
From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 December 2021 9:15 AM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#130]

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Billy Rebakis

Email address: * brebakis@urbis.com.au

Date of meeting: * Wednesday 7 December 2022

Agenda item title: * 84–90 Queens Bridge Street Southbank

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am. Can I please email in the submission? It is over 2mb

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne in support of your submission: * Yes

If yes, please indicate if you would like to make your submission in person, or via a virtual link (Zoom) to the meeting. Please note, physical attendance will be limited in accordance with City of Melbourne security protocols and COVID–safe plans and be allocated on a first registered, first served basis. * I wish to make by submission via Zoom

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 December 2021 9:20 AM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#131]

Categories:

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Reade Dixon

Email address: * R.Dixon@elenbergfraser.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: * 84-90 Queens Bridge Street Southbank

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Can we please email you the submission?
It is over 2mb.
Thanks :)

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne in support of your submission: * Yes

If yes, please indicate if you would like to make your submission in person, or via a virtual link (Zoom) to the meeting. Please note, physical attendance will be limited in accordance with City of Melbourne security protocols and COVID-safe plans and be allocated on a first registered, first served basis. * I wish to make by submission via Zoom

From: Reade Dixon <R.Dixon@elenbergfraser.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 December 2021 10:25 AM
To: CoM Meetings
Cc:
Subject: RE: [External] Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#131]

Hi
Please see below link to our presentation for tonight.
<https://we.tl/t-gE8eIDif8C>

Please also note from our office will present the project on our behalf.
We agree to the terms below and details are as follows:

Thank you.
R

Reade Dixon

ELENBERG FRASER
Level 1, 160 Queen Street Melbourne Victoria 3000 Australia

Email R.Dixon@elenbergfraser.com
Website www.elenbergfraser.com

The information in this message and its attachments are intended for the addressee only and may be confidential. Distribution, disclosure or copying of this information is prohibited. If you receive this message in error, please inform the sender by return email delete it and any attachments from your system. Elenberg Fraser does not warrant that this email is free from viruses or defects and takes no liability for loss or damage that may result from this communication.

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Friday, 3 December 2021 5:21 PM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: FMC meeting submission form (virtual meetings) [#1948]

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Alexander Fin

Email address: * alex@gurner.com.au

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: * Ministerial Planning Referral: TPM-2014-24B, 334-344 City Road, Southbank

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.
Verbal submissions in relation to Agenda Item 6.2
Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee live via phone or Zoom in support of your submission: * Yes

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Friday, 3 December 2021 5:24 PM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: FMC meeting submission form (virtual meetings) [#1949]

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Jamie Govenlock

Email address: * igovenlock@urbis.com.au

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: * Ministerial Planning Referral: TPM-2014-24/B, 334-344 City Road, Southbank

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.

Verbal submission in relation to Agenda item 6.2
Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee live via phone or Zoom in support of your submission: * Yes

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Friday, 3 December 2021 5:25 PM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: FMC meeting submission form (virtual meetings) [#1950]

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Nick Deans

Email address: * nick.deans@warrenandmahoney.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: * Ministerial Planning Referral: TPM-2014-24/B, 334-344 City Rd, Southbank

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.
Verbal submission in relation to Agenda item 6.2
Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee live via phone or Zoom in support of your submission: * Yes

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Monday, 6 December 2021 11:24 PM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#126]

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Ewan Ogilvy

Email address: * planningcra@gmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: * DEC21_FMC1_6.3_TP-2020-464_University_Square

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am. See Attachment

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:  [dec21_fmcl_6.3_tp2020464_university_square_cra_objection_final.pdf](#)
463.21 KB · PDF

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne in support of your submission: * No



The Carlton Residents Association Inc
A0034345G ABN 87 716 923 898
PO Box 1140 Carlton Vic 3053
planningcra@gmail.com
www.carltonresidents.org.au

Future Melbourne Committee DEC21 FMC1 Agenda Item 6.3

6 December 2021

To: Lord Mayor and Councillors, City of Melbourne
From: Carlton Residents Association
Subject: **Objection to TP-2020-464, Relocation of M Pavilion to University Square, 190-192 Pelham St, Carlton**

+++++

The Officer Recommendation in relation to this Application is a very disappointing outcome for the Carlton Community. In summary, the Association's key concerns include the following:

Poor Planning Process

The Minister for Planning has already agreed, in principle, to grant a 10 year Lease to the University to facilitate this project, and the M Pavilion website has revealed that **University Square will be, not might be, the location for the Glenn Murcutt 2019 designed M Pavilion**. Under these circumstances, how can the Carlton community treat the present planning permit process seriously?

A draft land lease between Melbourne City Council, the applicant, and the Minister for Planning (crown land manager) has been signed by the applicant. The Minister for Planning has given in principle support to the lease.

DEC21 FMC1 6.3 TP-2020-464 [p.22]

MPAVILION 2019 BY Glenn Murcutt. **To be located at The University of Melbourne, University Square**, Carlton, VIC, 3053 [<https://mpavilion.org/past-designs/>]

There is no indication in the documentation included in the report to Council whether other sites were considered for the location of the 2019 M Pavilion. Why not?

The suggested location of the Pavilion at the northern section of The Green is inconsistent with a key Design Response of the approved University Square Master Plan. This Design Response provided that the hard surfaced plaza area fronting Grattan Street should be the key location for the more active pursuits; in this way maximising the available green space for passive recreation.

Take advantage of the hard-surfaced area by using it to create spaces for activities including a recessed basketball half-court, table tennis and chess.

By locating these activities on the existing built form of the plaza, the more informal open lawn of 'The Green' will be preserved.

University Square Master Plan 2016 - Plaza & Grattan St Design Response [Extract]

There is also considerable doubt, as expressed by the Council's Open Space Planning Team, whether the Pavilion will satisfy key provisions of the Public Park and Recreation Zone

The pavilion and its activities are not park-related and could feasibly function in any number of different places, whether in parkland or not. Its proposed position in University Square does not contribute to the functioning of University Square as a place of public recreation and open space. It is unclear whether the events programming is anticipated to include commercial uses.

DEC21 FMC1 6.3 TP-2020-464 [p.29]

Contentious Aspects of the Application

The suggested uses for the Pavilion are incredibly broad [they include lectures, Art and other events], and the hours of operation very extensive. Under these circumstances, it seems that non-university initiated activities will be quite limited. Further, although the University is required to provide a Management Plan [as a Permit condition] best planning practice should require that such a document is provided at the outset. For example, the Applicant has provided no information where toilet facilities, for the use of patrons, will be provided.

4. The application seeks to allow a place of assembly and single storey open sided pavilion structure that will be used for programs / events held by the University of Melbourne for a maximum term of 10 years. The maximum capacity for the use is proposed to be 95 people.
5. Any event or activity programmed at the site is restricted to 7am – 10pm Monday to Saturday and 8am – 5pm Sunday. The proposal does not seek to allow live music entertainment nor the sale or consumption of liquor (no liquor licence is proposed).

DEC21 FMC1 6.3 TP-2020-464, University Square [p.1]

And again,

Prior to the commencement of the use, a Management Plan (MP) must be submitted that provides information relating to the nature, programming, availability, frequency, and management of events or programs on the land.

In addition to details of events or programs, the MP must provide information relating to the management of patrons including control of patrons and access to services such as toilets.

DEC21 FMC1 6.3 TP-2020-464, University Square [p.35]

Initial site works require an extensive “cut and fill” operation, to provide a level base for the Pavilion. Why is contaminated soil that exists on the site, not being **removed** as part of this operation? Further, it is clear from the Application documents that electricity will be supplied to the Pavilion, but the extent and nature of any artificial lighting remains unclear.

Total contaminated fill moved	100.9	m ³	
Under Topsoil Fill			
Total fill required under new topsoil to the south	164	m ³	
Contaminated fill relocated under topsoil to the south	100.9	m ³	Relocates all contaminated fill

DEC21 FMC1 6.3 TP-2020-464, University Square [p.13]

The MPavilion consists of a rectangular plan and round steel columns supporting wing-like trusses wrapped in translucent tensile membrane, **shaping a buoyant white roof that is lit from within at night.** [<https://mpavilion.org/past-designs/>]

Although the officer report indicates that a liquor licence is not proposed, given that alcoholic beverages are currently made available to patrons of the **existing** M Pavilion at Queen Victoria Gardens, and given that the University Square Master Plan has recommended that a café should be located within the Grattan Street Plaza area, it appears very likely that a liquor licence will be obtained in the future.

Design and locate a café and retail premise on the Barry Street side of the plaza that will be in close proximity to the new Metro Station, with facilities to borrow movable furniture and activity equipment for use in the park. [University Square Master Plan 2016 Plaza & Grattan St Design Response Extract]

And again

Is M Pavilion licensed? We sure are! You can purchase from a selection of alcoholic beverages at our Kiosk during the program. Please bring photo identification. [<https://mpavilion.org/faq/>]

Finally, although University Square is not currently a Graded Heritage Place within the Planning Scheme,

- University Square is included within the Carlton Heritage Overlay, and the Carlton Heritage Review 2021 has proposed to accord Significant status to this Square.
- Further, it must be acknowledged that the value of ALL Carlton's Squares, including University Square, is recognised in the Statement of Significance for the Carlton Precinct. According to this Statement, "The squares **represented valuable open space for both passive and more formal recreation** and, despite their small size, also proved popular with local sporting clubs." [Emphasis added]

Concluding Comments

Given that the proposed location for the **2019 M Pavilion** at University Square involves such a major departure from the 2016 University Master Plan, the Applicant should be required to provide evidence that alternative sites were examined thoroughly before settling upon **the more informal open lawn of 'The Green' at University Square.**

More particularly, the Council must acknowledge that the single most important **Heritage** attribute of University Square has to be the extent of the remaining **valuable open space for both passive and more formal recreation. In the Association's view ANY reduction in the area available for informal passive recreation would be a tragedy.**

Further, given the number of key issues still to be resolved, the Applicant should be required to provide a detailed Management Plan before any Notice of Determination is issued, rather than require such a basic document to be a condition of permit.

It is to be hoped that the Council will give appropriate weight to the Association's Objection.

Ewan Ogilvy [for the Carlton Residents Association]

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Monday, 6 December 2021 3:13 PM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#115]

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Fiona Whitworth

Email address: * fiona.whitworth@unimelb.edu.au

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: * 6.3 Planning Permit Application: TP-2020-464, University Square, 190-192 Pelham Street, Carlton

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:  [211203_mvavilion_com_fmc_submission.pdf](#) 82.19 KB · PDF

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne in support of your submission: * Yes

If yes, please indicate if you would like to make your submission in person, or via a virtual link (Zoom) to the meeting. Please note, physical attendance will be limited in accordance with City of Melbourne security protocols and COVID-safe plans and be allocated on a first registered, first served basis. * I wish to make by submission via Zoom



The University of Melbourne Submission in Support of MPavilion 2019 by Glenn Murcutt AO at University Square, Carlton

PURPOSE

This report provides information for City of Melbourne Council regarding MPavilion at University Square.

CONTEXT

MPavilion 2019 by Glenn Murcutt AO was gifted to the University of Melbourne by the Naomi Milgrom Foundation for ongoing use as a space for activation that would offer an opportunity to encourage engagement with the University and broader community.

