommendations for inclusion of properties in the Heritage Overlay and will be implemented through a Planning Scheme Amendment. In addition, objective 4 of principle 5 is to "Reuse existing building stock where feasible, including existing industrial buildings".

Author	Individual/ Organisatio n	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Access</b></p> <p>a. The plan does not adequately address traffic issues - existing congestion and future increased congestion that will occur with population growth (particularly on Macaulay Road and Dynon Road). Reduced reliance on cars is not realistic without significant increase in public transport which is out of the City of Melbourne's jurisdiction. Additional rail services will exacerbate traffic queuing on Macaulay Road and more delays for buses.</p>	<p>a. Include explanation of the constraints and opportunities to address traffic issues at the Macaulay Road/rail crossing intersection into Chapter 4 - Issues.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan recommends the development of a dynamic traffic management plan that minimises the impact of non-local vehicular traffic traversing the area. Private cars are low occupancy vehicles that quickly fill up limited space on the road network, thus priority will be provided to high occupancy vehicles, such as trains, to improve efficiency of access.</p> <p>While implementing a grade separation between Macaulay Road and the Craigieburn and Upfield railway lines would reduce conflict at this intersection, it would also be extremely costly for minimal traffic improvements given the width of Macaulay Road. Grade separation may have the impact of generating higher traffic volume and speeds which would compromise the amenity of the Kensington local centre and proposed Macaulay local centre. The design of separating railway and road infrastructure can also separate communities and would impact on the heritage character in the Kensington Station vicinity. The Structure Plan treats the roads west of the Moonee Ponds Creek, including Macaulay Road as local roads.</p>
		<p>b. Public transport is already at or beyond capacity. This will worsen with proposed growth. Upgrades locally (Metro line and Arden Central) and to outer areas (rail lines feeding into Kensington) need upgrading.</p>	<p>b. Addressed in Final Draft plan - No change required.</p>	<p>b. The City of Melbourne will continue to advocate for the Melbourne Metro, which aims to increase the capacity of the entire public transport network. This will help to alleviate stress on the City Loop to enable improved peak services. In addition, the City of Melbourne will continue to work with transport authorities for improved service frequency, and upgrades to stations to improve pedestrian access.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisatio n	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		c. Buses will be ineffective due to existing congestion and future increases in traffic congestion.	c. Include reference to the dedicated lanes that will provide bus priority on Boundary Road, as shown in Appendix A, in the Transport Section.	c. The Structure Plan proposes the bus route along Boundary Road will be given priority through a dedicated bus lane. This is shown in the street section in Appendix A.
		d. Flooding on Dynon Road will need to be addressed before incorporating a tram line.	e. Agreed, No change required.	e. The City of Melbourne will continue to advocate for a new tram along Dynon Road to better connect to Footscray and future growth on Dynon Road. The design and delivery will have to consider any potential flooding impacts.
	<p><b>5. Public Realm &amp; Open Space</b></p> <p>a. Further information required on Moonee Ponds Creek open space proposal, considering flooding issues.</p>		a. No change - detail to be provided through future master plan.	<p>a. The Structure Plan identifies opportunities to expand the Creek corridor to diversify how this area is used as public open space. The Arden-Macaulay Structure plan recommends that a master plan be prepared for the Moonee Ponds open space proposal to develop the best design outcome for this parkland. This would be developed with the input of key stakeholders. It will need to address any potential flooding issues as well as consider environmental and social benefits. Public open space can be included in areas which are subject to flooding and designed in a manner which is appropriate. The Structure Plan also identifies new public open space in areas where there are no flooding issues. These areas can accommodate a range of other open space uses and activities which would not be appropriate in an area subject to flooding.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. Each development needs to have minimum requirements for open space.</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>b. Design principles and provisions included in the Melbourne Planning Scheme seek to ensure adequate private open space is included in new developments. The Victorian Guidelines for Higher Density Residential Development includes objectives to ensure access to adequate open space is provided for all residents. The Structure Plan focuses on providing new public open space. This includes the provision of in-kind land contributions on larger development sites (See Strategy 9). All development will contribute to provision of open space through a levy - either a direct financial contribution to Council or in-kind land contribution on these larger sites.</p>
		<p>c. What happens to existing, viable businesses in sites proposed for open space (eg. Sutton Street)?  d. Building heights of 20m will overshadow open spaces. Stepped building heights may be viable solution.</p>	<p>c. No change required.  d. Reduce proposed height controls on properties fronting Haines Street, at 157 Racecourse Road and properties south of Chelmsford between Elizabeth and Fink Street to avoid excessive shading of Gardiners Reserve and proposed parks. Update Figure 3.17 with Figure A (in Attachment 2).</p>	<p>c. Council is in discussion with the owners of the affected sites to enable a transition from existing uses to open space on these sites.  d. The proposed building height and setback controls comply with the City of Melbourne's Urban Design policy, Clause 22.02 (Sunlight to Public Places) which prevents overshadowing public open space between 11am and 2pm. The height adjacent to Gardiners Reserve and the two new parks has been reduced to ensure compliance with this policy.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b></p> <p>a. How will Plan be implemented? It needs to be well coordinated to deliver desired planning outcomes.</p>	<p>a. Incorporate an additional Chapter - Chapter 8: Implementation</p>	<p>a. An additional Chapter will be included to demonstrate the staging of implementing all the actions included in the Plan. The City of Melbourne will prepare a Planning Scheme Amendment to support the implementation the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan. This will include amendment to the zoning, built form controls and opportunities to deliver new public open spaces. A separate Planning Scheme Amendment will be prepared in parallel to implement the Arden-Macaulay Heritage Review. The City of Melbourne will continue to work with key stakeholders and the community to implement other policy, advocacy, further design and research actions of the Structure Plan.</p>
<b>Oddie, Kaye</b>	Individual	<p><b>1. Executive Summary &amp; Introduction</b></p> <p>a. Increase in residential population (8-10 fold) should be matched by increase in open space (10+ fold)</p> <p>b. Compulsory acquisition of open space is required and must precede development approvals.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p> <p>b. Agreed, no change required.</p>	<p>a. The draft Melbourne Open Space Strategy identifies the quantity of open space needed in Arden-Macaulay to support the growing community. This has been prepared through an analysis of existing open spaces, the needs of existing and future communities. The number and size of these spaces have been integrated into the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan.</p> <p>b. The City of Melbourne is in discussion with the owners of identified open space sites. Where appropriate, mechanisms to acquire open spaces such as a Planning Acquisition Overlay will be implemented through a Planning Scheme Amendment.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. Funding collected to date through existing 'developer levy' for NWM area must be used immediately to purchase open space on MPCreek to meet objectives of MSS.</p> <p>d. Insert sentence on page 6 as follows: 'In the plan, the principles that are relevant to each section will be addressed.' to clarify that not all principles apply to all chapters.</p> <p>e. Ensure consistent formatting.</p> <p>f. Clarify statement "The growth framework plan in the draft MSS describes Arden-Macaulay as predominantly an urban renewal area." as the revised Growth Framework Plan (Planning Panels Victoria, August 2011) shows the area is predominantly 'ongoing change' area.</p>	<p>c. No change required.</p> <p>d. Include sentence as suggested.</p> <p>e. Apply consistent formatting throughout Structure Plan.</p> <p>f. No change required.</p>	<p>c. The Structure Plans include an action to prepare an Open Space Levy that will contribute to the purchase of new open space and the construction of parks.</p> <p>d. Including this sentence provides greater clarification.</p> <p>e. Ensure consistency in document.</p> <p>f. The draft MSS (approved by Council) includes this area as an urban renewal area. Ongoing change areas can still be subject to growth and therefore are included in the Structure Plan.</p>
		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; land uses</b></p> <p>a. Acknowledge in the overview that contamination of industrial sites could constrain development.</p> <p>b. Include objective to increase the amount of public open space.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p> <p>b. Include additional objective in Activities &amp; Land Uses, Principle 3 as follows: '9. Increase the provision of open space to support population growth.'</p>	<p>a. The potential impact of contamination of industrial sites is discussed in the issues section.</p> <p>b. To ensure that an objective of the transition of land uses in Arden-Macaulay is to deliver an increase to the open space network.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. Update Figure 1.1, CLUE 2008 land uses to a 2012 current plan and fix minor errors. d. Provide legend to better explain figure 2.2.</p>	<p>c. No change required. d. Include legend for figure 2.2 as requested.</p>	<p>c. Update map to latest available data - CLUE 2010 - to reflect current uses. d. To explain the information displayed in figure 2.2.</p>
		<p>e. Reword paragraph 3 on page 21 to: "Some of the primary industrial uses may cause off-site amenity impacts upon other land uses. Such impacts on residential neighbours could include noise and air emissions, light spill and traffic." [delete "The off-site amenity impacts are unknown ... neighbours."] f. Remove sentence "Additional development yields (read higher building heights, density and site coverage) may be needed to compensate for the remediation costs." The cost of remediation should be factored into a lower purchase price for the land, not compromise of the objectives of the Structure Plan for liveable neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>e. No change required. f. No change required.</p>	<p>e. In some instances, the off-site amenity impacts of primary industrial uses on other types of uses are not clear and can vary depending on existing uses. f. The built form proposals are determined by a series of design objectives that must be considered in all development outcomes. The sentence provides clarity that some sites could be significantly contaminated and require additional development yield to enable development.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>g. Figures 2.5, 2.7 – A number of parks and reserves in North and West Melbourne had extensions to their PPRZ zoning formalised following official discontinuation of unused road reservations that abutted or ran through them. These changes are not shown on Figures 2.5 and 2.7 for Gardiner Reserve, Pleasance Gardens and Vaughan Tce Reserve and should be corrected.</p>	<p>g. No change required.</p>	<p>g. Current approved zoning maps have been used in the preparation of the Structure Plan. The Public Park and Recreation Zone is not necessarily applied to all formally identified parks.</p>
		<p>h. Include preschool, primary or secondary school education facilities (or for older age/retirees) to serve the 4000+ additional residents.            i. The draft Structure Plan does not appear to recognise that overseas tertiary student numbers are falling and that another tertiary facility may not be warranted, let alone 'advocated for'.</p>	<p>h. Include community hubs and potential school site (to be confirmed with the DEECD) in Figure 2.10.            i. No changes required.</p>	<p>h. Provide clarity on proposed land uses and ensure consistency in document.            i. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan provides recommendations for the transition of the area over the next 30 years. Over the course of the implementation of the plan, demand for different facilities and services will fluctuate. The Structure Plan indicates that a tertiary education centre is being included in the proposal for Arden Central, which will be subject to a separate master plan prepared in conjunction with the State Government. The feasibility of this education centre will be considered through this master planning process.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Figure 2.10 – Amend legend from 'New laneway connections' to 'New laneway and pathway connections' as the proposed new laneway connection between Macaulay Rd and Shiel St is too steep to accommodate vehicular access. 8m laneway openings into Shiel St will significantly compromise the existing heritage graded tree avenue, in which there is only 10m between trees. It may be there will be other 'new laneways' in the plan that would be better designated as pedestrian pathways.</p>	<p>a. Revise wording in Urban Structure and Built Form, Strategy 2 from 'Laneways are to be a minimum width of 8m to accommodate vehicular movements' to 'Laneways should be designed to accommodate shared access which prioritises pedestrians and cyclists then vehicular access (where required and feasible) to provide access to private off-site parking. The design should accommodate garbage removal and significant landscaping opportunities. An 8m laneway will achieve this aim. A minimum width of 6 metres is required.'</p>	<p>a. The design and role of the new laneway network will prioritise pedestrian and cycling access and therefore there is no need to differentiate with pathways. Any laneways that are too steep to accommodate vehicular traffic will be considered at the detail design scale.</p>
		<p>b. Add to end of Objectives, Principle 4, point 4: "New buildings that adjoin heritage buildings have regard to the height, scale, rhythm and proportions of the heritage buildings and the streetscapes".</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>b. The Arden-Macaulay already contains a design objective to ensure that new development relates to adjacent heritage properties and the streetscape setting. See Principle 5, point 3.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisatio n	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		c. Add to beginning of Objectives, Principle 4, point 5 - 'Retain existing street geometry and respect historic street patterns in the urban renewal areas. Align buildings with the street pattern.'	c. No change required.	c. This is addressed in Objective 5 of Principle 4 (refers to aligning buildings with the street pattern) and Objective 3 of Principle 5.
		d. Add point 6 in Principle 6 'Discourage car parking and garages in street frontages'. e. Clarify impact of 'passive surveillance' on experience of open space as this can involve intrusion of private uses/development onto the park. Add point 'Ensure built development does not visually dominate public open spaces, parks, gardens and reserves and detract from the enjoyment of those spaces by the park users.' g. Reword Principle 7, point 9 to include protection from impact of 'air emissions'. h. Principle 7 (or 10) - Add dot point: 'Protect solar access for photovoltaic and solar hot water systems.'	d. No change required. e. No change required. g. Revise point to read ' Protect private internal amenity from off-site impacts, including noise, light spill, odour and other off-site impacts as appropriate'. h. No change required.	d. The third point in Objective 6 refers to limiting vehicular access along edges of open space, and the second dot point refers to having active frontages to open space. e. The Melbourne Planning Scheme provides guidance for the design of buildings adjacent to open spaces. g. Note, air emissions are measured by the Environmental Protection Authority and not City of Melbourne. h. The City of Melbourne will continue to advocate for improvements to the Victorian Planning System with respect to supporting the performance of solar systems.



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>I. Figure 3.4 and accompanying text: Clarify meaning of 'Proposed activity node'. Proposed activity nodes (and associated development) should not compromise existing character of Shiel St. Clarify the potential conflicts with the existing 'Stable Areas' and provide guidelines to protect those areas within the red activity node circles.</p>	<p>I. No change required.</p>	<p>I. The red circle of the activity nodes indicate a nominal 400m catchment. The zoning and built form propositions for each node are considered in more detail in Chapters 2 and 3 where interface conditions are considered in detail.</p>
		<p>j. Mandate extent of impervious ground area on each site to ensure that contaminated sites are not sealed with concrete. k. Include Melbourne Freight Terminal in Dynon Road as a significant generator of noise (and 24-hour operation).</p>	<p>j. No change required. k. Include as potential source in discussion of existing industrial noises.</p>	<p>j. The Structure Plan encourages a minimum of 30% green impervious area within each new development. Each development site will have specific site conditions and will be assessed on an individual basis. k. Included to provide clarity on potential noise sources.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>I. I support the revised Growth Framework Plan (August 2011) of the MSS, which recognises that the Melbourne Metro rail link has not been built or funded and is a long-term proposition. I do not support the State Government's DPCD letter to the MSS/Amendment C162 Planning Panels Victoria Chairman (dated 9 December 2011) indicating that the increased development density ('Urban Renewal Areas') should be set in place regardless of the rail link being approved, funded and built. What happens if the rail link does not proceed – and there are examples of rail links not being built in Melbourne – the Doncaster Rail Link and Melbourne Airport Link are two? Overdevelopment of the areas in question would take place; developers would gain unjustified, increased profits. Many of the Structure Plan's ten principles will have been trashed.</p>	<p>I. No change required.</p>	<p>I. The Structure Plan has been staged to ensure that development does not proceed in the southern area until the development of the Metro is committed by the State Government. The southern portion of Arden-Macaulay will therefore be designed in a manner which is well integrated with the new Metro station.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>m. Strategy 2 - Pedestrian pathways should be included in the mix. Specify minimum pedestrian pathway widths as 2.5m-3m to allow for mechanised footpath sweeper; and amend Actions – Policy (page 41) to include 'pathways'.</p>	<p>m. No change required.</p>	<p>n. Upgrades and enhancement to the existing pedestrian pathway network are considered in Chapter 5: Public Realm and Appendix A.</p>
		<p>n. Revise list under 'Location of new laneways has been determined by these considerations:' Revise point 5 to 'Providing rear services access for deliveries and garbage removal in local activity centres.' Revise point 6 to 'Protecting the integrity of the existing streets from many vehicular crossovers into private and public developments which compromises the pedestrian experience and streetscape values.'</p>	<p>N. Revise points as suggested.</p>	<p>n. Provides greater clarity on laneway location.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>o. Figure 3.9 - Edit Figure description to 'Melbourne examples of mixed use, mid-rise and high density development – to reflect the photos, left to right.</p> <p>p. Figure 3.10 - This is where the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan loses credibility. Where is the additional open space to cater for all the extra residents and workers? Image depicts poor outcome for open space. Much larger areas of public open space must be acquired/purchased within the Arden-Macaulay urban renewal areas to enable high quality public open space of sufficient sizes to avoid being overwhelmed and overshadowed by surrounding developments.</p>	<p>o. No change required. P. No change required.</p>	<p>o. All photographs depict mixed use, mid rise and high density developments. P. Figure 3.10 indicates proposed building controls to illustrate the proposed scale of development in context with adjacent suburbs. Actual buildings within the Structure Plan area are not shown. Private open space is not shown. Additional public open space that is provided as an in-kind contribution (in lieu of a open space levy cash contribution) is also not shown and will increase the provision of public open space. The degree of open space required has been determined by the draft Open Space Strategy. The built form proposals comply with the City of Melbourne's Clause 22.02: Sunlight to Public Open Spaces policy.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>q. Strategy 3 - "To achieve these criteria" &amp; Figure 3.12 - As shown by the examples in Appendix A, a 1:1 building height to street width, with no upper storey setbacks is too large. Six storey buildings on either side of a 20m wide street will 'canyonise' the street leading to poor amenity. Buildings will adversely dominate the streetscape and lead to poor residential and streetscape amenity, which is against the many objectives, principles and strategies in the structure plan. For example, the criteria (no. 1) to provide 5 hours of sunlight to ground floors within the streets with residential uses is pure 'mickey mouse' as the structure plan encourages a vertical mix use of uses through buildings with retail on ground floor, minimum 4m retail/commercial/ 'convertible' ground floor heights so no sunlight will be required at any level of the 20+m buildings where the ground floor is retail/ commercial! And the discretionary building heights the structure plan proposes, a 1:1 ratio will be meaningless.</p>	<p>q. Incorporate additional sentence into Chapter 3, Strategy 4 as follows: 'The proposed height control at the street frontage or property boundary are mandatory. Beyond the street frontage or property boundary, the height limits proposed are discretionary. Any discretion must comply with the setback conditions as outlined in Figures 3.13 to 3.16.' Update Figures 3.13 - 3.16 as per Figure C (in attachment 2).</p>	<p>q. Provide clarity on extent of mandatory and discretionary controls and illustrate design criteria for discretion.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>r. Strategy 3 - 4th last para: "Upper height limits are proposed as discretionary height limits." This single statement makes the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan a farcical strategic planning document. With discretionary upper height limits, Figures such as 3.17 are meaningless. Many of the ten Principles will be negated, as will their associated strategies, policies and actions. The structure plan's statement should be reworded as 'Upper height limits are proposed as mandatory height limits.'</p>	<p>r. Incorporate additional sentence into Chapter 3, Strategy 4 as follows: 'The proposed height control at the street frontage or property boundary are mandatory. Beyond the street frontage or property boundary, the height limits proposed are discretionary. Any discretion must comply with the setback conditions as outlined in Figures 3.13 to 3.16.' Update Figures 3.13 - 3.16 as per Figure C (in attachment 2).</p>	<p>r. Provide clarity on extent of mandatory and discretionary controls and illustrate design criteria for discretion.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>s. Strategy 4 – Interface Streets - Why shouldn't Interface Streets complement the existing heights of the established built form in the street by starting off at the same height? And particularly where the established built form is a Stable Area as defined in the MSS. For Shiel Street, the mandatory maximum height control on the southern side of the street should commence at 9m, stepping up to 10.5m, thence 14m to a maximum of 20m, with appropriate setbacks, and with the 20m height determined by the Macaulay Rd frontage. 30m (9-10 storeys) is too high for this interface block between the 'Stable Area' on the northern side of Shiel St and Macaulay Rd. 30+m would 'adversely dominate' the North Melbourne Recreation Reserve.</p>	<p>s. Reduce height controls at the interfaces with residential areas - include updated diagrams into Structure Plans as shown in Figure A and C (in attachment 2) to illustrate revised heights and setbacks in interface areas.</p>	<p>s. To ensure an appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>
		<p>(continued) These lower height limits for Shiel St through to Macaulay Rd would better meet MSS guidelines. Haines St South is also an Interface Street with Gardiner Reserve opposite which has not been recognised in the structure plan with protection of its scale, character and amenity as an existing local neighbourhood park and valued open space.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>t. Update figure 3.18 to reference the Melbourne Planning Scheme's Heritage Places Inventory, City of Moonee Valley Planning Scheme Heritage Places Inventory, and to the Conservation Studies of North &amp; West Melbourne and Kensington to ascertain all missing heritage buildings and precincts.</p> <p>u. Strategy 6, p52. Include green rooftops in calculation for building height.</p> <p>v. Strategy 6 – Actions - Policy - Replace: “Encourage” the provision of communal open spaces in new developments with ‘incorporate’ controls in the Planning Scheme for the provision of communal open spaces in new developments. Otherwise, the policy means ‘zilch’ and wouldn’t be entertained by developers against their profit margins.</p>	<p>t. No change required.</p> <p>U. Agreed, no change required.</p> <p>V. No change required.</p>	<p>t. Plan illustrates existing heritage controls within the Melbourne Planning Scheme. The review of the existing overlay is currently underway and will review all heritage items, not just buildings.</p> <p>U. Building heights are determined by height of building structure overall, regardless of use of rooftop.</p> <p>v. Not all sites will require the incorporation of communal public space. This is particularly relevant for small sites. On larger sites, an in-kind contribution of land, rather than an open space levy will contribute to an increased public open space network.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisatio n	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>w. Replace: 'exceptional' trees with 'significant' trees. The accepted terminology used in planning and heritage and in tree registers is 'significant'.</p> <p>x. Add: Apply open space levies to all new development to enable provision of additional public open space within the Arden-Macaulay area.</p> <p>y. Strategy 7 - It is strongly reiterated that the use of the terminology - 'passive surveillance' - must be qualified so that it does not become 'obtrusive' 'unwanted' surveillance of park users.</p> <p>z. Provide for walking, cycling and limited vehicle access along edges of open space to facilitate the activation of the edges. Add dot point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduce built form controls to provide an interface or buffer to protect public open space from adverse impacts of built development.</li> </ul>	<p>W. No change required.</p> <p>X. Agreed, no change required.</p> <p>Y. No change required.</p> <p>Z. Agreed, include additional dot point.</p>	<p>w. An 'exceptional tree register' is already under preparation. Go to <a href="http://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/Environment/UrbanForest/Pages/ExceptionalTreeRegister.aspx">http://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/Environment/UrbanForest/Pages/ExceptionalTreeRegister.aspx</a> for further information.</p> <p>x. An open space levy is proposed for all new development in the City of Melbourne.</p> <p>y. Passive surveillance is important to create a safe public realm. Individual developments will be assessed to make sure that they provide a positive contribution to the public realm without compromising the experience of the public.</p> <p>z. Clarifies desired outcome for interface between buildings and parks.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>aa.</b> Figure 3.2 - The unconventional way of depicting the land, with the direction of North pointing downwards, should be reversed so that Macaulay Rd is at the top and Arden St is at the bottom of the figure. The legend would remain stet.</p> <p><b>bb.</b> Figure 3.3 - Need to check and correct the spelling on this and all figures in the draft structure plan to Macaulay Road, not MacAulay or Macauley. [Also need to apply consistent use of either 'Arden-Macaulay' or 'Arden Macaulay' throughout the Structure Plan]</p>	<p>aa. No change required.</p> <p>bb. Spelling errors will be amended throughout structure plan.</p>	<p>aa. The aerial image provided does not need to be oriented north to convey the development pattern of the area.</p> <p>bb. All spelling errors to be amended in structure plan.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>cc. Figure 3.17 - Proposed building heights and setback controls - The maximum building heights along the Moonee Ponds Creek should be amended to 5 storeys (14-16m) to comply with the MPS Incorporated Plan Overlay 5 - Moonee Ponds Creek Concept Plan (see page 35), not 20m or 30m as depicted in Figure 3.17.</p> <p>dd. It should be noted there is little likelihood of the SPI AusNet West Melbourne Electricity Terminal site, bounded by Arden St, Lloyd St, the Moonee Ponds Creek and the railway line, being redeveloped. SPI PowerNet made clear at recent Planning Panels Victoria MSS/Am C162 hearings that it is planning to continue the existing use for another 50 years with major upgrade scheduled to commence in 2012.</p>	<p>cc. Remove references to the discretionary height control of five storeys underneath heading regarding the Incorporated Plan Overlay 5 - Moonee Ponds Creek Concept Plan.</p>	<p>cc. a. The reference to the Incorporated Plan Overlay (IPO) 5 – Moonee Ponds Creek Concept Plan imposing a discretionary height control of five storeys is an error in the final draft. There is no discretionary height control designates within the IPO. Any development proposal will need to comply with the building height and setback controls of the City of Melbourne's Urban Design policy, Clause 22.02 (Sunlight to Public Places) which prevents overshadowing public open space between 11am and 2pm.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>dd. The 30m maximum proposed building height along the NE and SW sides of Macaulay Rd, between Vaughan Tce/Haines St South and Gracie St/Fogarty St respectively should be reduced to 20m, similar to Laurens St. It could be argued that Laurens St, being closer to the future Arden Metro station, should have the 30m heights instead. Also, with 30+m building heights along NE Macaulay Rd and Arden St, and 20-30+m building heights along Fogarty St, the North Melbourne Recreation Reserve stands to become 'adversely dominated' by surrounding buildings and its amenity downgraded.</p>	<p>dd. No change to the Structure Plan.</p>	<p>dd. Noted.</p>
		<p>ee. The heights proposed adjacent to the parks are too high and contributes to this degrading of the quality and amenity of the existing parks, gardens and the Moonee Ponds Creek – and perpetrates it for proposed new parks and open spaces - by allowing 20-30+m discretionary high buildings to surround them (cf Figure 3.17). ff. Amend minor errors through document, including missing study area boundary, editorial errors, spelling errors, text size, legends and provide full references. Ensure colours on maps are clearly legible and distinguishable.</p>	<p>ee. No change required. ff. No change required. gg. All spelling and grammatical errors will be amended throughout structure plan. Colours will be refined where necessarily to assist legibility.</p>	<p>ee. This area forms part of Stage 2 and therefore will not be changed. ff. Development proposals will need to comply with the City of Melbourne's Clause 22.02: Sunlight to Public Open Spaces policy. The built form proposals will enhance the activation of the creek corridor and adjacent open spaces. gg. All spelling errors to be amended in structure plan. Colours to be refined where necessary.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Access</b></p> <p>a. Principal 8 Add 8. Protect surrounding residential areas and local neighbourhoods from through, commuter and freight traffic.</p> <p>b. Issues .... access to two tram routes (#57 along Flemington/Racecourse Rds and #59 along Flemington Rd)</p> <p>c. Legend for Fig 4.2 should read 'proposed' Melbourne Metro station ...'</p> <p>d. General edit for consistency - eg. replace 'cycle' path/route with 'shared pedestrian/cycle' path/route. Also, in this section, need to recognise and put forward a specific action to address the issue of pedestrian vs. recreational cycle vs. commuter cycle conflicts on shared paths.</p> <p>e. Strategy 2 - Key opportunities and Research- Figure 4.3 - Carving an off-road 'cycle' link on the west side of the Moonee Ponds Creek between Macaulay Rd and Arden St is crazy and totally opposed! This section of the Creek Corridor is the best piece of treed, grassed, usable open space with excellent amenity for passive recreational enjoyment.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p> <p>b. Amend issues to refer to two tram lines services.</p> <p>c. All legends in the structure plan will be corrected of any errors.</p> <p>D. Amend plan to be consistent.</p> <p>E. No change Proposed.</p> <p>F. Reduce number of Bridge crossings to include two crossings - at Sutton Street and near Chelmsford St.</p> <p>g. No change proposed.</p> <p>h. No change proposed.</p>	<p>a. Structure Plan refers to efficient movement of freight and traffic through the area.</p> <p>b. To correctly refer to two tram lines.</p> <p>c. To amend all errors.</p> <p>D. To ensure consistency.</p> <p>E. This will be considered through the preparation of the Moonee Ponds Creek Master Plan.</p> <p>f. Clarification provided.</p> <p>g. The proposed bus routes are designed to maximise connectivity between existing and future uses.</p> <p>h. The proposed cycle routes are designed to maximise connectivity between existing and future uses.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>f. Clarify text versus Figure 4.3 about the number of proposed pedestrian/cycle crossings over the Moonee Ponds Creek – one linking Sutton and Smith Sts, under the rail line and over the Creek or three crossings between Racecourse Rd and Macaulay Rd (Figure 4.3). There would appear to be little justification for three crossings in close proximity.</p>		
		<p>g. Figure 4.3 - The proposed bus route along Boundary Rd/Henderson St/Fogarty St should be rerouted to avoid destruction through widening of the existing narrow Henderson and Fogarty Sts and removal of their existing, attractive, mature tree avenues.  h. The proposed 'cycle' (rename as 'pedestrian/cycle') path between Munster Tce and Laurens St through the historic Laurens St Industrial Precinct, should be combined with the proposed laneway just to the north, and the combined path/lane should be marked 'subject to heritage considerations of the Laurens St Industrial Precinct'.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>Public Realm</b>  <b>Points in addition to those noted above in Urban Structure and Built Form are included below:</b></p> <p>a. This section fails to address children's playgrounds, which are an important part of the public realm and open space. The poor provision of children's playgrounds should be mentioned; there are only two in the nearby area: Gardiner Reserve and Robertson St. Park. Figure 5.3 would benefit from indicating existing children's playgrounds.</p> <p>b. Accessibility of open space - There are four crossing points: Racecourse, Macaulay, Arden and Dynon Rd within the study area.</p>	<p>a. Include location of children's playgrounds in Figure 5.3.  b. No change.</p>	<p>a. Update to provide clarity on existing facilities.  B. Noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisatio n	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. Figures 5.4 and 5.5 - As well as the very poor graphics, these figures are not particularly relevant to the Structure Plan. They are part of the Council's draft Urban Forest Strategy, which is currently undergoing consultation and has not been assessed or approved. In the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan, the draft Urban Forest and Open Space Strategies should be just referred to and as future policy documents.</p> <p>d. Figure 5.4 – Tree canopy cover – is misleading as it takes no account of evergreen vs. deciduous trees and their differing effects in winter vs. summer. Why are Macaulay Rd and Boundary Rd roadways coloured green?</p> <p>e. Figure 5.6 - This misleading figure indicates that Arden-Macaulay should be totally covered with buildings if low surface temperatures are to be achieved! Delete figure.</p>	<p>c. No change. D. No change. E. No change.</p>	<p>c. The figures provide context on the existing conditions within Arden-Macaulay. D. The figure includes all tree canopy and doesn't represent seasonal coverage. E. The figure provides clarity on the effect of the UHI in the public realm.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>f. Figures 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 should be replaced with an 'Existing Open Space' figure showing existing open spaces, existing treed streets, children's playground; it could also incorporate the walkable distances from Figure 5.3. The text can reference that tree ages and estimated longevity vary (draft Urban Forest Strategy) and existing tree canopy cover is 11%/desired 40%. Green, grassed areas and planted, garden areas are important factors in the overall picture, it is not just trees!</p> <p>g. Strategy 1: The Creek will not be revitalised with improved character/amenity as an environmental and recreational corridor unless a statement in keeping with the MSS provision (clause 21.04-5) is included, i.e. Limiting the scale of development along its banks will protect the character and amenity of the Creek Corridor.</p>	<p>F. Incorporate an additional figure that illustrates pedestrian catchments from existing and proposed parks into the Plan.</p> <p>G. No change.</p>	<p>f. Provide greater clarity on access to existing and new open spaces.</p> <p>G. The Built proposals in the Structure Plan will activate the Creek. The design of the creek corridor will be considered through a master plan.</p>
		<p>h. Design and Advocacy - Why should govt, other authorities and private landholders only be consulted? Community groups must be included in the statements.</p>	<p>h. Agreed.</p>	<p>h. The community will be consulted.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>i. Amend legend: Long-term investigation site for recreation space. Recreation should not be exclusive to 'active' recreation; 'passive' recreation should also be allowed for.</p> <p>'Fink Street' should be identified in Figure 5.7 – and also in Figures 3.17, 5.3, 6.1 and others as necessary. Otherwise, the location of the proposed Fink St Park is not identified.</p> <p>j. Strategy 3 - 1st dot point, add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifying potential sites for new parks on sites currently in public or private ownership. VicTrack, CityLink and the City of Melbourne own significant amounts of land that would be of potential use.</li> </ul>	<p>I. No change required.</p> <p>J. No change required.</p>	<p>i. A diversity of open space is required. This larger site has been identified as an opportunity to potentially address an increased need for active recreation (sport) as this requires significantly larger spaces than generally included in parks.</p> <p>J. New opportunity sites include VicTrack land. The parks have been located according to a designated set of criteria.</p>
		<p>k. Strategy 4 – North Melbourne Community Centre 2nd dot point: This implies that the indoor court and gymnasium recreational facilities at the NMCC could be relocated to the proposed open space along Langford St. So much for increasing the open space of the Moonee Ponds Creek Corridor (cf Figure 5.7), if it is then going to be built on! Need to clarify.</p>	<p>k. no change required.</p>	<p>k. The open space masterplans will consider the activities that will be programmed for in each park area.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>p. Strategy 8 - Figure 5.8 The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan does not include Shiel Street and Dryburgh St, north of Arden St. Therefore it cannot mandate changes to streets and areas outside its study area.</p>	<p>p. no change required.</p>	<p>p. The street sections are indicative of the type of street character desired that will deliver on the environmental and social principles outlined in the Plan. Any changes to streetscapes would be done through consultation with the community.</p>
		<p>6. Community Infrastructure  a. Strategy 1 Add:• Seniors programs (e.g. U3A)  b. Figure 6.1 Revise legend and plan to improve legibility and accuracy.  c. Strategy 4 - Is it realistic to advocate for a school on the Victorian Archives Centre site, given (1) the building is a recent construction; (2) it is understood the car park area is set aside for future expansion of the Archives Centre; (3) the site is likely to be significantly contaminated from its early use for a coal-gas gasometer; and (4) the recently constructed residential apartments fronting Macaulay Rd limit through access to Macaulay Rd  d. The proposal for a school, its requirements and amenity is not consistent with the structure plan's proposed building heights of 30+m for much of the site.</p>	<p>a. No change required.  B. Update to ensure legibility.  C. No change required.  D. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Services for the age are included in potential provisions at Community Hubs.  B. Ensure legibility.  C-d. The existing car park area is of sufficient size for a new school. Schools do not have to be delivered in the traditional format and can include multiple levels.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>7. Sustainable infrastructure</b></p> <p>a. Use consistent nomenclature: ML or megalitres, not Ml.</p> <p>b. Issues – Electricity - Amend: At the MSS/AmC162 Planning Panels Victoria hearings, SPI AusNet submitted that it is reconstruction is planned, starting in 2012 – not “in approximately ten years”. Include: Access to wind? e.g. roof top turbines??</p> <p>c. Figure 7.1 - The six sets of dashed lines for proposed ‘Electricity and water distribution from CHS’ across the Moonee Ponds Creek are opposed if they are located above ground and involving new infrastructure.</p> <p>d. Add ‘E-Gate’ to Figure 7.1 (in keeping with the text - Strategy 2.</p> <p>e. Strategy 6 - Advocacy - Must include Melbourne Water, a key responsible authority, in the consultations and liaisons.</p> <p>f. Strategy 9 - Opportunities - Add: • The City of Melbourne will strongly advocate for the introduction of state laws requiring deposits on all drinking containers to reduce the littering of streets and public open spaces and the pollution of waterways.</p>	<p>a. Update to include consistency.</p> <p>B. No change.</p> <p>C. Amend to revise timeframe of intended redevelopment of site.</p> <p>d. Include 'e-gate' on plan.</p> <p>e. Include Melbourne Water as important authority in the area.</p> <p>f. No change.</p>	<p>a. ensure consistency of formatting.</p> <p>B. Ensure updated information is included.</p> <p>C. Any proposed infrastructure would be located underground to ensure the design and environmental objectives are achieved within the creek.</p> <p>D. Provide context.</p> <p>E. Noted.</p> <p>F. This is not addressed at a Structure Plan level.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
McAuliffe, Rafe	Individual	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>a. Generally support the redevelopment of the Arden-Macaulay area and believe this is an excellent proposal overall, however have some specific concerns as outlined below.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>
		<p><b>3 Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Reduce proposed building heights at the Macaulay Road end of Barnett and Eastwood Streets to the order of 10m height maximum to ensure that the high value heritage character of these streets is not compromised. An abrupt change of 5m to 20m is inappropriate.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Access</b></p> <p>a. High density will produce detrimental effect on existing road network. Rail separations would be required for Craigieburn and Upfield lines. Further road upgrades in the area will be required.</p>	<p>a. Include explanation of the constraints and opportunities to address traffic issues at the Macaulay Road/rail crossing intersection into Chapter 4 - Issues.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan recommends the development of a dynamic traffic management plan that minimises the impact of non-local vehicular traffic traversing the area. Private cars are low occupancy vehicles that quickly fill up limited space on the road network, thus priority will be provided to high occupancy vehicles, such as trains, to improve efficiency of access.</p> <p>While implementing a grade separation between Macaulay Road and the Craigieburn and Upfield railway lines would reduce conflict at this intersection, it would also be extremely costly for minimal traffic improvements given the width of Macaulay Road. Grade separation may have the impact of generating higher traffic volume and speeds which would compromise the amenity of the Kensington local centre and proposed Macaulay local centre. The design of separating railway and road infrastructure can also separate communities and would impact on the heritage character in the Kensington Station vicinity. The Structure Plan treats the roads west of the Moonee Ponds Creek, including Macaulay Road as local roads.</p>
		<p>b. Restrict car parking to a maximum of 1 space per dwelling (located on-site) to avoid causing traffic chaos.</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>b. Car parking provision in new developments will be reviewed through the preparation of a Precinct Parking Plan which limits residential parking where possible, encourages car sharing and provides for bicycle parking.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
McAuliffe, Deb	Individual	<p><b>10. General Comments</b></p> <p>a. Generally support the redevelopment of the Arden-Macaulay area and believe this is an excellent proposal overall, however have some specific concerns.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>
		<p><b>3 Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Reduce proposed building heights at the Macaulay Road end of Barnett and Eastwood Streets to the order of 10m height maximum to ensure that the high value heritage character of these streets is not compromised. An abrupt change of 5m to 20m is inappropriate.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>4 Transport &amp; Access</b></p> <p>a. High density will produce detrimental effect on existing road network. Rail separations would be required for Craigieburn and Upfield lines. Further road upgrades in the area will be required.</p>	<p>a. Include explanation of the constraints and opportunities to address traffic issues at the Macaulay Road/rail crossing intersection into Chapter 4 - Issues.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan recommends the development of a dynamic traffic management plan that minimises the impact of non-local vehicular traffic traversing the area. Private cars are low occupancy vehicles that quickly fill up limited space on the road network, thus priority will be provided to high occupancy vehicles, such as trains, to improve efficiency of access.</p> <p>While implementing a grade separation between Macaulay Road and the Craigieburn and Upfield railway lines would reduce conflict at this intersection, it would also be extremely costly for minimal traffic improvements given the width of Macaulay Road. Grade separation may have the impact of generating higher traffic volume and speeds which would compromise the amenity of the Kensington local centre and proposed Macaulay local centre. The design of separating railway and road infrastructure can also separate communities and would impact on the heritage character in the Kensington Station vicinity. The Structure Plan treats the roads west of the Moonee Ponds Creek, including Macaulay Road as local roads.</p>
		<p>B. Restrict car parking to a maximum of 1 space per dwelling (located on-site) to avoid causing traffic chaos.</p>	<p>b. No change required. Action already included in plan.</p>	<p>b. Car parking provision in new developments will be reviewed through the preparation of a Precinct Parking Plan which limits residential parking where possible, encourages car sharing and provides for bicycle parking.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Cox, Geoff	Individual	<p><b>2. Land Use &amp; Activities</b></p> <p>a. Include location for a new school in Stage 1.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan identifies the Victorian Archives site in Shiel Street in North Melbourne as a suitable site for a potential school. This site is included in Stage 1. The State Government's Department of Education and Early Childhood Development is responsible for building and funding new schools. The DEECD will ultimately determine where a new primary school will be delivered to service inner Melbourne, however, the City of Melbourne will advocate for a new school in Arden-Macaulay.</p>
		<p><b>5. Public Realm &amp; Open Space</b></p> <p>a. Include a new open space in land north of Arden Street and east of Langford Street (currently City of Melbourne owned land) to service this area of Melbourne.</p>	<p>a. Include ped-shed diagrams for all existing and new parks to confirm access to parks in this area.</p>	<p>a. The area north of Arden Street has access to the existing parks (refer figure 5.3 that illustrates walking catchments to public open space). A new park is proposed in Arden Central (south of Arden Street) to provide open space in this area. A local park is also proposed for the area west of Langford Street.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>Cotter, Glenn</b>	Individual	<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Use</b></p> <p>a. Amend the land use zoning proposition to include the land bounded by Lloyd and Fink Streets as a Mixed Use Zone. This area is ideal for change and rejuvenation for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. Strategically this supports the need to accommodate population growth in inner city areas and recognises that industrial land is moving away from the CBD. Rezoning as mixed use will meet objectives of Clause 16 Housing of the City of Melbourne Planning Scheme.</p> <p>ii. Allied Mills can continue to operate with residents nearby. There are currently residents within 100m of the Mills. Welcome the opportunity to work with Allied Mills to ensure that all future residents understand that the Mills benefit from existing use rights and has the right to continue to operate.</p>	a. No change required.	a. The Business 3 Zone is more reflective of the existing mix of warehouses and offices in the area. The Business 3 Zone will support some new development, whilst also providing a buffer to the Allied Mills site which is a key primary industry in Victoria. A business zone will allow for an increase in employment uses. 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. As such, these provisions will enable existing industrial uses (those not permitted in a B3Z) and residential land uses to remain.

