

NOTE: This email address is confidential and restricted access. As agreed, please do not share or publish it. Thank you.

---

Hi,

I wish to make presentations, and will provide written submissions, for:

Future Melbourne Committee Meeting Tuesday 19 July 2022

<https://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/about-council/committees-meetings/meeting-archive/Pages/Future-Melbourne-Committee-19-July-2022.aspx>

- Agenda items 6.1, Report: **Neighbourhood key issues and City of Melbourne Projects for South Yarra** (Presenter: Rushda Halith, Director Community Development)
- Agenda items 6.4 **Fawkner Park Pasley Street North Entrance Improvements** (Presenter: David Callow, Director Parks and City Greening)

I also wish to make a submission/ask a question.

I will provide copies later.

Thank you,

Best regards,

B. McNicholas

Director, Walk in St Kilda Rd & Environs

Convenor, Planet Ark National Tree Day, Nature Care, Heritage and Lighting Events

**Privacy acknowledgement: \***

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

**Name: \***

Hamish Balzan

**Email address: \***

[REDACTED]

**Phone number \***

[REDACTED]

**Date of meeting: \***

Tuesday 19 July 2022

**Agenda item title: \***

6.2

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

Yes

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

I wish to make my submission in person

**Privacy acknowledgement: \***

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

**Name: \***

Michael Butcher

**Email address: \***

[REDACTED]

**Phone number \***

[REDACTED]

**Date of meeting: \***

Tuesday 19 July 2022

**Agenda item title: \***

6.2

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

Yes

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

I wish to make my submission in person

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

\*

**Name: \*** Jack Lyons

**Email address: \***

[REDACTED]

**Phone number \***

[REDACTED]

**Date of meeting: \*** Tuesday 19 July 2022

**Agenda item title:** 6.2

\*

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

Good evening Councillors, my name is Jack Lyons of Ratio Consultants, acting for the permit applicant in this matter.

I would firstly like to state and place on record that our client is fully supportive of the planning department's recommendation as printed and has no issue with the conditions of permit as recommended.

As detailed extensively within the Council officers' report, the proposal is entirely appropriate and consistent with the Melbourne Planning Scheme and has undergone extensive consultation with Council to respond to objector concerns and to address all Council queries.

Specifically, the proposal results in a satisfactory and appropriate outcome, noting:

- The proposed built form response is consistent with the mixed streetscape character, where there is a 2-4 storey building context as supported by Policy. The area is further characterised by established and more recent infill developments which have minimal front setbacks and landscaping along with a robust built form response.
- Significantly, the property is a "non-contributory" building within the broad South Yarra heritage precinct, noting that Council's heritage advisor and planning assessments have concluded that there is no evidence to doubt this grading, and that "the proposed demolition and new dwelling are supported from a heritage perspective".
- The proposed design has carefully considered neighbouring amenity through the orientation of the building to

the northern boundary, the provision of staggered southern and western setbacks, and a light court along the northern property boundary to match the adjacent light court.

In determining the application, the application must be considered on balance. Importantly:

- The proposal is entirely appropriate and consistent with the various applicable planning controls and policies of the Melbourne Planning Scheme, including in relation to heritage, built form and off-site amenity impacts.
- All of Council's internal referral departments are supportive of the application.
- The applicant sought to amend the application plans pursuant to Section 57a of the Act to respond to objector and Council concerns. This has facilitated a diligent and thorough officers report recommending condition support to Council.
- Opposing the granting of the planning permit would represent going against Council's own expert planning and heritage advice and would go against the various planning controls and policies that apply to the site.

Accordingly, we encourage Council to uphold its independent expert advice that supports the issue of a Notice of Decision to Grant Planning Permit consistent with the proposed conditions for the property at 95-97 Millswyn Street, South Yarra.