The Naomi Milgrom Foundation (NMF) is a not-for-profit charitable organisation founded in 2014 and led by philanthropist Naomi Milgrom AO. Its stated purpose is to enhance the presence and influence of creative culture in Australia through exceptional art, design and architecture, with an overarching commitment is to make the arts more accessible to more people. MPavilion is the Naomi Milgrom Foundation's (NMF) cornerstone cultural initiative. Each year, the NMF commissions an acclaimed architect to design a new outdoor pavilion which will function as a vibrant civic space and cultural laboratory. The MPavilion is then temporarily installed in Southbank's Queen Victoria Gardens, where it becomes the focus of a season of free community events and activations during the summer months. At the end of each season, the MPavilion is gifted to the people of Victoria and relocated to a new, permanent home.

MPavilion 2019 is the sixth in an ongoing series of annual architect-designed summer pavilions for Melbourne. Previous MPavilion's have been gifted by the Naomi Milgrom Foundation to other organisations including Monash University, which has played host to MPavilion 2017 since early 2018, serving as a contemporary amphitheatre from its second home at the University's Clayton campus, where it provides a meeting place for students and the broader community.

ABOUT THE PAVILION

Glenn Murcutt AO is one of Australia's most influential architects and the only Australian recipient of the Pritzker Architecture Prize (2002). Known for environmentally responsible designs grounded in an Australian background, Murcutt's MPavilion 2019 is his first civic city design. Murcutt's architecture motto derives from his education in Indigenous practices and cultures: *touch the earth lightly*. Responding directly to the elements of the Australian landscape through his designs and thoughtful use of materials, Glenn's practice is a harmonious blend of modernist sensibility, local craftsmanship, Indigenous structures, and his respect for nature.

A dedication to vernacular and sustainable design has seen Glenn take an experimental approach to his projects, also leading to an identifiable aesthetic: repeated use of slim structures and corrugated iron recall the iron woolshed; passive cooling is achieved through a manipulation of materials that respond to wind patterns, as well as the use of slats and fly screen. His buildings are highly adaptable.

Inspired by the memory of a light aircraft's wing as shelter, Glenn Murcutt's MPavilion2019 has steel columns supporting wing-like trusses covered in luminous Ceconite aircraft fabric. LED lighting illuminates the fabric ceiling, emitting a lantern-like glow; a gesture to its delicate footprint, and the transient nature of the interactions within.

PAVILION LOCATION

Under the terms of the Deed of Gift with the Naomi Milgrom Foundation, the University of Melbourne has committed to the reinstallation of the structure in a location agreed by the City of Melbourne and the Foundation.

After a series of discussions involving key City of Melbourne officers including Professor Rob Adams during 2019, a number of possible sites were reviewed. These included sites within the Parkville historic campus, a location in the vicinity of the Southbank campus and Melbourne arts precinct and also the proposed location at University Square. After this process of review, the other locations were ruled out, primarily due to the space requirements to properly site the MPavilion to achieve both the Architects vision, and the Naomi Milgrom's objectives to ensure public access to the gift of the pavilion as an activated site. University Square was selected as the preferred location not only for its scale, but as the site that afforded the best opportunity to encourage engagement between the University and wider community. Unique to this square, compared to others in the Carlton and Parkville grid, is its future proximity to train, along with tram and bus, transportation. This provision has been identified as encouraging visitors from outside the immediate surrounds to attend events at the Pavilion via public transport. In addition, University Square is presently undergoing significant works and alteration, due to the construction of the Parkville Metro Station that it abuts. This was also taken into account in selecting the site; that use of the Square was already disrupted due to the construction (scheduled to take place over many years), and that future built-form infrastructure is intended for the northern end of the Square, but not yet designed or commissioned, allowing it to be considered in parallel with the amenity the Pavilion will offer users of the Square. Significantly, the proposed location was also agreed to by the architect, Glenn Murcutt, whose design intention was to see the Pavilion in a parkland setting.

The University has worked with City of Melbourne officers to finetune the location and minimize the impact on provision of green open space and the central historic axis of the park.

Current status: As Crown Land Committee of Management for University Square, the City of Melbourne has obtained necessary State Government (DELWP) approval to issue a temporary licence to the University of Melbourne for the MPavilion site.

PROGRAMMING

The terms of the licence ensure that the public access to the MPavilion is protected and its ongoing use restricted to public activation and programming, as well as offering informal weather protection in University Square, an important public place for the local precinct. The University has liaised with the Tourism and Events department of City of Melbourne to develop a streamlined approach to manage community use, and bookings for events. Through this, community members can approach either the City of Melbourne or the University of Melbourne to book the Pavilion, and clear descriptions of this opportunity and the process will be made available online. Booking the pavilion is free for the community.

The Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning will play a strong role in programming the MPavilion in conjunction with the Museums and Collections Department. The University programming of the Pavilion, which will be open to the public to attend and free, is intended to be focused to coincide with key civic festivities in Melbourne – such as Naidoc Week, Knowledge Week, and Design Week for instance – as well as the University's Orientation Week. The first years of this program will explore First Peoples' understanding of

Place, and the built environment, through talks and participatory workshops, led by Indigenous staff of the University.

The relocation of MPavilion 2019 by Glenn Murcutt AO to University Square, a place that is central to the University campus as well as an important public square for Carlton will foster discussion and debate about the role design, architecture and culture have in creating cities that are liveable, creative and equitable. It will also enable the broader community further opportunity to experience Glenn Murcutt's architecture, and serve as a point of engagement for the University and the broader community, encouraging the vibrancy of our city to return.

The University has allocated significant budget towards the relocation, infrastructure and operations of the MPavilion (in excess of \$1.5m) demonstrating a strong commitment to public infrastructure.

APPROVAL

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Monday, 6 December 2021 8:06 AM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#114]

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Ivan Hexter

Email address: * ivanhexter@gmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: * Vic. Market Development

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am. Dear Committee,
Vic. Market Traders currently hold stalls that once attracted rents that were reasonable and considerate. The food & wares they sell are well priced based on reasonable rent. Please ensure this continues.

Thank you,

Ivan Hexter
Melbournian Visitor

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne in support of your submission: * No

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, 4 December 2021 9:08 PM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#110]

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Kristina Beck

Email address: * kristinamkbeck@gmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: 6.4 QVM business case

*

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit **by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting.** Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Dear all,

I am a constituent in the City of Melbourne local government area and have been observing this process for a few years, including the community campaigns raising questions about the process. I understand the need to make changes at the site, and think a lot of the changes make sense, such as more green space and better waste management.

My main concern is that the business case does not seem to understand, appreciate or even particularly acknowledge the cultural diversity of the market community and the broader Melbourne community. The business case briefly mentions a business nursery to act as an incubator, and references Melbourne makers, but does not propose anything meaningful or concrete to show that any of these initiatives, or the plan overall, values or intends to preserve the cultural diversity and inclusiveness of the market. Inclusiveness relates in part to affordability and access to low cost items, which in turn means rent has to stay affordable for traders who may not otherwise be able to set up shop in the CBD at all.

I understand the economic imperative and long term need to improve profitability of the market. But please don't

throw the baby out with the bath water. Perhaps this means setting aside portions of the market that are rent controlled or offered at a discount to emerging small businesses, or as some in the community campaigns have suggested, setting aside stalls and providing targeted support for emerging small and micro enterprises run by new migrants and refugees from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Perhaps you could engage first Australians in meaningful ways during the design process, beyond mentioning them in the naming of selected spaces, which comes across as tokenistic. E.g. the report references the heritage listed burial ground, Aboriginal people should be involved in decisions about how best to acknowledge this, and how best to educate visitors, particularly in the context of historic treaty negotiations.

I'm sure there are many other pragmatic ideas that would contribute to this. This requires continuous consultation that takes community concerns seriously, and actively looks for common ground and compromise. Community consultation is meant to be difficult, you need to expect conflict, when the council ultimately prioritises its own economic imperatives over the economic imperatives of the current traders and customers. This conflict shouldn't come as a surprise. Concerted and authentic effort needs to be made to understand the genuine underlying grievances and needs of the communities the market currently serves, not just at the planning stage but throughout the renewal process. I hope the market can expand its customer base without turning its back on those who have kept it alive and vibrant for this long. Effective consultation requires very specific expertise, and just has to be incorporated into the cost of doing business if you want an outcome that doesn't erode the council's reputation or leave a cloud hanging over the whole development for years to come.

In its current form, while the business case is informative, it seems a bit whitewashed, and seems to miscalculate or ignore the social and cultural capital that the market has accumulated over decades, in large part thanks to the diversity of traders and affordability of the market's offering.

Kind regards,

Kristina Beck

kristinamkbeck@gmail.com

Please indicate **No**
whether you
would like to
verbally address
the Future
Melbourne in
support of your
submission: *

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Monday, 6 December 2021 11:28 AM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#117]

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Ross Anderson

Email address: * ross.anderson0@icloud.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: * Queen Victoria Market – Updated Business Case

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[qvm2011206_business_case_response.pdf](#) 108.50 KB · PDF

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne in support of your submission: * No

6 Dec 2021

Response to Queen Victoria Market – updates business case

Page 11 Economic Analysis

FIGURE 1. TOTAL EMPLOYMENT GENERATED – OPTION 0, OPTION 1 AND INCREMENTAL

Option 0 is a Base Case scenario where City of Melbourne elects to not pursue the renewal program. The updated business case shows that there has been an increase in employment from 2020 to 2025, and no further employment growth after this date.

What is the basis for this assumption?

What analyse has been done to validate this assumption?

Option 1, Project business case.

What is the basis for the anticipated employment growth in the period 2025 to 2051?

What how will QVM alone drive the growth over this time frame?

What event growth is assumed that cannot be undertaken using the existing QVM infrastructure?

What are the employment growth factors included in option 1 that are not directly attributed to the QVM? We believe that all of these factors must be included in the baseline case so that apples can be compared with apples.

The option 0 baseline employment growth assumptions of 0 growth is not believable given the anticipated growth in the State and the Melbourne council area. Using assumptions of this nature demonstrate the lack of realistic analysis that has been undertaken to accurately define the growth environment over the next 20-30 years. Given that the state and federal treasure estimates have proven to be highly inaccurate over the longer term why has they business case used the highly artificial estimates?

Reference page 12

Describes a number of investment issues and proposed approaches to resolving them.

Issue 1. Outdated QVM & trader modes undermining the QVM sustainability.

Based on discussions with many traders one of the greatest problems associated with viability is the attitude of QVM management to traders. Changing the management's attitude to traders, from one of adversarial to that of a customer or a partnership would go a long way to improving sustainability of both the traders and the market.

A program of Change Management focusing on trader behaviour and practice will do nothing if QVM management's attitude does not change too. Traders are leaving the market for multiple reasons, one is QVM management, the other is their viability and sustainability.

Issue 2 - Inadequate facilities compromising QVM security, safety and compliance.

What root case analysis has been undertaken to analyse the safety incident issues to determine what the common causes are?

Today there is an obvious separation between the public's pathways and those used by the traders, e.g. the lane ways between the sheds, are effectively separated from general public access.

Just assuming that current commercial practice in a retail area will work the same way in a market is incorrect unless you intend to change the market into a 'modern' commercial retail experience, that will destroy the market experience for both the traders and their customers.

Issue 3 - QVM is constrained in offer is unable to meet evolving customer experiences

What quantitative research has been done to validate this perceived issue?

What are the 'evolving customer experiences' the Council is attempting to deliver?

Given the diverse retail offerings across the Melbourne CBD what improved customer experience is needed at QVM?

What is the increased diversification of customer experience the QVM management is planning for?

