## Contents

1.0 Introduction  
1.1 Approach to Preparing the Submission  
1.2 The Submission  
1.3 Submission Structure

2.0 Overview  
2.1 Hume City Council’s Response to Melbourne 2030

3.0 Implementation Plans  
3.1 Urban Growth Boundary  
   UGB Concept  
   Applying the Urban Growth Boundary  
      Sunbury  
      Greenvale  
      Craigieburn  
   Applying the UGB to Other Areas

3.2 Growth Areas  
   Hume Growth Area Plan  
   Long-Term Hume Growth Area  
   Shift In Direction of Hume Growth Area  
   Smart Growth Committees  
   Sunbury - “Contained” Development Area Plan

3.3 Housing  
   Regional Housing Working Groups  
   Housing Strategies and Monitoring Land Supply

3.4 Activity Centres  
   Growth and Change in Activity Centres  
   Concentrate Activity Within Centres  
   Lead By Example

---

Melbourne 2030 - Hume City Council Submission  
Adopted By Council 17 February 2003
## Contents

### 3.5 Green Wedges
- Overview of Council’s Response to Green Wedges
- New Rural Zones
- Legislation
- Regional Groupings
- Hume Green Wedge Actional Plan

### 3.6 Integrated Transport
- Upgrade Principal Public Transport Network
- Transport Needs in Growth Areas
- Freight and Commercial Transport

### 4.0 Considering Submissions

### 5.0 Conclusion

### 6.0 Appendix
- 6.1 Hume Consultative Process
- 6.2 Technical Requirements - Anomalies and Corrections
- 6.3 Draft Hume City Council Work Plan Commitments
1.1 Approach to Preparing the Submission

The submission has been prepared having regard to Council’s strategic planning framework which comprises:

- Municipal Strategic Statement – Hume Planning Scheme
- Local Strategy Plans
- Local Structure Plans

These documents provide the foundation for Council’s strategic planning and form the basis of Council’s response to Melbourne 2030.

In addition, as part of preparing Council’s submission, Council undertook an extensive consultative process with key stakeholders, interests groups, servicing agencies and the general community. The submission has taken into consideration the comments provided through this consultative process. These comments are reflected in Council’s submission, and represent a wider understanding of the Hume strategic planning framework currently in place.

1.2 The Submission

Council has prepared its submission to Melbourne 2030 following detailed review of Melbourne 2030 – Planning for Sustainable Growth, and the six-associated implementation plans. These plans include:

- Urban Growth Boundary Implementation Plan
- Growth Areas Implementation Plan
- Housing Implementation Plans
- Activity Centres Implementation Plan
- Green Wedge Implementation Plan
- Transport Implementation Plan

The submission essentially supports the principles, which underpin the nine key directions of the Melbourne 2030 Strategy. The primary focus of Council’s submission is the review of the six implementation plans and implications for planning within Hume City Council.

Council understands that the State Government will make available a forum to discuss issues raised in this submission.
prior to the final strategy release. Council welcomes this process.

A detailed executive summary is attached to this submission. It summarises the main points of discussion raised in Council’s submission and outlines proposed recommendations. The executive summary is structured on the headings of the six-implementation plans of Melbourne 2030.

1.3 Submission Structure

The submission is structured as follows:

• Introduction
• Overview of Hume Council’s Response to Melbourne 2030
• Implementation Plans - Issues & Recommendations
• Conclusion
• Appendix

An Executive Summary of Council’s submission has also been prepared. The executive summary identifies the key issues and suggested recommendations discussed in the submission.

While most of the discussion of the Melbourne 2030 document will be contained within the submission, reference will be made to a number of working documents contained in the appendix. These include:

Appendix 1:
Hume Consultative Process
Hume City Council undertook an extensive consultative process to inform the preparation of its submission to Melbourne 2030. Some of the comments discussed at these consultative forums are referred to within the submission.

An overview of the consultative process and a summary of comments received are outlined in the appendix.

Council has also attached submissions made to Melbourne 2030, which have been copied and referred to Council.

Appendix 2:
Technical Comments - Anomalies and Corrections
This appendix covers comments of a technical nature and identifies mistakes and errors. Corrections to Melbourne 2030 include situations where urban-zoned land has been excluded by the UGB, amendments have been approved by the Minister and not recognised, factual errors have occurred or further clarity is required as a result of the lack of accuracy or information on Melbourne 2030 maps / plans etc.

Appendix 3:
Draft Hume City Council Work Plan
Outlines the Draft Hume Work Plan, which addresses work plan tasks identified for Council in Melbourne 2030. These tasks have short to medium term time frames. Finalisation of this work plan will be dependent upon necessary funding and resources being available to Council.
2.1 Hume City Council’s Response to Melbourne 2030

The Strategic Framework

The Melbourne 2030 document is a comprehensive metropolitan strategy. It seeks to fill a significant gap in regional planning that has existed for in excess of two decades. Detailed local planning during this time has often been carried out in the relative absence of regional guidance or direction. Local government has undertaken a high level of strategic planning in this time, however this has essentially occurred without an overarching regional context. It is hoped that Melbourne 2030 will fill this void.

Council supports the State Government’s commitment to producing a 30 year strategic framework to guide the future development of Melbourne. There is overall agreement with the strategic planning principles, which underpin the policy directions of the document.

Hume will play a significant role in this framework.

At a broad level, the Council supports the following positive initiatives proposed in Melbourne 2030:

- Clear direction for urban growth & identification of green wedge areas
- Development tied to sustainability principles
- Better coordination of growth area planning - “smart growth principles”
- Creation of more affordable housing opportunities
- Designation and proposed design principles for activity centres and transit cities

Whilst the general directions and policies of Melbourne 2030 are endorsed by Council, the practicality of implementing and achieving these objectives will require a high degree of State Government commitment and resourcing. The draft strategy commits the State Government and its agencies to considerable strategic and project work. This must be undertaken in partnership with local government. The credibility of the strategy will to a large extent depend on the successful implementation of its key actions. Significant ongoing resources will be required to full fill the aims and actions of the Strategy.
Planning within growth area municipalities such as Hume requires a significant level of government involvement and commitment in order to achieve desired community outcomes. Whilst Council’s submission will to a greater degree concentrate on the urban growth boundary, growth areas and green wedge components of the strategy, all elements of the document will affect the sustainable development of the City over the longer term.

Growth area planning needs to address a number of sustainability issues. Establishing new communities with appropriate access to employment, social and physical infrastructure, open space and well-planned community activity centres is critical. The emphasis of Melbourne 2030 for determining the direction of future growth is based primarily on public transport infrastructure, at the expense of other equally important requirements.

While the Melbourne 2030 Strategy emphasises sustainability, the basis for setting the UGB in the Merri Corridor seems to be solely based on the location of existing heavy rail infrastructure. While this is an important factor, other important sustainability issues and principles are not considered, including:

- Land capability / suitability
- Natural features
- Provision and impact on physical infrastructure such as water, sewerage and stormwater
- Social services (including regional health services)

All key environmental, social and economic sustainability issues need to be considered in the setting of the UGB.

Planning in the City has in the past suffered from a lack of government commitment toward key infrastructure planning, funding and timely provision. This lack of commitment has curtailed the attainment of growth area plan objectives at the local level.

The sustainable development of Roxburgh Park and Craigieburn was in part based on the connection of the proposed community to a metropolitan rail line. Even though Council was able to gain developer contributions towards electrification, the State Government’s commitment to constructing the electrification and constructing additional railway stations, has lagged behind the near completed developments of Roxburgh Park and the Delfin Estate at Craigieburn – over 10 years since the State Government first committed to planning this infrastructure item. Households have now established themselves with the car as the primary means of travel. It will be difficult to change these established patterns with the later provision of electrified rail.

The attainment of key directions and policies of Melbourne 2030 will therefore necessitate State Government commitment not only to providing the planning foundations for success, but matching this with significant budgetary commitments.
There are a number of implementation aspects of the strategy which require further input and discussion prior to implementation. Council would welcome the opportunity for further detailed discussion on these matters.

The following is an outline of specific issues associated with each of the implementation plans and an outline of recommended ways forward.
Key Points of Discussion

- Council supports a defined UGB
- UGB to correspond with the proposed urban growth areas as identified in Council’s MSS, General Plan and Strategy Plans.
- UGB to be modified for Sunbury, Craigieburn and Greenvale/Attwood
- UGB to be considered for townships of Kalkallo & Bulla

UGB Concept

Council endorses the concept of setting a defined edge to metropolitan growth and containing development to ensure better use of existing and planned infrastructure. Council supports the need to provide a clear extent to urban development that provides certainty to landowners, investors, servicing authorities and the community and to curb speculation regarding the future development of Melbourne.

Hume Council’s fundamental concern regarding the location of the interim UGB, lies with the inconsistency of the boundary when assessed against Council’s Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS) and Planning Scheme.

The proposed urban growth areas identified within the Hume MSS reflect sound strategic planning and decision making. The defined growth areas depicted within the Hume MSS have not been chosen arbitrarily.

The General Plan and associated Strategy Plans form the basis of the strategic direction of Council’s MSS.

The General Plan and Strategy Plans were prepared following extensive community, land owner and government agency consultation. The Shire of Bulla adopted the General Plan and Strategy Plans on 16 November 1992. Following the adoption of the General and Strategic Plans, an amendment to Bulla Planning Scheme introduced the policy objectives of the Strategy Plans into the scheme.

The plans are well known in the community as evidenced by feedback and comments made through the public information sessions.

An Independent Panel / Advisory Committee reviewed the extent of the urban growth boundary as prescribed in the General and Strategy Plans as part of the hearing of submissions and review of the new format Hume Planning Scheme (1999).
The Hume MSS provides a strategic framework for defining a clear extent to urban growth within the municipality. The Hume MSS, General and Strategy Plans were supported by Ministerial approval of the new format Hume Planning Scheme. “Clause 21.02-2

Bulla General and Strategy Plans
“The Bulla General and Strategy Plans were developed in 1993 and set out strategic directions for land use and development in that part of the City which formally comprised the Shire of Bulla, as well as more specific strategies for different parts contained within.

The Hume MSS has been developed having regard to vision of the Hume City Council Corporate Plan 1999-2005 and Hume General and Strategy Plans.”

The Hume MSS, General & Strategy Plans provide a clear planning direction not only for Council but for developers, investors, key servicing agencies and the community. Melbourne 2030 states that the proposed urban growth boundary has been set to

“give a clear consistent direction needed to give certainty for decision makers, investors and the community and to reduce speculation”
(pg 4. Urban Growth Boundary Implementation Plan.)

The urban growth boundary identified in the Hume MSS provides this clear direction for growth within the City. The alternative urban growth boundary proposed within Melbourne 2030 has raised uncertainty for affected landowners, investors, servicing authorities and the community, given its disregard to the aforementioned adopted strategic framework.

**Recommendation**

- That the current urban growth boundary should reflect committed strategic planning in Council’s MSS.

**Applying the Urban Growth Boundary**

To vary the urban growth boundary (beyond a technical anomaly) for areas not designated for growth, a “transitional” case must be argued. To meet the tests of a “transitional case” Council must be able to demonstrate that there is a clear commitment for future urban development as identified within a local strategy. In addition, the changes to the interim urban growth boundary must be consistent with the intent of Melbourne 2030.

The following is an assessment of the urban growth boundary as applied and instances where the boundary should be modified to reflect Council’s strategic planning framework and the intent of Melbourne 2030.
Sunbury

Melbourne 2030 identifies Sunbury as an area not identified for urban growth. This does not reflect current and planned strategy work completed for Sunbury. The UGB set for Sunbury essentially follows the existing urban-zoned land.

The Hume Municipal Strategic Statement and Sunbury Strategy Plan identifies future “contained” growth for the Sunbury area.

Sunbury currently has a population of approximately 32,000. Within the 30-year time frame of Melbourne 2030, it is expected that Sunbury will reach its ultimate population of approx. 50,000. To do so, a number of zoned and proposed growth area land holdings as identified in Council’s MSS will need to be developed.

As expressed at the community information sessions held by Council regarding Melbourne 2030, there is an expectation in the broader Sunbury community that there will be a level of “contained” development within Sunbury. This development is expected to occur in a number of areas and as identified in the Hume MSS and Sunbury Strategy Plan.

The Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS) and Sunbury Strategy Plan provides the necessary strategic framework upon which to support a variation to the interim urban growth boundary. The future contained development of Sunbury will consolidate the urban areas of the town and ensure sustainable development occurs in close proximity to public transport, social and physical services and infrastructure.

A number of land holdings in Sunbury have been identified in the MSS for future development. The MSS recommended that land be placed in rural zones, to act as “holding” zones pending future rezoning and development plan preparation. For example, land along Racecourse Rd, has been zoned Rural but identified for future urban development within the MSS.

Council would therefore recommend that the UGB for Sunbury be modified to reflect the Hume MSS and Sunbury Strategy Plan.
Special Investigation Areas

There are areas identified in the Hume MSS that are subject to “special investigation” to determine their suitability for development.