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

**If yes, please      I wish to make my submission in person**  
**indicate if you**  
**would like to**  
**make your**  
**submission in**  
**person, or via a**  
**virtual link (Zoom)**  
**to the meeting.**  
**Please note,**  
**physical**  
**attendance will be**  
**limited in**  
**accordance with**

City of Melbourne  
security protocols  
and COVID-safe  
plans and be  
allocated on a first  
registered, first  
served basis. \*

**Privacy acknowledgement: \***

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

**Name: \***

Tom Buchan

**Email address: \***

[REDACTED]

**Phone number \***

[REDACTED]

**Date of meeting: \***

Tuesday 19 July 2022

**Agenda item title: \***

Planning Submission

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



[submission\\_from\\_99\\_millswyn\\_street\\_to\\_tp2021224.pdf](#)

109.83 KB · PDF

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

Yes

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

I wish to make my submission in person



19 July 2022

**95-97 MILLWYN STREET, SOUTH YARRA VIC 2141 - PLANNING APPLICATION TP-2021-224  
WRITTEN SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF A & K HUTTON**

We continue to act on behalf of Mr Alexander and Mrs Kirsty Hutton, the owners and occupiers of 99 Millswyn Street in South Yarra, the immediately adjoining property to the north of the subject site at 95-97 Millswyn Street.

On behalf of our client, we continue to strongly **object** to the proposed development at 95-97 Millswyn Street. What is proposed is entirely inappropriate and ultimately an unacceptable planning outcome.

Specifically, our client objects on the basis that:

- a) The proposed rooftop deck, west-facing windows and lack of screening to the limit overlooking impacts to habitable room windows and secluded private open spaces.
- b) The proposed walls both on boundary and the side setbacks, and the associated bulk to the north and to the streetscape.
- c) The proposal will erode the valued heritage and neighbourhood character qualities of the street.
- d) It should be noted that our client's property contains secluded private open spaces and habitable room windows interfacing the subject site.
- e) The amenity of our clients habitable and recreational spaces are largely, if not almost entirely, overlooked by the proposed upper floor windows and roof terrace. The plans do not indicate sufficient measures to address Clause 54.04-6 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme, with the use of "vegetative planter boxes" as screening not considered sufficient to ensure the amenity of our clients primary backyard area.
- f) The development proposes a poorly conceived design response which will provide detrimental impacts to the amenity of our client's property. The proposed height (exceeding 10m over three storeys) of the walls on and adjacent to the northern boundary directly adjacent to our client's courtyard and rear secluded private open space area (SPOS), is simply inappropriate and unacceptable and should not be approved.
- g) The proposed height and location of build mass is disruptive to the streetscape rhythm and lacks a sensitive transition in height and form to our client's property.

As currently proposed, we believe the Council should refuse the application because it;

- 1) Adversely and unreasonably impacts upon the amenity of our clients' secluded private open spaces at 99 Millswyn Street;
- 2) Adversely and unreasonably impacts upon the amenity of our clients' internal amenity, including the use of important open space areas and internal rooms;
- 3) Adversely and unreasonably impacts upon the streetscape character through an unduly large and an ungraduated building form to its neighbours.
- 4) Adversely impacts the streetscape and heritage qualities due to the lack of any meaningful garden in the front setback.
- 5) Adversely impacts upon the heritage character of the HO6 South Yarra heritage precinct, as well as see the loss of a likely candidate for heritage graded building and the lack of any meaningful garden in the front setback.
- 6) Does not comply with regard to the requirements of Clause 54.04-1 (Standard A10 – Side and rear setbacks), Clause 54.04-2 (Walls on boundary), Clause 54.04-3 (Daylight to existing windows) and Clause 54.04-6 (Overlooking) of the Melbourne Planning Scheme, clearly demonstrating that the proposal is an overdevelopment of the site and will result in adverse impacts to adjoining sites.

The amended design has not gone far enough to address our client's concerns and reduce the considerable off-site amenity impacts evident at present.

Our clients find it difficult to understand how the Planning Department has recommended support for the application.

It is important to note that from a heritage perspective, Councils' own advisor has stated that the existing dwelling *'is not necessarily devoid of historical or representative heritage value, particularly if found to be constructed during the postwar period (1940s/50s), a layer of significance to HO6.'*

We note that the existing dwelling on the subject site is an example of intact Bauhaus design likely of the inter-war era. We submit that the existing building is meritorious of an interim protection order pursuant to *Section 143 of the Heritage Act 2017*, on the basis that the existing dwelling demonstrates compliance with several attributes that comprise and contribute to the statement of significance for the Heritage Place.

This proposal blatantly disregards the policies and provisions contained within local planning policies and Clause 54 and will provide a design outcome that would materially and detrimentally impact upon the current amenity provided to client's dwelling at 99 Millswyn Street and adjacent properties.

