

## CITY NORTH STRUCTURE PLAN – REPORT ON THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

---

### Abstract

1. This report summarises the extensive stakeholder and community engagement process undertaken to inform the City North Structure Plan (the plan). The consultation process aimed to inform, raise awareness, work collaboratively with key stakeholders, build and strengthen relationships, encourage dialogue and seek feedback to inform the plan.
2. A diverse range of opportunities were provided to our stakeholders for their engagement in the plan. This led to individuals and organisations providing feedback on the proposals contained within the plan. Approximately 34 people attended the workshop and information session and across the consultation process, approximately 56 submissions received.
3. The findings following consultation are listed at Attachment 4 (Summary of submissions).

### Process

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

## **Project Management**

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

## **Expert Advice**

12. Advice from the following consultants has been used to inform the plan:
  - Structure Plan Consultation City North and Arden Macaulay September 2010 – Collaborations
  - Demographic Profile – Serryn Eagleson (EDG Research)
  - Transport System Review – Urban Trans
  - City North and Arden Macaulay Structure Plan Review: Property and Development Assessment – Deep End Services

## **Background**

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

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

14. The Phase 1 consultation period involved seeking the community's values and identification of issues and opportunities including priorities for the study area. To inform the draft Plan the City of Melbourne ran a month long consultation program. Members of the community were encouraged to provide input regarding their key values, issues, and opportunities for the City North area.
15. On 15 September 2010 the community and stakeholders (37) participated in a consultation workshop to determine their key values for the revitalisation of the City North and identify a range of issues and opportunities they felt should be addressed.
16. The community and stakeholders were notified and invited to attend by way of:
  - 16.1. Mail (sent to 2850 property owners in the subject area);
  - 16.2. The City of Melbourne web site;
  - 16.3. Direct liaison with resident groups and other key stakeholders.

17. The community were also invited to participate in a moderated forum through the City of Melbourne website. The website replicated the themes from the community consultation and was available to the public for one month from Wednesday 15 September 2011 to Friday 15 October.

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

18. Following the Phase 1 additional work was undertaken to develop the Draft City North Structure Plan.
  - 18.1. This involved research and analysis of information provided by the community and stakeholders. Internal workshops and charettes were carried out based on innovative ideas for the study area – October 2010.
  - 18.2. Using the outcomes of the previous processes a series of scenarios were developed through internal workshops and design charettes, this included exploration of potential implementation – October – November 2010.
  - 18.3. Internal workshops and meetings were carried out to identify the proposed scenario for consultation from December 2010 to April 2011. This included an intensive stakeholder workshop held on 7 December 2010 with state government agencies, service authorities and internal staff.
  - 18.4. A preliminary Draft Structure Plan was circulated to relevant internal staff and key government stakeholders in April 2011 for input.
  - 18.5. On 10 May 2011, the Draft Plan was endorsed by the Future Melbourne Committee for public consultation.

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

19. The Phase 2 consultation period was carried out between 11 May 2011 and 30 June 2011. This was extended from 23 June 2011 in response to requests from the community.
20. The following initiatives were undertaken to inform our community and stakeholders that the Draft Structure Plan was prepared and available for public consultation:
  - 20.1. The 'Have your say' City of Melbourne corporate website ([www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/futuregrowth](http://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/futuregrowth)) was updated to incorporate information relating to the Draft Plan including a full copy of the Draft Plan that was available for downloading.
  - 20.2. The email address [structureplans@melbourne.vic.gov.au](mailto:structureplans@melbourne.vic.gov.au) was maintained for the community to engage with the Strategic Planning Team. Questions relating to the plan were welcomed through this measure.
  - 20.3. Social networking sites including the "City of Melbourne" Facebook account were used to inform a broader catchment of the plan and consultation process. A Twitter account, #citynorth, was created for the structure plan.
  - 20.4. A corporate advertisement was published on page 1 of the Melbourne Leader on 23/05/2011.
  - 20.5. Hard copies of the Draft Plans were available for viewing at the following locations:
    - Melbourne Town Hall
    - Council House 2, Level 3 reception
    - City Library;
    - North Melbourne Library; and,
    - Flemington Library.

- 20.6. Flyers were mailed to all land owners throughout the study area advising of the draft plan and the consultation process, including an information session (8211 mailed). An email was sent to members of the community who had registered their interest or attended a previous consultation session. Key residents associations were also emailed and requested to inform their members.
- 20.7. Flyers promoting the draft plan and consultation process were displayed at the following locations:
- North and West Melbourne Neighbourhood Centre
  - The Hub @ Docklands
  - Kensington Community Centre
  - Kensington Neighbourhood House
  - Doutta Galla Community Health Centre
  - City Library
  - North Melbourne Library
  - North Melbourne Recreation Centre
  - Jean McKendry Neighbourhood Centre
  - Kensington Senior Citizens
  - Flemington Library
  - North Melbourne Community Centre
  - Kensington Primary School
- 20.8. Upon request hard copies of the Draft Plan and Background Report were provided to individuals and organisations.
21. An information session regarding the draft City North Structure Plan was held on 6 June 2011 at The Carlton Football Club. 34 people attended. The forum was facilitated by an external mediator from Collaborations Planning with Your Local Community Pty Ltd. The information session included an introduction by Councillor Clarke, a presentation by David Mayes, Manager Strategic Planning; and a question and feedback opportunity on the key elements of the Plan.
22. The project team presented at targeted stakeholder briefings including:
- 22.1. Parkville Association – 14 June 2011
- 22.2. North and West Melbourne Residents Association – 21 June 2011
- 22.3. Presidents of the Residents Associations - 15 June 2011. The following organisations were invited to attend:
- Carlton Residents Association
  - EastEnders
  - Hardware Precinct Residents and Tenants Group
  - Kensington Association
  - Kensington Public Tenants Association
  - North and West Melbourne Association
  - Parkville Association
  - Parkville Gardens Resident Association

- Residents 3000
  - The Coalition of Residents and Business Associations (CoRBA)
  - Flemington Association
23. A letter was sent to relevant members of parliament, state government ministers and the executives of relevant industry groups and institutions advising of the draft structure plan and consultation process.
24. City of Melbourne held an information session with key government organisations and stakeholders on 3 June 2011. Representatives from the following government departments, agencies and organisations and individuals were formally invited to attend:
- Department of Transport
  - Department of Business and Innovation
  - Department of Planning and Community Development
  - Melbourne Health
  - Moonee Valley City Council
  - Melbourne Water
  - Department of Health
  - Department Premier and Cabinet
  - Vic Roads
  - Sustainability Victoria
  - Department of Human Services
  - University of Melbourne
  - CitiPower
  - Major Projects Victoria
  - Vic Track
  - Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology
  - Vic Urban
  - Port of Melbourne
  - National Trust
  - The Honourable Bronwyn Pike, MLA
  - The Honourable Terry Mulder (Minister for Transport)
  - Mr. Adam Bandt MP
  - The Honourable Matthew Guy MLA (Minister for Planning)
  - The Property Council of Australia – Victorian Division
  - Urban Development Institute of Australia – Victoria Division
  - Walter and Eliza Hall Institute
  - The Royal Children’s Hospital
  - The Royal Melbourne Hospital
  - The South Parkville Working Group

25. Targeted meetings were carried out with the following organisations to discuss specific aspects of the structure plan:
- The Queen Victoria Market
  - The University of Melbourne

### Media Coverage

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

### Submissions

27. Submissions on the Draft Structure Plan were encouraged. As a result of consultation 62 submissions were received. Of the 62 submissions:
- 49 were from individuals;
  - 8 were from businesses and organisations;
  - 5 were from government.

### Conclusion

28. The consultation was widely promoted and comprehensive. The public consultation process lead to a diverse stakeholder base providing valuable feedback and input. The City of Melbourne received 62 submissions that have shaped and informed the final version.
29. The findings from the consultation process are listed at Attachment 4.

## SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

---

### Content

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

The written submissions raised 8 thematic responses and informed the finalisation of the Draft Plan. The eight themes and the frequency of which they were addressed are outlined below:

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

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

- The need for significantly improved and increased civic and public infrastructure such as child and aged care, hospitals/healthcare and education facilities.
- The need for appropriate sites for a primary and secondary school with adequate open space before finalising the structure plan.
- The need for mandatory height controls.
- The reliance of the plan on the proposed Metro line to justify high-rise development.
- Car parking and traffic management.

### Summary of Submissions

*The need for significantly improved and increased civic and public infrastructure such as child and aged care, hospitals/healthcare and education facilities.*

The key arguments included:

- Social infrastructure is needed to respond to the needs of the significantly increased population and people with particular needs.
- Developers are unlikely to be concerned with provision of community facilities and will not be around to deal with the dysfunctional communities that will result due to a lack of these facilities.

It is agreed that improvements to existing (and identification of additional) community infrastructure are needed to respond to the needs of the growing community. The City North Structure Plan provides an opportunity for a holistic approach to managing change. Additional community infrastructure opportunities and principles have been identified and integrated into the City North Structure Plan. Local and State Governments are responsible for the delivery of essential community services, with some services provided by the private sector. Partnerships for the ongoing delivery of community infrastructure have been identified. The City of Melbourne will continue to work with service providers and relevant agencies that have responsibility to provide and operate services to meet community needs.

*The need for appropriate sites for a primary and secondary school with adequate open space before finalising the structure plan.*

The key arguments included:

- Existing schools servicing the area are at capacity.
- Schools attract families to the area.
- New sites may need to be purchased or compulsorily acquired.
- Children will increasingly access open space at school due to higher density living.

In the process of developing the City North Structure Plan, the City of Melbourne has had discussions with the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) who have responsibility for managing existing schools and the delivery of new schools. The City of Melbourne will continue to liaise with the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development and will advocate for appropriate provision of education facilities to service the region in which City North is located. The Department of Education and Early Childhood is responsible for the delivery of new schools. The location and design of any future school will be determined by the Department.

*The need for mandatory height controls.*

The key arguments included:

- It is dangerous to introduce discretionary height limits as this will result in significantly higher buildings. Mandatory height controls create clarity and certainty for the community and VCAT.
- Recent VCAT decisions indicate buildings are approved above the limit.
- Developers see the discretionary heights as a starting point to argue up from/will push boundaries if they are discretionary.

It is dangerous to introduce discretionary height limits as this will result in significantly higher buildings. Mandatory height controls create clarity and certainty for the community and VCAT. Recent VCAT decisions indicate buildings are approved above the limit. Developers see the discretionary heights as a starting point to argue up from/will push boundaries if they are discretionary.

*The reliance of the plan on the proposed Metro line to justify high-rise development.*

The key arguments included:

- The Metro Line may never be approved and development will proceed to the detriment of the area, creating an inadequately serviced, huge population base, devoid of the old economic base.
- Existing infrastructure and road network would not be able to cope with an increase in population of residents and workers without the provision of the station. Public transport is already at capacity.
- The delivery of the Metro is uncertain. It is wrong to amend planning scheme height controls and carry out re-zoning to inflate land prices and developer expectations which may never be alleviated in relation to community infrastructure, open space, schools, recreation and traffic.
- The delivery of the metro is uncertain.

The Metro station is not the only trigger for change in City North as this is already underway due to the expansion of key institutions in the area, the Carlton United Brewery redevelopment, and State Government investment in medical facilities in the area. The City North Structure Plan will assist to manage this growth and change. In addition, the Structure Plan will be used to advocate to the State Government for other public transport proposals and improvements to complement the Metro or provide an alternative option for State Government investment. City North is an appropriate area to direct growth to as it accommodates a large number of jobs and is located in proximity to the city, enabling opportunities for walking and cycling.

*Car parking and traffic management.*

The key arguments included:

- Public transportation is already at capacity.

- Further consideration of the impact of reconfiguration of areas on emergency vehicles trying to access the area and access to the hospitals by visitors and employees is needed.
- There is insufficient car parking to cope with the hospital and medical facilities in Parkville.
- There is a residents parking scheme in Parkville which is no longer working well as people seeking medical facilities park in them if in a hurry.

The City North Structure Plan recommends the development of traffic and parking management plans for the area, noting particular destinations, such as the hospitals, the Queen Victoria Market and the universities. The City of Melbourne will continue to advocate for sustainable transportation through the Melbourne Transport Strategy Update and City North Structure Plan. The Transport Strategy Update advocates for enhanced frequency of services, including longer operating hours. The Structure Plan provides recommendations for enhancements to streetscapes to enhance pedestrian and cycling pathways. Prior to any capital works enhancements to streetscapes or road reconfiguration detailed design will consider the impact of any proposal on traffic and parking and any potential conflict between users. This will include consultation with stakeholders to ensure appropriate outcomes.



### CITY NORTH STRUCTURE PLAN - LIST OF SUBMITTERS

#### Submissions received in response to the draft City North Structure Plan from individual interested parties

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION	
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis	
Angelopolous	Tass	3.1	Amenity
		3.2	Building heights
		1.3	General comments
		2.3	Institutional uses
		3.0	Urban structure and built form
		9.6	Elizabeth Street
		4.5	Car parking
		5.3	Streetscape design
		2.6	Retail / commercial
Bishop	Helena John	8.3	Feedback on the consultation process
		3.2	Building heights
		6.1	Community facilities
		5.1	Parks
		3.4	Heritage
		4.5	Car parking
		4.6	Cars, roads and traffic
		8.1	Structure plan process and implementation
		4.4	Melbourne Metro
		3.0	Urban structure and built form
Bishop	Helena	9.8	Haymarket
Burton	Mark	9.8	Haymarket
		4.7	Bicycles
		4.11	Trams
		4.12	Walking
		5.0	Public realm
		9.6	Elizabeth Street

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION	
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis	
Collocott	Peter Patricia	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 5.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 8.1 4.4 2.4 3.0	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Parks Heritage Car parking Cars, Roads and Traffic Structure plan process and implementation Melbourne Metro Land use transition Urban structure and built form
Cook	Bill Jenny	8.3 3.2	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights
Cowling	Ray	6.1 2.5 2.4 8.1 3.0 3.2 3.4 8.3 3.3 5.1 4.5 4.4 8.3 4.11 2.6 9.8 4.6 3.5	Community facilities Residential Land use Transition Structure plan process and implementation Urban structure and built form Building heights Heritage Feedback on the consultation process Density Parks Car parking Melbourne Metro Feedback on the consultation process Trams Retail/Commercial Haymarket Cars, roads and traffic Neighbourhood character

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION	
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis	
Davies	Huw Helen	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 5.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 8.1 4.4 2.4 3.0	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Parks Heritage Car parking Cars, roads and traffic Structure plan process and implementation Melbourne Metro Land use transition Urban structure and built form
Duckworth	Mark	8.1 3.3 3.4 7.1 3.5 9.12 2.5 3.2 9.7 3.1 6.1 5.1 2.0	Structure plan process and implementation Density Heritage Infrastructure services Neighbourhood character Queen Victoria Market Residential Building heights Flemington Road Amenity Community facilities Parks Activities and land uses
Duckworth	Colin Mary	3.2 3.5 4.5 4.8 3.4 3.3	Building heights Neighbourhood character Car parking Public transport Heritage Density

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION	
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis	
Echberg	Bruce	3.2 3.0 9.12 7.8 8.1 9.6 9.8 2.0 9.15	Building heights Urban structure and built form Queen Victoria Market Sustainable development Structure Plan process and implementation Elizabeth Street Haymarket Activities and land use Victoria Street
Equiset Grollo Group		3.2 8.1 3.0	Building heights Structure plan process and implementation Urban structure and built form
Farell Ralph	Stephen Anthula	2.4 8.1 3.2 3.3 6.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.4 8.3 5.1	Land use transition Structure plan process and implementation Building heights Density Community facilities Heritage Parking Cars, roads and traffic Melbourne Metro Feedback on the consultation process Parks

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION	
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis	
Firth	Lucy	6.1 3.2 3.3 7.3 7.7 5.1 8.3 8.1 4.4 4.6 5.3 3.0 3.4 3.1 9.12 2.0 2.5 2.6 2.1 2.4 3.5 4.5 5.0	Community facilities Building heights Density Climate change adaptation Water Parks Feedback on the consultation process Structure plan process and implementation Melbourne Metro Cars, roads and traffic Streetscape Design Urban structure and built form Heritage Amenity Queen Victoria Market Activities and land use Residential Retail/Commercial Activity Centres Land use transition Neighbourhood character Car parking Public realm
Fyfe	Carolyn	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 5.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 8.1 4.4 2.4 3.0	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Parks Heritage Car parking Cars, roads and traffic Structure plan process and implementation Melbourne Metro Land use transition Urban structure and built form

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION	
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis	
<b>Gannon</b>	<b>Melita</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 5.1 8.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.4 2.4 3.0	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Parks Structure plan process and implementation Heritage Car parking Cars, roads and traffic Melbourne Metro Land use transition Urban structure and built form
<b>Gatto Ashley</b>	<b>Alba Alan</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 5.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 8.1 4.4 2.4 3.0	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Parks Heritage Car parking Cars, roads and traffic Structure plan process and implementation Melbourne Metro Land use transition Urban structure and built form
<b>Gerrand</b>	<b>Valerie</b>	2.4 3.2 3.3 3.4 4.4 4.6 4.5 5.1 6.1 8.1 8.3	Land use transition Building heights Density Heritage Melbourne Metro Cars, roads and traffic Car parking Parks Community facilities Structure plan process and implementation Feedback on consultation process

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION	
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis	
Gould Cebokli	Richard Magda	8.1 8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 5.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.4 2.4	Structure plan process and implementation Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Parks Heritage Car parking Cars, Roads and Traffic Melbourne Metro Land Use Transition
Graham	Janet	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 5.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 8.1 4.4 2.4 3.0	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Parks Heritage Car parking Cars, roads and traffic Structure plan process and implementation Melbourne Metro Land use transition Urban structure and built form
Green	Kate	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 5.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 8.1 4.4 2.4 3.0	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Parks Heritage Car parking Cars, roads and traffic Structure plan process and implementation Melbourne Metro Land use transition Urban structure and built form

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION	
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis	
Griffiths	J	8.3	Feedback on the consultation process
		3.2	Building heights
		3.3	Density
		6.1	Community facilities
		5.1	Parks
		3.4	Heritage
		4.5	Car parking
		4.6	Cars, roads and traffic
		8.1	Structure plan process and implementation
		4.4	Melbourne Metro
		2.4	Land use transition
		3.0	Urban structure and built form
Holland	David	8.3	Feedback on the consultation process
		3.2	Building heights
		3.3	Density
		6.1	Community facilities
		5.1	Parks
		3.4	Heritage
		4.5	Car parking
		4.6	Cars, roads and traffic
		8.1	Structure plan process and implementation
		4.4	Melbourne Metro
		2.4	Land use transition
		3.0	Urban structure and built form

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION	
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis	
Jungwirth	Margaret	5.1 4.8 4.5 4.7 4.12 3.4 6.1 7.2 3.3 8.1 3.2 3.0	Parks Public transport Car parking Bicycles Walking Heritage Community facilities Air Quality Density Structure plan process and implementation Building heights Urban structure and built form
Kehoe	Mary	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 5.1 4.5 4.6 8.1 4.4 2.4 3.0 3.4	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Parks Car parking Cars, roads and traffic Structure plan process and implementation Melbourne Metro Land use transition Built form and urban structure Heritage

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION	
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis	
Kelleher	Margaret	3.2 8.3 3.3 6.1 4.5 4.6 4.4 2.4 5.1 3.0 3.4 8.1	Building heights Feedback on the consultation process Density Community facilities Car parking Cars, roads and traffic Melbourne Metro Land use transition Parks Urban structure and built form Heritage Structure plan process and implementation
Kenneth D Opat Nominees Pty Ltd		9.12 9.15 3.2	Queen Victoria Market Victoria Street Building heights
Kidby	Meredith	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 5.1 8.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 4.4 2.4	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Community facilities Parks Structure plan process and implementation Heritage Car parking Cars, roads and traffic Melbourne Metro Land use transition
Kong	Teng	2.2 2.5 4.8 4.11 4.9 4.12 4.5 4.7	Industry Residential Public transport Trams Buses Walking Car parking Bicycles

<b>SUBMITTER</b>		<b>KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION</b>	
<b>Surname/organisation</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>See discussion in submission analysis</b>	
<b>Lacey</b>	<b>Jan</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 4.4 8.1 2.4 6.1	Feedback on the consultation process Building heights Density Melbourne Metro Structure plan process and implementation Land use transition Community facilities
<b>McRae</b>	<b>David Myrna</b>	8.1 3.0 3.2 3.1	Structure plan process and implementation Urban structure and built form Building heights Amenity
<b>Munro</b>	<b>Robert</b>	8.2 2.6 3.2 9.12	Policy and government Retail/Commercial Building Heights Queen Victoria Market
<b>Nairn</b>	<b>Roger and Virginia</b>	8.3 3.2 3.3 6.1 5.1 3.4 4.5 4.6 8.1 4.4 2.4	Feedback on the consultation process Building Heights Density Community facilities Parks Heritage Car parking Car, roads and traffic Structure plan process and implementation Melbourne Metro Land Use Transition

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION	
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis	
Nicholson	Mary	8.3	Feedback on the consultation process
		3.2	Building heights
		3.3	Density
		6.1	Community facilities
		5.1	Parks
		8.1	Structure plan process and implementation
		3.4	Heritage
		4.5	Car parking
		4.6	Cars, roads and traffic
		4.4	Melbourne Metro
		2.4	Land use transition
		3.0	Built form and urban structure
Noonan	Gerry	4.5	Car parking
		4.6	Cars, roads and traffic
North and West Melbourne Association		8.3	Feedback on the consultation process
		3.2	Building heights
		3.3	Density
		8.1	Structure plan process and implementation
		6.1	Community facilities
		5.1	Parks
		3.4	Heritage
		4.5	Car parking
		4.6	Cars, roads and traffic
		4.4	Melbourne Metro
		2.4	Land use transition
		3.0	Urban structure and built form