Council considers these areas to be “aesthetically and environmentally important” and require detailed assessment to ascertain what type of development, if any, is appropriate.

There are two remaining “special investigation areas” which require this detailed assessment to occur – “Craiglee” & “Sanctuary / Woodbourne”.

It is acknowledged that work was undertaken in relation to the “Sanctuary” land to support an amendment (C15) to the Hume Planning Scheme.

Advice to Council from the then Department of Natural Resources and Environment indicated that the development proposal, which formed part of the amendment, did not contain an appropriate level of information to determine the environmental impacts of the proposal. In the absence of this information the amendment was abandoned.

A more complete strategic land use review of these sites will determine whether the land is appropriate for urban development and if so, direct the type and form of development having regard to the objectives of the Hume MSS and Melbourne 2030.

The review of these investigation areas will involve a partnership approach with the Council, DSE, landholders and the community to ensure the aesthetic and environmental attributes of these sites are protected.

Pending the outcome of this strategic review, the land will either remain within or be removed from the UGB.

A planning assessment of Sunbury as a “contained growth” area could investigate a number of long term sustainability issues for the town, based on the directions of Melbourne 2030. This assessment could coordinate future development areas and assess key social and physical infrastructure planning requirements. This assessment could also include the strategic land use review of the identified “special investigation areas”.

Council could prepare this “contained growth” plan of Sunbury with support and assistance from DSE and other relevant stakeholders.
Recommendations

• That the UGB for Sunbury be relocated in line with Council’s Hume Municipal Strategic Statement and the Sunbury Strategy Plan.

• That this review will assess the appropriateness scale and form of development likely to be achieved in these locations having regard to the MSS Sunbury Strategy Plan and Melbourne 2030.

• That the UGB boundary, where it affects the land designated as “special investigation” – “Craiglee” & “Sanctuary/Woodbourne”, be reviewed.

• That DSE support Council in undertaking a strategic review, in consultation with landowners and other interested parties, of these sites within 12 months of the adoption of the Melbourne 2030 Strategy (or an agreed timeframe).

• That this review will also determine whether the sites should remain within the UGB.

• That the long term sustainability and planning of Sunbury as a “contained” growth area be supported and assisted by DSE and other relevant stakeholders.
Greenvale

Greenvale / Attwood area is not a defined growth area, however in accordance with the Hume MSS, there are future development sites which potentially could support the employment and open space needs of an established and developing community.

The proposed employment / open space sites were originally designated within the Greenvale/Attwood Strategy Plan. Subsequently the MSS recommended that the land remain in a Rural Zone with the condition that the zone act as a “holding zone” until such time as “an appropriate strategic land use could be determined”.

The land includes:

- Land located within the east west flight path, on both sides of Mickleham Rd
- The landfill site and associated buffer land in Western Avenue
- Land located on the south side of Western Av. between Victoria and Wright Streets
- The former Commonwealth owned land located on the north side of Western Avenue

All this land is currently shown outside the proposed urban growth boundary.

The sites are located east and west of Mickleham Rd. The MSS identifies the land for proposed future employment/development / open space uses (Note: residential is not permitted given the sites are affected by aircraft noise).

Since the approval of the Hume MSS a number of “business parks” have developed within the City and adjacent to the Melbourne Airport. There has been increasing interest in the subject land for similar activities, capitalising on the proximity to the Melbourne Airport.
Council is aware of potential investor commitment to some of the identified sites, pending future strategic work being carried out and rezoning of the land.

To assist the coordinated and integrated development of this land for employment / open space uses, Council is committed to preparing development principles and guidelines to direct a high quality and sustainable development outcome for this land. This can not be achieved if the land remains outside the current Urban Growth Boundary.

The following highlights the strategic opportunities of this land:

- Proximity to international airport and airport employment related activities
- Elevated and undulating topography and existing landscaped environment – opportunity to create a high quality business park environment
- High quality natural environments (creek)
- Proximity to historic Woodlands Estate & Homestead
- Proximity to high quality residential development near by
- Access to existing professional labour force
- Access to public and private transport infrastructure
- Close proximity to the Broadmeadows transit city
- Access to planned transport infrastructure linkages/connections – E14 reservation

Any development of the land will need to give regard to land use restrictions imposed due to aircraft noise constraints.

Council believes that the sites, which comprise the “proposed employment / open space land”, should be looked at wholistically and placed in a regional context. It is for these reasons that the future development of the land should also be linked to the wider planning of the Hume Growth Area. The details of this will be discussed further in this submission.

With regard to the UGB, it is considered appropriate that the land be included within the boundary, recognising the strategic intent of Council’s MSS which identifies the land for future urban purposes.

Any development of the land will need to give regard to land use restrictions imposed due to aircraft noise constraints.

Council believes that the sites, which comprise the “proposed employment / open space land”, should be looked at wholistically and placed in a regional context. It is for these reasons that the future development of the land should also be linked to the wider planning of the Hume Growth Area. The details of this will be discussed further in this submission.

With regard to the UGB, it is considered appropriate that the land be included within the boundary, recognising the strategic intent of Council’s MSS which identifies the land for future urban purposes.
Recommendations

• That the UGB be relocated in line with Hume Municipal Strategic Statement and Greenvale/Attwood Strategy Plan to include the proposed employment and open space land located east/west of Mickleham Rd land adjacent the Melbourne Airport.

• That the future planning of the land for employment uses be assessed having regard to potential linkages to the Hume Growth Area.

• That the Hume Growth Area Plan be widened to include this land.

Greenvale/Attwood Urban Growth Boundary Map
Current and Recommended
Craigieburn

Craigieburn is within the Hume Growth Area. Further discussion in response to the proposed direction of future growth will be discussed later in this submission. This section will concentrate on the location of the interim urban growth boundary and its inconsistency with Council’s strategic planning framework for this area.

The Hume MSS provides a clear strategic direction regarding the extent of future development for Craigieburn. Strategic work undertaken to guide the development of Craigieburn includes:

- Hume Municipal Strategic Statement (2000)
- Craigieburn Strategic Framework Plan (1999)
- Delfin & Lensworth Local Structure Plans (1999)

Key growth strategies within the Hume MSS for Craigieburn are as follows:

- “Encourage the continued development and use of land in accordance with the relevant approved local structure plans;
- Maintain the Hume Highway as the ultimate eastern limit of urban residential development in Craigieburn;
- Maintain Mickleham Rd as the ultimate eastern limit of urban development in the Merri Growth Corridor;
- Encourage the development of land bounded by Mickleham Road, Mt Ridely Rd, Hume Highway and overhead transmission lines to the north as a permanent separation and landscape buffer between Craigieburn and any other development that may occur to the north within the Merri Growth Corridor.”
The Craigieburn Strategy Plan supports the Hume MSS. The Craigieburn Strategy Plan was prepared to give direction and certainty regarding the extent of future development for Craigieburn.

The Strategy Plan includes a series of development objectives and key actions to guide the future development of Craigieburn.

Main elements of the Craigieburn Strategy Plan include:

- Plan for an ultimate population of up to 100,000 persons (including Roxburgh Park)
- Provide a clear ultimate urban boundary for Craigieburn - Mickelham Rd to the west, Mt Ridley Rd to the north (inter urban break), and Hume Highway to the east.
- Creation of an inter urban break to act as a buffer between Craigieburn and any future development to the north extending to Gunns Gully Rd.
- Creation of a new “regional” town centre, centrally located and highly accessible to what will be the ultimate urban area of Craigieburn.
- Maximise local employment opportunities near the town centre and east of the Hume Highway
- Plan the E14 as an arterial road and public transport corridor to centrally service the ultimate growth of Craigieburn, the town centre and employment area.

The Strategy Plan is consistent with the Hume MSS given it anticipates future urban development of Craigieburn to extend west to Mickleham Rd, north to Mt Ridley Rd (including the inter urban break) and east to the Hume Highway. The land east of the Hume Highway is designated for future employment uses.
Subsequent to the preparation of the Craigieburn Strategy Plan, the “Craigieburn Strategic Framework Plan” was prepared.

“It shows the overall framework for the coordinated and integrated development of two principal land holdings at Craigieburn - Silverton (now Lensworth) & George Adams Corp (now Delfin with the exception of the town centre site)

…………….as subsequent development occurs at Craigieburn the strategic framework will be extended to incorporate the relevant land parcels”. pg 1

The Craigieburn Strategic Framework Plan coordinates the development of approved local structure plan areas for Craigieburn as well as ensuring that this development is cognisant of the wider planning vision for Craigieburn.

Council believes that the degree of certainty captured in this strategic work for Craigieburn should be reflected in Melbourne 2030. This is not apparent when reviewing the current location of the Urban Growth Boundary.

It appears that the UGB only recognises zoned land covered by the approved local structure plan areas. This demonstrates a mis-understanding of the overall strategic context in which the Local Structure Plans are placed.

As raised in Council’s Melbourne 2030 Community Information Sessions, there is a very real and strong expectation from the Craigieburn community that Craigieburn will develop in line with Council’s current strategic planning vision for this area. Failure to recognise Council’s strategic planning work (Hume MSS, Craigieburn Strategy Plan, Craigieburn Strategic Framework Plan and Local Structure Plans) has generated local uncertainty and confusion.

The current location of the UGB does not recognise Council’s strategic planning, (which has been based on sustainability principles) has been endorsed by the community, servicing agencies and previous ministerial support.

Council’s concern is further exacerbated by what is understood to be the rationale chosen by the State Government to depart from Council’s committed strategic planning for this area (ie the absence of an existing fixed rail centrally servicing the growth area).

However, in accordance with the Craigieburn Strategic Framework & Approved Local Structure Plans provision has been made for transport options (private & public) in this area.
E14 Arterial Road

“The proposed E14 Arterial Road has been accommodated within a 50 m reservation to provide public transport facilities within the reserve (ie. Light rail).”

Pg. 19 Craigieburn Strategic Framework & Local Structure Plans, 1999

The E14 reservation has been purposely located “central” to the future Craigieburn development areas as identified in Council’s MSS. The current UGB would allow for limited urban development to locate west of the current E14 reservation. This is completely contrary to the current expectation of developers, servicing authorities and the general community.

The growth of Craigieburn has always been predicated around the provision of public transport. In light of the public transport function of the E14, and detailed strategic planning work undertaken by Council, there appears no strategic reason why the UGB should not reflect the committed planning for this area.

Discussions with Yarra Valley Water, Melbourne Water and Vic Roads (as part of Hume’s Melbourne 2030 consultative process) have confirmed that infrastructure planning and provision in the Local Structure Plan areas is being based on the overall strategic development of Craigieburn – as identified by the Hume MSS and other strategy planning work.

Discussions with the local structure plan developers - Lensworth, Delfin and George Adams Corp. (as part of Hume’s Melbourne 2030 consultative process) - have confirmed this higher level of infrastructure planning currently taking place. Key infrastructure investment is in place (or about to be set) anticipating further development of Craigieburn.

The location and reservation of the E14 has required land and financial contributions. Sewerage & water pipelines have been located and sized on the assumption of development extending to Mickelham Rd. Road infrastructure has been planned, located and constructed having regard to further development occurring outside the LSP areas.

Lensworth, Delfin and the George Adams Corporation Aust. have invested considerable financial resources toward the attainment of the ultimate infrastructure plan required by the Hume MSS, Craigieburn Strategy Plan, Craigieburn Strategic Framework Plan and approved Local Structure Plans.

In addition the size, function and location of other land use requirements such as the proposed town centre and surrounding employment land has been predicated on further development of Craigieburn. If the UGB remains in its current location both these sites will be on the “edge” rather than central to the future urban development of Craigieburn.
Craigieburn has been planned as a sustainable and, as much as possible, contained community, relying on critical provision of a range of services and infrastructure. The Craigieburn community has for a long time experienced the disbenefits of being largely a commuter community due to its relatively small size. To restrict the future development of Craigieburn now would not only result in loss of financial capital already invested in the Craigieburn growth area, but also risk the attainment of the ultimate planning vision for Craigieburn, and its community.

Council acknowledges that further strategic work needs to be undertaken in the Hume Growth Area. Nevertheless, Council believes that this further work (preparation of growth area plans) needs to be done from a positive rather than an uncertain basis. In this regard, the urban growth boundary should reflect currently committed strategic planning.

**Recommendation**

- That the UGB include land bounded by Mickleham Road to the west, the Mt Ridley Inter Urban Break to the north, Hume Highway (in part) to the east, and land bordering the Greenvale reservoir and Somerton Road to the south in accordance with the Hume MSS.

- That the UGB be relocated in line with the Hume Municipal Strategic Statement and Craigieburn Strategy Plan.
Applying the UGB to other areas

The Urban Growth Area Implementation Plan enables Councils to identify smaller settlements where there may be a need or benefit in defining an urban growth boundary.