Currently there is a huge diversity of retail experience within the Melbourne council area with a greater focus in the CBD area. Neither the market strategy nor this business case articulate what new and different retail and event experiences will be provided by the QVM that are not already available within the CBD. As any 'new' consumer experiences will need to compete with existing established venues, a number of which have multiple public transport options, i.e. multiple tram, bus and train access to the venue.

Issue 4 - Underperforming public and heritage assets at QVM hamper the liability of the norther CBD.

What is the quantity research that validated the perceived issues? Given that the CBD grid finishes at Latrobe Street.

What is the definition of an adequate return on heritage assets that is unique within Australia and the world?

How does this return on investment compare domestically and internationally with the return on investment of other heritage assets?

Based on the content in the business strategy and this business case the major issue for the Melbourne City Council is how to change the QVM from a loss-making business centre to one that does not drain the council's finances. We have not seen any minimal upgrade options that would improve the market's profitability with minimal changes to the existing structures and at a lower capital investment.

We have not seen any evidence to define what is an adequate return on a 'heritage asset', all of the scenarios are promoting a commercial retail environment sitting within a heritage building, only focusing on maximising the commercial return rather than what is needed to make the existing market viable in its current form.

While there has been some comment on the public consultation, virtually all discussion has been provided on the analysis of the themes that have come out from these consultations or the 7,500 responses to the QVM renewal strategy and existing business plans or how these public consultation themes have been included into the QVM renewal strategy and this business case.

Reference Page 21

Infrastructure and trader facilities and amenities

Basic services would also be provided to trader stalls (electricity, communications, hot and cold water), as well as centralised waste (including organic waste) collection points is a welcome improvement.

"Briefed trader storage requirements cannot be met in below-ground areas due to a lack of floor space. This shortfall would be met through appropriate refrigeration and under-counter storage at trader stalls under the open-air sheds.

Formalised B2B areas will be established in the Upper and Lower Markets in close proximity to fresh produce traders, to support the viability of traders and minimise unsafe vehicle movements."

This identifies that the proposed underground trader storage solution will not meet the anticipated trader storage requirements of the traders. The proposal does not address the

issue of trader traffic between this centralised storage facility and the trader's stalls during the trading day. Previous documents appear to indicate that once the loading period has ended the traders will have limited or no access to their storage areas. If traders are unable to replenish their display stands during the trading day it will dramatically affect the stall holder's viability.

What analyse has been done to map the movement and trader workflow between the traders existing backend and their display stands?

What work has been done to design stall configurations that will allow traders to store **all** of their stock for a day's trade, especially as fruit and vegetable traders will have different stocking requirements to other traders. Allowing fruit and vegetable traders to store a day's trading stock on their stand will substantially reduce the need for longer-term storage facilities.

Pedestrianise the market during core trading times

Anyone who watches the fresh produce trader's workflow will notice that there is a continuous movement between the backend storage often stored on truck, pallets or cool rooms as they replenished on their display stands. If traders are not able to store their days stock adjacent to their stall, they will be forced to return to the centralised storage to replenish stock on their stall. This will substantially increase the movement of stock on trolleys or pallets which will introduce a new traffic hazard to the public.

If traders are not able to hold a full day's stock on or near their stall, and if the trader's are unable to replenish the stock as needed, their financial viability and eventually the viability of QVM as a fresh produce market will be affected. Loosing or diminishing the fresh produce viability will in turn affect the viability of all of the adjacent produce traders. Why would someone go the QVM to buy their meat, fish or cheese and then have a limited capacity to select their additional fresh products?

Provision of a broader range of retail and hospitality offerings – Food Court, Meat, Fish and Dairy Halls

This strategy seems to assume that the market is a normal retail environment which it is not. Most of the stall holders are family based businesses. While improving the amenity around the stalls is greatly appreciated, forcing stall holders to extend their opening hours is going to drive away stall holders, especial those selling fresh produce. The typical working day for fruit and vegetable traders starts a 2-3 AM at Epping Wholesale Market they then travel to QVM to unload and set up their stand for the day. Extending the trading hours of these stall holders is not viable because of the increased costs and time away from family. Anecdotally I have spoken to a number of ex-stall holders that have found that they have increased their profitability and family lifestyle by moving their business out of the QVM. Making a QVM trader's life more difficult will reduce the overall number of traders at the market and this will reduce the variety of product provided by the diverse market experience that we have today. This will reduce the attraction for shoppers to come to the QVM.

Adding new a temporary event or retail space would provide opportunities to extend the effective use of the market, e.g. the summer time Wednesday event market however its effectiveness during winter is unknown. An event space must not be at the expense of the traditional market trading environment.

Reference page 36

TABLE 6. UPDATED INCREMENTAL VISITATION FORECASTS (MILLIONS)

Why does option 0 assume no organic growth beyond 2025, given that Melbourne's population is expected to grow?

What is the basis for the assumed growth rate in option 1?

How will proposed improvements to the QVM deliver this increased visitation rates independently of increased population and visitation rates to the state?

Does this analysis use any historical visitors growth figures to Victoria etc, if so these figures are independent of the improvements at QVM.

As stated earlier both state and federal treasure growth estimates have been demonstrated to be highly inaccurate. The proposed growth rates appeared to be highly optimistic, and a lower growth rate would substantially affect the longterm profitability of this business case.

Given that there will be an organic growth rate due to increases in population etc, so why does option 0 assume no growth beyond 2027. This approach has been included throughout this business case, this indicates that the impact of population changes have not being included in the business case. If a core assumption of this nature has been excluded, it calls into questions the other assumptions this business case is based on. Exclusion of population changes is artificially inflating the potential business case for the QVM renewal strategy.

Reference page 41

TABLE 8: OPERATING REVENUE ESCALATION RATES BY OPTION

In option 1 what is the basis for **Leasehold property rentals (New)** projected revenue increasing by 175%?

What analysis has been done to validate that the proposed new retail spaces will be commercial, given the existing diversity of retail and event spaces that already exist within the City of Melbourne and can be easily accessed using a existing free public transport services?

Is this because the QVM management is intending to change or to extend the retail options at the market? These proposed changes have been a core issue with the regular users of the market as we believe that inappropriate new retail opportunities to 'diversify the retail offering' will substantially diminish the cultural value of the market, effectively making QVM just another retail space to complete with all of the other commercial retails spaced in the CBD.

Reference page 49

TABLE 10: SUMMARY OF COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS (PRESENT VALUES \$000)

Why isn't option 0 included in the cost benefit analysis to to enable readers to compare option 0 and option 1 side by side?

Reference page 52

FIGURE 12. TOTAL INCOME (OUTPUT) LINKED WITH QVM – OPTION 0, OPTION 1 AND INCREMENTAL

Why does option 0 assume no increased in income over the forceable future?

Is this chart describing the income in net present value term, i.e. without inflation etc.?

We find the assumption for option 0 that there will be no increased income for years 2027 to 2050 completely unrealistic.

Figures 13 and 14 show the same flawed logic and analysis because they are assuming a completely unrealistic proposition.

The business case contains a lot of business assumptions, a number of which appear to be unrealistic, but does provide an appendix of these assumptions to validate that they are reasonable and consistent with the QVM business environment.

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Monday, 6 December 2021 4:36 PM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#123]

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Jackline Pecotic

Email address: * jipeco001@myacu.edu.au

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: * Questions 'Renewal of QVM'

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[report_to_the_future_melbourne_committee.docx](#) 2.11 MB ·

DOCX

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne in support of your submission: *

No

To whom it may concern,

I have reviewed several documents outlining the proposed changes to Queen Victoria Market Present Renewal.

Firstly, as a local who lives in the CBD and is a regular shopper at the market I feel it is worth pointing out that having the market nearby was a selling point for me when I purchased my apartment, likewise I am honoured that City of Melbourne is showing great interest in its viability and history.

After reading much of the document/s my overall comments and questions are focused on understanding how information from 2018 can be the driving force (data) of decisions, likewise I would also like to see current data around how the city is performing overall, foot traffic, other shopping districts and event spaces etc. (There is no data evident that compares the statements in any of the documentation).

Finally, I would encourage City of Melbourne to perhaps consider a pilot program and provide actual data that demonstrates what is working so far – for example there was mention of improvements from the 2018 plan, however no evidence of the ‘successes’ was presented.

With that in mind, please find my questions and comments below in red, note that I screen shotted the section from the relevant documents.

Document - Report to the Future Melbourne Committee, Agenda 6.5, 7/12/2021

- **Following the 2018 People’s Panel and a revised endorsed approach** for the delivery of market infrastructure, on 1 October 2019 Councillors endorsed an additional budget of \$4 million to the \$6.15 million already budgeted for further trading format enhancement opportunities across the market. (Purpose and background, point 2, page 1, Agenda 6.5, 7/12).
 - ***How is this relevant given the panel was 2018?***
- 6.1. Box hire operators, upper market general merchandise and fruit and vegetable traders were particularly supportive of the proposal. No traders objected to the proposal and there was strong support for the reconfiguration and consolidation of Upper Market fruit and vegetable and general merchandise stalls to improve retail density and the customer experience. While some traders wanted more fixed/lockable trading formats than the proposal, **a small number of traders sought assurance that general merchandise stalls will be retained, which will remain in J-L Sheds and lower E Sheds under the proposal.**
 - ***What assurance has been provided? In their contracts? Is it a formal assurance?***

- 8. A cost plan has been prepared by Ralph & Beattie Bosworth which estimates the complete cost for this project to be \$3.4 million including contingency. It is proposed that the project be delivered in stages:
 - 8.1. Stage 1: Delivery of 23 retail pods within upper A, B, C and D sheds, B2B area and general merchandise storage at a cost of \$1.8 million funded by the market renewal program.
 - 8.2. Stage 2: Four years after the completion of Stage 1, a further 19 retail pods will be installed within upper A, B, C and D sheds and E shed improvements at a cost of \$1.6 million to be funded by Queen Victoria Market Pty Ltd through revenue generated from occupancy of Stage 1.
- *Given the data is from pre pandemic – should we be committing to this spending and volume of 23 retail pods? Will this outshine the existing retailers?*
- Attachment 2 Agenda item 6.5 Future Melbourne Committee 7 December 2021 – picture (drawing) from page 4 –
 - *Looks overly crowded, will this cause issues with crowds? (How does this practice social distancing). With the intention of removing the current parking and changing it to an open space – is the new parking enough to cater for all these people?*
 - *Corporates are still slow to come back into city – presently it appears workforces are only returning 2 – 3 days a week if at all, has this been considered?*

Document - Report to the Future Melbourne Committee, Agenda item 6.4, 7 Dec 2021

- 5. Prepared by SGS Economics and Planning, the Updated Business Case is an evolution of the 2017 Business Case and subsequent 2019 Options Analysis which addressed the revised approach to deliver essential market infrastructure shaped by the 2018 People's Panel. The Updated Business Case forecasts how the market and surrounding precinct is likely to perform following delivery of the renewal program, comparing it to if the program did not go ahead, by analysing economic, population, employment, and other data taking into account the changing landscape as a result of COVID-19. (Refer Attachment 2)
 - *Did the Option Analysis predict the impact throughout 2020 and 2021? (Was it successful in its predictions)?*
 - *What other data was used to form the basis of this decision?*
 - *How much of the original Plan from Business case in 2017 is still being used for the Future Plan?*
 - *Shouldn't revised panel be formed and a 'pilot program' be considered to capture data that this strategy will work before committing all the funds to this idea?*
- 7. The report concludes that the precinct renewal is financially viable and for every dollar invested in the program, more than \$4 in value would be returned to the market and local community, even after COVID-19 challenges are taken into account. Only the renewal program can deliver annual growth to visitation levels through an enhanced shopper experience and return the market to profitability from 2025 onwards.