If approved, the proposal will set a problematic precedent for inappropriate and poorly conceived development within the street.

Impacts to the surrounding area will be severe, as evidenced by the plethora of objections received regarding the proposal. The contentious nature of the proposal (15 total objections received) is not ordinarily expected for the construction of a single dwelling; and should signal to the Council that the proposal is not reasonable in this site context.

We continue to rely on our comprehensive planning submission (objection) provided to Council on 25 February 2022, which outlines the above-mentioned issues in greater detail and provides a robust assessment of the relevant and most pertinent shortfalls with the proposal.

We respectfully request that the Council refuse the application based on external amenity impacts and local heritage policy grounds. The proposal fails to achieve an acceptable outcome against the planning policies in place within the City of Melbourne.

**SongBowdenPlanning**

Tom Buchan  
Senior Planner

Dear City of Melbourne Meeting Group Team

This is a written submission in regards to the Future Melbourne Committee meeting of Tuesday the 19<sup>th</sup> July 2022, and in particular Agenda Item 6.3 - Municipal Planning Strategy (Major Initiative 20).

Thanks to Sophie Handley, Director City Strategy, and City of Melbourne management team for all the work that has been done to produce and present this draft to the Future Melbourne Committee.

In regards to Open Space Strategies, City of Melbourne should be inspired by the renewal of Caulfield Racecourse from a training / horse race meeting venue to a dual racecourse devoted to horse race meetings, with the inside of the racecourse open to the general public, for parklands, sporting fields ,and even perhaps the option of an Astronomical Observatory.

With the example of Caulfield Racecourse in mind, City of Melbourne should be aware that on the 26<sup>th</sup> May 2022, Racing Victoria announced that it had purchased a large parcel of land near Tullamarine, a property more than three times the size of Flemington racecourse, for the potential development of creating a new racetrack and training centre. This is the future of the thoroughbred horse racing industry. Is this where all the Flemington trainers will take their stables and yards? And leave Flemington to be just a racecourse for horse race meetings, with the capacity for inside the racecourse to be transitioned into green open spaces, parkland and sporting fields and sporting infrastructure? Just like Caulfield?

City of Melbourne does have the ambition to have conversations with the VRC, in exploring what the options are for making the land inside the racecourse transitioned into open green space for the public, like they are doing at Caulfield Racecourse. This is mentioned on Page 52 of 224, section 11.03- 6L Flemington Racecourse and Melbourne Showgrounds. Bravo City of Melbourne, Bravo!

On page 5 of 224, the section 02.01 Context, there is concern about the wording of the start of the first sentence.

Instead of - The City of Melbourne (Melbourne) stands on.....

Could the City of Melbourne consider writing - The City of Melbourne (Naarm) is located on .....

Naarm is the name the First Nation tribes apply to the land where Melbourne is located.

On page 5 of 224, the section entitled History, there is concern about the wording of the start of the first sentence.

Instead of - Melbourne sits on the traditional lands .....

Could the City of Melbourne consider writing - Melbourne (Naarm) is located on the traditional lands .....

On page 6 of 224, in the third paragraph under the History section, the importance of Robert Hoddle is mentioned. However, there is no mention of Charles Joseph La Trobe, who had the imagination and vision to create all of the parks that surround the CBD, who had the vision to allocate a large area of land for the Royal Botanic Gardens (RBG). Victoria had the motto -The Garden State , thanks to the work of La Trobe and the RBGs first director Ferdinand Mueller. They had more impact on Victoria than Robert Hoddle. La Trobe was the first Governor of Victoria, and he planned the parks with the vision of what Melbourne would look like with a population of 5 million people.

On Page 10 of 224, Section 02.03- 3 Environmental Risks and Amenity, it is stated that climate change will deliver reduced rainfall. At this moment, NSW Premier Dominic Perrottet, after the biblical deluge that NSW has experienced this year, would find that concept surprising.

Climate change is happening, there are larger and more frequent extreme weather events occurring around the globe. City of Melbourne is to be applauded for its thoughtful and pragmatic approach to the challenges that climate change presents.

Should buildings in Fishermans Bend be built on stilts? What lessons can be learnt from the recent devastating floods in NSW?