<b>SUBMITTER</b>		<b>KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION</b>	
<b>Surname/organisation</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>See discussion in submission analysis</b>	
<b>Parkville Association Inc</b>		3.4 3.1 2.3 2.5 4.5 4.6 2.0 2.6 4.8 5.1	Heritage Amenity Institutional uses Residential Car parking Cars, roads and traffic Activities and land use Retail/commercial Public transport Parks
<b>Paszylka</b>	<b>Michael</b>	2.6 9.12	Retail/commercial Queen Victoria Market
<b>Phefley</b>	<b>Anne</b>	4.12 2.3 5.1 2.0 3.2 3.4 3.5 6.1 2.6 9.12 4.5 9.8 5.3 5.0	Walking Institutional uses Parks Activities and land use Building heights Heritage Neighbourhood character Community facilities Retail / Commercial Queen Victoria Market Car parking Haymarket Streetscape design Public realm
<b>Puchlenko</b>	<b>James</b>	1.2 2.5 8.1 3.4 3.5 3.2	Negative feedback Residential Structure plan process and implementation Heritage Neighbourhood character Building heights
<b>Ranger</b>	<b>Tom</b>	1.1 5.0 9.6 9.8	Positive feedback Public realm Elizabeth Street Haymarket

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION	
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis	
Rao	Asha	8.3	Feedback on the consultation process
		3.2	Building heights
		3.3	Density
		6.1	Community facilities
		5.1	Parks
		3.4	Heritage
		4.5	Car parking
		4.6	Cars, roads and traffic
		8.1	Structure plan process and implementation
		4.4	Melbourne Metro
		2.4	Land use transition
		3.0	Urban structure and built form
Read	Fiona	8.3	Feedback on the consultation process
		3.2	Building heights
		3.3	Density
		6.1	Community facilities
		5.1	Parks
		3.4	Heritage
		4.5	Car parking
		4.6	Cars, roads and traffic
		8.1	Structure plan process and implementation
		4.4	Melbourne Metro
		2.4	Land use transition
		3.0	Urban structure and built form

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION	
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis	
Rodan	Beverley-Anne	8.3	Feedback on the consultation process
		3.2	Building heights
		3.3	Density
		6.1	Community facilities
		5.1	Parks
		3.4	Heritage
		4.5	Car parking
		4.6	Cars, roads and traffic
		8.1	Structure plan process and implementation
		4.4	Melbourne Metro
		2.4	Land use transition
		3.0	Urban structure and built form
Sabbione	Anna	1.2	Negative feedback
		3.2	Building heights
		8.3	Feedback on the consultation process
Scully	Bobby Colm	8.3	Feedback on the consultation process
		3.2	Building heights
		3.3	Density
		6.1	Community facilities
		5.1	Parks
		3.4	Heritage
		4.5	Car parking
		4.6	Cars, roads and traffic
		8.1	Structure plan process and implementation
		4.4	Melbourne Metro
		2.4	Land use transition
		3.0	Urban structure and built form

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION	
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis	
<b>Siska</b>	<b>Lorraine</b>	8.3	Feedback on the consultation process
		3.2	Building heights
		3.3	Density
		6.1	Community facilities
		5.1	Parks
		3.4	Heritage
		4.5	Car parking
		4.6	Cars, roads and traffic
		8.1	Structure plan process and implementation
		4.4	Melbourne Metro
		2.4	Land use transition
		3.0	Urban structure and built form
<b>Suter</b>	<b>Geraldine David</b>	8.1	Structure plan process and implementation
		3.2	Building heights
		3.3	Density
		6.1	Community facilities
		5.1	Parks
		3.4	Heritage
		4.5	Car parking
		4.6	Cars, roads and traffic
		4.4	Melbourne Metro
		2.3	Land use transition
		8.3	Feedback on the consultation process
<b>Turner</b>	<b>Annie</b>	8.3	Feedback on the consultation process
		3.2	Building heights
		3.3	Density
		6.1	Community facilities
		5.1	Parks
		3.4	Heritage
		4.5	Car parking
		4.6	Cars, roads and traffic
		8.1	Structure plan process and implementation
		4.4	Melbourne Metro
		2.4	Land use transition
		3.0	Urban structure and built form

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION	
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis	
Vollman	Elizabeth	2.6 9.12	Retail/commercial Queen Victoria Market
Williams	Angela	8.3 8.1 3.3 3.0 6.1 2.3 5.0 3.1 3.4 2.0 9.12 9.8 5.3 4.5 1.3 5.1	Feedback on the consultation process Structure plan process and implementation Density Urban structure and built form Community facilities Building heights Public realm Amenity Heritage Activities and land uses Queen Victoria Market Haymarket Streetscape design Car parking General comments Parks
Yffer	Moira	3.0 5.1 6.1 3.2	Urban structure and built form Parks Community facilities Building heights

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis
<b>Submissions received in response to the draft City North Structure Plan from organisations</b>		
Bicycle Victoria	4.8	Bicycles
City West Water	7.7	Water
Department of Health	7.1	Infrastructure Services
Department of Human Services	2.5	Residential
Department of Planning and Community Development	8.1 2.0 9.7 9.8 3.2 9.12 4.4 4.11 4.1 4.5 4.7 4.12 4.0 4.9 3.0 4.8 5.3	Process and implementation Activities and land uses Flemington Road Haymarket Building heights Queen Victoria Market Melbourne Metro Trams Freight Cars, roads and traffic Bicycles Walking Transport and access Buses Urban structure and built form Public transport Streetscape design
Department of Transport	3.3 2.4 8.1 4.7 4.12 4.8 4.6 4.1 2.0 4.11	Density Land use transition Structure plan process and implementation Bicycles Walking Public transport Cars, roads and traffic Freight Activities and land use Trams

SUBMITTER		KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SUBMISSION	
Surname/organisation	First Name	See discussion in submission analysis	
Melbourne Water		7.7 3.3	Water Density
Queen Victoria Market		3.0 3.4 9.12 8.1 4.8 2.5 4.5 2.1 3.2 9.8 4.6 4.1 2.0	Built form Heritage Queen Victoria Market Structure plan process and implementation Bicycles Residential Car parking Activity centres Building Heights Haymarket Cars, roads and traffic Freight Activities and land uses
Royal Children's Hospital		4.5 4.6 4.8 2.3 6.1	Cars, roads and traffic Car parking Public transport Institutional uses Community facilities
VicRoads		4.6 4.4	Cars, roads and traffic Melbourne Metro



## CITY NORTH STRUCTURE PLAN - RESPONSE TO ISSUES

### 1.0 General comments about the Structure Plan

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	City of Melbourne response
Single comment	<b>1.1 Positive feedback</b>	Broadly speaking I believe the draft reflects a city I would like to live in. They provide the forwards thinking that appears to be lacking from planning in this city at the moment.	Noted
Low	<b>1.2 Negative feedback</b>	While there are several positives with the plan, there are aspects which are devoid of logic particularly relating to the inclusion of quiet, established, historical residential areas in what is otherwise a fundamentally non residential area.	Noted
		As a resident of Franklin Street, there is a sense of attachment and loyalty to this wonderful, but not for too long, precinct. The thought of two towering towers dwarfing this historical site is really infuriating, a real disgrace.	Noted
		I support more people living in the City of Melbourne. However, the Council cannot encourage more people to live in the City at the same time as ignoring what existing residents want. We need to create viable communities for the future. This is best done by building on existing communities. The draft structure plan, however, in its current form, would damage existing communities while not providing reasonable amenity for future residents.	Noted
		The Draft Structure Plan serves neither the history of Melbourne nor its future.	Noted
Single comment	<b>1.3 General comments</b>	What evidence has been collected to demonstrate that the proposed structure plan would have a positive impact on public health particularly from the perspective of building communities, access to quality open space?	Noted
Single comment	<b>1.3 General comments</b>	I live in an area where Lorikeets have their flight path. I fear some of the changes will either eradicate or at least detrimentally affect the Lorikeets.	Noted

## 2.0 Activities and land use

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
<b>Submissions received from individuals</b>					
Medium	<b>2.4 Land use transition</b>	Avoid the loss of commercial, industrial and employment areas that are linked to the inner areas of Melbourne and surrounding areas.	<p>The plan suggests that many workplaces will disappear in redevelopments. However this needs to be replaced and expanded in line with population growth.</p> <p>The plan to force out the service businesses will create problems for residents and city workers who currently can easily access services.</p> <p>Commercial and industrial areas linked to the Central Business Area of Melbourne provide important employment and economic opportunities and are easily accessible to inner urban residents avoiding the need for long commuting journeys and the resulting fuel consumption.</p> <p>Sustainable populations require economic activity nearby.</p>	<b>Noted- no change to the structure plan</b>	The Victorian Planning System and the Melbourne Planning Scheme protect the existing use rights of land uses that have been in operation within the last 2 years prior to a rezoning of land. As such, these provisions will enable existing land uses to remain within the Capital City Zone and thus not directing a loss of the existing land uses or jobs. The Capital City Zone enables a greater variety of land uses as of right, or subject to a permit, in comparison to the Mixed Use Zone, which has potential to encourage new employment opportunities and convenience services in proximity to central Melbourne. There will continue to be significant investment by the University of Melbourne, RMIT and the State Government in the area which will provide opportunities for employment and a range of uses complementary to the medical, educational and research institutions in the area.
Low	<b>2.0 Activities and Land Use</b> <b>2.5 Residential</b>	Do not rezone the Residential 1 area on the corner of Courtney and Harcourt Streets to Mixed Use.	This area contains Office of Housing town houses and is an established residential area. Rezoning may compromise the certainty of housing for residents of these townhouses as the rezoning suggests an alternative use should be contemplated in this area.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	The rezoning to the Mixed Use Zone does not comprise the certainty of housing for residents. The Mixed Use Zone is essentially a residential zone, however it also provides greater opportunity for the integration of a range of complementary services to service this accommodation.

## 2.0 Activities and land use

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Low	<b>2.1 Activity Centres</b> <b>2.6 Retail / Commercial</b>	Reconsider the location of the proposed hub in the Haymarket precinct - at Wreckyn Street and the corner of Grattan Street.	The nominated area at the Seven Eleven service station on Flemington Road beside does not seem appropriate as this area has a significant link to the services of the Errol Street and Lygon Street retail precinct.	<b>Noted- no change to the structure plan</b>	The hub proposed in the vicinity of the Haymarket is well located to service residents, as well as workers and visitors to the cluster of hospitals and the university. Although it is acknowledged that the Errol Street and Lygon Street retail precincts have links to City North, these are located beyond 400 metres for most people residences and workplaces in City North. The Haymarket vicinity is considered a suitable location for a local activity hub given it is within a walkable distance for people living and working in City North and it will also be highly accessible due to integration with the tram interchange and proposed Metro station. The City North Structure Plan also proposes to redevelop the Haymarket intersection to include a large civic space. The proposed hub within the University of Melbourne campus has been removed.
			Service station as a hub. I think this does not need to be explained. It is just silly. The other hub is at the University of Melbourne's Medical School - even sillier.		
Low	<b>2.6 Retail/ Commercial</b>	Do not change the retail provision at the Queen Victoria Market.	The Queen Victoria Market is iconic and unique and does not need a wider range of retail services.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	The City of Melbourne's long term strategy for Queen Victoria Market will identify ways to develop and enhance the market's role in light of the city's growth, community needs and consumer trends. The City of Melbourne wants to secure the future of the market and ensure its ongoing viability and relevance in a time of rapid change.
			It already provides a unique "retail experience" for fruit, vegetables, seafood and meat and some peripheral merchandise. A "wider more varied experience" is available a few hundred metres down the road in all the CBD shops which are similar to CBD shops throughout the western world.		

<b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Low	<b>2.0 Activities and land uses</b>	Do not rezone the mixed use area opposite the Queen Victoria Market	Under the Capital City Zone many uses become of right and the potential for any use in this area will be detrimental to the area and to its role supporting the Market.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	The Mixed Use Zone does not facilitate land use diversity as it is predominantly a residential zone. The Capital City Zone (CCZ) supports a strong mix of residential, retail and commercial uses. The CCZ is already applied to the south of Victoria Street. The extension of the CCZ to the north of Victoria Street will enable a vibrant, active and liveable environment that provides for a diverse residential, worker and visitor population to complement the Queen Victoria Market vicinity. The CCZ provides equal weighting to residential, commercial and retail functions.
Low	<b>2.3 Institutional uses</b>	Amend the plans to show the Royal Children's Hospital footprint not encroaching on Royal Park.	<p>The agreement is to return at least half of the area to parkland. It is deceptive to show it as biomedical.</p> <p>The footprint depicted for the Royal Children's Hospital at the corner of Gatehouse Street and Flemington Road in all maps of the Structure Plan presentation is incorrect.</p>	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The footprint of the Royal Children's Hospital has been amended in the City North Structure Plan to show the area which will be returned to parkland in 2014.

<b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>2.0 Activities and land uses 2.6 Retail/ Commercial</b>	Much emphasis was put in your presentation on bringing to the enlarged knowledge precinct a range of new shopping facilities, coffee shops etc. This may superficially make the area seem more attractive but it is only part of what provides a more exciting knowledge precinct and appear to ignore the unique character and capacity of Lygon Street and Errol Street. Nor does it recognise the steps taken, for example in Canada, to build such facilities underground adjacent to public transport.		<b>Noted - No change to structure plan.</b>	The City North Structure Plan provides a comprehensive approach to managing growth and change building on the existing strengths of the precinct whilst accommodating growth in a liveable and sustainable environment. Although it is acknowledged that the Errol Street and Lygon Street retail precincts have links to City North, these are located beyond 400 metres for most people residences and workplaces in City North. The Haymarket vicinity is considered a suitable location for a local activity hub given it is within a walkable distance for people living and working in City North and it will also be highly accessible due to integration with the tram interchange and proposed Metro station. The City North Structure Plan also proposes to redevelop the Haymarket intersection to include a large civic space. The integration of retail facilities underground removes activity and vibrancy from the street.
Single comment	<b>2.6 Retail/ Commercial</b>	Optimise the use of the Queen Victoria Market.	Its current opening hours are very restrictive so an extension to trade is required. Include more boutique stalls at the market to support local artists, craftsmen and designers. The current selection of stalls in the clothing/home ware area have unoriginal merchandise, many of which sell cheap imported goods.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	The City of Melbourne's long term strategy for Queen Victoria Market will identify ways to develop and enhance the market's role in light of the city's growth, community needs and consumer trends. The City of Melbourne wants to secure the future of the market and ensure its ongoing viability and relevance in a time of rapid change.

## 2.0 Activities and land use

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>2.6 Retail/ Commercial</b>	There is not enough emphasis on economic development in the draft City North Structure Plan.		<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	The Structure Plan proposes rezoning from Mixed Use Zone to Capital City Zone. The Capital City Zone enables a greater variety of land uses in comparison to the Mixed Use Zone, which has potential to encourage new employment opportunities and convenience services in proximity to central Melbourne. There will continue to be significant investment by the University of Melbourne, RMIT and the State Government in the area which will provide opportunities for employment and a range of uses complementary to the medical, educational and research institutions in the area.
Single comment	<b>2.6 Retail/ Commercial</b>	It is essential that future development contains massive amounts of office space employing many people and very many good quality retailers at ground level, not coffee and fast food outlets which may only be the flavour of present time, they will die a quickly as they evolved and other uses will blossom.		<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	The Capital City Zone provides a greater diversity of land uses which will complement the cluster of medical and educational institutions in the area and proximity to the city including office space.

<b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>2.6 Retail/ Commercial</b>	Do not extend city to allow uncontrolled commercial development.	Much of the area comprises university or residents and the quiet enjoyed should be respected. For example, allowing noisy venues should not be an option and only allowed in dedicated area where residents are not near the perimeter.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan provides a comprehensive approach to managing growth and change building on the existing strengths of the precinct whilst accommodating growth in a liveable and sustainable environment. It aims to encourage a balanced mix of of land uses including commercial to complement and service the additional residential and the existing land uses. The Capital City Zone provides a greater diversity of land uses which will complement the cluster of medical and educational institutions in the area and proximity to the city. It will also continue to facilitate residential development.
Single comment	<b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>	Do not provide more intensive retail or commercial or residential development or 80% active uses at ground floor along Royal Parade.		<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	Several hospitals and the University of Melbourne are clustered around southern end of Royal Parade. To appropriately service the visitors to the hospitals, and the students and workers in this precinct, a more intensive and a greater diversity of retail, commercial and residential development on the southern end of Royal Parade, near the intersection of Grattan Street, is considered appropriate.

<b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>2.5 Residential</b>	Rezone the whole of the north side of Courtney Street between Wreckyn and Harcourt Streets and up to Vale Street (including Villiers Street, Mary Street and Hotham Place) as Residential 1 Zone.	All this area is either established residential or heritage buildings.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	The Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) is essentially a residential zone but it allows for complementary land uses including shops and offices that provide greater opportunity for the integration of a range of complementary services in proximity to the knowledge precinct. The level of activity provided in a mixed use zone allows for an appropriate transition between the Capital City Zone and the Residential 1 Zone.
Single comment	<b>2.4 Land use transition</b>	Change the "ongoing change" areas in Courtney Street from Harcourt to Wreckyn Streets.	This area has undergone residential redevelopment over the past 5 - 20 years and there is only one block left for redevelopment, therefore characterising this as an area of ongoing change is drawing a long bow.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan retains the predominant Mixed Use Zone in the area bounded by Flemington Road, Peel Street, Capel Street, Courtney Street and Harcourt Street, with three pockets to be rezoned from the Residential 1 Zone to the Mixed Use Zone. The Mixed Use Zone is essentially a residential zone, providing some opportunities for complementary functions. It is acknowledged that much of the area has already undergone change. Therefore any "ongoing change" is likely to occur where development opportunities remain, is likely to be predominantly developed as residential.

## 2.0 Activities and land use

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>2.5 Residential</b>	I seek your explanation on the rezoning to "mix-used" development in areas which should be clearly define as residential. All inappropriate development such as "boutique development", shoe size apartments must be eliminated in this vicinity.		<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	Most of the precinct is presently included in a Mixed Use Zone (MUZ). Across the municipality this zone is typically applied as a buffer between the Capital City and the Residential 1 Zone. There are a few small pockets that are included within a Residential 1 Zone (R1Z) to the west of Peel street and on the corner of Courtney Street. The Structure Plan proposes to rezone these to the MUZ. The area between Peel, Victoria, Swanston and Grattan Streets is proposed to be rezoned from Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) to Capital City Zone (CCZ) as the MUZ has been unsuccessful in delivering land use diversity as it is predominantly a residential zone. The CCZ supports a strong mix of land uses by providing equal weighting to residential, commercial and retail functions. The zone dictates the land use parameters for what may occur on a site, built form controls are determined within the particular provisions and other sections of the planning scheme. The zone therefore has no impact on the size of developments or apartments constructed.

<b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>	Do not extend the Capital City Zone between Victoria Street and the University.		<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	The extension of the CCZ to the north of Victoria Street will enable a vibrant, active and liveable environment that provides for a diverse residential, worker and visitor population to complement the cluster of medical and education institutions in the knowledge precinct and the Queen Victoria Market vicinity. The CCZ provides equal weighting to residential, commercial and retail functions. This will also better integrate City North with the central city.
Single comment	<b>2.5 Residential</b>	Too much of the development in North and West Melbourne is for student housing - such a large quantity of this housing could become unsustainable. For a more sustainable future we need embryonic families which in turn need two bedroom units.		<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	
Single comment	<b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>	Much of the draft structure plan pays 'lip service' to existing uses, but the specific measures would undermine these objectives. Many of the areas identified are not requiring urban renewal. The narrative of the Draft Structure Plan reads like "spin" to cover up the actual objective, which appears to cram as many people as possible into the area with little regard for the current land use of these areas.		<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	

<b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>	The Capital City Zone as it has applied to the market precinct has proved to be an "evil" or destructive planning control that deprives existing owners of any process of involvement in planning decisions.		<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	
Single comment	<b>2.2 Industry</b>	I reject any industrial building development in the area that shares the same postal code		<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	
Single comment	<b>2.6 Retail/ Commercial</b>	Difficulties of businesses are due to the volume of through traffic in Peel Street, lack of pedestrian traffic along the west side of Peel Street (pedestrian traffic tends to disappear up the lane or up Victoria St away from the market) and the suitability of businesses that set up. Their problems are not related to the height of the retail ceiling.		<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	
Single comment	<b>2.5 Residential</b>	I reject any affordable housing development that shares the same postal code since there are already many existing. My suggestion is to upgrade all existing housing development in the area to the current design trend with a better architectural outlook		<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	

<b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>2.6 Retail/ Commercial</b>	Because of the sheer size of the Market it should not be the dominant factor in deciding the future. Commercial viability will make that decision. We cannot foresee all future commercial needs as they are always in ongoing change.		<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	

<b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
<b>Submissions received from organisations</b>					
Single comment	<b>2.0 Activities and Land Uses</b>	Include the blocks immediately to the south of Flemington Road as Capital City Zone.	This area is already under consideration for educational and/or health use and would support the precinct's specialised institutions and "round off" Haymarket. A mixed Use Zone would severely limit non-residential uses in this area and should be reconsidered.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	The Mixed Use Zone provides a suitable transition between the Capital City Zone and the Residential Zone to the west of the City North Structure Plan area.
Single comment	<b>2.5 Residential</b>	The intention to ensure the area has a residential component and that development does not preclude affordable accommodation is supported. Council should adopt a stronger target with respect to provision of affordable housing and develop to address the lack of housing choice provided in the area.		<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends that the City of Melbourne continue to investigate appropriate mechanisms to deliver 20 per cent affordable housing. To address the wider needs of housing diversity in the municipality, the City North Structure Plan recommends the preparation of a Housing Policy and the City of Melbourne work with the State and Federal Government, developers, institutions and community housing providers to support the delivery of affordable and diverse housing.
Single comment	<b>2.3 Institutional uses</b>	Consider helicopter access to service the Royal Children's Hospital and other tertiary hospitals (including an on-ground helipad).	In 15% of cases, the Royal Children's Hospital helipad will not be able to be used to various reasons such as weather. This on-ground helipad would be utilised by other hospitals in the precinct given the number of tertiary hospitals in the precinct and the Victorian Comprehensive Cancer Centre development. It would be useful if helicopter access was considered in the plan.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	Due to the specialised requirements of the hospitals, the selection of an appropriate helicopter landing site should be considered through a separate process.