- **‘enhanced shopper experience’ – what does enhanced mean in this context?**
- **What are the current numbers of walk-through foot traffic in other shopping districts (Melb Central/Emporium)?**
- **How are other markets going? (South Melb)**
- **Has a comparisons be made to other markets globally?**

Recommendation from management

12. That the Future Melbourne Committee:
 - 12.1. Notes the significant progress on the Queen Victoria Market Precinct Renewal program to date with major market infrastructure and heritage projects to be completed by end of 2024.
 - 12.2. Endorses the Queen Victoria Market Precinct Renewal updated Business Case 2021 noting a number of decisions relating to the outcomes of the Southern Development Site divestment will be formally considered by Council between July and September 2022.
 - 12.3. Endorses the Queen Victoria Market Renewal Program Delivery Plan.

- **How is the development plan relevant – what is current occupancy in the city?**
- **Are their any assurances that international students/workers returning from overseas?**
- **What deems the development plan as being successful (what is the criteria)?**

5. The QVMPR Renewal program has been shaped by significant community engagement over many years including:
 - Feedback from over 7,500 people to develop the 2015 Master Plan.
 - People’s Panel deliberative engagement process where a diverse group of 40 people representing traders, customers, residents and stakeholders, came together to consider how best to resolve the market infrastructure needs of the market.
 - Every renewal project has been developed with input from traders, stakeholders and the community to ensure the program delivers for both the market, residents and the broader community.

Relation to Council policy

6. The recommendation within this report align with aspirations as identified in the Council Plan 2021-25 to protect Queen Victoria Market as a traditional open-air market, through heritage restoration and the provision of essential services and facilities that enhance the customer and trader experience while also delivering precinct improvements through quality public open space, new connections to the city, community services and facilities.

Environmental sustainability

7. Delivery of the QVMPR Program will allow for the development of a sustainable market which is guided by a Precinct Sustainability Plan, rated through the use of the Green Star – Communities tool and which delivers on the six sustainability principles detailed in the QVMPR Master Plan 2015.

This report provides a further update to the Business Case. It re-interrogates the renewal program given its final design resolution, while incorporating the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on QVM's trading and the broader operating environment. This report seeks to compare:

- The Base Case (Option 0) scenario pre-renewal investment covering key visitation, financial and socio-economic assumptions.
- The Project Case (Option 1) based on the current QVMPR program, QVM P/L endorsed financial projections, final capital costs and implementation program, and covering key visitation and socioeconomic assumptions. The project scenario performance is analysed against the underlying

COVID 19 visitation impacts

After considering the short, medium and likely long term impacts of the COVID 19 pandemic, SGS Economics & Planning has adjusted downward the earlier forecasts of visitation to QVM as follows:

- When lockdowns and restrictions cease, visitation is expected to grow strongly but will remain at below pre-COVID levels for some time.
- Visitation under the Base Case will not recover to pre-COVID levels, settling at about 5 per cent lower than the pre-COVID figure.
- Under the Project Case, the incremental difference in visitation from the Base Case remains essentially the same in actual numbers (See Table 1)
- In the near term, Victorians will comprise a greater than normal share of visitors, though this will tend towards the historic share over time as international and interstate tourism normalise.

TABLE 1. UPDATED INCREMENTAL VISITATION FORECASTS (MILLIONS)

	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2041	2051
Base Case (million)	9.00	9.50	9.50	9.50	9.50	9.50	9.50	9.50
Project Case (million)	9.33	10.17	10.50	10.83	11.17	11.50	14.83	18.16
Victorian share of visitation	68%	66%	66%	66%	66%	66%	66%	66%

Source: SGS Economics & Planning

COVID19 urban development impacts

The City North Precinct/ Market Core Area is now expected to develop more slowly than what was anticipated pre-COVID. This is a result of a combination of reduced overseas migration, a loss of population moving interstate, and changing preferences among Australians in relation to high-density living.

- Prior to COVID, this part of inner Melbourne was projected to accommodate a population of just under 340,000 by 2038. Under these revised forecasts, population and dwelling growth will be around 11 per cent lower.
- Prior to 2020, it was estimated that employment in the City of Melbourne would grow to more than 680,000 by 2038. SGS' revised forecasts reduce this employment growth by approx. 18 per cent.

- **Covid will continue to impact – with that in mind, are these figures conservative?**

Cost benefit analysis

The cost benefit analysis adds relevant social and economic benefits onto the financial analysis, recognising the impact that the market's renewal has on community welfare levels. The non-financial benefits added include the following local area benefits:

- The enhanced experience for existing shoppers (visitors) at QVM
- The benefits enjoyed by new shoppers (visitors) attracted to the market
- The yields extracted by Victorian producers from tourist expenditures made at the Market.

- **What is the 'new shoppers' based on – has there been new shoppers so far? Has shopping patterns changed since Melbourne opened up?**
- **What is the demographics of the shopper?**

Vision for City North precinct:

"City North will have a diverse mix of uses and be a world-renowned knowledge district that grows out of the area's distinct urban heritage as a new and unique Central City precinct".³

Since the release of the 2015 Master Plan, a range of renewal projects have already been completed in line with the 2017 Implementation Framework, addressing the shopper and trader experience, as well as the broader heritage and planning requirements.

While there have been some changes to essential market infrastructure as a result of the 2018 People's Panel deliberative engagement process, the 2015 Master Plan vision and deliverables remain relevant and continue to deliver outcomes for the market and the broader community.

- **What has been successful so far – where is this data? What has been completed**
- **What are the benefits so far for the shoppers and trade?**

Furthermore, in July 2021 Queen Victoria Market Pty Ltd (QVM Pty Ltd) released its five-year strategy to support Queen Victoria Market's pandemic recovery and longer-term revitalisation. The strategy aims to preserve the heritage character and core offer that people love about the market, and build on that to make it an even better place to visit, shop and trade. The strategy aligns with the vision and core objectives of the renewal program with many of the initiatives dependent upon delivery of renewal program projects.

This report provides a further update to the Business Case. It re-interrogates the renewal project given its final design resolution, while incorporating the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on QVM's trading and the broader operating environment.

- **How was this revised plan pulled together?**
 - **Who was involved?**
 - **Were there forums with the public?**
 - **What data went into this decision?**
-
- **Car parking** – to be delivered in stages:
 - Relocate car parking – Phase 1: Relocate 500 open-air car parking spaces to the Munro Site.
 - Relocate car parking (Phase 2): Relocate 220 open-air car parking spaces with up to 500 and no less than 220 car parks elsewhere in the market precinct.

- **How successful has the new parking been?**
- **Are people using the parking?**
- **Will there be enough parking space if you move the existing open air car park? (For traders and all these new customers)? I understood 1000 car parks would be provided. Where is this located?**

Option 0 - Base Case

Option 0 is a Base Case scenario where City of Melbourne elects to not pursue the renewal program. The Base Case in this context is not 'doing nothing' but includes the progressive tackling of safety and food handling compliance issues, and the ongoing escalation of asset maintenance, as the ageing infrastructure within the precinct rapidly deteriorates. This scenario is based on historical operations and the insights, pre-pandemic.

The Base Case option has been explored to provide a baseline for decision making purposes, although it is acknowledged that the case for change has been articulated in earlier versions of the Business Case. The Base Case will not address the problems facing the market and will result in City of Melbourne being required to accept poor financial returns and poor long-term outcomes for the community from this important CBD location and asset.

- **Again, how can use pre – pandemic assumptions – is there no current data?**

3.2 Visitor rates and expenditures

It is also useful to consider visitor rates and expenditures by looking separately at Victorian-based visitors and domestic and foreign tourists.

For Victorians, retail expenditures are linked to income, wealth and consumer confidence. While the impacts of the pandemic have been significant across Australia, the impacts on employment and household expenditures for the majority of Australians has been relatively small. This being the case, it is likely that retail expenditures will remain high.

As discussed above, the pandemic has contributed towards the rapid acceleration of online retail expenditure. Figure 5 shows that nationally between February 2020 and July 2021, the proportion of total retail expenditure directed online rose from 6.6 per cent to 12.6 per cent. While much of this was driven by 'non-food' items, the proportion of 'food' expenditure occurring online nearly doubled, rising from 3.4 per cent to 6.4 per cent.

For Queen Victoria Market there is some risk of loss of visitation and expenditure linked with increasing 'home delivery' of shopping and pre-prepared food, and increasing sophistication in delivery systems among other food retailers (particularly the large supermarkets). The new QVM Online service and supporting click and collect/delivery service will be important in retaining market share.

- **What has been done to attract click n collect?**

Visitation, Base Case and Project Case

In previous versions of this business case, it was assumed that visitation would remain stagnant at 10 million without renewal, and that it would grow at a rate of 1 million every three years under the QVMPR Program. It was also assumed that the historic local visitation share would remain constant at 66 per cent of total visitation over the evaluation period.

Given the events of the past 18 months, it is reasonable to update these figures to reflect a new situation. It is now assumed that:

- Visitation forecasts are impacted in the short term due to COVID, with restrictions to movement and economic activities having an ongoing impact. When lockdowns and restrictions become a thing of the past, visitation is expected to grow strongly, but with lower tourism and behavioural changes meaning visitation remains below pre-COVID levels for some time.
- Visitation under the Base Case will not recover to pre-COVID levels, settling at about 5 per cent lower than the pre-COVID figure.
- Under the Project Case, the incremental difference in visitation from the Base Case remains essentially the same in actual numbers.
- In the near term, Victorians will comprise a greater than normal share of visitors, though this will tend towards the historic share over time as international and interstate tourism normalise.

- **Only 5% lower the pre-Covid – is this right?**

3.4 City North/ market core development patterns

The City North Precinct/ Market Core Area is expected to develop more slowly than what was anticipated pre-COVID. This is a result of a combination of reduced overseas migration, a loss of population moving interstate, and changing preferences among Australians in relation to high-density living.

Prior to COVID, it was estimated that this part of inner Melbourne would accommodate a population of just under 340,000 by 2038. Updated projections recently developed by SGS Economics & Planning on behalf of the City of Melbourne show that the rate of population (and dwelling) growth is likely to slow somewhat due to the factors mentioned above. Under these revised forecasts, population and dwelling growth will be around 11 per cent lower than projected figures prior to COVID.

Ultimately, the decline in demand for dwellings in the vicinity of the market is likely to mean that the potential for market renewal to trigger redevelopment in adjacent areas is also reduced.

- **With that in mind, should the plan be changed?**

Ultimately, the decline in demand for dwellings in the vicinity of the market is likely to mean that the potential for market renewal to trigger redevelopment in adjacent areas is also reduced.

Projected rates of growth in employment are also lower in the 'post-COVID world'. Prior to 2020, it was estimated that employment in the City of Melbourne would grow to more than 680,000 by 2038. SGS's revised forecasts project lower than previously forecast growth, with projected growth 82 per cent of previously forecast rates.

- **Why is the reduction of office workers in city not mentioned? Will this impact even further?**

Thanks in advance, for taking the time to read through my comments, I look forward to hearing from City of Melbourne's in response to my questions.

Kind regards

Jacky Pecotic

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 December 2021 9:02 AM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee public question form [#19]

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Bob Evans

Email address: * bobe@internode.on.net

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Your question

The revised business case for the Vic Market calculates a saving of \$40 million on the construction of the Queen's Corner Building which is to be achieved through collaboration with the private sector.