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) iii. The area already contains residential dwelling and is not pristine Industrial. Acoustic attenuation measures on new buildings will allow for changes to occur while still allowing Allied Mills to operate.</p> <p>iv. There are alternatives - eg. specific design overlays that would require new development to protect their own amenity or Section 173 agreements with new owners that stop them objecting to the operation of the mill and industrial uses. We support Allied Mills continued operation but don't believe this precludes change in the area.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) v. Rezoning to mixed use will meet objective of employment growth linked to public transport and Central Activities Districts and increase housing diversity and low-cost housing supply. There is much support from neighbours for rezoning to mixed use to reflect the existing uses and encourage rejuvenation. It does not make sense to keep land locked in the area for industrial usage as the precinct is expected to grow, the precinct is close to the CBD, it would increase employment opportunities and provide increase housing diversity and low cost housing</p>		
<b>Uren, Kate</b>	Individual	<p><b>10. General Comments</b>  a. Supportive of initiative to rejuvenate and revitalise Arden-Macaulay area. Proposals that bring in new residents are welcome. There are many great examples where industry and housing co-exist.</p>	a. No change required.	a. Noted.

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Use</b></p> <p>a. The south-west area of the Structure Plan should not be considered differently to the rest of the Arden-Macaulay area and should be rezoned now from Industrial 1 to Mixed Use. Industry (including Allied Flour Mills) and residents co-exist happily now and an arrangement that accommodates existing businesses in the area and allows future residents is possible and desirable to create a true mixed use zone.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Business 3 Zone is more reflective of the existing mix of warehouses and offices in the area. The Business 3 Zone will support some new development, whilst also providing a buffer to the Allied Mills site which is a key primary industry in Victoria. A business zone will allow for an increase in employment uses. 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. As such, these provisions will enable existing industrial uses (those not permitted in a B3Z) and residential land uses to remain.</p>
<p><b>Laurens Street Group (submitted by Courtney Witner of Rigby Cooke Lawyers)</b></p>	<p>Organisation</p>	<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Use</b></p> <p>a. All members of the represented group provide valuable services locally and within wider metropolitan Melbourne. Proposals to consider this area for urban renewal are premature as the strategic justification for this proposal, the delivery of the Melbourne Metro project, remains uncertain. Council's own recent revision of the MSS (C162) redesignates this area as Ongoing Change, not Urban Renewal. The structure plan cannot be considered until the status of the MSS and the MM Project are finalised.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan establishes a 30 year vision for the area. It acknowledges the need for a staged transition that is coordinated with the delivery of infrastructure to support urban renewal. The area bounded by Ink Lane, Langford Street, Boundary Road, Henderson Street, Fogarty Street, Arden Street and Dryburgh Street therefore forms part of Stage 2 of the Plan as urban renewal in this area must be coordinated with delivery of the Melbourne Metro that can support this change in use. Planning for the metro project is already underway. The Structure Plan provides a more comprehensive analysis of this area than the MSS which is a high level strategic document.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Hookey, Enid and Widmer, John	Individual	<p><b>10. General Comments</b></p> <p>a. The area north of Macaulay Road and west of Stubbs Street will be at the 'bleeding edge' of this experience of urban renewal.</p> <p>b. Addressing existing issues and the living conditions of existing residents and ratepayers could be the priority, rather than urban renewal.</p> <p>c. Items in the structure plan requiring advocacy and research and design work must be given priority over rezoning of land before advancing the concepts proposed, or given the acknowledged issues outside the City of Melbourne's control, the plan must be abandoned and an evolutionary approach to urban renewal be adopted.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p> <p>b. No change required.</p> <p>c. Include implementation chapter to provide clarity on the staging and coordination of implementation.</p>	<p>a. The integration of the urban renewal area at all interface areas has been carefully considered to ensure that the existing amenity of residents are not compromised. The built form proposals allow for a stepped increase in heights from the existing residential areas to the urban renewal areas. See figures A and C in attachment 2).</p> <p>b. Urban renewal will bring improvements to existing residents, including new local centres, enhance community services and facilities, and new and enhanced open space. Accommodating population growth is a significant challenge. Accommodating growth in the urban renewal areas will enable the protection of existing stable areas.</p> <p>c. The Structure Plan proposes a coordinated implementation of all actions. Rezoning can take approximately 1-2 years to implement and advocacy, research and design work can be progressed during this time period to ensure coordinated change.</p>
				<p>(continued) The rezoning will be accompanied by the introduction of a Developer Contributions Plan and open space levy that will provide some funding to implement actions within the Plan. An implementation chapter will be added to the plan to clarify the implementation staging.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Use</b></p> <p>a. The selection of this industrial land for rezoning and urban renewal is inappropriate for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) Locating high-rise apartments adjacent to CityLink is inappropriate as the City Link is a significant noise source. The structure plan acknowledges that noise should be dealt with at its source but offer no strategy for CityLink to build noise attenuation walls. Apartments will therefore be sealed boxed (with no passive cooling) and high levels of energy consumption for air conditioning. High-rise apartments will also overshadow the creek and compromise the quality of this open space.</p>	<p>a. Include action into Chapter 3, Strategy 6 to advocate to CityLink and the state government for sound attenuation of the CityLink freeway.</p>	<p>a. Opportunities to attenuate the noise emanating from the CityLink freeway should be explored to improve internal amenity. Acoustic attenuation of new developments is also recommended to ensure the quality of new dwellings.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. Railway services are at capacity and bottlenecks at North Melbourne station, into the Loop and into Flinders St station need to be solved to address network congestion. The advocacy suggested may take years to achieve any outcome.</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan recommends the development of a dynamic traffic management plan that minimises the impact of non-local vehicular traffic traversing the area. Private cars are low occupancy vehicles that quickly fill up limited space on the road network, thus priority will be provided to high occupancy vehicles, such as trains, to improve efficiency of access.</p> <p>While implementing a grade separation between Macaulay Road and the Craigieburn and Upfield railway lines would reduce conflict at this intersection, it would also be extremely costly for minimal traffic improvements given the width of Macaulay Road. Grade separation may have the impact of generating higher traffic volume and speeds which would compromise the amenity of the Kensington local centre and proposed Macaulay local centre. The design of separating railway and road infrastructure can also separate communities and would impact on the heritage character in the Kensington Station vicinity. The Structure Plan treats the roads west of the Moonee Ponds Creek, including Macaulay Road as local roads.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. Moonee Ponds Creek is subject to flash flooding and it is not feasible to redesign the creek without enormous expense. Pedestrian and cycling bridge crossings may not be feasible. City of Melbourne has no authority to rework the creek.</p>	<p>b. Remove the proposed creek crossings at Parsons Street and Robertson Street.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure plan recommends that a master plan be prepared for the Moonee Ponds open space proposal with the input of key stakeholders which would address any potential flooding issues. The expansion of the Creek corridor will diversify how this area is used as public open space. Public open space can be included in areas which are subject to flooding and designed in a manner which is appropriate. The City of Melbourne has an important role in leading a coordinated response that brings all relevant stakeholders into a shared process. Sufficient pedestrian and cycling connectivity is provided with few crossings. This provides a crossing point approximately every 200m.</p>
		<p>c. Residential car parking policy is unresolved. Additional population will bring increased traffic and parking demand. This needs to be solved now.</p>	<p>c. No change required.</p>	<p>b. Car parking provision in new developments will be reviewed through the preparation of a Precinct Parking Plan which limits residential parking where possible, encourages car sharing and provides for bicycle parking.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>e) Existing single storey homes will receive less sunlight and be overlooked. A 3m high dwelling is not in context with a 20m or higher square block fronting the pavement without a garden as a buffer or setback. The visual incongruity of stable areas abutting urban renewal built form will be stark and jarring, ridiculous even. Stable areas of Kensington not under heritage overlay need more protection. The dwellings that are low, small-scale character will become the anomalies with eroded amenity. Isolated areas under heritage control will likely suffer the same fate.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls at the interfaces with residential areas - include updated diagrams into Structure Plans as shown in Figure A and C (in attachment 2) to illustrate revised heights and setbacks in interface areas.</p>	<p>a. To ensure an appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character. At the interface areas, new buildings will be no more than 1 storey higher than existing structures.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>10. General Comments</b></p> <p>a. The City of Melbourne should not proceed to waste further taxes/rates on this structure plan until:</p> <p>i) The results of the Planning Panel's review of the latest version of the MSS are released for public review.</p> <p>ii) An updated study of the usage of industrial-zoned land is made and published. This study is dated 2008 and includes many inaccuracies.</p> <p>iii) The many advocacy and research statements included in the structure plan for Years 1 - 5 are replaced with feasible, implementable plans, authorised by external agencies and authorities upon which they depend.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan has been prepared in parallel with the Municipal Strategic Statement. The Structure Plan provides a more comprehensive analysis of this area than the MSS which is a high level strategic document. The Structure Plan provides for the transition of the precinct which is consistent with the draft MSS.</p> <p>b. The Industrial Land Use Study 2008 has been completed and considered by the Future Melbourne Committee. Council acknowledges the limitations of this study as it was an industrial land use study, not an industrial strategy. Council is considering the development of an Industrial Strategy.</p> <p>c. The City of Melbourne will work in partnership with the community, key stakeholders and government organisations and agencies to implement all actions in the Structure Plan.</p>
<b>Kensington Residents Association</b>	Organisation	<p><b>10. General Comments</b></p> <p>a. The impetus for 'urban renewal' is reasonable, given the underutilisation of much of the industrial land. The Association has given its in-principle support to the strategic planning process and has been very involved in participating in meetings and drafting submissions on the plan.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>3 Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. It is not clear whether the proposed heights are to be advisory or mandatory. Our view is that advisory height limits have little value in protecting amenity and therefore request that heights be mandatory. This submission is predicated on the assumption that heights are mandatory.</p> <p>b. Overall intensity of development (represented by 20m height limit) and inadequate protection for existing residential areas at the interfaces are serious matters that require fundamental consideration. The proposed 10.5m height at interfaces, and the shallowness of these transition areas are major concerns to the Association.</p> <p>c. The Draft Plan and the Draft MSS do not provide justification for the extent of development growth proposed in terms of height, scale and density. As the Plan declares growth must not be at unreasonable cost of the established community.</p>	<p>a. Include additional clarification on the extent of mandatory and discretionary controls and include updated diagrams as shown at Figures B and C in Attachment 2.</p> <p>b. Reduce height controls at the interfaces with existing residential areas and include updated diagrams into plans as shown in Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p> <p>c. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Provide clarity on extent of mandatory and discretionary controls.</p> <p>b. To ensure an appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p> <p>c. Proposed height, scale and density of urban renewal areas takes into account the impact on the established community.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>d. 10.5m interface in many areas will result in new structures dominating the existing residences. This is particularly the case where URA's adjoin low-scale residential properties or laneways. The 10.5m are too narrow and the change to 20m is too abrupt. The section diagrams shown on pp. 132-133 are alarming and indicative of these concerns. An incremental increase in building height and scale is required.</p> <p>e. We propose lower building heights at interface sites, no more than one storey higher than the existing height of residential dwellings, and ground-level landscaping and courtyards adjoining backyards/laneways. This is also likely to result in achieving more varied dwelling types/household sizes to promote a diverse population.</p>	<p>d. e. Reduce height controls at the interfaces with existing residential areas and include updated diagrams into plans as shown in Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>d. e. To ensure an appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>f. Incremental change in building height in line with the slope of Macaulay Road is suggested to add visual interest and recognise existing view lines and vistas. The proposed height of 20m at the corner of Rankins/Macaulay and Barnett/Macaulay are considered inappropriate. Identification of important views/vistas from public places is necessary to ensure that views are preserved.</p> <p>g. There is scope for 20m high buildings in certain locations however this height should not predominate and must be well away from existing residential interfaces.</p>	<p>f. Reduce height controls at the interfaces with existing residential areas and include updated diagrams into plans as shown in Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p> <p>g. No change required.</p>	<p>f. To ensure an appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p> <p>g. Noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Tyler, Jeff, Amra and Hope	Individual	<p><b>3 Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Reduce proposed building heights of 20m at the corners of Rankins and Macaulay Roads, and Barnett Street and Macaulay Road. Any structure at the corner of Rankins and Macaulay Roads will impact on the residential area fronting Rankins Road, which is a heritage overlay area (including properties from about 143 Rankins Road, with increasing severity of impact in proximity to the property adjoining the mixed-use area, 167 Rankins Road). Any structure erected on the site bounded by laneway, Macaulay Road, Barnett Street and laneway will also impact Rankins Road and Barnett Street properties. The proposed height is completely inappropriate for an interface and would have a devastating impact on the adjoining residential and heritage overlay areas, including:</p> <p>i) objectional visual bulk of 6-storey buildings compared with the adjoining 1- and 2-storey residential built form.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) ii) domination of the precinct by buildings that are out of scale with the existing built form.</p> <p>iii) potential overlooking into front and rear open spaces of adjoining properties.</p> <p>iv) detrimental impact on the heritage character of the existing precinct by the imposition of modern structures of excessive height.</p> <p>v) a drastic change in impact from the existing single storey structures to new 6-storey structures.</p> <p>The 20m height is also inconsistent with the planning and design principles (Principle 4, p38). Suitable building scale, heights and setbacks have not been introduced at Rankins/Macaulay and Macaulay/Barnett, nor does it appear that the existing character, context and immediate amenity have been sufficiently taken into account, and this would not bring a positive or respectful character.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) Even a height of 10.5m, which is applied at many sections of the interface between the proposed mixed use zone and existing residences, would have severe impact on Rankins Road. Replace the proposed 20m height limit with a stepwise design of a scale that reflects the existing built form.</p>		



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Niggel, Jenni	Individual	<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Replace the proposed 20m height limit with a stepwise design of a scale that reflects the existing built form and period of the residential area. The height limit of 20m on the corner of Rankins Road/Macaulay Road and Barnett Street/Macaulay Road will have a devastating impact on the surrounding area and is inconsistent with the guiding principles of the Structure Plan. This is primarily a residential area of heritage significance. The houses from 167 to 143 Rankins Road would be negatively impacted by any structure over two storeys on these two corners. The facades of buildings at 169-173 Rankins Road and 458-460 Macaulay Road should be included in the heritage overlay. As such buildings on these sites should be no higher than two storeys, be considered in a heritage context, be 'stepped back' from the street by a length of at least two rooms. The building materials should be high quality.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) The existing built form fronting Rankins Road is primarily single or double-fronted Edwardian/Arts and Crafts/Victorian, 1-2 storey dwellings (second storey as attic/rear extension). The interface, however, has a height of greater than 2 storeys. Impacts on adjoining areas include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) objectional visual bulk of 6-storey buildings compared with the adjoining 1- and 2-storey residential built form.</li> <li>ii) domination of the precinct by buildings that are out of scale with the existing built form.</li> <li>iii) potential overlooking into front and rear open spaces of adjoining properties.</li> <li>iv) detrimental impact on the heritage character of the existing precinct by the imposition of modern structures of excessive height.</li> <li>v) a drastic change in impact from the existing single storey structures to new 6-storey structures.</li> </ul>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>The 20m height is also inconsistent with the planning and design principles (Principle 4, p38). Suitable building scale, heights and setbacks have not been introduced at Rankins/Macaulay and Macaulay/Barnett; nor does it appear that the existing character, context and immediate amenity have been sufficiently taken into account, and this would not bring a positive or respectful character. Even a height of 10.5m, which is applied at many sections of the interface between the proposed mixed use zone and existing residences, would have severe impact on Rankins Road.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Bergman, Ephraim (Fred)	Individual	<p><b>5. Public Realm and Open Space</b></p> <p>a. Disagree with the Open Space proposal on submitter's property in Kensington. The Council has not shown justification for having any open space in this area that should not be provided by any private development that will take place in the future.</p> <p>b. Experience in the past with compulsory acquisition on another property has demonstrated that the property owners are not appropriately consulted and that the onus is on the property owner to ensure that they are not financially compromised.</p> <p>c. Submitter's property was purchased with anticipation of future rezoning and development. Open Space proposition means the property can no longer be used as (financial) security for facilities.</p>	<p>a. Provide additional clarity on the requirements for new public open space into the Structure Plan.</p> <p>B and c. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Additional open space is required to ensure that the needs of the future residential and worker population are met. Due to the existing ownership patterns in the area this requires purchase of privately owned land. The need for new open spaces has been established through Council's draft Open Space Strategy. Additional clarification on the need for this open space will be incorporated into the Structure Plan.</p> <p>b and c. Implementation of a public acquisition is determined by state government legislation. This determines the appropriate methods of valuation and compensation for affected property owners. Council will continue discussions with all property owners affected by the public open space proposal to progress opportunities to deliver a shared and agreeable outcome. The Council will work with property owners to develop an approach for each property to minimise the disruption to existing businesses operating on the site.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>d. Timing of amendment is unacceptable considering May draft treated all properties equally and proposed welcome changes (ie rezoning). Changing the plan just before the holiday season with a deadline for comment on 6th January is trying to bulldoze amendment through.</p> <p>e. The open space proposal (and zoning) effects the land from time draft is announced which is completely wrong. Purchase of the property for community use should only take place as and when it come on the market and not through compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>f. Submitter will spend alot of money defending their rights to be treated fairly.</p> <p>g. 'I implore you to reconsider and withdraw the current amendment and spend more time in consultation with all the landowners on what would be the best outcome for the area.'</p>	<p>d - g. No change required.</p>	<p>d - g. Implementation of a public acquisition is determined by state government legislation. This determines the appropriate methods of valuation and compensation for affected property owners. Council will continue discussions with all property owners affected by the public open space proposal to progress opportunities to deliver a shared and agreeable outcome. The Council will work with property owners to develop an approach for each property to minimise the disruption to existing businesses operating on the site.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Dickson, Karen	Individual	<p><b>3. Land Use &amp; Activities</b></p> <p>a. Rezone Bruce Street Kensington to Mixed Use (as per the May draft), not industrial. Mixed use is the appropriate zoning as it reflects the current use of properties in the area which have co-existed successfully for over 100 years. The existing cottages and heritage style buildings must be protected by a mixed use zone and the precinct should allow 'mixed use' to attract a diverse range of businesses. An industrial zone would only benefit a very narrow range of businesses currently operating in the area, while disadvantaging the majority.</p>	a. No change required.	a. The Business 3 Zone is more reflective of the existing mix of warehouses and offices in the area. The Business 3 Zone will support some new development, whilst also providing a buffer to the Allied Mills site which is a key primary industry in Victoria. A business zone will allow for an increase in employment uses. 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. As such, these provisions will enable existing industrial uses (those not permitted in a B3Z) and residential land uses to remain.
		<p><b>5. Public Realm and Open Space</b></p> <p>a. Welcome the suggested improvements to the Park and Recreation areas.</p>	a. No change required.	a. Noted.