Two small township settlements exist in the Hume City Council:

- Kallarlo Township
- Bulla Township

The need to apply the UGB to small townships would be where the UGB would assist in:

- “Controlling the leapfrogging of development demands
- Safeguarding environmentally sensitive locations
- Preserving agriculturally productive areas
- Retaining the separate identity of towns close to other urban areas”

Both the Kalkarlo and Bulla townships have been assessed against this criteria. Whilst Council has not currently experienced significant pressure to expand the boundaries of the townships (given current servicing constraints and aircraft noise restrictions), there is potential merit in using the UGB to clearly define the townships within the Hume Planning Scheme. The UGB would clearly direct where town services and facilities should be located and provide certainty to existing communities in these towns.

Recommendations

- That an Urban Growth Boundary be considered around the townships of Kalkarlo and Bulla.
Key Points of Discussion

- Future growth of Craigieburn as defined in Council’s Municipal Strategic Statement and Craigieburn Strategy Plan should form the basis for growth area planning for Hume.

- Status of the E14 as a public transport transit corridor servicing the Hume Growth Area needs to be recognised.

- Growth Area planning for Hume needs to start with a degree of certainty – UGB to recognise land committed to future urban in line with existing strategic work.

- Council to be the lead agency coordinating the Smart Growth Committee in partnership with DSE and other stakeholders.

- Smart Growth Committee to focus on infrastructure coordination and involve serving agencies DSE and Council.

- Melbourne 2030 to acknowledge the “contained” development of Sunbury.

The Growth Area Plan for Hume suggests the need to review land currently committed for future urban development. The State Government directive is to steer future growth into areas around existing high capacity public transport, in other words, fixed rail.

Council supports the notion that growth area planning should respond to a number of sustainability issues. This will determine the suitability of land for future development. Connection to public transport is a real and necessary determining factor when considering the appropriateness for future urban development. The type of public transport should not however be the sole determining factor – what should be assessed is an overall integrated public transport plan for a growth area that considers the broader range of public transport options including bus, rail and light rail connections to key activity nodes.

Hume Growth Area Plan – Growth Tied to Principle

Public Transport Network

The planning for the Hume growth corridor has always anticipated a range of public transport networks to service this growing community. The progressive reservation of the proposed E14 transit corridor, (which includes a 15m
wide bus transit lane) throughout the development of Craigieburn and Roxburgh Park was designed to provide a high capacity public transit corridor. The E14 is planned to extend from the proposed Craigieburn Town Centre to Somerton Rd – and ultimately further south to the Western Ring Road.

Given the current capacity issues on the Western Ring Road, the southern portion of this route requires further review.

Land north of Somerton Rd has largely been reserved via development contributions. Developers (in particular the Urban and Regional Land Corporation) have been required to provide land and contribute toward the construction of the E14 roadway.

Vic Roads is required to contribute to the construction of the additional carriageways and public transport reservation.

The E14 has not been planned or designed as a “freeway”. It has always been planned along the lines of a transit boulevard to service the growth areas of Hume. This is well documented in the approved Local Structure Plans.

The potential of the E14 as a transit corridor appears to have been overlooked by the Melbourne 2030 strategy and its Transport Implementation Plan. Emphasis on fixed rail as the only high capacity public public transport network to service growth areas has determined that the entire Craigieburn growth area be “re-examined”.

To the south of Somerton Rd, a Public Acquisition Overlay is currently in place, recognising the State Government responsibility for continued acquisition of the reservation. Vic Roads is responsible for the construction of the E14 in this location. This alignment runs between Meadow Heights and Greenvale/Attwood and eventually connects to the Western Ring Road.

Whether this alignment caters for road & bus or is solely a bus transit corridor requires further investigation. This will be in addition to determining how far south the reservation can be constructed.

There is strong support (which was highlighted in Council’s Melbourne 2030 Consultative Process) that the route south of Somerton Road should be for bus purposes only.
Suggested planning for this alignment south of Somerton Rd may follow the principles of an “off road” bus transit corridor similar to that pictured below.

It is imperative that the status of the E14 be recognised as a transit corridor. Vic Roads (with support from Council) has been negotiating developer contributions toward reserving and constructing the route.

Developer and community expectations for its construction as a public/private transport corridor have built up over time. The E14 transit corridor has been factored into the planning of the new communities of Roxburgh Park and Craigieburn. Given the near completion of these developments it is imperative that the E14 (including the public transport component) be constructed sooner rather than later.

The current - and very real - commitments toward constructing the E14 with a public transport reservation and electrification of the rail line to Craigieburn suggests that the Craigieburn Growth Area should not be “re-examined”.

Land in Craigieburn, which has been subject to detailed strategic planning work, should be designated in the Hume Growth Area Plan as “Future Urban”.

The State Government needs to review the potential of the E14 to include high capacity public transit infrastructure. Potentially, buses on this system feed into modal points (ie. Craigieburn and Broadmeadows rail stations) and activity centres, such as the proposed Craigieburn Town Centre and Broadmeadows Transit City.

Council believes that the E14 can provide an innovative response to servicing the transport needs (public and private) of a developing and developed community.

The need to review the committed future growth area identified within Council’s Craigieburn Strategy Plan and MSS is considered unnecessary. (Details of this committed strategic work is outlined in section 3.1 of this submission).

Craigieburn East – Employment Land
With regard to land located east of the Hume Highway, which has been designated as “Possible Future Urban Area” on the proposed Hume Growth Area Plan, Council makes the following response;

A “triangular” parcel of land located immediately east of
the Hume Highway and Craigieburn has been designated for future employment within the Hume MSS. Council’s MSS nominates the subject land within the

Relevant MSS strategies applying to this land include:

“Encourage the development and use of land within the Hume Highway employment corridor for a range of industry, warehousing and service businesses”.

The MSS, “Hume Planning Scheme” response to this land is to:

“Apply the Rural Zone to the land to the north of Craigieburn Rd East to act as a holding zone”

In addition, the Hume Freeway Craigieburn By Pass transverses this land. Direct access to the By Pass will be made available via a proposed interchange located immediately adjacent this land.

The land is strategically placed with regard to access to transport infrastructure.

There is currently a freight intermodal terminal at Somerton. The subject site presents a potential location for an additional freight intermodal terminal, given excellent access to the Hume Freeway, Craigieburn By-Pass and the Melbourne to Sydney rail corridor.

Prior to the release of Melbourne 2030, land use options (including the possible location of a freight intermodal terminal) were being explored by the landowner with Council and the State Government. The release of Melbourne 2030, location of the UGB and future growth direction anticipated for the Hume Growth Area have resulted in a high level of uncertainty for the future development of this land for employment/freight purposes.

In recognition of the site’s location (Hume Highway, immediate access to the Craigieburn By Pass via an interchange, excellent connections to road and rail freight networks, and linkages to existing manufacturing and commercial business in the Hume corridor), the land would be better placed for future employment uses.

This approach would be entirely consistent with the economic objectives of Council’s MSS.

In this context it is considered that Melbourne 2030 has concentrated primarily on future “residential” development, at the detriment of overlooking the employment potential of the Hume Corridor.
“possible future urban” emphasis on this land assumes “residential”, and fails to recognise Council’s future employment strategies.

It is essential that the land is included within the UGB and that the Hume Growth Area Plan identify this land as “Future Urban - Employment”.

Long Term Hume Growth Area

Council supports the need to investigate future development of the land north of Donnybrook Rd and east of the Hume Highway (in the vicinity of Kalkallo Township, bounded by the Merri Creek – but not including the proposed employment land previously discussed).

Council recommends that this land be defined in the Hume Growth Area Plan as “Possible future urban investigation”.

Further work to be undertaken as part of the Hume Growth Area planning may examine the potential to extend the metropolitan rail line just north of Craigieburn Station, then to the west to service any future development north of Donnybrook Rd, west of the Hume Highway.

The northern portion of the current E14 reservation could extend to this land. This potentially could see the location of a new major activity centre, serviced by road, bus and rail transport. This activity centre and transport infrastructure would be centrally placed to service a new developing community. The proposed Smart Growth Committee could further explore these options when overseeing the preparation of a Hume Growth Area Plan. The Hume Growth Area Plan should also be widened to examine the opportunities to be gained linking the growth area to other key land uses within the wider corridor – for example the Greenvale employment / openspace land and the Broadmeadows Transit City.

Shift in direction of Hume Growth Area

Summary of Strategic Implications

It remains Council’s contention that having only the land east of the Hume Highway depicted as “future urban investigation” within the Hume Growth Area Plan, with the remainder “to be re-examined” fails to recognise existing and supported strategic planning for this area.

Concentrating future urban development in this linear “Donnybrook” corridor would have the following strategic implications:

• Future growth areas would be removed from existing and establishing physical & social infrastructure within Craigieburn.

• Craigieburn is finally at the threshold to build a major town centre with regionally scaled infrastructure and services.

• This will ensure a more sustainable community. Shifting the focus will jeopardise this long awaited objective.

• Social implications for the Craigieburn community, who have been given a level of expectation that services would be developed in accordance with the MSS, Craigieburn Strategy Plan and approved Local Structure Plans.
• Craigieburn residents will reap no new infrastructure benefits if the direction of future growth is located at Donnybrook.

• Infrastructure always lags behind development. This would be the case if development occurred at Donnybrook. It would make more sense to have further development occur around Craigieburn where infrastructure has or will be developed in the short term.

• Cost of extending the electrification to Donnybrook would be financially unviable, given it will service only a small developable area. The cost of shifting the broad/narrow gauge is a significant consideration.

• Land east of the Merri Creek is within the Whittlesea City Council. Whittlesea has advised that it has no interest in this land as a potential growth area.

• The E14 was designed to “connect” the community – its location was planned to be “central” to development. The UGB & growth area plan conflicts with this planning objective.

• The 2030 strategy ignores that the rail line has only a one sided catchment.

• Demand in the corridor is gradually moving north. Once the Delfin Ltd. development is completed the Lensworth development will be the only developer. Lensworth alone will not be able to keep up with demand. There needs to be additional developers in the corridor.

• Development to the east of the Hume Hwy near Donnybrook will have amenity issues if developed for residential given it will be near a highway and a freight line.

• Realistic employment opportunities along the Hume Highway would be overlooked – emphasis appears on residential alone.

• Significant environmental issues regarding the Merri Creek environs in the Donnybrook area. Much of this land will need to be reserved for regional open space linkages.

**Recommendations**

That the Hume Growth Area Plan be modified to show:

• Land identified with the Hume MSS and Craigieburn Strategy Plan to be included within an urban growth boundary (as previously recommended)

• That this land be depicted as “Future Urban” with the exception of the triangular land to the east of the Hume Highway, which should be depicted as “Future Urban - Employment”

• That the remainder of the Hume Growth Area Plan to show the land outside the UGB area as "Possible Future Urban Investigation"

• That the Hume Growth Area be expanded to consider the wider corridor.
**Smart Growth Committees**

Council supports the need to establish Smart Growth Committees to oversee the preparation of growth area plans and to improve liaison between the State Government, local government and key stakeholders. Council considers that this is a positive step to ensure greater coordination and resourcing for growth area planning and the need to link infrastructure planning to budgetary commitments.

Council is however concerned with the lack of a clear model regarding the potential role and terms of reference of these committees.

Council believes the role of the Committee should focus on infrastructure and services coordination and as such the involvement of key servicing and service delivery agencies is crucial. Growth area planning at the local level has often failed to meet higher level infrastructure and service planning commitments given the past lack of commitment from key government servicing agencies. The Smart Growth Committee needs to be able to not only influence the direction of future growth, but to directly influence State Government budgetary commitments.

Council sees benefit in establishing partnerships of interests. However, the partnerships of interests for the Smart Growth Committee should remain at the “technical” level. Membership on the committee should comprise of key servicing and service delivery agencies responsible for high-level social and physical infrastructure provision and senior representatives from the Department of Sustainability and Environment.

Council would strongly urge local government to be the lead-coordinating agency with the City of Hume representative having chairing responsibility. It is expected that the Smart Growth Committee would seek the views and comments from other agencies and interest groups on an “at need” basis and have the capacity to second these other stakeholder interests as required during the planning investigation process.

Given the fundamental coordinating and planning role of the Smart Growth Committee, Council would recommend that the exact details of the Hume Smart Growth Committee - regarding roles and terms of reference - be discussed further with the Department of Sustainability and Environment.

It is necessary that the roles and terms of reference for each Smart Growth Committee reflect individual requirements – one template should not apply to all growth areas.


Recommendations

- That DSE notes that Council endorses the establishment of a Hume Smart Growth Committee to prepare the Hume Growth Area Plan.

- That the Smart Growth Committee should be coordinated and chaired by a representative of the Hume City Council.

- That the Smart Growth Committee should be a technical committee, involving key servicing and service delivery agencies, Council and the DSE.

- That the roles and terms of reference for the Hume Smart Growth Committee be discussed further with DSE.

- That the roles and terms of reference for Smart Growth Committees to vary according to each individual growth area – should not be one “template” to fit all.