<b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>2.0 Activities and Land Uses</b>	Develop a strategic plan for the Queen Victoria Market which identifies and attracts complementary uses.	There are many uses allowed as of right or discretionary, subject to planning permission in the Capital City Zone. The Structure Plan provides no details as to what users are to be encouraged and how. New uses may be complementary however may compete for valuable car parking provision, placing pressure on on-street parking.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	The City of Melbourne's long term strategy for Queen Victoria Market will identify ways to develop and enhance the market's role in light of the city's growth, community needs and consumer trends. The City of Melbourne wants to secure the future of the market and ensure its ongoing viability and relevance in a time of rapid change.
Single comment	<b>2.1 Activity Centres</b>	Define the meaning of new local centres and the type of services that will form part of this centre and how they will be encouraged into the area.	There is no common meaning in the Planning Scheme and more information is needed.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	It is intended that the 'local activity centres' expand upon the existing amenities to cater for the additional population growth and complement the existing land uses such as the market, universities, medical precinct, etc. The structure plan does not specify the exact land uses (as this can only be determined by the property market) it advocates for a change in zoning that will encourage a mix of land uses including retail, commercial, office, etc.

## 2.0 Activities and land use

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>2.5 Residential</b>	Do not increase the residential density and create a buffer of non-residential uses surrounding the Market or develop prescriptive requirements for residential developments that require the installation of effective noise attenuation measures.	Noise attenuation measures are necessary to ensure that new residents do not impact on the existing use rights of the Market. These measures should be set out in any future DDO affecting the Market and surrounding area, or alternatively permits should be conditioned allowing for noise attenuation measures for any new buildings and works. The increase in the residential population is of concern as the noise from activities within the Market and to and from the Market in the evening is not compatible with noise restrictions required in a residential zone. The Market anticipates intensifying the use of its site in the evening both in the summer and winter. Consistent objection to this type of activity as the residential community expands adjacent to the Market will inhibit its growth. The Market is a heritage asset and recognised as a significant open market. Therefore it is difficult to buffer the noise created by the patrons visiting the Market and the deliveries throughout the night. These conditions will exacerbate the conflict between the Market and residents.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan seeks for further integrate the market within the increasing community rather isolating it as an individual entity. The plan seeks to create a vibrant hub of activity around the market area both inside and outside of business hours. The intensity of land use that existing at the market is equivalent to many other capital city zone functions which are able to co-exist with various other land uses including residential. Elsewhere in the municipality noise attenuation measures are applied where there is a significant noise source such as the crowds at the stadiums or industrial noise. There is no evidence at this point in time to suggest that the operations occurring at the market are creating a significant or unreasonable noise source which would require noise attenuation measures.

<b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>2.6 Retail/ Commercial</b>	Do not refer to the Market's operating hours or product range.	We do not believe that these particular business activities are a relevant planning consideration to be dealt with in the Structure Plan and nor are they in keeping with the general broad concepts outlined elsewhere in the plan.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	City North is presently undergoing growth and change. The City of Melbourne's long term strategy for Queen Victoria Market will identify ways to develop and enhance the market's role in light of the city's growth, community needs and consumer trends. The City of Melbourne wants to secure the future of the market and ensure its ongoing viability and relevance in a time of rapid change.
Single comment	<b>2.5 Residential 2.6 Retail/ Commercial</b>	Consider the impact of the Queen Victoria Market on new residential uses.	Noise, light and freight may impact on new residences.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan seeks for further integrate the market within the increasing community rather isolating it as an individual entity. The plan seeks to create a vibrant hub of activity around the market area both inside and outside of business hours. The intensity of land use that existing at the market is equivalent to many other capital city zone functions which are able to co-exist with various other land uses including residential. Elsewhere in the municipality noise attenuation measures are applied where there is an significant noise source such as the crowds at the stadiums or industrial noise. There is no evidence at this point in time to suggest that the operations occurring at the market are creating a significant or unreasonable noise source which would require noise attenuation measures.

<b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Low	<b>2.4 Land use transition</b> <b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>	Increased density of development and activity in this inner city precinct and the opening up of the City North area to the central city by rezoning land use is supported. Bringing City North into the Capital City Zone makes sense given proximity to the CBD and links to the knowledge, bio precinct. The Capital City Zone allows for better integration of planning needs and transport planning for this area which is the gateway to the Elizabeth Street north end of the city compared to an Activity Centre.		<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	
Single comment	<b>2.0 Activities and land use</b>	Consider expanding on the narrative of Key Direction 1 especially around the growth of Melbourne's population which is a significant and challenging planning issue, in particular how this growth is balanced with the need to support the city's renowned liveability.		<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	

### 3.0 Urban structure and built form

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
<b>Submissions received from individuals</b>					
Medium	<b>3.2 Building heights</b> <b>3.4 Heritage</b>	Do not place a 40 metre height limit next to or over the Meat Market.	This will encourage transformation in height. The community expects that this site will not be altered.	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The mandatory height control of 14 metres will be retained in the northern side of Courtney Street, between Harcourt and Bedford Street.
			The Metropolitan Meat Market is one of the most important and significant heritage buildings in Melbourne.		
			The Meat Market should be specifically designated as not subject to redevelopment and Council should make it clear that any development adjacent to it must respect the height and heritage of the Meat Market.		
			There is insufficient regard for the heritage and built form of inner Melbourne. For example, the 24m height limit on the heritage listed Meat Market Craft Centre in Courtney Street, North Melbourne. A double storey heritage building with approximately and eight storey building is possible to be built (within the heritage facade) under the currently proposed plan.		

### 3.0 Urban structure and built form

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Medium	<b>3.3 Density</b>	Density doesn't mean high rise - Provide for a diverse housing stock in terms of scale, size, style and number of bedrooms.	<p>Housing should be provided for all household types, not just students and 1.5 person households. This will ensure there is a balanced community and mix of accommodation. Diverse communities are more sustainable in the long term as they are able to maintain a range of services and facilities useful to all age groups. Providing a diversity of accommodation will avoid hundreds of 40m square dog boxes which will inevitably lead to slums and segmenting the area of cheap student accommodation.</p> <p>The assumption is wrong that the only way to achieve increased population is by high-rise development, that is completely out of scale with existing built form of these communities. Higher density is not only achieved by high-rise. Much can be achieved through low to medium density development.</p> <p>To create a vibrant mix of residents and a mix of accommodation to avoid hundreds of 40m<sup>2</sup> dog boxes which will inevitably lead to slums and segmenting the area of cheap student accommodation.</p>	<b>Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	It is agreed that the style of development in City North should support a diverse community. The City of Melbourne will continue to advocate for a diversity of dwellings in new developments. However, the City of Melbourne has no statutory control over the number of dwellings or bedrooms provided within a development, or the number of people who ultimately inhabits these dwellings. The City North Structure Plan supports enhanced density in appropriate locations and provides a range of building heights to enable potential for a diversity of new development.

### 3.0 Urban structure and built form

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Medium	<b>3.3 Density</b>	Lower the density, proposed density is too high.	<p>The assumption is wrong that the only way to achieve increased population is by high-rise development, that is completely out of scale with existing built form of these communities. Higher density is not only achieved by high-rise. Much can be achieved through low to medium density development.</p> <p>The draft plan gives undue emphasis to density instead of other important issues such as heritage, architectural design, internal amenity, impact on neighbouring communities, social amenity and community.</p> <p>High rise isolates us from the natural environment.</p> <p>Too many people are being concentrated in this area.</p>	<b>Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	<p>Concerns regarding density are noted, however, due to various factors, densification of City North is already occurring. City North can be expected to continue to grow and change due to the State Government's investment in the redevelopment of the Royal Melbourne Hospital and Royal Women's Hospital, the investment of the University of Melbourne in new faculties to the south of the traditional Grattan Street boundary, the redevelopment of the Carlton United Brewery site and expansion of RMIT campus within this site.</p> <p>The City of Melbourne has decided to take a proactive approach to managing this growth and change over a long term 30 year period. The Structure Plan provides a mechanism for the City of Melbourne to appropriately balance future development pressures and address the needs and protect the values of the existing communities in a holistic manner. Increased density in appropriate locations provides many benefits including support for enhancement of community facilities and public transport services, the activation of streets within an area and more efficient use of land and resources.</p>

### 3.0 Urban structure and built form

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
As above - Medium	<b>As above - 3.3 Density</b>	As above - Lower the density, proposed density is too high.	There is no justification for the increase in the current population of North and West Melbourne which is approximately 150000. It is proposed in the City North Structure Plan that the population increases from 5500 to 19000.	<b>As above - Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	The City of Melbourne supports the State Government's investigation of the potential Metro Station as this would have a dramatic impact on access to the dense cluster medical, research and educational institutions in City North. The development of the Metro station in City North requires a complementary residential and worker density to be feasible. In addition, the Metro would be a catalyst for enhanced density. The Structure Plan seeks to achieve a range of densities suitable for the amenities provided and proposed in the area. For example locations which are most appropriate to accommodate increased density include areas with existing high frequency public transport infrastructure, (such as Elizabeth Street, Flemington Road and Swanston Street), and areas in proximity to proposed public transport infrastructure such as the Metro station, and areas in proximity to open space and conveniences.

### 3.0 Urban structure and built form

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
As above - Medium	<b>As above - 3.3 Density</b>	As above - Lower the density, proposed density is too high.	<p>There is evidence that the reliance on mid twentieth century concepts of high rise and high density is the source of much suffering if poorly planned and executed.</p> <p>City North is smaller than Docklands but the density is as high without the advantage of the waterfront and outlook for high rise buildings.</p>	<b>As above - Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	<p>There is a reduction in density towards established areas to ensure an appropriate transition and support a range low, medium and high density development. In order to respond to increased density and support the transition of this area, the Structure Plan identifies opportunities to enhance community infrastructure, open space, transport and sustainable infrastructure over a 30 year period.</p> <p>It should be noted that Docklands and City North have been subject to separate planning and design procedures with different intentions. Whilst the Structure Plan will allow for additional height, land use, population, housing diversity, community facilities, its not intended to be the same character of the Docklands. It should be noted Docklands was a brown field redevelopment site of a greater area with very few buildings and no existing community, where as the City North has an existing community, character and history which are considered when deciding upon the appropriateness of new built form.</p>

### 3.0 Urban structure and built form

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Medium	<b>3.0 Built form</b> <b>3.2 Building heights</b> <b>3.4 Heritage</b>	Have more regard for the built form and heritage of inner Melbourne with respect to the proposed building heights.	<p>The Design and Development Overlays should ensure new buildings respect the heritage context and are not too high adjacent to heritage buildings. The differing expectations between the design and development overlay and the treatment of heritage needs to be addressed. Much of the area is covered by a heritage overlay and this should be considered from a neighbourhood perspective.</p> <p>There is insufficient regard for the heritage and built form of inner Melbourne. For example, the 24m height limit on the heritage listed Meat Market Craft Centre in Courtney Street, North Melbourne. A double storey heritage building with approximately and eight storey building is possible to be built (within the heritage facade) under the currently proposed plan.</p> <p>Councillors and residents interpreted the contradiction as meaning less height because of heritage considerations, but VCAT maintained that the higher built form outcome was possible, absolutely unlimited by Heritage concerns.</p> <p>There are gross contradictions between Heritage controls and built form.</p>	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	In response to this feedback, clear performance based objectives for design and built form outcomes have been developed to ensure new development complements heritage and existing neighbourhood character. Proposed building heights have been lowered, or existing height limits have been retained, in areas with an a large number of heritage buildings which are protected by the Heritage Overlay. Lower street edge conditions have also been introduced in some streets where there are a large number of heritage buildings protected by the Heritage Overlay. In addition, the City of Melbourne is in the process of conducting a City North Heritage Review to investigate the suitability of including additional sites being protected by the Heritage Overlay. Clause 22.04 Heritage in the Capital City Zone and 22.05 Heritage Outside the Capital City Zone provides direction regarding the treatment of heritage places.

### 3.0 Urban structure and built form

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Medium	<b>3.2 Building heights</b>	Introduce mandatory height controls	<p>The building heights proposed are excessive and not mandatory. This is particularly dangerous given that the proposed discretionary height limits will result in significantly higher buildings. For example, based on recent VCAT decisions, the buildings in the structure plans with indicated heights of 60 metres could actually go to approximately 135 metres (ie 40/45 storeys or a 150% increase).</p> <p>Mandatory height controls create clarity and certainty for the community and VCAT. Developers see the discretionary heights as a starting point to argue up from/will push boundaries if they are discretionary.</p> <p>If height limits are advisory, we can expect to have to fight, proposal after proposal, as now, where developers attempt to stretch the envelope. If there are to be mandatory limits, + or - 20%, as has been suggested, we can predict that pretty much every development proposal will take advantage of the +. The net effect of 20% is that 5 storeys becomes de facto 6 storeys.</p>	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	<p>The City North Structure Plan includes clear performance based objectives for design and built form outcomes. The street edge height limits are mandatory and the upper height limit is discretionary. However any proposed building which exceeds this upper limit must demonstrate how it complies with the design objectives established in the Structure Plan.</p> <p>The existing mandatory height control of 14 metres will be retained along the northern side of Courtney Street, western and eastern side Capel Street ie the western side of Peel Street - with the exception of the land bounded by Courtney, Capel, Bedford and Peel Streets.</p>

### 3.0 Urban structure and built form

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Medium	<b>3.2 Building heights</b>	Lower building heights.	<p>High buildings do not produce a human scale.</p> <p>High buildings are detrimental to the privacy, access to light, overshadowing and air of adjacent buildings.</p> <p>High rise development creates a loss of community and is isolating from the natural environment.</p> <p>This will create wind downdrafts creating an unpleasant environment to live in or to walk around.</p> <p>High rise development would be detrimental to the nature, character and ambience of these historic inner city areas which contradicts the objective to "Build on the Unique Qualities of the Local Area". The needs and amenity of existing communities is also ignored.</p> <p>The assumption is wrong that the only way to achieve increased population is by high-rise development, that is completely out of scale with existing built form of these communities. Higher density is not only achieved by high-rise. Much can be achieved through low to medium density development.</p>	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	In response to this feedback, clear performance based objectives for design and built form outcomes have been developed to ensure new development complements heritage, existing neighbourhood character and protects a high level of amenity within buildings and on the street. Proposed building heights have been lowered, or existing height limits have been retained, in areas with an interface with the Residential 1 Zone or an existing low built form control to provide an appropriate transition. Lower street edge conditions have also been introduced in some streets where there are a large number of heritage buildings protected by the Heritage Overlay. Clause 22.01 - Urban Design Within the Capital City Zone provides direction regarding built form in order to protect neighbourhood character. Overshadowing upon existing residents will be protected under the existing Melbourne Planning Scheme provisions which allow for 5 hours of sunlight. Clause 22.02 (Sunlight to Public Places) will prevent overshadowing public open space between 11am and 2pm.

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
As above - Medium	<b>As above - 3.2 Building heights</b>	As above - Lower building heights.	The draft structure plan appears to cram as many people as possible into the area with little regard for the history, heritage, current land use and built form of the areas.	<b>As above - Change made to the structure plan</b>	The Mixed Use Zone will ensure that the standard amenity tests (Rescode) apply for new residential development applications. Planning applications for tall buildings which may cause wind affects will require expert wind tunnel testing at a planning permit stage. The recommendations of the testing may include alterations to the podium, canopy or height.
			There is evidence that high rise and high density is the source of much suffering if poorly planned and executed.		
			Too much reliance has been placed on the once proposed Metro Line to justify the high-rise development. Much of this development will proceed without the Metro Line being approved to the detriment of the inner area.		

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
As above - Medium	<b>As above - 3.2 Building heights</b>	As above - Lower building heights.	We do not need another Docklands experiment.	<b>As above - Change made to the structure plan</b>	Docklands and City North have been subject to separate planning and design procedures with different intentions. Whilst the structure plan will allow for additional height, land use, population, housing diversity, community facilities, its not intended to be the same character of the Docklands. It should be noted Docklands was a brown field redevelopment site of a greater area with very few buildings and no existing community, where as the City North has an existing community, character and history which are considered when deciding upon the appropriateness of new built form.
Low	<b>3.2 Building heights 3.4 Heritage 3.5 Neighbourhood character</b>	Do not change the proposed height control from 14 metres to 16 metres on the northern side of Courtney Street, eastern side of Capel Street and western side of Peel Street. Create a greater transition from the heights along Flemington Road to Courtney Street.	<p>Increasing the height limit to 24m would create an awful asymmetry with the other side of Courtney Street which comprises historic single and double storey terraces. Almost all the properties in this area are on small titles dominated by heritage architecture and thus a contradictory message will be sent. Inflated heights will result in the loss of heritage which is not acceptable to the community.</p> <p>Higher buildings will have a detrimental effect on the privacy, access to light, overshadowing and air of adjacent building, in addition to the character/aesthetics of the street and traffic build up and flow.</p>	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	In response to this feedback, the existing mandatory height control of 14 metres will be retained along the northern side of Courtney Street, western side of eastern side Capel Street and the western side of Peel Street - with the exception of the land bounded by Courtney, Capel, Bedford and Peel Streets, due to its proximity to the Haymarket tram interchange and proposed Metro site, in addition to open spaces.

### 3.0 Urban structure and built form

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
As above - Low	<b>3.2 Building heights</b> <b>3.4 Heritage</b> <b>3.5 Neighbourhood character</b>	As above - Do not change the proposed height control from 14 metres to 16 metres on the northern side of Courtney Street, eastern side of Capel Street and western side of Peel Street. Create a greater transition from the heights along Flemington Road to Courtney Street.	Increased height limits will result in the loss of valued local character.	<b>As above - Change made to the structure plan</b>	As above
			This area does not need urban renewal.		
			This contradicts City of Melbourne's past and future Planning Decisions.		
			In Zone 3, bounded by Capel and Peel Sts it is not appropriate to change the height from 14m to 16m because the height of the first floor is generally determined by the height of the first floor of the Victorian dwellings as in TP 2010-267 at 69-71 Peel St.		
			Applying a 20m or 8 storey height expectation takes away the certainty of housing for residents of the Ministry of Housing on the corner of Courtney and Harcourt Sts.		
The North side of Courtney Street has been carefully developed over the past 20 years in a way that respects the heritage of the street. This type of development is the only type appropriate for the area.					

### 3.0 Urban structure and built form

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
As above - Low	<b>3.2 Building heights</b> <b>3.4 Heritage</b> <b>3.5 Neighbourhood character</b>	<p>As above - Do not change the proposed height control from 14 metres to 16 metres on the northern side of Courtney Street, eastern side of Capel Street and western side of Peel Street. Create a greater transition from the heights along Flemington Road to Courtney Street.</p>	<p>It is not clear why Courtney Street is included in the Draft Structure Plan as most of this area is established residential heritage buildings. No buildings from Bedford Street to Harcourt Street are over 12 metres. The south side of Courtney Street is almost all 19th century cottages and terraces. 24m heights would not be a transition, however a frontal assault on the 19th century heritage of North Melbourne. This does not meet the objective in the draft Structure Plan to "respect the scale of the [area's] heritage buildings". This is an example of the disconnect between the objectives of the Draft Structure Plan and the actual measure proposed as respecting the scale of heritage buildings should also apply to the area around Courtney Street.</p> <p>This area is almost a complete Victorian Streetscape. The idea that developing the opposite side to 24 metres represents a "transition" is nonsense and undermines the objectives of the draft plan to take account of the history and heritage of the area.</p> <p>Courtney Street between Wreckyn and Harcourt Streets is almost an entirely established residential precinct on both sides of the road.</p>	<b>As above - Change made to the structure plan</b>	As above

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
As above - Low	<b>3.2 Building heights</b> <b>3.4 Heritage</b> <b>3.5 Neighbourhood character</b>	As above - Do not change the proposed height control from 14 metres to 16 metres on the northern side of Courtney Street, eastern side of Capel Street and western side of Peel Street. Create a greater transition from the heights along Flemington Road to Courtney Street.	<p>The maximum height of existing buildings on this side of the road and in the adjacent area is 9 to 12 metres.</p> <p>The area around Courtney Street is a pleasant residential area with the lovely Meat Market as a neighbour, if it is overshadowed with high rise apartment blocks it will lose its character and maybe turn into a slum and a wind tunnel.</p>	<b>As above - Change made to the structure plan</b>	As above
Low	<b>3.4 Heritage</b>	Document and preserve the built form, history and heritage of buildings in City North and upgrade heritage controls.	<p>To celebrate the area's distinct history - not wipe it out. Heritage can't be replaced. Actively preserve it. Be mindful of what you put next to a heritage building / area.</p> <p>To ensure future generations are able to view and be aware of the historical rich pattern of built form development in the area. To protect important buildings from the 20th century.</p> <p>Our main concern is to keep the historical aspects of these areas, once high-rise dense buildings appear, these will be lost forever.</p> <p>Along Flemington Road there are a number of existing 19th century buildings. Currently two apartment blocks are being developed. Their design pays no attention to the existing built form. These are in an area which has a Heritage Overlay. Clearly these Heritage controls were of no effect.</p>	<b>Noted - No change to the structure plan. City North Heritage Review commenced</b>	The City of Melbourne has commenced a Heritage Review for City North. This Review will investigate sites for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay via a Planning Scheme Amendment.