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Harrigan, Kate	Individual	<p><b>3. Land Use &amp; Activities</b></p> <p>a. Rezone Bruce Street Kensington to Mixed Use (as per the May draft), not Business 3. All other areas similar to Bruce Street are being re-zoned Mixed Use. Mixed Use is representative of the existing uses and will allow for the continued growth of these uses as well as preserve the environment for existing residents.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Business 3 Zone is more reflective of the existing mix of warehouses and offices in the area. The Business 3 Zone will support some new development, whilst also providing a buffer to the Allied Mills site which is a key primary industry in Victoria. A business zone will allow for an increase in employment uses. 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. As such, these provisions will enable existing industrial uses (those not permitted in a B3Z) and residential land uses to remain.</p>
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. The 20m height limit on Bruce Street is too high and will cause massive overshadowing on homes in the street and the area. It would detract from the look and feel of the area. Revise to take account of the number of homes on the street and in the area.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Setbacks have been included for all streets within the area to ensure an appropriate scale and solar access to the streets in the area. There are currently no height limits on these properties so without the introduction of controls. Solar access into the existing homes fronting Bruce Street will be maintained through the proposal to provide an open space north of these properties.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>5. Public Realm and Open Space</b></p> <p>a. Welcome the proposed park between Elizabeth and Barrett Street. It will bring a welcome break to the cement and brick around the homes in the area and provide a wonderful place for exercise and play for residents with families and pets.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>VicRoads</b>	Government	<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Access</b></p> <p>a. Comments on May Draft remain current. The structure plan is aspirational and makes network assumptions that are dependent on state infrastructure. The word 'investigate' should be used for those proposals that are subject to the delivery of this infrastructure.</p> <p>b. Actions outlined in document will need regular review given the challenging and potentially long-term nature of projects and uncertainty on network-wide impacts.</p> <p>c. VicRoad look forward to working with Council to further develop the vision and key directions of the plan, to consider the proposals in the context of the overall strategic road network and to identify current proposals that could impact on the structure plan (and vice versa).</p>	<p>a. Incorporate the word 'investigate' into key state infrastructure transport proposals.</p> <p>b. No change required.</p> <p>c. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Provides appropriate wording for state level infrastructure delivery.</p> <p>b. Noted.</p> <p>c. Noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Opie, Melissa	Individual	<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. The development proposed in the area north of Macaulay Road, between the Rankins Road and Barnett Streets will have the following detrimental impact on my property and the local community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The height limits are excessive and should be limited to two storeys consistent with existing properties on these streets. Any higher will significantly impact character of the area and the 'Kensington Village' atmosphere will disappear forever.</li> <li>ii. The heights will impact on the privacy of my open space, taking away existing views and natural light currently enjoyed. This will significantly devalue the property and other properties affected on Rankins Road.</li> </ul>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Access</b></p> <p>a. High-density apartments will add pressure to existing traffic congestion on Macaulay Road.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan recommends the development of a dynamic traffic management plan that minimises the impact of non-local vehicular traffic traversing the area. Private cars are low occupancy vehicles that quickly fill up limited space on the road network, thus priority will be provided to high occupancy vehicles, such as trains, to improve efficiency of access.</p> <p>While implementing a grade separation between Macaulay Road and the Craigieburn and Upfield railway lines would reduce conflict at this intersection, it would also be extremely costly for minimal traffic improvements given the width of Macaulay Road. Grade separation may have the impact of generating higher traffic volume and speeds which would compromise the amenity of the Kensington local centre and proposed Macaulay local centre. The design of separating railway and road infrastructure can also separate communities and would impact on the heritage character in the Kensington Station vicinity. The Structure Plan treats the roads west of the Moonee Ponds Creek, including Macaulay Road as local roads.</p>
		<p>b. There is not enough on-street parking for existing residents.</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>b. Car parking provision in new developments will be reviewed through the preparation of a Precinct Parking Plan which limits residential parking where possible, encourages car sharing and provides for bicycle parking.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>6. Community Infrastructure</b></p> <p>a. The extra 25,000 residents will impact an already overburdened community with insufficient child care, doctors and dentists to service existing residents.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan identifies additional community infrastructure needed to service the growing area and appropriate locations for these services and facilities. Urban renewal can bring benefits to the area that are shared by the whole community.</p>
<p><b>Gaskell, Nikki</b></p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p><b>10. General Comments</b></p> <p>a. The final draft is a vast improvement on the documents that have passed before it. Despite a few errors, the thought and attention to detail in each section is noteworthy. The vision included may not be too bad. 'My fear is that we will get the least and not the most of the plan'.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>2. Land Use &amp; Activities</b></p> <p>a. The area proposed for B3Z rezoning contains a dozen small residential properties. The plan is silent on the future for the existing residents. The uses allowed in a B3Z are more appropriate in the context of residents than those allowed in the industrial zone, however without a move to a mixed use zone (as proposed in the May draft) concerns are raised about the rights of existing residents as new businesses come in with the zoning changes. Both Allied Mills and existing small factories are good neighbours and, critically, quiet in the evenings.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Business 3 Zone is more reflective of the existing mix of warehouses and offices in the area. The Business 3 Zone will support some new development, whilst also providing a buffer to the Allied Mills site which is a key primary industry in Victoria. A business zone will allow for an increase in employment uses. 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. As such, these provisions will enable existing industrial uses (those not permitted in a B3Z) and residential land uses to remain.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. The 20m height limit proposed for the area between the Fink Street park, Bruce, Barrett and Elizabeth streets is excessive considering the existing small, single and double storey context. It would be more appropriate to treat it as an interface street as discussed in strategy 4 on pg 47 limiting the heights more in line with the existing houses and surrounding properties to a maximum 3-4 storeys.</p> <p>b. Height limits must be mandatory to actually implement the vision. This is particularly important at interfaces between new developments and existing areas.</p> <p>c. Height limits should be reduced to increase this allowance of natural light into lower levels of buildings.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p> <p>b. Incorporate additional sentence into Chapter 3, Strategy 4 as follows: 'The proposed height control at the street frontage or property boundary are mandatory. Beyond the street frontage or property boundary, the height limits proposed are discretionary. Any discretion must comply with the setback conditions as outlined in Figures 3.13 to 3.16.' Update Figures 3.13 - 3.16 as per Figure C (in attachment 2).</p> <p>c. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The proposed park ensures that the existing dwellings facing Bruce Street will not be overshadowed by new development.</p> <p>b. To clarify the application of mandatory and discretionary controls and to provide certainty on expected future development outcomes.</p> <p>c. Figure 3.12 indicates a minimum provision of solar access into the lower floors of proposed development. Natural light will be provided for a longer period throughout the day.</p>
		<p>d. Building heights near the very narrow lanes in appendix IVa appear overly high creating sunless tunnels.</p>	<p>d. Update laneway sections included in Appendix A to align with the preferred laneway condition as illustrated in Figure.3.13.</p>	<p>d. Ensure consistency in document and include preferred development outcome.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Access</b></p> <p>a. Improved access for walking and cycling, and public transport additions and upgrade is very welcome.</p> <p>b. Concerned that the improved network of roads (small connecting streets) will attract more through traffic.</p> <p>c. The opening up of Bent Street, for example, as a through road between Macaulay Road and Arden Street via Bruce Street will create a bypass traffic channel. A growing population will bring more cars looking to bypass choked main roads, even if the public transport and cycling options are improved.</p> <p>d. Include advocating for improved services and upgrade of South Kensington Station to reduce pressure on Kensington and Macaulay Stations.</p> <p>e. Support bike lanes separated from both driving lanes and parked car lanes, as per Type III d, Option 1, rather than Options 2 or 3.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p> <p>b. No change required.</p> <p>c. No change required.</p> <p>d. Add action into Transport and Access Strategy 1: Advocacy (1-5 years) to 'investigate the future role of South Kensington Station and options for improved access and service frequency.'</p> <p>e. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p> <p>b. The Structure Plan proposes a new network of laneways. These are not streets and will be designed to prioritise pedestrian and cycling access and only provide limited access for vehicular in order to facilitate access to adjacent private development.</p> <p>c. As per response b above, the proposed connection is a laneway only and through the design will not facilitate through traffic.</p> <p>d. Includes opportunities for increasing public transport network services and access to a station outside the study area but utilised by local residents.</p> <p>e. Noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>5. Public Realm &amp; Open Space</b></p> <p>a. Support the addition of open spaces and the improvements to the creek. In particular, support the Fink Street park for immediate local residents. This location also protects the amenity of existing residents on Bruce Street with private open spaces facing north (immediately abutting laneway/proposed park).</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>
		<p><b>6. Community Infrastructure</b></p> <p>a. Support the objectives of the section and note only that services for the aged do not appear with any prominence vs. schools, cultural services etc.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Services for the aged are listed as potential services that could be incorporated into the community hubs.</p>
		<p><b>7. Sustainable Infrastructure</b></p> <p>a. Strongly in favour of the objectives in this section and the broad, ambitious strategies identified to achieve them.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<p><b>Nicholas Theodossi (Submitted by Andrew Jones of Verve Projects Pty Ltd)</b></p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b></p> <p>a. Seek confirmation regarding the process for implementation of Stage 1 and Stage 2 of the Structure Plan. Will this be implemented via two separate planning scheme amendments?</p> <p>b. Has Council revisited the 5+ year timeframe attached to the preparation of the amendment for Stage 2 following the recent submission by the State Government to Infrastructure Australia which supports the Arden metro station proposal? Stage 2 appears to categorise all land as having the same timeframe for the commencement of redevelopment and does not:</p> <p>i) Identify and provide guidance on sub-precincts and key sites which are more development ready than others; or</p> <p>ii) Provide guidance in relation to interim arrangements for sub-precincts and key sites to be redeveloped in advance of Stage 2 being approved.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p> <p>b. No change required.</p> <p>c. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The transition of Arden-Macaulay to a mixed use area will occur in two stages. Stage 1 will commence from the adoption of the Structure Plan by Council. This will be implemented through a Planning Scheme Amendment for the land use and built form controls recommended in the Structure Plan for the area located on the western side of the Moonee Ponds Creek, and north of Ink Lane and Macaulay Road on the eastern side of the Moonee Ponds Creek. Stage 2 will apply to the balance of Arden-Macaulay. It is anticipated that this stage will commence construction in 2025 in conjunction with the delivery of the Melbourne Metro at Arden Central. The initial Planning Scheme Amendment process (commencing in 2012) will apply to the area denoted as Stage 1 only.</p> <p>b. The extent of land indicated as Stage 2 is to be coordinated with the Metro to ensure an integrated outcome. Opportunities for early redevelopment will be considered on a site-by-site basis and must demonstrate that they are delivering on the long-term aims of the structure plan, nor forcing out existing business or facilities that require time to introduce change.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) Not all land within Stage 2 is under the influence of the metro station proposal and the absence of an interim position within the Structure Plan which facilitates the early redevelopment where appropriate will unnecessarily delay appropriate development. Include principles or guidelines which must be met to enable redevelopment to be facilitated ahead of the Stage 2 approval. Separate Stage 2 into Stage 2A and 2B (the land hatched in Figures 5.7 and 5.8). The timeline for stage 2A should not be the same as 2B due to the greater certainty in relation to the future urban structure due to its established surrounds and that it is not influenced by further design work with the metro station as per stage 2B. Flexibility should also be provided for the early redevelopment within Stage 2B.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) The Structure Plan should include a provision which enables landowners to seek the early rezoning and redevelopment of their land where it can be demonstrated that their land can be redeveloped without implications for the design and layout of the metro station precinct. 189 Arden Street and adjoining properties to the west which front both Arden Street and Barwise Street may have potential for early redevelopment as a sub-precinct prior to the approval of the metro station precinct because of their separation from the core station precinct by Barwise Street. The Arden Central Precinct figure/plan should include notations or text to this effect.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. Greater focus upon the Arden Central precinct should be provided through a detailed figure or plan which provides guidance of the status of land and relationship with future planning of the metro station precinct and should distinguish between the land quarantined until further metro station design work is undertaken and the land within Arden Central which is not subject to the future design work and may have potential for early redevelopment prior to the approval of Stage 2. The figures in the Structure Plan indicate different precinct and issue-based boundaries relating to the metro station and this creates complexity. The Structure Plan figures and text propose four categories of land in Stage 2: 1. All land within Stage 2 is under the influence of the metro station, 2. Land within the Arden Central precinct, 3. Land outside the Arden Central precinct; and 4. A sub-precinct within Arden Central which is subject to metro station planning.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The extent of land indicated as Stage 2 is to be coordinated with the Metro to ensure an integrated outcome. Opportunities for early redevelopment will be considered on a site-by-site basis and must demonstrate that they are delivering on the long-term aims of the structure plan, nor forcing out existing business or facilities that require time to introduce changes to their operations to allow the introduction of sensitive uses, in particular, the Lost Dogs Home. 185 Arden Street is zoned mixed use and could currently be developed according to the existing controls (land use and height).</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) The timing for rezoning of all four categories appears to be linked to the metro station and this is questionable given the precinct's established urban location and key sites such as 185 Arden Street already have a number of fundamentals (eg. likely preferred future zone) required to facilitate early redevelopment and should not be held back for development constraints to be freed up for other properties. The Structure Plan should provide greater guidance of staging of redevelopment within the four categories rather than adopting a blanket approach linking all land within Stage 2 to the metro station proposal where it is evident that development can occur independently of the metro proposal.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Remove the 20m height control proposed for 185 Arden Street and include a notation which states "future height subject to further investigation". It is noted that the maximum height control is discretionary. The blanket approach to height controls along the eastern side of Laurens Street has no regard to the size, corner location and interfaces, compared to other properties along Laurens Street and the broader precinct.</p> <p>b. Remove the 30m height control proposed for 189 Arden Street and surrounding properties within the land subject to metro station planning area. The Structure Plan does not set out the preferred future zoning pattern of the Arden Central precinct (as per Figure 2.10), however, does so at this property. This is considered premature in the absence of the design and layout of the metro station precinct.</p>	<p>a. No change required. B. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The existing DDO32 (14m height limit) will remain until the progression of Stage 2. The proposed 20m height limit is indicative of the scale of development appropriate at this site considering immediate proximity to the proposed metro <i>and</i> immediate co-location with lower scale residences.</p> <p>b. The 30m height proposed delivers the appropriate design objectives for the public realm and is based on the built form principles as outlined in the Structure Plan.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>Familton, Ben</b>	Individual	<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b></p> <p>a. Include the Young Husband site in the Structure Plan as the planning application was rejected by Council. To not do so will impact on the credibility of the planning process and the neighbourhoods trust in the ability to execute on the plan.</p>	<p>a. Remove references to Amendment C177 and replace with height and zoning propositions.</p>	<p>a. As Amendment C177 was abandoned in December 2011, the Young Husband site at 2-50 Elizabeth Street, Kensington will be rezoned in a manner which is consistent with the rationale for the Business 3 Zone in this area. This will also include built form controls.</p>
		<p><b>6. Community Infrastructure</b></p> <p>a. Education must be included within the Plan as a mandatory deliverable, particularly to fulfil the city of knowledge Future Melbourne criteria and support the huge increase in residents. Without an agreed plan with the Ministry of Education and Early Childhood then it would appear the well being of around 4000 children based on population projection potentially are at risk.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. It is agreed that the provision of education facilities is imperative to support the growing community. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan identifies the Victorian Archives site in Shiel Street in North Melbourne as a suitable site for a potential school. This site is included in Stage 1. The State Government's Department of Education and Early Childhood Development is responsible for building and funding new schools. The DEECD will ultimately determine where a new primary school will be delivered to service inner Melbourne, however, the City of Melbourne will continue to advocate for a new school in Arden-Macaulay.</p>
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. The proposed built form and artist impressions lack character and don't alleviate fears of turning the area into another Docklands. The design should allow for the components of what makes Melbourne different e.g. lane ways, hidden areas etc which people can discover.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The design of each development site will be assessed at the planning application stage according to the City of Melbourne's urban design policies which encourage high-quality design outcomes. An expanded network of laneways is included in the Structure Plan.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Access</b></p> <p>a. Reassess the direction being taken to minimise car parking. Although people may own a car they may not necessarily drive it every day. Providing developments with limited parking reduces the amenity for those developments and residents. Greater consideration should be made to directing non local traffic away from using Macaulay Road as a thoroughfare.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>b. Car parking provision in new developments will be reviewed through the preparation of a Precinct Parking Plan which limits residential parking where possible, encourages car sharing and provides for bicycle parking.</p>
		<p><b>5. Public realm</b></p> <p>a. Recreational spaces will be under greater pressure if the East/West tunnel is to proceed. All these activities and uses will move to another area, and with an additional 17000 or more residents it is difficult to understand how the plan will cope.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan identifies upgrades to existing public open spaces, including the revitalisation of the Moonee Ponds Creek as an environmental and recreational corridor, in addition to five new local parks. The extent of new public open space is guided by the City of Melbourne's draft Open Space Strategy.</p>
		<p><b>10. General comments</b></p> <p>a. The plan is a great step forward for the precinct.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Dare, Anthony	Individual	<p><b>Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Reduce proposed building heights of 20m at the corners of Rankins and Macaulay Roads, and Barnett Street and Macaulay Road, and also call your attention to the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street South where the comments would also be relevant and replace with a stepwise design of a scale that respects the existing built form. Any structure at the corner of Rankins and Macaulay Roads will impact on the residential area fronting Rankins Road, which is a heritage overlay area (including properties from about 143 Rankins Road, with increasing severity of impact in proximity to the property adjoining the mixed-use area, 167 Rankins Road. Any structure erected on the site bounded by laneway, Macaulay Road, Barnett Street and laneway will also impact Rankins Road and Barnett Street properties.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) The proposed height is completely inappropriate for an interface and would have a devastating impact on the adjoining residential and heritage overlay areas, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) objectional visual bulk of 6-storey buildings compared with the adjoining 1- and 2-storey residential built form.</li> <li>ii) domination of the precinct by buildings that are out of scale with the existing built form.</li> <li>iii) potential overlooking into front and rear open spaces of adjoining properties.</li> <li>iv) detrimental impact on the heritage character of the existing precinct by the imposition of modern structures of excessive height.</li> <li>v) a drastic change in impact from the existing single storey structures to new 6-storey structures.</li> </ul> <p>The 20m height is also inconsistent with the planning and design principles (Principle 4, and other sections of the Draft Plan).</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) Suitable building scale, heights and setbacks have not been introduced at Rankins/Macaulay and Macaulay/Barnett, nor does it appear that the existing character, context and immediate amenity have been sufficiently taken into account, and this would not bring a positive or respectful character. Even a height of 10.5m, which is applied at many sections of the interface between the proposed mixed use zone and existing residences, would have severe impact on Rankins Road.</p>		
Dare, Anna	Individual	<p><b>10. General comments</b></p> <p>a. I am concerned that my suburb and street will suffer detrimentally if the proposed plan goes ahead in it's current form.</p> <p>b. I believe that inner city living can still be enjoyed with an increase of residents, but ONLY if the new buildings take the current residents into account and do not have us having to give up much of what is precious to us as residents (i.e. privacy in our own homes and maintaining the heritage standing Kensington already has).</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. The main objections are the height of buildings to be permitted and the loss of heritage features that are currently in Kensington. Reduce the height of 20m on the corner of Rankins Road - Macaulay Road and Barnett Street - Macaulay Road and replace with a height more in keeping with this neighbourhood. This should be only 2 storeys which is even double the height of what is currently there. The proposed height of 20m, nearly 6 storeys high, would just be totally unacceptable given that what we have now is single storey buildings - we are being asked to accept a jump to 6 storeys. A 6-storey building would impact us terribly, due to overlooking greatly limiting the privacy in our yards - privacy is one of our main issues living in the inner city.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) A large modern building of 6 storeys would be completely out of place in this heritage area and would dominate the street. It would be clearly visible from my front yard. The plan would also impact the corner of Macaulay and Eastwood Street South in much the same way. It would be horrible living in Kensington!</p>		
O'Keefe, Carmel	Individual	<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Disappointed that concerns about inappropriate discretionary height limits in Rankins Road raised in response to the Draft Arden-Macauley Structure Plan in June 2011 have not been addressed. Proposed building heights and setback controls in Figure 3.17 shows that the impact on residents in the historically significant Rankins Road are not being considered at all. Rankins Road residences adjoin the zone which means the impact of inappropriate building heights on them is just as significant as for those residences that fall within the zone.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) Maintaining 20 metre height levels from the flat of Moonee Pond Creek up Macauley Road to the much higher level of the Macauley/ Rankins/ Eastwood corners means that new buildings would not only dwarf adjoining one and two story residences, but tower over existing structures such as the railway signal box, Kensington Railway Station and Kensington Village area, and destroy the character and value of this heritage overlay precinct which was identified in Graham Butler's 1985 Flemington and Kensington Conservation Study as being of enduring importance. Abandon the proposed 20m building height limits adjoining Rankins Road, Eastwood Street and Barnett Street Kensington and review transitional building heights and set-backs in this area so that they are less than the proposed 10.5 meters.</p>		
		<p>(continued) Your current proposal not only fails to take into account the scale of adjoining residential buildings and the gradient of the zoned area but fails to respect the existing heritage context of Rankins Road, Eastwood Street and Barnett Street.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>5. Public Realm</b></p> <p>a. I share my neighbours' and wider community's continuing concerns about needing to cater for open space for the proposed massive (25,000) increase in local population.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan identifies upgrades to existing public open spaces, including the revitalisation of the Moonee Ponds Creek as an environmental and recreational corridor, in addition to five new local parks. The extent of new public open space is guided by the City of Melbourne's draft Open Space Strategy.</p>
		<p><b>6. Community Infrastructure</b></p> <p>a. I share my neighbours' and wider community's continuing concerns about needing to cater for social infrastructure for the proposed massive (25,000) increase in local population.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan identifies additional community infrastructure needed to service the growing area and appropriate locations for these services and facilities. The Plan also includes an action to establish a Developer Contributions Plan as a funding mechanism for this infrastructure.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Access</b></p> <p>a. I share my neighbours' and wider community's continuing concerns about needing to cater for the proposed massive (25,000) increase in local population; and the impact the plan has on traffic, parking and public transport capacity.</p>	<p>a. Include explanation of the constraints and opportunities to address traffic issues at the Macaulay Road/rail crossing intersection into Chapter 4 - Issues.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan recommends the development of a dynamic traffic management plan that minimises the impact of non-local vehicular traffic traversing the area. Private cars are low occupancy vehicles that quickly fill up limited space on the road network, thus priority will be provided to high occupancy vehicles, such as trains, to improve efficiency of access.</p> <p>While implementing a grade separation between Macaulay Road and the Craigieburn and Upfield railway lines would reduce conflict at this intersection, it would also be extremely costly for minimal traffic improvements given the width of Macaulay Road. Grade separation may have the impact of generating higher traffic volume and speeds which would compromise the amenity of the Kensington local centre and proposed Macaulay local centre. The design of separating railway and road infrastructure can also separate communities and would impact on the heritage character in the Kensington Station vicinity. The Structure Plan treats the roads west of the Moonee Ponds Creek, including Macaulay Road as local roads.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. It is essential in Rankins Road and Barnett Streets to access the laneway that opens onto Macaulay Road in order to park cars behind residences. The inevitable access restrictions that would result from increasing the scale of adjoining buildings, coupled with the subsequent increase in population and traffic would have a severe impact on the amenities of these residences, and would also add to the already significant problem of parking and traffic flow in and around the Kensington Railway Station.</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>b. The laneway (CL159) will remain open. See also response a. above.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
O'Brien, Darragh	Individual	<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b></p> <p>a. The proposed plan is very clear in its support for community and cultural infrastructure however, the actual mechanisms for achieving those aspirations are inadequate. Strategically located centres are required, not only within the geographic centre of the study area, but also on the boundaries with existing communities. The single site selected for an unspecified community space is inadequate to meet the needs of the existing and proposed new community. At present, the plan refers to council's advocacy for the inclusion of new schools, recreation areas, arts and cultural facilities, but there is little to indicate how this will be achieved. If approved, the zoning and height restrictions will be irrevocably altered, paving the way for commercial development. That much is certain and clearly defined within the structure plan. Less certain are the strategies that will guarantee the delivery of essential, non-commercial elements that define the difference between success and failure in terms of new urban communities.</p>	<p>a. Amend the proposed zoning proposition (figure 2.7) to indicate the site on the corner of Langford and Macaulay Road as a PUZ2 zone.</p>	<p>a. The structure plan identifies two new community hubs and an upgrade of the North Melbourne Community Centre. It also includes an action to prepare a Developer Contributions Plan to establish a funding mechanism to assist in the delivery of these facilities (land acquisition, design and construction). These are strategically located to ensure that facilities are located on sites that are well connected to local centres and public transport to ensure ease of access. The structure plan identifies the need to acquire land for the new hub in Stage 1 on the corner of Macaulay Road and Langford Street. The zoning plan will be amended to indicate this long-term use.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>How will council and the committee ensure that the proposed social infrastructure will actually be achieved? What formal instruments/overlays will be adopted, on a site-by-site basis? Will the ability to develop sites within the precinct be tied to the prior establishment of community facilities etc.? The consequences of not achieving those social aspirations is disturbingly evident in the dead urban spaces of Southbank, or the non-spaces of docklands that will take years to recover – even after a decade. I believe that we not only have a duty of care to future generations, but at this non-repeatable moment, we actually have the capacity to do something about it. The future consequences of our decisions today may be enormous, but they are manageable with enough time and participation. When the moment has passed, the question we have to live with is: did we do all that we could? The Structure Plan needs to include master planning on a micro level to explain how the aspirations in the report will be achieved.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. Prior to rezoning the area, a detailed process of urban planning needs to identify a series of potential locations suitable for these non-commercial, generative functions. Although I am aware that council may not own some of the sites, they could then be re-zoned PUZ once they have been obtained. In the interim, they should not be rezoned - similar to the way in which the plan deals with the proposed new park areas. The Future zoning could also allow for a future combination of mixed use and public use on the one site.</p>		
<p><b>O'Brien, Darragh</b></p>		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b>  a. Reduce the height limits on Macaulay Road as this is excessive. Heights should be graded from 9m at Kensington Station up to 20m at Macaulay station, making use of the natural slope of Macaulay road. To compensate, there is community support for an increase in height at the centre of the new precinct.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Washington, Darryl, Langford Property Pty Ltd	Individual	<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. Objection to the latest modification to the plan since May changing our property from mixed use back to industrial and seek to have this decision reviewed, and the area be recommended as mixed use on the grounds that,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The area is suitable and meets the criteria to be zoned mixed use as decided previously and recommended by strategic planning in the pre-May recommendations;</li> <li>-Town planning criteria confirmed this by their pre May recommendation of mixed use be made.....but this has now been changed solely for political reasons I am led to believe on the possibility of some state govt. action that is probably unlikely at best due to electoral change , finance etc</li> </ul>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The extent of land indicated as Stage 2 is to be coordinated with the Metro to ensure an integrated outcome. Opportunities for early redevelopment will be considered on a site-by-site basis and must demonstrate that they are delivering on the long-term aims of the structure plan, nor forcing out existing business or facilities that require time to introduce changes to their operations to allow the introduction of sensitive uses, in particular, the Lost Dogs Home.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) -This area changed back to industrial is a very small pocket( est. 15000sq m) in context of the whole proposed rezoning bounded by Langford st, Gracie st, Boundary rd, and Ink lane surrounded by mixed use within a distance from around 120meters -240;</p> <p>-This change back to industrial discriminates against some ratepayers vis a vis others very close by, and is unfair, and inconsistent;</p> <p>-This change limits re development and holds back regeneration of the area .....</p> <p>Our property like others in this pocket is crying out for redevelopment, which with the uncertainty and now back to industrial, severely limits the viability to redevelop a significant prominent site of 3362 sq m with 3 street frontages</p> <p>-However under mixed use a significant redevelopment is feasible, and great improvement to the area and increased rate collection could take place</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Parkinson, Fiona	Individual	<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. I would like to express my concern regarding proposed heights for future developments covered by the plan, specifically the current industrial sites in the area of Macaulay Road/Rankins Road/Barnett Street, Kensington. The heights proposed in the plan are up to 20m or approximately six stories. Buildings as large as this would be inappropriate in this area. Whilst our home would not be directly affected by overlooking or shadow issues, buildings of such bulk would adversely affect the general amenity of the area visually as well as creating traffic issues and parking difficulties. Carefully consider the future amenity of the area and its residents and consider any building above 3 stories to be inappropriate and out of character for the area.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>
		<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Access</b></p> <p>a. The surrounding streets which already provide the only parking for Kensington Railway Station, would potentially become clogged with a significantly increased population in this area, whether is be residential or commercial property.</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>b. Car parking provision in new developments will be reviewed through the preparation of a Precinct Parking Plan which limits residential parking where possible, encourages car sharing and provides for bicycle parking.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>Barberis, Irene</b>	Individual	<p><b>5. Public Realm</b></p> <p>a. Update the Scarborough Place streetscape in the near future. There is one light for this street - many ugly and I think dangerous wires coming from this (what looks like) temporary street light. There are no trees painted by council in the street scape. I would like to suggest, to soften and enhance the potential beauty of this hidden 'gem' of a street, that Cape Chestnut trees be planted at various spots. I would like to have a Cape Chestnut tree outside my property. These trees are compact and interesting with their pointed star like foliage and the beautiful pink flower - they hold their shape and are not cumbersome trees. Plant these trees soon so that by the time mixed use is given to the northern side of the street, they will be well established ready for a more domestic feel</p>	a. No change required.	a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan includes indicative street sections outlining the proposed upgrades to streetscapes in the precinct. Design objectives for the laneways include the inclusion of landscaping. The Structure Plan does not comment on the type of tree to be planted. The appropriate tree type and timing of planting would be determined by City of Melbourne's urban landscape team and considered through consultation with local residents. The City of Melbourne's Urban Forest Strategy is currently open for consultation.
<b>Harrison, Sarah</b>	Individual	<p><b>10. General comments</b></p> <p>a. Whilst I am in favour of the development of the Kensington area and believe that growth is very important (in complete favour of the park &amp; recreation area/s proposed), I also have a concern.</p>	a. No change required.	a. Noted.