What is the projected construction budget for the building? How much is council contributing to the construction costs? How will council select the collaborating private constructor? Are negotiations under way with the potential collaborator?

From the revised business case, it appears that council is yet to decide whether the Queen's Corner Building will be used "to accommodate municipal purposes, market purposes or retail and hospitality purposes complementary to the market". Will the private constructor have any financial or controlling interest in the Queen's Corner Building when it is completed? How and when will council decide what the ultimate purpose is for this building?

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 December 2021 9:53 AM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#135]

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * David Legge

Email address: * dslegge@ozemail.com.au

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: * Queen Victoria Market

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[qvm_business_case_is_a_fantasy.docx](#) 14.68 KB · DOCX

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne in support of your submission: *

No

QVM Business Case is a Fantasy!

They new business case for the QVM says by spending \$244 million now the market will make *\$5 million profit in 2030 increasing to approximately \$10 million in 2050!!* How many companies would try to sell an investment based on income in 2050!!! 30 years out! In 2050 \$10 million might buy a loaf of bread!

They say that the benefit will be \$4.13 for every \$1 Dollar spent in today's money. They say that because of the new works every visitor for the next 30 years will spend an additional \$4 every visit. 10 -18 million visitors a year increasing. That theoretically has a benefit in today's dollars of \$600 million dollars! We say because the changes to parking and access roads will limit cars that will mean that the average visitor will actually spend less. Clearly a person who drives a car to go shopping can buy more than someone who walks or rides a bike. This has been the basis of the market. The bulk buy once a week, big shop by people from all over Melbourne is why it works. There may be no additional financial benefit from the additional expenditure if cars don't come.

Their plan allows for a big reduction in carparks. They do not count the public car parks around the market that will be lost. There are 1000 car-parks in total now. They have now said "720 and up to 1000 car-parks" Before it was guaranteed 1000 new car-parks. The new car parks are in big buildings with lots of people who will also drive cars. Would Bunnings or Coles turn their car-parks into a park?

Closing Franklin Street access road will make it very difficult for people to get into the new car parks. The public does not understand that the council is closing a public road and foot paths and street parking and selling it a development site. Has this ever been done before in Melbourne?

Most of the proposed expenditure is not spent on the market but on replacing the car-park. Why close it? Why is the Council money being spent to subsidise high rise building that will dominate the precinct and cut off the access roads.

Why should the market make a profit? Our major tourist attraction and heritage asset that cost the MCC nothing. The government spends \$60 million each year on the Grand Prix. It would be more value to invest \$5-10 mill on the QVM to maintain its historical significance for future generations.

How is it a saving to get a private developer to own the Queens Corner Building? Will the private developer do it for nothing? This is nonsense. Giving away or selling more public land assets. This land was also public car parking. Now gone for pop up park.

From the report.

With the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and the continued uncertainty, City of Melbourne's financial challenges have seen the overall QVMPR budget revised from the endorsed \$308 million gross to not more than \$268 million gross. While cost savings have been made across the overall program to ensure delivery of the renewal against the 2015 Master Plan, a reduction of \$40 million was achieved largely due to the construction of Queens Corner Building now being considered to be built in collaboration with a private developer.

David Legge

Melbourne 3000

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 December 2021 12:00 AM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#127]

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Mary-Lou Howie

Email address: * howie.marylou@gmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: * 6.4 Queen Victoria Market Precinct Renewal – Business Case

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[_business_case_submission_mlh.docx](#) 19.12 KB · DOCX

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne in support of your submission: *

No

Agenda 6.4 Queen Victoria Market Precinct Renewal – Business Case

Dear Lord Mayor, Deputy Lord Mayor and Councillors,

The updated 'Business Case' is a confusing, rambling document that is meant to be primarily about the financials - a disappointing, expensive and indecipherable effort by SGS Economics and Planning.

All the figures presented are theoretical and conjecture using at best, unorthodox accounting.

.It *'forecasts how the market and surrounding precinct is likely to perform following delivery of the renewal program'*

It confuses and conflates the financial return on the (QVM) adjoining precinct which the Council does not control, and QVM, the market, further highlighting the importance of creating a discreet QVM Master Plan that truly acknowledges the elevated heritage status of QVM and which protects it as a National treasure. At present the use of the QVM Precinct Master Plan is used interchangeably with a loosely termed QVM Master Plan confusing the two.

It once again misrepresents the good work done in good faith by the Peoples' Panel

The economic drivers are based on increased cost to traders and customers

Economic Financial Drivers commencing from 2025 to 2050

- **Increase rents more quickly from 2% to 7% per annum in the open sheds**
- **Lease of new properties in QVM = 75% of unknown figure**
- **Increase the rentals faster on BoH (Back of House) rentals from 2% to 4% per annum**
- **Parking increase 7% to 16% per annum**
- **The annual visitation are projected to double by 2050 due to the renewal project yet without the project visitation will be not increase in 30 years – rather farfetched and not explained.**

People's Panel

Quote: it addresses *'the revised approach to deliver essential market infrastructure shaped by the 2018 People's Panel'* – point 5, Key Issues.

This is a disingenuous misrepresentation of the People's Panel recommendations that the Business Case proposes to support.

As one of the stakeholder members of the People's Panel, I can attest there was no recommendation regarding the proposed Specialty Market Trading Format changes such as the proposed lockable 10 and 20 foot retail container pods in A Shed, Upper Market (Key issues 5.1) nor Street food/food trucks hospitality.

The People's Panel's recommendations were arrived at in good faith and hard work by the panel re the Market's ageing infrastructure, operational requirements, trader's needs and car parking. Panel members gave up a considerable amount of their time to participate in the workshops.

The misrepresentation, or at best inflated interpretation, of their deliberation is disrespectful to the process and the people who participated.

To follow, the key People's Panel recommendation regarding trader infrastructure:

'People's Panel Recommendation 1: Infrastructure for traders: review of infrastructure (storage and amenities)

- *Re-test initial consultation with traders*
- *Undertake a thorough audit of trader wants and needs – Trader feedback is that much of the infrastructure is not required & that such gold plating will lead to higher costs and rent to their businesses*
- *Questioned the excessive amount of storage being offered*
- *Recommended a formal and regular review and consultation process to ensure future upgrades are aligned with trader wants and needs*
- *Recommend that trader surveys be conducted by independent auditors.*

*Rationale: Feedback from traders on the people's panel suggest that the infrastructure provided is **excessive and unnecessary.**'*

(In effect the traders on the panel questioned/mistrusted the consultation process, its veracity and outcomes and want an independent audit)

Furthermore, the People's Panel took place in 2018. Melbourne 2021, reeling after the COVID two years has changed considerably since then.

This Business Case has been poorly tailored to fit the Council's pre-determined agenda to repurpose Queen Victoria Market.

It spells the death of all that is great about QVM, a traditional outdoor market comprising myriad small family businesses who are its backbone and on which Vic Market's reputation is built. These businesses will be threatened by the considerable increase in rents that drive the proposed profitability and revenue to Council. The increased operating costs will be passed on to customers.

Not only will these costs drive away small family businesses, QVM will no longer be the value for money shopping destination for which it is known. It is not difficult to imagine who will replace our brilliant traders.

QVM strength is that it is a market for everyone, it is about people – the interaction between traders and customers and the layers that form the patina of its intangible values easily threatened through inappropriate change, hypotheticals, conjecture and indecipherable accounting.

Mary-Lou Howie
Friends of Queen Victoria Market

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 December 2021 9:51 AM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#134]

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Miriam Faine

Email address: * miriam.faine@bigpond.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: * Queen Victoria Market Precinct Renewal – Updated Business Case and Delivery

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:  [21712_fmc .docx](#) 156.56 KB · DOCX

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne in support of your submission: * Yes

If yes, please indicate if you would like to make your submission in person, or via a virtual link (Zoom) to the meeting. Please note, physical attendance will be limited in accordance with City of Melbourne security protocols and COVID-safe plans and be allocated on a first registered, first served basis. * I wish to make by submission via Zoom

Queen Victoria Market Precinct Renewal – Updated Business Case and Delivery Plan

The latest Updated Business Case (UBC) is a further step back from the grandiose Doyle plan and FOQVM welcome this. (Interestingly, although the UBC several times references change in the plans since 2015, there is no acknowledgement that the Doyle plan had to be entirely junked for non-compliance with HV guidelines)

Still no QVM Master Plan

However, following the Doyle model, the latest plans still sublimate QVM Renewal within QVM Precinct Renewal. **Once again, we point out that the renewal program is NOT based on a popularly endorsed Master Plan for the Market.** FOQVM continues to dispute the inaccurate if often repeated claim that:

Every renewal project has been developed with input from traders, stakeholders and the community to ensure the program delivers for both the market, residents and the broader community. (Pt 5. on Attachment 1)

UBC makes much of local and wider area benefits (p46); the Key Projects Item 4 in the Delivery Plan and the subsequent pages don't refer to the market at all but to neighbourhood renewal. The UBC confuses and conflates the financial return on private development in the adjoining City North precinct, with the case for renewal of QVM itself.

The UBC is post hoc and speculative

It is written to justify the previously approved renewal strategy. It is speculative ... it 'forecasts how the market and surrounding precinct is *likely* to perform following delivery of the renewal program' (Report p1)

The Base Case (Option 0) shows absolutely no growth at all (and projects from a COVID year!). The Option 0 baseline employment growth assumptions of 0% growth are unbelievable given anticipated population growth in the State and the Melbourne area. Basing the argument on a demonstrably false assumption illustrates the poor quality of analysis that has been undertaken.

This Base Case scenario also does not include the (hopefully evident) benefits of the works already taken... instead still referring to 'ageing infrastructure within the precinct which rapidly deteriorates' (p15UBC)

The report shows further evidence of shoddy thinking: The annual visitation is projected to double by 2050 due to the renewal project: yet without the project, apparently visitation will not increase **at all** over 30 years. Even with natural population growth?????

And while the Delivery Plan refers to '**almost** \$4 in value would be returned to the market and local community', UBC asserts:

Ultimately, for every dollar invested in the project, \$4 in value is returned to the local community, delivering \$963 million in local area benefits. Moreover, implementation of the QVMPR Program supports 340 more jobs in the City of Melbourne, each and every year over the long term (p4)

The UBC is not evidence based

Its sole function is to prove that:

'Only the renewal program can deliver annual growth to visitation levels through an enhanced shopper experience and return the market to profitability from 2025 onwards. (Report, p1)'

But no data then other than continued assertion, is provided for statements such as the following:

Delivering annual growth to visitation levels, reaching 18 million visitors by 2050 with significant benefits through an enhanced shopper experience and expenditure. (UBC p4).

UBC lacks any workings and provides little methodology, instead confidently providing a series of hypothetical figures. By spending \$244 million now the market will apparently make \$5 million profit in 2030, increasing to approximately \$10 million in 2050. (p40 UBC). On what basis does the UBC make this assumption? How can anyone know now what might happen in 30 years?

Similarly, job forecasts are for 787 jobs precisely (p50 UBC). Not 786? Or 788? And how on earth do we know?

Similarly, the mythical \$4.00 extra spent on every visit after renewal (worth an additional cup of coffee, or 800g of Black Russian tomatoes (\$5.00 p k. last Friday).

