

**From:** Wufoo  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 8 March 2016 11:57:27 AM (UTC+10:00) Canberra, Melbourne, Sydney  
**To:** CoM Meetings  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#579]

**Name: \*** Angela Williams

**Email address: \*** [angelasewilliams@gmail.com](mailto:angelasewilliams@gmail.com)

**Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button: \*** Future Melbourne Committee meeting

**Date of meeting: \*** Tuesday 8 March 2016

**Agenda item title: \*** 6.4

\*

**Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than noon on the day of the scheduled meeting. We encourage you to make your submission as early as possible.**

There were no NRZ gazette in North and West Melbourne, nor Parkville, Kensington, East Melbourne or Carlton, for that matter, and only a few small slithers in South Yarra.

The reasoning behind the gazettal by the Minister of this outcome is unknown, but it remains an anomaly that the only residential areas within the City of Melbourne which the State Government views as worthy

To manage and ensure that development respects the identified neighbourhood character, heritage, environmental or landscape characteristics.

The criteria adopted by the City of Melbourne for the application of the NRZ within the municipality were:

- Areas within a 'stable residential area' as defined in the Municipal Strategic Statement,
  - Areas within a Heritage Overlay precinct, and
  - Areas that comprise a 'larger area' with streetscapes (street corner to street corner) where at least 80% of lots have one or two dwellings of one or two storeys.
-

I note that there was concern expressed by the RZSAC that the criteria had not been consistently applied by either the City of Melbourne in their proposed zones, and a recommendation was made for north and West Melbourne, and other areas within the municipality:

The Committee supports the proposed application of the NRZ1 in North and West Melbourne as proposed in the draft Amendment. The Committee also believes that Council should review the extent of the zone as part of a future separate process, including ground- truthing the application the 80% criterion and reviewing whether minor variations to this criterion might result in better zone boundary outcomes.

I note that the Council proposed zones were not gazetted, rather, the Minister chose to apply a small area of NRZ in South Yarra.

I consider this has left almost the whole of the residential areas within the City of Melbourne vulnerable to growth aspirations which I believe is contrary to the Municipal Strategic Statement and Heritage Strategy.

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

*(No opportunity is  
provided for  
submitters to be  
heard at Council  
meetings.) \**

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

\*

**From:** Wufoo  
**Sent:** Monday, 7 March 2016 3:33:58 PM (UTC+10:00) Canberra, Melbourne, Sydney  
**To:** CoM Meetings  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#577]

**Name: \*** Chris Thrum

**Email address: \*** [mineralsands@hotmail.com](mailto:mineralsands@hotmail.com)

**Contact phone number (optional):** 0422066973

**Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission: \*** Future Melbourne Committee meeting

**Date of meeting:** Tuesday 8 March 2016

**Agenda item title: \*** Agenda Item 6.5 Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C245 Queen Victoria Market Precinct Renewal FMC 8th March 2016

**Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than noon on the day of the scheduled meeting. We encourage you to make your submission as early as possible.**

This is a written submission in regards to Melbourne City Council Future Melbourne Committee Meeting scheduled for the 8th March 2016 and in particular, the Report to the Future Melbourne (Planning) Committee Agenda Item 6.5, Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C245 Queen Victoria Market

Precinct Renewal

On the 12th of May 2015 , the Future Melbourne Committee (FMC) resolved to seek authorisation for the Minister for Planning to exhibit Amendment C245 and authorisation was granted on 6th September 2015. Amendment C245 was placed on exhibition from 29th October to the 4th of December 2015. One hundred and fifty six submissions were received. The report is detailed and covers important aspects of the QVM redevelopment.

To enhance flexibility in any future development ,it would be beneficial to the City of Melbourne if the magnificent skateboarding community were catered to. A strong positive relationship between the City of Melbourne and the skateboarding community is an essential ambition for all parties concerned. The amendment includes a large area of open public space with an adjoining building that may contain commercial, retail, and community facilities.

Incorporating the Melbourne skateboarding community into this aspect of the QVM should be one of the aims of the project. This would achieve a public realm improvement.

One submitter suggested the widening of footpaths on A'Beckett Street to allow increased footpath dining and improve the surfaces. This proposed facet would be a positive outcome for the Melbourne skateboarding community as it would provide more room for travel via skateboard.

Skateboarding is a legitimate mode of transport in inner Melbourne, and incorporating skateboarding in the approach to transport will enable future mobility growth.