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. Bruce Street is included in the proposal to be re-zoned to Business 3 which to my understanding 'will prohibit residential use'. It was also my understanding, that this area would be subject to 'mixed use' re-zoning which I am highly in support of; this would allow the existing housing to remain and families to feel secure. The majority of the remaining homes actually pre-date most of the industrial use and are all that remains from the time when the area had many more homes, please keep in mind when making your decisions that some 'still' live here.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Business 3 Zone is more reflective of the existing mix of warehouses and offices in the area. The Business 3 Zone will support some new development, whilst also providing a buffer to the Allied Mills site which is a key primary industry in Victoria. A business zone will allow for an increase in employment uses. 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. As such, these provisions will enable existing industrial uses (those not permitted in a B3Z) and residential land uses to remain.</p>
Tonkin, Neil	Individual	<p><b>3. Built form &amp; Urban Structure</b></p> <p>a. Concerned that there is so much 6 floor buildings space allocated as the traffic in the area is already congested and 6 story developments will make this significantly worse.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan recommends the development of a dynamic traffic management plan that minimises the impact of non-local vehicular traffic traversing the area. Private cars are low occupancy vehicles that quickly fill up limited space on the road network, thus priority will be provided to high occupancy vehicles, such as trains, to improve efficiency of access.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. If the car parking spaces for the new developments are insufficient there will be a real problem for residents with cars trying to find a park at night (a la Richmond where residents are having to park a kilometre from their home. Restrict the height of development to 4 floors, which is more in keeping with the area, and ensure developers provide at least one car park per apartment.</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>b. Car parking provision in new developments will be reviewed through the preparation of a Precinct Parking Plan which limits residential parking where possible, encourages car sharing and provides for bicycle parking.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Harrington, Duncan	Individual	<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Use</b></p> <p>a. I'm amazed that there is no recognition of the existing homes on Bruce Street in the proposed zoning changes. The current land use map already recognises that people live here and it would seem to fit with the planning direction of the area to at least allow the area to become a 'Mixed Use' zone. This would in some way recognise the existing dwellings and represent the actual land use. The homes that remain (survived) on Bruce street should also be protected by heritage, as they have been here since WW2 and represent the fact that the entire street used to be lined with cottages and more substantial houses.</p> <p>Protecting the remaining homes and including them in zoning that represents the actual use (MUZ) would seem to fit with the direction intended for the area and the other business in the street.</p>	a. No change required.	a. The Business 3 Zone is more reflective of the existing mix of warehouses and offices in the area. The Business 3 Zone will support some new development, whilst also providing a buffer to the Allied Mills site which is a key primary industry in Victoria. A business zone will allow for an increase in employment uses. 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. As such, these provisions will enable existing industrial uses (those not permitted in a B3Z) and residential land uses to remain.

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>Dodd, Leonie</b>	Individual	<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Concerned about a proposal to allow buildings of up to 20 metres to sites in Rankins Road immediate area. Any of the streets extending from Macaulay Road including Eastwood Street South, Rankins Road or Barnett Street are part of a heritage overlay area which should be maintained as such. Since at least 1997 permits have allowed two or sometimes three story structures for both residential and commercial properties in this area which has maintained the village feel of this area but also allowed for progress in developing new residential and commercial sites. We submit our concern that this proposal is being considered and urge that the 20 meter height proposal be reconsidered to include a respect for the low scale heritage context of this area.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>McQuilten, Mary</b>	Individual	<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Reduce the 20 metre height limit proposed in the immediate area of Rankins Road, Kensington to include a respect for the low scale heritage context of this area. Any of the streets extending from Macaulay Road including Eastwood Street South, Rankins Road or Barnett Street are part of a heritage overlay area which should be maintained as such. Since at least 1997 permits have allowed two or sometimes three story structures for both residential and commercial properties in this area which has maintained the village feel of this area but also allowed for progress in developing new residential and commercial sites.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>
<b>Gambino, Mark</b>	Individual	<p><b>10. General Comment</b></p> <p>a. Kensington is one of the most hospitable, diverse and cultural (I refer to Revolt and the artists studios within the Younghusband building.</p> <p>b. The lives of many will be affected by the proposed changes; changes that have not considered nor reflect the existing use of the area.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>Burke, Matt</b>	Individual	<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Reduce the height proposed at the corner of Rankins and Macaulay Roads in Kensington to better suit the surrounding streetscape. A development to 20 metres in height would have a significant negative impact on the neighbouring properties and streetscape, taking into consideration that the surrounding dwellings are a mix of 1 and 2 storey structures. A development to the proposed height of up to 20 metres or even the original height of 10.5 metres would not befit the surrounding structures.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>Evans, Mark</b>	Individual	<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Reduce the proposed 20 metre height control at the corner of Rankins Road/Macaulay Road/laneway and Macaulay Road/Barnett Street/Laneways and replace with a stepwise design of a scale which is more respectful. The current proposal appears to be inconsistent with one of the key design principles; 'Respect the existing low-scale, heritage context'. The thought of a 20 metre building on the corner of Macaulay and Rankins Road stepping down to a strip of single and double storey buildings is a violation of the above principle that would have a severe impact on the utility, particularly parking and aesthetic of the area.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>
<b>Evans, Mark</b>		<p><b>10. General Comment</b></p> <p>a. Although there is much to commend about the plan, there are some parts of the plan which are inconsistent with one of the key design principles; 'Respect the existing low-scale, heritage context'.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls at the interfaces with residential areas - include updated diagrams into Structure Plans as shown in Figure A and C (in attachment 2) to illustrate revised heights and setbacks in interface areas.</p>	<p>a. To ensure an appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character. At the interface areas, new buildings will be no more than 1 storey higher than existing structures.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>Koenig, Meike</b>	Individual	<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. Supports the idea of the 3 local centres, but wouldn't like them to just be a small shopping area as it is at the Newmarket train station. Either one of them should be developed properly as a major shopping centre (there are a few old factory buildings that would be suitable) or each one of them should encourage small local shops &amp; cafes, so a vibrant interesting area can develop.</p> <p>b. Retain some industrial zoning to ensure small industrial businesses can remain in the area to ensure the areas diversity</p>	<p>a. No change required. B. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan recommends that the development and design of the proposed local centres be further considered through additional planning. This will include the preparation of a master plan for the Macaulay activity centre and the area near North Melbourne station, and a plan for Flemington Bridge and Racecourse Road emerging centres with the City of Moonee Valley. There is currently a proposed for a mixed use development that includes a Woolworths within the Macaulay Shopping Centre.</p> <p>b. Areas of industrial zoning will be retained in Stage 1. In addition, the Melbourne Planning Scheme protects existing use rights of land uses that have been in operation within the last two years prior to the rezoning of land. As such, these provisions will enable existing industrial land uses to remain within the Mixed Use Zone. The B3 zone proposed for the south-west of the study area allows some new industrial development.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Access</b></p> <p>a. New railway station is great – will trains run more frequently to the city though? –at the moment you often can hardly get on train in these areas at peak times or have to wait for along time during off peak hours.</p> <p>b. Off road bicycle network (not just a bicycle lane) would be great to encourage more cycling as a lot of people are too scared of cars to ride their bikes to the city.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p> <p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The City of Melbourne will continue to work with transport authorities for improved service frequency, and upgrades to stations to improve pedestrian access and will continue to advocate for the Melbourne Metro, which aims to increase the capacity of the entire public transport network. This will help to alleviate stress on the City Loop to enable improved peak services. Additional rail services will improve the efficiency of moving thousands of commuters.</p> <p>b. Where appropriate, off road bicycle lanes will be implemented in the Arden-Macaulay area to support cycling safety. Separated cycle lanes are proposed on some streets - refer Appendix A.</p>
		<p>c. Include sufficient parking for any new developments at least one car park per apartment. It is a very good idea to promote car free living and using alternate transport but realistically there will always be one car per household for weekend &amp; evening use, shopping etc.. Especially as there is no 24 hour public transport and taxis are hard to get and expensive. It is unrealistic to believe that no-one will own a car if the car parking is hard to find.</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>b. Car parking provision in new developments will be reviewed through the preparation of a Precinct Parking Plan which limits residential parking where possible, encourages car sharing and provides for bicycle parking.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>5. Public Realm</b></p> <p>a. More large green areas should be included and many trees planted as the green areas are already very limited in this area</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted, five additional parks are proposed for the area as well as a significant enhancement of the Moonee Ponds Creek.</p>
		<p><b>3. Built form &amp; Urban Structure</b></p> <p>a. Reduce the transition between low scale and 20 metre height controls. I don't think a 10 story building adjacent to any 1 story house is suitable. Maybe wide green strips adjacent to the street or laneway, with large trees could be planned and planted between single story existing buildings and 10.5m high new apartment developments? Laneways - you will definitely be able to see anything that is 10 metres high from the backyard adjoining the laneway.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls at the interfaces with residential areas - include updated diagrams into Structure Plans as shown in Figure A and C (in attachment 2) to illustrate revised heights and setbacks in interface areas.</p>	<p>a. To ensure an appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character. At the interface areas, new buildings will be no more than 1 storey higher than existing structures.</p>
		<p>b. Keep the heritage feel of the historic living areas - Victorian houses and ensure these areas don't get over shadowed with high apartment buildings – any development bordering/ backing onto single story housing shouldn't be higher than double story to avoid over shadowing and destroying liveable space see principle 4 on page 36.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls at the interfaces with residential areas - include updated diagrams into Structure Plans as shown in Figure A and C (in attachment 2) to illustrate revised heights and setbacks in interface areas.</p>	<p>a. To ensure an appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character. At the interface areas, new buildings will be no more than 1 storey higher than existing structures.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
West, Madeleine	Individual	<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. We have always been happy with the comfortable mix of business and residential zones that comprised our neighbourhood, and so had no objections to the original proposal of zoning the area for 'mixed usage'. This would allow some of the necessary commercial ventures to flourish while still respecting the presence of residents, many who have been here for some time - some are 180 years old. The zoning of the area as specifically for business to appease Allied Mills however is doing all of us who live in and support Kensington daily an enormous disservice. We have three small children, and already it is impossible for them to play in the front yard with the regular flow of heavy trucks (who have a habit of speeding in our small street) and vehicles from local businesses. We have no objection to this as it stands but to increase that flow further would be unsupportable.</p>	a. No change required.	a. The Business 3 Zone is more reflective of the existing mix of warehouses and offices in the area. The Business 3 Zone will support some new development, whilst also providing a buffer to the Allied Mills site which is a key primary industry in Victoria. A business zone will allow for an increase in employment uses. 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. As such, these provisions will enable existing industrial uses (those not permitted in a B3Z) and residential land uses to remain.

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		(continued) The original plan appealed with its promise of a proposed park and/or recreation area, and this would fit perfectly in a 'Mixed use' zone, but to commit our neighbourhood, our homes, and our families to the zoning proposed under this final draft would fail to reflect not just our needs, but those of the whole community.		
<b>Rushworth, Susan</b>	Individual	<p><b>10. General Comments</b></p> <p>a. There are a lot of admirable objectives in the plan. However, I have serious concerns about the feasibility of the plan, especially the infrastructure required to support such a large increase in population. ... Just because the area is well-established does not mean that the existing infrastructure has the capacity to support a massive increase in population. The proposed plan indicates residential development well ahead of the supporting infrastructure, and appears to depend quite heavily on a new railway line that is not yet developed and may never be. This is irresponsible.</p>	a. No change required.	a. The Structure Plan includes an action to prepare a Developer Contributions Plan. This will provide a funding mechanism to assist in the delivery of infrastructure to meet the needs of the future population. Future infrastructure projects are identified in the plan. The introduction of an open space levy will also contribute to the provision of new and enhanced public open space.

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Infrastructure</b></p> <p>a. The plan relies significantly on public transport infrastructure, including the proposed new station that will not even definitely go ahead. There is inadequate recognition of the stresses on the existing public transport systems by the existing population. For example, there is no acknowledgement of overcrowding on the Craigieburn line, only on the Upfield lane. Anyone who catches a train from Kensington station during morning peak will tell you that the Craigieburn line trains are significantly more crowded than the Upfield line at Macaulay station. It is simply not credible to think that the public transport systems will cope with such a massive increase in population, even with more frequent train services. On that issue, Metro (and Connex before them) have consistently insisted that they cannot increase frequency of trains during peak times. I am unconvinced that the new east-west line will resolve this problem.</p>	<p>b. Addressed in Final Draft plan - No change required.</p>	<p>b. The City of Melbourne will continue to advocate for the Melbourne Metro, which aims to increase the capacity of the entire public transport network. This will help to alleviate stress on the City Loop to enable improved peak services. In addition, the City of Melbourne will continue to work with transport authorities for improved service frequency, and upgrades to stations to improve pedestrian access.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		(continued) As a regular commuter, North Melbourne does not seem to be the bottleneck - or at least only in so far as it is the entry point to the city loop. So long as the Craigieburn and Upfield lines enter the CBD via the loop, I can't see how the new line will make any difference to congestion on either line.		
		<p><b>7. Sustainable infrastructure</b></p> <p>a. This is an old part of town and much of the physical infrastructure is ageing. In particular, there have been major failures of the sewerage system in the past 25 years, and the statement that the existing infrastructure is sufficient to support the increase in population is not credible.</p> <p>b. I could not see any specific plans to address the risk of flooding in the areas bounding Moonee Ponds Creek</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p> <p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan makes recommendation for improvements to infrastructure services to support the growing population.</p> <p>b. The Arden-Macaulay Structure plan recommends that a master plan be prepared for the Moonee Ponds open space proposal with the input of key stakeholders which would address any potential flooding issues. In addition, it recommends that further investigations of potential flooding impacts be investigated.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. It is beyond belief that streets lined with buildings 20m in height will offer an improved pedestrian experience (stated as one of the principles of the plan). I cannot imagine how such a street can be anything other than oppressive.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The 20m height limit on 20m wide streets will enable good solar access to the streets, high levels of natural light and a scale that is in proportion to the street width. The structure plan also includes design objectives for active streets and articulated street frontages. These provide additional interest and stimulation within the street to enhance the pedestrian experience.</p>
		<p>b. The proposed built environment creates a residential area that is a complete contrast to the neighbouring residential areas. Essentially, it will be a forest of tower blocks of 20m or higher, with a few minor concessions limiting street frontages to a mere 3 stories. There is considerable risk that the character of the area will be lost completely.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls at the interfaces with residential areas - include updated diagrams into Structure Plans as shown in Figure A and C (in attachment 2) to illustrate revised heights and setbacks in interface areas.</p>	<p>a. To ensure an appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character. At the interface areas, new buildings will be no more than 1 storey higher than existing structures.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. It would be wonderful to have more employment opportunities closer to home, but what would they be? The plan talks of jobs, but only in general terms. Would it offer any opportunities other than retail and cafes? For professional workers, for example?</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The plan proposes a range of zones which will allow a range of land uses. Retail and entertainment employment is encouraged within the activity centres. The Business 3 Zone encourage office and some industrial development. Stage 2 includes significant employment proposals including, in the short term, retention of existing industrial uses. In the long term, the new metro will provide direct connectivity to the Hoddle grid to stimulate significant job growth in the area.</p>
<p><b>Friends of the Moonee Ponds Creek</b></p>	<p>Organisation</p>	<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. Welcomes the revision to the Structure Plan's overarching document, the Municipal Strategic Statement / Amendment C162 to the Melbourne Planning Scheme, in the change of urban renewal intensity from 'Urban Renewal Area' to 'Ongoing Change Area' for the section of the Creek from Macaulay Road to Dynon Road. However, the northern section from Macaulay Road to Racecourse Road remains designated as a high intensity 'Urban Renewal Area'.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Draft MSS designates these areas as Urban Renewal. The Structure Plan provides a more comprehensive analysis of this area than the MSS which is a high level strategic document. This enables the Structure Plan to establish recommendations for the area that are in-line with the objectives of the MSS and that provide further clarity on achieving the MSS directions. Council expects to receive the Panel's report on the MSS in February 2012.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Reduce the proposed height control of buildings along the Creek from 20 metres, and in some sections of 30 metres to 5 storeys (16 metres) as set out in the Melbourne Planning Scheme Incorporated Plan Overlay 5 - Moonee Ponds Creek Concept Plan. This will be in keeping with Clause 21.04-5.</p>	<p>a. Remove reference to the discretionary height control of five storeys underneath heading regarding the Incorporated Plan Overlay 5 - Moonee Ponds Creek Concept Plan.</p>	<p>a. The reference to the Incorporated Plan Overlay (IPO) 5 – Moonee Ponds Creek Concept Plan imposing a discretionary height control of five storeys is an error in the final draft. There is no discretionary height control designates within the IPO. Any development proposal will need to comply with the building height and setback controls of the City of Melbourne's Urban Design policy, Clause 22.02 (Sunlight to Public Places) which prevents overshadowing public open space between 11am and 2pm.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. Replace proposed "discretionary" maximum height limits with mandatory height limits. The structure plan will lose credibility if proposed height limits can be disregarded and are meaningless. Many objectives, principles and strategies in the structure plan and provisions in the MSS relating to the Moonee Ponds Creek will be negated.</p>	<p>b. Incorporate additional sentence into Chapter 3, Strategy 4 as follows: 'The proposed height control at the street frontages, lane frontages and southern boundaries are mandatory. The heights across the remainder of the site are discretionary up to a maximum of +30% of the nominated height ( for 20m this would allow 26m). Beyond the street frontage or property boundary, the height limits proposed are discretionary. Any discretion to increase the height must comply with the setback conditions as outlined in Figures 3.12 to 3.16.' Update Figures 3.12 - 3.16 as per Figures B and C (in attachment 2).</p>	<p>b. The additional sentence and diagram provide clarity on the preferred future development outcomes.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. Setbacks should be included in the built form propositions for the Creek corridor, in keeping with the MSS. This will protect the waterways and banks from excessive overshadowing and minimise excessive overlooking or by 'adverse domination'. This building height and setback control would be in keeping with objectives, principles and strategies in the Structure Plan.</p>	<p>c. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Any proposal will need to comply with the building height and setback controls of the City of Melbourne's Urban Design policy, Clause 22.02 (Sunlight to Public Places) which prevents overshadowing public open space between 11am and 2pm.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Access</b></p> <p>a. Opposed to the proposal for multiple cycle/pedestrian crossings to be installed over the Creek including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Alfred-Parsons Streets</li> <li>-Sutton-Smith Streets</li> <li>-Mark-Robertson Streets.</li> </ul> <p>These crossings are in addition to the three to-be-upgraded existing pedestrian/cycle/traffic crossings at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Macaulay Rd Bridge</li> <li>-Arden St Bridge</li> <li>-Racecourse Rd, as part of the Flemington Bridge Station upgrade and in addition to further pedestrian/cycle crossings proposed as part of the public realm open space at Chelmsford Street and Bruce Street and in the face of the existing obtrusive CityLink structure alongside and passing over the Creek.</li> </ul>	<p>a. Remove the proposed creek crossings at Parsons Street and Robertson Street. Note, retain the proposed creek crossing at Smith/Sutton Street</p> <p>Remove the Bruce Street creek crossing.</p>	<p>a. Sufficient pedestrian and cycling connectivity is provided with fewer creek crossings. This provides a crossing point approximately every 200m. Sufficient pedestrian and cycling connectivity is provided with fewer creek crossings. This provides a crossing point approximately every 200m. Excessive crossings could be visually and environmentally detrimental to the creek corridor.</p>
		<p>(continued) This multiplicity of crossings over the Creek will be visually and environmentally detrimental to the Creek and will negate many of the objectives and strategies to protect and enhance its natural attributes and open space amenity and revitalise its environs.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. Proposal for a third cycle path where one already exists and another one is proposed close by is not supported, although the FoMPC supports improvements in cycle/pedestrian pathways along the length of the Moonee Ponds Creek. The western side of the Creek between Macaulay Road and Arden Street is narrow, but a 'prime' piece of open space for the Creek and it should remain for passive enjoyment and not be carved up by a 3m wide cycle path.</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>b. The design of Moonee Ponds Creek is subject to a master plan which would consider in more detail the extent of pedestrian and cycling accessways.</p>
		<p><b>6. Community Infrastructure</b>  a. Concerned about location of community hub and active sporting and recreational facilities within the Creek corridor along Langford Street. Given the population of Arden-Macaulay is predicted to increase 8-fold, then there should be an 8-fold increase in the provision of open space. Other land outside the Creek's open space corridor could be found for built recreational facilities.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan identifies upgrades to existing public open spaces, including the revitalisation of the Moonee Ponds Creek as an environmental and recreational corridor, in addition to five new local parks. The location of the community hub and sporting and recreational facilities in the Creek corridor will activate this important open space asset. The hub is located on the east of the creek and railway line. It is separated from the creek parkland and will not compromise the quality of the creek.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>7. Sustainable Infrastructure</b></p> <p>a. This admirable section is supported - excepting:  The proposal for a Central Services Hub and service links across the Creek could be in the form of overhead power lines and pipes. This would be opposed for reasons of protecting and enhancing the Creek amenity. Use of existing services infrastructure should be investigated along with putting the service links under the Creek corridor. Placing it within the Creek corridor as depicted would necessitate removal of existing mature native vegetation and allowance for road/service vehicles access to the detriment of the Creek's banks, environs and open space amenity. It is therefore opposed. The alternate options for locating the tunnel should be pursued, namely under streets or rail lines.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The implementation of the Central Services Hub and tri-pipe distribution system links will include consultation with key stakeholders to ensure that this protects the amenity and environmental performance of the Moonsee Ponds Creek. Any services within the creek corridor are proposed as underground services.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b></p> <p>a. Melbourne Water is a key organisation for the Moonee Ponds Creek and should be a party to the proposed projects relating to the sustainable infrastructure projects. The FoMPC should also seek to be part of the community consultations for these projects and ongoing consultation in relation to the plan and its implementation.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The implementation of the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan will include consultation with relevant stakeholders including Melbourne Water and the Friends of the Moonee Ponds Creek.</p>
<p><b>North and West Melbourne Association</b></p>	<p>Organisation</p>	<p><b>10. General comments</b></p> <p>a. The NWMA welcomes forward thinking about planning. However, the proposed Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS) and ancillary Structure Plans (SPs) seek to optimise in only one primary direction, excessively prioritising growth above other directions. Our position is that the SPs, and the MSS which refers to them, are unready and councillors should seek major changes to them. More specifically, the whole Arden Macaulay (AM) SP should be excised pending clarity about Melbourne Metro (MM), and the City North (CN) SP should be altered in substantial ways.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Growth is occurring at a state and municipal level. In the City of Melbourne there is residential growth and business growth. Council welcomes both and working to ensure that that growth is planned to maintain the City's ongoing high levels of liveability, prosperity and sustainability.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. The proposed MSS and the key Structure Plans on which it rests excessively prioritise catering for population growth – as the very term ‘future growth’ indicates. Other equally, or more, important considerations, such as provision of social and civic infrastructure, to match existing needs, let alone future needs, are treated at best as secondary. For example, extra school capacity is needed now, before any rezoning or urban renewal in either Arden Macaulay or City North. The current MSS provides growth opportunity that has already saturated existing school capacity, and of course Docklands has none. Essentially the Structure Plans represent a ‘rack, stack and pack’ approach – modern-day Corbusianism. No other options with more modest growth scenarios with different trade-offs, including community wellbeing and liveability etc, were countenanced or discussed.</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>b. The Structure Plan proposes growth that is integrated with the delivery of infrastructure and services to support this growth. The Structure Plans include actions to prepare Developer Contributions Plans and Open Space Levy contributions as mechanisms to contribute to funding this infrastructure. Existing surrounding established will in many instances benefit from this new infrastructure. Council will continue to advocate with the State government for the timely delivery of a new school. The Structure Plan includes strong advocacy for a school in this area, including nomination of a specific site. However, the provision of schools is determined by the DEECD. The Structure Plans propose a high-density, mid-rise and mixed use development pattern to create compact, walkable, liveable and sustainable communities. This has been central to the development of the Structure Plan.</p>
		<p>(continued) Significant, completely adequate growth opportunities could be achieved but with much better planning and outcomes for the community.</p>		