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
As above - Low	<b>As above - 3.4 Heritage</b>	As above - Document and preserve the built form, history and heritage of buildings in City North and upgrade heritage controls.	<p>The character of these funky neighbourhoods is being eroded by overdevelopment. A number of old pubs have been knocked down and multistorey apartment buildings built instead. Also, 1920s heritage is as important as 1980s heritage, but nothing is being done to preserve it.</p> <p>The plan has insufficient detail as to how the review of heritage grading and precincts will occur and also what the intent is to increase or decrease the level of protection offered to heritage assets.</p>	<b>As above - Noted - No change to the structure plan. City North Heritage Review commenced</b>	As above
Low	<b>3.2 Building heights</b>	Reduce the proposed heights opposite the Queen Victoria Market	<p>This does not serve to protect existing D graded buildings which contribute to setting the market in its historic context.</p> <p>The height controls were set after rigorous investigation as part of C61. The strategic justification is inadequate in light of modelling and planning panel evidence considered over the last decade.</p>	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The street edge height along Victoria Street has been reduced to 20 metres to respond to the heritage context of the Queen Victoria Market. The mandatory building height of 14 metres has been retained along Peel Street. The heights in the area to the south of Victoria Street are being considered through the Central City (Hoddle Grid) Built Form Review.

### 3.0 Urban structure and built form

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Low	<b>3.1 Amenity</b>	Develop internal design controls.	<p>No statements in the plan regarding internal amenity in the Draft Structure Plan. Developers argue that providing bedrooms with borrowed light and ventilation is provision of affordable housing. This is not good enough for future residents and public health outcomes. to limit west and east facing windows. It is unclear how things such as zero carbon and high amenity could be delivered within the current planning scheme or without any mechanisms outlined to date.</p> <p>The plan should provide protection to the access to the sun and outlook and reasonable levels of privacy.</p> <p>To create a vibrant mix of residents and a mix of accommodation to avoid hundreds of 40m2 dog boxes which will inevitably lead to slums and segmenting the area of cheap student accommodation.</p>	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan seeks to achieve a sustainable and liveable precinct. Chapter 3: Urban Structure and Built Form identifies Principles, Strategies & Actions to achieve this. Strategy 4 details design performance criteria including the penetration of natural light to all floors and Strategy 7 provides direction on creating high quality, liveable dwellings. There are some limitations however on what can be achieved within the planning controls with regard to internal amenity.
Low	<b>3.1 Amenity</b>	Include further detail as to how the precinct will be liveable and how this will be measured.	What will distinguish this area, proposed to have high rise buildings, from Docklands or the CBD - Neither of these areas are considered to be liveable and both drag down Melbourne's previously held reputation as a liveable city.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan seeks to achieve a sustainable and liveable precinct. Chapter 3: Urban Structure and Built Form identifies Principles, Strategies & Actions to achieve this. In particular Strategy 1 provides design and built form outcomes that instigate height controls that will create sustainable development patterns, which respond to the existing rich heritage character and which provide a transition to existing low-scale suburbs.

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Low	<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b> <b>3.2 Building heights</b>	Do not arbitrarily mandate building heights and include detailed urban design requirements/comprehensive built form outcomes in the Structure Plan area and interface area.	<p>Developments should be considered on their merits.</p> <p>In many cases, height controls and other planning controls are prohibitive/discourage good development. Over-prescribed planning controls such as mandatory height limits significantly reduce the likelihood of these issues being resolved due to the restriction in allowable development.</p>	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	<p>The City North Structure Plan includes clear performance based objectives for design and built form outcomes. The street edge height limits are mandatory and the upper height limit is discretionary. However any proposed building which exceeds this upper limit must demonstrate how it complies with the design objectives established in the Structure Plan.</p> <p>The existing mandatory height control of 14 metres will be retained along the northern side of Courtney Street, western side of eastern side Capel Street and the western side of Peel Street - with the exception of the land bounded by Courtney, Capel, Bedford and Peel Streets.</p>

### 3.0 Urban structure and built form

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Low	<b>3.1 Amenity</b>	Protect the access to the sun, outlook and reasonable levels of privacy to existing residential development and low rise structures.	Melburnians in the inner and central part of the city have a great quality of life. The plan is silent on how existing amenity will be protected. Height controls in the plan are not designed to protect existing residents unless their property has a heritage overlay. Existing development should not be in permanent darkness and shadow.	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	In response to this feedback, clear performance based objectives for design and built form outcomes have been developed to ensure new development complements heritage, existing neighbourhood character and protects a high level of amenity within buildings and on the street. Clause 22.01 - Urban Design Within the Capital City Zone provides direction regarding built form in order to protect neighbourhood character. Overshadowing upon existing residents will be protected under the existing Melbourne Planning Scheme provisions which allow for 5 hours of sunlight. Clause 22.02 (Sunlight to Public Places) will prevent overshadowing public open space between 11am and 2pm. The Mixed Use Zone will ensure that the standard amenity tests (Rescode) apply for new residential development applications.

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Low	<b>3.2 Building heights</b> <b>3.5 Neighbourhood character</b>	Reduce building heights to a three storey height limit along Royal Parade and Flemington Road.	<p>The proposed height restrictions are too tall for these residential areas. Flemington Road is a gateway into the City of Melbourne with Royal Park on one side and residential buildings on the other, high rise apartment blocks would detract from the uniqueness of Melbourne as a liveable city.</p> <p>The area is mostly residential and heritage listed. The mostly 2 storey height limit needs to be retained. The character of the area needs to be maintained. Royal Parade is characterised by residential and heritage and does not need more intensive retail or commercial development as indicated by the 40m height limit and 80% active frontage.</p>	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The southern ends of Royal Parade and Flemington Road have a high level of development due to the pattern of development of the hospitals and the University of Melbourne. To accommodate additional residential and employment growth, to reinforce the role of these streets as civic spines and to improve the pedestrian experience an increased height limit of 40m is proposed. A 40m height limit will create a stronger definition to the streetscape, a greater intensity of activity, respect the scale of the existing heritage buildings and will not dominate the important landscape qualities of these boulevards.
Single comment	<b>3.4 Heritage</b> <b>3.5 Neighbourhood character</b>	Develop a separate detailed plan for the Queen Victoria Market and surrounding streets that takes full account of the historic and vibrant character of the QVM precinct.	The QVM precinct needs to be considered separately as it is an essential part of what gives Melbourne its character. There have already been poor decisions made in Elizabeth Street that detract from the character of the QVM precinct. The destruction of the Stork Hotel in Elizabeth Street is an example of this. An historic building and important community and cultural asset has been removed and it can never be restored. This precinct requires very careful, specific and considered planning.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	Council's long term strategy for Queen Victoria Market will identify ways to develop and enhance the market's role in light of the city's growth, community needs and consumer trends. The City of Melbourne wants to secure the future of the market and ensure its ongoing viability and relevance in a time of rapid change.

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>3.2 Building heights</b>	Include Bouverie and Leicester Streets south of Queensberry Street in the built form vision of the north side.	With the focus on Lincoln Square and Little Carlton, the whole north side should be included and form part of that project. This division is artificial and will promote low quality building which has thus far occurred south of Queensberry Street. Thus the podium concept should apply across the whole area and create a common amenity.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan includes a mandatory Street edge height limit for Leicester and Bouverie Streets south Queensbury Street consistent with those provided north of Queensbury Street.
Single comment	<b>3.2 Building heights</b>	Consider increasing proposed height limit on Elizabeth Street.	At present the CBD, Parkville and North Melbourne feel disconnected. Elizabeth Street is a strategic link and gateway to the CBD and integrate nodes of activity at QVM, RMIT, Melbourne Uni and the medical precinct. The streetscape is similar to a Parisian grand boulevard and presents opportunity for it to be transformed into a great boulevard that acts as a spine for the precinct.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	To accommodate additional residential and employment growth, to reinforce the role of Elizabeth Street as a civic spine and to improve the pedestrian experience an increased height limit of 40m is proposed. A 40m height limit will create a stronger definition to the streetscape, a greater intensity of activity, respect the scale of the existing heritage buildings and will not dominate the important landscape qualities of this important boulevards.

### 3.0 Urban structure and built form

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>3.2 Building heights</b>	Increase the proposed height along Victoria Street from 24m to 40m	<p>40m buildings can be accommodated on Victoria Street with no physical or amenity impacts onto the Queen Victoria Market (QVM), including overshadowing. Built form at the scale of 40m will provide a strong urban edge to the QVM and would allow Council to set a high architectural and urban design outcome which will contribute to the revitalisation of the area and enhance the setting and value of the QVM.</p> <p>The proposed height control is disconnected from the strategic aims for Victoria Street as a main boulevard, as this height control matches the smaller streets which will not elevate Victoria Street to a boulevard and civic activity centre. The affected area of Victoria Street is well separated from North Melbourne by both Peel Street and Capel Street which are both wide streets. 40m will have no adverse visual or amenity impacts particularly given the backdrop of the central city and separation by these major roads. The draft City North Structure Plan nominates higher built form to the eastern end of Victoria Street and there is no discernable difference between the north side of Victoria Street between Swanston and O'Connell Street and the north side of Victoria Street between O'Connell and Peel Street that warrants a different approach. The height should be comparable to Elizabeth Street and Flemington Road.</p>	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan proposes a 24 metre height, with a 20 metre height limit at the street edge with a 4 metre setback along the north side of Victoria Street adjacent the Queen Victoria Market. This is an increase from the current height control of 14 metres which is considered too low in the context of the existing public transport and retail activity along Victoria Street. The proposed height control is considered appropriate for new development to integrate with the existing character and heritage of the area and complement the Queen Victoria Market vicinity. The height also provides a transition in scale between the 14 metre height control along Peel Street to the higher scale of Elizabeth Street and the Hoddle Grid.

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>3.2 Building heights</b>	Reduce or remove mandatory floor to ceiling heights.	The structure plan proposal for a minimum 4m ground floor and 3.6 for upper levels is not aligned with contemporary residential development which is closer to 3m. A mandatory approach will be counter productive to the provision of affordable housing.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	Buildings that are designed to be flexible in use are more sustainable as they can be adapted over time. In commercial buildings the floor to ceiling height is 4 metres and in residential buildings is 3.5 metres.
Single comment	<b>3.2 Building heights</b>	Include further information about sustainable development.	Both documents are totally inadequate in their discussion and requirement of sustainable development. Tall buildings are not sustainable or flexible buildings. There is no discussion of this issue or requirement for buildings to demonstrate that they optimise density and sustainability.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	Sustainable built form is discussed in detail in chapter 3: Urban Structure and Built Form and chapter 7: Sustainable Infrastructure.
Single comment	<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>	Further vision and detail in the architect's impressions of the structure plan sites is needed.	These impressions suggest that development will proceed in the usual cost-cutting way - that is ignoring the exciting possibility of creating something of true architectural excellence with innovative, world-leading, sustainable design.	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The images in the City North Structure Plan have been refined to improve the visual detail regarding the propositions. A three dimensional model has been included to demonstrate how the built form of the area may change in the future. Street sections have also been included to better demonstrate a visual impression of how these streets may be upgraded over time.

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>	Reconsider zero setbacks and no podiums.	This will not deliver human scale. This is likely to create wind tunnels and unpleasant environments. This is likely to create overshadowing.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	<p>In response to this feedback, clear performance based objectives for design and built form outcomes have been developed to ensure new development protects a high level of amenity for existing buildings and on the street. Lower street edge conditions have also been introduced in some streets, with a set back for upper levels to create a human scale at street level. Clause 22.01 - Urban Design Within the Capital City Zone provides direction regarding built form in order to protect neighbourhood character. Overshadowing upon existing residents will be protected under the existing Melbourne Planning Scheme provisions which allow for 5 hours of sunlight. Clause 22.02 (Sunlight to Public Places) will prevent overshadowing public open space between 11am and 2pm. The Mixed Use Zone will ensure that the standard amenity tests (Rescode) apply for new residential development applications.</p> <p>Planning applications for tall buildings which may cause wind affects will require expert wind tunnel testing at a planning permit stage. The recommendations of the testing may include alterations to the podium, canopy or height.</p>

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>3.3 Density</b>	Increase public transport provision before density is increased.	Local public transport is already under pressure. The Metro Rail Tunnel has no time-line and budget and is at least 10 years down the track.	<b>Noted - change made to the structure plan</b>	<p>The Metro station is not the only trigger for change in City North as this is already underway due to the expansion of key institutions in the area, the Carlton United Brewery redevelopment, and State Government investment in medical facilities. City North is an appropriate area to direct growth to as it accommodates a large number of jobs and is located in proximity to the city, enabling opportunities for walking and cycling. The City North Structure Plan will assist to manage this growth and change. City North is well serviced by trams, buses and Flagstaff and Melbourne Central stations to the south. The reliability of bus and tram services is impacted by traffic and insufficient priority at intersections.</p> <p>The City North Structure Plan proposes upgrades to streets to enhance the priority given to public transport. In addition, the City of Melbourne will use the City North Structure Plan and the Transport Strategy (draft 2011) to advocate to the State Government for investment in the Metro to serve the growing residential and worker community, in addition to extensions to the tram network to create new routes.</p>
Single comment	<b>3.3 Density</b>	While most people would agree with increased densification it must be done with great care as it has the potential to overwhelm and destroy existing urban villages.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>3.1 Amenity</b>	The plan opens the door to significant impairment of the quality of life of residents in the area. Public benefits of the plan may be slow, while private development activity will be immediate.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	
Single comment	<b>3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form</b>	Can we have something other than concrete, metal and glass boxes with gaudy, colourful bits stuck on?		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	
Single comment	<b>3.1 Amenity</b> <b>3.4 Heritage</b>	Parkville is a heritage asset which is an unique intact Victorian residential precinct with its supporting shops and amenities e.g. churches, halls etc. Parkville is still very largely intact and provides an important amenity to the knowledge precinct and an important heritage asset to Victorians. Parkville appeals as a village heritage precinct not removed from the knowledge precinct, but		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	
Single comment	<b>3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form</b>	Are planning applications going to be assessed based on what density they deliver? This is a very blunt tool. Would a density measure be given priority over other important issues such as heritage, architectural design, internal amenity, impact on neighbouring properties?		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form</b>	The built form review does not recognise the special character and scale of the western side of Elizabeth Street between Bourke Street and Queen Victoria Market. This is a streetscape of mixed period buildings mostly on small sites that deserves special protection under built form and other urban design controls that will protect and enhance the existing urban fabric.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The Central City (Hoddle Grid) Built Form Review is a separate project which has informed the City North Structure Plan.
Single comment	<b>3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form</b>	Retain site by site control over exactly what is and what is not built.	I am concerned about the degree of control the City will have on developers, who will get access to prime sites for mixed-use development. If this can be ruled over by VCAT, we will have the current, unacceptable situation.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City of Melbourne has decided to take a proactive approach to managing the growth and change of City North over a long term 30 year period. The City North Structure Plan provides a mechanism for the City of Melbourne to appropriately balance future development pressures and address the needs and protect the values of the existing communities in a holistic manner. The Melbourne Planning Scheme triggers site by site evaluation of a proposal where a permit is required.
Single comment	<b>3.3 Density</b>	There will be insufficient transport for more intense residential development, seeing that both the University and the hospitals are undergoing expansion and are bringing in hundreds more commuters who will be encouraged to use public transport.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>3.1 Amenity 3.3 Density 3.4 Heritage</b>	Much of the draft structure plan pays 'lip service' to heritage, but the specific measures would undermine these objectives. Many of the areas identified are not requiring urban renewal. The narrative of the Draft Structure Plan reads like "spin" to cover up the actual objective, which appears to cram as many people as possible into the area with little regard for the history, heritage and built form of these areas. The needs and amenity of existing communities is also ignored.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	
Single comment	<b>3.2 Building heights</b>	Only include the strip along Flemington Road in area 6. Do not change the height limits beyond this without a full survey of the current built form, heritage and community impact.	Whilst some development along Flemington Road would be appropriate, Area 6 includes a large number of existing 3 storey residential buildings. Mary Street is included entirely within Area 6. This is a narrow street that is largely residential. It includes a few 19th Century terraces on its north side. Building a 40 metre building in Mary Street would be disastrous. It would also be clearly contrary to the Draft Structure Plan's Key Direction 3 to "cultivate the characterful backstreet neighbourhood".	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan retains the 14 metre mandatory height limit along the northern side of Courtney Street and includes a transitional height of 24 metres towards the 40 metre height control on Flemington Road. This transition of heights is considered appropriate given the proximity of the area to the Haymarket tram interchange and proposed Metro site, in addition to open spaces.

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>3.0 Urban Structure and Built Form</b>	The universities should be given greater flexibility as to what they build.	The emphasis should be about creating an intelligent precinct.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	It is important that university and other institutional buildings are integrated with the activity and surrounding development pattern of the city. Therefore universities will be required to follow the same built form controls.
Single comment	<b>3.4 Heritage</b>	Lack of respect for existing heritage will be made worse under the draft plan. The Draft Structure Plan states that development should "respect the scale of [the area's] heritage buildings". Development is already taking place in areas of North Melbourne with a heritage overlay. This development often fails to respect the heritage and history of the area. There are already examples of the appropriate way ahead. The scale of this development, also in Villiers Street, incorporates the area's heritage and has appropriate scale.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	
Single comment	<b>3.3 Density</b>	Amend discrepancies in future density and population projections.	The document indicates a density of 320 residents per hectare, which over 130 hectares = 41,600 residents. The report notes that there is to be an increase to 19,000. Another page refers to a density of 400 residents which would equate to 52,000 people.	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The discrepancies regarding future density and population projections have been corrected throughout the City North Structure Plan.

### 3.0 Urban structure and built form

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b> <b>3.2 Building heights</b>	Enhance the height controls of the Design and Development Overlay 32 (DDO32) applying to the area to the immediate west of City North (181-189 Capel Street) to a minimum of 20 metres.	<p>The revision to the DDO 32 will enable complementary development in appropriate locations on the Structure Plan area's western fringe. The site is located at the confluence of three 'proposed activity centres', opposite two small pocket parks and is near excellent public transport accessibility . It is in proximity to the CBD, Queen Victoria Market and wide range of services, education and employment opportunities within the Parkville Precinct. There are no site specific heritage listings on the property.</p> <p>The mandatory 14m height limit is inappropriate. Higher built forms can meet the emerging built form objectives. The location of the places is very close to proposed areas of built form enhancement along Peel and Courtney Streets. This siting provides the opportunity for a built form of greater than 14m in height, as it will be read more as part of the taller Peel / Courtney Street precincts. Development over 14m can still meet the current Design Objectives for DDO32, which are likely to be revisited due to higher built forms envisaged in the Structure Plan (and re-casting of the references to the 'scale' of these areas). There is potential to provide a strong visual frame and a range of vibrant ground floor active and upper floor residential uses which would enhance surveillance and public usage of the pocket parks on Courtney Street.</p>	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The site is outside the City North Structure Plan area. It is considered that the 14 metre height control provides an appropriate transition between the City North area and the established residential area of North Melbourne, bearing in mind the large number of heritage properties in the vicinity.

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>	Tower buildings should only be allowed on carefully designated sites where their envelope is clearly specified. All other development should be strictly within the designated podium height level. Towers generally spoil development by requiring excessive car parking below and above ground and making the buildings less flexible and sustainable.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	
Single comment	<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>	Introduce mandatory requirements for sustainable features including orientation, cross ventilation, open air clothes drying, avoidance of air conditioners.	It is unclear how this could be delivered within current planning scheme or with any mechanisms outlined to date.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	These matters are dealt with through the building permit process. At the planning permit stage the details and specification of building design are notional. Therefore it would be premature to mandate sustainable features at this early stage.
Single comment	<b>3.2 Building heights</b>	Reduce building heights around the Haymarket		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan considers the Haymarket as an appropriate area to increase building heights given that it is at the intersection of several tram corridors and the cluster of medical institutions.