Another meaningless figure:

The value which *new* customers might place on the improved retail experience would be reflected in the additional travel cost – in both terms of *time* and *out-of-pocket expenses* – they bear in diverting from alternative sources for retail goods and services. This has been estimated at \$4.14 per visit in 2021 dollars. (p43 UBC)

The Cost Benefit Analysis shows a 4.13% benefit cost ratio based on series of unjustified figures, as well as on a very low nominal discount rate (p10 UBC).

And the following figures are neither clear – is the \$116m the sale of the Southern site? – nor justified. During the renewal program’s capital works, income generation increases by \$116.6 million in 2021, with annual income increases reducing in line with the value of works completed in each year of the renewal program. After renewal is complete, incremental income generation grows from \$7.9 million in 2026 to reach \$200 million per annum in 2050. (p49 UBC)

The only information on methodology is a garbled note on p58:

While input-output analysis is often criticised for overstating the economic impacts of projects, SGS has established a rigorous process for moderating the IO multipliers generated. Essentially, SGS scales down Australian level economic multipliers, originally derived from the industry-by-industry transactions table in the ABS National Accounts, to state than local area levels reflecting each geography’s economic size, composition and concentration of specific industry groups. SGS then further reduces the multipliers generated after assessing the level of underutilised labour in the economy, at the time of modelling, to ensure that competition effects are appropriately reflected. (p58 10) ????

Rubbery figures

Granted that restoration works are already well underway, it seems odd to project a higher increase in operating costs for case 0 (p37UBC)

Without renewal investment the market will generate operating profits of \$1.7 million or less to 2028, with the modelling suggesting ongoing and increasing losses after that point in time. **This operating result is prior to any payments to Council for use of the precinct.** Moreover, the operating profit estimated is before depreciation, meaning that the already aged assets at the market will not gradually be renewed over time; they will merely be repaired and maintained on a reactive basis. (p40 UBC)

According to Table 2 (p6) the financial viability of the project is arguable. It relies on land sales (116m) to provide the supposed 5.7% profit, but also includes the residual value of assets – not standard accounting practice as I understand it:

The figure below shows that, using such an approach, Option 1 achieves its peak debt, of approximately \$298 million⁶, in 2029. This debt will reduce thereafter as revenue generation begins to outstrip interest payments on the loan facility. As shown in the figure below, if the residual value of assets is included in Year 30, all debts are effectively extinguished. However,

recognising that this **may be a difficult revenue to realise**, if the residual value of assets is excluded, **then the project will not be paid off over the 30-year period**. (p41 UBC)

Rent increases?

The UBC shows a 100% increase over 5 years in existing trader rents to enable the forecast operating profit. (p38 UBC). This is very steep for small traders recovering from the effects of COVID.

(New) Leasehold property rentals projected revenue is an increase of 175% (175% over what if they are new leases???) However, no analysis has been presented to show that the proposed new retail or hospitality spaces will be commercially viable, given the existing diversity of retail and event spaces that already exist within and around the City of Melbourne. This strategy risks making QVM just another (empty) retail space to compete with all the other (empty) commercial retail spaces in the CBD.

And not included is the cost of disruption to market during ongoing building works over the next 3 years. The UBC is contradictory here: 'Importantly, delivery of major market infrastructure and heritage projects will be complete by the end of 2024' according to the Report (p1), but according to the Delivery Plan, Market square and Southern Development Site (SDS) works are projected to continue well beyond 2025, and certain to affect visitation and profits.

Renewal Plans

FOQVM believes it would provide more value to simply invest \$5-10 mill on the QVM to maintain its historical and cultural significance for future generations.

Future Market Strategy

Previous FOQVM submissions have addressed the inadequacies of this from customer and trader viewpoints.

Shed restoration

In the UBC, we read that

the shed restoration project encompasses a range of maintenance, repair, conservation, restoration, improved essential services and structural enhancement works to restore and preserve the existing heritage fabric and where necessary, enhance the structural integrity of the market sheds. (p17)

In actual fact, traders in the restored sheds are already identifying increased heat load through new skylights, leading to spoilage of fresh produce and poor amenity.

Logistics and storage

These 2 related issues continue to tax the renewal team. There is reference to

a new vehicle management system to monitor and control vehicles; new systems to manage loading, deliveries and vehicles into the precinct and manage logistical and mobile plant equipment in designated areas following renewal; and alternatives to forklifts for use outside of designated areas. (p22 UBC)

but no details or costings are provided.

The proposed 'improved' solution to trader storage needs was to construct purpose-built storage away from the stalls in the new Trader shed. We were told in 2020 that new infrastructure, that the Trader Shed and the Northern Shed, were required to modernise logistics and storage in the market. The UBC repeats the claim that

Due to the inadequacy of current facilities, traders operate in a way that is out of step with contemporary retail practices elsewhere in Melbourne. A lack of dedicated back-of-house facilities mean that there is a lack of separation between forklifts, vehicles and pedestrians; a practice which results in a risk to customer health and safety, adversely impacting amenity and reduces the market's ultimate capacity (p21)

Moving trader storage to Queen St and out of the purpose-built laneways between the sheds will in fact increase chaos and congestion rather than reduce it.

As we pointed out in 2020, once the early morning loading period has ended the traders will still need to access their storage areas because traders need to replenish their display stands during the trading day. This would mean continual traffic between any centralised storage facility and the stalls during the day. If traders are not able to store their days stock adjacent to their stall, they will be forced to return to the centralised storage during the day to replenish stock on their stall and this will INCREASE restocking movements across the market. This will substantially increase the movement of stock on trolleys or pallets which are allegedly a hazard to the public.

The UBC admits that underground trader storage solutions will not meet the anticipated trader storage requirements of the traders. For example: 'These new facilities will provide **some** separation of pedestrians from the back-of-house activities, hence improving current safety and site security practices '(p16)

Constructing (expensive) purpose-built storage facilities does not resolve the logistics issues but rather exacerbates them. The UBC seems to have finally grasped this point:

Insertion of a completely new logistics and storage backbone for the Queen Victoria Market, **including improved storage at trader stalls**, would assist in *reducing the total volume of restocking movements across the precinct.* (p23 UBC)

It now advocates point-of -sale storage:

Increased quantity and quality of storage would enable traders to operate with a greater quantity of stock on-hand and reduce total restocking movements across the precinct. (p24 UBC)

Now we are told that (as we predicted in 2020), the Trader Shed and the Northern Shed will not adequately resolve the perceived issues:

Briefed trader storage requirements cannot be met in below-ground areas due to a lack of floor space. This shortfall would be met through appropriate refrigeration and under-counter storage at trader stalls under the open-air sheds. (p18 UBC)

And

The market infrastructure buildings would be supplemented by appropriate refrigeration and storage at fresh produce stalls in the open-air sheds. (p16)

The truth is that Trader Shed and Northern Shed are redundant facilities

The two new sheds are manifestly not fit for purpose, redundant and a waste of public money.

Or? Perhaps there are other plans for these sheds??

Both the Northern Shed and Trader Shed have specific roles in providing logistics facilities for market operations, as well as allowing for programming flexibility for the public and integration with the public realm, potentially accommodating cafes and/ or other active uses. (p25 UBC)

Why not continue to use the laneways behind the stalls?

There is no need for purpose-built storage facilities in the first place. The traditional solution to logistics and storage in the market was the construction of wide laneways between the sheds for traders to park their vehicles and provide handy storage, including refrigerated facilities and the 'silver' boxes. The obvious solution to a non-problem is to continue use the laneways for storage.

There is clear separation between the public areas and the lane ways between the sheds, used by the traders are effectively separated from general public access. Use of trader vehicles and refrigerated boxes for storage on site ensures freshness and choice of product

It is in both traders and customers best interests to continue store goods and produce in the laneways in their vehicles or storage boxes, as has always been done, also using the laneway for vehicle movements if necessary, during the day. The UBC acknowledges this probability:

Forklifts will be permitted to operate in areas of the market where there is a physically segregated environment from people, however in the majority of areas this is not practical and where physical segregation is not possible, alternative load shifting equipment to minimise potential pedestrian vehicle interaction so far **as reasonably practicable**. (P22 UBC)

Instead of continuing to use the laneways, traders are being pushed into homogenous, unergonomic, enclosed fixed stalls

Instead of adopting the traditional solution to storage and logistics at the market – that is to use vehicles and storage boxes on site with access through the laneways between the sheds, new fixed structures are being planned for the stalls.

In order to meet the briefed trader storage and waste disposal requirements of trader, some under-counter storage would be required for traders in the open-air sheds along with the introduction of waste hubs. While these facilities are intended to be relocatable, there would still be some loss of flexibility to the space within the heritage sheds. (P26)

Insertion of a completely new logistics and storage backbone for the Queen Victoria Market, including **improved storage at trader stalls**, would assist in reducing the total volume of restocking movements across the precinct. (p23 UBC)

And ‘Some fixed refrigeration and storage would be delivered at trader stalls in the open-air sheds.’ (P27; see also p29) while

‘QVM Pty Ltd storage would be provided as part of future storage space under the sheds and within the Trader Shed. Alternative locations for market storage and service areas currently located in the Franklin Street Stores will also help to minimise potential conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians by reducing vehicle movements across the precinct’(p18)

It will be interesting to see Heritage Victoria’s (HV) views on these plans for fixed, uniform enclosed structures in the sheds.

HV has already rejected supermarket type display units in the sheds, in spite of the UBC insisting that:

These improvements will also unlock opportunities for current traders to diversify their offer (particularly fruit and vegetable traders) as well as attracting diverse traders and offers to the marketplace. (p26)

In contradiction, UBC does refer to active edges to improve permeability into the market from surrounding streets. (p29). But it is hard to see how the wall of fixed stalls facing out from the market Peel St in A Shed and the B2B areas in C and D sheds will allow this.

Stall amenities

The UBC repeats numerous times the needs for water, power and wifi in the sheds. In fact, cold water and power are available to each stall already.

Change management training

Page 21, UBC refers to change management training (sic) for traders, so they conform to management expectations. By trader ‘development’, we understand increased trader compliance and discipline. As an alternative, FOQVM would like to suggest change management training for market managers, so they learn to value and support the Market’s 150-year-old culture.

Parking

According to the UBC,

It is anticipated that by increasing trading hours and substantially reducing service vehicle movements in public areas, a greater number of visitors would be attracted to the precinct increasing activity over an extended period. (P25)

In fact, the changes to parking and access roads which will limit cars may mean the current 'visitor' will actually spend less. People from all over Melbourne bulk buy once a week This has been the basis of the market over the last 150 years and these customers are still loyal.

The proposed scope of works will reduce the capacity of the intersections, particularly at the Dudley Street / Peel Street and William Street / Franklin Street intersections. While this may not be desirable for motorists, it would improve safety, accessibility and connectivity for cyclists, pedestrians and public transport users. (P24 UBC)

Clearly a person who drives a car to go shopping can buy more than someone who walks or rides a bike. There may be no additional financial benefit from the additional expenditure if cars don't come.

The implicit assumption here is that visitors will come for other purposes than bulk shopping such as entertainment, in an 'expanded year-round calendar of market, community and private festivals, promotions, events, activities and other programming to activate more of the precinct throughout the day, evening and week. (p25 UBC) and there is no need for parking.

