

MPS- Activity Centres

Title/Question: Theme 1: Activity Centres
 Tool Type: Form
 Activity ID: 305
 Report Date Range: 9 Sep 2021 - 21 Oct 2021
 Date Exported: 26 Oct 2021 09:45 am

Contribution ID	Date Submitted	Do you agree with the identified key			If not, which objective/s and why?	With consideration of objectives in the other themes, can you identify any gaps in this theme that the MPS should consider?
		Yes	No	Unsure		
					Objectives 1 & 3 are acceptable but I have grave misgivings regarding objective 2. I am not sure exactly what is contained in the idea of "medium density housing (including mid-rise commercial development and apartments)". I would hate to see anything like the high rise monstrosities which have arisen in Box Hill. My feeling is for development no more than 3 storeys high, with adequate parking, plenty of set back to allow greenery & shade trees. The housing development opposite Eltham North Primary School is a very good example of development which maintains the Eltham character - leafy, green, low rise & constructed of materials in keeping with Eltham. The small pockets of greenery & open space scattered throughout Woodridge were in danger of being built upon, being deemed "lazy assets". Complete nonsense! We need pockets of green more than ever now, very valuable assets, with climate change threatening.	I will comment on the housing theme also as my views here will overlap.
19290	Oct 21, 2021, 05:15 PM			1		
					Key objective 1 Why does Council permit Diamond Creeks major shopping/activity centre with Coles Supermarket as its anchor,trade for many years with only ONE toilet pan to serve its hundreds of permanent customers.Coles have simply taken over original public toilets for staff only use. Has Council an active health officer? How is this centre allowed to get away with it?. We are tired of observing third world practices such as urinating out the back facing the railway track.. Cant Nillumbik do better than that in 2021?.	Key objective 1 With no real landscaping or planting around the carparking areas Diamond Creek shopping centre on both sides of the road, with ramshackle basic shopfronts appears like an early frontier town and has virtually no appeal. It is there only to sell produce but has no appeal or provides any amenity. Does Council have a Landscape architect? If this is to become a major activity centre it is in need of a 'rev up' by Council.
19288	Oct 21, 2021, 03:59 PM			1		

				<p>I'm unsure if they're gaps, but I would just like to stress the need for *safe* infrastructure for non-car use. Bike lanes should not be placed in the gutters of roads and should be treated as separate infrastructure. I think many people would consider riding bikes as opposed to driving if alternative methods were actually viable and safe. It would be really good to see council working with Vic Roads and the state department to ensure townships (including access to them) have appropriate development.</p> <p>There should be higher density around town centers (since Hurstbridge, Diamond Creek, and Eltham all have access to trains and buses now) and an emphasis on walking and riding bikes.</p> <p>I would *highly* recommend watching videos from this channel as they show how different life can be when we treat "car alternatives" as genuine and equal ways of travelling and living: https://www.youtube.com/c/NotJustBikes</p> <p>I don't identify as a cyclist and I haven't been interested in using a bike for transport in over a decade, but it's something I would strongly consider if I felt it was safe.</p>
19277 Oct 21, 2021, 01:26 PM	1			
19195 Oct 19, 2021, 08:10 AM	1	i fully support the PALS SUBMISSION		
		2. This objective would be strengthened by the addition of specific definitions regarding medium density, mid-rise commercial development, apartments. Active transport [eg walking, cycling] must be given priority in design processes, and encouraged.		
		3. This objective must include consideration of walkability and cycleability. Systems of community transport that minimise reliance on cars (eg walking school buses, greater connectivity among community, car pooling etc) must be supported.		<p>- Indigenous tree canopy and understorey are protected throughout Nillumbik, including Activity Centres within the Shire. Council actively pursues net increase of indigenous vegetation in urban and rural areas.</p> <p>- Township or structure plans must guide the strategic vision for each activity centre</p>
19161 Oct 14, 2021, 09:26 PM	1			
				<p>- Indigenous tree canopy and understorey are protected throughout Nillumbik, including Activity Centres within the Shire. Council actively pursues net increase of indigenous vegetation in urban and rural areas.</p>
19122 Oct 11, 2021, 11:29 AM	1			
				<p>Placement of community hospital in Apollo Parkways does not fit into the stated activity centres/the services provided there.</p>
19091 Oct 09, 2021, 10:03 AM	1			

19078 Oct 08, 2021, 10:10 AM	I support the PALs submission	I support the PALs submission
	<p>1) Diamond Creek still poor relation to Eltham with regard to community services, there is no library, no decent swimming pool and no modern gym facility. Diamond Creek provides centre for large rural area, so parking needs to be managed well. Many rural people commute from DC as trains are more frequent from there.</p> <p>2) Huge expansion of housing along Yan Yean Road, although not in Nillumbik, puts pressure on infrastructure, sporting facilities and businesses.</p> <p>3) Would question availability of public transport to Research and Hurstbridge, who is going to catch train from Eltham or DC to go shopping in Hurstbridge. Research is only accessible by the occasional bus. Rural people use these centres and most use cars, so need improved parking. Also seems to be little flexibility in planning scheme with regard to new enterprises in Research or Hurstbridge.</p>	<p>Panton Hill and St Andrews are important to rural people and provide schools, eating places, fuel and post offices, so they need to be included.</p>
19038 Oct 07, 2021, 06:04 PM	1	
	<p>I want to see good provision for parking - for commuters, s casual parking and disabled parking. All the emphasizes on walkability ignores the fact some people are just not up to that, especially given the hilly nature of the terrain. There is really NO thought given to the use of the spaces by disabled and older people who will make up more of the Nillumbik population in the years ahead. To cater for the ageing population of Nillumbik there should be as least some emphasis on the use of the centres by older and disabled people eg provide seating along the roads to let people take a break.</p>	<p>MUCH better parking, introducing paid parking to ration the available space. I would probably want to see the traders parking costs increased by a huge amount..</p> <p>I would like to see more emphasis on apartments with a less strict imposition of stereotypical materiality restrictions. There should be MUCH more emphasis on retaining and increasing tree canopy in the built areas as this will reduce the heat island effects of townships which will be exacerbated by climate change. .</p>
19037 Oct 07, 2021, 06:01 PM	1	

		<p>This is not completely a question of yes or no but as there are suggestions for most of them I have selected no.</p> <p>I think all objectives should be informed by and reflect that Nillumbik is a Green Wedge Conservation Shire first and foremost and this should be apparent throughout all Themes within the MPS (see below)</p> <p>Objective 2 Suggest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the addition of specific definitions regarding medium density, mid-rise commercial development, apartments. - Active transport [eg walking, cycling] must be encourage by being allocated priority in design processes. <p>Objective 3 Suggest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearer evidence of priortising walkability and cycleability and systems that minimise dependence on cars eg community buses, car pooling. 	<p>I think that for each of the themes there should be a clearly evident how it is informed by the overarching vision and purpose of Nillumbik as a Green Wedge and Conservation Shire. This wish of the Nillumbik Community has been represented to Council over and over again, including in the recent Our People, Our Places, Our Future consultation and should be clearly reflected in all Council Plans and Strategies, including all aspects of the MPS.</p> <p>For the overall MPS recurrent with each theme there is the need to not only develop policies, plans and guidelines, but that there is resource allocation to monitor their implementation and ongoing adherence, to ensure effectiveness. This is currently a gaping deficit.</p> <p>Suggest the inclusion of objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indigenous tree canopy and understorey are protected throughout Nillumbik, including Activity Centres within the Shire. (including resource allocation to - Council actively pursues a net increase of indigenous vegetation in urban and rural areas. - Township or structure plans that require the need for tree canopy and understory protection must guide the strategic vision for each activity centre.
19029 Oct 07, 2021, 03:58 PM	1	<p>Key Objective 2) Medium density and mid-rise do not fit Eltham town's landscape with its hillside location and Main Road would be overshadowed by such development. Design needs to work with the landscape and with Eltham's treed neighbourhood character and local expectations.</p>	<p>Major Activity Centres reflect community values, interests and neighbourhood character. Eltham has always been known as "Leafy Eltham" and residents voted "trees" as being the most important aspect of living in Eltham (Wingrove Ward Meeting). Built form in the town centre needs to be offset by indigenous planting and tree shaded gathering areas.</p> <p>Bicycle racks needed near to the shops to reduce reliance on cars and support healthy lifestyles.</p>
19028 Oct 07, 2021, 03:55 PM	1	<p>I feel frustrated that the focus seems to be very much on Eltham activity centres. We are part of Nillumbik and in Yarrambat and don't even have a general store open or a bakery. We have been proposed a township plan and still nothing . We have been locked down with very little within our 5 kms. I have lived here for 17 years and it's not good enough with the high level of rates we pay and the lack of amenities.</p>	<p>As above .. whilst activity centres are great if you live close to them it's not great for those of us that don't and lack facilities.</p>
19017 Oct 06, 2021, 09:52 PM	1		

19005	Oct 06, 2021, 08:01 PM	1		<p>A gap is that indigenous trees and vegetation should be protected throughout Nillumbik, including activity centres; Council should actively pursue the planting of indigenous vegetation in both urban and rural areas, and protect existing indigenous vegetation from being removed. The local biodiversity and ecology of Nillumbik should be fostered. Bike and foot travel should be encouraged via the design process.</p>
			See below	<p>The objectives must be linked to a statement that our activity centres will be reflective of the broader natural beauty of the area. They will reinforce what is distinctive about Nillumbik, i.e. the integration of built form and indigenous vegetation.</p> <p>The activity centres will promote the meeting of social and cultural needs of the community.</p> <p>The activity centres will capitalise on what is unique about them - enhance the indigenous tree canopy and the experience of the natural environment whilst partaking in shopping, accessing services, etc. (in contrast to the Greensborough Plaza and Doncaster Westfield which are indoor centres).</p>
19004	Oct 06, 2021, 07:59 PM	1	<p>I am concerned about the wording in Objective 2 particularly the terms mid-rise commercial and apartments.</p> <p>Only a small area in Eltham's Activity Centre, for example, allows any mid-rise development and only to 4 storeys maximum with this tapering to 3 with possible in-roof in another small area. We don't want to see Eltham any further ruined by hideous apartments that at present don't truly allow for enough green space to plant substantial canopy trees which would be a change for the better.</p>	<p>Allowing for tree canopy planting within the Activity Centre commercial and Apartment development land, to mitigate the heat island effect, to retain some Eltham character and not only rely on the street frontages for tree planting as it simply isn't enough.</p>
18999	Oct 06, 2021, 05:13 PM	1		

		<p>They are all very general; Objective 1 appears to restate the obvious that you will continue doing what you have been doing, with an indication, but no elaboration on how you will support higher levels of business activities and "other" activities. By their exclusion it is very difficult to offer any opinion on this objective. I also note that unquantified generalities make for unmeasurable objectives and would suggest less generalisation and more specifics may help in garnering support.</p> <p>In regard to Objective 2, it would be of concern that council be seeking an "increased role" in the provision of mid-rise and commercial and apartments. Why is it not possible to explain what the expectations of the new role will be. For example will it affect rate payers and residence of the area? will there be planning changes and what are they.</p> <p>In regard to Objective 3, It is good that a "blend" of activities will continue, so status quo.</p>	<p>The claim is made (objective 3), that the existence of public transport which I understand is not provided by council, generally supports higher "than otherwise" levels of business and activities. The objective asserts the existence of the transport will lower car usage. It is far from clear exactly what Council intends to do to meet this objective or how success will be measured.</p>
18998 Oct 06, 2021, 05:08 PM	1		
		<p>Objective 1: Should include :While maintaining and protecting the neighbourhood character of the areas.</p> <p>Objective 2: Concern with undefined Medium rise? How will this be accomodated with existing neighbourhood character of the areas.</p> <p>Objective 3: Must accept that a lot of Nillumbiks residents live away from the centres and rely on vehicles for transport which must be accommodated.</p>	
18981 Oct 06, 2021, 02:00 PM	1		
		<p>These objectives are about urban areas. As a rural lifestyle grazing and hobby farming resident the only things that interest me about these areas is how much of my rates money goes into funding them, and that I have parking there when I go to conduct business. Not an area of interest or one that impacts us aside from this.</p>	<p>Activity Centres have limited relevance to grazing and hobby farming residents.</p> <p>The only consideration for rural residents in the planning scheme for these areas is that there must be sufficient road access and car parking so that rural residents can park to conduct family and property business. If these needs are ignored, we will conduct this business elsewhere. This move would not contribute to the economic sustainability of Nillumbik Activity Centres.</p>
18967 Oct 06, 2021, 08:43 AM	1		
		<p>Doesn't have a walkway and is dangerous for pedestrians to get there from the train. It's not truest accessible to all.</p>	<p>Make the centre accessible and safe by providing a proper walkway from the station</p>
18966 Oct 06, 2021, 07:27 AM	1		
			<p>Shouldn't the eltham community Hospital be based close to one of these activity centres (not squeezed into Apollo Parkways)</p>
18961 Oct 05, 2021, 08:16 PM	1		