In regards to Amenity, safety and noise (Page 11 of 224) could the City of Melbourne consider including the paragraph -

Encourage developers, architects, builders to create residential apartments that are designed to reduce the ambient sound level of a vibrant 24 hour urban environment. City of Melbourne knows that Melbourne (Naarm) is the music capital of Australia.

City of Melbourne should have the aim of being a city that has a fleet of electric-powered garbage trucks that deliver an excellent waste removal service.

On Page 16 of 224, under the Creative Industries banner, in the first paragraph could the City of Melbourne include - Animation;  
after - film, television and radio; .

It's important to recognise that the animation industry in Melbourne is world-class. The animation scene in Melbourne is the best in Australia.

On Page 17 of 224, in the Transport section, the City of Melbourne should support the idea of two underground train tunnels underneath Fisherman's Bend, running between Newport Station and Flinders Street Station. This would be world class transport infrastructure. This should be in City of Melbourne's Strategies for Transport section.

On Page 42 of 224, 11.03- 6L East Melbourne and Jolimont, there is concern that any development between Richmond Train Station and Flinders Street Station will increase the Urban Heat Island, and would have an adverse effect on the nearby parks and gardens.

A tremendous amount of work has gone into this draft. When I read through the draft, including the Draft Spatial Plan there were 154 pages available to read. Chances are Cr Leppert enjoyed Page 140.

Best regards,  
Chris Thrum



**Privacy acknowledgement: \***

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

**Name: \***

David Hamilton

**Email address: \***

[REDACTED]

**Phone number \***

[REDACTED]

**Date of meeting: \***

Tuesday 19 July 2022

**Agenda item title: \***

6.3 Municipal Planning Strategy (Major Initiative 20)

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



[southbank3006\\_submission\\_to\\_fom\\_19\\_july\\_2022\\_agenda\\_item\\_6.3.pdf](#)

279.02 KB · PDF

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

No



**Subject: Municipal Planning Strategy 2022-32**

**Purpose:** To outline the perspectives of Southbank3006 Inc, as a resident community group based in Postcode 3006, on the Municipal Planning Strategy, Melbourne Planning Scheme (at pages 73 to 75), and the Draft Spatial Plan as they relate to Southbank 3006 (East).

**Key Issues:**

***Southbank3006 is concerned that the Draft Spatial Plan requires significant work in relation to Southbank before it is adopted. Our concerns relate to.***

1. The Draft Spatial Plan (Plan) should be the document that provides guidance and direction to the State Government, residents, and developers as to the type of built environment that should be created over the next 10 years. Unfortunately, it fails to live up to that expectation and is a “more of the same” assuming what has emerged over the past 10 years can be continued for the next 10 years. *It therefore needs to be strengthened to give guidance to all interested parties as to what the City expects in this precinct as to how the Strategic Directions detailed on Pages 6 and 7 of the Draft Spatial Plan will be achieved in Southbank.*
2. The Plan has an heroic view that development will “slow” in the period but provides no guidance as to how that could eventuate. It seems to be a capitulation that growth will continue unfettered and that developers will seek and obtain Ministerial dispensations as a matter of course. Whilst that may be a reality it would assist if the Draft Spatial Plan did in fact put forward a different vision providing a counterfactual against which Ministerial decisions can be tested.
3. The Draft Spatial Plan makes appropriate references to the lack of and the need for Open Space in Southbank 3006 (east) and traffic management which will create low traffic neighborhoods. But the Plan ignores the policy disconnect between these statements on these issues whilst embracing the continued development of high-rise multi-unit dwellings infilling the remaining few sites in Southbank 3006 (east) further exacerbating the open space shortage for land use and traffic issues. *The policy disconnects inherent in the Plan and enabling continued high-rise multi-unit dwellings as Southbank’s reality need to be addressed urgently before adoption.*
4. *The plan needs to be updated to use August 2021 ABS data for Southbank. The plan relies on 2020 forecasts of the 2016 census. The reality is that in the period 2016 to 2021 the population in Southbank3006 (East) grew 34.4% and continues to be the most densely populated area in the State, and in the 10-year period 2011 to 2021 it grew 142%. Southbank3006 (East) is the site of 2 of the tallest residential buildings in Australia and shortly the 3<sup>rd</sup> all within 400m of each other.*
5. The issues flagged in the Council’s strategy paper and the reality of the ABS data are exacerbated in a neighborhood already dominated by high rise apartment building development. Namely there is no investment in social infrastructure and the social development of the community of residents. *We are unable to see how the Spatial Plan for Southbank:*
  - *Prioritises Land Use to maximise social, environmental, and economic benefit for residents.*
  - *Promotes Community health and wellbeing through considered approaches to design and infrastructure provision. It is as if the lessons from 2 years of COVID19 pandemic are conveniently ignored in the fostering continued high rise apartment building development.*
  - *Facilitates resident Movement in Southbank 3006 by creating places and redesigning streets to be low traffic neighbourhoods (LTNs) that encourage people movement. In this regard we would recommend that the Council repudiates the City Road Master Plan as an outdated concept where the funds could be better directed to both LTNs in Southbank and Greenline.*