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
<b>Submissions received from organisations</b>					
Low	<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b> <b>3.2 Building heights</b>	Do not arbitrarily mandate building heights and include detailed urban design requirements/comprehensive built form outcomes.	Sympathetic, appropriate and quality design is far more important. More information should be provided about how the Council will guide appropriate built form around the Market. Whilst mandatory heights can minimise the impact of tall buildings, there should be more design objectives that ensure compatibility with its historic surrounds. Detailed urban design requirements should accompany any proposed mandatory height controls. The current built form controls are succinct and vague and open up the planning scheme to interpretation. Many proposals have exceeded the recommended height limit even though the design objectives are not met. There is no consistency in decision making and despite guidelines having a statutory basis in the planning scheme, they are never adhered to.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan includes clear performance based objectives for design and built form outcomes. The street edge height limits are mandatory and the upper height limit is discretionary. However any proposed building which exceeds this upper limit must demonstrate how it complies with the design objectives established in the Structure Plan. The existing mandatory height control of 14 metres will be retained along the northern side of Courtney Street, western side of eastern side Capel Street and the western side of Peel Street - with the exception of the land bounded by Courtney, Capel, Bedford and Peel Streets.
			Mandatory height controls are only supported in specific circumstances.		
Single comment	<b>3.3 Density</b>	The structure planning process that will encourage increased density of development and activity in this precinct is supported.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>3.2 Building heights</b>	Reconsider proposed heights south of the Queen Victoria Market to recognise the demise of the CBD transition or stepping up of heights concept.	Whilst recognising the heritage value of parts of Peel Street this should not produce an incongruous built form profile (one side significantly different to the other) in what is to become an increasingly important thoroughfare leading to Haymarket.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The heights in the area to the south of the Queen Victoria Market are being considered through the Central City (Hoddle Grid) Built Form Review.
Single comment	<b>3.2 Building heights</b>	Consider increasing the common 40m height limit.	The 40m height limit may be too restrictive, particularly along Flemington Road. This is not to say that there could not be a maximum podium height.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	Clear performance based objectives for design and built form outcomes have been developed to ensure new development complements heritage and existing neighbourhood character and reinforces great streets. A height limit of 40 metres along key boulevards will create a stronger definition to the streetscape and enable a greater level of activity in a manner which respects the scale of existing heritage buildings and does not dominate the important landscape qualities of these boulevards.
Single comment	<b>3.2 Building heights</b>	Reconsider podium height proposal	It is unclear why a mandatory podium height is proposed, particularly as this is presented within a range.	<b>Change made to the structure plan.</b>	Clear performance based objectives for design and built form outcomes, including street edge conditions, have been developed to ensure new development complements heritage and existing neighbourhood character and reinforces great streets. A street edge condition will allow for a better integration of new development into existing heritage streetscapes.

### 3.0 Urban structure and built form

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>3.2 Building heights</b> <b>3.4 Heritage</b>	Consider built form proposals to support the growth/change of the Queen Victoria Market	The Market recognises the rationale for restricting the height limit within the State significant site including the car park for the purpose of maintaining its historic setting. However, large scale high rise developments on small allotments are being permitted around the immediate vicinity compromising the Market's role as the dominant element in the landscape. The Market's mandatory height limit restricts the Market's potential to grow to accommodate the needs of its visitor. Although the potential to develop the underdeveloped car park may have an impact on the heritage setting, it will also relieve pressure on the heritage buildings by accommodating additional services and facilities including cool stores and provide appropriate revenue to put back into the conservation management of the culturally significant site.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City of Melbourne's long term strategy for Queen Victoria Market will identify ways to develop and enhance the market's role in light of the city's growth, community needs and consumer trends. The City of Melbourne wants to secure the future of the market and ensure its ongoing viability and relevance in a time of rapid change. The City of Melbourne is working with market management, the State Government and other stakeholders to develop initiatives that will position QVM to keep pace and compete with other retailers and ensure that QVM remains a great place for Melburnians to shop and come together long into the future. The enhancement of the market will not take place overnight. The City of Melbourne is taking a long-term approach to ensure that any changes made to this precious landmark are well-considered and made with minimal impact to the people who currently trade at and use the market. The renewal of the market is likely to stretch over the next decade.
Single comment	<b>3.4 Heritage</b>	Include Queen Victoria Market in the heritage overlay	We note that whilst the plan refers to Queen Victoria Market as one of the heritage listed places within the study area, figure 2.1 does not show the spaces as part of the heritage overlay. The Market is covered by HO7 and we therefore believe that this plan should show the Market hatched.	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The heritage map has been updated in the City North Structure Plan to accurately reflect the Heritage Overlay which covers the Queen Victoria Market. The City of Melbourne is in the process of conducting a City North Heritage Review to investigate the suitability of including additional sites in the Heritage Overlay.

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>3.4 Heritage</b>	The objectives of local policy 21.05, 22.04 and Schedule 14 to the Design and Development Overlay should inform the heritage values of the Market in the plan.	These have not been sufficiently addressed in the plan.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The objectives of 21.05 and 22.04 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme will still apply. A Planning Scheme Amendment will implement the built form objectives in the City North Structure Plan. Where appropriate, the objectives within Schedule 14 to the Design and Development will be integrated.
Single comment	<b>3.4 Heritage</b>	Further detail regarding how the development within the area is going to be compatible with the heritage setting of the Queen Victoria Market.		<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	Clear performance based objectives for design and built form outcomes have been developed to ensure new development complements heritage and existing neighbourhood character. Proposed building heights have been lowered, or existing height limits have been retained, in pockets near the Queen Victoria Market. Lower street edge conditions have also been introduced in Victoria Street opposite the Queen Victoria Market. In addition, the City of Melbourne is in the process of conducting a City North Heritage Review to investigate the suitability of including additional sites being protected by the Heritage Overlay. Clause 22.04 Heritage in the Capital City Zone and 22.05 Heritage Outside the Capital City Zone provides direction regarding the treatment of heritage places.

<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>3.2 Building heights</b>	A recent number of planning approvals have allowed for demolition of modest buildings that contribute to the streetscape to be replaced by oversized towers on small allotments which exceed the maximum building heights recommended in the planning scheme for the precinct. If these types of approval continue, the historic low scale Market will be under threat of being isolated from its compatible surrounds by intrusive contemporary towers.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan.</b>	
Single comment	<b>3.0 Urban structure and built form</b>	Provide more information early in the process about the content of proposed Design and Development Overlays.	To assist in the implementation of the objectives outlined in the Plan.	<b>Noted - no change to structure plan.</b>	Chapter 3 Urban Structure and Built Form provides clear direction on proposed built form including height and proposed Design and Development Overlay controls. Through the Planning Scheme Amendment process, these proposed Design and Development controls will be exhibited.
Single comment	<b>3.3 Density</b>	Increasing the density within City North will have a significant impact on the volume and quality of stormwater runoff.		<b>Noted - no change to structure plan.</b>	

## 4.0 Transport and access

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment		City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
<b>Submissions received from individuals</b>					
Medium	<b>4.4 Melbourne Metro</b>	Reduce reliance on the proposed Metro line to justify high-rise development.	<p>Existing infrastructure and road network would not be able to cope with an increase in population of residents and workers without the provision of the station. Public transport is already at capacity. The delivery of the Metro is uncertain. It is wrong to amend planning scheme height controls and carry out re-zoning to inflate land prices and developer expectations which may never be alleviated in relation to community infrastructure, open space, schools, recreation and traffic.</p> <p>I have no faith in this occurring - state governments cannot manage to get what exists today running efficiently.</p> <p>Too much reliance has been placed on the once proposed Metro line to justify the high-rise development. Much of this development will proceed without the Metro Line being approved to the detriment of the inner area.</p> <p>The Metro Line may never be approved and the community would be left, yet again, with an inadequately serviced, huge population base, devoid of the old viable and more sustainable economic base that it replaced.</p>	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	<p>The Metro station is not the only trigger for change in City North as this is already underway due to the expansion of key institutions in the area, the Carlton United Brewery redevelopment, and State Government investment in medical facilities. City North is an appropriate area to direct growth to as it accommodates a large number of jobs and is located in proximity to the city, enabling opportunities for walking and cycling. The City North Structure Plan will assist to manage this growth and change.</p> <p>City North is well serviced by trams, buses and Flagstaff and Melbourne Central stations to the south. The reliability of bus and tram services is impacted by traffic and insufficient priority at intersections. The City North Structure Plan proposes upgrades to streets to enhance the priority given to public transport. In addition, the City of Melbourne will use the City North Structure Plan and the Transport Strategy (draft 2011) to advocate to the State Government for investment in the Metro to serve the growing residential and worker community, in addition to extensions to the tram network to create new routes.</p>

4.0 Transport and access					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment		City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Medium	4.5 Car parking 4.6 Cars, roads and traffic	Provide more information about car parking and traffic management.	Further consideration of the impact of reconfiguration of areas on emergency vehicles trying to access the area and access to the hospitals by visitors and employees is needed. There is insufficient car parking to cope with the hospital and medical facilities in Parkville.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends that a strategy be developed to reduce congestion on City North's streets by redirecting through traffic to by-pass routes outside the central city. It also recommends that on street car parking be reviewed.
			There are severe problems in South Parkville with regard to road traffic speed and the danger to pedestrian traffic particularly to school students at University High School and Errol Street Primary School.		
			Insufficient consideration of the current traffic and parking issues facing inner Melbourne and the resulting situation that would result if these Structure Plans were implemented.		
			Public transportation is already at capacity.		

## 4.0 Transport and access

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment		City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
As above - Medium	<b>As above - 4.5 Car parking 4.6 Cars, roads and traffic</b>	As above - Provide more information about car parking and traffic management.	<p>Parking is a problem for residents of Parkville which has a resident parking scheme which has operated for some years. Now however it is not working well because there is insufficient parking to cope with the hospital and medical facilities demand. For example there are now many people driving into South Parkville desperately seeking parking which is not available at the medical facility because they have been called to important medical appointments or to seriously ill relatives. Such people are understandable not deterred by a 'no parking' sign or a 'resident only' parking area. They are desperate, in a hurry, and often distressed, often after having driven considerable distances from outer Melbourne or country areas. So they park in residential areas without a permit and for as long as their crisis lasts. With an even larger concentration of the critical medical institutions, the problem will be exacerbated unless the specific nature of traffic and parking in this area are addressed in the design phase of the structure plan.</p> <p>There is not enough parking in these areas and more residents will also increase the problem.</p> <p>Unless the traffic coming from the north or west along the tram routes or from areas serviced by trains, the reliance on public transport might be a pipe-dream.</p>	Noted - no change to the structure plan	As above.

## 4.0 Transport and access

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment		City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Low	<b>4.5 Car parking</b>	Only reduce car parking rates in developments if alternatives are provided.	<p>There is not enough parking in these areas and more residents and workers will increase the problem and pressures on street parking. Alternative measures should ensure surrounding streets do not become swamped. People will have cars so parking must be provided and not just on street.</p> <p>Parking requirements for new buildings should only be reduced if good public transport is available.</p>	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City of Melbourne will advocate for upgrades to the public transport system servicing City North, in addition a high quality pedestrian and cycling network will be developed. The majority of City North is already required to meet Clause 52.06-6 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme which allows the provision of zero on-site car parking spaces and places a discretionary limit of one car parking space per dwelling for developments over four storeys.

<b>4.0 Transport and access</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>		<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Low	<b>4.4 Melbourne Metro</b>	Do not prepare the draft Planning Scheme Amendments until it is confirmed that the Metro is to be funded and constructed. Council should publicise a contingency plan.	<p>The proposals for "City North" are based on the assumption of a major public transport upgrade including a new Metro. Even if a new Metro is approved and funded, it will be 15 to 20 years before it is built.</p> <p>It is wrong to amend planning scheme height controls to inflate land prices and developer expectations and create problems which may never be alleviated in relation to community infrastructure, open space, schools, recreation and traffic.</p>	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The Metro station is not the only trigger for change in City North as this is already underway due to the expansion of key institutions in the area, the Carlton United Brewery redevelopment, and State Government investment in medical facilities. City North is an appropriate area to direct growth to as it accommodates a large number of jobs and is located in proximity to the city, enabling opportunities for walking and cycling. City North is well serviced by trams, buses and Flagstaff and Melbourne Central stations to the south. The City North Structure Plan proposes upgrades to streets to enhance the priority given to public transport. In addition, the City of Melbourne will use the City North Structure Plan and the Transport Strategy (draft 2011) to advocate to the State Government for investment in the Metro to serve the growing residential and worker community, in addition to extensions to the tram network to create new routes.
Low	<b>4.5 Car parking</b>	Minimise car parking spaces for new dwellings.	This is acceptable.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The majority of City North is already required to meet Clause 52.06-6 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme which allows the provision of zero on-site car parking spaces and places a discretionary limit of one car parking space per dwelling for developments over four storeys.

<b>4.0 Transport and access</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>		<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>4.5 Car parking</b>	Provide car parking as part of new developments/do not reduce car parking provision rate.	No parking requirement waivers - it just flows onto the streets! Parking facilities for access to parks, including disabled.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The majority of City North is already required to meet Clause 52.06-6 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme which allows the provision of zero on-site car parking spaces and places a discretionary limit of one car parking space per dwelling for developments over four storeys.
Single comment	<b>4.5 Car parking</b> <b>4.7 Bicycles</b> <b>4.12 Walking</b>	Incorporate more bicycle tracks, wider pedestrian walks and better allocation of car parking spaces.		<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan includes street sections which include bicycle paths, wider pedestrian pavements and improved allocation of on-street car parking.
Single comment	<b>4.7 Bicycle</b> <b>4.12 Walking</b>	Identify more pedestrian paths and bicycle paths which are safe for day and night use.		<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan includes street sections which include bicycle paths, wider pedestrian pavements and improved allocation of on-street car parking.
Single comment	<b>4.8 Public transport</b>	Plan for public transport prior to more residents / workers.	There is not enough public transport to cope now.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The densification of City North is already underway due to the expansion of key institutions in the area, the Carlton United Brewery redevelopment, and State Government investment in medical facilities. The City North Structure Plan will assist to manage this growth and change. The Structure Plan identifies several proposals to enhance public transport in the area. The City of Melbourne will continue to advocate for these proposals to ensure that City North is well serviced as the area continues to grow.

<b>4.0 Transport and access</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>		<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>4.8 Public transport</b> <b>4.9 Buses</b> <b>4.11 Trams</b>	Further consideration of upgrading works of more public transport - your suggestion on the train/bus services are ideal.		<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	Additional information regarding the upgrading of public transport has been included in the City North Structure Plan.
Single comment	<b>4.5 Car parking</b>	Remove long term on street car parking	An emphasis should be made to improve the street scapes and remove a lot of the long term 4 hour and daily parking which appears in the middle of many streets and looks like a long term car park, plant more trees and grass the central median areas with trees as in other streets of Carlton and even recently in Abbotsford st North Melbourne.	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan includes street sections which include improved allocation of on-street car parking and landscaping of these spaces.
Single comment	<b>4.7 Bicycles</b> <b>4.10 Trams</b> <b>4.12 Walking</b>	Implement Option 1 of the Haymarket reconfiguration as it provides good pedestrian and cycle connections as well as better civic spaces.	Option 1 looks best as it seems to be the most simple for trams, and also provides good ped and cycle connections, as well as better civic spaces. Just as critical is getting development around Haymarket to respond to the revitalised space as well as the grand boulevards that meet there.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends a master plan be prepared for the Haymarket to determine the optimal design for this important space.
Single comment	<b>4.12 Walking</b>	Footpaths are becoming choked with outside tables.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	

<b>4.0 Transport and access</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>		<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>4.8 Public transport</b>	There will be insufficient transport fore more intense residential development, seeing that both the University and the hospitals are undergoing expansion and are bringing in hundreds more commuters who will be encouraged to use public transport. At the moment the trams are usually over crowded and even if the metro is extended to the Haymarket Roundabout this will only ease the problem , not solve it.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	

4.0 Transport and access					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment		City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	4.11 Trams	<p>Tramlines through Haymarket. It is a fabulous idea to take the trams past the front of the two hospitals, but why not then into the Haymarket via Royal Parade, but keep the Zoo tram going from Peel St straight into Flemington Rd, thereby making the Haymarket simpler and still using the same number of tram points. (Alternatively the Peel St tram line could converge with the Elizabeth St tram line at the edge of the Haymarket, leaving the Haymarket as almost a simple intersection with a single pair of North-South tramlines). And would the trams pull into the kerb immediately in front of the hospitals - how much safer is that than having so many people race across Flemington Rd to catch a tram when the lights are red? Priority at all lights for the trams of course.</p>		Noted - no change to the structure plan	

<b>4.0 Transport and access</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>		<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>4.5 Car parking</b>	The loss of parking spaces in Peel Street will only bring speeding traffic closer to residential properties as the changes further South down Peel St have done. Next VicRoads will want to narrow the footpath to fit more vehicular traffic in. The parked cars are a good calming measure. VicRoads is so insensitive to the community that it still has a 60 kph speed limit on two sides of Queen Victoria Market whereas tiny little Prahran market and the whole of Sydney Rd to Bell St have a 40 kph speed limit.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	

## 4.0 Transport and access

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment		City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
<b>Submissions received from organisations</b>					
Single comment	<b>4.7 Bicycles</b> <b>4.1 Freight</b> <b>4.12 Walking</b> <b>4.6 Cars, roads and traffic</b>	Acknowledge cross boundary constraints on transport demands so that functionality is promoted across local government areas. Actively plan freight, vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle routes with neighbouring municipalities to overcome breaks in continuity.	The structure plan contains only a few examples of bicycle paths extending into other neighbouring areas but do not form part of a comprehensive effort to integrate the networks.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan includes street sections which demonstrate upgrades to streetscapes within City North. Prior to the delivery of any of these upgrades the City of Melbourne will consult with neighbouring municipalities and key stakeholders.
Single comment	<b>4.11 Trams</b>	What provision is CoM making to enable the tram proposals in the future? Is CoM planning on making a financial contribution to them?	There are mentions about upgraded Trams, efficient transport interchange (at Haymarket), high quality public transport on Elizabeth Street, extension of the tram network along with infrastructure and other upgrades.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City of Melbourne will continue to advocate the State Government for the upgrades to the tram network.
Single comment	<b>4.8 Public transport</b>	Issue 3 notes the lack of east-west public transport as an issue for City North. This fails to link it to the east-west issues mentioned in the Arden Macaulay Structure Plan.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The proposed Melbourne Metro rail tunnel will provide a key east west link as will the proposed tram extensions along Victoria Street and ultimately through E-Gate and along Dynon Road as proposed in the City North and Arden-Macaulay Structure Plans respectively.
Single comment	<b>4.11 Trams</b>	The strategic requirement for a tram route the length of Victoria Street and Grattan Street to address the east-west connection is not clear.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The extension of the tram route along Victoria Street will provide a continuous link from the east to the west of the city and enhance north south public transport connections, as will the bus in Grattan Street.
Single comment	<b>4.4 Melbourne Metro</b> <b>4.11 Trams</b>	Emphasise the linkage between Haymarket and the Metro 1 station in Grattan Street and the importance of locating the tram interchange as the key joining element.		<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The potential integration of the Haymarket with the proposed Metro station is mentioned in the City North Structure Plan.

<b>4.0 Transport and access</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>		<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>4.1 Freight 4.6 Cars, roads and traffic 4.7 Bicycles 4.12 Walking</b>	Test the Haymarket proposals to more fully satisfy vehicle movements and the advantages of maximising ped/cycle access to the area as a whole. There also needs to be consideration of emergency services vehicles which need access to the area often at high speed for separating and safety of pedestrians.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends a master plan be prepared for the Haymarket to determine the optimal design for this important space and provide for and prioritise modal needs.
Single comment	<b>4.4 Melbourne Metro</b>	Planning/zoning should not be dependent on the Metro rail for progressing growth and development options. Although zoning should be designed to maximise longer term outcomes and not restrict appropriate densities for Metro benefit in surrounding areas.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	Significant land use change and growth is already underway in the area; the Structure Plan will provide a framework to manage this change to ensure quality design outcomes as the area continues to expand and develop. The Metro station is not the only trigger for change in City North as this is already underway due to the expansion of key institutions in the area, the Carlton United Brewery redevelopment, and State Government investment in medical facilities. City North is an appropriate area to direct growth to as it accommodates a large number of jobs and is located in proximity to the city, enabling opportunities for walking and cycling.
Single comment	<b>4.8 Public transport</b>	The hospital precinct is also a 24/7 and shift worker employment node which will require safe and legible accessibility at all hours.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	An action in the City North Structure Plan is to work with the Department of Transport to provide better interpeak public transport services for shift workers and students.

<b>4.0 Transport and access</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>		<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>4.11 Trams</b>	Connecting Victoria Street to North Melbourne via a tram may have some merit but in Grattan St may create more problems than it solves.		<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	In response to this advice, the City North Structure Plan proposes a bus along Grattan Street which will enable more design and route flexibility which does not impact on emergency services access to the hospitals.
Single comment	<b>4.6 Cars, roads and traffic</b> <b>4.7 Bicycles</b> <b>4.12 Walking</b>	Improve and include planned improvements to public realm, including pedestrian and cycling access, increased tree planting, conversion of car parking in the centre of the street into landscaped areas and signage, which will assist in calming traffic.	There are likely to be several stages of development before the Metro and all modes need to be encouraged and planned for. Public realm improvements eg streetscapes can assist with calming the whole area as well as specific traffic calming. Ensuring traffic signals are aligned and ped crossing where they are needed then the environment will give some predictability to movement for walking and cycling which is lacking at present.	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan includes street sections which include bicycle paths, wider pedestrian pavements, improved allocation of on-street car parking and landscaping of streetscapes to assist with traffic calming.
Single comment	<b>4.7 Bicycles</b>	Provide additional bike parking.	As large developments occur and institutions are built, they include green travel planning measures in implementation.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The Structure Plan includes actions to increase bike parking in new development, on street and in various locations across the precinct.
Single comment	<b>4.0 Transport and access</b> <b>4.9 Buses</b>	East-west connections for all modes needs to be improved and bus 401 to North Melbourne station promoted more widely for cross town travel and connections to trains going west. Is there an option to extend this service to Lygon Street?		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan proposes a bus along Grattan Street. The City of Melbourne will work with the Department of Transport to determine the most appropriate route to improve this east-west connection.
Single comment	<b>4.0 Transport and access</b>	Refer to the City of Melbourne's draft Transport Strategy		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	Recommendations in the Structure Plan are consistent with the Council's Transport Strategy (draft 2011).