18930	Oct 05, 2021, 12:32 PM	1	<p>There needs to be more specific detail given about what constitutes commercial activity. Some things classified as such may not be suitable in our Activity Centres.</p> <p>The lack of definition of medium-density housing, mid-rise commercial development and apartments is concerning. There is also no mention here that Nillumbik is a low growth area. Hence the current medium density and apartment complexes may already be meeting the demand. There needs to be an audit of vacancy rates in the current buildings of this nature.</p>	<p>There is no mention of protection of the current vegetation or of the requirements in any new build to plant canopy trees as well as middle and under storey vegetation, preferably indigenous/native. The topography of Eltham Activity Centre means that the built environment is particularly intrusive. Too much of the canopy is already lost which would have softened. screened and continued what I would hope still is a valued feature of Nillumbik.</p>
18881	Oct 04, 2021, 04:00 PM	1		
18867	Oct 04, 2021, 03:05 PM	1	<p>I am opposed to medium density housing including mid-rise commercial development and apartments).</p>	<p>mid-rise commercial development and apartments should be left to adjoining councils like Mannigham so that Nillumbik can retain its significant point of difference</p>
18856	Oct 02, 2021, 08:06 PM	1		<p>Needs to be an emphasis on pedestrian 'walkability' and cycling in the context of energy efficiency, reducing emissions and reducing vehicle congestion.</p> <p>Importance of indigenous remnant vegetation, particularly local native trees within Activity Centres.</p>
18851	Oct 02, 2021, 02:04 PM	1		<p>This objective must include consideration of walkability and cycle-ability. Systems of community transport that minimise reliance on cars (eg walking school buses, greater connectivity among community, car pooling etc) must be supported. Community transport in out-lying areas to assist residents enable residents to access activity centres.</p>
18845	Oct 02, 2021, 10:04 AM	1		<p>Ensure indigenous tree canopy and understorey are protected throughout Nillumbik, including Activity Centres within the Shire. Council must actively pursues net increase of indigenous vegetation in urban and rural areas.</p> <p>Strengthen protection of trees in all areas especially in areas of development; improve compliance checks on building sites.</p>

18826 Oct 01, 2021, 12:15 PM	1	<p>Define mid-rise commercial development in metres or floors. Mid-rise is too vague.</p> <p>What different types of diverse housing include? Too broad a statement.</p>	
18824 Oct 01, 2021, 11:13 AM	1	<p>Where are the boundaries of the major activity centres and neighbourhood activity centres specifically defined ?</p> <p>Where are the terms "medium density" and "mid-rise" defined?</p> <p>I am concerned that the objectives of increased housing density is being applied without adequate consideration of vegetation, tree canopy and streetscape landscape. While the % of property occupied by the building footprint is 'controlled' and although the balance may be intended to allow scope for vegetation, it is generally hard-paved for vehicle access and parking with minimal/token planting on borders.</p> <p>Adequate increased vehicle parking provisions need to be included to accommodate parking by the increased number of residents.....it is not feasible to rely on kerbside street parking to take-up this increase in residential parking demand. Onsite parking may require a reduction in the number of residences on the site or increased costs due to construction of underground parking.</p> <p>The objectives should include strong reference to the protection/retention/alignment with/ reflection of the cultural, historical and environmental values of the shire or locality. These objectives should be integrated with proposals of development/increased density....not merely a cosmetic afterthought regarding the colour and texture of cladding etc!</p>	<p>While activity centres seek to minimise the need for vehicular travel within the activity centre, the concentration of services in the activity centres attract clients from the surrounding areas and further afield. It cannot be assumed that the majority of people will travel to the activity centre by public transport. Provision for vehicle parking must be made for people coming from 'outside' the activity centre to access services within the activity centre and those accessing public transport services from the major transport node.</p>
18817 Sep 30, 2021, 11:49 PM	1	<p>Objective 2. We don't need any more apartments and mid rise development. Mid-rise development leads to less trees, more traffic, congestion and a lower standard of living. This type of development only really benefits developers. Melbourne has many other areas where higher density development is more appropriate.</p>	<p>Whilst it is important to contain growth within the MAC's it should not be at the cost of retaining local character, tree canopy and high environmental standards.</p> <p>Providing diverse housing opportunities is important for an ageing community.</p> <p>Pedestrian access at Eltham station is very poor.</p> <p>The public transport hub needs to be more accessible for all and especially for people with mobility issues.</p>
18814 Sep 30, 2021, 10:02 PM	1		<p>Eltham is great the way it is. I'd like to see sustainable growth and less growth to keep the area's amenity and landscape kept the way it is. I don't think many people want to see the Doncasterisation of Eltham over the coming years.</p>

18813 Sep 30, 2021, 09:37 PM	1	Key objectives 2, medium density and mid-rise apartments and complex's will destroy the character of the area.	Yes, there is no mention of keeping larger blocks, which in turn protects trees and vegetation and no mention of restrictioning future development.
18812 Sep 30, 2021, 09:27 PM	1	<p>It's unnecessary development- why do either need to be increase? Traffic and big cost infrastructure will not be paid for by Council but rate payers will be negatively impacted; traffic congestion, schools, pools carbon emissions and increase waste which is not being reduced. Both Eltham and Diamond Creek are surrounded by vegetation. Increasing population and commercial activities will reduce vegetation cover. To much pressure on existing ammenities. Council should leave the population as is and operate within current budget; population growth is not the</p> <p>Answer. No more tree removal, no more people, no more waste of rate money on art. No more rate payers, paying for electricity for rate payers. Where are all these people going to live - send them to city where high density is appropriate, Not in the green wedge. Leave the green wedge green. Go ahead and develop Kinalake if you want! Nillumbik is green - keep us green with</p>	<p>The MPS does not reflect what the long standing and current residents want or need for these areas. It is an unsatisfactory document that ignores all values of the green wedge and its protections. It doesn't reflect how residents and the community want to use Diamond Creek or Eltham centres. There is no benefit to the community - increases to the population will have the opposite and very negative effect (traffic, waste, carbon emissions, vegetation impacts, busyness and crowding, less open space and an unhealthy increase in population density). This is not Nillumbik's responsibility- keep the green wedge green, keep our neighbourhood character. Keep the endangered species safe and protected. Where will development stop? Hasn't covid shown us the benefits of low density populations ? Our covid numbers tell story and benefits of current population limits and ammenities in the shire.</p> <p>No population growth cap is identifiable.</p> <p>No minimum block size to reflect current neighbourhood feel such as backyard trees.</p> <p>Reduce council staff and therefore costs</p> <p>Strengthening of green wedge protection is missing.</p> <p>Existing Trees and plants be given a monetary value to support the environment. All high rises to be banned.</p> <p>Landowners to be supported not penalised for owning land and/or farming.</p> <p>All new buildings are required to operate as carbon neutral.</p> <p>Sustainable principles brought to the forefront</p>

and develop Kinglake if you must! Nillumbik is green - keep us green with properties and different to every other suburban Council. Stop forcing land owners to sell, reflective of greedy Council. Save some species for goodness sake.

Diamond creek to get mid rise apartments is the most awful proposal ever.

Mid rise will destroy the character, environmental objectives and contribute to climate change. Keep Diamond Creek high rise free. Keep the green wedge green.

All new developments should have 12 star ratings and internal building temperatures of between 16-24 degrees, all new buildings must be carbon neutral and produce no building waste. All trees be given a monetary value, \$100000 per tree.

Activity centres are not welcomed or required, these services already exist and are not needed.

Sustainable principles brought to the forefront.

Mid-high density and buildings are not environmentally friendly, not sustainable and encourages an increase to population which puts more pressure on current requirements. What's the magic population number - many people live in Nillumbik because of the green wedge, space, small population density, access to natural environment, trees, ability to own land and enjoy farm animals and native animals.

Current reduction in native species over the last 40 years is a clear indicator that increasing population is detrimental to the environment.

Increase in population will increase energy demands and therefore carbon emissions which is a negative outcome.

Increase in population will put pressure on future resources; more schools, cemeteries, parks, landfill, recycling centres, roads, hospitals, doctors where will they fit if we sell everything now? Letting consumerism plan our future rather than planning for a healthy and environmentally friendly future.

Apartments are not required in Nillumbik, they can stay in Doncaster.

I do not want the activity centres- who is next poor old Hurstbridge and Wattle glen. Plenty of empty offices, shops and homes that are wastfully sitting empty therefore it is unsustainable to build more.

Parking is already a nightmare and increasing population will make this worse - I'm not walking shopping home or riding my bike to the doctor (how many Council workers do? Send your maintenance crew out on public transport!).

Increase minimum block size,
You guys spent 20million to turn a pool in Eltham -disgraceful,
how can you plan and keep the area the way we like it?
Here's an idea, schools all reduce their land and make some social
housing on site.
Stop letting developers make money and take it out of the shire.
It's a terrible plan, no value for our children and the environment.
Unacceptable and disappointing. No measures of environmental
impacts and future are outlined to a satisfactory standard, just
reflects greed and money.
Why not fill in Kanagroo Ground, Warrandyte or Allendale Rd?
Build an apartment block above the Council offices - no, I guess
you don't want it in your backyard either. Don't do it to use and
waste our future environment, once it's gone it's gone and you
can't get it back.
Give the roads back to VicRoads to nagar and pay for (great
savings),
Increase and add more open spaces, car parks, increase traffic
lanes and more traffic signals, make more bike paths and wider.
More people more costs - do the accounts, more people does not
reduce your council
costs. Tell the state government to develop regional areas not our
beautiful green wedge. Come on Nillumbik fight to protect our
shire, keep it green.
I guess a 3 storey housing apartment on the football ovals might
work? Parking already exists, there are heaps, overwhelming used
by only men in the shire...

Please protect the green wedge for future generations, save the mid/high rises for the city and other councils in Melbourne.
Collect money from closed religious groups in shire not those that welcome all and provide charity work.
What is the carrying capacity of Nillumbiks native species and human populations - it's not mentioned?

All

New buildings to be solar powered. Ban 4WDs in planned activity centres as they are unnecessary.

Ban single use plastic at all shops like Coles and woolies.

Eltham and Diamond Creek are already developed to capacity, why not focus on developing and expanding populations in St Andrews, Kanagroo Ground, Research, Cottlesbridge, Kinglake, strawthewn - these areas could all become activity centres, and have plenty of room for high rises (no more out of character than mucking around with Diamond Creek or Eltham). These areas are more central to the shire and are currently lacking in amenities and commercial developments, easy to add bus routes and roads currently under traffic volume and capacity - plan doesn't explore these options.

Socio economic plan is currently unsatisfactory. Economic plan is inaccurate (cost/ benefits is unsatisfactory) and environmental plan needs to be independently conducted.

Population increase will just put more pressure on existing infrastructure, existing environment which has not been accounted for to a high enough degree.

We can't all afford Tesla's.

Let objective 2:

Medium rise commercial and residential is not the way the Nillumbik shire should continue to develop.

Eltham in particular is becoming unrecognisable due to mid rise apartment complexes.

18781 Sep 29, 2021, 09:55 PM

1

Objective 2: Activity centres will simply expand join up and encroach into local semi rural areas.

Need to cap the activity centres.