- That the recommendations from the Smart Growth Committee must be supported by budgetary commitments from key stakeholders towards infrastructure and service provision.

Sunbury - “Contained” Development Area Plan

As previously stated, the “contained” growth and development of Sunbury is not recognised within Melbourne 2030 or the Growth Area Implementation Plan. Whilst Council strongly agrees with the recommendation to not identify Sunbury as a growth area, the planned level of sustainable development proposed within the boundaries of Sunbury will benefit from greater planning coordination. The general principles and outcomes espoused for the formation of the Smart Growth Committees may be applicable to guiding the future “coordinated” development of Sunbury.

Recommendations

- That DSE supports Sunbury as a contained growth and development area and considers the potential to resource and support a contained growth committee to oversee the further orderly planning of the town.

- That Council chairs this committee and determines roles and terms of reference in consultation and partnership with the DSE.
Melbourne 2030 anticipates 620,000 additional households (925,000 persons) over the next 30 years. Household size is expected to decline due in part to the aging of the population.

The key emphasis of Melbourne 2030 is to manage this increase in population by:

Encouraging new housing within:

- Strategic redevelopment sites and activity centres
- Established areas.
- Nominated growth areas

The location of development will be contained within the defined urban growth boundary. New housing will need to be established near existing or proposed infrastructure, namely principle public transport.

Overtime, the direction for new housing development is expected to shift, with more development occurring within nominated strategic redevelopment sites and activity centres rather than growth areas.
Increasing housing affordability will be a key objective of Melbourne 2030 with local government identified as a major player in assisting this objective.

Melbourne 2030 highlights a number of housing directions. The success or failure of these directions will depend on the successful implementation of the actions identified in the Housing Implementation Plan.

Council believes that the housing objectives of Melbourne 2030 are based on sound planning principles. Directing new housing in close proximity to existing and planned infrastructure – namely public transport - is a sound principle.

Council is however concerned that to achieve this objective in established communities, there may be a number of complexities which have not been fully tested. If population estimates are not realised in activity centres and strategic redevelopment sites and growth is restricted on the fringe, this may lead to housing and land shortages and consequently housing affordability issues.

It is therefore critical that the housing directions of Melbourne 2030 are in fact achievable and practical. Council maintains its reservations as to whether such a dramatic shift in the direction of future housing development (from fringe to activity centres and strategic redevelopment sites) is achievable without a stronger interventionist role from the state government.

Given this is the key direction of Melbourne 2030, this proposed planning outcome will need to be regularly monitored to ensure credibility of the strategy.

**Regional Housing Working Groups**

The Housing Implementation Plan recommends ways to meet housing needs over the next 5 years. Key recommendations include; establishing Regional Housing Working Groups (RHWG’s), developing local housing strategies; monitoring land supply; and developing residential subdivision and higher density housing provisions and guidelines.

Council “conditionally ” endorses the establishment of regional housing working groups. Council believes the proposed grouping of Hume with other northern Councils appears appropriate, however it should be recognised that Hume also has regional housing similarities with Melton Shire Council.

Whilst Council endorses the establishment of RHWG’s, it is imperative that these working groups operate under the auspice of a clear and defined role and terms of reference.

In addition, for RHWG’s to be successful, the core membership of the working groups should not exceed 10 – 15 members. A series of interest groups could be called in as the need arises.
As the title suggests, it must be set up as a “working” group. Whilst the exchange of information amongst local government, housing agencies and providers will assist in the research role of the working group, it is important that this does not become the group’s sole purpose. It must have clear deliverable outcomes from the outset. Regional housing groups in the past have had little tangible direction and instead have become information-sharing forums. This has sometimes led to high levels of resources used for little tangible outcomes.

If properly managed, RHWG’s may have the potential to provide a wider entrepreneurial role. Linking local government with state, community and private housing providers may assist in achieving more affordable housing examples “on the ground” – especially in areas where housing affordability is low.

Numerous housing development proposals of varying degrees of density are considered at the local government level. If developers can be linked with interested government and community housing agencies, this may result in more “partnership” developments. A housing “entrepreneurial” role is often hard to resource at the local level. The establishment of a RHWG could assist in making these “partnerships” a reality. In this regard RHWG’s could pro-actively facilitate and “lead by example” appropriate housing outcomes “on the ground”.

Whilst the group will assess housing issues and trends within the region, there will be circumstances where a regional perspective may not be relevant. For example, housing issues in the inner municipalities may be completely different to those experienced on the fringe.

The working group must acknowledge that there will never be a “one model fits all” regional housing approach that can be applied to all municipalities. The working groups should acknowledge both housing similarities and differences and work within this context.

It needs to be recognised however that the emphasise of providing affordable housing solutions remain with both the State and Federal Government. It is the role of both State and Federal Government to facilitate and finance initiatives to ensure the provision of appropriate and affordable housing options. Local Government has only a relatively small role to play in this provision.
Recommendations

- That the achievement of the housing development trends predicted in Melbourne 2030 be reviewed and then monitored on an ongoing basis.

- That the RHWG’s to have a clear role and terms of reference, which identifies specific outcomes to be achieved.

- That the RHWG’s should include an entrepreneurial role in coordinating housing development and partnerships.

- That both the State and Federal Government have the primary role to finance and facilitate the provision of appropriate and affordable housing.

Housing Strategies and Monitoring Land Supply

Council has prepared a Housing Strategy, which essentially provides a framework for the need to complete further work on three key housing actions; sustainable residential communities, social housing and older persons accommodation.

Council’s Housing Strategy provides an overview of key issues affecting the city and a suggested way forward.

The Housing Strategy was prepared prior to the release of Melbourne 2030 and accordingly will need to be reviewed in light of the housing directions of the state government strategy.

Council would be concerned if the review of its Housing Strategy was limited to only planning for a 10 year “zoned” residential land supply as identified in Melbourne 2030. This projection is for the approved LSP area of Craigieburn alone, and does not anticipate the proposed urban land supply in Sunbury and future development of Craigieburn.

Council has based its population forecasts on this future urban land supply. It is therefore necessary that the review of Hume Housing Strategy recognises planned future development.

Hume City Council recommends that Melbourne 2030 be revised to include a more realistic land supply assessment of land zoned residential and land zoned & proposed residential. With the combined proposed urban areas of Sunbury and Craigieburn Melbourne 2030 should show up to 20 years “future urban” land supply for Hume.
Only until this land supply calculation has been corrected can Council begin to prepare a meaningful review of its Housing Strategy in line with Melbourne 2030.

**Recommendations**

- That the DSE notes that Council will review its Housing Strategy based on the requirements of Melbourne 2030, following the review of land supply forecasts identified in Melbourne 2030 for Hume.

- That the State Government ensure a transparent review and monitoring process is put in place to document the success of the Melbourne 2030 “compact city” objectives.
Activity Centres

Key Points of Discussion

• Support general concept of Activity Centres and the need for detailed structure plans

• Activity centres planned in growth areas to be recognised – in particular the proposed Craigieburn Town Centre should be identified as a major Activity Centre.

• Difficult to establish the extent of higher density housing to be achieved at nominated activity centres until structure plans are prepared.

• Housing densities should reflect opportunities and constraints that apply to individual activity centers.

• Activity Centre plans must recognize potential difficulties in achieving housing densities at all centres.

• There will be varying degrees of success for each centre, given individual planning circumstance.

• Implementation of structure plans for activity centres will need to be reviewed and monitored by the State Government in order to assess whether the policy of contained growth is achievable.

• A clear time / trigger needs to be established when the urban growth shift from growth areas to activity centres is anticipated to occur.

• State government resources required to plan and implement over 100 activity centre structure plans will be extensive.

• Consider appropriateness of using transit city projects as examples to lead the development of structure plans for major activity centres – other scenarios may be more applicable in some instances.

• Need to consider structure plan requirements for the planning of new activity centres in growth areas.

• Potential review of the Campbellfield, Mahoneys Rd retail centre as a major activity centre.
Melbourne 2030 places strong emphasis on redirecting future urban development to nominated activity centres. Activity centres are classified into the following types:

- Central Activities District
- Principal Activity Centres
- Major Activity Centres
- Specialised Activity centres
- Neighbourhood Activity

The Hume City Council has been nominated one Principal Activity Centre (Broadmeadows) 3 Major Activity Centres (Roxburgh Park, Sunbury and Gladstone Park) and one Specialised Activity Centre – (Melbourne Airport).

The selection of the activity centres in Melbourne 2030 has been based primarily on their connection to the principal public transport network.

Structure Plans will need to be prepared for each of the centres nominated for Hume addressing:

- Role and function of centres
- Boundaries of the centre
- Form of mixed-use development including location of areas for high-density housing
- Opportunities for expansion
- Potential for site assembly to locate large scale uses
- Interface issues
- Accessibility and traffic, carparking and public transport arrangements
- Walking and cycling accessibility
- Provision of physical and social infrastructure
- Marketing and centre management.

Whilst all structure plans will address these issues, the degree of success to which all plans can accommodate the above will vary.

The Melbourne 2030 strategy does not specify exactly what degree of change is expected for each centre, especially with regard to the level of housing to be accommodated. It should be acknowledged that not all activity centres selected for Hume will be able to achieve the same levels of higher density housing development.

Council supports the concept of locating a mixture of land uses within activity centres. Council “in general” supports the centres nominated by the Strategy. Council considers that, until the detailed structure planning is undertaken for these centres, it would be difficult to assume high levels of residential development at each centre.

Further, there may be potential to review the role of the existing Campbellfield, Mahoneys Rd retail centre as a major activity centre given its proximity to the Upfield Railway line.
Growth and Change in Activity Centres

Council supports the need to prepare structure plans for each of the centres nominated. The structure plans should determine the level of mixed-use activity; density of housing to be accommodated, and urban design objectives.

The successful implementation of structure plans will require a significant level of intervention from both state and local government. The time and resources required to help facilitate land assembly and urban redesign works will be extensive.

Whilst Council supports the activity centre concept as it applies to Hume, there is wider concern that the redesign of potentially 25 Principle and 79 Major Activity Centres across Melbourne will require an extensive amount of time and resources from the state government. It is not apparent that this level of commitment has been realistically factored into the Activity Centres Implementation Plan - 5 year Action Plan.

Given that the main thrust of Melbourne 2030 rests on the need to contain more growth in activity centres, the success or failure of the implementation of activity structure plans, is crucial to the success or failure of the metropolitan strategy plan.

There appears to be no exact time / trigger identified when the shift from fringe growth to activity centres will occur. There needs to be a clear monitoring and review process put in place to keep track of the success of the “contained” growth policy direction. Impacts on Melbourne’s housing supply & demand will need to be regularly monitored if restrictions are placed on fringe development. All structure plans prepared for activity centres will require continued state government monitoring.

Recommendations

- That the determination of the level of higher density housing to be achieved at nominated activity centres should follow preparation of detailed structure plans.

- That planned activity centres in growth areas should be recognised with Craigieburn Town Centre to be identified as a Major Activity Centre.

- That population forecasts for activity centres be reviewed after structure plans are prepared.

- That the state government commits to prioritizing activity centre structure plans.

- That the State Government provides a mechanism to identify the shift from fringe to activity centre urban growth.
Concentrate Activity Within Centres

Out of centre development is generally not supported by the Activity Centre Implementation Plan. This type of development would have to satisfy the tests of out of centre assessment criteria.

Council supports this policy direction, however there may be some difficulty accommodating larger scale bulky goods retailing uses in or around existing activity centres. Even if sites were assembled, the location of bulky goods retailing uses may not be the most optimum use of land within or nearby established activity centres.

Council supports the need to locate large-scale bulky goods retail uses in the general vicinity of existing centres, but not necessarily always within centres.

Recommendations

- That detailed structure plans be prepared to review the appropriateness of bulky goods retailing in or around activity centres.

Lead By Example

Activity centre objectives will be promoted by using the development of Transit Cities as demonstration projects.

Whilst this is a worthwhile exercise, some of the issues associated with the Transit Cities projects may not be relevant when planning major activity centres. Transit City’s will have a high degree of state government intervention, with land assembly and marketing of these centres. If this resource is not made available to other activity centres, it may be difficult to apply the Transit City “lead by example” model.

The Implementation Plan does not address the establishment of criteria for the development of new activity centres in fringe developments. It is considered that there should be structure plan criteria established for assessing proposed activity centres in growth areas. Examples of successful structure plans for new centres should also be used as “leading examples”.

Recommendations

• That DSE ensures that projects chosen to “lead by example” are relevant and applicable to more than one activity centre “scenario”.

• That the DSE review the appropriateness of using transit city projects as examples to guide major activity centre structure plans.

• That DSE prepare structure plan guidelines for new activity centre development in growth areas.

• That DSE uses successful “new” activity centre structure plans as examples to guide structure planning in growth areas.
Key Points of Discussion

- Identification and protection of Green Wedges and the need to prepare green Wedge Action Plans is strongly supported and broadly consistent with objectives of the Hume MSS.