In this light we can read the repeated references to carparks rapidly reducing from 1000 as initially promised, to 700 (p 16 UBC; p 25; p28 and so on) with the suggestion the SDS will accommodate 200 more carparks max rather than 500. According to p26

Car parking spaces delivered in the Southern Site and Munro development are intended to be adaptable for other uses in the event demand for car parking spaces reduces in the future. P26

Although the UBC insists that

Moreover, the requirements of the State Agreement remain fulfilled by the renewal program. Initiatives being delivered as part of the complementary Future Market Strategy will further contribute to meeting the requirements of both the investment logic and the State Agreement. (p5)

And

In simple terms, the only way that the State Government will allow the sale proceeds of public land to the market's south to be used by City of Melbourne to fund works at the market is if the State Agreement is triggered and its terms fulfilled. (p14)

The suggestion here is that negotiations with developers and the State government re the SDS may involve reduction in market parking, among other things.

The Southern Development Site (SDS)

According to 12.2 in the Report, a number of decisions relating to the outcomes of the Southern Development Site divestment will be formally considered by Council between July and September 2022. Despite that, we understand the SDS has already been advertised to developers. It seems less than transparent to read that SDS will allow for mixed-use redevelopment to the south of the market. (p16) and will accommodate up to 500 market parking places, as promised if this is simply not true.

Queens Building

It has apparently now been decided (by who?) that Queens Building will be privately developed, in order to save money.

Queens Corner Building: Construct the Queens Corner Building to accommodate municipal purposes, market purposes or retail and hospitality purposes complementary to the market and adjoining public open space. (p13UBC)

We ask: How can the Council sell a public asset when the scope and purpose of the building has not been decided yet?????

FOQVM is extremely concerned about the loss of trading in the market

We are told that 4 sheds (J, K,L, and M) will be repurposed for entertainment. (p13 UBC) and that

Formalised B2B areas will be established in the Upper and Lower Markets in close proximity to fresh produce traders, to support the viability of traders and minimise unsafe vehicle movements. (p18 UBC)

This means a very substantial cut in the available trading area in the market and seriously reduces the markets appeal as 'largest open-air market in ????????' ? Victoria? Melbourne? North Melbourne? Basically, the renewal means giving up on revitalising the market and instead repurposing it. This is a huge loss for Melbourne

We agree with the UBC that 'Not all costs and benefits can be quantified and then monetised (that is, expressed in dollar terms) precisely given their inherent intangibility, often forcing decision makers to integrate quantitative and qualitative results' (UBC p43)

In that case, why should the market make a profit? It is a major tourist attraction and heritage asset that has cost the CoM nothing. For a comparable example, the Town Hall sits on prime Melbourne real estate and all it produces is hot air. Not a young person in sight. They could start with a nice big underground carpark and then 'renew' the existing building for hospo. Balcony for outdoor dining. Council Chamber is ideal for Comedy Festival...

The real market experience?

The UBC confirms management's desire for more oversight over the market offering.

P26 suggests curatorial role for management –

Increased opportunity for some new retail space would enable the potential for product diversification in the new fixed retail and hospitality tenancies in the Queens Corner Building.

Together with a 'Traders Attraction Strategy' (sic)

We say that this is the very antithesis of a market which is based on spontaneous trading interactions and negotiations between traders and customers.

The intention is clearly to change and diversify the retail options at the market. The UBC does not recognise that the essence of a market is that it is distinctive way of trading, not a just 'place'. –

A range of flexible spaces to cater to demand associated with a variety of retail types is proposed. These would help ensure that the market is attractive to a wide variety of retail types and that retail diversity is maximised. (p26)

FOQVM believes that that proposed changes to 'diversify the retail offering 'will substantially diminish the attraction and viability of the market, as effectively in this case the market is competing with many other hospitality and retail focussed precincts in the city. **To survive, the market MUST maintain its value as a distinctive shopping experience based on its traditions and culture.**

Dr Miriam Faine, Secretary Friends of Queen Victoria Market

PS Although the UBC references the Changing Places strategy, there seem to be no plans for disabled access

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 December 2021 12:06 AM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#128]


Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Mary-Lou Howie

Email address: * howie.marylou@gmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: * 6.5 Queen Victoria Market Precinct Renewal – A-E Sheds Upper Market Specialty Market Trading Format Improvement Project

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:  [fmc_submission_agenda_6.5.docx](#) 1.95 MB · DOCX

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne in support of your submission: * No

6.5 Queen Victoria Market Precinct Renewal – A-E Sheds Upper Market Specialty Market Trading Format Improvement Project

Dear Lord Mayor, Deputy Lord Mayor and Councillors,

It is noted that consultation re the changes to the changes to the Specialty Market trading format was limited to the QVM P/L and council whom one would expect support. It is disappointing that the community, along with key QVM stakeholders, were not invited for comment before this agenda seeks endorsement by the very councillors that represent the community. This does seem to suggest that as far as the Council is concerned this is fait accompli.

We have requested a Community and Stakeholder Reference Group for Queen Victoria Market, which considers plans and proposals before they are finalised, presented to FMC or enacted, and that it includes representations from Friends of Queen Victoria Market, Royal Historical Society of Victoria, Protectors of Public Lands, the National Trust of Australia (Vic.), the Queen Victoria Market Traders Representative Committee, experts in heritage, marketing, planning and community. It will help embed community participation, proper process and protocols in city decision-making and the CoM will end up with better submissions and better outcomes for Council, for Melbourne and for communities.

Re 5.7: Heritage Victoria pre-application meeting

The pre-application consultation with Heritage Victoria that took place earlier in the year cited in the 'Key Issues' does not infer in any way endorsement by Heritage Victoria of the schematic plans nor give feedback on the plans. I understand from Heritage Victoria the meeting referred to in the Agenda 6.6 was a standard pre-application meeting to discuss details to ensure that 'documentation is complete, and can reduce delays from further information having to be sought during the assessment stage.' 'Any commentary made by Heritage Victoria during a pre-application meeting and in subsequent correspondence should not be interpreted as acceptance or refusal of a proposal. Permit applications are determined following consideration of the application against relevant policies and the criteria of the Heritage Act.'

It offers comfort that matters such as this that effect the cultural and social significance of a place registered on the Victorian and National Heritage Listing, that is of major importance to all Australians, is in the hands of and subject to Heritage Victoria approval.

Changes to the retail format

Much is mooted about the success of the 'temporary' shipping containers in String Bean Alley to exemplify how the change of format would benefit the market. We, the customers and traders of QVM, know that this has not been the case. We know that trade in String Bean Alley is very lacklustre, at best does better at the busier weekend day market and at

Night Market. It is the least dynamic part of the market and is helped by the foot traffic from the QVM existing car park.

This proposal changes of the retail pods under the shed offends the heritage nature and spirit of QVM by making it a static place of fixed cubicles diminishing the QVM aspects that are unique - a vibrant market place whose theatre is the temporary nature of the stalls, where set up and pack down at the end of each trading day is a feature of true market operations.

Furthermore, the proposed quantity of these retail pods would change the visual and operational dynamic of our heritage market, the very things that QVM has a reputation for.

Re point 2, Purpose and background – People’s Panel and the endorsed approach for the delivery of market infrastructure

The document makes reference to a pre-COVID 2018 People’s Panel without further comment. As one of the stakeholder members of the People’s Panel, I can attest there was no recommendation regarding the proposed Specialty Market Trading Format changes such as the proposed lockable 10 and 20 foot retail container pods in A Shed, Upper Market (Key issues 5.1) nor Street food/food trucks hospitality (5.4).

The People’s Panel’s recommendations were arrived at in good faith and hard work by the panel re the Market’s ageing infrastructure, operational requirements, trader’s needs and car parking. Panel members gave up a considerable amount of their time to participate in the workshops.

The misrepresentation, or at best inflated interpretation, of their deliberation is disrespectful to the process and the people who participated.

To follow, the key People’s Panel recommendation regarding trader infrastructure:

‘People’s Panel Recommendation 1: Infrastructure for traders: review of infrastructure (storage and amenities)

- *Re-test initial consultation with traders*
- *Undertake a thorough audit of trader wants and needs – Trader feedback is that much of the infrastructure is not required & that such gold plating will lead to higher costs and rent to their businesses*
- *Questioned the excessive amount of storage being offered*
- *Recommended a formal and regular review and consultation process to ensure future upgrades are aligned with trader wants and needs*
- *Recommend that trader surveys be conducted by independent auditors.*

*Rationale: Feedback from traders on the people’s panel suggest that the infrastructure provided is **excessive and unnecessary.***

(In effect the traders on the panel questioned/mistrusted the consultation process, its veracity and outcomes and want an independent audit)’

Hospitality focus

So much hospitality is planned for QVM when hospitality is declining in a post-COVID CBD. What is left is being propped up by financial incentives by the City of Melbourne in the effort to revive and retain it. It seems perverse that the QVM renewal is planning to invest

in 'activating' QVM by employing a declining model rather than focussing and building on its core business on which its reputation is built and on what Melbourne wants and needs.

Note that two hospitality traders have closed their businesses in E shed only last week. One is Merlot's, a substantial coffee roaster and cafe on the corner of E Shed and Peel St. These closures have incurred a huge financial loss to their owners. Why then would new future businesses invest in QVM given the declining trader occupancy? Surely this does not evoke confidence in potential future business in the market. I suggest the 'declining trader occupancy' can be attributed to poor QVM management rather than lack of appropriate infrastructure.

Process

The initial tabling of this agenda was unsubstantiated by proper process ie to first provide a Business Case to inform and justify the significant changes to the proposed changes to QVM's trading format which are not heritage compliant. It seems that it was conveniently deferred from last FMC meeting appearing to bow to community pressure, to overcome this oversight. Surely this demonstrates a topsy turvy process where infrastructure changes precede the business case, the latter designed to fit a pre-determined agenda.

Sadly the retrospective updated Business Case that is also presented at this meeting does little to support these changes and which indeed highlights why the community opposes them.

Conclusion:

Proper planning processes and process need to be in place that will protect our heritage market and create a solid foundation on which to make it great again.

Given we are all passionate and heavily invested in the success and future Queen Victoria Market my recommendations are as follows:

- Complete the CoM Heritage Review – overdue September 2021.
- Create a specific, discreet QVM Master Plan that protects this place Queen Victoria Market which is of elevated heritage significance. This is different to, and confused with, the QVM Precinct Master Plan which includes the surrounding area in which QVM is located.
- Update the Conservation Management Plan
- Set up a Community and Stakeholder Reference Group for QVM
- Devise a new post-COVID QVM business model
- Focus on QVM's core businesses to build on and strengthen its what it does best.

Thank you.

Mary-Lou Howie
President
Friends of Queen Victoria Market Inc.

Email: Howie.marylou@gmail.com



Victoria Market 1993. Peter Brown.

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Monday, 6 December 2021 3:20 PM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#122]

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Peter Gerrand

Email address: * pgerrand@gmail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: * 6.5 Queen Victoria Market Precinct Renewal – A–E Sheds Upper Market Specialty Market Trading
* Format Improvement Projec

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

As a long-time local resident and regular shopper at the QVM (usually three times a week), I write to support the proposed renewal of the Upper Market.

Over the past twenty five years, I have been staggered at the time the traders in Sheds A to E need to spend every market day in setting up and then later dismantling and storing their products, under the current arrangements. I am equally staggered at those who defend this time-wasting practice in the name of heritage. Do we need to bring back draft horses instead of motor vehicles to bring in produce to the food stalls? Or reinstate the child labour practices of the 1920s? Of course not. An intelligent community decides which practices of the past are valuable and should be retained, and which should not.

The essential character of the Upper Market is the great diversity of small goods of all kinds sold by small, independent traders. Not only can this be retained under the new proposal, but the traders in the new lock-upable stalls will presumably have electric power with which to extend their range of goods, and the way they display them.

The design of the new stalls looks excellent. For the sake of both the traders and we, their customers, I warmly support this initiative.