18707 Sep 27, 2021, 10:55 AM

1

18626 Sep 26, 2021, 04:46 PM	1	<p>Additional comments to</p> <p>Objective 1</p> <p>Active transport needs to be a priority to encourage increased walking and cycling access to both major activity centres, including effective accessible and signed links from trails and public transport. Effective, accessible and well located bicycle storage options are required in all activity centres. Tree canopies and understory planting needs to be protected with locally indigenous planting requirements strongly promoted and enforced.</p> <p>Objective 2</p> <p>Housing activities including diversity of housing and in particular, medium density housing, commercial and apartments requires more specific definitions to protect against overdevelopment and loss of neighbourhood character. Tree canopies and understory planting needs to be protected with locally indigenous planting requirements strongly promoted and enforced.</p> <p>Objective 3</p> <p>Active transport needs to be a priority to encourage increased walking and cycling access to both the Hurstbridge and Research Neighbourhood Activity Centres, including effective accessible and signed links from trails and public transport. Accessible off road links for pedestrians and cyclists need to be safe and clearly defined from the Diamond Creek Trail at Hurstbridge. Effective, accessible and well located bicycle storage options are required in all activity centres.</p>	<p>Green Character in the activity centre.</p> <p>How, as the Activity centres becomes more developed can the 'green' character of the township remain especially on the east side of Main road ?</p> <p>Access in and around the activity centres. It is no good developing these areas and increasing the density without appropriate parking and convenient access.</p> <p>Having additional walkabilty for shoppers and residents to encourage walking, bike storage for riders near shops ?</p> <p>Parking in and around Coles and Woolworths at peak times is a nightmare, is additional parking being considered for local staff.</p>
18442 Sep 22, 2021, 12:41 PM	1	<p>The definition of medium density housing and where the mid rise commercial developments and apartments are located within the activity centre is of some concern.</p> <p>A neighborhood street that has single story dwellings and 3 x 2 story townhouse developments such as Cecil street, Eltham should not be allowed to have 6 x 3 story solid built form apartments as proposed recently (but knocked back by VCAT). Allowing planting for canopy trees and native vegetation should be made a priority so as not to lose the character of the town.</p>	

			Yarrambat?? We dont even have a made footpath in the main street or to any of the connecting bus stops.
18431 Sep 21, 2021, 08:41 PM	1		
		Objective 3 is not an objective it is a statement. - unless the objective is to preserve the status quo. This would indicate no investment in areas outside of Eltham and Diamond Creek.	
18365 Sep 19, 2021, 05:12 PM	1		
		In general I do agree however I think objective 2 is confusing when talking about growth. There is green field development happening in Diamond Creek and there is a substantial amount of infill occurring in residential areas. I think this objective should explicitly say that these areas will 'continue to accommodate most of the shire's commercial and medium density housing.	I also think that the role of indigenous vegetation in the activity centres should be acknowledged and that any existing mature indigenous trees should be retained, planting opportunities (especially for canopy trees) will be maximised and indigenous vegetation favoured for new plantings.
18342 Sep 18, 2021, 10:08 PM	1		
18291 Sep 17, 2021, 12:57 PM	1		
		Key Objective 2 - Nillumbik has an aging population but it is also decreasing as young people move away. Any medium density housing should be limited in size so as not to remove the country feel of the towns.	
		Key Objective 3 is unrealistic. Nillumbik Council has little control over public transport and Hurstbridge and Research have very little public transport.. Both towns can continue with a blend of uses but they are too small and rural for there to be sufficient public transport to result in fewer cars.	
18285 Sep 17, 2021, 10:37 AM	1		

		<p>the appeal of the Major Activity Centres is their leafiness and village feel associated w the built form response and scale of development. Great care should be taken to ensure that new development does not impact on these places in a negative way.</p> <p>the Planning scheme should require very high design standards from new development in the activity centres to ensure that building heights, visual bulk and scale do not detract from the appeal of Eltham and Diamond Creek.</p> <p>Hurstbridge needs a more attention on reducing vehicle speeds through the main street. this will improve pedestrian safety and encourage better trading conditions</p>	<p>The strategy should look at how it can better support small villages of Kangaroo Ground, Panton Hill Christmas Hill and St Andrews.</p>
18278 Sep 17, 2021, 07:13 AM	1		
		<p>Key objective 2. I don't agree with medium density buildings in our area. It cuts down our green space which is why people bought into the area. It generates higher density of people, more traffic congestion and there's not enough infrastructure put in place to support this.</p> <p>I don't agree with the housing opportunities in objective one for the same reason. It's disappointing that council allows land to be subdivided, making our area higher density.</p>	
18267 Sep 16, 2021, 08:20 PM	1		
		<p>Need more housing for older single women living in poverty</p> <p>We as a community should explore all of the opportunities to provide social and community housing for our vulnerable community members</p>	
18254 Sep 16, 2021, 06:26 PM	1		
18230 Sep 16, 2021, 03:54 PM	1		No
		What about Yarrambat?	
18217 Sep 16, 2021, 10:55 AM	1		

		<p>I don't want to see medium density housing with terribly skinny roads that are really designed for single use ie driving or parking not both! I'm horrified for fire truck drivers in an emergency with narrow roads, cars parked on the road and there's barely enough room for a car let alone a fire truck or an ambulance! I don't want a mini Fitzroy with multiple high rises in the area either. I really think access for through traffic in eltham and diamond creek is getting to the point of severe congestion! One train in DC and the traffic is backed up to the secondary college. More people are living further out and no one has thought about the roads! The Fitzsimmons Rd new development won't fix the single lane into and leaving Eltham! There will still be a traffic jam! The single lane needs to be widened!</p>	As above
18144 Sep 12, 2021, 05:20 AM	1		
		<p>I agree with one and three, but not with the plan for mid-rise commercial development and apartments. I would want to see more details on this before agreeing.</p>	Providing more detail for each objective.
18124 Sep 11, 2021, 12:55 PM	1		
		<p>Partially agree, though should include all areas along the existing rail corridor otherwise would be a waste of infrastructure.</p>	
18083 Sep 10, 2021, 08:38 AM	1		

Built Environment

Title/Question: Built Environment
Tool Type: Form
Activity ID: 308
Report Date Range: 9 Sep 2021 - 21 Oct 2021
Date Exported: 26 Oct 2021 09:56 am

Contribution ID	Date Submitted	Do you agree with the identified key			If not, which objective(s) and why?	With consideration of objectives in the other themes, can you identify any gaps in this theme that the MPS should consider?
		Yes	No	Unsure		
	19307 Oct 21, 2021, 10:23 PM		1		Our concern here is general rather than specific in recognition of the design principles within the current planning scheme. However, it is important that anything new and innovative/'different', whether urban or rural, is not automatically excluded due to subjective interpretation by inexperienced or biased minorities. Key objectives 1-3 Please refer to my my comments under planning relating to major activity centres and more specifically relating to Diamond Creek. Council need to develop a Landscape plan for both sides of the main Diamond Creek shopping centre and a staged plan to implement.	
	19289 Oct 21, 2021, 04:10 PM		1		Ratepayers need action not just virtue signally words from consultants..	Urban design outcomes really need to recognise the importance of accessible townships (bikes, mobility aids, etc). They should not be seen as an addition or afterthought to car centric urban planning. One example is having designs that reflect the difference between a street and a road and designing around that (e.g., streets prioritise people, roads prioritise cars).
						It is vitally important that alternative forms of transport and accessibility are understood, with outcomes improved to include them.
						We also need themes to reflect the need for higher/diverse density around town centers (which isn't an excuse for cheaply made, poorly designed apartments). More people should be living around towns, less should be living far away.
	19282 Oct 21, 2021, 01:53 PM		1			
	19198 Oct 19, 2021, 08:26 AM				i support the PALS submission and recommendation	
					Yes, my strategy is to develop wattle glen and especially Wilson road huge lands need to be subdivided in to smaller lots, streets to narrow, path ways needed, lights need to be put on roads, some of the green wedge areas need to be developed to prevent a bush fire risk also improving every facility in the area will benefit the community.	Wattle glen Wilson road contains different multiple land sizes there's an acre land and a 20 acre land both zoned as a green wedge, we need to build up this area and subdivide the huge lands in to to a smaller lots if we want to keep it as a green wedge we still able to make it a low density zone this will make our community grow. Thank you
	19189 Oct 18, 2021, 09:42 AM		1			

			<p>2. Note that enhancement and attractiveness need to be consistent with the values of greatest priority as expressed by the community in Our People, Our Place, Our Future ie preservation of the green wedge, protection of biodiversity and action on climate change.</p>	<p>Indigenous tree canopy and understorey are protected throughout Nillumbik, including the built environment and all new developments within the Shire. Council actively pursues net increase of indigenous vegetation in both urban and rural areas.</p> <p>In urban areas, introduce 'Biodiversity Sensitive Urban Design. In rural areas, the need to recognise that the built environment and associated infrastructure (e.g. access roads, car parking etc) is a secondary use and must be sub-ordinate to primary rural land uses/conservation</p>
19164	Oct 14, 2021, 09:34 PM	1		
			<p>Recognise the full extent of the environmental impact when reviewing building permits i.e. if vegetation must be cleared in order to provide a 'safe' site in bushfire/flood events</p>	<p>Indigenous tree canopy and understorey are protected throughout Nillumbik, including the built environment and all new developments within the Shire. Council actively pursues net increase of indigenous vegetation in both urban and rural areas.</p> <p>In urban areas, introduce 'Biodiversity Sensitive Urban Design. In rural areas, the need to recognise that the built environment and associated infrastructure (e.g. access roads, car parking etc) is a secondary use and must be sub-ordinate to primary rural land uses/conservation.</p>
19125	Oct 11, 2021, 11:41 AM	1		
			<p>The objectives are silent with regard to the form, scale and appearance of building design on residential properties. An objective should be included that ensures development is designed to protect and enhance the valued landmarks, views and vistas of the unique landscape of the Municipality.</p> <p>It is noticeable over recent times large poorly designed double storey dwellings are being approved by Council on large residential allotments rather than being designed to sit within the landscape. The dwellings are poorly articulated, do not step down in the landscape and generally constructed of one material.</p> <p>The built form screams look at me, look at me.</p> <p>There is an example of a large storage shed recently built on an isolated ridgeline removed from a property domestic zone. It disrupts the wonderful viewline across valleys to the Dandenong Ranges.</p> <p>Another example is the construction of an outbuilding the size of a large dwelling which appears clearly to have been established to be used for a commercial enterprise on a residential lot.</p> <p>Within the Municipality landscaping to minimise the impact of these buildings is near impossible due to the BMO provisions. Hence the Mc Mansions that are now being built are diminishing the attractiveness of the Municipality unique landscape.</p>	
19121	Oct 11, 2021, 10:24 AM	1		
19063	Oct 07, 2021, 09:54 PM	1		

Key Objective 1

Apply design principles which will create a built environment that strengthens the inclusiveness and accessibility of our neighbourhoods, activity centres, facilities and services, while respecting our natural environment. Agree that township character needs to be maintained, but not sure how this works with current State Planning policy.

Key Objective 2

Promote urban design outcomes in activity centres and townships that retain the historical and individual characteristics of each area while enhancing its attractiveness, distinctiveness, safety and accessibility. Due to poor planning in the past, it is hard to regulate for the historical and individual characteristics of Eltham and Diamond Creek, when they are both such a mish mash of previous design styles. Drawing a line in the sand now may help, but also deter developers from coming to Nillumbik.

Key Objective 3

Design places and development to maximise access for all users, including pedestrians and cyclists, and cater for the mobility needs of people of all abilities. Agree. However, topography of Nillumbik and lack of public transport will make this difficult outside of major activity centres.

Key Objective 4

Protecting habitat links and minimising fire and flood risk and erosion are important considerations in siting buildings and works, particularly in rural areas. This is important in all areas, why would rural areas be singled out here. Is this an opportunity for another overlay for the rural areas? Habitat links can also be fire wicks so a bit tricky. Overlays already exist for areas at risk of inundation.

Key Objective 1) Should include words in capitals:
"Apply design principles which will create a built environment" THAT IS ENHANCED BY INDIGENOUS PLANTS AND TREES "and that strengthens etc .."

Key Objective 2) Should include words in capitals: "Promote urban design outcomes in activity centres and townships that retain the historical and individual characteristics of each area" ENHANCING INCLUSIVENESS BY PROVIDING TREE SHADED GATHERING SPACES " and enhancing its attractiveness, distinctiveness, safety and accesssibility."

19059 Oct 07, 2021, 09:03 PM 1

This is not completely a question of yes or no, nor am I unsure, but as there are suggestions for many of them I have selected no.

Obj 2
Note, as I suggested in relation to the Activity Centre Theme enhancement and attractiveness need to be consistent with the values of greatest priority as expressed by the community in Our People, Our Place, Our Future ie preservation of the green wedge, protection of biodiversity and action on climate change.

Obj 4
Additional suggestion for this objective:
Restrict the granting of building permits if vegetation must be cleared in order to provide a ‘safe’ site in bushfire/flood events

19054 Oct 07, 2021, 07:02 PM 1

Suggested overarching objective for this Theme, as also suggested for Activity Centres Theme
Indigenous tree canopy and understorey are protected throughout Nillumbik, including areas of built environment and all new developments within the Shire. Council actively pursues net increase of indigenous vegetation in both urban and rural areas.

In urban areas, Biodiversity Sensitive Urban Design is required.

In rural areas, planning requirements need to ensure that the built environment and associated infrastructure (e.g. access roads, car parking etc) is a secondary use and must be subordinate to primary rural land uses/conservation.