- Each Green Wedge has unique features and will require a tailored approach – regional groupings may not achieve this in all instances.

- Difficult to apply new zones and “fix” legislation in the absence of a Green Wedge Action Plan.

- Legislation suggests a “one cap fits all” approach - potential for more flexibility to consider uses which satisfy broader green wedge objectives.

- Economic viability of the green wedge will help ensure their long-term sustainability.

- Green wedge action plans to address sustainable land use outcomes, which differ from wedge to wedge.

- Management of the green wedge requires a higher level of state government support than which currently exists – metropolitan benefits must be recognised and appropriately resourced.

- Need to recognise that many farms require off site farm income to survive financially.
Overview of Council’s Response to Green Wedges

Council supports Melbourne 2030’s policy objective to protect the green wedge areas of metropolitan Melbourne. The recommended actions to improve the economic, social and environmental sustainability of these areas are commended. The concept of a non-urban wedge has been part of the planning objectives for the non-urban areas of Hume City Council for some time, originating from the policies of the former Shire of Bulla.

However, greater attention needs to be given to issues associated with maintaining the long-term economic sustainability of green wedges.

Melbourne 2030 supports the retention of the Sunbury Green Wedge. The Calder Freeway and the northern and eastern boundaries of the Hume City Council form this wedge. Current state and local planning policy in the Hume Planning Scheme also supports a non-urban wedge between Broadmeadows and Sunbury.

Rural land occupies 72% of the Hume municipality - this translates to approximately 363 square kilometres. A relatively small portion of this land is used for rural living or hobby farm purposes. However, the majority is nominally used for some form of agricultural activity, predominantly for sheep and cattle grazing and cereal cropping.

Inadequate size of rural land holdings for large scale farming; conflicts generated by proximity to urban areas; topographic and seasonal differences; and continued land speculation, continues to limit investment and reinvestment in agriculture across the urban fringe areas of Melbourne. This is more apparent in Hume, where only a few distinct areas are considered as having high value agricultural potential.

In this context, the protection of non urban land for solely agricultural pursuits, could be argued to have a tenuous basis for longer term strategic planning decisions in Hume. In part, the perceived low agricultural value of rural land in Hume continues to feed the expectation that the City’s rural areas have subdivision and development potential.

Council is concerned that it can not properly consider the application of the proposed zones and legitimacy of the legislation in the absence of the Green Wedge Action Plans.

Council also considers that by restricting uses within the legislation to “traditional” rural uses, may potentially ignore the benefits gained by allowing other appropriate uses which can achieve wider social, economic and environmental objectives of Green Wedge Areas.
New Rural Zones

Council is concerned that the proposed Green Wedge and Rural Conservation Zones are intended to be applied in the short term. The proposed zones will, in effect, result in the application of the Green Wedge Zone for all land not covered by the proposed Rural Conservation Zone.

Council recommends that the proposed zones be applied following the completion and recommendations of the Green Wedge Action Plan.

For example, development of appropriate renewable energy installations such as solar or wind facilities may be an appropriate “utility” use for parts of the Green Wedge with poor agricultural and or environmental features.

Anecdotal information gained through the Hume City Council, Melbourne 2030 community consultation sessions, indicated that many farms within the Green Wedge are under utilised through lack of farming knowledge, or on the expectation that further subdivision is inevitable. This has created significant land management issues including the spread of weeds, which further makes land management on existing working farms unviable. This also undermines the ecological integrity of remnant and natural features on farming land, which the “green wedges” seek to maintain.

Within Hume, over 40% of existing farms are of less than 40 hectares and account for about 10% of the land area currently used for farming activities.

Recently released ABS farm business data reveals that average farms had an operating surplus of 20% but of concern, nationally, was that 18% of farms had a turnover of less than $50,000 and had a farm business profit margin of 0.1%.

Clearly there is evidence to suggest that a considerable amount of work is required toward the development of a sustainable Green Wedge.

Within the Hume Green Wedge it has become increasingly apparent that:

- Effective land management cannot be achieved where uneconomical farms exist; and,
- Part time farmers often do not have the time, money (or in some cases the knowledge or inclination) to undertake effective and sustainable land management activities.

As such, it is submitted that Melbourne 2030 proposes to introduce new planning measures for the Hume Green Wedge which is based on a limited understanding of the broader issues affecting the area.

Council therefore cannot support the introduction of the new planning zones prior to the completion of the Hume Green Wedge Action Plan.
Recommendation

• That the introduction of the proposed Green Wedge and Rural Conservation Zones follows the completion of the Hume Green Wedge Action Plan.

Legislation

Council supports the introduction of the Green Wedge legislation. It, along with the UGB, will assist in managing development expectation in Green Wedge areas, which has been a key factor in limiting investment in agriculture within the Hume rural areas.

Council, however, considers it inappropriate to develop legislation which fixes the range of allowable uses, or the existing subdivision controls in the Hume Green Wedge, prior to completion of the Green Wedge Action Plan.

Council supports introduction of “transitional” legislation until details of the legislation can be fixed through the Action Plan work.

Council is concerned that a “one cap fits all” approach to the proposed Green Wedge legislation will not lead to sustainable outcomes for Hume’s rural areas. Other municipalities with high quality agricultural land and areas of environmental and scenic value, rightly seek legislation to protect these areas and to control non rural land use, (eg. Yarra Ranges, Nilumbik and Mornington Peninsula). This may not be the case for municipalities like Hume, where the agricultural and economic viability of some land within the wedge area is low.

For example, the development of the Aitken Hill conference and function centre in Mickleham is located within the Hume “non urban wedge”. The design of this centre fits comfortably within a rural setting and the development of the site has enabled better management...
of the surrounding rural land. Under the proposed legislation espoused in Melbourne 2030, such a development would be prohibited.

The introduction of uniform legislation ignores the diversity of the Green Wedge Areas and assumes that:

- The existing range of land uses in each Green Wedge is sustainable.
- All Green Wedges have had the same level of research and investigation into appropriate land use and subdivision size.
- The development pressures in each Green Wedge are exactly the same.

It is therefore considered that the green wedge legislative requirements be modified to allow for the discretion to consider other uses which may assist the achievement of wider green wedge objectives.

**Recommendations**

- That DSE notes that Council supports legislation to protect and provide direction for the green wedges.
- That the list of uses in the Green Wedge legislation be reviewed following the completion of the Green Wedge Action Plans.
- That transitional legislation be maintained until further detailed assessment is completed as part of the preparation of Green Wedge Action Plans.
- That the legislation make allowances for permitting other uses “where the proposal can demonstrate achievement of wider green wedge social, economic and environmental objectives”.
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Regional Groupings

Council understands the rationale behind the proposed regional grouping of Council’s, to develop green wedge action plans. Even so, it believes a more workable solution would be for each municipality to prepare individual Green Wedge Action Plans. The scale of the land to be reviewed in the green wedge on a regional rather than local level would be extensive and the issues too varied. Given the high priority associated with the preparation of a Green Wedge Action Plan for Hume, Council would be concerned that the magnitude of such a project would not be completed within a “short term” time frame.

It is also considered that there may be little commonality with the Green Wedge areas of Whittlesea and Brimbank – given variables such as different topography, rainfall and land uses.

Council nevertheless acknowledges the importance of consulting with the neighbouring municipalities as part of the Green Wedge Action Plan preparation process.

Council therefore supports the preparation of a municipal “Hume Green Wedge” Action Plan.

Recommendations

- That Green Wedge Action Plans be prepared on a municipal (Hume City Council) level rather than as a regional grouping.
- That DSE notes that Council will consult with adjoining municipalities.
- That the Sunbury Green Wedge be referred to as the “Hume Green Wedge”.

Hume Green Wedge Action Plan

Council has committed itself to undertaking a rural review to address many of the tasks now to be undertaken as part of the preparation of Green Wedge Action Plans. In this regard, Council strongly supports the need to prepare a comprehensive strategic review of its rural areas in order to provide a clear and sustainable social, environmental and economic planning direction.

It is essential that the State Government provides greater resourcing to maintaining the green wedges (ie. land management works, advice & education, rebates, government grants / financial incentives to genuine farmers etc) to ensure a coordinated approach to the implementation of green wedge action plans. A stronger role for the State Government is warranted, given that many of the benefits achieved by maintaining the green wedges are felt at the metropolitan as well as municipal level.

Council recognises the need to protect areas of high conservation and natural heritage value. However, significant resources are required to ensure proper assessment of these issues in the development of Green Wedge Action Plans. Mechanisms need to be explored for supporting the protection of relevant natural features and environmental values.

Melbourne 2030 identifies “Melbourne Airport and related flight paths” as key features of the Sunbury Green Wedge.

The Airport Environs Area will continue to extend over the significant areas of rural land in the Hume Green Wedge. However it is also expected that the Melbourne Airport Environs Strategy Plan will significantly reduce the area covered by the existing Airport Environs Overlay.

The Melbourne Airport Environs Strategy Plan must be adopted and approved by the State Government so that the areas significantly affected by aircraft noise can be identified and sustainable land use investigated in these areas as part of the Hume Green Wedge Action Plan.
The Green Wedge Action plans are proposed to include the, “identification of land for metropolitan parks or open space links”.

Given that most of this land in Hume is within private ownership and located on rural land (where there is limited, if no subdivision potential) - the achievement of this objective will either require direct land acquisition by the State Government or exploration of alternative arrangements – (eg.. long term leasing or public access rebates).

Most of Jackson’s Creek is within private rural land ownership but has been identified as an existing regional open space link in Melbourne 2030. Whilst this may simply be a mistake (most of the land is in private ownership), it is uncertain whether the future acquisition of this land as an open space linkage will be factored into the preparation of the rural Action Plan for the Hume Green Wedge. Development of regional parks along waterways is a good planning principal, however open space adjacent to agricultural activities may result in land use conflicts. These issues need to be explored in more detail.

Melbourne 2030 identifies that Green Wedge Action plans need to recognise that the rural areas are not a metropolitan “park”, but are active living areas that include agriculture and other non-urban activities.

Whilst recognising the environmental qualities of the Green Wedges, the planning for these areas needs to be cognisant of their long term economic sustainability. Without taking this into account, it will be very difficult to achieve many of the environmental and social objectives of the Green Wedge.

**Recommendation**

- That the Sunbury Green Wedge be retitled the Hume Green Wedge, recognising the wider municipal approach to planning for this area.

- That the Hume Green Wedge Action Plan comprehensively address economic, environmental and social sustainability issues affecting green wedge areas.

- That the State Government commit to the adoption of the Melbourne Airport Environs Strategy Plan to control inappropriate land uses in rural areas affected by aircraft noise and encourage sustainable land uses in these locations.

- That a clear procedure be put into place by the state government, addressing how proposed regional open space along water ways can be achieved.

- That the state government takes a lead role in the better management of metropolitan green wedges by providing resources toward land management and financial incentives to the genuine farming community.

- That the State Government give a strong commitment to resourcing the actions of the Green Wedge Action Plans.
Key Points of Discussion

- Demand management of the current public transport system is over emphasised in Melbourne 2030.

- Limited focus on identifying new public transport initiatives for growth areas.

- Strong emphasis on doing further work – timelines and budgetary commitments are “tight” and uncertain.

- No recognition of the planned E14 Transit Corridor designed to service rapid public transport needs of the Hume Growth Areas (developing and proposed).

- Lack of exploration of other types of public transport other than improving the existing traditional network.

- Radial links not explored in the transport plan – gaps in the current system not addressed. New radial links to based on existing and new infrastructure.

- No recognition of the strategic advantages of the Hume Highway and rail corridor providing efficient movement and distribution of freight – existing freight rail corridor identified to potentially serve residential uses.
Council supports the State Government initiative to better integrate land use planning with transport planning. Planning for the efficient provision of principal public transport networks in close proximity to residential, employment and activity centre uses is a desirable objective to work toward.

The desired outcome of increasing patronage on public transport, through direct investment in public transport infrastructure, increasing service availability and improved reliability and safety of service is supported. In addition, the policy objective of maintaining an efficient road system to ensure better movement and connection of freight to airports, sea ports and interstate is to be commended.

Particular recognition of the Melbourne Airport and the Hume transport corridor as important elements of the freight network, to be protected and improved, is also endorsed.

Whilst commending the general principles of Melbourne 2030 which aim to achieve greater integration between transport and land use planning, Council has a number of concerns with the implementation of the actions contained within the Integrated Transport Implementation Plan and Melbourne 2030. Some of these concerns have been previously mention in sections 3.1 and 3.2 of this submission.

In general, Council is concerned that the Integrated Transport Plan is focussed on demand management and identification of further strategic work (ie. preparing Bus Plan, Train Plans etc) to the exclusion of new initiatives to assist growth areas.

Further strategic transport planning work should not limit itself to focusing on the traditional bus, train and tram network. The Implementation Plan needs to consider other forms of public transport such as off road bus transit systems.