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b></p> <p>a. Having major submissions due in a short time frame over the holiday period is just one example of the problems we see with the process as it has been conducted – at odds with good and proper consultation. From the outset the ‘consultation’ process has been to railroad through a preferred approach, without inviting true community participation and input. This has been exacerbated by constant short deadlines and response times, with no satisfactory explanation and responsibility shifting as to their setting. Our understanding is should the Future Melbourne committee approve the structure plan adoption then the intention is zoning and other planning amendments be put forward to Council with no opportunity for comment at the very next meeting cycle.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Written submissions will be accepted to the February Council Meeting. Council will be considering whether to exhibit the Planning Scheme Amendment for public comment which will provide a minimum period of 4 weeks to provide additional written submissions.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. The height limits should be mandatory. It has been apparent in the process that officers have entrenched views against mandatory height controls, believing them to be both undesirable and unachievable. To some extent this is simply planning orthodoxy, but it probably reflects planners' biases, both at council level and, possibly more importantly, in the state Department of Planning. This is despite the fact that some areas in North and West Melbourne already have mandatory height limits, (re)introduced in a significant amendment to the Melbourne Planning Scheme about 10 years ago and retained since through various MSS updates and other planning scheme amendments. By and large, we consider that the mandatory height limits have worked well.</p>	<p>b. Incorporate additional sentence into Chapter 3, Strategy 4 as follows: 'The proposed height control at the street frontages, lane frontages and southern boundaries are mandatory. The heights across the remainder of the site are discretionary up to a maximum of +30% of the nominated height ( for 20m this would allow 26m). Beyond the street frontage or property boundary, the height limits proposed are discretionary. Any discretion to increase the height must comply with the setback conditions as outlined in Figures 3.12 to 3.16.' Update Figures 3.12 - 3.16 as per Figures B and C (in attachment 2).</p>	<p>b. The additional sentence and diagram provide clarity on the preferred future development outcomes.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) Other inner-city councils have since sought and seen them introduced into their planning schemes. Instead of mandatory height limits, deceptive discretionary height limits are proposed – deceptive in that they are not ‘limits’ in any sense that matters, or that the community understands. For example, there have been instances where developer proposals exceeding discretionary height limits by up to a factor of 2.5 have been approved at VCAT, even when refused by the City of Melbourne. Council has recommended some at this 2.5 level factor too.</p> <p>‘Artistic images’ and ‘indicative illustrations’ in the SP documents, e.g. p32 and p43 intended to give the reader a sense of what the future built form might be, depict existing buildings and future developments which are only as high as the discretionary height limits, and in some cases lower, e.g. p32. This is deceptive.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>6. Community Infrastructure</b></p> <p>a. Further, social and civic infrastructure – schools in particular – should be built immediately, before any further growth is fostered. Repeatedly, officers have been reluctant to specifically zone potential school sites, for example PUZ (a common zoning for schools), so as to reserve them.</p>	<p>a. Amend the proposed zoning proposition (figure 2.7) to indicate the site on the corner of Langford and Macaulay Road as a PUZ2 zone.</p>	<p>a. The structure plan proposed a school site within existing state government land. The DEECD is responsible for delivering new schools. Council will continue to advocate to the state government for the provision of a new school in the area.</p> <p>The Structure Plan identifies two new community hubs and an upgrade of the North Melbourne Community Centre. It also includes an action to prepare a Developer Contributions Plan to establish a funding mechanism to assist in the delivery of these facilities (land acquisition, design and construction). The structure plan identifies the need to acquire land for the new hub in Stage 1 on the corner of Macaulay Road and Langford Street. The zoning plan (Figure 2.7) will be amended to indicate this long-term use.</p>
		<p>c. The Council already owns significant holdings used by Citywide near the North Melbourne Recreation Reserve. Instead of proposing to buy or reserve other land, these should be used for social and civic infrastructure purposes.</p>	<p>c. No change required.</p>	<p>c. The community hubs in Arden-Macaulay are considered to be the most appropriate sites for the provision of community and education services as they are strategically located in proximity to local centres. The draft Open Space Strategy does not identify a need for significant additional areas of new open space in the vicinity of the North Melbourne Recreation Reserve.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>5. Public Realm</b></p> <p>a. Additional open space for North and West Melbourne is inadequate. Likewise active recreation facilities, for example, no new sports ovals are proposed or identified.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan identifies upgrades to existing public open spaces, including the revitalisation of the Moonee Ponds Creek as an environmental and recreational corridor, in addition to five new local parks. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan proposes the development of innovative spaces for community sport and recreation to be integrated on the eastern side of the Moonee Ponds Creek, south of Macaulay Road, facing Langford Street. This would be co-located with the proposed Macaulay Community Centre. In the delivery of Stage 2, the Structure Plan recommends the investigation of the creation of a parkland between the North Melbourne Recreation Reserve to provide for community sport and recreation needs. This space has potential to accommodate recreation facilities such as an oval or field.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. The industrial area is wrongly characterised as 'underutilised' throughout the structure plan and generally downgrades its current role and existing vitality. The current MSS values the industrial zones and seeks to protect them. The industrial area includes the two major milling operations, which provide important economic functions and employment, but has myriad other users and businesses.</p> <p>b. The approach, in response to key industrial zone users and occupiers and the Planning Panel Victoria direction, of now splitting AM into sub-areas and staging them is ad hoc and hotchpotch.</p> <p>c. The area is known to have flood risk. Recently various Victorian councils have refused housing developments in flood prone areas, in part due to perceived liability in the event of rising sea levels.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p> <p>b. No change required.</p> <p>c. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Although the area north of Macaulay Road is in the Industrial 1 zone, only a handful of sites in this area actually require an industrial zone to operate, indicating that there are opportunities to commence a transition to support an alternative range of uses in the area without jeopardising the continued operation of the majority of businesses in the area. The rezoning of the Arden-Macaulay includes a staging process to enable key industrial uses in the south remain in operation and is only rezoned in conjunction with the delivery of significant infrastructure such as the Melbourne Metro to facilitate a transition from industrial uses.</p> <p>b. The Structure Plan has been staged to ensure that development does not proceed in the southern area until the development of the Metro is committed by the State Government. The southern portion of Arden-Macaulay will therefore be designed in a manner which is well integrated with the new Metro station.</p>
				<p>c. The Arden-Macaulay Structure plan recommends that a master plan be prepared for the Moonee Ponds open space proposal with the input of key stakeholders which would address any potential flooding issues. In addition, it recommends that further investigations of potential flooding impacts be investigated.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Access</b></p> <p>a. Throughout the MSS and Structure Plan process it has been repeatedly stated that the AM SP is predicated on the Melbourne Metro, for which funding is at best uncertain. Whilst public transport investment generally is to be applauded, the Victorian public has become too accustomed to proposed new or reopened rail services never appearing, or falling short, despite countless studies and proposals. The MM is very expensive, with some public transport experts commenting that it is unnecessary and other projects such as extension of the existing rail network more important and better value.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The State Government is currently investigating the feasibility of delivering the Melbourne Metro. The implementation of the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan will be implemented in two stages to ensure that development does not proceed the delivery of suitable transport infrastructure to support the growing population. It is anticipated that this stage will commence construction in 2025 in conjunction with the delivery of the Melbourne Metro at Arden Central to ensure a high level of integration with the new station.</p>
		<p>b. Even if against-the-odds funding for MM occurs, other sites for the proposed station could be better, such as Arden St, which would allow key industrial users to remain.</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>b. The City of Melbourne will continue to work with the State Government with respect to the delivery of the Metro and prepare a master plan in partnership with the State Government for Arden Central.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<p><b>Allied Mills (Submitted by Mark Woolley of Gadens Lawyers)</b></p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b>  a. The structure plan is premised on the construction of Arden Central Station and associated infrastructure. The Structure Plan's key directions that the viability of Arden Central as a centre is dependent upon the extension of a high quality rail service connecting Arden Central directly to Melbourne. It is presumed on page 6 of the Structure Plan that urban renewal will attract infrastructure investment, which would broadly include the construction of Arden Central station and associated rail infrastructure. While plans for Melbourne Metro (including the construction of Arden Central station) have been submitted to Infrastructure Australia for funding, there is no guarantee that (a) this request will be granted; or (b) in the event that funding is granted in part, that the Arden Central station component of the Melbourne Metro design will not be discarded.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The State Government is currently investigating the feasibility of delivering the Melbourne Metro. The implementation of the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan will be implemented in two stages to ensure that development does not proceed the delivery of suitable transport infrastructure to support the growing population. It is anticipated that this stage will commence construction in 2025 in conjunction with the delivery of the Melbourne Metro at Arden Central to ensure a high level of integration with the new station.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. The Structure Plan appears to rely heavily on the Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS) which has not completed that Planning Scheme Amendment process. The Amendment C162 Panel Report has not been released as at the date of this submission and therefore there is no certainty regarding the final form of the MSS. The release of and consultation on the present iteration of the Structure Plan is therefore premature, inappropriate and inconsistent with strategic planning. Remove all reference to the 2010 exhibited MSS.</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>b. The Structure Plan provides a more comprehensive analysis of this area than the MSS which is a high level strategic document. This enables the Structure Plan to establish recommendations for the area that are in-line with the objectives of the MSS and that provide further clarity on achieving the MSS directions. Council expects to receive the Panel's report on the MSS in February 2012.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>5. Public Realm</b></p> <p>a. Given that the majority of the Arden Macaulay area south of Chelmsford Street is proposed to be rezoned to a Business 3 Zone or remain industrially zoned, our client opposes the proposed placement of a Public Park and Recreation Zone in the area east of Elizabeth Street, south of Fink Street, west of Barrett Street and north of Bruce Street. It is considered that this is an inappropriate and unmerited sterilisation of the many designated landholdings in this cache given the broadly industrial and commercial nature of the surrounding land uses. The extent of the parkland proposed (11,000m2) appears to be excessive if the underlying intention is to develop this precinct as an industrial/business area with a minor residential pocket.</p>		<p>a. The public open space proposed for Fink Street is required to support future residents and workers. The draft Open Space Strategy has undertaken a review of existing and future need. The south-western portion of the Arden-Macaulay study area currently has poor access to existing open space. This affects existing residents and workers in the area. The significant infrastructure constraints (rail and road connections) significantly compromised pedestrian access to this area. This makes the need to provide a suitably size, local park an important component in delivering long-term liveability for the area.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. Replace the reference to Amendment C177 at 2-50 Elizabeth Street with the retention of the Industrial 1 zone or Industrial 3 zone or rezone to a Business 3 zone. This is considered appropriate given this is immediately north of the Allied Mills Site, and is in line with the following statement about the latter zone in the Structure Plan "[this zone provides a distance buffer from new residential uses to the industrial use on the Allied Mills site."</p>	<p>a. Remove references to Amendment C177 and replace with height and zoning propositions.</p>	<p>a. As Amendment C177 was abandoned in December 2011, the Young Husband site at 2-50 Elizabeth Street, Kensington will be rezoned in a manner which is consistent with the rationale for the Business 3 Zone in this area. This will also include built form controls.</p>
		<p>b. While our client supports the retention of its site in an Industrial 1 Zone, it considers that the language of the Structure Plan should extend beyond this and consistently seek to protect existing industrial land uses from encroachment of sensitive land uses.</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>b. The Structure Plan provides sufficient objectives and strategies to protect the Allied Mills operation. This includes a zoning buffer proposition of Business 3 as an appropriate land use that protects Allied Mills operations from encroachment of sensitive uses.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. The Policy Context set out on page 14 of the Structure Plan should include the ILSS given that there are industrial land uses of state significance in the study area that should be protected in accordance with the recommendations of the ILSS.</p> <p>c. The EPA Industrial Residual Air Guidelines (IRAE Guidelines) recommends that sensitive land uses are not established within a minimum of 300 metres of a flour mill in order to prevent amenity impact on the beneficial uses required to be protected by State Environmental Protection Policies (SEPPs). The IRAE Guidelines also note that it is possible that greater buffer distances than those specified therein may be necessary and sound planning will need to take into account all potential impacts of a development proposal in this regard.</p>	<p>b. The Industrial Land Use Study is not a policy, however has been used to inform the analysis and recommendations in regards to Allied Mills site. A citation to this study will be included on page 21.</p> <p>c. No change.</p>	<p>b. Provide greater clarity on existing studies and their relationship to the Structure Plans.</p> <p>C. To ensure that new development does not compromise existing, viable industrial uses a requirement for new development to deal with reverse amenity impacts is included in the actions on page 52.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) In the event that a sensitive land use is established within 300 metres of the Allied Mills Site in contravention of the IRAE Guidelines and SEPPs, the agent of change should be responsible for any required ameliorative measures (for example, those associated with noise or air emissions) necessitated by inappropriate proximity to Allied Mills' pre-existing land use.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>d. The Structure Plan lacks consistency with City of Melbourne studies on which it purports to rely. The Structure Plan notes on page 21 that Figure 2.2 (extracted from the City of Melbourne Census of Land Use and Employment 2008) therein identifies the existing sites within the Arden Macaulay Area that require an industrial zoning to enable future expansion of their operations. It identifies that most of the land south of Chelmsford Road and west of the Moonee Ponds Creek proposed to become Mixed Use Zone by Figure 2.7 is incongruously recommended for retention in an industrial zone in Figure 2.2. The necessity for retention of the present industrial zoning of this area is reinforced by the existence within of the Seeing Eye Dogs Australia dog training facility located at 17 Barrett Street, Kensington.</p>	<p>d. No change required.</p>	<p>d. Vision Australia (Seeing Eye Does Australia) has written in response to the May draft indicating that they are comfortable with the proposed rezoning to Mixed Use.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>10. General Comments</b></p> <p>a. Remove references to amendment C177. All language references and mapping references within the Structure Plan to the site located at 2-50 Elizabeth Street, Kensington being subject to a separate planning process must be removed as such references are contrary to proper strategic planning and incorrect, following Council's abandonment of Amendment C177.</p>	<p>a. Remove references to Amendment C177.</p>	<p>a. As Amendment C177 was abandoned in December 2011, the Young Husband site at 2-50 Elizabeth Street, Kensington will be rezoned in a manner which is consistent with the rationale for the Business 3 Zone in this area. This will also include built form controls.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Reduce the proposed built form control of 20 metres applied to much of the land in the area south of Chelmsford Road and west of the Moonee Ponds Creek as this is excessive and inappropriate given the vast majority of land in this area will either remain industrial or be rezoned to Business 3 Zone. While such height limits may be appropriate for the high density residential apartment developments that were envisioned for this precinct in the previous iteration of the Draft Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan, they are unnecessary in what has been designated as a predominantly industrial/commercial precinct in the present structure plan.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height limits south of Chelmsford Street between Elizabeth and Barrett Street. No change to sites along Moonee Ponds Creek.</p>	<p>a. This ensures compliance with Clause 22.02: Sunlight to Public Open Spaces. The building heights in the area have been determined through an established design criteria. Setbacks at upper levels reduce the visual bulk and overshadowing impact on the public realm. The heights maintain good solar and daylight access to the street.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<p><b>Song, Richard, Sutton Street Property Pty Ltd</b></p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p><b>5. Public realm</b>  a. Objection to the identification of this property as green space as the company purchased the property as a long term investment and there is a relatively fresh 10 year lease commencing about a year ago. The tenant had committed to the fit out of the premises prior to moving in and is planning to stay in the premises beyond the current lease. To relinquish the property after owning it for a short period of time will forego a lot of opportunity costs in the future of the area. In line with the original investment objective and with the proposed rezoning, the development potential of the property would have been significantly enhanced. It is hoped that Council can explore other possibilities for green space for this scheme.</p>	<p>a. No change proposed.</p>	<p>a. The provision of public open space is an important component of delivering sustainable urban renewal. The proposed park in this location meets the important objectives around providing high quality, accessible open space for existing and future residents and workers. The introduction of a public park will have long-term benefits to the local community. Council will continue discussions with all property owners affected by the public open space proposal to progress opportunities to deliver a shared and agreeable outcome.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>Hallows, Bruce</b>	Individual	<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b></p> <p>a. The time frame in which you request a submission by January 6th 2012 is patently unreasonable and an abuse of fair administrative process. I first became aware of Councils latest proposal by virtue of its above mentioned letter and no stage during the councils consultative process relative to amendment C162 had there been any indication of a proposal to make the area surrounding Barrett &amp; Fink Streets Public Open Space. This is a very radical proposal and is planning by ambush. The proposal should have been made clearly public at the outset as I do not believe such an important proposal could have been dreamt up at the last moment. The whole process reflects poorly on your strategic Planning Staffs. I wish to record my vehement opposition to Councils proposal and wish to obtain professional planning advice to enable me to make an appropriate submission and response.</p>	<p>a - f. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Future Melbourne Committee resolved on 6 December 2011 that any future agenda items regarding significant strategic plans or policies allow for a minimum 14 day period for further comment or submissions. The Future Melbourne Committee resolved to make the City North Structure Plan available for comment for a period of 4 weeks to enable additional time for comments to be provided due to the holiday period. Dissatisfaction with the process is noted. The propositions for Open Space were prepared as an integrated planning exercise that considered the benefits of urban renewal within Arden-Macaulay. The MSS does not consider the location of new parks. The Structure Plan has been prepared in parallel with the draft Open Space Strategy which investigates the requirements for open space to meet the existing and future needs of residents and workers. The provision of public open space is an important component of delivering sustainable urban renewal and will have long-term benefits to the local community. Council will continue discussions with all property owners affected by the public open space proposal to pr</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>5. Public Realm</b></p> <p>a. The current PUZ proposal confers an enormous benefit to developers adjacent to the Barrett &amp; Fink St areas ie. Younghusband and Chelmsford St sites and the area comprising the south east corner of Barrett and Chelmsford St. Little regard has been given to the ongoing requirements of existing landowners within the Public Open Space Zone and the transition to alternative land uses contemplated by amendments C162.</p> <p>b. The park proposal at the Barrett and Fink Street site has thrown out my business plans. I had advanced plans to renovate and extend the existing building which are appropriate under Industrial 3 usage or Mixed Use Zone.</p>	<p>a-b. No change required.</p>	<p>a and b. As noted above, the location and size of the parks has been determined by the Draft Open Space strategy. A distributed number of small parks would not provide the diversity of open space required for the area.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. From a Planning perspective is it appropriate Councils Public Open Space proposal confers a profound benefit on the immediate surrounding properties with little benefit to other areas in the Arden Macaulay precinct. Has council or its planners considered smaller scale Public Open Space areas scattered throughout the precinct thereby conferring a more equitable benefit to all occupiers and allowing existing businesses to continue their operations in a viable manner with certainty of tenure.</p>	<p>c. No change required.</p>	<p>c. As noted above, the location and size of the parks has been determined by the Draft Open Space strategy. A distributed number of small parks would not provide the diversity of open space required for the area.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<p><b>Department of Planning and Community Development and Department of Transport</b></p>	<p>Government</p>	<p><b>10. General Comments</b></p> <p>a. This letter is not intended to pre-empt any decision that the Government or the Minister for Planning may make in relation to the Structure Plan or any subsequent amendments and is the made on the basis of the views of the Departments.</p> <p>b. The Structure Plan sets out a number of principles, objectives, directions, strategies and actions for the Arden Macaulay precinct. We broadly support these, noting that the precinct is strategically located in proximity to the central city and existing services, facilities and transport. Work to date has identified that this precinct has potential to accommodate significant development in an important central Melbourne location, including retail, commercial and residential development, as well as open spaces and community facilities.</p>	<p>a. No change required. b. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted. b. Noted.</p>
		<p>(continued) These characteristics, combined with the scale of growth that could be accommodated, demonstrate the state significance of the precinct.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. The Arden Melbourne Metro station would play an important role in catalysing considerable growth in the precinct through providing increased levels of access to the central city. It is also likely that other investments would be required in order to capitalise on the station investment and deliver central city growth. This would enable a continuation of Melbourne's competitive advantage in providing such land for the growth of central Melbourne, as well as increasing the level of services available to existing residents.</p>	<p>c. No change required.</p>	<p>c. Noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>d. Melbourne Metro is proceeding into the statutory and environmental approvals stage. This process will enable Government consideration of a corridor for the future construction of the project if funding is made available. The MM project was also included on the State Government's latest Infrastructure Australia (IA) submission as a priority for delivery funding, and is considered 'ready to proceed' by IA. The bid seeks IA support for additional funding for pre-construction work. This would include further refinement of the urban redevelopment requirements associated with the Arden Station. Consultation with existing land owners is expected to occur and this will ensure community and stakeholder views are considered. The strategic value of the Arden precinct for urban renewal cannot be underestimated.</p>	<p>d. No change required.</p>	<p>d. Noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. It is important to ensure urban renewal is delivered in conjunction with the new station, as this will both allow the site's full potential to be realised and support this development with mass transit. The case for a new station is significantly weakened without an appropriate change to the surrounding urban area. We support the Structure Plan approach, and in particular the staging plan, which acknowledges the parts of the precinct that would undergo change associated with the new station and the likely timing for this development.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>5. Public realm</b></p> <p>a. It is noted that VicTrack and DOT owned land abutting the Upfield rail corridor along Langford Street has been identified in the Structure Plan as being potential future public open space. This designation should not be applied at this time and instead only be considered as part of more detailed planning for stage 2 of the Structure Plan's implementation. This would allow DOT in consultation with VicTrack, DPCD and the City of Melbourne to consider all VicTrack land holdings in the stage 2 area in an integrated manner including the lands potential ongoing use for railway purposes, or re-use for public open space and urban renewal. It is understood that discussions have been held with VicTrack with respect to the treatment of land identified to be rezoned to public open space within the stage 1 area of the Structure Plan.</p>	<p>a. Amend the Stage 1 boundary to remove land south of the corner of Langford and Macaulay Road and to relocate this land into Stage 2.</p>	<p>a. The open space on Langford Street is primarily to service residents and workers coming into the area in Stage 2. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan includes actions for the City of Melbourne to work with VicTrack to negotiate potential sites to extend the Moonee Ponds Creek corridor.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Property Council of Australia	Organisation	<p><b>10. General comment</b></p> <p>a. The Property Council of Australia commends Council on the work done to prepare the structure plan and the importance of having solid planning frameworks in place to plan for Melbourne's future is acknowledged and endorses the urban renewal agenda outlined by the Future Melbourne Plan and subsequent draft Municipal Strategic Statement.</p> <p>b. The Property Council is concerned that the full potential of this area as well as the strategic intent of Future Melbourne and the MSS, is not being adequately translated into the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p> <p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p> <p>b. Noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. The provision of the Melbourne Metro One rail tunnel is vital infrastructure for the future development of Melbourne and the Arden-Macaulay area. The Central Arden area of the Structure Plan should leverage off its unique location and potential for a new high capacity rail station by ensuring the surrounding heights maximise the opportunity for commercial office space, retail and residential development.</p>	<p>c. No change required.</p>	<p>c. Noted.</p>
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Concerned about the proposed scale of the development as visual images and stated objectives within the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan identify a low-medium scale development form, which appears to be at odds with the strategic intent of Future Melbourne and the MSS that describe large scale opportunities and associated yield. Given the area covered by the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan, the proposed development objectives are too minimal and increased higher scale development should be incorporated.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan proposes a transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character. Higher density development is appropriate in proximity to activity centres and public transport infrastructure and has already been incorporated into the Plan.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b></p> <p>a. It is fundamental that the planning frameworks can be properly implemented by the private sector. In order to deliver upon stated policy and community objectives of urban renewal, the development industry will require appropriate returns to offset development risks. This requires the vision and planning controls to be responsive to market needs. The significant amount of strategic work completed thus far is of little value if the necessary pre-conditions for significant private investment are not created. The implementation of stated objectives and design outcomes will depend on private investment and property development. The Property Council urges Council to identify implementation measures as a critical objective of the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan and ensure planning and height controls respond to market realities.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. The staging of the north and south areas is acknowledged. However, the first stage development to the north should seek to establish the market conditions that will provide for the large-scale development of the Arden Central precinct. It takes time for property markets to mature and the northern precinct will play an important role in the ultimate development of the area. The Stage 1 northern area will play an important role in demonstrating to financiers and bankers that the risks of associated with property development are acceptable. However, even without the provision of the Melbourne Metro One rail tunnel in the short term, structure planning needs to preserve future development at an appropriate scale.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) Considering the proximity of the structure plan area and the significant growth pressures being faced by the city, the northern areas of the Structure Plan should ensure maximum housing supply. Historically in Melbourne there has been a lag between the initial inception of large scale urban renewal projects and subsequent market demand. In order to build a market base that can facilitate large scale construction around any potential Arden station, the Northern area must be feasible for residential apartment development, as well as other uses.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. The housing affordability targets in strategy 4 are not supported and Council should consider replacing this with opportunities to streamline the planning process, fast-track approvals and increase density through these means. The provision of affordable housing is fundamental to the ongoing prosperity of Melbourne and the Property Council acknowledges the merit of this objective. However, inclusionary zoning operates as an inefficient tax and does not provide a sustainable solution to the provision of more affordable housing. If 20% affordable housing is mandated, market dynamics are such that the remaining 80% will bear the cost of the designated 'affordable' houses.</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>b. The target for the provision of 20 per cent affordable housing was established as a goal of <i>Future Melbourne</i>. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan recommends the action for further investigation regarding appropriate mechanisms for the delivery of affordable housing and also the development of a housing policy.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) The introduction of a mandated affordable housing quota is counterproductive. Creating equilibrium between supply and demand is the most effective way to put downward pressure on property prices. Within the inner city housing market there has been substantial price growth even with a large number of apartments being constructed, owing to underlying demand. Supply of well-located development opportunities, that maximise yield, is the most efficient and effective way of placing downward pressure on price (assuming constant demand).</p>		



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. Council's objective for a concentration of employment related uses within the Arden-Macaulay area to complement existing investments in the CBD and surrounds is supported. However, the market demand for new commercial office space will only be induced upon delivery of Arden Metro. Without this infrastructure investment, existing supply opportunities in Docklands, CBD and surrounds will continue to be more attractive. It is unlikely that areas to the north would be able to support any large scale commercial development given its limited market appeal. Without a significant anchor such as the Arden Metro station, the employment, community and market aspirations outlined in the Structure Plans will be unlikely to be achieved.</p>	<p>c. No change required.</p>	<p>c. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan establishes a 30 year vision for the area. It acknowledges the need for a staged transition that is coordinated with the delivery of infrastructure to support urban renewal. The area bounded by Ink Lane, Langford Street, Boundary Road, Henderson Street, Fogarty Street, Arden Street and Dryburgh Street therefore forms part of Stage 2 of the Plan as urban renewal in this area must be coordinated with delivery of the Melbourne Metro that can support this change in use. Planning for the metro project is already underway.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>d. There would be sufficient demand to warrant an additional activity centre at the existing North Melbourne station given the significance of a potential centre proximate to the proposed Arden Metro station, notwithstanding the limited availability of developable land in the existing station precinct catchment.</p> <p>e. Zoning and height controls proximate to all designated activity centres should facilitate development to maximise opportunities for sustainable travel modes, such as walking and cycling, without major physical barriers.</p>	<p>d. No change required.</p> <p>e. No change required.</p>	<p>d. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan proposes the development of an activity centre near North Melbourne station.</p> <p>e. The built form propositions are higher in activity centres and are proposed to be designed in a manner to maximise opportunities for walking, cycling and public transportation.</p>
		<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Access</b></p> <p>a. The Property Council is concerned that the success of the Structure Plans relies heavily on the delivery of significant rail infrastructure. It will be vital that Council works closely with Victorian Government agencies to ensure the greatest potential for the success of these areas exists.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The City of Melbourne will continue to work with transport authorities for improved service frequency, and upgrades to stations to improve pedestrian access and will continue to advocate for the Melbourne Metro, which aims to increase the capacity of the entire public transport network.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>Williams, Angela</b>	Individual	<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b></p> <p>a. Publicise the comments received from Government Departments and Organisations in the interests of transparency.</p>	a. Noted.	a. The comments received in response to Government Departments and organisations have been placed on the City of Melbourne where permission has been granted by the organisation to make this available.
		<p>b. A Q&amp;A meeting held between officers and residents in late December was advised that following the February Future Melbourne consideration of the Structure Plan, the officers will put Draft Planning Scheme Amendments before the Council Meeting at the end of February. I consider that the council should insist that the draft PSAs are taken through a committee cycle, as only then can the wider community have an opportunity to make submissions and address the council about the detail which will subsequently placed on exhibition. From past experience, the community know that the devil is in the detail, and it is important that the PSAs which are place on amendment, as far as possible, enjoy wide community support.</p>	b. No change required.	b. Noted. The Planning Scheme Amendment will be consistent with the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan. Written submissions will be accepted to the February Council Meeting. Council will be considering whether to exhibit the Planning Scheme Amendment for public comment which will provide a minimum period of 4 weeks to provide additional written submissions.

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. I remain at a loss to understand why these structure plans have to proceed at breakneck speed, rather than to progress with adequate time for the community to absorb the vast amount of detail contained in the plans and debate the issues prior to council making a decision.</p>	<p>c. No change required.</p>	<p>c. Noted.</p>
		<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Access</b>  a. In Boundary Rd, which is currently only two lanes, the introduction of a bus lane in wither direction is likely to be a quasi increase in the road capacity, one which is considered to be contrary to the historic 'condition' which City Link imposed when the toll road was introduced. Commentary is sought from the council officers whether preliminary advice has been sought or received from Vic Roads/DoT about such proposals.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Structure Plan recommends that the City of Melbourne work with the State Government to introduce the dedicated, proposed bus route along Boundary Road. VicRoads has expressed their willingness to work together to achieve better transport outcomes for the area.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>6. Community Infrastructure</b></p> <p>a. I do not accept that there will be adequate schooling provision by 2040 in the North Melbourne area with the City North and Arden Macaulay areas with the consideration to date of one primary school on the site of the former archive. It is short sighted to not set aside a preferred location for both primary and secondary schooling in the combined area, and potentially two new primary schools. The demographics of the area are rapidly changing, and the increase in numbers of people wishing to live and work in the area is bringing children who will need to go to already full schools. These schools will need access to open space and to areas for multipurpose and sports usage which they can have ownership over during the day and school terms - this need does not fit well with existing multipurpose spaces, so new ones will need to be identified.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan identifies the Victorian Archives site in Shiel Street in North Melbourne as a suitable site for a potential school. This site is included in Stage 1. The State Government's Department of Education and Early Childhood Development is responsible for building and funding new schools. The DEECD will ultimately determine where a new primary school will be delivered to service inner Melbourne, however, the City of Melbourne will advocate for a new school in Arden-Macaulay.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(Continued) They can also double as the community spaces outside of school time, but these need to be set aside. To say it is a State Government responsibility is short sighted, as the DEECD is commonly working in partnership with local government in the growth corridors for councils to be build combined recreational and kindergarten facilities with schools in order to gain mutual benefits. The City of Melbourne should lead the way, and carefully consider where these shared facilities would be best located for the community.</p>		
<p><b>Woolworths</b> (Submitted by Sarah Wallbank of Urbis)</p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p><b>10. General Comments</b> a. It is agreed the Arden Macaulay area represents a significant underutilisation given its proximity to the CBD. There is significant potential for regeneration of this area, to contribute employment and residential uses, and to provide new community and retail facilities to service existing and future growth.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. It is agreed that a staged approach to regeneration of the area is practical, and agree that the subject site should be located within Stage 1.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>
		<p>b. A more sophisticated policy approach to delivery of affordable housing is required. Melbourne City Council should not contain an over-simplistic policy that encourages all development to provide 20% affordable housing, to be delivered in conjunction with a housing association. We consider this provide a needs-led analysis or contextual solution. For example, the subject site has a large number of public housing provided by DHS in a very close proximity, and it is considered that further delivery of social housing in this context may not be required nor desirable.</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>b. The target for the provision of 20 per cent affordable housing was established as a goal of Future Melbourne. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan recommends the action for further investigation regarding appropriate mechanisms for the delivery of affordable housing and also the development of a housing policy.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. The establishment of a new local activity centre in the vicinity of Macaulay Road to meet the current and future demands for local retail and other services is supported.</p> <p>d. The development of a centre that is co-located with the potential future school site is supported.</p>	<p>c. No change required.</p> <p>d. No change required.</p>	<p>c. Noted.</p> <p>d. Noted.</p>
		<p>e. The proposed zoning should extend the Business 1 zone to 101-117 Canning Street, 168-190 Macaulay Road and 2-24 Vaughan Terrace, which is clearly within the proposed local centre. A Business 1 zone is most appropriate for an activity centre location.</p>	<p>e. No change required.</p>	<p>e. The proponent's development proposal has been conceived in a mixed use zone which has not precluded the proponent from achieving their development objectives.</p>
		<p>f. We support delivery of housing diversity across the Activity Centre, and consider that delivery of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom apartments will add variety to the existing housing stock in adjacent area, which tends to be dominated by detached and terraced dwellings.</p>	<p>e. No change required.</p>	<p>e. Noted.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisatio n	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. It is agreed that the regeneration of the wider activity centre must be at sufficiently high densities to support public transport, create a compact city and take advantage of the excellent urban infrastructure in the nearby areas, including road networks and the Melbourne CBD.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>
		<p>b. It is recommended that as the many built form principles and indicative sections are translated into policy, Melbourne City Council consider these as a guide, and allow for site and context specific design, rather than a 'planning by numbers' approach.</p>	<p>b. Incorporate additional sentence into Chapter 3, Strategy 4 as follows: 'The proposed height control at the street frontages, lane frontages and southern boundaries are mandatory. The heights across the remainder of the site are discretionary up to a maximum of +30% of the nominated height ( for 20m this would allow 26m). Beyond the street frontage or property boundary, the height limits proposed are discretionary. Any discretion to increase the height must comply with the setback conditions as outlined in Figures 3.12 to 3.16.' Update Figures 3.12 - 3.16 as per Figures B and C (in attachment 2).</p>	<p>b. The additional sentence and diagram provide clarity on the preferred future development outcomes.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. It is agreed that buildings must be of high quality and improve the poor quality of existing streetscapes.</p> <p>d. Concerned about the recommendation for creation of intersections every 50-100 metres. While permeability is important, the requirement is excessive and unnecessary to create a legible and walkable urban form.</p>	<p>c. No change required.</p> <p>d. No change required.</p>	<p>c. Noted.</p> <p>d. Additional through block linages are required in Arden-Macaulay to ensure a high level of permeability through very large blocks.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>e. Concerned that a through block link, open to the sky and a minimum of 8 metres wide, has been identified along the south-eastern boundary of the subject site. There is no destination for this link (such as an intersection or open space), which runs from Canning Street to Macaulay Road. Delivery of this link in the short term will result in an potentially unsafe link 'to nowhere'. The Draft Plan does not consider the considerable fall in topography from Canning Street to Macaulay Road, in the order of 4 metres, which would make future development to activate such a laneway difficult. Further, a vehicular link in this location will undermine efforts in our existing permit application to separate retail traffic (vehicles and service delivery) from the residential areas to the north-east of the site.</p>	<p>e. No change required.</p>	<p>e. This through block link will provide improved connectivity between bus routes along Shiel Street and the parks located on the southern side of Macaulay Road. As the Structure Plan is a 30 year vision for the transition of the area, in the future these laneway links will create better connected communities. The link is proposed on the Archives site.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) From a commercial operations perspective, servicing the site via the laneway will comprise the capacity of the site to accommodate a full-line supermarket, as the turning space for large trucks will require around a third of the floorplate area. It is recommended that a through block link is considered in the longer term, once further regeneration of the area is underway, and is provided as part of the redevelopment of the adjacent Archive site.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>f. There is potential for a significantly greater height than the proposed 30 metre height control to be considered on the subject site given the scale of surrounding development (including the 21 level tower to the north of the site), its corner location and three street frontages, the wide streets and green space that frame the site, the insufficient supply of housing in Melbourne, and aspirations for an activity centre in this location. A diagram prepared by Buchanan is attached which shows how the Activity Centre might instead evolve, focusing height as an urban marker of a vibrant and active centre.</p>	<p>b. Incorporate additional sentence into Chapter 3, Strategy 4 as follows: 'The proposed height control at the street frontages, lane frontages and southern boundaries are mandatory. The heights across the remainder of the site are discretionary up to a maximum of +30% of the nominated height ( for 20m this would allow 26m). Beyond the street frontage or property boundary, the height limits proposed are discretionary. Any discretion to increase the height must comply with the setback conditions as outlined in Figures 3.12 to 3.16.' Update Figures 3.12 - 3.16 as per Figures B and C (in attachment 2).</p>	<p>b. The additional sentence and diagram provide clarity on the preferred future development outcomes.</p>
		<p><b>5. Public Realm</b> a. We are generally supportive of the greening of the streets of North Melbourne and improvement to public open space. With regard to the proposed street hierarchy and indicative street sections, we urge Council to apply these as a guide only rather than rely on prescriptive controls.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The street sections included in the appendix are indicative.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. With regards to the proposal to require a land contribution (rather than cash) from Clause 52.01 Open Space, we consider that Council should be more flexible in this approach. For example, in the case of the subject site, a large area of open space (Clayton Reserve) is located within very close proximity. The further provision of land for public green, open space is not required and would impact on the operations of the retail component of the development proposal. We consider that in this case, a cash contribution would be better used to improve the quality and offering of this open space.</p>	<p>b. No change required.</p>	<p>b. Cash or in-kind land contributions would be considered at the planning application stage.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>EG Funds Management Pty Ltd (Submitted by Robert Keiderman of Contour Consultants Aust Pty Ltd)</b>	Individual	<p><b>2. Activities and Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. Supportive of the original proposal to rezone the area generally bounded by Chelmsford Street, Arden Street, Elizabeth Street and Barrett Street from Industrial 1 and 3 zones to the Mixed Use Zone.</p> <p>b. Concerned by new proposal for the balance of the precinct to be zoned as a Business 3 Zone in lieu of a Mixed Use Zone. It is understood that this in response to submissions made on behalf of Allied Mills. This recent change in position by Council officers is of significant concern and, with respect is submitted to be without proper basis and is flawed.</p>	a. No change required.	<p>a. The Business 3 Zone is more reflective of the existing mix of warehouses and offices in the area. The Business 3 Zone will support some new development, whilst also providing a buffer to the Allied Mills site which is a key primary industry in Victoria. A business zone will allow for an increase in employment uses. 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. As such, these provisions will enable existing industrial uses (those not permitted in a B3Z) and residential land uses to remain.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. With respect to the land holding at 1-7 Elizabeth Street, advice from Burton Acoustic Group prepared on behalf of the client, attached, concludes that noise from industrial sources in the area, including from Allied Mills is not an impediment to the future redevelopment of this land for mixed-use purposes, including for residential use.</p> <p>d. It is requested that Council's initial intention to include the precinct bounded by Chelmsford Street, Arden Street, Elizabeth Street and Barrett Street in a Mixed Use Zone be maintained. The Mixed Use Zone is the most appropriate zone that reflects the mixed use character of this area.</p>	<p>c. No change required.</p>	