<b>4.0 Transport and access</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>		<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>4.6 Cars, roads and traffic</b>	Retain road access through City North for vehicles servicing and accessing the hospitals.	As a state-wide tertiary paediatric hospital, the Royal Children's Hospital (RCH) needs to maintain road access for regional families, families with children with disabilities, and families with children requiring emergency treatment. Many of these families are unable to use public transport. There are instances where clinical staff need to access the hospital by road without significant delay.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends the development of a strategy to reduce congestion in City North's streets by redirecting through traffic to by-pass routes outside the central city area. Emergency service vehicle access will be maintained at all times.
Single comment	<b>4.1 Freight</b>	Further consideration of the movement of freight within the precinct particularly in areas like the Market.	The Market is dependent upon deliveries in order for over 700 city based businesses to operate. Noise and light will impact on potential new residential uses in the area.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends that the City of Melbourne prepare a strategy for low impact, efficient freight servicing of City North.
Single comment	<b>4.7 Bicycles</b>	Consider road use patterns around the Queen Victoria Market to inform decisions about bike paths	The push to encourage increased pedestrian and cycling around the Market may create conflict with the current road use patterns around the Market.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends that the City of Melbourne's Bicycle Plan is reviewed to enhance the bicycle network and minimise potential conflicts between street users. The City North Structure Plan includes street sections which demonstrate where dedicated bicycle paths will be likely to be developed.
Single comment	<b>4.6 Cars, roads and traffic</b> <b>4.5 Car parking</b>	Carry out traffic assessments around key locations such as the Market.	To determine available on street parking before plans are implemented to reduce car parking for residential and commercial development in the area.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends that a master plan be prepared for streets identified for upgrading. Through this process, the City of Melbourne will consult with all key stakeholders and will investigate the impact on the wider arterial road network and key destinations.

## 4.0 Transport and access

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment		City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	4.5 Car parking	Provide car parking as part of new developments/do not reduce car parking provision rate.	<p>There are major concerns with the policy to encourage residential development and increased densities. Whilst the plan identifies this as an appropriate location due to the public transport infrastructure, there are no restrictions to owning a car and the pressure on available on street around the Market together with the reduction in off street car parking requirements will jeopardise the ongoing viability of the Market heavily reliant on car usage. Car ownership levels cannot be controlled and legislated and there is no certainty that the availability of on street car parking will continue.</p> <p>The setting of the Market is protected making it difficult to develop the bitumen car park. Therefore, the ability for the Market to provide better access and more parking is severely limited.</p> <p>Such actions will put pressure on centres like the Market, whose parking facilities are used by people visiting residents. With the large number of hospitals on street parking is already in high demand in the City North. With the large number of hospitals on street parking is already in high demand.</p> <p>The plan identifies changes to existing zones to facilitate more commercial and entertainment activity around the Market. This will provide for increased competition for available on street parking. This will impact on available on street parking.</p>	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The majority of City North is already required to meet Clause 52.06-6 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme which allows the provision of zero on-site car parking spaces and places a discretionary limit of one car parking space per dwelling for developments over four storeys.

<b>4.0 Transport and access</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>		<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>4.5 Car parking</b>	Retain all parking around the Queen Victoria Market.	<p>The plan identifies the need to increase the residential diversity and encourage other types of residents in addition to students. It is acknowledged that a student population would not put pressure on existing car parking however other types of residents may have increased car ownership. This together with a strategy to reduce off street car parking in new developments will increase demand for on street parking near the Market. The Market should not be in competition for available on street parking with other uses that may generate demand. All available parking around the Market should be available to ensure its long term viability to attract regional and outer metropolitan users coming into the city.</p> <p>Address issues facing many sites heavily reliant on car usage and deliveries. Include a recommendation to prepare a car parking policy for the Market and include requirements in Clause 52.06-6 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme.</p>	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends that on-street car parking provision is reviewed.
Single comment	<b>4.7 Bicycles</b>	Check location of existing and proposed bike paths.	Royal Park proposed bike path already exists. Many paths have been specified but are not.	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	

<b>4.0 Transport and access</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>		<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>4.6 Cars, roads and traffic</b> <b>4.8 Public transport</b>	Efforts to reduce vehicle traffic in City North is supported. The idea of improving efficiency of public transport to the precinct and linking in with both the airport and metropolitan Melbourne and encouraging only smart-city driving is supported.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	

4.0 Transport and access					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment		City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>4.6 Cars, roads and traffic</b>	Further investigate of the structure plan proposals, including the reallocation of road space or reduction in the number of traffic lanes, on the wider arterial road network.	<p>Traffic modelling and a Network Fit Assessment is required. A Network Fit Assessment would be needed for the proposals in order to understand how they align with the Road Use Hierarchy and wider network implications.</p> <p>Many proposals in the structure plan have road network implications, including:            Re-configuring the Haymarket Roundabout;            Transforming Victoria Street into a "high quality boulevard" by removing traffic lanes and providing new public spaces at the intersections of Victoria/Swanston Streets and Victoria/Elizabeth Streets;            Transforming Elizabeth Street into a "gracious boulevard", from Victoria Street to Haymarket Roundabout, by removing traffic from the centre carriageways and encouraging higher density development, consisting of 40m buildings and wide footpaths;            Developing a tram route the length of Victoria Street;            Traffic calming and implementing 40kph on key arterials; and            Modifying key signalised intersections, including wider crosswalks, auto phase activation for pedestrians and shorter cycle times.</p>	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends that a master plan be prepared for streets identified for upgrading. Through this process, the City of Melbourne will consult with all key stakeholders and will investigate the impact on the wider arterial road network and key destinations.

<b>4.0 Transport and access</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>		<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>4.6 Cars, roads and traffic</b>	Address how the road network, access and mobility, and key arterials will be impacted by the Structure Plan proposals.	Whilst supporting the principles of improving cycling and pedestrian accessibility within the precinct, the structure plan does not address the following: How the road network may operate or cater for these changes; The access and mobility impacts associated with the proposed significant projected growth and increase in car parking; The importance of Victoria Street and Elizabeth Street as key arterial roads, particularly during peak periods. There will also be increased reliance on Victoria Street from the Arden Macaulay and Dynon precincts to provide connections to the north of the CBD.		The City North Structure Plan recommends that a master plan be prepared for streets identified for upgrading. Through this process, the City of Melbourne will consult with all key stakeholders and will investigate the impact on the wider arterial road network and key destinations.
Single comment	<b>4.4 Melbourne Metro</b>	Regularly review actions in the City North Structure Plan in light of the delivery of the Melbourne Metro.	The Structure Plan does not consider a fall back position. For example, what happens if the Melbourne Metro is not operational by 2020 or if the high level policy targets (including mode shift assumptions) are not attained.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The Structure Plan sets out a framework and vision to 2030. As growth occurs the Plan will need to be reviewed regularly to ensure currency, reflect unexpected change, and to ensure timely delivery of services and infrastructure. The Melbourne Metro is only one of several significant influences.
Single comment	<b>4.6 Cars, roads and traffic</b>	Consider the importance of Victoria Street and Elizabeth Street as key arterial roads.	These are particularly important during peak periods. There will also be increased reliance on Victoria Street from the Arden/Macaulay and Dynon precincts to provide connections to the north of the CBD.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends that a master plan be prepared for streets identified for upgrading. Through this process, the City of Melbourne will consult with all key stakeholders and will investigate the impact on the wider arterial road network will be investigated.

## 5.0 Public realm

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
<b>Submissions received from individuals</b>					
Medium	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Identify and provide parks, sports grounds, and open space to meet the future needs of the proposed significantly increased population.	<p>Insufficient consideration has been given to the need for significantly improved and increased civic and public infrastructure such as parks and open space.</p> <p>The city is already too hot.</p> <p>I do not believe the plans contain enough recreation space for such a population growth.</p> <p>No open space is set aside in the structure plan. The area which are listed as public realm improvements will be necessary in some form to provide amenity to this high density environment but in no way do they substitute for open space which can be enjoyed away from traffic.</p> <p>If open space is identified first, you will attract much better and more appropriate development.</p> <p>There is no planning for additional recreational or public open space.</p> <p>Organise water collection and storage for it. Plant trees... shade trees. Real park (not just sports grounds or a few street trees.) Oxygen tanks for life. Healing places for people. Provide them with toilets and drinking water and seats. Safe fencing and gating for children's play areas and shade. Parks - best antidote/prevention for Urban Heat Island.</p>	<b>Change the structure plan</b>	It is agreed that enhancements to existing open space and the identification of new open spaces are required to support the needs of the growing community. The City of Melbourne's draft Open Space Strategy provides indicative areas where new open space is needed to cater for the growing population. These requirements have been integrated into the City North Structure Plan. The Structure Plan recommends that the City of Melbourne prepare a Development Contributions Plan to be integrated into the Melbourne Planning Scheme to contribute funds for the development of these spaces. The Structure Plan also recommends that a contribution rate for public open space be specified in Clause 52.01 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme and a policy be developed to enable land to be contributed in lieu of a financial contribution where appropriate.

<b>5.0 Public realm</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
As above - Medium	<b>As above - 5.1 Parks</b>	As above - Identify and provide parks, sports grounds, and open space to meet the future needs of the proposed significantly increased population.	This is a once in a generation opportunity for urban renewal. However the plan falls short of this in many ways in providing for a population equivalent to a good sized town.	<b>Change the structure plan</b>	As above
			This will not be a quality area for working or living. The document refers to the opportunity to add public open space. Why say this when your plan obviously does not include it?		
Low	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Do not sign off the structure plans until additional public open space have been identified and secured.	<p>The provision of additional open space was not identified in the draft plan. Additional open space (including active and passive spaces) will be essential due to increased density. Trees along roads are not sufficient recreational and restorative spaces. Children will need access to adequate open space for their health and well being.</p> <p>North and West Melbourne are recognised by Council as having the least open space within the City of Melbourne.</p>	<b>Change the structure plan</b>	The City of Melbourne's draft Open Space Strategy provides indicative areas where new open space is needed to cater for the growing population. These requirements have been integrated into the City North Structure Plan. The Structure Plan recommends that the City of Melbourne prepare a Development Contributions Plan to be integrated into the Melbourne Planning Scheme to contribute funds for the development of these spaces. The Structure Plan also recommends that a contribution rate for public open space be specified in Clause 52.01 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme and a policy be developed to enable land to be contributed in lieu of a financial contribution where appropriate.

<b>5.0 Public realm</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Low	<b>5.0 Public realm</b>	Do not transform Haymarket into a public open space.	The public realm in the midst of 40m high buildings are not attractive with such a plethora of streets traffic, trams etc meeting. The notion of replacing the heritage building on the corner of Pelham and Elizabeth Streets should not be supported for achieving this outcome.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The Haymarket is dominated by traffic because of the roundabout format of the intersection. There is a significant opportunity to capitalise on the 0.5 hectare area that the roundabout consumes. The Structure Plan proposes a long term strategy to improve the Haymarket into a significant civic gathering space at this important gateway to the central city. The City of Melbourne will work with VicRoads and other key stakeholders to develop a master plan for the Haymarket. This will address approaches to calm traffic to optimise the enjoyment of this area as a gathering space.
			The Haymarket will always be a major traffic space with lots of pollution.		
Low	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Amend the plans to show the Royal Children's Hospital land returning to parkland.	It is deceptive to show it as biomedical.	<b>Change the structure plan</b>	The footprint of the Royal Children's Hospital has been amended in the City North Structure Plan to show the area which will be returned to parkland in 2014.
			The footprint depicted for the Royal Children's Hospital at the corner of Gatehouse Street and Flemington Road in all maps of the Structure Plan presentation is incorrect.		

## 5.0 Public realm

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>5.0 Public realm</b>	One part of the City North draft in particular I believe should be commended is that regarding Elizabeth street and the Haymarket roundabout. A large public open space at the Haymarket would be the grand entrance to Melbourne city from the north that is currently lacking. Trafalgar square in London underwent a similar shift in priority from motor traffic to pedestrian and has been a major success. It has revitalised the square and public events are now common there. The Haymarket proposal is much grander in scale and ambition than what was done in Trafalgar square and that is why I think it would be wonderful.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	
Single comment	<b>5.1 Parks</b>	Properly recognise that parks in the are well utilised.	This is not correct. They are well used and serve the needs of people working in disciplines (especially research) that require places to walk, to sit, to think quietly without interruption from noise, games, running and busy activities. They often seek and need solitude close to their working environment for optimum productivity. Thus these facilities are not underused, but are a specific need in a knowledge precinct.	<b>Change the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan indicates that this parkland is well utilised.
Single comment	<b>5.3 Streetscape design</b>	Refine diagrams and proposed views of green areas.	These are misleading as they emphasise green areas even where they are just street planting.	<b>Change the structure plan</b>	Refined street sections and diagrams have been included in the City North Structure Plan.

<b>5.0 Public realm</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>5.3 Streetscape design</b>	Clarify the provision of street trees along both sides of Victoria Street between Howard Street and the CUB site.	It would appear as if there would need to be a significant portion of the street taken to add these trees in. Therefore are their still two lanes of traffic and the tram lines proposed in the street or is it downgraded to one lane and a bicycle lane? How will this impact on traffic moving around the city. it is already congested, and the population and worker increase proposed will add to, not lessen, the traffic coming into the area.	<b>Change the structure plan</b>	Refined street sections and diagrams have been included in the City North Structure Plan. This shows how the street trees could be integrated into both sides of Victoria Street.
Single comment	<b>5.3 Streetscape design</b>	Improve streetscapes and replace a lot of the long term car parking in the middle of streets with more trees and grass.	An emphasis should be made to improve the street scapes and remove a lot of the long term 4 hour and daily parking which appears in the middle of many streets and looks like a long term car park, plant more trees and grass the central median areas with trees as in other streets of Carlton and even recently in Abbotsford st North Melbourne.	<b>Change the structure plan</b>	Refined street sections and diagrams have been included in the City North Structure Plan. These sections demonstrate how streetscapes can be improved through the redistribution of some car parking spaces and carriageways in some streets for street greening.
Single comment	<b>5.3 Streetscape design</b>	Greening of the streets is good but with the height limits, how will the sunshine get in for any significant part of the day?		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	

<b>5.0 Public realm</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>5.0 Public realm 5.3 Streetscape design</b>	The plan is environmentally dubious. It refers to a disconnected fact which is misleading that 22% of Melbourne's area is urban forest and that raising this to 50% would reduce the summer temperature by 7 degrees. The proposed plan has nothing to do with increasing urban forest. It is suggested that the area will be given over to green roofs - the word mandate in this context is misleading.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	
Single comment	<b>5.0 Public realm 5.3 Streetscape design</b>	Implement Option 1 of the Haymarket reconfiguration as it provides good pedestrian and cycle connections as well as better civic spaces.	Option 1 looks best as it seems to be the most simple for trams, and also provides good ped and cycle connections, as well as better civic spaces. Just as critical is getting development around Haymarket to respond to the revitalised space as well as the grand boulevards that meet there.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends a master plan be prepared for the Haymarket to determine the optimal design for this important space.

## 5.0 Public realm

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
<b>Submissions received from organisations</b>					
Single comment	<b>5.3 Streetscape design</b>	Improve and include planned improvements to public realm, including pedestrian and cycling access, increased tree planting, conversion of car parking in the centre of the street into landscaped areas and signage.	This will respond to the staging regarding the metro as there will be development before this comes to fruition, and this can also provide traffic calming.	<b>Change the structure plan</b>	Refined street sections and diagrams have been included in the City North Structure Plan. These sections demonstrate how streetscapes can be improved through the redistribution of some car parking spaces and carriageways in some streets for street greening.

<b>6.0 Community Infrastructure</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
<b>Submissions received from individuals</b>					
Medium	<b>6.1 Community Facilities</b>	Identify and provide civic and public infrastructure such as child and aged care, hospitals and schools with adequate open space, to meet the future needs of the proposed significantly increased population.	<p>Social infrastructure is needed to respond to the needs of the significantly increased population and people with particular needs.</p> <p>Developers are unlikely to be concerned with provision of community facilities and will not be around to deal with the dysfunctional communities that will result due to a lack of these facilities.</p> <p>Insufficient consideration has been given to the need for significantly improved and increased civic and public infrastructure such as child and aged care, hospitals/healthcare and education facilities.</p> <p>There is no planning for additional schools to accommodate school aged children.</p> <p>This is a once in a generation opportunity for urban renewal. However the plan falls short of this in many ways in providing for a population equivalent to a good sized town.</p>	<b>Change the structure plan</b>	<p>It is agreed that improvements to existing and identification of additional community infrastructure are needed to respond to the needs of the growing community. The City North Structure Plan identifies the opportunity for the development of four community hubs in City North. Additional detail regarding the opportunities to enhance the provision of community infrastructure has been integrated into the City North Structure Plan. The City of Melbourne's Community Infrastructure Framework is reviewed regularly to align infrastructure delivery with population growth (and increased demand).</p> <p>The Structure Plan recommends that the Community Infrastructure Plan consider the specific delivery of services within each hub.</p>

<b>6.0 Community Infrastructure</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
As above - medium	<b>As above - 6.1 Community Facilities</b>	As above - Identify and provide civic and public infrastructure such as child and aged care, hospitals and schools with adequate open space, to meet the future needs of the proposed significantly increased population.	Two schools are indicated but the proposals are not clear. Errol St Primary school and University High School are full.	<b>As above - Change the structure plan</b>	The Structure Plan recommends that the City of Melbourne prepare a Development Contributions Plan to be integrated into the Melbourne Planning Scheme to contribute funds for the development of these community hubs. Local and State Governments are responsible for the delivery of essential community services, with some services provided by the private sector. Therefore the Structure Plan recommends the development of partnerships for the ongoing delivery of community infrastructure. The City of Melbourne will continue to work with service providers and the State Government to provide and operate services to meet community needs. Council will continue to advocate for and work closely with the State Government and private sector to ensure community infrastructure provision is aligned with population needs as the area develops.

<b>6.0 Community Infrastructure</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Low	<b>6.1 Community Facilities</b>	Do not sign off the structure plans until primary and secondary school sites, with adequate active open space have been identified and secured.	<p>Schools attract families to the area.</p> <p>New sites may need to be purchased or compulsorily acquired.</p> <p>Children will increasingly access open space at school due to higher density living.</p> <p>Existing schools servicing the area are at capacity</p> <p>If school sites are identified first, you will attract much better and more appropriate development.</p> <p>In greenfield estates the position of the school site, tho not yet built is a major selling point - the same will be so in Melbourne. People know that the current schools are full to overcrowded and this is already a deterrent to living in the city.</p>	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	<p>In the process of developing the City North Structure Plan, the City of Melbourne has had several discussions with the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development who have responsibility for managing existing schools and the delivery of new schools.</p> <p>The City of Melbourne will continue to liaise with the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development and will advocate for appropriate provision of education facilities to service the region in which City North is located.</p> <p>As the Department of Education and Early Childhood is responsible for the delivery of new schools. The location and design of any future school will be determined by the Department.</p>

<b>6.0 Community Infrastructure</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Low	<b>6.1 Community Facilities</b>	Identify school sites with adequate recreation space.	<p>I don't feel that sufficient schools have been planned for, both primary and secondary - and the recreation space that they would need.</p> <p>The population increase is predicted to house the additional population in high rise density apartments which have no access to open space. Thus, the children when attending school will need to access adequate open space for their health and wellbeing [don't forget we have a national obesity problem]. The proposed concept of vertical schools must be challenged.</p>	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	<p>In the process of developing the City North Structure Plan, the City of Melbourne has had several discussions with the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development who have responsibility for managing existing schools and the delivery of new schools.</p> <p>The City of Melbourne will continue to liaise with the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development and will advocate for appropriate provision of education facilities to service the region in which City North is located.</p> <p>As the Department of Education and Early Childhood is responsible for the delivery of new schools. The location and design of any future school will be determined by the Department.</p>

<b>6.0 Community Infrastructure</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Low	<b>6.1 Community Facilities</b>	Reconsider the location of the proposed hub near the Haymarket.	<p>The nominated area at the Seven Eleven service station on Flemington Road beside does not seem appropriate as this area has a significant link to the services of the Errol Street and Lygon Street retail precinct.</p> <p>Service station as a hub. I think this does not need to be explained. It is just silly. The other hub is at the University of Melbourne's Medical School - even sillier.</p>	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan.</b>	<p>The hub proposed in the vicinity of the Haymarket is well located to service residents, as well as workers and visitors to the cluster of hospitals and the university. Although it is acknowledged that the Errol Street and Lygon Street retail precincts have links to City North, these are located beyond 400 metres for most people residences and workplaces in City North. The Haymarket vicinity is considered a suitable location for a local activity hub given it is within a walkable distance for people living and working in City North and it will also be highly accessible due to integration with the tram interchange and proposed Metro station. The City North Structure Plan also proposes to redevelop the Haymarket intersection to include a large civic space. The proposed hub within the University of Melbourne campus has been removed.</p>

<b>6.0 Community Infrastructure</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>6.1 Community Facilities</b>	Much emphasis was put in your presentation on bringing to the enlarged knowledge precinct a range of new shopping facilities, coffee shops etc. This may superficially make the area seem more attractive but it is only part of what provides a more exciting knowledge precinct and appear to ignore the unique character and capacity of Lygon Street and Errol Street. Nor does it recognise the steps taken, for example in Canada, to build such facilities underground adjacent to public transport.		<b>Noted - No change to structure plan.</b>	The City North Structure Plan provides a comprehensive approach to managing growth and change building on the existing strengths of the precinct whilst accommodating growth in a liveable and sustainable environment. Although it is acknowledged that the Errol Street and Lygon Street retail precincts have links to City North, these are located beyond 400 metres for most people residences and workplaces in City North. The Haymarket vicinity is considered a suitable location for a local activity hub given it is within a walkable distance for people living and working in City North and it will also be highly accessible due to integration with the tram interchange and proposed Metro station. The City North Structure Plan also proposes to redevelop the Haymarket intersection to include a large civic space. The integration of retail facilities underground removes activity and vibrancy from the street.