There may be cost benefits in exploring other modes of public transport modes which may be more economical than continuing within only the confines of the current metropolitan public transport network.

A major theme running through the Integrated Transport Plan is the need to complete numerous projects by the State Government. There must be a clear commitment to backing this recommendation with resources and timelines.

**Upgrade Principal Public Transport network**

Improvements to the current public transport system will go some way in improving the reliability of the current principal public transport system. Improving services, frequency and infrastructure are commendable actions.
Council is concerned however that the focus should be more on planning for a combination of demand management, introduction of new services and timing provision of infrastructure.

The key actions of preparing a Bus, Train and Tram Plan concentrates on improving the “current” system. This is needed, but is only the first step in the process of achieving greater public transport usage. It will be no good providing services to growth areas when households have already been established with three cars in the garage.

With regard to improving Hume’s existing public transport network, clarification is sought regarding Figure 6 – “Melbourne’s Principal Public Transport Network”. It is uncertain whether the plan shows an extension of the tramline from Airport West to Gladstone Park, or an improvement to the current bus network, or simply the existing bus network. Council has consistently supported the extension of the tram line in this location.

**Recommendations**

- That the proposed Bus, Train and Tram Plans should focus on existing as well as proposed public transport networks. In particular, networks needed to support growth areas.

- That further certainty be provided regarding the future light rail extending from the Airport West Shopping Centre to Gladstone Park Shopping centre.
Transport Needs in Growth Areas

Whilst Council strongly supports the principle of ensuring transport infrastructure is in place at the time of developing new communities, reality has shown that there are substantial delays to the provision of this infrastructure — most notably public transport infrastructure (apart from “on road” bus networks).

The planned transit corridor (E14) for the Hume growth area has been notably omitted from the principal public transport network and growth area plans. This is of extreme concern to Council given the level of commitment Council and the state government has given to this vital piece of infrastructure in the past. It is essential that Melbourne 2030 recognise the E14 transit corridor.

The E14 transit corridor has provision for a public transport reservation. Melbourne 2030 Integrated Transport Plan needs to comprehensively review the full potential of the E14 transit corridor as part of the Hume Growth Area planning process.

Designing high capacity public transport infrastructure into the planning of new growth areas requires not only state government support but also tangible budgetary commitments. It is the early construction of public transport infrastructure, which will ensure the travel patterns of new communities are directed toward public transport use – Melbourne 2030 must recognise and plan for this reality.

The division of responsibilities for transport planning between the Department of Infrastructure and the Department of Sustainability and Environment is unclear and may potentially result in problems achieving an integrated and coordinated response to transport planning, especially for growth areas. A clear process for dealing with this “split” in responsibilities will need to be addressed by the state government.

Recommendation

- Melbourne 2030 must recognise past and current state government commitments to the planning and construction of the E14 transport corridor.
- Planning for public transport provision in growth areas must be linked to achievable budgetary and timeline commitments in order to establish community travel patterns at an early stage.
Freight and Commercial Transport

Council supports the preparation of a Freight and Logistics Plan for metropolitan Melbourne. Hume City Council is strategically placed regarding the interstate movement of freight and linkages to ports.

Whilst Council supports the preparation of a Freight and Logistics Plan, it is considered that the current vision in Melbourne 2030 does not recognise the strategic advantages of the Hume City Council. In particular the full potential of the current freight rail corridor adjacent the Hume Highway is not recognised. Council is concerned that Melbourne 2030 places a “residential” emphasis on the land surrounding the Donnybrook rail station. Council strongly believes that this is a strategic site for employment based uses which can capitalise on the existing freight, road and rail network.

Melbourne 2030 should review the locational advantages of designating a proposed freight intermodal terminal at Craigieburn East. Council would like to discuss this matter further with the State Government.

The development of this terminal needs to be further explored given potential benefits to be gained for both the cities of Hume and Whittlesea.

Council requires that Melbourne 2030 consider the efficient freight movement needs of the existing heavy rail network located in Craigieburn East and Donnybrook, in its planning for the Hume Growth Area.

Recommendations

- That Melbourne 2030 recognises the freight movement logistics associated with the Hume corridor and considers the location of a multi modal freight terminal at Craigieburn East.
- That Hume City Council be directly involved in the preparation of the proposed Freight Plan, given Hume’s strategic location.
Process for Considering Submissions

Council requires a clear indication as to how submissions will be considered. Council is concerned that an independent Panel/Advisory Committee may be set up to hear all submissions in the absence of Council involvement.

Council seeks that where there is disagreement between state government and local government regarding the urban growth boundary alignment, further discussion with Council should be undertaken prior to the State Government finalising this boundary.

Council welcomes on going dialogue with the DSE regarding the content of its submission.
Conclusion

Melbourne 2030 is a comprehensive land use and transport strategy. It provides clear direction to the principles of development for metropolitan Melbourne, and those principles form the basis of metropolitan planning policy. The government should be commended for its efforts to prepare a metropolitan wide plan.

Council has some concerns, however, regarding the implementation details of the strategy. These concerns form the basis of Hume’s submission to the State Government for Melbourne 2030.

Council sees this submission as the first step in the process of establishing ongoing dialogue with the State Government regarding the successful implementation of Melbourne 2030.
Appendix
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Appendix
Hume City Council Submission
Consultative Process – Overview

Council undertook an extensive consultation process to assist the preparation of its submission to Melbourne 2030.

This consultative process enabled the general community to participate in community information sessions, which were held at Sunbury, Craigieburn and Broadmeadows. The information sessions enabled over 150 residents to gain an overview of key directions of Melbourne 2030, an outline of how Melbourne 2030 affects the future planning of Hume and an opportunity to participate in open discussion. All comments made at these sessions were recorded and form part of this appendix.

In addition Council sought comments from key external stakeholders, comprising of servicing agencies, major developers, interest groups, and other municipalities. Issues discussed with key stakeholders concentrated on aspects of Melbourne 2030, which would influence the future planning of the city. Given the time constraints of responding to the Melbourne 2030 document, this stakeholder consultation was targeted. All comments from these sessions are recorded within this appendix.

Council also provided advice to land owners who requested further information regarding Melbourne 2030 and implications for their land. A number of “one on one” meetings were held with landowners at their request. Comments and issues discussed at these meetings are provided in this appendix. In addition all copies of submission made to Melbourne 2030 which were referred to Council for our information have been attached to this appendix. These submissions have been considered and have informed Council’s submission.

The consultative process undertaken by Council has helped “shape” Council’s submission. In the main most comments were supportive of Council’s current strategic framework (MSS). A level of confusion and uncertainty was expressed where Melbourne 2030 diverged from Council’s strategic direction. This was especially so for discussions related to Melbourne 2030 Hume Growth Area Plan and the location of the UGB for Sunbury and Craigieburn.
The following is a summary of the outcomes of this consultative process.

**Stakeholder Meetings – Servicing Authorities**

**Yarra Valley Water**
Discussion with Yarra Valley Water involved general discussion about Melbourne 2030, and the designated Hume Growth Area. Concerns were expressed that the current UGB does not recognise current infrastructure planning occurring in Craigieburn and infrastructure is currently being sized to accommodate an ultimate Craigieburn population as per the Council’s MSS.

**Melbourne Water**
Melbourne Water have been modelling drainage catchment plans for the Craigieburn areas based on the Craigieburn Strategy Plan and Council’s MSS - which anticipates growth west to Mickleham Rd. Changes to the anticipated level of growth will dramatically alter the planning for these catchment areas.

**Vic Roads**
Discussion was held with the Sunshine Regional Office and the traffic management team located in Kew. The final alignment of the proposed E14 arterial road/bus route between Somerton and Craigieburn Rd West will be finalised shortly. Construction is anticipated in an 8-10 year timeframe – current level of priority is medium. There was acknowledgment that the E14 could be designed to full fill a public transport role – this would require government commitment and resources.

**Western Water**
Recognise potential to continue open space linkages along the Jackson’s Creek. There are opportunities for water recycling to service areas south of Sunbury. Green wedge land use such as viticulture can take advantage of the recycled water pipeline.
Stakeholder Meetings – Major Developers

- Delfin
- George Adams Corp.
- Lensworth

Key issues discussed:

- Belief that the growth area boundary should reflect more than existing developments and should go to Mickleham Rd.
- Concerned E14 not recognised – believed it was never in question- just an issue of timing.
- Query emphasis on existing town centre as a major activity centre. Emphasis should be placed on the proposed Craigieburn Town Centre – as part of the location of the UGB along Mickleham Rd.
- There was general concern that the strategy was not prepared having regard to industry knowledge in the Craigieburn growth area.
- UGB should include Mt Ridley development and land to the west – Mickleham Rd. A number of investors have already made commitments (Peet & Co.) to plan for residential development west of the existing LSP area.
- The E14 needs to be built to its proposed status for it to service the town centre – E14 is critical to the success of the town centre. Development needs to be either side of the E14 / town centre. Location of the town centre has been predicated on its “central” location – this is not reflected in the location of the UGB.
- All modelling for the town centre, residential development, employment land development has been done on the existence of the E14. Craigieburn needs the town centre given it is critically under supplied with retail floor space.
- Cost of extending the electrification to Donnybrook would be finically unviable given it will service only a small developable area. The cost of shifting the broad/narrow gauge is a significant consideration.
- Craigieburn railway station should be designed as a high-level commuter station.
- The 2030 strategy ignores that the rail line has only a one sided catchment.
Stakeholder Meetings – Interest Groups

Victorian Farming Federation

Economic Viability of farming

- Should consider the economic feasibility of the green wedge in addition to environmental sustainability objectives.
- Current financial difficulties faced by farmers require that the state government give financial incentives to farmers to keep the “green wedge”.
- To keep farming viable the government should ensure that farmers could financially survive.
- Farming is currently running at a loss. Farm sizes are too small to make an adequate profit. Farmers can not compete with larger farming operations.
- Problems with the current federal tax system
- No recognition for the cost of running a farm – most farmers need a second job – this affects the operation of the farm – social, environmental and economic impacts.
- Maintaining the green wedge – feels like a “them and us” – the public want rural vistas but no one is prepared to assist rural land managers to maintain this vista.

Rural Action Plans
- Circumstances in the Hume Green Wedge are very different to other green wedge areas – there needs to be recognition of this.

Regional Open Space in rural Areas
- Issues regarding “proposed” open space near creeks – this land is private land connected to a farming business. If this land were to be designated for open space farmers would need to be properly compensated.
- Given past and current experiences regarding the quality of state managed open space, farmers are concerned that any open space designation adjacent rural land will adversely impact on the farming operation (weeds, illegal access on private land, fire risks etc.)
Sunbury Conservation Society

- SCS expressed strong support for the Green Wedge areas as outlined in Melbourne 2030.
- There was support for the proposed green wedge legislation and rural zone controls.
- The current UGB is supported, especially with regard to the extent of the boundary identified for Sunbury.
- Considered critical that the "Sanctuary" land remains outside the current UGB. This land should form part of the green wedge, given past environmental research and assessment undertaken by DNRE, has indicated its inappropriateness for urban development.
- Support given to the UGB as currently shown for Craigieburn.
- Support for the preparation of Green Wedge Actions Plans to address proper land management issues in rural areas.
**Neighbouring Council**

Mitchell Shire Council

- Mitchell Shire Council supports further incremental development directed toward Wallan (proposed additional 2000 lots).

- There is the suggestion that if the development of Craigieburn goes to Gunns Gully Rd then there will be potential servicing implications for land around Beveridge.

- In this instance the Council believes that if the UGB is moved to the Gunns Gully Rd boundary then the Shire of Mitchell must be considered as part of any structure planning process for the City of Hume.

**Landowner Meetings – initiated at their request**

- Gap Rd South – Residents
- Kerrie & Lawrence Paratz
- Tony Johnson & Fred Andraos
- Wilbow Corporation
- Rolling Meadows
- Veronica Burgess
- Mr. Moore –
- John Benjamin
- James Webster
- Ben Beccia
- Mr & Mrs Barr
- Peet & Co.
- Ted Marantelli, Glen Pirani
Discussion of Issues

Urban Growth Boundary

Sunbury

- The land located south of Gap Rd has been recognised for future urban development in Council’s MSS. The UGB excludes this land.
- Residents expressed concern that Melbourne 2030 has eroded the degree of certainty, which had been given in the past that the land was suitable for urban development. A significant amount of time and resources had already been spent by landowners on the preparation of a local structure development plan and outline development plan for this area. Residents were concerned that the DSE had failed to acknowledge Council’s MSS and the strategic planning work already undertaken to justify the inclusion of this land within the UGB.
- Vineyard Rd town approach to Sunbury might benefit from some form of urban development, which could incorporate urban design and landscaping treatments.
- Discussion related to the UGB and the land located east of Goonawarra along Lancefield Rd, Sunbury which is outside the UGB and MSS growth area boundary.
- Resident expressed concern that a number of land holdings designated in the Hume MSS for future urban purposes, (north of Gap Rd), were not included within the UGB for Sunbury.