*Council needs to take leadership and foster these strategies in Southbank as a matter of urgency as a City with the State Government as individual developers will ignore them unless actively encouraged to address them.*



***Melbourne Planning Scheme Draft (at pages 73 to 75) needs to be radically recast if it is to be a Planning Scheme that aligns with the Council's Strategic Design Directions***

1. In line with our comments on the Draft Spatial Plan above the Melbourne Planning Scheme Draft is littered with contradictions and policy disconnects and as such requires a radical rework to align it with the Draft Spatial Plan and the reality of what exists in Southbank3006 (East) today if it is to form the basis of creating the built environment and the framework for land use planning going forward.
2. The stated Vision in the Melbourne Planning Scheme (MPS) is that *"Southbank will continue to grow as Melbourne's premier arts precinct and an extension of the central city, focused on the Birrarung (Yarra River). It will develop into a truly walkable neighbourhood that provides a great environment for people"*. The MPS then proceeds to ignore this vision when considering housing, transport, and open space.

*Housing Strategies*

3. The Draft MPS continues to rely on Housing Strategies that, *"Encourage high density residential and commercial development in the Capital City Zone area"*. There is no justification for this other than this is what has happened in the past. The Draft Spatial Plan wistfully hopes for a transition to slower development. But continuing with a Housing Strategy contained in the Draft Melbourne Planning Scheme for Southbank3006 will exacerbate the shortage of open space, degraded community facilities, lack of social infrastructure, and exacerbate traffic and transport issues. Today there is 2.5sqm of open space per resident well below the City of Melb target of 21 sqm of open space per person. Increasing the population will degrade the amount of open space per person further.
4. The Draft MPS needs to call a halt to that approach of the past in the area *"North of CityLink and west of Moore Street"* and instead adopt a planning framework to *"Encourage medium scale development across all of Southbank"* not just in some select precincts. In the 10-year period between 2011 and 2021 the population in Southbank East grew 142% including the areas designated as medium density.

*Economic Development Strategies:*

5. The Economic Development Strategies lack any direction as to how the facilities developed for Art, Entertainment and Educational uses envisaged for the area will integrate with the wider Southbank community in which they sit.
6. Planning with that as the sole economic objective only encourages *"destination"* facilities disconnected from the neighbourhood and risks further alienating residents in the area.

*Transport and Open Space Strategies:*

7. The Transport Strategies and Open Space Strategies in the plan both need significant revision if they are to provide a useful framework in which to develop Southbank 3006 over the next 10 years. The Melbourne Planning Scheme needs to recognise that both Transport and Open Space would be enhanced by a specific commitment in the document to create Low Traffic Neighbourhoods across Southbank as part of a positive planning requirement. LTN's encourage people to walk, cycle or use micro or public transport, but still allow the use of cars for residents, deliveries, and emergency services.
8. The Draft MPS's *Transport Strategy* is to *"Encourage a network of through block links to increase permeability, amenity, and safety throughout and to improve access to the Birrarung (Yarra River) and Arts Precinct"*. None of which is focussed on the needs of residents of Southbank and can be used to disadvantage local resident movement across, through, and round their neighbourhood. But the MPS should shift *the objective to being one that focuses on creating Low Traffic Neighbourhoods across Southbank* as it delivers a preferable outcome to the one contained in in the Draft MPS.
9. *Open Space for Southbank3006* is optimistically going *"to be provided along the access to, and along, the Birrarung (Yarra River) and adjoining public spaces and increase the ecological and biodiversity function of this green corridor"*. None of this Open Space is close to, or easily

accessible to, most residents in Southbank3006. In fact, these are destination spaces for greater Melbourne and the State so NOT local Open Space provision.