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) The attached advice from Essential Economics, prepared on behalf of the client, concludes that the inclusion of this precinct within a Business 3 Zone rather than a Mixed Use, as Council initially proposed will effectively sterilise the precinct from new development in the foreseeable future, despite the precinct being characterised at present by under-utilised or vacant property. Further, the encouragement of a mix of employment and residential activities under a Mixed Use Zone, as opposed to a Business 3 Zone, would result in an increase in jobs and economic activity in the area being something that is unlikely to be delivered under a Business 3 Zone. Council's existing and proposed MSS emphasises protection of existing industry and identifies that the onus should be placed on new development to implement appropriate mitigation measures to minimise impacts on nearby established industry.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(Continued) That is why 'controls' such as DDO226 dealing with noise protection is the more appropriate mechanism. With respect, industry such as Allied Mills will not be adversely affected by the introduction of mixed use zoning.</p> <p>Industry of th is nature now represents an exception within the precinct, but will nonetheless be able to continue to function in this area as they currently do. That industry will have comfort that detailed interface issues relating to amenity buffers and acoustic attenuation and the like, will be addressed and tested through necessary planning scheme amendment and planning permit application processes.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>EG Funds Management Pty Ltd (Submitted by Mark Naughton of Planning &amp; Property Partners Pty Ltd)</b>		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. Concerned by the change in the position of the Structure Plan insofar as it affects its sites and the area of Kensington generally bordered by Arden Street, the railway line, Chelmsford Street, Bairrett Street and the Moonee Ponds Creek. Our client is of the understanding that such changes essentially emanate from discussions with Allied Mills Pty Ltd ("Allied Mills"). It is submitted that the reasons behind this change in position lack transparency and that no strategic justification or detailed analysis exists to support such changes.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>	<p>Noted, as above. The reports mentioned were produced to support the specific design rationale of Amendment C177 and these reports do not necessarily translate in the application of other sites in the area.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. The Structure Plan correctly recognises that the profile of businesses in the area has changed, creating an area which is largely underutilised, redundant or vacant (particularly considering its proximity to the CBD). It acknowledges the drift to now obsolete planning controls and the resultant low value land uses. It correctly highlights the misalignment of existing land use planning controls with highest and best land use outcomes.</p> <p>c. The proposal to rezone the area to Business 3 Zone ("B3Z"), rather than MUZ, in the context of Council's recognition of the existing out of date planning controls and underutilisation currently affecting the precinct, is perplexing, it goes against all sound strategic planning considerations, as well as expert analysis in respect of economic and amenity considerations.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>d. The Structure Plan indicates that the B3Z is required to provide a distance buffer to the Allied Mills site, but the expert analysis at this time is that such a buffer is simply not required. No analysis exists to indicate that a buffer is necessary. Allied Mills is already within close proximity to existing residential areas in Bellair Street and Chelmsford Street. A number of dwellings are also located opposite Allied Mills, in the area directly across Elizabeth Street. Allied Mills is far from an unimpeded operation and is already subject to a number of constraints on its operations by virtue of, amongst other things, the registered section 173 Agreement on its title, controlling its operations. Leading acoustic consultants, Burton Acoustic Group, conclude that noise from industrial sources in the area, including from Allied Mills, is minor and entirely manageable by way of acoustic glazing and design.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) In many instances, it is simply mitigated by modest distance from the source. Similarly, Dr Terry Bellair, a leading expert in buffer and related matters, has examined Allied Mills' operations and believes that there are no concerns with dust and odour emissions. His advice has been that the Allied operation will not be prejudiced by more sensitive uses in the area.</p> <p>e. Apply the MUZ, as originally proposed by Council, as this is the most appropriate land use control for this precinct. Allied Mills represents an exception to the general decline of this industrial precinct. Nonetheless, it will be able to continue to function as it currently does, with mixed use development in the area. Essential Economics believes that such a MUZ zoning would invigorate new investment within the precinct. A MUZ is more in keeping with the realities of this area and is supported by key State and local planning policies.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>f. The relevance of the planning controls that effect the precinct are out of date and it is urged that Council to consider the concepts of economic stagnancy and un-utilised land.</p>		
<p><b>Kansom Holdings Pty Ltd (Submitted by Kaz Bartaska)</b></p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b>  a. The timing of the submissions deadline is impractical as it occurs over the festive holiday period.  b. I did attempt to follow the links provided in your email of the 21" December to understand the process of submissions but it is not clear. Despite searching for guidelines on making a submission I could not see any such information nor to where it should be directed.</p>	<p>a. Noted.  b. Noted.</p>	<p>a. The Future Melbourne Committee resolved on 6 December 2011 that any future agenda items regarding significant strategic plans or policies allow for a minimum 14 day period for further comment or submissions. The Future Melbourne Committee resolved to make the City North Structure Plan available for comment for a period of 4 weeks to enable additional time for comments to be provided due to the holiday period.  b. Noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. The neighbourhood has real potential for mixed residential development. Considering its proximity to the city we do see this type of plan as inevitable.</p> <p>b. The plan includes development of the cement site at the junction of Arden and the Tollway for public transport access/hub. Clearly necessary! Imagine its development around a clean creek with a park and full bicycle access!</p>	<p>a and b. No change required.</p>	<p>a. and b. noted.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>5. Public Realm</b></p> <p>a. The Moonee Ponds creek is a key weakness to the region. Without a total clean up and beautification project any abutting development contains a health and safety risk as well as an eyesore. The creek is a key opportunity, a cornerstone of development along that corridor. The bike track, the banks of the creek, the entrance to the Yarra present an absolute opportunity to dramatically enhance the environment. Imagine the creek being dredged and clean. Imagine it being accessible for recreation. Imagine then developing residences, appropriate infrastructure such as cafes along that corridor and the value that it would add to the whole community.</p>	<p>a. Noted, no change proposed.</p>	<p>a. The propositions for Open Space were prepared as an integrated planning exercise that considered the benefits of urban renewal within Arden-Macaulay. The Structure Plan has been prepared in parallel with the draft Open Space Strategy which investigates the requirements for open space to meet the existing and future needs of residents and workers. The provision of public open space is an important component of delivering sustainable urban renewal and will have long-term benefits to the local community. This includes a significant enhancement of the Moonee Ponds Creek - including expansion of the creek at a number of points. It is important that this includes a diversity of open spaces to accommodate both active and passive recreation.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. Removing a viable block from a valuable area to replace it with a park when only metres away we have an exceptional opportunity for an ideal park does not make sense. Better to invest the cost in rehabilitating the creek. A clean creek will attract positive development and not allow sheer opportunism to milk the area without maximising its value to the community.</p> <p>c. Melbourne needs positive enhancement, it needs to build on its reputation as a garden city and provide a healthy social environment and not unbridled reactionary residential development.</p>	<p>b - c. Noted, no change proposed.</p>	<p>b and c. The propositions for Open Space were prepared as an integrated planning exercise that considered the benefits of urban renewal within Arden-Macaulay. The Structure Plan has been prepared in parallel with the draft Open Space Strategy which investigates the requirements for open space to meet the existing and future needs of residents and workers. The provision of public open space is an important component of delivering sustainable urban renewal and will have long-term benefits to the local community. This includes a significant enhancement of the Moonee Ponds Creek - including expansion of the creek at a number of points. It is important that this includes a diversity of open spaces to accommodate both active and passive recreation.</p>
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. The old buildings in Elizabeth Street are also an opportunity. To see them lose their potential charm and enhancement potential to stark replacement with high-rise takes us in the wrong direction. These buildings have community merit and potential for softening a development.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The built form design objectives include the reuse of existing older buildings where possible. A review of existing heritage controls is also underway which will review the heritage status of all buildings in Arden-Macaulay.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>Flemington Association</b>	Organisation	<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b></p> <p>a. Racecourse Road is the boundary between the Cities of Melbourne and Moonee Valley. This presents obvious planning challenges, which are evident in the draft structure plans for Racecourse Road (Moonee Valley) and Arden-Macaulay (Melbourne), which is happening simultaneously. The respective councils are imposing substantially different visions for their respective parts of Racecourse Road. Despite commitments to ‘work together’, the Association’s experience is that consultation and communication between the two councils on planning issues is minimal and largely ineffective. This criticism applies equally to planning on a macro scale (the structure plans) and planning on a micro scale (individual planning applications).</p>	<p>a. No change proposed.</p>	<p>a. The City of Melbourne has been working with the City of Moonee Valley on the Racecourse Road Activity Centre Structure Plan (RRAC SP). The heights and zonings for areas within the Arden-Macaulay area have been assessed in their context. The Structure Plan proposes, however, to prepare a master plan for this area that will enable further integration with the CoMV’s work. It is acknowledged that a coordinated response to this area is valuable. The RRAC SP boundary has recently been expanded providing further opportunity to consider integrated outcomes. This master plan will also work with the Office of Housing to develop the future vision for Racecourse Road and Flemington Bridge.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. Remove Racecourse Road from the Structure Plan. Racecourse Road does not logically form part of the Arden-Macaulay area. Racecourse Road is designated by Melbourne 2030 as a Major Activity Centre (although the Association considers that it would be more appropriate to designate it as a Neighbourhood Activity Centre). Most of Racecourse Road falls within the City of Moonee Valley. Moonee Valley City Council is currently preparing a structure plan for Racecourse Road. Since Racecourse Road has, in itself, been designated as an Activity Centre, it is inappropriate to then seek to include parts of Racecourse Road in the structure plan of another area. The concept of planning of 'centres' is undermined by treating an area as part of two centres. If Racecourse Road is said to be part of two centres (i.e. the Racecourse Road Activity Centre and the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan area), then it logically must fall at the boundaries of each centre. It is illogical to say that an area can be the centre of two centres.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>If Racecourse Road is accepted as being at the boundary of two centres, then Racecourse Road should not be expected to accommodate the higher population and density growths expected of a 'centre'. It was suggested at the consultation meeting on 20 December 2011 that Racecourse Road was included because of its proximity to Flemington Bridge Railway Station. As discussed below, we consider that certain areas around Flemington Bridge Railway Station need consideration and planning guidance. That consideration and guidance should be the subject of a separate study. If Racecourse Road is being considered because of its proximity to Flemington Bridge Railway Station, then it is appropriate that it be considered as part of the separate study of the Flemington Bridge area, rather than as part of the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. We understand that the City of Melbourne has consulted with the City of Moonee Valley regarding the Racecourse Road Structure Plan. As a result of this consultation, parts of Racecourse Road that fall on the City of Melbourne's side of the boundary have been included in the Racecourse Road Structure Plan to facilitate the sharing of Council resources (e.g. Flem-Ken Town Hall and the Kensington Community School). Should it be felt necessary to provide planning guidance for the eastern part of Racecourse Road, it should be done in consultation with the City of Moonee Valley as part of its development of the Racecourse Road Structure Plan. Planning objectives could be provided in the Racecourse Road Structure Plan and then adopted by the City of Melbourne as part of its planning schemes as necessary.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>d. The area east of Flemington Bridge Railway Station is in need of rejuvenation. In particular, the triangular area bordered by Flemington Road, Racecourse Road and Boundary Road needs attention. It is currently a mixture of residential and commercial uses (i.e. a petrol station and a car wash). It is bordered by three roads with high traffic volumes and is somewhat of an island amongst traffic. Future development is appropriate for this area and guidance should be provided for that development. Other areas that may be appropriate for future development include Racecourse Road to the east of Citylink, which includes another petrol station and a brothel. The fact that these areas were not included in the original study area for the Structure Plan was a major oversight. This oversight should not prevent further planning being undertaken for the area.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(continued) As discussed at the consultation meeting held on 20 December 2011, we consider that a separate study of the area around Flemington Bridge Railway Station should be conducted and appropriate planning guidance be developed for this area. Such a study should include the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The triangle area bordered by Flemington Road, Racecourse Road and Boundary Road;</li> <li>• The area of land adjacent to the eastern side of the Flemington Bridge Railway Station (i.e. bordered by Racecourse Road to the south, Boundary Road to the east and north and the Upfield Railway Line to the west);</li> </ul>		



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Racecourse Road between Citylink and Lambeth St. Such areas are either in need of rejuvenation or are areas that, due to their proximity, are likely to utilise the Flemington Bridge Railway Station. A study of the Flemington Bridge Railway Station area should include clear objectives to increase the frequency of trains at the Flemington Bridge Railway Station. Currently trains are timetabled at 20 minute intervals during peak hour, which is approximately half the number of peak hour trains timetabled at outer suburban stations, such as Frankston.</li> </ul>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Reduce proposed heights of 30 metres on Racecourse Road. Similar heights are proposed in only two other parts of the Structure Plan: the land to the east of Macaulay Railway Station; and land around the proposed Arden Metro Railway Station. Both of these areas are the 'anchors' of the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan, evidenced in the name and in the selection of the study area. Racecourse Road is not a centre or anchor of the study area; rather, as discussed above, it is on the boundary of the study area (as well as another activity centre). It is illogical that Racecourse Road, which is at the very edge of the City of Melbourne, should be considered appropriate for buildings of 30m in height, whereas sites closer to the CBD are treated in a more conservative manner.</p>	<p>a. No change proposed.</p>	<p>a. See above response.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>For example, the Meat Market, which has good public transport connections and is proximate to educational, entertainment and employment opportunities and is closer to the CBD, is proposed for 14m, a mere 4m increase on the current 10m height. In comparison, Racecourse Road, where heights are generally less than 10m, is proposed for a tripling in height to 30m. Planning generally adopts the approach of focusing or concentrating development in central areas and then gradually decreasing densities and heights further out from the centres. This approach has been adopted for the Structure Plan, with heights decreasing for sites further from Macaulay and the proposed Arden Railway Stations. The exception is Racecourse Road, where the heights again shoot up to 30m. The only justification given for this increase is Racecourse Road's proximity to Flemington Bridge Station.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>As discussed below, the Flemington Bridge Station area is not part of the study area; should be dealt with as part of a separate study; and does not justify increased heights as part of the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan.</p> <p>b. Heights of 30m in the eastern part of Racecourse Road are inconsistent with the Racecourse Road Structure Plan currently being developed by the City of Moonee Valley. In that structure plan, heights of 3-4 storeys are proposed for the area between the Craigieburn Railway Line and Nottingham Street. Objectives for the Debney Park Housing Estate have been proposed, which are predicated on the need for a separate master planning exercise in coordination with the Office of Housing.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>Should such a redevelopment occur, heights of no more than 4-6 storeys are proposed. If the two structure plans are approved in their current forms, then both structure plans will have failed to achieve a consistent and coherent vision for Racecourse Road. The resulting development, with different height limits applying to opposite sides of the road, will result in an ad hoc development, which would be no better than if there had been no structure plans at all.</p> <p>c. Future development of the housing estate will depend on the State Government and the Office of Housing. Any redevelopment of the area will be expected to be a redistribution of existing housing, as opposed to an area for increased growth. Although it is theoretically possible that a new building could be built over the existing car park, this is not appropriate.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>More buildings on the boundary of Racecourse Road would further separate the housing estate from the rest of the Flemington community by visually closing off the estate from the surrounding built form.</p> <p>We consider that the Structure Plan should directly address the housing estate as an architectural precedent.</p> <p>Flemington has seen the housing estate used as a precedent for two high-rise developments (the Lombards tower and 1 Ascot Vale Road). It is entirely inappropriate for the housing estate towers to be used as a precedent or justification for high-rise development and this should be clearly stated in the Structure Plan. It is widely acknowledged across professions that the housing estate towers are poor housing models, with social, architectural and environmental deficiencies.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>d. We note that some of the areas in the Structure Plan are proposed to have height decreases. In particular, the area bordered by Racecourse Road, Citylink, Boundary Road and Macaulay Road is planned to have a decrease in building heights. The area is currently an industrial area with large warehouses. The Association suggests that larger developments could be accommodated in this area without disrupting the overall visual bulk or visual impression of the area. Rather than seeking to impose excessive building heights in Racecourse Road, consideration should be given to maintaining higher building heights which already exist in the study area. It is not apparent why the City of Melbourne would decide to preserve Younghusband, yet actively encourage the destruction of larger, similar structures in order to allow the building of lower rise buildings.</p>		
<p>Dally, Katharine and Brant, Dion</p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p><b>10 General Comments</b> a. We read about the new structure plan with excitement as there is so much opportunity for improvement and rejuvenation in the Kensington/ north Melbourne area.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>	

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Reduce proposed height control on corner of Rankins Road and Macaulay Road to a more reasonable 9m or 10.5m limit as per the surrounding area and to better consider the local community and their interests. Major concern regarding the proposal for a height limit of 20 metres for the corner of Rankins rd and Macaulay rd which is inconsistent with the principle of "integrating the area's heritage into urban renewal." Any structure erected on the site bounded by Rankins/ Macaulay/laneway will impact on the residential area fronting Rankins Road, which is also a heritage overlay area. Furthermore, any structure erected on the site bounded by laneway/Macaulay/Barnett/laneway will impact not only on the residential area fronting Barnett Street, but also the rear yards of a number of the Rankins Road properties, starting with 167.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>The sites proposed for rezoning to mixed use are currently occupied by single storey structures and a yard. In the proposal, apart from a slim area of 10.5 m, the heights proposed are 20 m, or approx. 6 storeys. At this height, there would be detrimental impacts on the adjoining residential and heritage overlay areas, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) objectionable visual bulk of 6-storey buildings compared with the adjoining 1- and 2-storey residential built form.</li> <li>(b) domination of the precinct by buildings that are out of scale with the existing built form.</li> <li>(c) potential overlooking into front and rear open spaces of adjoining properties.</li> <li>(d) detrimental impact on the heritage character of the existing precinct by the imposition of modern structures of excessive height.</li> </ul>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>In Rankins Road, the properties 159 to 167 will be the most affected, with any structure on the corner visible from all front gardens and from some rear private open spaces. If this structure is 20 m in height, it is difficult to imagine that it could do anything but dominate these properties and the precinct in general. There will be similar impacts in Barnett Street.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>Muhifait, Petra</b>	Individual	<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Reduce the proposed height limit in the vicinity Macaulay Street to 10.5 m. The proposed development would almost double the height of the buildings that are presently in situ, dwarfing these buildings and residences. This could have the potential for overshadowing, diminishing access to natural light and creating wind and noise issues in the small lane way that separates my residence from the proposed developments. Macaulay St has an incline from Macaulay Station to Kensington Station. Visually, creating a graduated and varied street scape as the building go up the hill would be more appropriate, visually interesting/pleasing to existing residents and less of a wind tunnel; with the lowest height buildings being on the bottom of the hill.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>Traffic flow in this area is already a problem. Smaller developments would create less further adverse impact on already existing and unsolved problems. Development at the bottom of the hill should be sensitive and blend with the nearby single story cottage character of this small pocket of Kensington. Going from 9 m (cottages) to 10.5 m to 20 m is a rather large increase, particularly for any developments at the bottom of the Kensington hill. Overall, I feel that this area clearly has much to offer and developing it appropriately would only benefit everyone.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Department of Education and Early Childhood Development	Government	<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b></p> <p>a. The Department has welcomed the opportunity to work with the City of Melbourne over the last 12 months to identify opportunities for Government education provision for the existing and future residents. The Department are advising that no decision has been made and they are still completing a study to identify appropriate locations for a future school. The Department expresses concerns that the nomination of a possible schools site may cause false expectations in the community.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted. The City of Melbourne considers that the site identified in Figure 6.2 is appropriate for consideration for a potential school site. The Structure Plan clearly articulates that the DEECD is responsible for building and funding schools and will determine where a school site will be delivered. However, it is important that the City of Melbourne is active in supporting the DEECD to identify appropriate sites and provides the community with an understanding of sites that the City will continue to discuss with the DEECD.</p>
		<p><b>6. Community Infrastructure</b></p> <p>a. The Department believes that the statement "There are currently no schools provided in the Arden-Macaulay" in the Education and lifelong learning section on page 93 should be updated to reference schools accessible from the Structure Plan area.</p>	<p>a. Reference to schools accessible from the area will be acknowledged.</p>	<p>a. Providing further context.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. The Department believes that the statement " ... the North Melbourne Primary School is at capacity. " in the Education and lifelong learning section on page 93 should be edited to " .. the North Melbourne Primary School is nearing capacity". The North Melbourne Primary School has the ability to accommodate additional capacity in the short term.</p>	<p>c. Revise wording on p 93 from 'According to the Department of Education, the North Melbourne Primary School is currently at capacity' to 'The Department of Education has advised that the North Melbourne Primary School is nearing capacity.'</p>	<p>c. Updated information provided by Department of Education.</p>
<p><b>Groppi, Roger</b></p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p><b>10. General Comments</b> a. I commend the City of Melbourne for putting together the proposal.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Reduce the 20 metre height limit on Macaulay Road. The immediate impact &amp; proximity of multi storey buildings up to +/-20m high within 4 to 15m of residential property boundaries. The proposed retail/commercial area on the north side of Macaulay, between Barnett St, laneways &amp; Rankins Rd including the corner of Rankins and Macaulay, is at least 20 meters high. This area is currently occupied by single storey non-residential buildings including a café, a dressmaker, vacant shopfront &amp; 2 panel beating business' – one with a large ground level open car park/storage area. The draft proposal will impact on our immediate privacy together with our adjoining neighbours via overlooking &amp; 'voyouring' into our private open spaces &amp; dwellings from above thus devaluing all affected properties.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. The transition in height from the existing residential to proposed retail/commercial buildings in general is quite abrupt going from the current 9m maximum residential height to greater than 20m in less than 3-5m in many areas. I would urge Council to provide more detail and ensure that the transition from 9 to 20 meters is made in steps in a similar fashion to Building Regulations 2006 Part 4 – Siting - in particular Regulation 414 Side and Rear setbacks where the transition would go from 3.6m at setback of 1m from boundary through to 20m at a mandatory setback of 15.1m from the side or rear boundaries. This would be less dramatic &amp; may appease the current backlash from residents together with future protection of residential &amp; heritage areas.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls at the interfaces with residential areas - include updated diagrams into Structure Plans as shown in Figure A and C (in attachment 2) to illustrate revised heights and setbacks in interface areas.</p>	<p>a. To ensure an appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character. At the interface areas, new buildings will be no more than 1 storey higher than existing structures.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. The existing historical and heritage aspects of these areas both residential &amp; industrial must be maintained and protected to some degree as a sense of balance between new &amp; old together with a sense of community &amp; village feel rather than drab, monotonous multi-storey concrete boxes. Keep the community happy rather than the money hungry developers.</p>	<p>c. No change required.</p>	<p>c. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan includes an action to undertake a review of the existing heritage overlay and gradings. This heritage review has commenced and is being conducted in parallel with the Structure Plan. It is anticipated that the Arden-Macaulay Heritage Review will be considered by the Future Melbourne Committee in mid-2012. The Heritage Review will make recommendations for inclusion of properties in the Heritage Overlay and will be implemented through a Planning Scheme Amendment.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Access</b></p> <p>a. The immediate impact of traffic &amp; parking issues which will eventuate in the immediate vicinity due to the proposed influx of both residential &amp; retail/commercial population &amp; excessive traffic congestion due to minimal capacity of existing roads &amp; the existing railway crossing which is already causing major traffic &amp; parking issues. Not to mention the current multi-storey developments which have already commenced or soon to within the area.</p>	<p>a. Include explanation of the constraints and opportunities to address traffic issues at the Macaulay Road/rail crossing intersection into Chapter 4 - Issues.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan recommends the development of a dynamic traffic management plan that minimises the impact of non-local vehicular traffic traversing the area. Private cars are low occupancy vehicles that quickly fill up limited space on the road network, thus priority will be provided to high occupancy vehicles, such as trains, to improve efficiency of access.</p> <p>While implementing a grade separation between Macaulay Road and the Craigieburn and Upfield railway lines would reduce conflict at this intersection, it would also be extremely costly for minimal traffic improvements given the width of Macaulay Road.</p> <p>Grade separation may have the impact of generating higher traffic volume and speeds which would compromise the amenity of the Kensington local centre and proposed Macaulay local centre. The design of separating railway and road infrastructure can also separate communities and would impact on the heritage character in the Kensington Station vicinity.</p> <p>The Structure Plan treats the roads west of the Moonee Ponds Creek, including Macaulay Road as local roads.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. The overall traffic burden on the Arden-Macaulay corridor/thoroughfare will be immense to all residing in the immediate and adjoining areas due to increased population into the area together with the current traffic issues and the multiple railway crossings/stations in the area. Much more planning and infrastructure improvements will be required to alleviate these issues otherwise they will cause gridlock situations on a daily basis.</p>	<p>a. Include explanation of the constraints and opportunities to address traffic issues at the Macaulay Road/rail crossing intersection into Chapter 4 - Issues.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan recommends the development of a dynamic traffic management plan that minimises the impact of non-local vehicular traffic traversing the area. Private cars are low occupancy vehicles that quickly fill up limited space on the road network, thus priority will be provided to high occupancy vehicles, such as trains, to improve efficiency of access.</p> <p>While implementing a grade separation between Macaulay Road and the Craigieburn and Upfield railway lines would reduce conflict at this intersection, it would also be extremely costly for minimal traffic improvements given the width of Macaulay Road.</p> <p>Grade separation may have the impact of generating higher traffic volume and speeds which would compromise the amenity of the Kensington local centre and proposed Macaulay local centre. The design of separating railway and road infrastructure can also separate communities and would impact on the heritage character in the Kensington Station vicinity.</p> <p>The Structure Plan treats the roads west of the Moonee Ponds Creek, including Macaulay Road as local roads.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>Niggli, Robert</b>	Individual	<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Reduce the height of 20 m for corner of Rankins Road/Macaulay Road, and Barnett Street/Macaulay Road to a height that meets the planning guidelines and principles – which in my opinion would be no greater than two storey, and stepped back from the street. in relation to the height classification at the corner of Rankins Road/Macaulay Road, and Barnett Street/Macaulay Road. Residents would be most impacted by any inappropriate development, and as far as I can ascertain; there is no precedent for such the dramatic change in heights between a residential area and a new development. The sites proposed for rezoning to mixed use are currently occupied by single storey structures and a yard. In the proposal, apart from a slim area of 10.5 m, the heights proposed are 20 m, or approx. 6 storeys.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>This area of Rankins Road is primarily a residential area; of heritage significance. The houses from 167 Rankins Road to 143 Rankins Road would all be negatively impacted by any structure over two storey erected at the corner of Rankins Road and Macaulay Road; and Barnett Street and Macaulay Road. Two key development principles seem to have been ignored: Principle 4: Introduce suitable building scale, heights and setbacks at interface areas, taking into account the existing character, context and immediate amenity and p. 41 - Respect the existing low-scale, heritage context. The existing residential context at the edges of the Arden-Macaulay area is low-scale residential. Urban renewal needs to bring a new positive character to the area, while respecting the character and identity of existing adjacent suburbs. It is important and our responsibility to preserve heritage buildings.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		I find it difficult to understand how any structure should not also have to be sympathetic to the heritage nature of the street and the original buildings.		
<b>Young, Ian</b>	Individual	<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Concerned about the impact of the proposed plan on Rankins Road/Eastwood Street precinct immediately opposite the Kensington Railway station (city side). " .... There appears to be no consideration for the topography of the area (Kensington Village is on a hill at the top of Macaulay road) – a 20 metre limit at the corner of Macaulay Rd and Eastwood street is different to the 20 metres at bed rock of the Moonee Ponds creek beneath the Tullamarine freeway (which was the reference point constantly used by the presenter).</p> <p>Maintaining height levels in excess of 20 metres from the flat of a swamp up to the corner of Eastwood street with no set backs would dwarf adjoining residences.</p>	a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.	a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>It is my hope that the panorama of Melbourne's CBD from Skinny Park at the corner of Belair St and Macaulay Road should mainly be preserved and not become the point where all one can see is a 21st century over development that destroys the character and heritage value of this historically significant precinct." I raised the issue of height control and lack of consideration of the topography of Macaulay road at the public information forum in June, and the City of Melbourne Planning representative assured the public gathering that the plans had intended to take this into account. A stepped height control in 'sympathy with the Citylink freeway' was my recollection of his words, and I was most definitely left with a general impression that the lack of height controls in the draft plan presented at the meeting required corrections and that we could expect the final plan would be amended to take these into account.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>However on reviewing the current plan (fig 3.17 pg 51) this appears to not be the case. A 20 metre height restriction along both sides of Macaulay Road with no setback remains in place. Once again, I wish to restate my view that it is entirely inappropriate that there be no set-back or height restrictions on the street frontage of Macaulay Road from Rankins Road/Eastwood Street down the hill to the creek bed/overhead freeway. I believe the triangular area of properties at the corner of Macaulay Road, Rankins Road and Eastwood Street, directly facing the Kensington Railway Station to be of historical significance and worthy of preservation. While this area only adjoins the area of the Structure plan – it will no doubt be greatly impacted by the Arden Macaulay Structure Plan.</p>		



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>Prior to the change of council boundaries several years ago, we and our adjoining neighbours invested much time, effort and financial resource, with the support of City of Moonee Valley and the Heritage Restoration Fund, to restore the façade and cast iron veranda of one of the oldest and original buildings in the area. At the time we also documented the history of this area, and I believe this project not only put our 'money where our mouth is' but has been our small contribution to the local community who from time to time stop by on local historic walks and tell stories of Marvellous Melbourne and years gone by. We hope and trust that the City of Melbourne will also see this area as the gateway to the village of Kensington and a slice of our history worthy of keeping intact, maintaining and insulating from being dwarfed by 21st century developments.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		b. Concerned about the proposed Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan which will lead to significant over development and significantly change the character of the Kensington community.	b. No change proposed.	b. The Structure Plan includes appropriate controls at the interface areas to ensure a respectful integration with the existing character of Kensington.