			I don't agree with the notion of keeping everything within the strait jacket of what is now considered appropriate materialituy in Nillumbik. I'm not suggestin revolution but some evolution.		I would like to see more emphasis on apartment building extending outside the current areas. Combined with enforced tree canopies think apartments would enhance the streetscape compare with the never ending completely boring set up where three houses are plonked on what was a single lot. Council should take a MUCH more active role in encouraging developers amalgamate sites to allow for more innovative provision of housing. Council also need to provide a framework that -- regardless of what the State Government might require -- protects consumers from shoddy builders.
19043	Oct 07, 2021, 06:28 PM	1	Objective 4. -Habitat links are also important in the urban parts of our Shire! (inside the UGB) (as are the other things listed). -The words" important considerations" are lily livered weasel words that are designed to allow development regardless as long as the development promises to plant a few tube stock in some far away piece of land in the Shire. The words important consideration ought to be changed to say critical consideration, or crucial, but not "important." - Planting offsets ought not be permitted. O.1. Ditto, mere respect for our natural environment is not strong enough wording and is tacked onto the end of the Objective as an afterthought and as mentioned in the Climate Change section, Climate change considerations need to be included in all Objectives.		See above re Climate Change. -Mudbrick building tradition and the notion of limiting embedded energy in built form in addition to other measures to lessen a buildings carbon footprint such as size (building envelopes) siting for passive solar (and solar), room for a clothes line! -Room in all areas, including Activity Centre developments, for canopy trees to reduce heat islands and enhance wellbeing.
19032	Oct 07, 2021, 04:34 PM	1			subdivision to huge blocks in wattle glen should be considered especially the blocks on the edge of the green wedge. Streets need to be full developed let’s compare wattle glen to sunbury or mickelham the development there is growing so fast we must develop wattle glen it’s only 25km away from cbd.
19023	Oct 07, 2021, 02:56 AM	1			A key objective expressly requiring the creation, retention and/or enhancement of indigenous tree canopy, within our built environment, is required.
			See below.		From an urban design perspective, built form is to be integrated into indigenous vegetation.
19007	Oct 06, 2021, 08:20 PM	1			ESD principles need to be incorporated into buildings, recognising that the Shire was at the forefront of sustainable building since the latter part of the last century.
					Design principles should include the protection and proliferation of indigenous tree canopies and flora; Council should actively pursue the net increase of such planting. Ecologically Sustainability Development (ESD) consultants/principles should be applied to all developments - renewable energy should always considered as a feasible source of power, along with low embodied-energy materials and passive design principles. Parking should be limited and minimal, to encourage active and/or public transport.
19006	Oct 06, 2021, 08:19 PM	1			Council actively pursues net increase of indigenous vegetation in both urban and rural areas. Live Local Plant Local!
18993	Oct 06, 2021, 04:05 PM		Objective 2: Also respects and reflect Local character. Objective 4: Also Without incurring loss of environmental values		

18989	Oct 06, 2021, 03:47 PM	1	<p>Objectives</p> <p>Needs to be a fifth objective to protect the indigenous tree canopy and understory in urban areas. In this respect consider the introduction of 'Biodiversity Sensitive Urban Design' as a planning tool to achieve this outcome.(as is already done with Water Sensitive Urban Design).</p>	<p>In rural areas, the need to recognise that that the built environment and associated infrastructure (e.g. access roads, car parking etc) is a secondary use and must be sub-ordinate to a primary rural land uses of the natural environment and/or agriculture on existing cleared land.</p>
18970	Oct 06, 2021, 08:51 AM	1	<p>Key objectives 1 – 3 are irrelevant to rural grazing and hobby farming residents as they deal exclusively with urban built development. If car parking for rural residents coming into these areas could be specifically mentioned this would be useful. Rewrite Key Objective 4 is already covered – needs to be rewritten to read – providing for the safety and amenity of rural residents and their properties, minimising fire risk, minimising flood and erosion and protecting habitat links are important considerations in siting buildings and works in rural areas.</p> <p>If the same is required in urban areas it is suggested this is already protected in waterways planning, and public land planning.</p>	<p>safety, amenity and service of rural grazing and hobby farming residents is a gap noticeably absent from this narrative</p>
18943	Oct 05, 2021, 02:46 PM	1	<p>Whilst it is stated to respect the natural environment , this is not strong enough wording. This does not necessarily allow for the biodiversity to flourish .The natural environment should determine the design principles.</p> <p>If bushfire and floods and erosion are risks then that site should be declared unsuitable to build on.Vegetation should not be cleared to mitigate bushfire risk.</p> <p>..There needs to be more emphasis on preserving the individual characteristics of the areas, with particular regard to the style of building. Particular streets have concentrations of architecture from a certain period and this should be maintained. Nillumbik has strong artistic, architectural and landscaping history. These features need to be lauded and preserved.</p>	<p>The built environment is to fit into the natural environment so that it is not the feature.The housing should nestle into the hills and landscape including vegetation.</p> <p>Historic, artistic ,architectural and landscaping heritage must take precedence in the consideration of the built design principle of Nillumbik.</p>
18922	Oct 05, 2021, 11:44 AM	1	<p>Key Objective 1</p> <p>Suggest add phrase re streetscapes such as::</p>	
18892	Oct 04, 2021, 05:13 PM	1	<p>Apply design principlesetc...etc.....while respecting our natural environment and protecting or enhancing current streetscapes.</p>	
18887	Oct 04, 2021, 04:41 PM	1	<p>Objective 2 and 4 (see below for amendments)</p>	<p>Objective 2 (above): Urban design outcomes must also be consistent with the high priority community values expressed in the 'Our People..etc' survey, i.e. preservation of the Green Wedge; protection of biodiversity and action on climate change.</p> <p>Objective 4 (above): Building permits need to be restricted if vegetation must be cleared in order to provide a 'safe' site in bushfire/flood events.</p>
18882	Oct 04, 2021, 04:01 PM	1	<p>Needs to be a fifth objective to protect the indigenous tree canopy and understory in urban areas. In this respect consider the introduction of 'Biodiversity Sensitive Urban Design' as a planning tool to achieve this outcome.(as is already done with Water Sensitive Urban Design).</p>	<p>In rural areas, the need to recognise that that the built environment and associated infrastructure (e.g. access roads, car parking etc) is a secondary use and must be sub-ordinate to a primary rural land uses of the natural environment and/or agriculture on existing cleared land.</p>
18870	Oct 04, 2021, 03:09 PM	1		<p>I think that improvements to existing built environments is required I do not support creating new built environments</p>

Objectives 1 - 4. They are mostly dull objectives, as are the objectives, under Infrastructure.

They suit engineers.

Nillumbik should be positive and set splendid Architectural objectives and measures to enhance the special character of the municipality's heritage, character, arts, lifestyle, culture, Mud brick buildings, Green Wedge, bushland, hills, villages, etc.,

Nillumbik should publish a Style Guide for buildings, especially, apartments and villa units, requiring that they enhance, rather than detract from the above.

This style guide should be complemented by a Streetscape Style Guide of Nillumbik's essential character as noted above.

Nillumbik should engage Architects and not Engineers, to develop these guides and specific to towns and villages within the municipality as well as of general application across the municipality.

The Local Character and Place Guidelines 2019 of the NSW Government offer and insight how this might be done in Nillumbik. See at <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/-/media/Files/DPE/Guidelines/Local-character-and-place-guideline-2019-05-21.pdf> It says - "The Guideline has been drafted in collaboration with Government Architect NSW, who recognises the importance of local character in planning for future growth of great places. The Guideline has been developed to align with Government Architect NSW policies including Better Placed"

Compare this to Victoria's poorer offering - Understanding Neighbourhood Character Practice Note 43 Of 2018. See at https://www.planning.vic.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0029/97184/PPN43-Understanding-Neighbourhood-Character.pdf

18833 Oct 01, 2021, 02:29 PM

1

Additional Comments to

Key Objective 2

An effective, strong and responsive Neighbourhood Character Policy is required to control urban design outcomes in activity centres, residential areas and townships. This policy should not support the type of non Nillumbik styles of recent developments that do not comply with earlier neighbourhood character controls. Retention of historical characteristics of all areas, including residential, should be considered a priority.

Key Objective 4

18832 Oct 01, 2021, 02:28 PM

1

Any potential planning permits should be restricted if significant vegetation clearance is required

Create more single level 2-3 bedroom houses for older residents to downsize into.

Many of us can't afford to move into the 1.3 million+, double story townhouses that are being built. I get that developers think you can live in the bottom and have the upstairs for visitors but why pay for an area of a house that will probably have limited usage and you can't get up the stairs yourself to enjoy?

18829 Oct 01, 2021, 12:28 PM

1

And having a small garden area around these new dwellings would be ideal to grow a few annuals, veggies or herbs. After all, many of us have done this for 30+ years so why would we want to stop entirely.

Over development in the Eltham area is changing the view of the area. Need to protect the current Eltham area and stop the over development of allowing multiple housing and high rise residences.

18754 Sep 29, 2021, 06:58 PM

18706 Sep 27, 2021, 10:52 AM

1

No. 4

You already have all rural areas zoned fire, and flood risk as well as termite.

This is already covered, what are u really trying to achieve?

18357 Sep 19, 2021, 04:08 PM

1

Access for pedestrians is needed, not for cyclist, u just spent billions on them

				<p>I like objective 1 but I think it will function as lip-service in practice since without a more specific aims for social or affordable housing the objective will not be measurable. Consideration should be given to alter this objective to make it more achievable.</p> <p>I would like to see an objective about increasing sustainable design in the shire - for example having an objective regarding a minimum star rating or passive haus certification for new structures. Reduction of energy use per occupant and disincentives for oversized dwellings could be considered. Reuse/reclamation of materials in new developments could be included as well as incentivising local/Australian made materials.</p> <p>I think it is important that the built environment is oriented well for solar access for both the new development and impacts to surrounding developments.</p> <p>A built environment to soft landscaping ratio could be considered as an objective in different zones to enable adequate space for the establishment of canopy trees.</p>
18344	Sep 18, 2021, 10:32 PM	1	<p>Key Objective 3</p> <p>Cyclists should be constrained to areas of low risk eg. they should not be allowed on narrow, winding roads that impede normal traffic flow. This is a risk to motorists and cyclists.</p> <p>Cyclist lanes should be developed where practicable, without impacting high use parking areas, and cyclists should be constrained to these roads.</p>	
18295	Sep 17, 2021, 01:50 PM	1		
18233	Sep 16, 2021, 04:05 PM	1		<p>Very well constructed plan</p>
18127	Sep 11, 2021, 01:01 PM	1	<p>Key Objective 4</p> <p>Protecting habitat links and minimising fire and flood risk and erosion are important considerations in siting buildings and works, particularly in rural areas.</p> <p>The inclusion, in particular, of rural areas is strongly suggestive of a bias already in the objectives of this report. All other objectives are easily related to the urban areas - this one is much broader</p>	<p>#1. what does "inclusiveness and accessibility" actually mean?</p>
18104	Sep 10, 2021, 02:43 PM	1		

Climate Change

Title/Question: Climate Change
Tool Type: Form
Activity ID: 314
Report Date Range: 9 Sep 2021 - 21 Oct 2021
Date Exported: 26 Oct 2021 09:57 am