One submitter said the park should be a park without any buildings and this idea is sympathetic to a public open space that incorporates skateboarding activity.

One submitter mentioned that the area needs to provide for the increasing diverse population, particularly families. With an increase in the number of children many of them will benefit from the skateboarding community being catered to. Amendment C245 incorporates response to creating ...

<http://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/about-council/committees-meetings/future-melbourne-committee-meetings/Lists/CouncilMeetingAgendaItems/Attachments/142/mar16-fmc1-agenda-item-6.5.pdf>

Skateboarding at Lincoln Square has been in the news of late -

<http://www.theage.com.au/victoria/melbourne-council-destroys-australias-best-skate-spot-for-little-bogans-20160226-gn4l9r.html>

Melbourne council destroys Australia's best skate spot for 'little bogans'

[www.theage.com.au](http://www.theage.com.au)

The City of Melbourne will resurface Lincoln Square in Carlton to exclude skateboarders, following complaints from other park users.

In the Report to the Future Melbourne (Environment) Committee Skateboarding in Lincoln Square Carlton at the Future Melbourne Committee meeting of 21st April 2015 it was mentioned that -

One of the key issues that was raised in the report was the acknowledgement that changes to Lincoln Square to discourage skateboarding will displace a large volume of skaters to other sites within the central city (Key Issue 8)

Lincoln Square

<https://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/about-council/committees-meetings/meeting-archive/Lists/CouncilMeetingAgendaItems/Attachments/12277/AGENDA%20ITEM%206.1.PDF>

Report to the Future Melbourne (Environment) Committee

[www.melbourne.vic.gov.au](http://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au)

Attachments: 1. Supporting Attachment 2. Draft changes to Lincoln Square Report to the Future Melbourne (Environment) Committee Agenda item 6.1

Another issue that was raised in the report was (Key Issue 10) that funding for a temporary trial site of up to \$150,000 can be supported from existing budget allocations in the 2014-2015 year.

By committing to incorporate the skateboarding community into the future of QVM City of Melbourne will be sending a strong signal that they support the skaters of Melbourne.

A new planning framework called Skate Melbourne is being developed and City of Melbourne should be applauded for initiating this. Incorporating skateboarding activity into the QVM location development and deferring the adjustments to Lincoln Square and allowing further consultation with the community with the Skate Melbourne planning framework platform would be a positive outcome for the community.

Yours sincerely

Chris Thrum

email - [mineralsands@hotmail.com](mailto:mineralsands@hotmail.com)

Phone - 0422066973

**would like to** Yes  
**address the Future**  
**Melbourne**  
**Committee in**  
**support of your**  
**submission: \***

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

\*



ABN 42 089 376 634

Peter Papageorgiou

7 March 2016

Council Business

Melbourne City Council

PO Box 1603

Melbourne VIC 3001

Fax: 9658 8084

Com.meetings@melbourne.vic.gov.au

Dear Mayor & Councillors,

**Future Melbourne Committee Meeting No.76: 8 March, 2016**

**Written Submission Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C245 – Queen Victoria Market**

I am taking this opportunity to make this written submission to Agenda Item 6.5, which relates to Planning Scheme Amendment C245 for the Queen Victoria Market. I wish to highlight that we own the land at 446-450 Queen Street, Melbourne and am also speaking on behalf of the owners 432-438 Queen Street, Melbourne.

During the exhibition process for the proposed Amendment, professional representation of Hansen Partnership was sought, where they prepared a written submission to raise a number of specific and technical issues with the proposed amendment.

However following the conclusion of the exhibition process, I was quite frustrated to be advised that Council Officers did not intend to undertake any further discussion or consultation on issues raised, nor would provide clarification on specific highlighted questions.

I acknowledge that the Officers Report on this matter broadly summarises the issues raised in the submission made by Hansen Partnership on our behalf. However I note that the Officers Report then chooses to respond to these issues in a collective manner (i.e. Attachment 3). Yet when reading the details of Attachment 3, it is written in a generic style, that it does not specifically address or respond to our specifically raised issues.