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>Gilbert, Kerrie</b>	Individual	<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Reduce the proposed building at the corner of Macaulay/Rankins Road (the parcels bounded by Rankins/Macaulay/laneway and Macaulay/Barnett/laneways) and replace with a stepwise design of a scale that respects the existing built form. The proposed height of this building is not in keeping with the landscape of Rankins Road and impinges on the privacy and aspect of the housing along both Rankins Road and Barnett Street and is also not in keeping with the surrounding residential housing which residents pride themselves in keeping the landscape of the area to reflect inner-city community living. The increase of the height of this proposed building would lead to an increase in the number of residents and this would lead to an increase in the number of cars within the area.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls in the blocks surrounded by Macaulay Road, Rankins Road, Barnett Street and on the corner of Macaulay Road and Eastwood Street. Refer Figures A and C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. To ensure appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>Macaulay Road is already a busy road and traffic is non-stop on most days especially at peak hours. With the Macaulay and Kensington Stations along Macauley Road, the area is becoming over loaded with traffic and has the potential to cause danger to existing residents and pedestrians. This height is completely inappropriate for an interface and would have a devastating impact on the precinct. The impacts on the adjoining residential and heritage overlay areas would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) objectionable visual bulk of 6-storey buildings compared with the adjoining 1- and 2-storey residential built form.</li> <li>(b) domination of the precinct by buildings that are out of scale with the existing built form.</li> <li>(c) potential overlooking into front and rear open spaces of adjoining properties.</li> <li>(d) detrimental impact on the heritage character of the existing precinct by the imposition of modern structures of excessive height.</li> </ul>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>(e) a drastic change in impact from the existing single storey structures to new 6-storey structures.</p> <p>After comparing the planning and design principles contained in the Draft with this proposal, I submit that the 20 m height is also inappropriate because it is inconsistent with those principles:</p> <p>As two examples from many that could have been selected, I submit the following (page numbering is taken from the pdf as downloaded, not the Plan document itself): p. 38 - Principle 4: Introduce suitable building scale, heights and setbacks at interface areas, taking into account the existing character, context and immediate amenity. I submit that suitable building scale, heights and setbacks have not been so introduced at Rankins/Macaulay and Macaulay/Barnett, nor does it appear that the existing character, context and immediate amenity have been taken sufficiently into account.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>p. 41 - Respect the existing low-scale, heritage context. The existing residential context at the edges of the Arden-Macaulay area is low-scale residential. Urban renewal needs to bring a new positive character to the area, while respecting the character and identity of existing adjacent suburbs. I submit that the proposal would not bring a positive character to this precinct and would not respect its character. Further passages affirming these principles are found at pp. 1, 9, 30 and 38 (several further references). The Draft proposes that along many sections of the interface between the proposed mixed use zone and existing residences, a transition height of 10.5 m be imposed. I submit that even at 10.5 m, the impacts on Rankins Road would be severe.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<p><b>Spokes, Lee and Suzanne (Submitted by Trevor Ludeman of Project Planning &amp; Development Pty Ltd)</b></p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p><b>5. Public Realm</b>  a. The owners object to the identification of their properties for the provision of public open space as part of the proposal for a park in Sutton Street. The businesses that operate from this property employ 25 people and the location in proximity to the CBD has made it attractive to large corporate clients who require the shredding of documents.</p>	<p>a-c. No change proposed.</p>	<p>a -c. The propositions for Open Space were prepared as an integrated planning exercise that considered the benefits of urban renewal within Arden-Macaulay. The MSS does not consider the location of new parks. The Structure Plan has been prepared in parallel with the draft Open Space Strategy which investigates the requirements for open space to meet the existing and future needs of residents and workers. The provision of public open space is an important component of delivering sustainable urban renewal and will have long-term benefits to the local community.  Council will continue discussions with all property owners affected by the public open space proposal to progress opportunities to deliver a shared and agreeable outcome.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. The exhibited version of the structure plan (May 2011) did not identify the subject site as being required for parkland. The strategy was to expand and upgrade the Moonee Ponds Creek parkland corridor. New local parks along the west) Kensington) side of the Creek were to be identified to make up to the current deficit. One of the principles was to create a network of high quality urban square and local parks linked by walking and cycling tracks. At Section 2 Activities and Land Uses the document identifies that there is good provision of open space on the east side of the Moonee Ponds Creek, but inadequate provision on the west side of the creek in the Kensington areas. Access to larger areas within North Melbourne, Macaulay and to Royal Park is negated by the lack of access over the Moonee Ponds Creek. This issue is to be addressed within the Open Space strategy to be exhibited in 2011.</p>		<p>d. Council will continue to discuss the open space proposals with all property owners affected by the Open Space proposals.  e and g. The criteria for selecting park locations is included in the draft. A diversity of open spaces is required therefore not all sites can be located along the Creek in proximity to the CityLink Freeway.  f. Affected property owners were notified in November prior to the Final Draft going to the December FMC. Dissatisfaction with the process is noted.  g. - m. The Draft Open Space Strategy is a high level strategic document that identifies the need for future open space and the general locality that this is required. Specific sites are not nominated. The Council will work with property owners to develop an approach for each property to minimise the disruption to existing businesses operating on the site.</p>



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>In terms of indicative new locations these were identified in Figure 5.1, where a plethora of sites were identified on both sides of the creek, as both new public and new private open space. Public open space was identified as sites 1A -1D and up to 6. Figure 5.1 identifies “private open space” as the envelopes left over after development, with buildings surrounding such space. Private open space that was identified would be part of the vacant sites at 85 Sutton and extending through to 74 Mark Street. The client’s property at Sutton Street was not identified, with these buildings, including those along Boundary Road as being retained for development (indicative building footprints). In terms of strategies, Sutton Street was identified as “Opportunity site 4, with the short term goal being to the need to upgrade open space adjacent to the North Melbourne Community Centre.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>The long term strategy was to explore with the State government the need to improve the provision of public open space within any redevelopment proposals for the residential housing estate. The other opportunity sites identified were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Arden Macaulay Square (#2);</li> <li>b) Robertson Street Reserve ext (#3);</li> <li>c) Arden Street Park (#5) and</li> <li>d) Gardiner Reserve (#6).</li> </ul> <p>c. In the Final Draft document the site is identified as potential new open space sites. The lack of open space on the west side of the Moonee Ponds Creek is still acknowledged (p67). At p74 "Strategy 1" new open space along the western side of the creek, north of Macaulay Road will be consolidated with the creek environs, while the shared path along the east side would be enhanced. There is no explanation for the change in open space strategy, as exhibited, nor the reasons why 71 to 69 Sutton Street have been chosen as a public park.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>There is no explanation about how the draft document with its identified sites for both public and private open space have been reduced to new sites identified under Strategy 3 to create 5 new local parks, being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Alfred Street;</li> <li>b) Sutton Street ( new park of 5500m2);</li> <li>c) Langford Street;</li> <li>d) Fink Street;</li> <li>e) Robertson Street Park.</li> </ul> <p>d. Under Actions, "Advocacy" the need to negotiate with landowners of Robertson Street and Alfred Street to provide new open spaces, is identified but not Sutton Street owners?</p> <p>e. Give the location of vacant land at 85 Sutton Street (0.8ha), 74 Mark Street (0.53ha) and 59 Alfred (1.2ha) it is unknown why sites with existing buildings and business in operation were identified for this purpose.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>f. From a transparency perspective the change in strategy from exhibition to final draft is very significant change, yet the owners were not notified of this issue.</p> <p>g. Examination of the submissions received reveal a concern about the lack of open space, however none appear to nominate Sutton Street as a preferred area for open space.</p> <p>h. We note that the draft Public Open Space Strategy currently on exhibition does not identify these specific sites.</p> <p>i. The identification of these buildings, and business, in addition to 71 Sutton Street is problematic from a Responsible Authority's perspective, whereby the application of a Public Acquisition Overlay has to be applied. The proposed acquisition is also problematic for the conduct of each business given the uncertainty it creates to investment and future expansion.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>j. The acquisition and compensation of businesses in addition to the land, and the further costs of environmental auditing the remediation of the site will be an expensive exercise, as distinct from the provision of space as part of development. i.e. redevelopment of this site or as part of vacant sites in Sutton, Mark and Alfred streets.</p> <p>k. It is unknown why land is required on the east side of the Moonee Ponds Creek, when the identified lack of open space is on the west side?</p> <p>l. Open space should be provided by way of the development of each site, as identified in the May 2011 document. This would be achieved through clause 52.01 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme and/or through the Design &amp; Development Overlay, where this outcome would be prescribed.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		m. The strategy appears to be one of forced relocation of existing light industrial activities from the precinct by way of open space acquisition.		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. We note the strategy to support the continued operation of industrial uses, whilst their operation remains viable. It is unknown whether this statement applies to all industrial uses or to the icon operations of the flour mills or other manufacturing uses. The use of the term “viability” however cannot be used as a strategy.</p> <p>b. The owners are confident that the current operation can continue within the Mixed Use Zone as an existing use, which would also service the new businesses to be located within the redeveloped Macaulay-Arden precinct. The collection and baling of waste paper is not a noise emitting land use, with all equipment being electric hydraulic and deliveries taking place during normal working hours. Shredding involves one machine with little noise emission and located within an enclosed and secure building, which is required for ASIO accreditation.</p>	<p>a - b. No change required.</p>	<p>a-b. As above, the Council will work with property owners to develop an approach for each property to minimise the disruption to existing businesses operating on the site.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. The owners do not see this land use as becoming redundant, given the success of this business in this locality over the past 15 years. The principle of “great diversity of land uses, including a vertical mix” could be achieved on site. It would be expected that these uses could be relocated into a basement with a new building located above with commercial (ground) and residential above (above ground). From a mixed use perspective there is no reason why most light industrial activities can be located within purpose built buildings, given new building techniques, technologies. This would still achieve a mix of uses, offering a range of employment opportunities, rather than the “middle class” view of a mix involving white collar office based land uses with residential above.</p>		



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>d. The relocation of this business outside of the CBD would result in loss of employment; where at present employees are from the North Melbourne public housing opposite the site. Just as it is important to provide affordable housing for lower income people to live within the central city; it is also vitally important to provide employment opportunities for those who are located in public housing. Not all will be employed within the knowledge intensive economy. Community Infrastructure Principle 3 identifies the need to create liveable local neighbourhoods and to retain and create local services and jobs, while at Principle 9 “support people of diverse backgrounds” would be achieved by the retention of these recycling operations and other like uses.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Spokes, Lee and Suzanne		<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b></p> <p>a. When I purchased the property it was nearly empty at this time no one wanted these buildings they were ugly old warehouses. I ran my paper recycling business and with a lot of hard work I was able to grow the business and expand next door. All New Paper Recycling and In Confidence employ 25 people and 3 contractors. Over years we have employed disadvantage people and many of our staff that sort paper would struggle to find other types of work. There has been large investments made each year and the relocation of our very large shredding machinery &amp; baler would cost large amounts of money. If we were not close to city of Melbourne some key clients wouldn't use our company. My business would be in serious financial trouble if we were made to relocate.</p>	<p>a. No change proposed.</p>	<p>a-b. As above, the Council will work with property owners to develop an approach for each property to minimise the disruption to existing businesses operating on the site.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>I would be expecting Melbourne City Council to pay for not only relocation costs but also all costs associated with finding and buying another factory in our area if they were to force me to sell my buildings including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Stamp Duty &amp; Legal costs</li> <li>-Capital Gains (which i wouldn't be in a position to pay)</li> <li>-Relocating Machinery,</li> <li>-Compensation for disruption to business</li> <li>-Large concrete pits for 3 in ground conveyor systems.</li> <li>-Electrical installation</li> <li>-Computer and phone systems.</li> </ul> <p>There is vacant land everywhere around our street including the bottom of Sutton &amp; Mark St which has been empty for ever. Left side of Alfred St all factories have been pulled down. There are factories that aren't used and many factories that have not had tenants in them for years.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<b>RAID@3051 (Residents About Integrated Development )</b>	Organisation	<p><b>10. General Comments</b></p> <p>a. Whilst the aspirational focus and nature of the Structure Plan is acknowledged and applauded, it remains words on paper unless there is acceptance of the priorities and strategies and action is realised. This Plan, and all other Structure Plans, need a principal proponent to drive the priorities of the Plan/s which requires leadership, advocacy and commitment of the Melbourne City Council and its Officers.</p> <p>b. Concerned the Structure Plan, being a 30 year vision, is subject to the annual budget approval process.</p> <p>c. Request officers prepare a table of changes (summary) between the current Structure Plan and the draft Structure Plan.</p> <p>d. The Structure Plan is a vast improvement on the draft plan, particularly in regards to the increased open space, schools and community infrastructure.</p>	<p>a. Inclusion of implementation plan outlining the actions and timing priority.</p> <p>b. Noted.</p> <p>c. Table of changes available on website.</p> <p>d. Noted.</p>	<p>a. An implementation plan will be included in the Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan to support the delivery of the strategies and actions.</p> <p>b. Although the annual budget process is the mechanism used for funding, the Structure Plan and the Municipal Strategic Statement will give more certainty in Council's ongoing future budget expenditure as it fits into Council's strategic directions.</p> <p>c. A summary of changes between the draft and Final Draft Structure Plan is available on the City of Melbourne website.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b></p> <p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan area borders a number of other municipalities. Ensuring that there is connection and collaboration with long-term planning for those municipalities is critical to respectfully and appropriately accommodate government population growth targets within existing populations and communities including the requisite provision of services and facilities commensurate with immediate, short and long-term needs. We look forward to your consideration on the expectation of Council as principal proponent in ensuring that the finally endorsed Arden Macaulay Structure Plan, inclusive of community input, and the consequent infrastructure and service features including transport infrastructure, educational and public health, child care and aged care facilities are priorities of the requisite state or federal government departments. The enduring legacy of the Plan needs this level of leadership and sustained commitment.</p>	<p>a. No change required.  B. Update Figure 1.1 to illustrate 2010 Clue Data.</p>	<p>a. Noted, the Plan includes actions to work with the City of Moonee Valley and state government to ensure an integrated and implementable plan.  B. The latest research and data is included in the Plan with the exception of Figure 1.1 which will be updated to indicate 2010 Clue data.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. There is significant research into population growth, open space, under-utilised land etc that has been undertaken by the Melbourne City Council, and others, that needs to be reviewed, updated as required so as to clearly underpin and provide objective measures for decision making in finalising the Structure Plans</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. The proposed growth proposition must take into account existing stretched facilities and resources.</p> <p>b. Include stronger language into objectives and principles.</p> <p>c. One additional point under Principle 2 is along the lines of versatility and flexibility. Building design and products need to support flexibility. For example, the current trend of tilt slab construction for high-rise developments and single bedroom student accommodation are not conducive to refurbishment potential. This is due to a combination of the design constraints in the single bedroom model matched to the use of building materials that do not readily accommodate re-design or enlargement.</p> <p>d. The Issues section (p. 19 - 21) would benefit from a comparison, or at very least reference to other areas of Melbourne CBD within close proximity and demonstrate similar features and clearly provide additional opportunities for accommodating population growth including South Melbourne, Port Melbourne, Footscray etc.</p>	<p>a-b and d-I No Change Required.</p> <p>C. Include additional sentence on p51 as follows: 'Building construction, where possible, should allow for flexible change of use'.</p>	<p>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</p> <p>a. Urban renewal will bring additional services and facilities to the area that can benefit existing residents.</p> <p>b. The principles and objectives clearly articulate the preferred vision for the area. The implementation of these principles will be through the Planning Scheme Amendment which will provide further clarity on proposed controls.</p> <p>c. Noted and added to plan.</p> <p>d. Sufficient clarity is provided on existing densities (employment and residential) in the inner northern areas of the city in Figure 3.4.</p> <p>e. The City of Melbourne will continue to advocate for the delivery of the Melbourne Metro. Additional bus services are also incorporated into the transport strategy to create an integrated network. Two stages have been introduced to allow integrated planning with the delivery of the Melbourne Metro.</p> <p>f. The public realm master plan will consider the redesign of existing streets to ensure good access. Indicative sections are included in Appendix A.</p> <p>g. Existing densities of these sites and the general locality are indicated in Figure 3.4.</p> <p>h. Figure 1.1 will be updated with CLUE 2010 information.</p> <p>i. Noted.</p> <p>j. Many of the issues noted are relevant to a number of s</p> <p>k. Noted. The Planning Scheme Amendments will incorp</p> <p>l. Noted, this centre will be consistently referred to as 'M'</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>e. Reference to the Melbourne Metro underground would appear to have gained greater credibility given the advice re recent Victorian State Government action. This is of course, a critical infrastructure public transport access plank for development of the AM area, and will be an early requirement to minimise impact on the current public train services and assist with traffic management issues. However it must be recognised that this is a significant infrastructure development that will take years to come to fruition. In the meantime the pressured public transport system will need to be managed well and an overall integration and addition to existing services is a very important first step. Initiatives such as additional bus routes and services that service North Melbourne station in particular would be one solution. Strategy 2: (p. 26 – 27) re the Melbourne Metro is an aspirational concept. The problem remains however what can happen and when if this major infrastructure project is not supported?</p>		



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>g. Whilst AM is in close proximity to City Link access to such arterial links is congested and limited by restrictions associated with legislation promulgated at the time of City Links development to maximise its use and has resulted in the narrowing of feeder roads. This needs to be looked at carefully.</p> <p>h. Regarding identification of current population in the AM area again it is important to relate this to the surrounding neighbourhood – what is the population and associated densities in the residential areas of North Melbourne and Kensington (for example, the DHS housing estates in both suburbs). The AM area is not greenfield nor an island and the relationship between the existing populations bordering the area is an important consideration. An added useful dimension to the data provided would be the employment numbers in the AM area.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>i. Greater detail is needed regarding the 'vacant and underutilised land' – at a recent MCC Council meeting in early December 2011 a business owner spoke passionately and convincingly about his viable business providing employment for 25 people. Where is the audit of the potential commercial space that is 'underutilised'? If not available this needs to be actioned immediately and a clear statement of intent proposed for what this means and how will it support the principles within the AMSP. Given the points raised above the statement 'it is evident that the Arden-Macaulay precinct is generally underutilised and has the potential to realise a significant redevelopment' (p. 20) is challenged. The historic drift argument (p. 20) needs clarifying – why is the non-office jobs increase an issue? As does the concept of the potential for off-site amenity impacts (p. 21).</p> <p>j. Issues of flood prone land, open space, existing planning controls, cost of site contamination; and poor quality of streetscape are each the legacy of the existing AM area and therefore not a surp</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>k. It would be useful for each of the issues identified in the Structure Plan to be aligned to a specific Strategy/ies that addresses the issue and again cross-referenced in the Strategy. This will assist the community in accounting for the various issues. A table format would accommodate this.</p> <p>l. Strategy 1 (p. 22 – 25) is supported in principle based on what is understood to be the intent in the use of words such as stages, harmonious transitions, links growth and delivery of key infrastructure, protects existing key industrial uses. However, the devil is in the detail and the accompanying maps (eg. p. 25) are difficult to interpret.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>m. Strategy 3 (p. 28): three local activity hubs are an interesting concept. One query is the identification of the Macaulay – Macaulay Road/ Canning Street (and station) location for the activity hub in particular. Maps included in the documentation have erroneously identified Canning Street extending west beyond Boundary Road. Canning Street terminates at Boundary Road and therefore may be inappropriately identifying Canning Street as part of this proposed activity centre. There is a need to acknowledge existing retail and entertainment activity that is in existence such as in proximity to Flemington Bridge Station.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. The RAID group supports urban consolidation when well conceived and executed, and when it contains the appropriate mix of community infrastructure, transport planning and management, housing and commercial activity. In general RAID approves of the urban structure and built form proposals contained in the Arden Macaulay Structure plan as outlined below, however RAID also has a number of concerns.</p>	<p>a. Reduce height controls at the interfaces with residential areas - include updated diagrams into Structure Plans as shown in Figure A and C (in attachment 2) to illustrate revised heights and setbacks in interface areas.</p>	<p>a. To ensure an appropriate transition of development scale and heights from stable residential areas to the urban renewal areas to protect existing residential amenity and character. At the interface areas, new buildings will be no more than 1 storey higher than existing structures.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. RAID supports the aim for new buildings must be well designed, however measures need to be put in place to ensure that this happens. RAID proposes that a standing panel of leading architects and urban designers be formed to judge design quality outcomes, especially for pivotal buildings in order to ensure that the built environment of the Arden-Macaulay area is of the highest quality.</p> <p>c. RAID looks forward to seeing the detail of the proposed Strategy 1 guidelines (A Vibrant district around Arden-Macaulay). At present the current statement is vague and ill defined. Some areas of concern in the draft Structure Plan include: High density does not mean high rise!</p>	<p>b. Incorporate additional sentence into Chapter 3, Strategy 4 as follows: 'The proposed height control at the street frontages, lane frontages and southern boundaries are mandatory. The heights across the remainder of the site are discretionary up to a maximum of +30% of the nominated height ( for 20m this would allow 26m). Beyond the street frontage or property boundary, the height limits proposed are discretionary. Any discretion to increase the height must comply with the setback conditions as outlined in Figures 3.12 to 3.16.' Update Figures 3.12 - 3.16 as per Figures B and C (in attachment 2).</p>	<p>b. The additional sentence and diagram provide clarity on the preferred future development outcomes.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>1. The preferred model of development should be as set out on pages 44 and 45 of the Structure Plan. Four to six stories (nominally 12 to 20 meters high) with activated street frontages as per the examples shown in the Structure Plan are optimum for increasing density, access to light and air and for maximizing social interaction and street life. Developments of four to six stories avoid or minimize adverse outcomes such as excessive overshadowing, wind tunnel effects, excessive capital outlays, social alienation and disjointed streetscapes. In addition a degree of uniformity of building height as well as façade treatment and selection of materials helps to create a sense of unity and community and is to be encouraged.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>2. Development in excess 6 stories (i.e. more than 20 meters tall) should be the confined to limited areas or rejected out of hand, in particular when in close proximity to existing low rise residential areas and sensitive areas such as parks and other public facilities, where excessive height can lead to overwhelming visual dominance, overshadowing and adverse wind effects.</p> <p>3. RAID supports a strict 20 meter height limit in the Structure Plan area. Failing that, the 30 meter high guidelines proposed in some areas under the current draft Structure Plan must be reduced in scope to avoid sensitive areas, in particular immediately adjacent existing low rise residential areas, to the north side of Macaulay Road between Boundary Road and the Moonee Ponds Creek and to the north side of Macaulay Road the current State Archives / former Gasworks site, where of a 30 meter high buildings would cast shadows over Gardiners Reserve and plunge Macaulay Road into gloom for much of the year and would visually overwhelm the existing historic buildings on the Gasworks</p>		



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>4. RAID rejects that any new building be in excess of 40 meters (none is indicated on the plans, but it is included in the legend: why?).</p> <p>5. RAID is also concerned that even the proposed 20 meter height limit is likely to be exceeded by developers who view the height limit as a starting point to negotiate a taller final outcome. This approach to supposed height limits by developers has a long track record, the proposal for the current Zagame development in King Street West Melbourne exceeds the height limits set out in the relevant Design Development Overlay by a factor of 2.5. In a neighbourhood slated for a maximum height of 20 meters a similar outcome would result in buildings of 50 meters or more. Council needs to make proposed height limits that are real and mandatory so that there is no mixed messages or confusion for prospective developers and subsequent decision-makers.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>6. Given that many of the new proposed multi-story buildings are to be residential it is RAID's view that many of the new rear lanes - indicated as being 8 meters wide in the 'proposed sections' - are not wide enough to allow for adequate light and privacy to the residential units, especially at the lower levels. Increased setbacks should be mandated for these units.</p> <p>d. Heritage Buildings and Areas Must Be Identified and Respected. The draft structure plan indicates that the heritage values of the area will be respected. RAID commends this and supports the integration of the new with the old. Furthermore the historically significant streetscapes and plantings should be retained as far as is possible.</p> <p>e. Pleased to see a five-six storey height limit in the area, although in practice this can be exceeded by appeals to VCAT</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>5. Public Realm</b></p> <p>a. All existing public open space must be retained and new areas for public open space be identified and developed form the use of future residents and workers. The new open spaces should be integrated with existing and with the treeed streets common in the area to form near continuous network of green spaces in the area, as set out in Strategy 7.</p> <p>b. Particularly in relation to open space, RAiD@3051 Inc recognises that the emerging policies of the City of Melbourne have serious implications in the Arden Macaulay area. As the current document recognises, it and nearby neighbourhoods are less well provided with open space than are other parts of the municipality. Not only is there less open space but it is often difficult to get to and even then is limited in use. In preparation for the new developments and increased population that will be introduced into the area, we appreciate the coherence of the planning some of which will have to deal with long term issues.</p>	<p>a-c. No change required. D. Additional maps that illustrate pedestrian catchments to all existing and proposed parks will be included.</p>	<p>a-c. Noted. D. Provide greater clarity on walking catchments to proposed open spaces.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. The plan recognises that a major feature, the Moonee Ponds Creek, is degraded and in serious need of attention along its bed and banks. The plan also identifies possible new areas of open space some of which would need to be acquired. In the absence of plans, priorities and budget claims, it is difficult to see how these generous ideas can be implemented and wherever they were compromised, the quality of the plan overall would be diminished.</p> <p>RAiD@3051 would like to see an analysis of the steps needed to develop the creek and the new open space areas for local use.</p> <p>d. Of particular interest is the proposed benchmark - that all residents should be within a 300 metre walk to an open space area. A measure of this important feature of inner city life is significant but to be related to the real life experience of residents, we suggest that the 300 metre mark be coupled to measures of population density and the range of activities provided within an accessible area.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>6. Community Infrastructure</b></p> <p>a. RAID welcomes the inclusion of a new school in the Structure Plan area, however is concerned that this is an inadequate allowance given the proposed population growth in the area. In the 1980s there were 4 state schools in the North and West Melbourne area. Today there is only 1, North Melbourne (Errol Street) Primary School. Errol Street has grown from 240 students a decade ago to more than 540 in 2011 and is currently beyond capacity. Given the projected increase in residents RAID believes that 2 or more primary schools, and at least one additional secondary school needs to be constructed and planning for this must be immediate. Therefore provision for these should be made in the final Structure Plan and sites with adequate open space identified for them.</p> <p>b. Provision must also be made for new child care centres to cater for new residents and for people working in the area.</p> <p>c. Provision must also be made for properly integrated aged care services which make the aged a part of the life of community.</p>	<p>a-e. No changes proposed.</p>	<p>a-e. The Structure Plan includes an action to prepare a Community Infrastructure to ensure integrated planning and delivery of services. The DEECD is responsible for the delivery of schools. The City of Melbourne will continue to advocate for the delivery of a new school in the Arden-Macaulay area.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>d. Supportive of principles 3, 7, 8 and 9 as identified in the Objectives in this section. The proposal for integrated service community hubs is also supported. There is an overdue immediate need for schools, childcare and the aged care services and facilities.</p> <p>e. Policy and service delivery needs to be based on sound research which is understood to already exist. Social infrastructure review should be informed by ABS and MCC demographic data of current and future population profile and projections, including personal mobility. Given this the vagueness of community infrastructure timelines, service alignment and lack of clear partnership processes and firm commitment for services in which the MCC is the key proponent on behalf of its ratepayers and residents needs to be addressed.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>4. Transport &amp; Access</b></p> <p>a. Supportive of the general objectives of 'Transport and Access' delineated in relation to Principles 1, 6 &amp; 8 on page 58 of the draft Structure Plan.</p> <p>b. Public Transport integrated with urban renewal (Strategy 1) - Arden Central Station: We support the Structure Plan's advocacy for the development of a new station at Arden Central on a new Melbourne Metro rail line - this is critical to any increase of residential density in the Arden Macaulay area. If the proposed station does not proceed then these densities would need to be revised downwards OR alternative transport strategies adopted, eg. a new tram line built through the structure plan area. It is recommended that the development of a new station at Arden Central is well linked in with other transport modes in the vicinity. If the new station does not proceed then the densities proposed in the draft MCC structure plan would need to be revised downwards OR alternative transport strategies adopted.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>	<p>b. The City of Melbourne will continue to advocate for the Melbourne Metro, which aims to increase the capacity of the entire public transport network. This will help to alleviate stress on the City Loop to enable improved peak services. In addition, the City of Melbourne will continue to work with transport authorities for improved service frequency, and upgrades to stations to improve pedestrian access.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. Public Transport integrated with urban renewal (Strategy 1) - Linking Modes of Transport: Smooth and efficient interchange between various transport modes and between rail lines is critical to encouraging future public transport patronage within the structure plan area. We are yet to be convinced that the proposed bus link along an extension to Boundary Road will achieve the necessary degree of bus/tram/train integration required for this area.</p> <p>d. Public Transport integrated with urban renewal (Strategy 1) - North Melbourne Station: We believe that the frequency of services needs to be increased on the North Melbourne Line, with direct bus links established in the short-term from the Arden- Macaulay renewal area (including the proposed Woolworths' development site) to the station. It is recommended that the frequency of services on the North Melbourne Rail Line is increased, with direct bus links created in the short-term from the Macaulay Road precinct to the station.</p>		