Contribution ID	Date Submitted	u agree with the identified key objecIf not, which objective(s) and why?			With consideration of objectives in the other themes, can you identify any gaps in this theme that the MPS should consider?
		Yes	No	Unsure	
19309	Oct 21, 2021, 11:12 PM			1	<p>While several Key Objectives in this Theme are of very real concern, it is appropriate that the subject of bushfire preparedness should be referenced in Theme 10. However, this subject should have also appeared in context in every Theme, and particularly 2 and 3. Why was this not the case?</p> <p>It is essential that Council recognise and support the contribution made by rural land owners to mitigate bushfire risk through sound property management; subjective terminology such as 'poorly located, designed or managed use or development' must only be considered in context with agreed definitions that are not subject to interpretation by inexpert or biased minorities. Council is only one voice in the process of determining how land should be used and managed in bushfire prone areas, with appropriate consideration given to landowners who provide essential maintenance of their properties, along with independent experts across a variety of fields.</p> <p>I fully support the PALS submission</p> <p>1-4. This objective relates to bushfire management, the risk of which increases with climate change, but it is not an objective about climate change per se</p> <p>NOTE: These objectives have a disproportionate emphasis on bushfire.</p> <p>Suggestions for strengthening the objectives in order to address the Climate Change Theme and achieve climate change mitigation, are listed below.</p> <p>Suggestions for objectives for consideration:</p> <p>Promote Environmentally Sustainable Design (ESD) throughout planning policies</p> <p>Tree canopy, understory and small herbaceous plant cover are protected and increased in the urban areas</p> <p>Planning policies should facilitate and enable renewable energy developments without compromising biodiversity and conservation values.</p> <p>Suggestions for alternate objectives from Plan Melbourne</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Improve energy, water and waste performance of buildings through environmentally sustainable development and energy efficiency upgrades.Facilitate the uptake of renewable energy technologiesMitigate exposures to natural hazards and adapt to the impacts of climate changeRequire climate change risks to be considered in infrastructure planningReduce pressure on water supplies by making best use of water resources. This describes how issues such as climate change impact on water security through reduced rainfall, increased evaporation, increased flood risk.Protect and enhance the health of urban waterways. This recognises that the impacts of climate change combined with urban development from Melbourne’s growing population influence the quality and quantity of urban stormwater run-off and pose a number of challenges for the health of Melbourne’s waterways. <p>From Victoria’s Climate Change Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Ensure new residential development is well-designed, durable, resilient to climate change and built to a high-quality standard.
19204	Oct 19, 2021, 08:36 AM				
19171	Oct 14, 2021, 10:00 PM			1	
19131	Oct 11, 2021, 12:08 PM		1		<p>Protect and increase tree canopy in urban areas to mitigate the impact of increasing temperature with global warming, and ongoing loss to date. There needs to be an urgent focus on residential areas where consolidation and subdivision of large lots and increasing density of dwellings is taking place and tree canopy in ESD consultant should be part of the design team for new Council-owned developments (new buildings and major refurbishments) to set the highest possible environmental/energy standard for the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Support energy efficient building design and use of renewable energy systems in residences and commercial buildings, including a prohibition on the approval of building permits that rely on gas for hot water or heating. <p>Suggestions for objectives for consideration:</p> <p>Promote Environmentally Sustainable Design (ESD) throughout planning policies</p> <p>Tree canopy, understory and small herbaceous plant cover are protected and increased in the urban areas</p> <p>Planning policies should facilitate and enable renewable energy developments without compromising biodiversity and conservation values.</p> <p>Suggestions for alternate objectives from Plan Melbourne</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Improve energy, water and waste performance of buildings through environmentally sustainable development and energy efficiency upgrades.Facilitate the uptake of renewable energy technologiesMitigate exposures to natural hazards and adapt to the impacts of climate changeRequire climate change risks to be considered in infrastructure planningReduce pressure on water supplies by making best use of water resources. This describes how issues such as climate change impact on water security through reduced rainfall, increased evaporation, increased flood risk.Protect and enhance the health of urban waterways. This recognises that the impacts of climate change combined with urban development from Melbourne’s growing population influence the quality and quantity of urban stormwater run-off and pose a number of challenges for the health of Melbourne’s waterways. <p>From Victoria’s Climate Change Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Ensure new residential development is well-designed, durable, resilient to climate change and built to a high-quality standard.
19116	Oct 10, 2021, 08:48 PM				
19067	Oct 07, 2021, 10:02 PM			1	
19064	Oct 07, 2021, 09:55 PM			1	<p>These objectives place far to much emphasis on bushfire management, which is a symptom of climate change. I think the emphasis in this theme should be around climate change mitigation. Objectives 1,2,3, & 4 are all about bushfire management not climate change per se. Noting that bushfires are worsened with climate change but were occurring before climate change.</p> <p>Suggested alternatives which should place an emphasis on Council's role in climate change mitigation are presented below.</p> <p>1 Ignores explicit mention of flooding</p> <p>The first four objectives relate to bushfire management and not specifically to the theme of Climate Change. This appears to be a disproportionate focus on bushfire. The next three objectives very broadly relate to climate change, but do not address planning initiatives that could lead to climate mitigation measures.</p> <p>Protect and increase tree canopy in urban areas to mitigate the impact of increasing temperature with global warming, and ongoing loss to date. There needs to be an urgent focus on residential areas where consolidation and subdivision of large lots and increasing density of dwellings is taking place and tree add flooding . Remember when all the walkways across Diamond Creek were washed away?</p> <p>Suggestions for strengthening the objectives in order to address the Climate Change Theme and achieve climate change mitigation, are listed below.</p> <p>1. Promote Environmentally Sustainable Design principles (ESD) throughout all planning policies including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">engage an ESD consultant as part of design team for new Council-owned developments (new buildings and major refurbishments) to set the highest
19052	Oct 07, 2021, 06:53 PM				
19035	Oct 07, 2021, 05:29 PM			1	

			<p>The first 4 Objectives could all be put into one Objective about managing bushfire risk, a risk that has always been with us but that is worsening due to climate change.</p> <p>I am concerned that the built form could lead to more habitat loss with this wording and as I have commented earlier, perhaps it is time to say no more development if the risk of further degradation of the land/waterways will occur if it is the only way to make the building safe. Arguably there is no safe place in our Shire but there are certainly places that are far less safe than others. Any MPS ought not be planning subdivisions in "bushfire prone areas." (O.4) The only way to make it safe would be to knock out all vegetation and concrete everything!</p> <p>Objectives 5-7 ought to be put first.</p> <p>O.5. I would like to see the word 'direct' be deleted from the sentence so as to include both direct and indirect contributions by Council to global warming being reduced.</p> <p>O.6. I would like the use of the word "mitigation" rather than just responding, adaptation and preparation, which makes it seem as though we are all just passive players who have no ability to proactively set out to reduce our own footprint. Mitigation measures need to be embedded at the beginning of any planning application, and be integral to it, not tacked onto an application in the aftermath as a token gesture that signifies nothing.</p> <p>3 and 4. Just makes it sound as though it will be impossible for anyone to build in the green areas of the shire without going broke applying for endless permit after permit.</p>		<p>See above and:-</p> <p>** Every Objective must include and have embedded in it, Climate Change impacts, whether negative or not, and if negative an impact, whether measures that will not further destroy habitat/waterways but will reduce the carbon footprint of the development are possible, and if possible, are enforceable as part of any permit.</p> <p>** Other Government Bodies, such as Major Roads Projects Victoria (think of the destruction of Eltham's Gateway with the 10 lane highway we didn't want) , or Yarra Valley Water (think Christmas Hills Land), must also comply with any MPS Objectives and the rules that will govern all of us.</p> <p>**The MPS must reflect the fact that it is meant to be protecting and enhancing the habitat values of Melbourne's last intact Green Wedge. It must not lose sight of this fundamental objective.</p>
19030	Oct 07, 2021, 04:12 PM	1			
19016	Oct 06, 2021, 09:40 PM	1			
18995	Oct 06, 2021, 04:37 PM				
18992	Oct 06, 2021, 04:04 PM	1	<p>Fire is only one probable impact from climate change. Change in weather patterns and increase temperature also require appropriate responses.</p> <p>Planning policies should encourage renewable energy developments without compromising environmental values.</p> <p>Facilitate the uptake of renewable energy technologies.</p> <p>Protect and increase tree canopy in urban areas to mitigate the impact of increasing temperatures.</p> <p>Almost every one of these objectives focuses on preparation for and adaptation to climate change, rather than actually addressing or preventing it. These objectives appear to imply that humans are helpless in the face of climate change and have no option but to accept and adapt to it. Instead, Nillumbik should</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Recognising the role that protecting and increasing of our rural indigenous vegetation and wildlife corridors takes in reducing emissions and helping to mitigate the impact of climate change on our native fauna.•For agricultural land use help to encourage new technologies and practices that help reduce emissions.•Promoting Environmentally Sustainable Design throughout planning policy.•Facilitating the uptake of renewable energy technologies without compromising biodiversity and conservation values (e.g. solar farms in already cleared areas)•Planning for passive ‘energy reduction’ design (such as the use of treecover to shade buildings that reduces energy consumption for cooling during summer).•Ensuring new residential development is well-designed, durable and resilient to climate change and built to a high quality standard.•Protecting and increasing tree canopy from ongoing loss in urban areas to date to mitigate the impact of increasing temperatures with global warming. <p>There needs to be an urgent focus on residential areas where consolidation and subdivision of large lots and increasing density of dwellings is taking place and tree canopy being lost.</p>	
18985	Oct 06, 2021, 03:10 PM	1	<p>The objectives seem to deal mainly with bushfire and while that is important there are many other issues to consider and these are detailed in the gaps text box.</p> <p>Do not support the insertion of these key objectives into the planning scheme.</p> <p>Delete Key Objectives 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7 – these are irrelevant for planning purposes and the planning scheme.</p> <p>Delete Key Objective 3 – this is factually incorrect – it is not location, design, or use of property that intensifies risk – as much as it is management of private property, the management of surrounding private property and the management of surrounding public properties. These activities are not covered by the planning scheme.</p> <p>Amend Key Objective 4 is already covered by the Bushfire Management Overlay and Bushfire Prone Areas Mapping, planning and building codes. These should be referenced.</p> <p>Objective 3 council can avoid this by doing more on road Side road bush fire mitigation</p> <p>Council has an obligation to fulfil their bush fire mitigation strategy.</p>		<p>this is about permit applications and land use - that is what the planning scheme does - using it as some form of a pageant is not appropriate and will not produce a useable fit for purpose statement</p>
18976	Oct 06, 2021, 09:04 AM	1			
18959	Oct 05, 2021, 07:18 PM	1			
18953	Oct 05, 2021, 04:58 PM	1	<p>There is not any suggestion on what Council is doing to address Climate Change.</p> <p>Bushfire is only one problem the Shire is facing with Climate Change.</p> <p>First Nations people should be consulted on land management.</p>		<p>To address Climate Change in a meaningful way there need to be objectives such as-</p> <p>increasing the amount of vegetation and in particular canopy trees in urban areas to mitigate the heat island effect</p> <p>-introducing planning controls which ensure the use of renewable energy and energy saving devices</p> <p>-restrict development so that there is room on site for adequate tree and understorey planting</p> <p>-approve sustainable living housing and commercial buildings</p> <p>-increase the amount of open green space</p> <p>-restrict development in bushfire and flood prone areas</p> <p>Climate change will put stress on native fauna in our Green Wedge so council must plan to facilitate wildlife movement to avoid native animals being isolated and trapped in habitat pockets. An ESO review is overdue and now urgent to address this obvious consequence of climate change. Habitat 'buffer' areas need to be defined, also wildlife corridors and linkages to allow movement principally in a north-south direction to avoid fauna heat stress. Increased vegetation will be needed. Council must refer to the proposed Amendment C101 (ESO review) for the technical work already completed on this.</p>
18940	Oct 05, 2021, 02:26 PM	1			
18936	Oct 05, 2021, 01:36 PM	1			
18931	Oct 05, 2021, 12:34 PM				
18910	Oct 04, 2021, 10:20 PM				
18898	Oct 04, 2021, 06:23 PM	1			
18879	Oct 04, 2021, 03:41 PM	1	<p>I believe the Theme should be "Mitigation of the impacts of climate change and response to natural disasters"</p> <p>1 As it sits it implies climate change is the sole cause of fire and emergencies</p> <p>What aload of garbage , less rules not more.</p>		<p>Key Objective 4 should include consideration of flood issues and the effects of changes in land form such as significant cuts or fills associated with developments.</p> <p>Suggest:</p> <p>Put people first and don't treat them like fools.</p>
18861	Oct 04, 2021, 12:06 AM				
18852	Oct 02, 2021, 02:04 PM	1	<p>I would like to see stronger climate action and a climate declaration from the council. And lowering emissions ought to be central in all decisions, it's</p> <p>1 foundational to our future.</p>		<p>If one of the objectives is to avoid intensifying bushfire risk to people and property through poorly located, designed or managed use or development, then</p>
			<p>Additional Comments relating to the Climate Charge theme 10 to</p>		<p>Response to climate change needs to be higher up in the list. Yes, we need to prepare for the challenges, but we first need to stop doing the damage.</p>
18839	Oct 01, 2021, 04:35 PM	1	<p>Key Objective 7</p> <p>Community support includes encouragement to protect tree canopies, use Environmentally Sustainable Design (ESD) principles with buildings, utilise renewable energy and provide safe evacuation options for people with disabilities in times of bushfire.</p> <p>Only the last three Key Objectives state anything about climate change. All the rest are a response to climate change, namely the expected increase in bushfire threat.</p>		
18435	Sep 21, 2021, 11:14 PM	1	<p>Climate change recognition means a complete overhaul of the ways we produce and request carbon at an individual, community and State level. The changes will be monumental and beyond the capacity of most individuals to comprehend before the final tipping points are reached and ther his no way to reverse the situation. Models indicate that this is less than 10 years. So get cracking, drop all plans to continue with business as usual and throw the Council into full Climate-change planning as if our lives depended on it.</p>		