<b>6.0 Community Infrastructure</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
<b>Submissions received from organisations</b>					
Single comment	<b>6.1 Community Facilities</b>	The draft Plan acknowledges future demand for non-hospital services will not be met by existing facilities. In phase two of the Royal Children's Hospital redevelopment, facilities including a supermarket, creche, gymnasium and hotel are proposed to address the needs of the community. There opportunities for the development of partnerships between the Royal Children's Hospital and the City of Melbourne to strengthen youth support services in City North.		<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	

## 7.0 Infrastructure services

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
<b>Submissions received from individuals</b>					
Single comment	<b>7.2 Air quality</b>	Include procedures to ensure the quality of air.	With so many businesses, research institutes and hospitals in the area. Quite dangerous really. Potential for disaster.	<b>Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan includes an action which proposes to undertake a feasibility assessment which would include the consideration of emissions, noise, vibrations, access issues and the capacity of the existing services.
Single comment	<b>7.8 Sustainable Development</b>	Include further information about sustainable development.	Both documents are totally inadequate in their discussion and requirement of sustainable development. Tall buildings are not sustainable or flexible buildings. There is no discussion of this issue or requirement for buildings to demonstrate that they optimise density and sustainability.	<b>Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	Sustainable built form is considered and discussed in detail in chapter 3 Urban Structure and Built Form and chapter 7 Sustainable Infrastructure .
Single comment	<b>7.3 Climate change adaptation</b>	This is a once in a generation opportunity to provide quality options, environmental protection and prosperity. However the plan falls short due to the unmanaged flooding problems that Council expects to increase with climate change.		<b>Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan acknowledges that this is an opportunity for the precinct. This is inherent in the Structure Plan and more specifically recognised in the chapter 7: Sustainable Infrastructure. A key objectives is to establish City North as a vibrant, attractive and self sustaining precinct, which better services the community through urban and built form that is energy efficient and adapted to climate change.
Single comment	<b>7.1 Infrastructure Services</b>	Identify the infrastructure needed to support the increased population.	The Draft Structure Plan does not adequately deal with the infrastructure needed to support the population increase it envisages.	<b>Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan acknowledges the infrastructure needed to support the increased population in chapter 7: sustainable infrastructure.

## 7.0 Infrastructure services

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
<b>Submissions received from organisations</b>					
Low	<b>7.7 Water</b>	A more sustainable approach to water and water sensitive urban design strategies is welcomed and encouraging.		<b>Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	
Single comment	<b>7.7 Water</b>	Ensure redevelopments incorporate stormwater management infrastructure.	Increasing the density within City North will have a significant impact on the volume and quality of stormwater runoff. Incorporating stormwater management infrastructure will ensure that the stormwater drainage system and receiving waters are not placed under additional stress.	<b>Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	This is consistent with chapter 7 Sustainable Infrastructure in particular Strategy 2 and Strategy 6. City of Melbourne will continue to work with the relevant water authorities to ensure a sustainable stormwater outcome is achieved.
Single comment	<b>7.7 Water</b>	Further development of an infrastructure component to the City North Structure Plan to identify and make the most of all opportunities regarding the treatment and harvesting of stormwater and potential works to reduce flows to Elizabeth Street would be welcomed.	Given the existing flood risks and the need to maximise stormwater treatment within the precinct.	<b>Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	This is consistent with Chapter 7 Sustainable Infrastructure in particular Strategy 2 and Strategy 6. City of Melbourne will continue to work with the relevant water authorities to ensure a sustainable stormwater outcome is achieved.
Single comment	<b>7.7 Water</b>	Further hydrological and hydraulic studies will be required to support redevelopment works, particularly any changes to Elizabeth Street.	The Elizabeth Street main drain serves much of the City North area. Significant overflows from this drain can occur after larger storm events, leading to flooding of local properties and basements. Redevelopment within the City North area may cause additional flooding on adjacent properties.	<b>Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	This is consistent with Chapter 7 Sustainable Infrastructure in particular Strategy 2 and Strategy 6. City of Melbourne will continue to work with the relevant water authorities.
Single comment	<b>7.7 Water</b>	Flood mitigation works may be required to ensure that there is no increase in flood levels from a 1:100 year storm event.	Mitigation works could include onsite detention systems, retarding basins, stormwater harvesting storages, and possibly rain gardens.	<b>Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	This is consistent with chapter 7 Sustainable Infrastructure in particular Strategy 2 and Strategy 6. City of Melbourne will continue to work with the Water Authorities.

<b>7.0 Infrastructure services</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>7.1 Infrastructure Services</b>	Any future proposal to extent the services of cogeneration plant requires further discussion and analysis.		<b>Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	This is consistent with the Sustainable Infrastructure Chapter. Strategy 1, Strategy 3 and Figure 7.1 in particular the City of Melbourne recognises existing opportunities and proposes to continue working with key stakeholders. The Action included states - Continue consulting with key stakeholders on being involved with a district energy and recycled water network and the potential to house a CSH. Stakeholders should include the University of Melbourne, Melbourne Health, RMIT University, Royal Children's Hospital and the Queen Victoria Market.
Single comment	<b>7.7 Water</b>	Identify suitable sites for the treatment of wastewater and stormwater.		<b>Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	Comment noted. This is consistent with Chapter 7 Sustainable Infrastructure in particular Strategy 1, Strategy 2 and Strategy 6. City of Melbourne will continue to work with the relevant water authorities.
Single comment	<b>7.7 Water</b>	Proponents may be required to submit detailed functional designs and landscape designs to ensure appropriate conditions or advice with respect to water.		<b>Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	

## 7.0 Infrastructure services

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>7.5 Energy</b>	Discuss future proposals regarding extending current services with the Royal Melbourne Hospital and Royal Women's and Department of Health.		<b>Noted - No change to the structure plan</b>	This is consistent with the Sustainable Infrastructure Chapter. Strategy 1, Strategy 3 and Figure 7.1 in particular recognise existing opportunities and proposes to continue working with key stakeholders. The Action included states - Continue consulting with key stakeholders on being involved with a district energy and recycled water network and the potential to house a CSH. Stakeholders should include the University of Melbourne, Melbourne Health, RMIT University, Royal Children's Hospital and the Queen Victoria Market.

## 8.0 Structure plan process

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
<b>Submissions received from individuals</b>					
Medium	<b>8.3 Feedback on Consultation Process</b>	Conduct a more detailed consultation process and extend the deadline for submissions to allow more important work to take place.	Review the document for errors, confusion, ambiguity and misleading statements and images before re-releasing and the consultation process begun again.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The Consultation on the draft City North Structure Plan began in September 2010 with a stakeholder workshop, online forum and opportunities to provide written submissions.
			We object to the process involved in adopting these plans. This is not consultation. This is briefing us on what the Council and the State Government propose to do, asking for our feedback, and then Council proceeding, ignoring most of what we have said in response. There has been no enunciation of a vision, of how the various parts of North and West Melbourne relate to this proposal, the need for community infrastructure to be planned first, or even the consideration of a range of options as to how the plan might be developed to give the community some role in deciding its direction.		The consultation phase in May – June 2011 offered the opportunity for comment on the development of the draft City North Structure Plan. This included a public information session, information available online and the opportunity to provide written submissions. The timeline for the City North Structure Plan was extended from the original September Future Melbourne Committee to December 2011 to provide more time for Council to consider all submissions and to undertake additional work, as required, to address specific feedback received on the plans. All submissions have been considered in the finalisation of the City North Structure Plan.
			Council consulted with key stakeholders and tested scenarios with Universities, Market, Hospitals, VicRoads, State Government and Key developers, suggesting a bias. The process must be started over in order to get a balanced view in the formulation stage. The consultation period was fast, brief and limited to a one hour question time, with a two week notice of meeting only to land owners.		The consultation report, submitted to the Future Melbourne Committee, includes all submissions received, the City of Melbourne's response and an overview of changes made to the Structure Plan in response to the feedback. There will be more consultation opportunities over the next 18 months for feedback on the implementation of these Plans.

## 8.0 Structure plan process

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
As above - medium	<b>As above - 8.3 Feedback on Consultation Process</b>	As above - Conduct a more detailed consultation process and extend the deadline for submissions to allow more important work to take place.	<p>We do appreciate that the Council is at least resourcing a consultation process that reaches out into the diverse communities within the City of Melbourne - it was possible for us to have attended six different meetings on these plans. However, we feel that much more needs to be done to incorporate the views of residents and small business, who feel very excluded by much of the process adopted by this Council in determining both the MSS and these Structure Plans.</p> <p>I feel no ownership of the plans. Without real consultation there will be conflict and distress which you can avoid by putting the plans aside until the community has had a voice.</p> <p>The process has been too short.</p>	<b>As above - Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	An overview of this process was emailed to all submitters and individuals who registered to stay informed about the progress of the City North Structure Plan, and is available on the website.

## 8.0 Structure plan process

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Medium	<b>8.1 Structure Plan process and implementation</b> <b>8.3 Feedback on consultation process</b>	Review the criteria used in the preparation of the Structure Plan so that the views of local people are better represented.	Melbourne City Council and the Victorian State Government should review the criteria used in the preparation of the structure plans so that the views of local people, voters and stakeholders and rate payers are better represented. It appears the plans are more about providing developers with high-rise development sites, rather than implementing a vision of a sustainable and human scale city - a repeat of all the problems of the development of Docklands.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	<p>Due to various factors, densification of City North is already occurring. City North has been undergoing change as a result of the State Government's investment in the redevelopment of the Royal Melbourne Hospital and Royal Women's Hospital, the investment of the University of Melbourne in new faculties to the south of the traditional Grattan Street boundary, the redevelopment of the Carlton United Brewery site and expansion of RMIT campus within this site. Based on these developments, City North can be expected to continue to change - and as such is suitable for urban renewal as identified in the Draft Municipal Strategic Statement. The City of Melbourne has decided to take a proactive approach to managing this growth and change over a long term 30 year period.</p> <p>The Structure Plan provides a mechanism for the City of Melbourne to endeavour in a holistic manner to appropriately balance future development pressures and address the needs and protect the values of the existing communities. The Structure Plan focuses density in appropriate locations - near existing and proposed public transport infrastructure and activity areas. It also identifies opportunities to enhance community infrastructure, open space, transport and sustainable infrastructure.</p>

## 8.0 Structure plan process

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Medium	<b>8.1 Structure Plan process and implementation</b>	Reduce reliance on the proposed Metro line to justify changes to built form and land use.	Existing infrastructure and road network would not be able to cope with an increase in population of residents and workers without the provision of the station. Public transport is already at capacity. The delivery of the Metro is uncertain.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	Due to the expansion of key institutions in the area, and State Government investment in medical facilities in the area, City North is already undergoing change. The Metro station is not a trigger for change, as this is already underway. The Structure Plan will assist to manage this growth and change. As such, it is vital that the City of Melbourne advocate to the State Government for investment in the Metro, in addition to other public transport proposals. City North provides an appropriate context for renewal as it accommodates a large number of jobs in the area and is located in proximity to city enabling opportunities for walking and cycling.
			The Metro Line may never be approved and development will proceed to the detriment of the area, creating an inadequately serviced, huge population base, devoid of the old economic base that it replaced.		
			I have no faith in this occurring - state governments cannot manage to get what exists today running efficiently.		
Single comment	<b>8.3 Feedback on Consultation Process</b>	Amend the plans in response to community feedback.	It is trusted that this will occur.	<b>Change to structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan has been amended in response to the community feedback where considered appropriate.
Single comment	<b>8.1 Structure Plan process and implementation</b>	Remove the Queen Victoria Market, Peel Street West, Courtney Street and Flemington Road from the structure plan.	The Draft Structure Plan imposes an idea of "City North" onto a number of very diverse existing communities and tries to force them into an approach that does not work. The approach does not respect the important differences between the areas included. Each of the 8 areas identified has quite diverse needs and uses.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan considers this area holistically given the large land area of the Queen Victoria Market, and the tram corridors of Peel Street and Flemington Road.
Single comment	<b>8.1 Structure Plan process and implementation</b>	Remove Courtney Street from the Draft Structure Plan.	This is established residential or heritage buildings.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan includes Courtney Street as it is an interface area between the area undergoing change and the established residential area of North Melbourne.

## 8.0 Structure plan process

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Low	<b>8.1 Structure Plan process and implementation</b>	Do not prepare the draft Planning Scheme Amendments / make any commitments until it is confirmed that the Metro is to be funded and constructed. Council should publicise a contingency plan.	<p>The proposals for "City North" are based on the assumption of a major public transport upgrade including a new Metro. Even if a new Metro is approved and funded, it will be 15 to 20 years before it is built.</p> <p>It is wrong to amend planning scheme height controls to inflate land prices and developer expectations and create problems which may never be alleviated in relation to community infrastructure, open space, schools, recreation and traffic.</p> <p>I have no faith in this occurring - state governments cannot manage to get what exists today running efficiently.</p>	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	Due to the expansion of key institutions in the area, and State Government investment in medical facilities in the area, City North is already undergoing change. The Metro station is not a trigger for change, as this is already underway. The Structure Plan will assist to manage this growth and change. As such, it is vital that the City of Melbourne advocate to the State Government for investment in the Metro, in addition to other public transport proposals. City North provides an appropriate context for renewal as it accommodates a large number of jobs in the area and is located in proximity to city enabling opportunities for walking and cycling.

## 8.0 Structure plan process

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Low	<b>8.1 Structure Plan process and implementation</b>	Review the document for errors, confusion, ambiguity and misleading statements and images and make available for consultation.	The structure plan must distinguish between intended outcomes and pipe dreams that cannot be realised.	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan has been amended to remove errors, and any content or images which may lead to confusion, ambiguity or be considered to be misleading.
			Inaccuracies/generalisations in the plan were disconcerting.		
			The Draft Structure Plan is based on poor analysis of existing land use and built form and a lack of understanding about the ways current residents and businesses interrelate with each other and the rest of the community. The Draft Structure Plan also displaces a concerning lack of attention to detail and has a number of errors in it. There are a number of serious internal contradictions in the Draft Structure Plan, in particular between the overall objectives and some of the specific measures.		
Single comment	<b>8.2 Policy and government</b>	I am unclear how the City North Structure Plan 2011 complements the Municipal Strategic Statement and broader Local Planning Policy Framework, Hoddle Grid Built Form Review and the Queen Victoria Market Master plan, which is of concern to me and something I would like clarified.			

<b>8.0 Structure plan process</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>8.3 Feedback on Consultation Process</b>	The structure plan documents do not demonstrate the generation and evaluation of alternative scenarios, and then identify preferred options. Only one scenario is presented. The impact of this is that the community feels disempowered and there is no evidence in the information sessions that I have attended about the structure plans that there is broad support for what is proposed. I do not consider the draft plans have been able to reach the stage of public acceptance and need considerable re-work and further engagement with the community PRIOR to council embarking on drafting Planning Scheme amendments.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	
Single comment	<b>8.3 Feedback on Consultation Process</b>	I live half way between the structure plan areas. I would have loved to have had input into ideas for developments in these areas. Instead we get what I fear will be a fait accompli, with room for comment around the edges.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	

## 8.0 Structure plan process

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>8.2 Policy and government</b>	The state and local government policy to encourage Melbourne's population to grow is irresponsible and likely to result in a city bereft of the heritage character and other charms that are a large part of its appeal to visitors and residents. Unfettered growth will undermine Council's best intentions to reduce greenhouse gas and pollution and achieve its goal of zero carbon emissions. The growth at all costs philosophy should be replaced with strategies to discourage population growth.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	

## 8.0 Structure plan process

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>8.3 Feedback on Consultation Process</b>	<p>There has been insufficient time for the community to come to grips with an extensive range of about the plans documentation contained in the structure plans for such far reaching consequences for North Melbourne. The City of Melbourne has not used recognised channels to publicise these draft structure plans and information sessions. More extensive letter boxing was required, in addition to distribution of posters and plans. A lack of Councillors attended the sessions. As a participant in the September 2010 process, I was not advised of the outcome. The structure plans are only available as large files on the internet and only readable if colour printed. The internet is only a wonderful resource to those who access it. I live opposite the structure plan boundary and was not letter boxed about the information session in time to attend. The black and white brochure was placed under my door the night of the public meeting.</p>		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	

<b>8.0 Structure plan process</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>8.2 Policy and government</b>	The excessive development accommodated by the Built form review and City North Structure Plan will have a detrimental effect on the other transit oriented activity centres like Dandenong and Frankston which are unable to attract the form of development and uses planned for central Melbourne.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	
Single comment	<b>8.1 Structure plan process and implementation</b>	The plan holds a great deal of interest and responds to a need to guide and enhance the development process which is occurring in this area. It has many good ideas in it that we, as long term residents, hope come to fruition. However it is a question of implementation that concerns us. Today's news about action to be taken by the State Planning Minister is just one indication of the manifold influences which could change the course of the plan.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	

## 8.0 Structure plan process

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>8.1 Structure Plan process and implementation</b>	<p>The demarcation between area 3 and area 6 has no logic to it and appears to have been drawn without any real on-the-ground survey of what is there at the moment. This is a large area and the boundary between Area 3 and Area 6 actually contradicts the boundary of the Urban Renewal identified in the Municipal Strategy Statement - Clause 21 (Post Exhibition version) of the Melbourne Planning Scheme. There, a strip lining up with Vale Street and much closer to Flemington road is identified for development. Likewise it is illogical to include part of Hotham Place, a narrow lane off Courtney Street, in Area 3 and part in Area 6.</p>			<p>These areas have been defined by an on-site inspection of the existing built form. Further detail has been provided on the future intent of built form controls in this area that responds to these precincts. The structure plan considers areas that are both urban renewal and ongoing change.</p>

## 8.0 Structure plan process

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>8.1 Structure Plan process and implementation</b>	The Planning Scheme Amendment process to implement the Structure Plan provides the opportunity to revise the Design and Development Overlay 32 applying to the area to the immediate west of City North (181-189 Capel Street).	<p>The revision to the Design and Development Overlay 32 will enable certain complementary forms of development in appropriate locations on the Structure Plan area's western fringe. The development of land along the western fringes of the Structure Plan area are likely to be mutually influential on the other. A holistic approach to the implementation of the Structure Plan which is also cognisant of the role that fringe locations around the Structure Plan edges play in the ultimate achievement of the objectives for the urban renewal area, is prudent and good planning practice. The site is located at the confluence of three 'proposed activity centres'.</p> <p>The site is located in proximity to two small pocket parks, excellent public transport accessibility and its proximity to the CBD, Queen Victoria Market and wide range of services, education and employment opportunities within the Parkville Precinct. There are no site specific heritage listings on the property.</p>		The structure Plan provides a mechanism for the City of Melbourne to endeavour in a holistic manner to appropriately balance future development pressures and address the needs and protect the values of the existing communities. The Structure Plan focuses

<b>8.0 Structure plan process</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>8.3 Feedback on Consultation Process</b>	We were asked to give our opinions on future planning, but I ask you: who is going to listen? We are not land-developers and it is obvious that it is land-developers who have the last word. I am interested in the beautification of the city, they are interested in the beautification of the dollar.		<b>Change made to structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan has been amended in response to the community feedback where considered appropriate.
Single comment	<b>8.1 Structure Plan process and implementation</b>	What evidence has been collected to demonstrate that the proposed structure plan would have a positive impact on public health particularly from the perspective of building communities, access to quality open space?		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan proposes new community infrastructure and open space to be located within walking distance of residences and workplaces to ensure a high quality living and working environment.

## 8.0 Structure plan process

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
<b>Submissions received from organisations</b>					
Low	<b>8.1 Structure plan process and implementation</b>	Include an implementation table outlining short, medium and long term priorities.		<b>Change made to structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan includes actions to achieve each strategy. It is indicated if these actions are to be implemented in a 1 year, 1 to 5 year or 5 year plus timeframe.

## 9.0 Site specific comments

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
<b>Submissions received from individuals</b>					
Low	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	Do not change the retail provision at the Queen Victoria Market.	The Queen Victoria Market is iconic and does not need a wider range of retail services.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	City North is presently undergoing growth and change. Council's long term strategy for Queen Victoria Market will identify ways to develop and enhance the market's role in light of the city's growth, community needs and consumer trends. The City of Melbourne wants to secure the future of the market and ensure its ongoing viability and relevance in a time of rapid change.
			It already provides a unique "retail experience" for fruit, vegetables, seafood and meat and some peripheral merchandise. A visit and a bratwurst and coffee are always favourites with our visitors from the UK and USA who regret the disappearance of similar markets in their home countries. In countries where such markets exist they do not operate seven days a week as there is no need for them to do so. A "wider more varied experience" is available a few hundred metres down the road in all the CBD shops which are similar to CBD shops throughout the western world.		
Low	<b>9.8 Haymarket</b>	Do not provide public open space at the Haymarket.	The public realm in the midst of 40m high buildings are not attractive with such a plethora of streets traffic, trams etc meeting. The notion of replacing the heritage building on the corner of Pelham and Elizabeth Streets should not be supported for achieving this outcome.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The Haymarket is dominated by traffic because of the roundabout format of the intersection. There is a significant opportunity to capitalise on the 0.5 hectare area that the roundabout consumes. The Structure Plan proposes a long term strategy to improve the Haymarket into a significant civic gathering space at this important gateway to the central city. The City of Melbourne will work with VicRoads
			The Haymarket will always be a major traffic space with lots of pollution. It is not a public open space to enjoy.		