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>e. Public Transport integrated with urban renewal (Strategy 1) - Macaulay Station: Train services through Macaulay Station are already overcrowded. However if the frequency of services is increased on the Macaulay Line, the peak hour traffic movements along Macaulay Road will be severely impacted upon. It is recommended that further consideration be given to the potential conflict between increased services on the Macaulay rail line and the peak hour traffic movements along Macaulay Road.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>f. Efficiently manage traffic and freight movements through and to the area (Strategy 3) - Macaulay Road &amp; Truck Access: As the gateway to Kensington &amp; beyond, Macaulay Road is gridlocked at peak hours; it is difficult to see how it could cope with additional traffic loads compounded by semi-trailers attempting to access development sites such as the Woolworths' proposal. We are concerned at the real possibility of delivery trucks cutting through residential streets in adjoining neighbourhoods to access the proposed urban renewal area. Traffic calming measures in place in North Melbourne such as placement of roundabouts, blocking of streets, no left/right turns etc have greatly enhanced the impact of through traffic and must be maintained. This then limits, or creates risk, for large vehicles such as delivery trucks using the streets. Additionally historically significant trees, such as the 100 plus year old English Plane trees in Canning Street with their grand canopy are at risk of being damaged by high vehicles travelling on, or parking in, Canning Street.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan recommends the development of a dynamic traffic management plan that minimises the impact of non-local vehicular traffic traversing the area. Private cars are low occupancy vehicles that quickly fill up limited space on the road network, thus priority will be provided to high occupancy vehicles, such as trains, to improve efficiency of access.</p> <p>While implementing a grade separation between Macaulay Road and the Craigieburn and Upfield railway lines would reduce conflict at this intersection, it would also be extremely costly for minimal traffic improvements given the width of Macaulay Road. Grade separation may have the impact of generating higher traffic volume and speeds which would compromise the amenity of the Kensington local centre and proposed Macaulay local centre. The design of separating railway and road infrastructure can also separate communities and would impact on the heritage character in the Kensington Station vicinity. The Structure Plan treats the roads west of the Moonee Ponds Creek, including Macaulay Road as local roads.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>This must be avoided and a planned delivery management strategy identified and monitored.</p> <p>g. Efficiently manage traffic and freight movements through and to the area (Strategy 3) - Increased Traffic Volumes Through Abutting Neighbourhoods: our low-rise neighbourhood has long comprised quiet inner urban streets due to the relief directly attributable to traffic calming measures, and residents must not lose this quality of life due to substantially increased traffic flows resulting from future development in the proposed urban renewal area. No traffic management measures have been proposed in the draft structure plan for residential areas abutting the urban renewal area –the surrounding urban context appears to have been overlooked. It is recommended that the implementation of a traffic management plan for the area also considers the management of detrimental impacts in the abutting low-rise neighbourhoods.</p> <p>h. The current proposed location of the metro station is not well integrated with existing transport and needs to tie in with the rail network.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>7. Sustainable Infrastructure</b></p> <p>a. The RAID group supports the highest standards of environmentally sustainable design and environmentally sustainable infrastructure provision in the Arden Macaulay Structure Plan area. In general the draft Structure Plan outlines measures that are proposed are those that RAID would like to see implemented.</p> <p>b. While RAID supports the proposed guidelines RAID would also like to see measures ensuring that these proposals are implemented in future developments. We look forward to seeing mandatory requirements introduced to ensure the best possible environmental outcomes in the final version of the Arden Macaulay Structure Plan.</p>	No change required.	Noted.

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<p><b>George Weston Foods (Submitted by Tim Power and Emily Skyes of Freehills)</b></p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b></p> <p>a. Although content that the principles of the Structure Plan now acknowledge support for the continued operation of industrial uses whilst their operation remains viable, GWF maintains the following key concerns about the Structure Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Structure Plan should not be progressed until Amendment C162 has been approved;</li> <li>- a separate Structure Plan should be developed for the Arden-Macaulay South Precinct, but the development of this plan should be deferred until the Victorian government has committed to a timetable to develop the Melbourne Metro project and the Arden Metro Station;</li> <li>- the Structure Plan should be amended to ensure consistency with the MSS, in particular, by acknowledging the distinction between north and south Arden-Macaulay precincts, the existence of the Ongoing Change area, and aligning the Structure Plan with the MSS' Implementation Strategy; and</li> </ul>	<p>No Change proposed.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan has been prepared in parallel with the Municipal Strategic Statement. The Structure Plan provides a more comprehensive analysis of this area than the MSS which is a high level strategic document. The Structure Plan provides for the transition of the precinct which is consistent with the draft MSS.</p> <p>b-c. The Structure Plan proposed two stages of development in order to facilitate integration with the Melbourne Metro project.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>the preparation of a Gateway to Arden Central master plan should be deferred, on the basis that it is premature prior to realisation of the Melbourne Metro.</p> <p>b. As noted in GWFs previous submission dated July 2011, it is premature to finalise the Structure Plan until the revised MSS has been approved given the possibility that further changes may still be made. We also note that the revised draft MSS refers to a strategic review of the Arden-Macaulay South precinct being undertaken in the event of the realisation of the Arden Metro Station. Given the uncertainty regarding the timing, funding or even the likelihood of the Station and the Metro project proceeding, GWF submits that the Structure Plan for Arden-Macaulay South should be deferred until the Victorian government has secured funding for the Melbourne Metro project and the Arden Metro Station and committed to a development timetable.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. As explained at the panel hearing, GWF welcomes the Council's proposed revisions to the exhibited draft MSS which provide some protection for existing industrial uses. In particular, GWF supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the distinction between the north and south Arden Macaulay precincts; and</li> <li>- the Arden-Macaulay South Precinct moving from an Urban Renewal Area to an area of Ongoing Change.</li> </ul>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>Despite these changes to the draft MSS, the Structure Plan continues to apply to the entire Arden-Macaulay precinct and refers to the entire precinct as being suitable for urban renewal, albeit in two stages. The Council's proposed distinction between Urban Renewal Areas and areas of Ongoing Change is also not reflected in the Structure Plan. By adopting only one structure plan for the entire Arden-Macaulay precinct, GWF is concerned that the Council is attempting to plan for both the north and south precincts now. As currently drafted, the Structure Plan assumes that the area of Ongoing Change as specified in the proposed MSS will be automatically suitable for urban renewal upon commencement of Stage 2 in 2025. This is inconsistent with the Implementation Program set out in clause 21.07 of the proposed MSS, which indicates that separate structure plans will be prepared and a strategic review of the Arden-Macaulay South Precinct undertaken in the event the Arden Metro Station is realised.</p>		



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>Accordingly, GWF submits that Stage 2 be removed and a separate structure plan should be developed for the Arden-Macaulay South Precinct when the Victorian government has secured funding for the Melbourne Metro project and the Arden Metro Station and committed to a development timetable. Alternatively, the Structure Plan should be amended to ensure consistency between the Structure Plan and Amendment C162, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- clearly defining Stage 1 as the Arden-Macaulay North Precinct and Stage 2 as the Arden-Macaulay South Precinct;</li> <li>- acknowledging that the land in the Arden-Macaulay South Precinct is an area of Ongoing Change; and</li> <li>- reflecting the MSS Implementation Strategy. That is, clarification that the land within Stage 2 will be the subject of further strategic work once the Melbourne Metro is realised and will not be automatically suitable for urban renewal from 2025.</li> </ul>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>The Structure Plan should make no further comment as to the future land uses for Arden-Macaulay South Precinct as these will be determined by the future strategic review.</p>		
		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. Supportive of the proposals to retain the Site's existing Industrial 1 zoning during Stage 1 and not to rezone land within the influence of the Metro station (which would include the Site) until the Metro proceeds. The Structure Plan also proposes to prepare a master plan in the next 1- 5 years for the interface between Laurens Street and North Melbourne Station, as the gateway to Arden Central. In our view, it will be premature to prepare the master plan prior to undertaking the future strategic review.</p> <p>b. GWF is concerned that the long term land use strategy shown in Figure 2.10 (page 33) shows the Site to be used for mixed use activities. No time frame is provided for the implementation of this long term strategy, and therefore, this Figure 2.10 should be deleted as land use in Stage 2 should be determined by the future strategic work undertaken once the Metro is realised.</p>	<p>No Change Required.</p>	<p>Noted. The Structure Plan indicates a long-term vision for this area, however future planning is required to ensure integration with the proposed Melbourne Metro.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. GWF previously expressed concerns that the earlier draft structure plan included the Site on the provisional list for further investigation for inclusion in the North and West Melbourne Heritage Overlay H03. In response, the Council has stated that heritage controls are not proposed on Weston Milling (page 249, 'Response to Issues' Table). GWF welcomes the Council's response that no heritage controls will apply to the Weston Milling site. However, the Structure Plan should reflect this. Strategy 5 still proposes to investigate additional buildings for inclusion within the Heritage Overlay, but has removed the provisional investigation list. The Arden Macaulay Study Area border, previously denoted by the orange line, has been removed from Figure 3.18, meaning it is now unclear which land will be subject to further investigation.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The heritage review is currently underway. All sites in the Arden-Macaulay Study Area, including the GWF site are under review.</p>
<p><b>George Weston Foods (Submitted by Phil Gleeson of Urbis)</b></p>		<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b></p> <p>a. The Structure Plan contradicts Planning Scheme Amendment C162 as it assumes the southern part of the precinct will be an urban renewal area.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan has been prepared in parallel with the Municipal Strategic Statement. The Structure Plan provides a more comprehensive analysis of this area than the MSS which is a high level strategic document. The Structure Plan provides for the transition of the precinct which is consistent with the draft MSS.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Tait, Stuart and Leifman, Jane	Individual	<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Concerned about zoning immediately to the east of the laneway running along the back of houses located in Barnett St between Macauley Rd and Robertson St.</p> <p>b. While we acknowledge the positive change to height regulation we are extremely disappointed that the plan has not considered a green buffer zone between the laneway and the proposed mixed use development. The combination of laneway and green buffer would provide pedestrian and bike access from Macauley Road through to Robertson Street and greater privacy to existing dwellings. The benefit of a green buffer would support a number of principles described in the plan under "Urban Structure and Built Form". We believe that the oversight of a green buffer contravenes the following objectives stated on page 36 of the Plan:</p> <p>- Principle 3.2 - the final Plan allows 10.5m dwellings to be built along the edge of the laneway with no set-back. The potential for dwellings to overlook existing backyards does not support the principle of liveable</p>	<p>a. Include requirement to widen existing Laneway (Council Lane CL167) to improve pedestrian and cycling access and provide opportunities for landscaping and will allow opportunities to vehicular access into private development (to reduce potential impact on quality of the public realm in the proposed activity centre).</p> <p>B. Reduce height limit at interface as illustrated in Figures A - C in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>a. A widened laneway will provide additional opportunities for landscaping and will create a larger offset distance to nearby development.</p> <p>B. The reduced height limits at the interface will reduce impact on existing developments.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>medium density residential and working environments. A green buffer zone would provide capacity to grow trees and maintain the existing privacy enjoyed by residents in these houses.</p> <p>-Principle 3.4 - The final Plan allows for an extension of the park on the corner of Barnett St and Robertson St but a green buffer zone would also greatly expand access to high quality public open space. This area north of Macauley Road is devoid of shade and a green buffer zone planted with trees would provide habitat for birds and respite from the heat for existing and new dwellings and residents</p> <p>.  - Principle 4 - The Plan allows for buildings of a height of 10.5 m to abut the laneway. This is not in keeping with the character with existing dwellings, is disproportionate to existing heritage buildings, is not complimentary to the character of the weatherboard homes and exposes existing residents to viewlines from the new dwellings. A green buffer would provide a natural boundary between the old and new and provide sufficient protection to amenities enjoyed by existing residents.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>Principle 6 - The Plan in its existing form does not create a great street scape when buildings of 10.5 m abut existing laneways, particularly when existing dwellings abut the laneway opposite. A green buffer will transform the laneway into a welcoming walkway from Macauley Road to Robertson Street and the existing park on the corner of Robertson and Barnett St.</p> <p>- Principle 7 - The existing Plan does not encourage a mix of housing sizes within the new dwellings. The Plan encourages exploitation of the planning heights and should provide a mix of heights in keeping with existing residences. The green buffer proposed in this submission provides high quality open space for new and existing dwellings and residents , encourages the planting of new trees and provides a microclimate and enhanced environmental considerations for the area .</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>Principle 10 - The existing Plan exposes new dwellings to the full extent of the western sun. A green buffer will protect these new dwellings from the western sun and allow greater exposure of the existing dwellings to the eastern sun, particularly during winter. A green buffer will promote cool ventilation to the new and old dwellings.</p> <p>In the Plan's Strategy 4 on page 47, precedence has been created through requirements specified for certain laneways and streets. We believe the referred laneway east of Barnett St should be eligible for special consideration and that a green buffer be located between the laneway (and existing dwellings , that are located within a heritage overlay) and the proposed development.</p> <p>We suspect that council, in ignoring our request for a green buffer, are beholden to the commercial landowners of the warehouses to the east of Barnett St, who will benefit greatly from any development of their land. Council are ignoring the concerns of current residents, who have occupied our dwellings for considerable time.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>A green buffer makes sense because it supports many of the objectives outlined in the Plan. We urge Council to seriously consider this amendment to the Plan and ensure that current residents are not overlooked in determining the future of our area.</p> <p>c. a. The height limitations proposed in the existing Plan (for the laneway behind Barnett Street between Macaulay Road and Robertson Street) do not provide appropriate protection for the existing residents and does not provide a suitable transition from the old to the new.</p>		
<b>Nowak, Stephen</b>	Individual	<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. In relation to the overall plan I am in favour of a mixed use plan as this allows the area to change overtime to the needs of the community that includes light business and residential use.</p>	a. No changes proposed.	a. Noted.



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>5. Public Realm</b></p> <p>a. With respect to my particular area –as it is planned as MUZ I do not understand the requirement for OPEN SPACE, especially such a large area impacting on probably about 15-20 businesses and properties. There is within 300-400 metres to the East, the North Melbourne Recreational Reserve on Arden St and a few hundred metres to the West is the extensive JJ Holland Park on Kensington Rd.</p> <p>b. As a property owner, I have invested extensively within the last 18 months in the building with the plan for a long term Investment holding. As a business owner, I have invested in upgrading the offices and showroom for our clients/customers, together with overall improved staff facilities to attract the right people. It would be at a major cost and inconvenience, to my staff, customers and me to have to shift my business. In addition to direct costs, it would cause me significant loss and damage for loss of income, loss of potential development profit and other losses for which I would need to be compensated.</p>	<p>a-b. No Change proposed.</p>	<p>a -b. The propositions for Open Space were prepared as an integrated planning exercise that considered the benefits of urban renewal within Arden-Macaulay. The Structure Plan has been prepared in parallel with the draft Open Space Strategy which investigates the requirements for open space to meet the existing and future needs of residents and workers. The provision of public open space is an important component of delivering sustainable urban renewal and will have long-term benefits to the local community. The criteria for selecting park locations is included in the draft. Council will continue discussions with all property owners affected by the public open space proposal to progress opportunities to deliver a shared and agreeable outcome. The Council will work with property owners to develop an approach for each property to minimise the disruption to existing businesses operating on the site.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>As a concerned citizen I would think it a large waste of resources and environmentally irresponsible to demolish my perfectly good solid building and the others within the street that are proposed for open space. In my view it is imperative that existing industrial and business land uses be preserved and protected and that any structure plan must incorporate this.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Cooke, Stan	Individual	<p><b>10. General Comments</b></p> <p>a. Support very strongly the expansion of high rise density in the arden central, as this will ensure the expansion of HMCs'As'including the expansion of LCAs near rail stations/activity centre/business/rental centres in all areas of RP.</p> <p>b. Congratulates the CJLA for committing to the expand the production of LCAs in the RPs' area by 20% and believes that this should be targeted towards chosen Shareholders,as the majority are locked out or suffering stress.</p> <p>c. Can see no economic or financial rational for not allowing high rise/high density LCA'sin existing Shareholder/Customers areas of the RP particularly near activity centres and transport hubs,but more importantly such restrictions goes against Melbourne 2030 Directions 1/6(Melbourne 2030:Drctns 1/6)</p> <p>d. Supports very strongly objectives 1/47,but not 6/9 as they prevent market forces from consuming the land in the most cost-effect/efficient manner,which means these objectives threatens the economic/financial viability of the area</p> <p>e. Very strongly supports recommendation 1 under strategies and r</p> <p>f. Not sure of recommendation 2 but would</p>	a-h. No change required.	a-h. Noted.

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<p><b>HWD Alfred St Pty Ltd (Submitted by Peter Avery of Peter J. Avery Pty Ltd)</b></p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. Questions the need for four laneways and public open space (2500m<sup>2</sup>) through site as this is excessive, unsustainable, being almost 50% of the site. The East West Laneway along the southern boundary is superfluous, and should be deleted, and the POS area excessive for the function needed, and should be reduced. Proposed that this will result in the Public Realm area being more like 25% of the site area (950m<sup>2</sup>) - refer to images in full submission.</p> <p>b. Replace the upper level set backs to CityLink with no upper level setbacks.</p> <p>c. Replace upper level setback proposed in Street Type IVc with no upper level setbacks.</p> <p>d. Propose deleting the East West Lane - which has no destination to the west, and severely and detrimentally impacts smaller sites to the south east of the subject property and replace with preferred laneways - refer to images in full submission.</p>	<p>a. Revise wording in Strategy 3, p 77, first column to: '1. Alfred Street A new park, in the order of 2,500 m<sup>2</sup> in size...' B and c. No change.</p> <p>d. Ensure consistency through the document by removing extension of East-West Laneway from the site.</p>	<p>a. The scale of the park is an important component of the open space network.</p> <p>B. The upper level setbacks ensure daylight into the proposed north-south street. This is important considering the scale and dominance of the adjacent CityLink freeway.</p> <p>D. Extension removed to ensure consistency.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>e. We believe it is not possible to achieve 100% ground level activation throughout the subject property and propose two 'activated Lanes, and one 'Service Lane' refer to images in full submission.</p> <p>f. We agree in principle with the heights, with some clarifications – refer to images in full submission.</p> <p>g. Proposal for this site is included in the full submission - this includes built form in accordance with draft structure plan; introduction of 'north south' lane thru site; provision for small local park; overall height of buildings to be increased to compensate for reduction in developable site area; deletion of east west lane to south of subject site; one laneway will need to be a service lane only.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>Proposal includes buildings around the central park with three laneways provided in north-south direction. The area shown as an internal green space surrounded by buildings of different heights, is a Communal Residents open space 892m<sup>2</sup> area planned to be 'non Public Realm' and on a different level to the larger 1687m<sup>2</sup> Public Realm Open Space area (adjacent to Alfred St) due to it being planned above the two levels (ground and first floor levels) car parking areas planned to be provided. Local Park recommended (being less than the park size shown on Figure 2.10, 5.7 and 7.1 (2500m<sup>2</sup>?) and more like shown diagrammatically on Figures 2.7, 3.17 and 6.1. (&lt;2000m<sup>2</sup>).</p>		
<p><b>Comdain Property (Submitted by Penelope Smith of Fulcrum Urban Planning)</b></p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p><b>10. General comments</b>  a. The Structure Plan is a significant document which provides a clear vision for the future and has the potential to deliver good outcomes; and the precinct is growing in popularity as a place to live with declining industrial uses.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. Noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
<p><b>Lost Dogs Home (Submitted by Virginia Jackson of Harlock Jackson)</b></p>	<p>Organisation</p>	<p><b>10. General Comments</b></p> <p>a. The plans should recognise the presence of the LDH in the precinct. It should be specifically addressed in the description of the south-west quadrant, it should be shown on the long term land use strategy in figure 2.10 and its properties should be correctly nominated in Figure 1.1. It is disappointing that the LDH is not referenced in the Structure Plan as it is an important community service, or its significance as a land owner, an occupant or an employer is mentioned.</p> <p>b. The Structure Plan presupposes that the Lost Dogs Home is going or is no longer present.</p>	<p>a. Include reference to LDH as a community facility on Page 92 to acknowledge their function as existing community infrastructure in the area.</p>	

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>c. The existing location is crucial to the LDH's operations. The LDH intends to remain at North Melbourne. It would not be possible to find another site that meets its needs. The LDH will be progressively redeveloped over the next 5-15 years which will enable it to reduce its noise emissions to an acceptable level. The new Sick and Injured Animal Facility is a good example of the insulation and acoustic protection that can be designed. This means the LDH can remain at North Melbourne with sensitive uses in its midst.</p> <p>d. The Structure Plan does not adequately address the future needs of the LDH.</p> <p>e. Figure 1.1 incorrectly nominates the existing uses on LDH land: 2 and 13 Gracie Street are nominated as storage, 54 Gracie Street is manufacturing space use and 1 Boundary Road is nominated as offices. This needs to be amended.</p> <p>f. It is our understanding that 2 Gracie Street has a D heritage grading which is not shown on figure 3.18.</p>		



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. Whilst this is not specifically recommended in the draft Plan, a rezoning of the LDH land to Mixed Use would be disastrous for its future operations. Whilst the Home would retain Existing Use Rights, its ability to redevelop would be severely curtailed. The Home seeks a more suitable zoning of its land eg a purpose designed Special Use Zone. The SUZ could ensure there is a Master Plan and/or Management Plan for the site to ensure appropriate acoustic treatment is provided in any new works. Most of the animal related uses of the LDH would be prohibited in the MUZ above a threshold of 5 animals. The timing of Stage 2 is crucial to the LDH's viability. It is considered that this needs to be carefully considered in the plan. The LDH can remain at this location in the long term. It requires enough time to transition to a facility that has acceptable acoustic treatment whilst ensuring new sensitive uses in its midst also provide for their own noise protection. It also needs an appropriate zoning of the LDH land.</p>	<p>a. No change proposed. B-f. Include additional references as noted to acknowledge importance of LDH in the area.</p>	<p>a. Stage 2 provides the appropriate mechanism to consider future rezoning and protection of the site and to allow the LDH to adjust and redesign to improve compatibility with new sensitive uses in the area. Comments acknowledged and these issues are best resolved in Stage 2. This includes the requirement for new development will be required to address reverse amenity impacts. b-f. Acknowledges importance of LDH.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>b. Include the LDH in the references to the need to protect existing industry (page 20, principles 1 (2) and 2 (6) and (7).</p> <p>c. Include the LDH in the references to iconic industrial sites that figure prominently in locals' collective consciousness. Specific mention could be made here of the LDH especially given the Heritage Overlay which applies over the original site at 2 Gracie Street.</p> <p>d. Include mention of LDH in discussion of issues on page 21 (eg paragraph 1 of page 23).</p> <p>e. The LDH should be mentioned in the description of the south-west quadrant on page 25 as should the Special Use Zone for the LDH land.</p> <p>f. The LDH should be included on the long term land use strategy provided in Figure 2.10. It is shown as Mixed Use.</p>		

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>3. Urban Structure &amp; Built Form</b></p> <p>a. The proposed laneway running between the LDH's main site and its Lost Cats' Home is unworkable. It would be acceptable for the laneway to run alongside the north-eastern side boundary of 54 Gracie Street providing no acquisition of LDH land is required.</p> <p>b. To remain at North Melbourne the LDH needs appropriate siting and controls over new sensitive uses within 500 metres of the Home.</p>	a-h. No Change Required.	a. Comments acknowledged and these issues are best resolved in Stage 2. This includes the requirement for new development will be required to address reverse amenity impacts.

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>9. Process &amp; Implementation</b></p> <p>a. Notwithstanding the above comments, the LDH believes the Structure Plan is premature given the final MSS has not been approved and it is predicated on development of Arden Station which is not yet resolved. In the normal course of events, the MSS would precede the development of the Structure Plan. It is crucial that the new MSS is approved before the Structure Plan due to the substantial change anticipated by the draft plan to land use and built form. The future of the precinct has been hotly debated and is far from resolved. Many submitters argued that the recommendations contained in the draft MSS were not strategically justified. In this context, further consideration of the Structure Plan should be deferred.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan establishes a 30 year vision for the area. It acknowledges the need for a staged transition that is coordinated with the delivery of infrastructure to support urban renewal. The area bounded by Ink Lane, Langford Street, Boundary Road, Henderson Street, Fogarty Street, Arden Street and Dryburgh Street therefore forms part of Stage 2 of the Plan as urban renewal in this area must be coordinated with delivery of the Melbourne Metro that can support this change in use. Planning for the metro project is already underway.</p> <p>The Structure Plan provides a more comprehensive analysis of this area than the MSS which is a high level strategic document.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>6. Community Infrastructure</b></p> <p>a. Refer to the range of valuable services the LDH provides to residents of the City of Melbourne on page 95, including The LDH provides a range of valuable services for residents of the City of Melbourne including pound, veterinary services, education and training for dogs and responsible pet ownership etc.</p> <p>b. Refer to the LDH's auditorium at 13 Gracie Street as a valuable community resource at page 96 and following pages. We note that 13 Gracie Street is nominated in Figure 6.1 as existing community and cultural infrastructure.</p>	<p>a. Include reference to LDH as a community facility on Page 92 to acknowledge their function as existing community infrastructure in the area.</p>	<p>a. acknowledges important contribution of the LDH.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p><b>5. Public Realm</b></p> <p>a. Clayton Reserve is a well established off-leash area that is also used by the LDH to exercise its dogs. The LDH constructed the fencing. Off-leash areas are extremely import to the dog owning community. For many people walking their dog is their main form of recreation and the social capital and health benefits have been well documented. Any plans to remove the off-leash designation would need to be compensated for with one or more alternatives in the local area. The active recreation and community space beside the Moonee Ponds Creek on Figure 6.1 is one option.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	<p>a. The Arden-Macaulay Structure Plan recognises the importance of retaining a dog-off leash park in the area. In the longer term, there is potential for the Clayton Reserve dog off-leash function to be relocated into the new open space on Langford Street.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
Thomas, Julie	Individual	<p><b>2. Activities &amp; Land Uses</b></p> <p>a. The first draft which showed a Mixed Use Zone in the area was terrific as it allowed existing businesses to continue to operate and allowed for mixed use including commercial.</p> <p>b. Replace the PUZ with the Mixed Use Zone or at the very least reinstate the Industrial 3 Zone to ensure some certainty and enable business expansion. Concerned by the PUZ applied to the property. This has creulled plans for expansion of the business and proposed showroom which was to provide extra space to showcase products to wholesalers and retailers - all of which would be covered under MUZ. Business plans are on hold.</p> <p>c. Through the meetings and workshop regarding the Structure Plan, the overwhelming census was that people from Kensington wanted business, industry and residential to be able to co-exist.</p>	a. No change proposed.	<p>a -c. The propositions for Open Space were prepared as an integrated planning exercise that considered the benefits of urban renewal within Arden-Macaulay. The Structure Plan has been prepared in parallel with the draft Open Space Strategy which investigates the requirements for open space to meet the existing and future needs of residents and workers. The provision of public open space is an important component of delivering sustainable urban renewal and will have long-term benefits to the local community.</p> <p>Council will continue discussions with all property owners affected by the public open space proposal to progress opportunities to deliver a shared and agreeable outcome.</p> <p>The Council will work with property owners to develop an approach for each property to minimise the disruption to existing businesses operating on the site. Dissatisfaction with the process is noted.</p>

Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>d. The timing is appalling as residential real estate has been suffering, many business sectors have been doing it tough following the GFC, the economic outlook for 2012 is limited at best and then we find ourselves in this extraordinary position through a very flawed and unsatisfactory planning process.</p> <p>e. Experienced concern and confusion when a letter was received following a review by the Panel Committee appointed by the Minister for Planning to say that the area had been designated as an area of 'ongoing change'. It was very confusing as one of the planners said that the reviews did not stop council proceeding with the proposed draft but 'in time'. I was told that if were were to be MUZ in the draft plan then we would continue to be. But there was not much we could do until council reviewed the structure plan in December. Based on this advice we sat back to await Council's deliberations. Surprised to learn that the designation was for PUZ. We had the impression it was a fait accompli and that we had little chance of overturning the decision.</p>	<p>a. No change required.</p>	



Author	Individual/ Organisation	Comment	CoM Actions	Explanation
		<p>f. Replace the PUZ with the Mixed Use Zone or at the very least reinstate the Industrial 3 Zone to ensure some certainty and enable business expansion. Concerned by the PUZ applied to the property. This has creulled plans for expansion of the business and proposed showroom which was to provide extra space to showcase products to wholesalers and retailers - all of which would be covered under MUZ. Business plans are on hold.</p>		