10. What Southbank requires is green open space, in particular micro parks and community gardens, distributed across the entire neighbourhood. The Draft MPS should encourage the removal of on street parking around Southbank and use this reclaimed land to transform it into green space, community and micro gardens or pocket parks close to where the people live and are family friendly spaces. Where residents can enjoy a cleaner, greener and above all safer outdoor environment.

This then should form the Objective for Open Space in Southbank going forward so the objective in the Draft MPS should be reframed to be one *“to create land space in Southbank and to transform it into green space, community and micro gardens or pocket parks close to where the people live and are family friendly spaces. Where residents can enjoy a cleaner, greener and above all safer outdoor environment.”*

**Recommendation:**

- i. *The Housing Strategies contained in both the Melbourne Planning Scheme and the Spatial Plan need to pivot from high density residential and commercial development to medium density development across all of Southbank (East) (i.e.) the area in Postcode 3006 excluding South Wharf.*
- ii. *The Transport Strategy objective in the Melbourne Planning Scheme for Southbank needs to be realigned to one that focuses on creating Low Traffic Neighbourhoods across Southbank.*
- iii. *The Open Space objective in the Melbourne Planning Scheme and the Spatial Plan for Southbank needs to be reframed “to create land space in Southbank and to transform it into green space, community and micro gardens or pocket parks close to where the people live and are family friendly spaces. Where residents can enjoy a cleaner, greener and above all safer outdoor environment.”*
- iv. *The Spatial Plan for Southbank needs to prioritise its focus to one that “Promotes Community health and wellbeing through considered approaches to design and infrastructure provision”.*
- v. *The Spatial Plan needs to be updated to use August 2021 ABS data for Southbank, in particular time series data for Southbank (East) where the population has grown 142% in the 10-year period making it the highest population density neighbourhood in Australia without any investment in social and community infrastructure to support this population growth.*

*In summary:*

*Council needs to take leadership and foster these strategies in Southbank as a matter of urgency as a City with the State Government as individual developers will ignore them unless actively encouraged to address them.*

**David Hamilton**  
**President**  
**Southbank3006 Inc**



18 July 2022

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

\*

**Name: \*** Gayle Gledhill

**Email address: \***

[REDACTED]

**Phone number \***

[REDACTED]

**Date of meeting: \*** Tuesday 19 July 2022

**Agenda item title:** Municipal Planning Strategy

\*

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

The Melbourne South Yarra Residents Group (MSYRG) has been working on behalf of members in postcodes 3141 and 3004, to enhance and preserve the character and amenity of the City of Melbourne component of South Yarra.

The MSYRG welcomes the Municipal Planning Strategy and appreciates the work undertaken to build an overview of the South Yarra neighbourhood – both within the Municipal Planning Strategy and Neighbourhood key issues and City of Melbourne planning projects for South Yarra.

It is also pleasing there are specific intentions to progress the ongoing heritage review in South Yarra which the MSYRG on behalf of residents, has committed significant resources over several years.

However, the MSYRG would like to make the following points. While we acknowledge and recognise there will be further opportunities for consultation, feel it is important to highlight that the following matters will be tabled during future consultation.

1. In regard to the Heritage Review, there has been no significant review of heritage in South Yarra since the 1980's. The current review has been ongoing for several years without finalisation. Until the review is completed,

vulnerable buildings are not provided adequate protection under the current planning provisions. The MSYRG requests that the Future Melbourne Committee provide adequate resources, support and guidance to the wider City of Melbourne to finalise and conclude the ongoing Heritage Review for South Yarra as a matter of urgency.

2. The descriptions of the South Yarra area are very accurate from an open space and open parkland perspective. However, residents would like to highlight that these spaces are not the preserve of residents but are shared with the wider Melbourne and Victorian community. As a result, there are key challenges around the public usage of these parklands and the quiet enjoyment of residential areas adjoining the parkland. This was particularly evident during Covid, but also is an ongoing issue around public and key events which impact residential streets on a regular basis. We feel that this aspect should be expanded in the key challenges for South Yarra.

3. The key challenges describing South Yarra also overlook issues which are commonplace in many inner city Melbourne areas, but in equally relevant in South Yarra – these include insufficient parking and traffic congestion.