9.0 Site specific comments					
Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Low	9.6 Elizabeth Street	Give more prominence to and establish a grand vision for creating a grand boulevard along Elizabeth Street	Elizabeth Street should be a Grand Boulevard but a grand boulevard should have a grand vision. This does not mean just removing the car yards but ensuring what replaces is not cheap and nasty in appearance. The amenity needs to be properly considered.	<b>Noted - no change made to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan provides several proposals to support Elizabeth Street as a grand boulevard including streetscape improvements, improved built form objectives and active street frontages. Street sections are included to demonstrate these proposals. The Structure Plan provides additional detail regarding the redesign of the Elizabeth Street boulevard to redistribute additional space for pedestrian activity and the creation of a green linear parkland. To accommodate additional residential and employment growth, to reinforce the role of Elizabeth Street as a civic spine and to improve the pedestrian experience an increased height limit of 40m is proposed. A 40m height limit will create a stronger definition to the streetscape, a greater intensity of activity, respect the scale of the existing heritage buildings and will not dominate the important landscape qualities of this important boulevards.
			As a strategic link and gateway to the CBD its significance is understated. At present the CBD, Parkville and North Melbourne feel disconnected. Elizabeth Street could link these separate precincts and via the broader City North precinct, become more of an integrated central city. It needs to better connect the disparate nodes of activity at QVM, RMIT, Melb Uni and the medical precinct. The streetscape is similar to a Parisian grand boulevard, and presents great opportunity for it to be transformed into a grand boulevard that acts as the spine for the precinct. More office/residential development is needed above the ground floor. Maybe the 40m height limit is too low. Other land use strategies/controls look good for helping to reactivate the street and its frontages. Need to encourage car/motor bike dealers to relocate and retail/cafe/office to replace it. Maybe extend the footpaths out and reallocate road space from private motor vehicles to pedestrians.		

<b>9.0 Site specific comments</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Low	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	Reduce the height controls opposite the Queen Victoria Market.	<p>The height of 20m opposite the Queen Victoria Market cannot be supported as this does not serve to protect the graded buildings along this street which may only be D graded building but play an important role in the setting of the market in its historic context.</p> <p>The height controls were set after rigorous investigation as part of C61. The strategic justification is inadequate in light of modelling and planning panel evidence considered over the last decade.</p>	<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The street edge height along Victoria Street has been reduced to 20 metres to respond to the heritage context of the Queen Victoria Market. The mandatory building height of 14 metres has been retained along Peel Street. The heights in the area to the south of Victoria Street are being considered through the Central City (Hoddle Grid) Built Form Review.
Low	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	Do not rezone the mixed use area opposite the Queen Victoria Market	Under the Capital City Zone many uses become of right and the potential for any use in this area will be detrimental to the area and to its role supporting the Market.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The Mixed Use Zone does not facilitate land use diversity as it is predominantly a residential zone. The Capital City Zone (CCZ) supports a strong mix of residential, retail and commercial uses. The CCZ is already applied to the south of Victoria Street. The extension of the CCZ to the north of Victoria Street will enable a vibrant, active and liveable environment that provides for a diverse residential, worker and visitor population to complement the Queen Victoria Market vicinity. The CCZ provides equal weighting to residential, commercial and retail functions.

<b>9.0 Site specific comments</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	Optimise the use of the Queen Victoria Market.	Its current opening hours are very restrictive so an extension to trade is required. Include more boutique stalls at the market to support local artists, craftsmen and designers. The current selection of stalls in the clothing/home ware area have unoriginal merchandise, many of which sell cheap imported goods.	Noted - no change to the structure plan	Council's long term strategy for Queen Victoria Market will identify ways to develop and enhance the market's role in light of the city's growth, community needs and consumer trends. The City of Melbourne wants to secure the future of the market and ensure its ongoing viability and relevance in a time of rapid change. The City North Structure Plan proposes to strengthen the Queen Victoria Market vicinity by exploring opportunities for open space and community infrastructure.
Single comment	<b>9.8 Haymarket</b>	Reduce building heights around the Haymarket		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan.</b>	The City North Structure Plan considers the Haymarket as an appropriate area to increase building heights given that it is at the intersection of several tram corridors and the cluster of medical institutions.
Single comment	<b>9.8 Haymarket</b>	Implement Option 1 of the Haymarket Roundabout concepts.	Option 1 looks best as it seems to be the most simple for trams, and also provides good ped and cycle connections, as well as better civic spaces. Just as critical is getting development around Haymarket to respond to the revitalised space as well as the grand boulevards that meet there.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan.</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends a master plan be prepared for the Haymarket to determine the optimal design for this important space.
Single comment	<b>9.8 Haymarket</b>	Cut off the Capel Street/Bedford Street access from Haymarket roundabout.	To prevent rat running through North Melbourne residential streets. It is not a satisfactory entry to the Roundabout as it only gives access to Flemington Road and leads to confusion. There is opportunity to extend the pocket park already there.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan.</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends a master plan be prepared for the Haymarket to determine the optimal design for this important space. Limiting road access to the intersection may be considered in this process.

<b>9.0 Site specific comments</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>9.8 Haymarket</b>	Ensure trams have priority in the Haymarket.	VicRoads are happy to see trams slowed by the new layout. We urge Council not to approve this scheme until a device is added so that trams may roll forward a metre to trigger the lights. After all, each tram is equivalent to over a hundred cars (over 50 in much of the off-peak) so the small delay suffered by perhaps 30 cars per tram is inconsequential.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan.</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends a master plan be prepared for the Haymarket to determine the optimal design for this important space. The City of Melbourne will consult with key stakeholders through this process to ensure tram priority through the intersection and safe pedestrian access to tram interchanges.
Single comment	<b>9.8 Haymarket</b>	Do not remove the Queensberry Street stop.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan.</b>	The City North Structure Plan does not propose to remove the Queensberry Street tram stop.
Single comment	<b>9.8 Haymarket</b>	Vicroads idea to stagger the entry to middle carriageway is a brilliant idea to reduce the number of directions to choose from at a given point. We wonder if it is possible to grass the entire middle carriage way in Elizabeth St from Victoria St to the roundabout, and instead create short right turn lanes in the position of the current median at Queensberry St.		<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan includes street sections for Elizabeth Street which demonstrate the possibility of extending the central median.

## 9.0 Site specific comments

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>9.15 Victoria Street</b>	Increase the proposed height along Victoria Street from 24m to 40m	<p>40m buildings can be accommodated on Victoria Street with no physical or amenity impacts onto the Queen Victoria Market (QVM), including overshadowing. Built form at the scale of 40m will provide a strong urban edge to the QVM. A higher built form would allow Council to set a high architectural and urban design outcome which will contribute to the revitalisation of the area and enhance the setting and value of the QVM.</p> <p>The proposed height control is disconnected from the strategic aims for Victoria Street as a main boulevard, as this height control matches the smaller streets which will not elevate Victoria Street to a boulevard and civic activity centre. The affected area of Victoria Street is well separated from North Melbourne by both Peel Street and Capel Street which are both wide streets. 40m will have no adverse visual or amenity impacts particularly given the backdrop of the central city and separation by these major roads. The draft City North Structure Plan nominates higher built form to the eastern end of Victoria Street and there is no discernable difference between the north side of Victoria Street between Swanston and O'Connell Street and the north side of Victoria Street between O'Connell and Peel Street that warrants a different approach. The height should be comparable to Elizabeth Street and Flemington Road.</p>	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan proposes a 24 metre height, with a 20 metre height limit at the street edge with a 4 metre setback along the north side of Victoria Street adjacent the Queen Victoria Market. This is an increase from the current height control of 14 metres which is considered too low in the context of the existing public transport and retail activity along Victoria Street. The proposed height control is considered appropriate for new development to integrate with the existing character and heritage of the area and complement the Queen Victoria Market vicinity. The height also provides a transition in scale between the 14 metre height control along Peel Street to the higher scale of Elizabeth Street and the Hoddle Grid.

<b>9.0 Site specific comments</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	The built form review does not recognise the special character and scale of the western side of Elizabeth Street between Bourke Street and Queen Victoria Market. This is a streetscape of mixed period buildings mostly on small sites that deserves special protection under built form and other urban design controls that will protect and enhance the existing urban fabric.		<b>Noted - no change to structure plan</b>	The Central City (Hoddle Grid) Built Form Review is a separate project which has informed the City North Structure Plan.
Single comment	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	The Capital City Zone has been an evil or destructive planning control as it deprives existing owners of any process of involvement in planning decisions. It also raises expectations of developers. Tailored mandatory height controls and proper evaluation of applications will help.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	

## 9.0 Site specific comments

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	Develop a separate detailed plan for the Queen Victoria Market and surrounding streets that takes full account of the historic and vibrant character of the QVM precinct.	The QVM precinct needs to be considered separately as it is an essential part of what gives Melbourne its character. There have already been poor decisions made in Elizabeth Street that detract from the character of the QVM precinct. The destruction of the Stork Hotel in Elizabeth Street is an example of this. An historic building and important community and cultural asset has been removed and it can never be restored. This precinct requires very careful, specific and considered planning.		Council's long term strategy for Queen Victoria Market will identify ways to develop and enhance the market's role in light of the city's growth, community needs and consumer trends. The City of Melbourne wants to secure the future of the market and ensure its ongoing viability and relevance in a time of rapid change. The heights in the area to the south of Victoria Street are being considered through the Central City (Hoddle Grid) Built Form Review. In addition, the City of Melbourne is in the process of conducting a City North Heritage Review to investigate the suitability of including additional sites being protected by the Heritage Overlay.
Single comment	<b>9.6 Elizabeth Street</b> <b>9.8 Haymarket</b>	One part of the City North draft in particular I believe should be commended is that regarding Elizabeth street and the Haymarket roundabout. A large public open space at the Haymarket would be the grand entrance to Melbourne city from the north that is currently lacking.	The area in its current state is a major disappointment. Why do we have car yards in the central city? Trafalgar square in London underwent a similar shift in priority from motor traffic to pedestrian and has been a major success. It has revitalised the square and public events are now common there. The Haymarket proposal is much grander in scale and ambition than what was done in Trafalgar square and that is why I think it would be wonderful.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan.</b>	

<b>9.0 Site specific comments</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>9.6 Elizabeth Street</b> <b>9.8 Haymarket</b> <b>9.15 Victoria Street</b>	The proposals for changing the character of public space and street activity at the Haymarket Roundabout, along Elizabeth and Victoria Streets are admirable but not convincingly demonstrated by design work so far.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan.</b>	
Single comment	<b>9.6 Elizabeth Street</b>	Melbourne City Council has been lazy in the last decade in the northern part of the city where quality of public open space is very low. It is good to hear that Elizabeth Street is about to get some well overdue design consideration even if it is only because there is a need to renewal of tram infrastructure.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan.</b>	
Low	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	With respect to the Queen Victoria Market rejuvenation no detail has been provided about this process or proposal.	It is inappropriate to ask for comments on these two capstone plans in isolation from each other as they will greatly impact on one another.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan.</b>	Council's long term strategy for Queen Victoria Market will identify ways to develop and enhance the market's role in light of the city's growth, community needs and consumer trends. The City of Melbourne wants to secure the future of the market and ensure its ongoing viability and relevance in a time of rapid change.

<b>9.0 Site specific comments</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	The Queen Victoria Market is a vast area of about 18 acres in a dominant location of the City of Melbourne and the CBD, and as such has a profound influence over the surrounding areas ever since it commenced. It is now very under utilised and operates only on 5 days with very low hours of trading. This in turn effects other retailing in the surrounding areas. I am at the coal face in this area every day and have been since 1946. I have observed all the changed and now witness the deterioration of trading and change of people who come to the area, particularly in the last year.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan.</b>	Council's long term strategy for Queen Victoria Market will identify ways to develop and enhance the market's role in light of the city's growth, community needs and consumer trends. The City of Melbourne wants to secure the future of the market and ensure its ongoing viability and relevance in a time of rapid change.
Single comment	<b>9.7 Flemington Road</b>	Only include the strip along Flemington Road in area 6. Do not change the height limits beyond this without a full survey of the current built form, heritage and community impact.	Whilst some development along Flemington Road would be appropriate, Area 6 includes a large number of existing 3 storey residential buildings. Mary Street is included entirely within Area 6. This is a narrow street that is largely residential. It includes a few 19th Century terraces on its north side. Building a 40 metre building in Mary Street would be disastrous. It would also be clearly contrary to the Draft Structure Plan's Key Direction 3 to "cultivate the characterful backstreet neighbourhood".	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan retains the 14 metre mandatory height limit along the northern side of Courtney Street and includes a transitional height of 24 metres towards the 40 metre height control on Flemington Road. This transition of heights is considered appropriate given the proximity of the area to the Haymarket tram interchange and proposed Metro site, in addition to open spaces.

## 9.0 Site specific comments

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
<b>Submissions received from organisations</b>					
Single comment	<b>9.7 Flemington Road</b> <b>9.8 Haymarket</b>	Include the blocks immediately south of Flemington Road in the Capital City Zone.	This area is already under consideration for educational and/or health use. This will support the precinct's specialised institutions and "round off" the Haymarket. A Mixed Use Zone would severely limit non-residential uses in this area.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The Mixed Use Zone provides a suitable transition between the Capital City Zone and the Residential Zone to the west of the City North Structure Plan area.
Single comment	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	Reconsider proposed heights south of the Queen Victoria Market to recognise the demise of the CBD transition or stepping up of heights concept.	Whilst recognising the heritage value of parts of Peel Street this should not produce an incongruous built form profile (one side significantly different to the other) in what is to become an increasingly important thoroughfare leading to Haymarket.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The heights in the area to the south of the Queen Victoria Market are being considered through the Central City (Hoddle Grid) Built Form Review.
Single comment	<b>9.8 Haymarket</b>	Emphasise the linkage between Haymarket and the Metro 1 station in Grattan Street and the importance of locating the tram interchange as the key joining element.		<b>Change made to the structure plan</b>	The potential integration of the Haymarket with the proposed Metro station is mentioned in the City North Structure Plan.
Single comment	<b>9.8 Haymarket</b>	Test the Haymarket proposals to more fully satisfy vehicle movements and the advantages of maximising ped/cycle access to the area as a whole. There also needs to be consideration of emergency services vehicles which need access to the area often at high speed for separating and safety of pedestrians.		<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends a master plan be prepared for the Haymarket to determine the optimal design for this important space and provide for and prioritise modal needs.

## 9.0 Site specific comments

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	Consider the impact of the Queen Victoria Market on new residential uses.	Noise, light and freight may impact on new residences.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan seeks for further integrate the market within the increasing community rather isolating it as an individual entity. The plan seeks to create a vibrant hub of activity around the market area both inside and outside of business hours. The intensity of land use that existing at the market is equivalent to many other capital city zone functions which are able to co-exist with various other land uses including residential. Elsewhere in the municipality noise attenuation measures are applied where there is an significant noise source such as the crowds at the stadiums or industrial noise. There is no evidence at this point in time to suggest that the operations occurring at the market are creating a significant or unreasonable noise source which would require noise attenuation measures.

<b>9.0 Site specific comments</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	Do not increase the residential density and create a buffer of non-residential uses surrounding the Market or develop prescriptive requirements for residential developments that require the installation of effective noise attenuation measures.	Noise attenuation measures are necessary to ensure that new residents do not impact on the existing use rights of the Market. These measures should be set out in any future DDO affecting the Market and surrounding area, or alternatively permits should be conditioned allowing for noise attenuation measures for any new buildings and works. The increase in the residential population is of concern as the noise from activities within the Market and to and from the Market in the evening is not compatible with noise restrictions required in a residential zone. The Market anticipates intensifying the use of its site in the evening both in the summer and winter. Consistent objection to this type of activity as the residential community expands adjacent to the Market will inhibit its growth. The Market is a heritage asset and recognised as a significant open market. Therefore it is difficult to buffer the noise created by the patrons visiting the Market and the deliveries throughout the night. These conditions will exacerbate the conflict between the Market and residents.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan seeks for further integrate the market within the increasing community rather isolating it as an individual entity. The plan seeks to create a vibrant hub of activity around the market area both inside and outside of business hours. The intensity of land use that existing at the market is equivalent to many other capital city zone functions which are able to co-exist with various other land uses including residential. Elsewhere in the municipality noise attenuation measures are applied where there is a significant noise source such as the crowds at the stadiums or industrial noise. There is no evidence at this point in time to suggest that the operations occurring at the market are creating a significant or unreasonable noise source which would require noise attenuation measures.
Single comment	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	Further consideration of the movement of freight within the precinct particularly in areas like the Market.	The Market is dependent upon deliveries in order for over 700 city based businesses to operate. Noise and light will impact on potential new residential uses in the area.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends that the City of Melbourne prepare a strategy for low impact, efficient freight servicing of City North.

## 9.0 Site specific comments

Frequency of issue in received submission	Sub Category	Overview of requested change or comment	Comments made to support this request	City of Melbourne response	Discussion to explain response
Single comment	<b>9.8 Haymarket</b> <b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	Reconsider establishing and enhancing links from the Market to the Haymarket. Enhance links between the Queen Victoria Market and the legal precinct and retail core instead.	It is more important that links with the legal precinct and retail core is enhanced and activated as opposed to the link to Peel Street to link it with Haymarket.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan.</b>	City North is presently undergoing growth and change. Council's long term strategy for Queen Victoria Market will identify ways to develop and enhance the market's role in light of the city's growth, community needs and consumer trends. We want secure the future of the market and ensure its ongoing viability and relevance in a time of rapid change.
Single comment	<b>9.6 Elizabeth Street</b> <b>9.15 Victoria Street</b>	Consider the importance of Victoria Street and Elizabeth Street as key arterial roads.	These are particularly important during peak periods. There will also be increased reliance on Victoria Street from the Arden/Macaulay and Dynon precincts to provide connections to the north of the CBD.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan.</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends that a master plan be prepared for streets identified for upgrading. Through this process, the City of Melbourne will consult with all key stakeholders and will investigate the impact on the wider arterial road network will be investigated.
Single comment	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	Do not refer to the Market's operating hours or product range.	We do not believe that these particular business activities are a relevant planning consideration to be dealt with in the Structure Plan and nor are they in keeping with the general broad concepts outlined elsewhere in the plan.	<b>Noted - No change to structure plan.</b>	City North is presently undergoing growth and change. Council's long term strategy for Queen Victoria Market will identify ways to develop and enhance the market's role in light of the city's growth, community needs and consumer trends. We want secure the future of the market and ensure its ongoing viability and relevance in a time of rapid change.
Single comment	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	Carry out traffic assessments around key locations such as the Market.	To determine available on street parking before plans are implemented to reduce car parking for residential and commercial development in the area.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends that a master plan be prepared for streets identified for upgrading. Through this process, the City of Melbourne will consult with all key stakeholders and will investigate the impact on the wider arterial road network and key destinations.

<b>9.0 Site specific comments</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	Further consideration of the movement of freight within the precinct particularly in areas like the Market.	The Market is dependent upon deliveries in order for over 700 city based businesses to operate. Noise and light will impact on potential new residential uses in the area.		The City North Structure Plan recommends that the City of Melbourne prepare a strategy for low impact, efficient freight servicing of City North.
Single comment	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	Consider road use patterns around the Queen Victoria Market to inform decisions about bike paths	The push to encourage increased pedestrian and cycling around the Market may create conflict with the current road use patterns around the Market.		The City North Structure Plan recommends that the City of Melbourne's Bicycle Plan is reviewed to enhance the bicycle network and minimise potential conflicts between street users. The City North Structure Plan includes street sections which demonstrate where dedicated bicycle paths will be likely to be developed.
Single comment	<b>9.7 Flemington Road</b>	Consider increasing the common 40m height limit, particularly along Flemington Road.	The 40m height limit may be too restrictive, particularly along Flemington Road. This is not to say that there could not be a maximum podium height.	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan.</b>	Clear performance based objectives for design and built form outcomes have been developed to ensure new development complements heritage and existing neighbourhood character and reinforces great streets. A height limit of 40 metres along key boulevards will create a stronger definition to the streetscape and enable a greater level of activity in a manner which respects the scale of existing heritage buildings and does not dominate the important landscape qualities of these boulevards.

<b>9.0 Site specific comments</b>					
<b>Frequency of issue in received submission</b>	<b>Sub Category</b>	<b>Overview of requested change or comment</b>	<b>Comments made to support this request</b>	<b>City of Melbourne response</b>	<b>Discussion to explain response</b>
Single comment	<b>9.12 Queen Victoria Market</b>	Retain all parking around the Queen Victoria Market.	<p>The plan identifies the need to increase the residential diversity and encourage other types of residents in addition to students. It is acknowledged that a student population would not put pressure on existing car parking however other types of residents may have increased car ownership. This together with a strategy to reduce off street car parking in new developments will increase demand for on street parking near the Market. The Market should not be in competition for available on street parking with other uses that may generate demand. All available parking around the Market should be available to ensure its long term viability to attract regional and outer metropolitan users coming into the city.</p> <p>Address issues facing many sites heavily reliant on car usage and deliveries. Include a recommendation to prepare a car parking policy for the Market and include requirements in Clause 52.06-6 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme.</p>	<b>Noted - no change to the structure plan</b>	The City North Structure Plan recommends that on-street car parking provision is reviewed.