As such the critical issues raised in our submission, but which remain to date unanswered include:

- The level of technical built form modelling used by Council Officers to justify proposed building form controls is unclear.
- The proposed built form controls seem to specifically favour the larger Council owned sites, while negatively reducing development opportunity smaller sites (such as our land). Council Officer has not clarified whether this was specifically intended, or is an accidental oversight within the drafting of the control.
- Council Officers have not clarified the intent of the proposed controls which are not clear in their drafting and interpretation.
- Council Officers have not clarified the responsibilities around who is to prepare the Development Plan required by the proposed overlay.
- Council Officers have not discussed or provided any comment on the alternative built form modelling prepared as part of Hansen Partnership's submission to the Amendment.

Despite highlighting these unanswered matters, I am not seeking for a specific response from Council on these matters. Rather I am primarily making this submission this evening to highlight my complete frustration regarding Council Officers' assessment and management of Amendment C245 to date.

Based on the handling of the amendment process to date, it appears that Council Officers are intent on deferring all discussion and consideration of issues raised to the Planning Panel. I consider this to represent poor planning and management on behalf of Council Officers, and particularly more so when the Amendment would result in substantial benefit for Council owner sites, to the detriment of smaller surrounding privately owned land such as my property and neighbouring sites.

I consider that Council Officers should have taken a much more proactive role in discussing and negotiating issues raised in submissions made to Amendment C245, rather than simply recommend the matter to be heard by a Planning Panel without ANY modification being proposed to the Amendment. In this instance I consider this to be a clear failing of Council, particularly give the dual roles as landowner and Responsible Authority.

Noting the complete lack of discussion or clarification of issues raised, I intend to strongly and vigorously contest Amendment C245 during the Planning Panel process, and will seek to have professional representation to do so.

In addition to this written submission I intend to reinforce its main points through a verbal presentation at the Council meeting.

Yours sincerely.

Mr Peter Papageorgiou

---

**From:** Wufoo  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 8 March 2016 11:50:39 AM (UTC+10:00) Canberra, Melbourne, Sydney  
**To:** CoM Meetings  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#578]

**Name: \*** Felicity Watson

**Email address: \*** [felicity.watson@nattrust.com.au](mailto:felicity.watson@nattrust.com.au)

**Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button: \*** Future Melbourne Committee meeting

**Date of meeting: \*** Tuesday 8 March 2016

**Agenda item title: \*** 6.5 Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C245 Queen Victoria Market Precinct Renewal

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



[2016\\_03\\_08\\_future\\_melbourne\\_committee\\_submission.pdf](#)

358.02 KB · PDF

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

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.) \**

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

---



National Trust of Australia (Victoria)  
ABN 61 004 356 192



**NATIONAL TRUST**

8 March 2016

Future Melbourne Committee  
City of Melbourne  
GPO Box 1603  
Melbourne VIC 3001.

Tasma Terrace  
4 Parliament Place  
East Melbourne  
Victoria 3002

Email: [info@nattrust.com.au](mailto:info@nattrust.com.au)  
Web: [www.nationaltrust.org.au](http://www.nationaltrust.org.au)

File No: B2282

T 03 9656 9800  
F 03 9656 5397

**RE: Future Melbourne Committee Agenda Item 6.5: Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C245 Queen Victoria Market Precinct Renewal**

Dear Councillors,

The National Trust is disappointed that no changes have been recommended to Amendment C245 following the consideration of submissions received during the exhibition of the amendment. We continue to have significant concerns regarding the proposed amendment which would, for the first time, result in the total erasure of the full historical extent of the market site and former cemetery.

We support the recommendation to request the Minister for Planning appoint an Independent Panel to consider the submissions to Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C245, and look forward to the opportunity to address the panel regarding this important amendment.

Yours sincerely,

Felicity Watson  
Senior Community Advocate

## Statement in support of my submission objecting to amendment C245

At the service of various commercial interests, and through the agency of this amendment, the City of Melbourne appears determined to push ahead with plans that will fundamentally and detrimentally impinge on the heritage value of the QVM and its surroundings .

In particular, the further destruction and desecration of the Old Melbourne Cemetery which would result from the “re-alignment” of Franklin St is to be deplored. In the words of a previous advisor to the City of Melbourne, historian Chrystopher Spicer, such an act is best described as “cultural vandalism.”

Although inconvenient for a few rapacious developers, the burial place and the remains of Melbourne’s first citizens should be accorded due respect; and that means no further interference in the form of excavation (including unnecessary and invasive archaeological excavations), no building - including roads - above or beneath , and no car parking.

The entire scheme for QVM needs to be revised with *genuine* regard for the unique cultural and historical significance of the area.

Russell Mooney