Greenvale

- Concern that the land identified for future employment/development (east & west of Mickleham Rd, Greenvale) within the Hume MSS has been located outside the UGB.
- The UGB was considered contradictory to the strategic planning undertaken by Hume regarding this land. The UGB was affecting the potential to apply for a rezoning for this land.

Craigieburn

- Landowner raised concerned that the employment locational advantages of the land located east of the Hume Highway in the Hume employment corridor have not been identified in Melbourne 2030 UGB. The land is identified for future employment uses within Council’s MSS. The Craigieburn By Pass transverses the site along with a major interchange. The land is located adjacent a freight rail line.
- Land holder concern that land previously identified for urban development in Hume MSS and strategy plans are located outside of the UGB. It has been expected that this development would occur at some time and there appears to be no good reason for the land to be excluded.
Green Wedge

- Concern regarding the Green Wedge and Urban Growth Boundary, having particular regard to the green wedge legislation which could potentially “lock” the land into no development potential in the medium to long term. It was considered that the legislation would essentially take away any future potential to request a rezoning.
- Long-term sustainability of farming quality of the land and the inability to access water – in particular recycled water for the Western Water pipe line were seen as future problems to sustain current rural activities.
- Concerned that the UGB did not consider potential for urban development west of Mickleham Rd given location to existing infrastructure and services. It was considered more beneficial to extend development in the Hume Growth Area, to the west of Mickleham Rd rather than further to the north, given development will be further removed from existing infrastructure and employment areas.
- Land west of Mickleham Rd, Greenvale (Bonds Lane area) should have the minimum subdivision requirement to be reviewed as part of the preparation of the Green Wedge Action Plans and application of new green wedge zone. Most land is 2 hectares – currently an 8-hectare minimum subdivision applies. Limited subdivision potential is sought. This would not be contrary to the objectives of the Green Wedge given it would reflect existing subdivision patterns in this area.
General Questions Raised:

1. Rural landowners – why were they all not advised of consultation sessions?
   A. Agree this is an issue unfortunately Council can not control circulation of the local newspaper. Council’s Hume Newsletter is sent to every household. The newsletter was sent in December and outlined proposed consultation. A letter was sent to landowners immediately affected by the location of the urban growth boundary.

2. When did Hume first learn about 2030?
   A. The state government on 8 October 2002 officially launched Melbourne 2030. Council was involved in some workshops as part of the preparation of the document. Council also commented on an issues paper prepared almost 18 months ago.

3. Will the notes/Minutes of tonight’s discussions be made available?
   A. Yes

4. What about Sunbury? (General comment)
   A. Issues regarding Sunbury will be discussed in the presentation.

5. Right to farm; farm controls – EIS, fire control, maintenance of additional public open space.
   A. Issues regarding the green wedge will be discussed later in the session.

6. Airport Environs – Glossed over in 2030.
   A. These issues will be addressed in the response to the green wedge issues.
7. What is Council intending to do with Special Investigation Areas (In or inside UGB)

A. Councils presentation tonight will highlight areas in Council’s MSS which do not respond to the urban growth boundary – the special investigation areas will be included in this consideration.

8. Was there consultation about UGB? Are they now saying Council has got it wrong?

A. Essentially the government department placed an urban growth boundary around existing zoned land for all of Melbourne. It is up to the individual Council’s to identify land, which has been covered by a local strategy for future urban purposes but has not been recognised by the UGB.

9. Minister well aware of issues re Sanctuary. Is Council putting applications on hold in light of VCAT. Council is selectively referring to 2030 when it suits us.

A. Council must refer to Melbourne 2030 when assessing applications for planning permits and when considering amendments.

10. What was the economic basis for Sunbury Activity Centre?

A. Activity Centre was chosen as a major activity centre given it is located on a public train line and it services a residential area.

11. Supply projections in 2030. Is Hume (including Sunbury)?

A. No. The land supply reflects the Craigieburn growth area alone.

12. What is Council intention in relation to Urban Growth Boundary for areas outside of UGB.

A. Once the UGB has been finally determined this land will be contained within a green wedge.
Notes / Comments From Group Discussions:

**Group 1:**

1. Request for change to the Strategy Plan.
2. For that area within the – Somerton Road North, Mickleham Road West, Craigieburn Road South, Konagadera Road East area of land.
3. That this area should be considered for Rural Living and a variation of size from 25 hectares to say 6 hectares, with regulated, housing design, surplus water within the cortlege, rural type road, encourage other than fossil fuel.
4. This type of development is in high demand and there appears little planning in the presently proposed strategy.
5. To best of knowledge there is little such land available at a reasonable price.
6. Council intends to allow some areas for housing – less than 1 hectare in size – on the road frontage to Mickleham Road on east side.
7. Employees who work at the Airport should have the opportunity to purchase smaller areas than 100 acres – as it is proposed. The area would still continue to appear rural.
8. Employees at the Airport should not be forced to travel to the airport from up to fifteen kilometres at Craigieburn or beyond.
9. Services are all available at the south/east corner of the area noted.
10. It would be wise and perhaps reasonable, that if it be said that “stakeholders” will be taken notice of then council or the Department might consider further conferences or perhaps correspondence to advise of major change to the ability of stakeholders to negotiate their land.
11. Where there exists small blocks of land, as there is along the Mickleham Road west side perhaps consideration be given to evaluation as to how these ratepayers can in any way be considered “rural”.

**Group 2:**

Sanctuary Zone – Green Wedges and Urban Green Belt

1. Rural Character to be maintained beyond current UGB.
2. Don’t move UGB.
3. Don’t let commercial interests spoil our Sunbury environment.
4. I think we think the Council has already taken their stand.
5. Council has not taken notice of the size of local roads in this area – Enterprise Drive, Racecourse Road.
Strategic Planning In Hume
1. Hume City Council cannot use lack of planning as an excuse.
2. Hume City Council has not investigated Special Investigation Areas. Why?
3. Hume City Council has not made a Rural Action Plan.
4. Hume City Council has not applied overlays – heritage, environmental, etc.
5. Hume City Council has not done land capability studies.
6. Said they would do all these things before. Why should we / Government believes Hume City Council will do them now?

Transport
1. Interchange of Tullamarine and Calder Freeways needs to be fixed.
2. What is the public transport plan for Sunbury? Will we be linked to other centres? Will it grow with development?

Housing
1. No buildings over 2 storeys.
2. What about car parking to meet increased needs.
3. VCAT needs to be reviewed.

Reference to Sept 3, 2002 – Leader Newspaper
Hume Council’s Economic Development Director Kurt Bruhn said, “there was no demand for more subdivisions” re Sunbury Green Wedge.

The Leader Tuesday 8 October 2002
1. Sunbury Residents Association supports the green wedges and doesn’t want further subdivision.
2. Cr. Ann Potter supported the new green wedge legislation, as did Sunbury Chamber of Commerce and Cr. Jack Ogilvie says it reinforces overlays.

Rescode
Roads in new estates are too narrow. No access for fire vehicles, emergency vehicles, rubbish collection - already a problem in some estates.
**Group 3:**

**Green Wedge**

1. Representation from landowners in formulating action plans that have a direct impact on the financial viability of the landowner. Green wedge action plans to be based on municipal areas. Green Wedge planning controls should lead to sustainable viability outcomes for the landholders. Green Wedge not be used for obnoxious waste. The majority of Hume farming properties are not viable so why limit Sunbury’s growth yet – have development in Victoria food bowl area around Pakenham / Cranbourne.

2. Sunbury has great access to Melbourne yet its growth is restrictive. Who is going to look after the Rural Conservation Zone.

3. Land Management Issues make it difficult to farm eg. Spray Zones, Chemicals, Aeroplanes. Planting of trees in conservation zones generally in creek valleys – harder to fight fires. Housing often at end (or edge) of gullies / valleys. Where are our children going to live if growth restricted in Sunbury. More public money to be spent on rural areas.

4. 3 – 5 Acres – 10% area

5. What is going to be done to make dams available for drinking water, plus fruit and vegetable growth, lands to be put aside for market gardens / orchards. Plus fish sustainability?

6. How will farmers be allowed to grow cattle, sheep, poultry for food consumption with whatever limited space – water access?

7. Forestry plots within suburbs for oxygenation of better living.

8. Talks on urban development but nothing for agriculture.

**Group 4:**

**Urban Growth Boundary – Sunbury**

1. Gap Road issues – north between Wilsons Lane and Calder Highway

2. UGB should recognise the adopted ODP for this land.

3. UGB should be moved to the Wileman Road.

4. Does not take into account future growth of Sunbury.

5. Already services in place: water, sewerage, public transport, access to Calder.


7. Issues with weed control: No assistance, not viable for farming, not viable for having animals.


12. Treated as urban by Western Water.
13. Calder highway is a natural division.
14. Development further north has affected natural water supply / runoff from the hill (Mt Holden development).
15. Social Services – costs negligible, buses, sporting facility.
16. Employment – Sunbury has access to employment in other areas.
17. Existing employment land – good access – needs to be marketed properly – University? Business Park – R & D?

**Housing**

1. Need diversity in housing types in Sunbury.
2. Retirement Villages (not gated)
3. Higher density – 3 storey max, issues for elderly.
4. Parking in Sunbury an issue – one way streets?
5. Employment – Ag industries to service the green wedge.

**Group 5:**

Concerns / comments

1. Restrictive nature of UGB in Sunbury.
2. MSS has an inbuilt review process and could grow with Sunbury whereas ‘2030’ is inflexible.
3. Lack of flexibility for housing options at lower densities.
4. Airport overlays should be reviewed to ‘as 2030’ and issue or private operator having right of refusal over private land should also be reviewed.
5. Green Wedge controls do not provide incentives for ongoing maintenance with onus only on landowners (becoming a weed wedge).
6. Fire prevention plans for all public lands as outlined in 2030.
7. Green wedge increases restrictions on landowners and creates non economic situations which will eventually lead to policy failure.
8. Green wedge concept is 25 years too late and farm economics have now dramatically changed (negative).
9. Without positive implementation plans and procedures in place, Council should maintain present processes until provided by DSE.
10. Green wedge is creating a brown wedge by protecting uses such as toxic waste, tips, quarries.
11. Intensive uses such as vineyards, orchards, feed lots, poultry will have difficulty meeting new requirements of green wedge zone.
12. Future growth of suburbs is unreasonably restricted.
13. Raises moral question as to why rural landowners should bear the costs of green wedge philosophy for the benefits or urban residents.
14. Rural infrastructure is constantly being reduced or curtailed (eg. loss of Newmarket / Dandenong – Pakenham, also grain handling from Sunbury / Geelong.
15. Rural Social infrastructure also under threat.
16. Aging rural landowners.
17. Inability of rural landowners to put in succession planning options.
18. Multiple generations involved in landholdings, however green wedge concept makes this difficult.
19. Lack of detail in preparation of rural action plans and concerns that it will not include rural landowners.
20. Council should be more questioning of strategy.
21. The green wedge fails to address aging of landowners with loss of ongoing family commitment and chance of ongoing enterprises or new enterprises.
22. Concerns over lack of land holder involvement in action plans.
23. Council should support its MSS as it stands particularly in view of the level of state / public involvement in the adoption of current planning scheme controls.
24. Another great leap forward as proposed by MMBW.
25. Concerns relating to future development densities in Sunbury to meet growth forecasts without the additional areas in MSS and now excluded by urban growth boundary.
26. Disappointed that submission concentrated on Craigieburn and not Sunbury.

**Group 6:**

2. Opening up of Enterprise Drive is negative – capacity, traffic, Settlement road easement.
3. Development of Settlement road and access by further block development – incorporate reserve area.
5. Fire hazard – Racecourse Road – area not maintained.
6. Growth along north west corridor.
7. Activity Centre – ‘Country feel’.
8. Preference Calder area identified for development.
9. Infrastructure – who is responsible ‘State Govt’ ‘Developers’.
10. Arterial roads.
11. Other services – hospital, aged care.
12. Entry to Sunbury ‘gateway’.
13. Craiglee – retain ‘vista’, keep outside UGB – impact of traffic from Lancefield etc.
14. Sanctuary – rural living, access, road network, minimum 1 hectare – 4 hectare blocks – extensive reserve areas.
15. Racecourse Road – move UGB, use as residential access via Elizabeth Drive.
16. Activity Centre – not high density.
17. Crossing(s) of railway line.
18. Public transport – more frequency, across to city.
19. Grasslands – redevelop, include as activity centre.
20. Support Green Wedge – develop alternatives for existing, landowners’ lifestyle pr/ with caveats for maintenance etc.
   Needs a green wedge.
22. Quality of life.

**Group 7:**

**Vineyard Road**

1. The current proposal is to put a hard edge (along fence wire) separation between residential and rural. This is against all notions of good planning a better approach is to have an Inter Urban Break from Moore Road to the residential zone or a phasing zone from rural to residential (700 mtr).
2. Residential Development should not butt up against rural zones. Some buffer is required. Rubbish, Farming practices, Human interaction, Financial impact on rural landowners.