18363 Sep 19, 2021, 04:26 PM			3 is not your business/jurisdiction		
18348 Sep 18, 2021, 11:04 PM		1	4 there are already good measures in place		
			5 not where I want my money spent		
					I don't think they go far enough in terms of carbon neutrality for the shire. It would be great for there to be something in there about energy efficient
18315 Sep 17, 2021, 08:56 PM		1	Key Objective 7: Rather than just 'support' Council to take a proactive and leadership role in encouraging the community to reduce their contributions to climate change.		
			Key Objective 5		
			Whilst we would all like to see a reduction in climate change, how we reduce the impact should be methodically planned, communicated and agreed.		
			I recently read that 800 residents responded to a Shire conducted climate action survey, with 87% of respondents stating they would like to see the Shire achieve net zero by 2050.		
			Firstly, 800 respondents are hardly representative of a total population of ~65,200 residents, in fact 87% of 800 is just 696 residents, or just over 1% of the total population. Given the likelihood of respondents having a keen interest in surveys regarding climate change, the 1% is likely to be skewed, dubious at best.		
			Secondly, I'm unsure how you can agree to such targets without understanding what activities / events are currently contributing to climate change within the Shire, and by how much, and what actions are being proposed to reduce those impacts, and the consequences of implementing those proposed actions. Only		
18301 Sep 17, 2021, 02:31 PM		1	1 after having these questions answered can one make an intelligent, well informed decision.		
18280 Sep 17, 2021, 08:39 AM					
18262 Sep 16, 2021, 07:11 PM		1			
					Work toward a paperless office or minimise hard copies wherever possible
18240 Sep 16, 2021, 04:21 PM		1			Proceed with the solar farm on the old tip site
			The shire attempts to be scaring residents instead of taking steps to ameliorate the danger. Why are subdivision permits being issued for bushfire areas? If the threat is real, why allow MORE people to face the risk?		
18207 Sep 15, 2021, 04:51 PM		1	Not sure why weather-related (ie storms and fires) are only mentioned in the "climate change" section, and not throughout the MPS. Yes it's linked to climate change, but they should also be recognised in more sections as well.		Fire prevention in areas such as the Plenty Gorge so that habitat isn't lost WHEN there is a fire (not if).
18133 Sep 11, 2021, 01:14 PM		1	#5... would have liked to see this expanded into subpoints/objectives		

Economic Development

Title/Question: Economic Development
Tool Type: Form
Activity ID: 310
Report Date Range: 9 Sep 2021 - 21 Oct 2021
Date Exported: 26 Oct 2021 09:59 am

Contribution ID	Date Submitted	If not, which objective(s) and why?			With consideration of objectives in the other themes, can you identify any gaps in this theme that the MPS should consider?
		with the identified I	Yes	No	
		</			

practices that are responsive to, and care for, local soils, slope, climate, indigenous flora and fauna, 13 waterways and the community; reduce and eliminates dependence on chemical inputs, particularly herbicides, phosphates, and insecticides; encourages the use of contemporary best practice to achieve the above. This includes rehabilitating indigenous biodiversity, use of wildlife-friendlier fencing, maintaining soil coverage, harnessing renewable energy sources, conversion to indigenous grasses and other foods, increase of habitat connectivity.

5. Suggest add ...or winery... while ensuring that any “in conjunction uses” or other modifications to existing use are according to approved Land Management Plans, which detail how the environment, habitat links and biodiversity are protected

I would like to see added:

4. Agriculture is an important area of economic development:

- Promote land use in rural areas in accordance with the capability and productive potential of the land.
- Retain existing agricultural land for soil based agricultural production.
- Promote sustainable agricultural activities and land management practices that minimise adverse impacts on the primary production and environmental values of surrounding land and the catchment.
- Protect and enhance agricultural land for both its productive potential and environmental value.

Add Sustainable/regenerative objectives:

Sustainable Agriculture is an important area of economic development:

- Promote land use in rural areas in accordance with the natural capability and sustainable productive potential of the land. This must be locally responsive, and be protective of local soils, waterways, vegetation, and fauna. This also ensures no further clearing of vegetation.
- Retain existing agricultural land for soil based, sustainable, regenerative, ecologically friendly agricultural production.
- Promote sustainable, regenerative, ecologically friendly agricultural activities and enforce land management practices that do not have adverse impacts on the environmental values and/or primary production of surrounding land and the catchment.
- Protect agricultural land for both its productive potential and environmental value. Apply regenerative practices that are responsive to, and care for, local soils, slope, climate, indigenous flora and fauna, waterways and the community; reduce and eliminates dependence on chemical inputs, particularly herbicides, phosphates, and insecticides; encourages the use of contemporary best practice to achieve the above. This includes rehabilitating indigenous biodiversity, use of wildlife-friendlier fencing, maintaining soil coverage, harnessing renewable energy sources, conversion to indigenous grasses and other foods, increase of habitat connectivity.

Also - ensuring that any “in conjunction uses” or other modifications to existing use are according to approved Land Management Plans, which detail how the environment, habitat links and biodiversity are protected

			<p>Key objective 4 - Agriculture is a narrow term and often does not include equine industries, please either make it clear that Agriculture includes equine related activities, or address equine related activities separately in the plan as equine activities are very important in Nillumbik. Soil based agriculture is also quite a restrictive term and not a great term to be using here - why are we limiting this to soil based agriculture? What does soil based agriculture actually mean? What does it exclude and include? Does it exclude (for example) livestock? or does it exclude only animals fed on supplementary feeds rather than pasture grown in the soil (e.g. pigs, chickens?)</p> <p>Key objective 5 - This makes no sense. Why are we restricting commercial activities in the green wedge to those that can be used in conjunction with agriculture, rural industry or winery? Plenty of people run home businesses in all different kinds of areas/industries - are you proposing that this should be stopped? why? If you aren't proposing this please change the wording so that your intent is clear</p>	
19081	Oct 08, 2021, 10:49 AM	1		
19076	Oct 08, 2021, 07:42 AM	1		Encourage redevelopment and improvement of Eltham's commercial centre behind Bridge Rd and Susan St.
19069	Oct 07, 2021, 11:05 PM	1	Theme 6: Economic Development Key Objective 1	<p>A growing number of cafes and craft bars are opening here, something Eltham residents really appreciate, but the area is a mess! Covid lock down has created a new working from home culture for many in Nillumbik, home offices are probably going to be on-going.</p> <p>Suggest the following objective as I have also suggested in my comments on the Green Wedge Theme, is listed here, in Economic Development:</p> <p>‘Recognise that the rural areas often lack existing infrastructure. Including essential services, community facilities and internet coverage, and explore options for increasing connectivity without compromising habitat and wildlife corridors.’</p>
19056	Oct 07, 2021, 07:14 PM	1	<p>Obj 2 Retaining and enhancing community/neighbourhood character must take priority, and must not be impacted by commercial interests. Environmentally and socially sustainable enterprises must be encouraged.</p> <p>Obj 4 Suggested additions to highlight the importance of Nillumbik promoting sustainable agriculture and to support innovation and leadership in this area.</p> <p>Sustainable Agriculture is an important area of economic development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Promote land use in rural areas in accordance with the natural capability and sustainable productive potential of the land. This must be locally responsive, and be protective of local soils, waterways, vegetation, and fauna. This also ensures no further clearing of vegetation. •Retain existing agricultural land for soil based, sustainable, regenerative, ecologically friendly agricultural production. •Promote sustainable, regenerative, ecologically friendly agricultural activities and enforce land management practices that do not have adverse impacts on the environmental values and/or primary production of surrounding land and the catchment. •Protect agricultural land for both its productive potential and environmental value. Apply regenerative practices that are responsive to, and care for, local soils, slope, climate, indigenous flora and fauna, waterways and the community; reduce and eliminates dependence on chemical inputs, particularly herbicides, phosphates, and insecticides; encourages the use of contemporary best practice to achieve the above. This includes rehabilitating indigenous biodiversity, use of wildlife-friendlier fencing, maintaining soil coverage, harnessing renewable energy sources, conversion to indigenous grasses and other foods, increase of habitat connectivity. <p>Obj 5 Suggested addition ...or winery... while ensuring that any “in conjunction uses” or other modifications to existing use are according to approved Land Management Plans, which detail how the environment, habitat links and biodiversity are protected</p>	

			Need to add some metrics for the in conjunction with agriculture use of green wedge land.
		Objective 5 not strong enough	Need to ensure that developers cannot get away with calling a single lemon tree out the back next to the dunny as "agriculture".
19045 Oct 07, 2021, 06:36 PM	1	<p>Equally need to ensure that proposals for in conjunction uses are not refused based mainly on the personal whims of some council staff member</p> <p>Key objectives 1 – 3 are irrelevant to rural residents. Review and rewrite Key objective 4 – this is contradictory – the productive potential of the land is not necessarily soil based agricultural production – sustainable agricultural activities are not necessarily soil based agricultural production – land management practices that minimise adverse impacts of primary production and environmental values may not be soil based agriculture either. Agricultural land is already being protected by the Victorian Government. Nillumbik does not need to duplicate what is already occurring. Delete Key objective 5 and replace it with something more appropriate – this objective is not true or desirable. Green wedge rural areas house significant home business and “commercial” activities (whatever these are). They always have and always will. This is appropriate now and into the future. What is a rural industry? Horse agistment is a significant economic activity in rural Nillumbik now, and will remain so into the future. This is appropriate. Where is the tourism, accommodation and day stay destination economic development objective? The purpose of green wedge areas is to provide infrastructure, recreation opportunities, environmental benefits, and agriculture for metropolitan Melbourne. If council removes opportunities for this area to deliver to it’s purpose the area will continue to be vulnerable. Let’s be really clear on this – most lifestyle grazing and hobby farming families do not particularly value the influx of visitors driving through here on weekends – but we all recognise it is important for the viability and sustainability of the area and so we share. It is interesting to us that our sharing is reciprocated with proposals that seek to ignore, undermine, punish, limit, restrict, economically and socially disadvantage and harm us for no benefit – which is what council proposals have consistently done for more than 16 years.</p>	
18972 Oct 06, 2021, 08:56 AM	1	<p>The wording does not provide enough protection for the character of the activity centres to still be retained even if further businesses or developments occur. Any new place of employment must adhere to strict planning guidelines for not overwhelming the current built and natural landscape. The possibility of more tourism and or commercial or agricultural ventures in the Green Wedge run the risk of spoiling what Nillumbik hopefully wants to preserve.....environment, biodiversity, flora and fauna habitat, health of waterways etc. Even if restricted to agricultural, rural industry and winery these ventures can become too large and destructive of the entire environment.</p>	<p>pushing any economic activity from green wedge areas is not achievable, not desirable, and not practical. we are all aware council aims to bring economic decline to green wedge areas - and this is a breach of several Victorian laws - suggest revising this - it is in the public domain now and is unconscionable conduct by council</p>
18946 Oct 05, 2021, 03:40 PM	1		<p>The economic social and environmental priorities need to be explained in this objective. How is the infrastructure in the more rural areas to be introduced? Again this is an issue which needs environmental consideration if new ventures are to be considered.</p>
18926 Oct 05, 2021, 12:02 PM	1	<p>Key Objective 1 could be strengthened by reference to increasing local employment e.g. Focus on strengthening existing enterprises and facilitating new business initiatives that provide increased local employment opportunities and respect the Shire's environmental. social and economic development priorities.</p>	
18906 Oct 04, 2021, 10:10 PM	1	<p>Objective 4: In the rural conservation zone (RCZ) conservation is the primary use, so agriculture must be secondary to conservation so it must serve to sustain conservation purposes in all instances. Objective 5: Should be re-written to better describe the 'in conjunction' relationship i.e. "...restricted to activity centres or purposes that can be used in conjunction with existing viable agriculture, existing viable rural industry or existing viable winery. The commercial or tourism activity must operate according to a land management plan which shows how biodiversity, habitat links and rural amenity are protected".</p>	