4. A significant concern of all residents is the unending wave of planning applications, many of which fall outside planning policies and guidelines but require significant time, financial resources and energy of City of Melbourne to assess proposals and by residents to lodge prepare and lodge objections.

5. In regard to transport, there are multiple references to the new Metro Rail facilities under construction at Domain. However, it is important to highlight that during construction public transport has been impacted with the re-routing of the 58 tram, and increased road congestion with the closure of Domain Road /St Kilda Road intersection. Furthermore, the issues relating to the reinstatement of the Number 58 tram is a key challenge that will need to be addressed in the short term by both the community and the City of Melbourne

6. There is also a reference in the Municipal Planning Strategy to ‘Strengthen the connections between Domain Parklands and Fawkner Park’. It would be helpful if further information regarding this were contained in the Municipal Planning Strategy.

Gayle Gledhill

President

Melbourne South Yarra Residents Group

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

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

\*

**Name: \*** Katie Roberts

**Email address: \***

[REDACTED]

**Phone number \***

[REDACTED]

**Date of meeting: \*** Tuesday 19 July 2022

**Agenda item title:** 6.3 Municipal Planning Strategy (Major Initiative 20)

\*

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

I am a Carlton resident & homeowner with young children. There are a lot of very exciting plans in the Municipal Planning Strategy. But I am concerned about the lack of discussion of the housing shortage in Carlton and the rest of the inner city.

The 2040 plan for Carlton (and other suburbs) assumes a worsening housing shortage. Currently in Carlton, for every job there are about two residents. But the 2040 plan is to lower that to 1.67 residents for every worker. Why plan for fewer residents per job? Carlton is a wonderful, desirable place to live. Home prices have already been skyrocketing but now rental vacancies are very low and rents are going up as well. The 2040 plan has me worried about whether my children will be able to afford to stay in the neighborhood they are growing up in.

Carlton is adjacent to the CBD. It should have the same population density as a place like Brooklyn, NY. We are planning for 'low rise' to preserve heritage, and this comes at the expense of our children and our environment – since the lack of housing in the inner/middle suburbs is leading to ongoing outer suburb sprawl. Our over-focus on heritage and low-rise housing is also a factor preventing social/public housing from being developed at scale throughout our neighborhoods where people most want to live.

**Please indicate whether you would like to** No

---

verbally address  
the Future  
Melbourne in  
support of your  
submission: \*

---

NOTE: This email address is confidential and restricted access. As agreed, please do not share or publish it. Thank you.

---

Hi,

I wish to make presentations, and will provide written submissions, for:

Future Melbourne Committee Meeting Tuesday 19 July 2022

<https://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/about-council/committees-meetings/meeting-archive/Pages/Future-Melbourne-Committee-19-July-2022.aspx>

- Agenda items 6.1, Report: **Neighbourhood key issues and City of Melbourne Projects for South Yarra** (Presenter: Rushda Halith, Director Community Development)
- Agenda items 6.4 **Fawkner Park Pasley Street North Entrance Improvements** (Presenter: David Callow, Director Parks and City Greening)

I also wish to make a submission/ask a question.

I will provide copies later.

Thank you,

Best regards,

B. McNicholas

Director, Walk in St Kilda Rd & Environs

Convenor, Planet Ark National Tree Day, Nature Care, Heritage and Lighting Events



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

\*

**Name: \*** Jennifer McDonald

**Email address: \***

[REDACTED]

**Phone number \***

[REDACTED]

**Date of meeting: \*** Wednesday 20 July 2022

**Agenda item title:** 6.4 Fawkner Park Pasley Street North Entrance improvements

\*

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

I wish to respond to the report on the completion of the major works in Fawkner Park.

This has been a very contentious project. I give a brief summary. There are outstanding issues which need to be rectified in the planning process for new works in Heritage Parks.

We need adequate community consultation, the inclusion of heritage expertise from the early stages of planning and a current Master Plan is required to guide decision making.

1. Community concerns. I appreciate the efforts the Council is taking to include community participation in new projects.

Community consultation for the new major project in the Heritage listed Park did not reach the large number of residents on the North and West of the Park but centred around the Park entrance.