Please indicate No
whether you
would like to
verbally address
the Future
Melbourne in
support of your
submission: *

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 December 2021 9:53 AM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#133]

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Peter Lovell

Email address: * phlovell@lovellchen.com.au

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: * Queen Victoria Market Precinct Renewal – A-E Sheds Upper Market

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:

 [20211207_fmc_meeting_lovell_chen_advice_.pdf](#) 152.24 KB · PDF

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne in support of your submission: * Yes

If yes, please indicate if you would like to make your submission in person, or via a virtual link (Zoom) to the meeting. Please note, physical attendance will be limited in accordance with City of Melbourne security protocols and COVID-safe plans and be allocated on a first registered, first served basis. * I wish to make by submission via Zoom

MEMORANDUM

TO		FROM	Peter Lovell, Lovell Chen
RE	QVM – Market Renewal- Heritage Advice	DATE	7 December 2021

Future Melbourne Committee 7 December 2021

Queen Victoria Market Precinct Renewal - A-E Sheds Upper Market Specialty Market Trading Format Improvement Project

Lovell Chen, Architects and Heritage Consultants is providing heritage advice to the Queen Victoria Market on the project and amongst other matters is responsible for the preparation of the Heritage Victoria permit application.

Lovell Chen has carefully assessed the heritage aspects of this project against the Queen Victoria Market Conservation Management Plan.

The Conservation Management Plan outlines that the ongoing use and operation of the market may require physical change to, and adaptation of significant elements in order to address compliance, safety and business functions. Where this occurs, the overriding objectives are first to retain and conserve significant fabric, and secondly to plan and undertake such works in a manner which is sensitive to the significant form and presentation of the buildings and elements.

We believe this project responds to these considerations as the project addresses safety and necessary business functions for the market to operate effectively. The proposed works will help to sustain market operations within the sheds, albeit in a modified manner and have appropriately addressed the heritage values of the place.

The first consideration in assessing the impact of the proposed works is the impact on the heritage fabric of the market. This proposal involves no removal of or alteration to the heritage fabric and no excavation. It is a proposal which is entirely and straightforwardly reversible. As such it is cautious in its approach recognising that over time such installations are highly likely to change.

The second consideration in assessing the impact of the proposed works is the impact on the visual presentation of the place and issues such as sight lines, enclosure and the ability to appreciate the scale and expanse of the sheds.

The heritage of the market is both tangible as evidenced in the building fabric and intangible as evidenced in sounds, smells and visual presentation. The intangible experiences have always been dynamic dependent upon time of day, nature of the activity and the like. Over time market paraphernalia – stalls, displays, signage, storage have changed. This proposal, as in String Bean Alley, introduces elements which present as more permanent. In resolving the design and placement care has been taken to manage the introduced elements to maintain the openness of the sheds and to ensure that there is still the ability to understand their scale and expanse. The introduction of the pods and the

enclosed back of house and business to business areas will alter the visual presentation of this part of the market but in doing so will support its ongoing use. They are changes directed at sustaining the place while maintaining both the tangible and intangible values for which the place is recognised.

Finally, as per the Conservation Management Plan, any new development proposed at the QVM should maintain its role as an authentic working market by supporting ongoing market operations, and enhancing the amenity of the market for customers and traders. New development should also reflect and respond to the valued building and development patterns, and historic site characteristics. This project is in line with these requirements and Lovell Chen's assessment is that the proposed works are not works which will diminish the heritage significance of the market.

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, 5 December 2021 11:18 AM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#113]

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Jillian Renwood

Email address: * ri3044@mail.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 14 December 2021

Agenda item title: * QVM

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am. What started as a renewal of the Market is now becoming a complete reversal from open air Market to enclosed pods destroying the livelihood of the many hard working traders who are now suffering hardship from poor decisions which make no sense. Shoppers in general are as confused as Traders

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne in support of your submission: * No

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, 5 December 2021 10:31 AM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#112]

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Re Casey

Email address: * mareacasey@outlook.com

Date of meeting: *

Agenda item title: Queen Vic Market

*

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

I am at a lose to understand why there is a push to change the Market and make it a generic suburban supermarket. I can shop in my own neighbourhood if I wanted that but I don't!

Don't increase rents that push out traders.

Don't change the aisles and install more container shop fronts.

Don't encourage big name franchises to take over individual traders.

Preserve the unique heritage.

Listen to the traders & users of the Market & respect their voices.

The high rise is too much and overshadows the area.

You are doing a mis service to a city that has suffered so much in the last 2 years. Let Melbourne be Melbourne and one way is by leaving the Market as it is. It is one of our best, well lived & loved features. Don't try to fix something that isn't broken.

Re Casey.

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address No

the Future
Melbourne in
support of your
submission: *

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Monday, 6 December 2021 2:07 PM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#120]

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

*

Name: * Tim Bracher

Email address: * exoff@yarrariver.melbourne

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: 6.6 Final Greenline Implementation Plan

*

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

The Yarra River Business Association – representing 160 small to large businesses of the Lower Yarra River – congratulates Council and Capire on undertaking such a comprehensive public consultation process to guide the design of the Greenline project. It was a pleasure to be part of the process and the number and quality of responses from all people and organisations clearly shows the shared passion about what Greenline can achieve.

This Association asks the question why the Sandridge Bridge is not being officially embraced as part of Greenline. Half the rail bridge is available for a high quality, high profile 'green' conversion – a mini NYC 'highline'. Such an inclusion would also formally link the northbank to Southbank, thus emphasising synergy between the two banks. It seems a great oversight in such a far-reaching planning document not to embrace the potential of Sandridge Bridge.

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne in No

support of your
submission: *

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 December 2021 9:34 AM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#132]

Privacy acknowledgement: I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.
*

Name: * Felicity Watson

Email address: * felicity@yarrapools.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: 6.6 Final Greenline Implementation Plan
*

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. See attached.
Submissions will not be accepted after 10am.

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:

 [2021_12_07_yarra_pools_letter_to_future_melbourne_committee_greenline_implementation_plan.pdf](#)
93.06 KB · PDF

Please indicate whether you No

would like to
verbally address
the Future
Melbourne in
support of your
submission: *



7 December 2021

Lord Mayor Sally Capp and Councillors
Future Melbourne Committee
City of Melbourne

Dear Lord Mayor and Councillors,

Re: Future Melbourne Committee Agenda Item 6.6 Final Greenline Implementation Plan

On behalf of Yarra Pools, I write to thank the City of Melbourne for formally considering our proposal for a Yarra Pool as part of the Greenline project. Naturally, we are deeply disappointed with the conclusion that the delivery of the proposal is not feasible within the current scope of the Greenline project.

The work of Yarra Pools is, and always has been, in the spirit of civic generosity, and a recognition of the urgency we face as a community in addressing the health of the Yarra Birrarung in the face of a growing population and a climate crisis. Our pool proposal was the result of thousands of hours of pro bono work by a dedicated team of experts, supported by partners such as Melbourne Water, Arup, and the visionary work of WOWOWA Architecture. I would like to acknowledge the work of the many individuals and organisations involved in developing this proposal, as well as the enormous support of our stakeholders and the broader community.

We are encouraged by the conclusion by Council officers that there may be future opportunities to consider a swimming pool in the city's waterways, and we encourage Councillors to consider this in future planning for the Yarra Birrarung.

Finally, given Council's commitment to formally assessing our proposal, I would like to request that Council provides us with a written response to our proposal outlining the process that was undertaken to consider the proposal, as well as details regarding the considerations which led to the officer recommendation not to proceed with the project.

While we are disappointed that a pool is not recommended to be included in the Greenline project, we commend Council for this important investment in the renewal of the north bank of the Yarra Birrarung.

Yours sincerely,

Felicity Watson
President
Yarra Pools | Yarra Swim Co

felicity@yarrapools.com

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Monday, 6 December 2021 4:36 PM
To: CoM Meetings
Subject: Future Melbourne Committee submission form [#125]

Privacy acknowledgement: * I have read and acknowledge how Council will use and disclose my personal information.

Name: * Ross Brewer

Email address: * rbrewer45@bigpond.com

Date of meeting: * Tuesday 7 December 2021

Agenda item title: * Item 6.6 Greenline Implementation Plan

Alternatively you may attach your written submission by uploading your file here:



[fvgreenlinecouncilsubmissiondec2021.docx](#) 29.66 KB · DOCX

Please indicate whether you would like to verbally address the Future Melbourne in support of your submission: * No

1/12/2021

MMHN Submission

FMC

7 December

Agenda Item 6.6 Greenline Implementation Plan

MMHN is very pleased support this Motion which represents such progress in implementing the *Greenline* Project.

However, close analysis of the text raises significant concerns. Regrettably from the maritime historical perspective, this *Greenline* plan does not reflect the fundamental importance of maritime trade on the entire river. The river, its banks and its role have defined this city.

A quotation (p33) from a submitter encapsulates the necessity of adequately understanding the river. “*People currently see the river as dirty and they don't understand the stories behind it and the benefits it brings us.* Although the plan refers to enabling ‘connections’ it appears to overlook the river itself – the waterways – always the primary connection of immense significance in the emergence of Melbourne as a great maritime trade port city.

The river and its banks must be recognised and understood by planners as a single entity with a continuous and significant maritime trade presence not only along the entire north bank of the inner reaches of the Yarra but extending around into Victoria Harbour. Given that Lendlease now predicts development to the tip of Collins Wharf may take another 15 years, and given the dire need to activate Docklands, MMHN strongly encourages the CoM to modify this current *Greenline* implementation plan in such a way as to incorporate Harbour Esplanade and New Quay Promenade.

MMHN proposes a low-cost extension of *Greenline* to effectively encircle Melbourne’s heritage-listed Victoria Harbour. and potentially activate Docklands businesses by drawing both local and international visitors. Two legitimate existing waterways ‘precincts’ - Harbour Esplanade Precinct and New Quay Precinct could be easily generate public visitation by installation of informational and directional signage at the end of Jim Stynes Bridge that could direct the public across to Harbour Esplanade. Victoria Harbour is known to have been the site of the Blue Lake/Swamp, which was pre-contact, an abundant source of food. This should certainly feature in a *Greenline* ‘precinct’.

We reconfirm that MMHN is strongly supportive of *Greenline* and it must ensure historical accuracy, which lends reputational credibility to this city. We feel designated 'precinct' names should strive for historical accuracy. For example - Parts of the north bank were radically re-configured post-settlement (e.g. Collins Wharf and Victoria Harbour). Yet the 'precinct' is designated 'Salt Water Wharf Precinct' when the wharf was created as maritime mercantile infrastructure. MMHN takes the view meaningless name 'Eco Park' is not appropriate on this site, which so clearly features significant maritime harbour infrastructure. e.g. navigation aids and the heritage-listed Harbour Trust Tower.

We note that an earlier Dockland Plans appropriately name this area the Sir John Coode Park - in referencing the engineer who designed his world-renowned civil engineering project which enabled the Port of Melbourne to prosper. Such Maritime heritage deserves accuracy and respect.

We note recommendations 10.5.1 & 10.5.2 authorizes the General Manager, Property Infrastructure and Design to make "*minor editorial changes*" and will "*continue detailed planning and programming*" in relations to precincts.

MMHN welcomes any opportunity to assist the CoM in ensuring that the already commendable *Greenline* project better reflects the rich maritime heritage - *Maritime Melbourne* - in the best possible way.

Kind regards

Ross Brewer
Member MMHN Board.