				<p>ADD New Objective:</p> <p>Progress the off-road shared trail network and connections across all public land tenures to link with neighbouring municipalities, maximising visitation and safe recreation opportunity.</p> <p>With Key Objective 4, ADD a 5th dot point:</p> <p>* Protect existing grazing land for animal keeping and rural activities</p>
18904	Oct 04, 2021, 10:02 PM	1		
18874	Oct 04, 2021, 03:32 PM	1		
			Additional Comments to	
			Key Objective 1	
			Also undertake training and development processes to raise the awareness of local traders of the benefits in responding to the catering needs of cyclists and walkers utilising the Diamond Creek Trail and other off road exercise options in Nillumbik. These could include cafes, restaurants, accommodation providers and servicing facilities.	
			Key Objective 2	
			An effective, strong and responsive Neighbourhood Character Policy is required to control urban design outcomes in activity centres, residential areas and townships. It should be a priority to enhance identified community and neighbourhood character, which should not be compromised by commercial interests.	
			Key Objective 3	
			Also uses within industrial precincts should not compromise or impact on the amenity of residential areas adjoining these precincts.	
			Key Objective 4	
			Prioritise and encourage sustainable and ecologically friendly agricultural activities in Green Wedge areas, while protecting waterways and neighbourhood and community character.	
			Key Objective 5	
			The range of tourism and commercial activities within the Green Wedge needs to respond to the existing supporting services, land use requirements and community facilities.	
18835	Oct 01, 2021, 03:16 PM	1		
			Objective 1 is so broadly written re facilitating new businesses that we could wind up with a bunch of 'new initiatives' that don't fit into a Green Wedge.	
18831	Oct 01, 2021, 01:14 PM	1		
			Objective 4 - there is no mention of agriculture based on animals or equestrian which currently exist in the Shire. Both are well established and should be allowed to continue.	
18376	Sep 19, 2021, 06:21 PM	1		
			What does this council see as 'Primary Production" this should be clearly stated.	
18359	Sep 19, 2021, 04:15 PM	1		
			Absolutely not! What is your goal here... to reduce rural property value! You are trying to bring back c101 and c31	
			Key Objective 5	
18297	Sep 17, 2021, 02:03 PM	1		
			Within limits, National Parks for people to enjoy should be encouraged within the Green Wedge.	
			Objective 4 should be brought into the current century by allowing modern uses such as hydroponic gardening as well as soil based	
18236	Sep 16, 2021, 04:13 PM	1		Review objective 4
			Nillumbik needs development and jobs. Pinning all hopes on agriculture is too green and unrealistic. Broaden your view.	
18221	Sep 16, 2021, 11:11 AM	1		Township for Yarrambat

18129 Sep 11, 2021, 01:04 PM

Much of the key objectives deal with bricks and mortar businesses. How do you plan to support/promote micro and service-based businesses in the Shire?
1

Green Wedge

Title/Question: Green Wedge
Tool Type: Form
Activity ID: 306
Report Date Range: 9 Sep 2021 - 21 Oct 2021
Date Exported: 26 Oct 2021 09:40 am

Contribution ID	Date Submitted	Do you agree with the identified key objectives?	If not, which objective(s) and why?	With consideration of objectives in the other themes, can you identify any gaps in this theme that the MPS should consider?
		Yes No Unsure		
19293	Oct 21, 2021, 05:50 PM		Objectives 4, 7 & 8 are very important. I would like to see the Green Wedge protected from development, no stealthy enlargement of the Urban Growth Boundary. With climate change to be considered we need green open spaces now more than ever. It has been termed the "lungs of Melbourne" & so it should remain. I'm not sure what essential services, infrastructure, & community services involves, but I can sympathise with the need for internet coverage. Objective 5: Ensure development in rural areas mitigates potential fire risk. What sort of development would be proposed?	
19281	Oct 21, 2021, 01:49 PM	1	Key objective 4. There is no evidence of conflict between agricultural and residential rural land use to be 'managed'. Our small rural landowners have for many years been the underappreciated true custodians of our Green wedge, the majority area 90%+,lies outside the shires residential zones. Our small rural landowners who are over regulated by very restrictive planning overlays need to receive far more support from Council and not be further frustrated by ill considered restrictive controls. I request that Council implements recommendations incapsulated within the Nillumbik Proactive landowners (PALS) submission made at this time.	Whilst we should always preserve areas of known environmental significance Council should not be tempted to try to 'lock away' areas of land as 'conservation zones' in the guise of 'natural resource management'. Our small rural landowners already do an excellent job in managing their land without additional frustrating interference.
19278	Oct 21, 2021, 01:31 PM	1	It's not that I disagree with any of the objectives, but I can't tell if this acknowledges that protecting the environment also includes sustainable and appropriate development. This doesn't only mean stopping bad development like subdividing plots away from the business areas of towns, but actively working towards providing different forms of housing/housing densities around townships. Part of the green wedge characteristics is living in leafy green towns, so it would be fantastic to see a creative vision where we can have higher density in Hurstbridge, Eltham, and Diamond Creek without compromising the environmental importance of living in Nillumbik (i.e trees providing appropriate shade alongside streets/bike lanes/paths).	
19196	Oct 19, 2021, 08:13 AM	1	i fully support the PALS SUBMISSIONS	

			<p>The protection of the environment and biodiversity should guide all planning in Nillumbik.</p> <p>Other suggested objectives:</p> <p>Apply a building envelope to minimise the development footprint for built form and associated infrastructure by minimising fragmentation otherwise caused by scattered development.</p> <p>The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) is treated as a hard boundary which does not allow for extension into the Green Wedge.</p> <p>Extend and support Trust for Nature covenants</p> <p>Continue to investigate the feasibility of planning permit conditions defining a maximum footprint for domestic areas (avoiding fragmentation) on lots with Green Wedge and Rural Conservation Zone taking into consideration biodiversity, landscape and agriculture.</p> <p>Develop policies to effectively control invasive plant and animal populations, and restrict planting of environmental weeds.</p> <p>Review the application of Environmental Significance Overlays and Significant Landscape Overlays across the Green Wedge zones in line with Government policy, ensuring enforcement of protections and adequate resourcing</p>
19162	Oct 14, 2021, 09:29 PM	1	<p>1. Recognise that the preservation of the green wedge, protection of biodiversity, and action on climate change, hold the greatest value – and are therefore top priority - for the Nillumbik Community.</p> <p>(Consistent with the findings from the Our People, Our Place, Our Future community consultation)</p> <p>6. All development in rural areas minimises potential fire risk in a way which is acceptable to, and compatible with, First Nations People’s stewardship of the land, as well as being compatible with Climate Change mitigation and preservation of biodiversity.</p> <p>8. Suggested addition:</p> <p>... whilst ensuring agricultural practices employ sustainable and regenerative practices, protect the Green Wedge and reinvigorate biodiversity.</p>
			<p>The protection of the environment and biodiversity should guide all planning in Nillumbik.</p> <p>Apply a building envelope to minimise the development footprint for built form and associated infrastructure by minimising fragmentation otherwise caused by scattered development.</p> <p>The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) is treated as a hard boundary which does not allow for extension into the Green Wedge.</p> <p>Extend and support Trust for Nature covenants</p> <p>Continue to investigate the feasibility of planning permit conditions defining a maximum footprint for domestic areas (avoiding fragmentation) on lots with Green Wedge and Rural Conservation Zone taking into consideration biodiversity, landscape and agriculture.</p> <p>Review the application of Environmental Significance Overlays and Significant Landscape Overlays across the Green Wedge zones in line with Government policy, ensuring enforcement of protections and adequate resourcing</p>
19123	Oct 11, 2021, 11:35 AM	1	
19105	Oct 10, 2021, 08:28 AM		I support PALs submission. 100%
19104	Oct 10, 2021, 08:24 AM		I am I. Support of the document that PALs have submitted , stand behind what they have said
19102	Oct 09, 2021, 07:18 PM	1	<p>I wish to add my support to the PALS submission. If you want to reduce mud in runoff into the creeks, then start by sealing all your dirt roads.</p> <p>I agree with PALS in their submission.</p>
19092	Oct 09, 2021, 10:08 AM	1	<p>Revise Objective 3. Rural areas cannot 'lack existing infrastructure'. They can (and do) lack infrastructure existing elsewhere in the shire.</p> <p>Key objective 4 makes no sense - what conflict is there? land parcels that are unviable for what? Remove this objective please</p> <p>Key objective 2 regarding native vegetation needs to be balanced against fire risk</p>
19080	Oct 08, 2021, 10:33 AM	1	
19079	Oct 08, 2021, 10:11 AM		<p>I support the PALs submission</p> <p>I support the PALs submission</p>
19074	Oct 08, 2021, 12:26 AM	1	<p>4 & 5</p> <p>Minimum subdivision is set I believe at around 20 acres. The message I take from these statements is that it will be even harder, if not impossible to build a home on current vacant legitimate blocks. This is not fair and equal to all.</p> <p>I think a balance needs to be found between protecting the green wedge and fire risk. Tracts of rural land can help as fire breaks. A balance needs to be found here to protect wildlife and human life</p>
19073	Oct 07, 2021, 11:58 PM	1	<p>Objective 4: any possible conflict between agricultural and rural residential land uses and a risk that further residential development will fragment rural land into unviable land parcels should not be an issue, as the Green Wedge is legislated by State Parliament. Council do not have the remit to over-ride State legislation.</p>

19060 Oct 07, 2021, 09:20 PM

1

Supporting the rural residents to navigate the planning process in a timely and economical way, which is non-punitive and supports their aspirations, their family and their value as a member of the rural community and a part of the wider Nillumbik family. Not some criminal that should be punished for living in this GW and wanting a hobby farm or lifestyle property.

- 1) Not sure how recognising that the rural areas (land zoned Rural Conservation or Green Wedge) contain sites of environmental and landscape significance, natural resource based activities and residences translates into Planning outcomes, unless it means additional overlays. I would think that recognising that the majority of RCZ and GW zoned land is in private ownership, with historical settlement patterns and land uses might have some meaning. Natural resource based activities? does this mean enjoying living here and having lifestyle property, potentially with cleared grazing land.
- 2) Who are we protecting our Green Wedge from? we have an urban growth boundary, there are only a few vacant blocks that might get a building permit. This Council is buying into "The Green Wedge Protection" mythology. What is it's environmental integrity, surely that is what has evolved due to mining being abandoned, large orchards and some other farming no longer being viable, allowing re vegetation, due to farms being sub-divided forty years ago and the more marginal land being left to return to bush by lifestyle property owners. It is not National Park, The GW is primarily something that the people who have lived here, many intergenerationally have created, either by replanting, allowing re-growth, retaining cleared grazing land etc. that is all part of its unique environmental integrity. It is already a safe haven for native wildlife, thriving biodiversity and native vegetation. There are no multi-developments planned, no huge tourist attractions, nothing that threaten these things. Can we not also protect, if it needs protecting the historical significance of its patchwork of farms, hobby farms and lifestyle properties and the diversity of livestock and farming that does still occur.
- 3) Recognise that the rural areas often lack existing infrastructure. Including essential services, community facilities and internet coverage. Is this to acknowledge and help those who live in rural areas or provide another reason why they shouldn't live there. Kinglake is an example of a thriving township, not in Nillumbik, but serving those in that part of the shire, since Black Saturday it's community infrastructure has improved, the businesses are thriving and it even has a proper petrol station. Rural residents love living here and acknowledge that we don't have same services as the rest of Nillumbik, so please don't then punish us further with more overlays and planning restrictions.
- 4) Acknowledgment of land use conflict between agricultural and rural residential land uses and a risk that further residential development will fragment rural land into unviable land parcels. There is no such thing as an unviable land parcel in rural areas, as existing sub-division will confirm, with many .5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 acre properties existing harmoniously with their neighbours. What is this land use conflict that is described here? The only conflict with smaller lots is the requirement under the Ball rating to remove vegetation.
- 5) Manage the issues of land use conflict, resource use and environmental management arising from the diversity of uses through sustainable land use and natural resource management. Again the only land use conflict is the one which may occur when existing cleared grazing land is subjected to enforced planting, stock reduction or fencing of waterways. The other conflict occurs when existing or new properties seek building permits in areas with RCZ zoning and require numerous and costly environmental reports and the requirement of paying offsets. If Council is going to hide the potential of additional overlays under the heading of land use conflict, it needs to articulate where this conflict is occurring. Is it between environmental planners and residents or Ideologically driven, but misguided Councillors. Ground truth needs to be done to prove the premise for this objective.
- 6) Ensure development in rural areas mitigates potential fire risk. Bal ratings and BMO overlays already regulate this with regard to new development and also for those seeking to expand or add infrastructure to their properties. If this meant that Council infrastructure in rural areas, such as club houses, ovals etc could be hardened up to provide some shelter during bush fire this would be good. If it meant that rural roads would be widened and site lines improved by removal of fuel this would be good. Impossible to mitigate potential fire risk, so I guess, this will be another reason for Council to reject applications from any that wish to develop a home or business in rural areas.
- 7) Avoid sensitive use and development on land that contains or may contain unacceptable levels of soil contamination, unless testing and necessary remedial treatment have been undertaken. Advocate to State Government to undertake Shire Wide testing and analysis of contaminated land. Ridiculous. Think this means that no sport or recreational activities, horse riding etc will ever take place on old tip sites. Other than that do not see the point of it. Mining was rampant in many of our bush land reserves, along the streams and waterways of Research and Smiths Gully, yet development has occurred on these sites. Many of the orchards in Hurstbridge, South Eltham and other areas used DDT and other long lasting contaminants. It is a problem, but not one I think the State Government will concern itself with. How would Council use this information if it was obtained? how would it impact on existing use rights. Alistair Knox Park is built on the old Eltham tip, perhaps you should start with that.
- 8) Protect and enhance agricultural land for both its productive potential and environmental value. Does this mean Council

o) Protect and enhance agricultural land for both its productive potential and environmental value - Does this mean Council will give cleared grazing land and other farm land some status in the planning scheme? will it have its own environmental value allocated to it, so that it too can be protected as part of the GW and not be subjected to re vegetation. What if it is for keeping of livestock, such as horses, that is deemed an agricultural use, but not necessarily adding to the GDP. Yet has value for residents and visitors alike.