It is still unclear where the proposed need for a new public multifunctional court in this location came from. It does not appear to have been from the community. This is the playground area of 2 Primary Schools and a Kindergarten and a well frequented magnificent Park landscape

2. Heritage considerations. Heritage expertise and advice were not included in the detailed development of the plans and little attention was given to it. This was unacceptable and the planning team once committed to their plans were not open to negotiation and changes such as a simpler court and adjusted location.

. It was not until Heritage Victoria was required to issue a Permit for the works that a wider community of residents

and all the prominent Victorian Heritage organisations became involved and responded with quite detailed submissions on the adverse impact of the type of court and its location on Park values.

Heritage Victoria refused a Permit for parts of the works and noted considerable public concern. However the City Council did not respect the decision of Heritage Victoria, the Independent Heritage authority, and rather than continue negotiation with the planning team, instead the City of Melbourne appealed to the Heritage Council to overrule the Permit refusal.

The community voice well represented by Heritage Victoria for the preservation of the high community and aesthetic values of this wonderful Park was overpowered by the resources of the City of Melbourne where at great expense, SC and legal team, expert witnesses and their preferred heritage consultants and voluminous documentation persuaded the 3 member Heritage Council to rule in favour of the COM. The community did not have paid legal or heritage representation to authenticate their submissions, give authority to their values and to interrogate questionable assertions.

We were not happy with this process.

Our Heritage Parks deserve the best outcomes.

From our experience it is imperative that Heritage expertise is involved in the early stages of the planning for new works in Heritage listed Parks so that there is better management of reducing heritage impacts where possible.

### 3. Master Plan guidance for new projects in Heritage Parks

The Master Plan of 2006 recommended a review of the Plan in 2016 and this has not been done. The Master Plan required review for the new major change to the Park but these works were communicated to the public in the consultation period as improvements and replacement and not necessitating a Master Plan review process.

It cannot be said the new court is consistent with the Master Plan.

There is no statement in the Master Plan to justify this assertion.

The Master Plan states “ balancing these uses ( high passive and active recreational use ) with the highly valued character of the Park is an ongoing challenge.” True in 2006 when written. Even more so today.

It is important the original Master Plan is updated to respond to today’s community needs and pressures on the Park because of the many different and possibly conflicting activities that intersect and need to be managed to continue to be enjoyed there.

A Master Plan//CMP updated with appropriate community representation is required before further works take place in Fawkner Park.

The new court has not been welcomed by the many residents who use the Park for recreational rather than sporting activities. The “magnificent setting” of Fawkner Park as described in the Master Plan has been altered by the location of a large concreted area of highly patterned sports court with skating edges and additional paving and bike lanes replacing an expansive area of lush green grass and dappled sunlight beside the historic Avenue of Elms. The new infrastructure in the Park is part of the view on the Eastern side of the Park and more prominently so with the bare winter trees. It does impact the character and ambience of the Park particularly from the North and East. The court is often empty. Increasingly activities are taking place on the grass and equipment is brought into the

Park.

When there is action on the court there can be a mix of primary schoolchildren and supervisors, teenagers and older youth and skates and bikes. It does not look like a comfortable mix of activities.

The replacement of trees is not so encouraging. 9 well established and attractive trees were removed. Small trees have replaced them.

We hope in Fawkner Park the mistakes of the recent past will not be repeated.

Thank you.

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

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

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

\*

**Name: \*** Jill Quirk

**Email address: \***

[REDACTED]

**Phone number \***

[REDACTED]

**Date of meeting: \*** Tuesday 19 July 2022

**Agenda item title:** 6.4 Pasley Street North Entrance improvements

\*

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

The Master Plan referred to is 2006 is in great need of updating and it is a shame that major works were carried out in Fawkner Park in the absence of an updated MP. This is an urgent matter and should be completed before contemplating any other works in Fawkner Park.

5. Numerous submissions were made opposing these works and supported by Heritage Victoria who denied a permit for the works. This decision was subsequently over-ruled by Heritage Council. The initial stakeholder consultation process appears to have been inadequate with many local people not notified of the proposed works.

7. Regarding drainage, it would appear that the problem may have moved to another part of the park. On July 17th many patches around the multi-purpose court were soft, wet and muddy.

The replacement of lawn in Fawkner Park with a large synthetic area and surrounding hard surfaces inevitably mean increased noise and increased heat in summer

The construction is a very visible scar on the park and is so intrusive as to be visible from Toorak Road.

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

---

No