**Transport Links**

1. What links are provided to support industry – especially rural industry. Many rural roads are used for residential traffic – who complain about farm trucks / machinery.

There are many other government regulations/requirements that affect farming operations. Green wedge objectives need to address ALL Government Regulations related to farming – in a holistic way across all levels of government.
1. To recognise planned subdivisions in Gap road.

**Group 8:**

1. Gap road North / South should be developed – It is in the current doc as a growth area – existing service infrastructure. Low – High Density development.
   - Eg. Public transport, sewerage, natural gas, water, power, phones, rubbish collection.
   - Environmental hazard to the Sunbury township. Eg. fire, noxious weeds and vermin, illegal rubbish disposal.
   - Excellent access to Calder Highway direct from Gap road (rather than via existing over-loaded arterial road – ie Vineyard Road.
   - Blocks as they are, are not suitable for rural pursuits eg running stock, town dogs, trespassers.
   - Not suited for community recreational purposes.

2. Aging population
   - What services are being considered and planned? (The document does not address the issues around providing suitable services.)
Craigieburn

Craigieburn Session, Wednesday, 22 January 2003

Notes

General Questions:

1. Is 2030 seeking to establish satellite cities?
   A. Melbourne 2030 is seeking to define clear areas for further growth located on public transport routes.

2. How do we support Council submission?
   A. By forwarding a submission to the Department outlining your comments and support for Council’s future planning for the area.

3. Concerns with Green Wedges – look what happened to Canberra …..fire concerns on the boundary of urban/rural.
   A. Issues will be addressed as part of preparation of Rural Action Plans

4. What happens to land outside of the UGB which was identified for growth?
   A. Land will be placed in a green wedge. In some cases this is not appropriate. For example there is land in Greenvale, which will be more suited to employment/openspace uses than rural. Council placed the land in a rural zone to act as a holding zone until development could occur. The UGB does not recognise this future use.

5. Transport problem – no east-west
   A. Council is aware of the wider east-west transport linkages problems. These issues have been identified in a draft transport study. Further work on this issues will be undertaken.

6. Bus O’bahn in Adelaide is very good. (statement not a particular question)
Group 1:

1. Smart Growth committee to consist of at least 2 representatives from ratepayers.
2. Oppose urban growth to the east of Hume Highway:
   - Merri Creek Nature Park (Residential development will damage area of ecological and conservation importance)
   - Freight Line (used along passenger line) (Heavy long carriage trains will create noise pollution in residential region, plus traffic problems – freight trains up to 80 carriages long).
   - Developing east of Hume will require more capital works such as bridges, overpasses, tunnels to be built at a large cost to Federal Government.
3. Support Hume City Council current MSS with development to the west of Hume to Mickleham Road.
4. 10 year land supply disadvantages Hume City Council in favour of over developed eastern sprawl of Melbourne although finite supply of land may correlate with higher land prices – a cap on development will lead to a cap on funding for area at Federal and State Government – look at (country) Bairnsdale / East Gippsland.
6. Land to Mickleham Rd will enable better subdivision of land due to current infrastructure and proximity to existing hubs of Tullamarine and employment / industry in the west.
7. High Density living in Hume will be a socio-economic disaster if current MSS is not approved – Urban Growth Strategy follows European City Models as opposed to regional US cities ie. Charlotte, Dallas, Houston (very similar to Melbourne). European high rises have high crime rates and poverty – refer to Manchester – London Council Estates.

Group 2:

Other Issues:

1. Waste Collection Old Sydney road plus recycle bins.
2. Police the dumping of rubbish.
3. Traffic hazards – double lines overtaking all the time – go further up to Yuroke instead of on Mickleham Road near Greenvale.
Melbourne 2030 Issues:

1. Trains large enough to carry all passengers so people don’t have to stand.
2. Safer/larger Park and Ride facility.
3. Spur line through Craigieburn.

Issues:

1. High density housing around activity centres. Higher density – social housing or private development? Should be spread throughout community.
2. High density concerns re social impact (youth issues – kids “hanging around”).
3. Process for developing 2030 – was Hume City Council input sought at policy development stage.
4. Focus on public transport – people will still travel in cars to access public transport. Thus distance to public transport point is not always a relevant determinant.

Group 3:

1. Green wedge and Rural conservation zones are overly restrictive. There should still be scope for the Rural Zone to apply.
2. The MSS growth corridor should be retained.
3. The quality of the land through the Melbourne 2030 proposed corridor is of a poor quality. It should be used for industry / commercial.
4. When you stand on a platform at Donnybrook Station and a freight train goes through, the platform actually shakes. It’s not suitable for residential development.
5. Mickleham Road and Old Sydney road can’t accommodate heavy traffic. They need to be upgraded or traffic diverted.
6. Most people go out of their way to avoid crossing the Hume Highway at Donnybrook Road. The Hume forms a significant barrier to East-West travel. Donnybrook Road needs an overpass.

Group 4:

1. E14 – support – schools – Mickleham Road congestion.
2. Mt Ridley access from Hume Hwy.
3. UGB extended to MSS.
4. East of highway – not green wedge – employment or residential.
6. Activity Centre – as MSS.
7. Use of existing infrastructure, rather than build new.
8. Transport – school bus – Aitken college.
9. Donnybrook

**Group 5:**

1. Splitting Craigieburn over train line is not a good idea.
2. Green wedge – bush fires is OK.
3. Solution may be cleared and well worked zones around residential sites.
4. Shopping in Craigieburn focus on strip shops – structured parking.
5. Future Activity Centres appear to be satellite cities.
6. Transport – difficult to go east or west – better bus services, or direct link to major facilities ie. Hospital / airport.
7. Train line that links suburbs east – west rather than into the city only.
8. Definitely no green wedge over Hume (right side) off railway line.

**Group 6:**

1. Growth area plan
2. Coordination between Whittlesea and Mitchell and Hume re Donnybrook growth area.
3. Protection of Merri Creek is important.
4. Need to look at possibility of grey water re use to the north of Guns Gully road (Beveridge) – Environmental impact on land.
5. What about Kalkallo township? UGB around township? Need to look at total Kalkallo area – not just residential zoned land but also properties surrounding Kalkallo.
6. Kalkallo Township not serviced by Hume Newsletter – query as to whether there can be a delivery of newsletter to local Post Office.
General Questions Raised:

1. Why has growth gone slower in the north/west than the south/east?
   A. Growth has occurred at a slower rate in the north/west given the concentration of Melbourne’s population is in the south east and this has put pressure on more development occurring in this corridor.

2. Council lets areas within Hume get run down. Lets development happen in places where it shouldn’t. (Quality of development in many areas of Hume is very poor which affects property values and investment).
   A. Issues regarding enforcement of planning permit conditions for particular sites will be discussed at the end of tonight’s session.

Notes / Comments From Group Discussions:

Group 1:

1. E14 – Transit bus / transport is a great idea.
2. Support Council view for E14 as infrastructure already exists.
3. What about Merri Creek? Explore more issues / build factories.
4. Campbellfield is a slum – needs to be worked on – needs lots of work to beautify the area.

Group 2:

1. Land around Somerhill Road should be residential like Mt. Ridley therefore support growth like the Government wants.
2. Growth should happen as proposed in MSS. Freeway was moved to present affecting creek. Support MSS.
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List of submitters who forwarded copies of their submissions for Council’s consideration at the Ordinary Council Meeting of 17 February 2003:

Tuscany Manor Pty Ltd
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L. Karmel, P. Kerr and J. J. Webster
KLM Gerner Consulting Group on behalf of several landowners
Peter & Jan Barr
Clement – Stone on behalf of Cleanaway
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SJB Planning on behalf of Zaram Pty Ltd
John P Lovell
Danny & Cheryl Schneider
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Tract Consultants Pty Ltd on behalf of PEET and Company Pty Ltd (PEET) re land in Craigieburn
Tract Consultants Pty Ltd on behalf of PEET and Company Pty Ltd (PEET) re land in Greenvale
Tract Consultants Pty Ltd on behalf of Mr Ted Marantelli and a group of landowners in Greenvale
Appendix 6.2
Technical Comments
Anomalies and Corrections
Technical Comments – Anomalies and Comments on Statutory Provisions

This section outlines anomalies, mistakes and matters which require further consideration which Council has identified in Melbourne 2030.

1.0 Application of the Urban Growth Boundary

1.1 Anomaly - Western Avenue, Westmeadows
A parcel of existing Industrial 3 zoned land along Western Avenue, Westmeadows has been left outside of the Urban Growth Boundary as shown on the following plan.

The Urban Growth Boundary should be moved to include this land as an anomaly in accordance with Stage 1 Application of the interim UGB outlined in Implementation Plan 1 – Urban Growth Boundary.
1.1 Transitional Case: Amendment C31
Council adopted Amendment C31 on 25 November 2001. The Amendment rezones land in Western Avenue, Westmeadows from Rural Zone to Business 3 Zone.

The Amendment was submitted for Ministerial approval on 17 December 2002. The Amendment was exhibited in the normal manner with submissions heard by an Independent Panel in August 2002. The Panel supported the Amendment as exhibited.

It is submitted that the Urban Growth Boundary be moved to include the Business 3 Zoning proposed in Amendment C31 as a transitional case outlined in Implementation Plan 1.

1.2 Melbourne Airport
Further consideration needs to be given on the application of the UGB within Melbourne Airport, which as Commonwealth Land is not subject to state planning legislation.

Implementation Plan 1 – Urban Growth Boundary indicated that the application of the UGB within Melbourne Airport follows the boundary of land set aside for Business and Industrial purposes.

It is not clear how this approach to delineating the UGB within the airport will facilitate the encouragement of uses consistent with its primary function or the development of mixed uses, which do not compete with nearby Principal, or Major Activity Centres.

A more sophisticated approach is required to define areas which contain uses related to the primary function of the airport and non-aeronautic development. Such an approach would provide the basis for the assessment of Airport Master Plans and Major Development Plans with the objectives of Melbourne 2030.

The current location of the UGB within the Airport is inconsistent and includes the existing terminal precinct which is clearly related to the function of the airport and excludes airport land north of the Tullamarine Freeway and south of Annandale Road which are identified in the existing Melbourne Airport Master Plan for Business and Industrial purposes.
2.0 Hume Growth Area Plan
The Hume Growth Area Plan shown on Page 25 of the Growth areas Implementation Plan contains a number of errors, which have been a source of concern and confusion.

2.1 The plan shows the area of potential urban development to be re-examined (shaded yellow) extending to western side of Mickleham Road.

The land west of Mickleham Road is not identified for urban development in the Hume MSS. The current plan has raised expectation that there is some development potential to the west of Mickleham despite the direction outlined in the MSS.

2.2 The plan shows a white unshaded area along the western and northern extent of the Urban Growth Boundary. This has caused some confusion over the timing of development in this area and the final location of the UGB.

2.3 The plan shows the existing Craigieburn Town Centre as a Major Activity Centre. However, it is not included in the list of Activity Centres on Page 32 of the Activity Centres Implementation Plan. Clarification of the status of this centre is required.

2.4 There has been some confusion on the location of the ‘potential public transport orientated centre’ located on Craigieburn Road, west of the existing town centre. The plan incorrectly shows this centre adjacent to the existing urban area. It should be located further west and on the north side of Craigieburn Road.

3.0 Proposed Changes to Ministerial Direction 6 – Rural Residential Development
Council supports the proposal to amend Ministerial Direction 6 to apply to proposals to rezone land to create lot sizes between 0.4 hectares and 8 hectares.
4.0 Transport Plan
Lack of clarity regarding the proposed improved public transport links to the Gladstone Park Shopping Centre from Airport West Shopping Centre. Is it proposed to be a tram extension or an approved bus network connection?

5.0 Regional Open Space Linkages
Page 106, Figure 39 – Refers to the Jackson’s Creek as “existing open space network”. Most of this land is within private land ownership and not reserved for public open space. This figure is technically incorrect and should be amended to show “proposed” regional open space linkage.
Appendix 6.3
Draft Work Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Melb 2030 Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submission to Melbourne 2030</td>
<td>February 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth Area Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Areas Development Sequencing Plan</td>
<td>within 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Area Plan - Hume Corridor</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume Integrated Transport Study</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Scheme Amendment - Growth Area Plans</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Wedge Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Wedge Townships Policy</td>
<td>within 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume Green Wedge Action Plan</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Living Review</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Scheme Amendment - Green Wedge Action Plan and zones</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity Centre Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Centre Strategy Plan</td>
<td>within 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Centre Car Parking Policy</td>
<td>within 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Area Activity Centre Planning</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Scheme Amendment - Activity Centre Policy and Zones</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Centre Structure Planning</td>
<td>2-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Housing Strategy</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Growth Boundary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review UGB - Special Investigation Areas</td>
<td>within 12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>