9) Our connection to the Green Wedge is celebrated by all who live, work or enjoy their time in it- Motherhood statement - means little to those who choose to live here and look after it. We Celebrate our rural life and our rural communities, not any mystical connection to some descriptor.

I wonder whether you might have had more input had you not made this Planning Strategy so comprehensive - all in one report. Perhaps you prefer people NOT to take the time to read and comment on.

We are on land, which we care for at great expense, huge amounts of time and energy are also put into our land. We LOVE where we live and all we ever hear about is looking after a bird, or insect or whatever, we don't want some "greenie" dictating to us - we don't tell those in suburbia how to live!

We 100% support PALS submission - let's listen to those actually ON land!

19047 Oct 07, 2021, 06:41 PM

This is not completely a question of yes or no but as there are suggestions for most of them I have selected no.

Objective 1
Referring to 'sites of environmental and landscape significance' can lead to a narrow focus on Commonwealth significance under the EPBC Act or State significance under the Flora and Fauna Guarantee etc. A common default (even in planning scheme amendments and VCAT cases) is to down-play environmental significance if there's a lack of Commonwealth or State significant species, rather than recognising that all areas of vegetation/habitat are significant and must be protected.

Natural resource-based activities, including agriculture, must not be to the detriment of the environment, and must actively work to enhance the health and abundance of indigenous biodiversity.

Suggestions for other objectives
Other suggested objectives:
Apply a building envelope to minimise the development footprint for built form and associated infrastructure by minimising fragmentation otherwise caused by scattered development.
The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) is treated as a hard boundary which does not allow for extension into the Green Wedge.

Extend and support Trust for Nature covenants

Continue to investigate the feasibility of planning permit conditions defining a maximum footprint for domestic areas (avoiding fragmentation) on lots with Green Wedge and Rural Conservation Zone taking into consideration biodiversity, landscape and agriculture.

Develop policies to effectively control invasive plant and animal populations, and restrict planting of environmental weeds.

Review the application of Environmental Significance Overlays and Significant Landscape Overlays across the Green Wedge zones in line with Government policy, ensuring enforcement of protections and adequate resourcing

19042 Oct 07, 2021, 06:26 PM

1

Recognise that the preservation of the green wedge, protection of biodiversity and action on climate change hold the

recognise that the preservation of the green wedge, protection of biodiversity, and action on climate change, hold the greatest value – and are therefore top priority - for the Nillumbik Community.
(Consistent with the findings from the Our People, Our Place, Our Future community consultation)

Referring to the Green Wedge in Nillumbik containing ‘residences’ implies that residential land use is supported in the Green Wedge zones. This is not the case in the RCZ or GWZ and to imply otherwise is contrary to the purposes of those zones

Objective 3
Suggested reword
‘Recognise that the rural areas often lack infrastructure, including essential services, community facilities and internet coverage, and explore options for enabling community connections whilst minimising the impact on vegetation.’

Ob 4
Development cannot be to the detriment of the environment and/or lead to further loss of existing agricultural land.

Ob 5
Needs to take into account
The management of conflicting land-use, resource use and environmental management, is done through the development, enforcement and ongoing review of land management plans, in conjunction with environmental protection strategies and enforcement. These processes must be adequately resourced.

Ob 6
Suggest that it is reworded to say
Development should only proceed where the proposed development meets the first principle of avoiding and minimising loss of native vegetation.

In addition
All development in rural areas minimises potential fire risk in a way which is acceptable to, and compatible with, First Nations People’s stewardship of the land, as well as being compatible with Climate Change mitigation and preservation of biodiversity.

Ob 8
Suggested addition:
... whilst ensuring agricultural practices employ sustainable and regenerative practices, protect the Green Wedge and reinvigorate biodiversity.

Protection of the Green Wedge and the relevant zones must be the paramount and overarching aim and must not be allowed to be compromised by ideas that might be described as "Living in the Green Wedge.

Natural resource-based activities, including agriculture, must not be to the detriment of the environment, and must actively work to enhance the health and abundance of indigenous biodiversity.

Recognise that the preservation of the green wedge, protection of biodiversity, and action on climate change, hold the greatest value – and are therefore top priority - for the Nillumbik Community.
(Consistent with the findings from the Our People, Our Place, Our Future community consultation)

Referring to the Green Wedge in Nillumbik containing ‘residences’ implies that residential land use is supported in the Green Wedge zones. This is not the case in the RCZ or GWZ and to imply otherwise is contrary to the purposes of those zones

Under 8: Suggested addition:... whilst ensuring agricultural practices employ sustainable and regenerative practices, protect the Green Wedge and reinvigorate biodiversity.

The protection of the environment and biodiversity should guide all planning in Nillumbik.

Other suggested objectives:
Apply a building envelope to minimise the development footprint for built form and associated infrastructure by minimising fragmentation otherwise caused by scattered development

Need to emphasise ENFORCEMENT activities to ensure that everyone follows the rules. Make sure Council has the resources to do this..

		<p>While not against the assumed intent of a majority of the Key Objectives, we have concerns about all of them when they are considered in the context of the wording used in the Strategic Direction document within the MPS. Of particular concern are Key Objectives 1, 2, 4 and 5.</p> <p>It is essential that the MPS review is not driven by subjective assessment of what is important/relevant and what is not; for example, use of the terms 'poorly located, designed or managed' must be supported by previously agreed definitions that cannot be left to interpretation.</p>	
19039	Oct 07, 2021, 06:06 PM	1	
			<p>The MPS is not acknowledging that are large majority of rural residence are lifestyle and hobby farms and contribute greatly to the existence of the GW. Why is this? It would seem from these objectives that they may be considered as a conflict for land use but as conflicts are not specified,it's hard to know and comment on. I get a feel from these objectives that they have been born out of terrible anxiety and are perceived problems. All objective should be based on data that provides evidence to the issue not on the anxiety of a minority of community members. The majority of Nillumbik residents sit in the middle of the bell curve with the hard greens and the developers either side and we just want a balance and to enjoy our connection to the GW and not theirs!</p>
19031	Oct 07, 2021, 04:33 PM	1	
		<p>Key Objective 2</p> <p>Protect our Green Wedge and its environmental integrity to ensure a safe haven for native wildlife, thriving biodiversity and native vegetation.</p> <p>The Green Wedge and the environment is protected by various State Laws so it does the need local planning to protect, it is unnecessary. The MPS and the objectives should not replicate other State laws and acts. the Objective should read Acknowledge our Green Wedge and the environment it provides as a safe haven for native wildlife, thriving biodiversity and native vegetation.</p> <p>📎</p> <p>Key Objective 4</p> <p>Acknowledgment of land use conflict between agricultural and rural residential land uses and a risk that further residential development will fragment rural land into unviable land parcels.</p> <p>I find this objective is unclear. What are the conflicts? and under what evidence base can you say this? Are you saying that the larger rural lots in the GW that could be legally divided into small lots, should not be? as it will no longer be viable as agricultural land to farm? If it is not economically viable to farm, then what are you expecting lot owners to do? Are you really intending to penalise individuals who have a legal right to subdivide? If so then council need to prove that the land can be viable to farm.</p> <p>Key Objective 5</p> <p>Manage the issues of land use conflict, resource use and environmental management arising from the diversity of uses through sustainable land use and natural resource management.</p> <p>Another unclear objective what does this mean? Please use clear simple language so the meaning of the objective is transparent. I'm not even going to hazard to guess what this means.</p> <p>Key Objective 7</p>	

Protect and enhance agricultural land for both its productive potential and environmental value.
 What makes this objective different from the ones above? I get the feeling from all the objectives that unless the GW has bush blocks or productive farming that any other land use is unacceptable so rural lifestyle living properties will be seen as unacceptable and yet they under pin the GW and makes it sustainable. We do not live in a National or State Park but in Metro Melbourne. What do you consider the environmental value of agricultural land?

Key Objective 8

Our connection to the Green Wedge is celebrated by all who live, work or enjoy their time in it.
 Again, what does this objective mean? and what is it designed to achieve? My connection to the GW may not be your connection, so which of our connections are we celebrating? This objective sound exclusive not inclusive! Makes it sound like we only have one connection and everyone must feel it too! To make it more inclusive “Our diverse connections to the Green Wedge are celebrated by all who live, work or enjoy their time in it.”

19022	Oct 07, 2021, 02:44 AM	1			In wattle glen there are huge blocks that need to be developed! wattle glen needs a major development will be great to make a use of this huge lands and use them for the community. This will benefit the area and the community that live in it.
19021	Oct 06, 2021, 11:03 PM	1			<p>In agreeing with the above objectives however in addition, as an owner of 20 acres of land on the edge of the Green Wedge (Wilson Road, Wattle Glen), I believe it is important to consider allowing further subdivision into smaller lots (STCA) given subdivision in this area has not occurred since 1986 / 1987. This area is a beautiful landscape, is only 25 km from the Melbourne CBD and should be benefited by the people and by the community. It is a disadvantage to the land and area that it is not being used to its full potential and capacity and not being recognised for this potential.</p> <p>The land that is on the edge of the Green Wedge should be changed to, at least, a low density zone to make the Wattle Glen area larger and allow for further growth in this area, whilst still ensuring that the native wildlife and native vegetation is maintained and protected as this would be vital to the Shire.</p>
19019	Oct 06, 2021, 10:19 PM	1	<p>The objectives seem very leading to me. They do not take into consideration the potential opportunities for tourism and the number of hobby farmers in the area. Many rural owners have livestock which does not seem to be covered. It sounds to be like the proposal is to lock it up and throw away the key. It does not deal with the issue of lack of diverse housing options in the area.</p> <p>The Green Wedge should be able to be enjoyed by everyone however not restrictive controls on private property.</p>	<p>Promoting Tourism opportunities for our area</p> <p>Hobby Farmers</p> <p>With north east link to be built consideration needs to be given to greater housing diversity in appropriate areas</p> <p>Need to address the issue of housing affordability in the shire and look to create appropriate rezoning of land close to infrastructure to support greater number of residents. Nothing like Doreen but clever environmentally sensitive developments that fit into Nillumbik's way of life. Somewhere I would love to retire!</p>	
19018	Oct 06, 2021, 10:00 PM	1	Protecting the environment at the cost of bushfire and human safety. The council is contradictory on this issue.		
19014	Oct 06, 2021, 09:31 PM	1	I'm concerned the wording of these objectives are masking something deeper. Think c101 & c 81. I have a sneaking suspicion this is a back door attempt to reintroduce something similar which I object to.	No, but how is the council going to improve internet coverage? (Part of key objective 3)	
19013	Oct 06, 2021, 09:29 PM	1	Because they are motherhood statements and it is not clear what it means in real terms	As above	

			Most importantly, protection of the environment and ecology should guide all planning by the Council.
			Also: - Treat the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) as a hard boundary - extension into the Green Wedge is prohibited. - Implement policies to control invasive flora and fauna. -Complexify methods and approach to fire management in a way that is acceptable to or informed by First Nations People stewardship of the land, that is, in a way that is compatible with climate change mitigation and revitalises biodiversity.
19011	Oct 06, 2021, 09:12 PM	1	
			There is nothing about protecting existing rural landholders rights, nothing about rural grazing and hobby farmers. No mention of business, tourism, amenity, or infrastructure in rural areas.
			Yes protection the the rights of rural residents and their rightful use of their land.
19010	Oct 06, 2021, 09:09 PM	1	
			Objective 5.(the first O.5)(see earlier submission on the previous Objectives I didnt realise I couldnt go back into it to add to it!) O 5's sentence reads like something out of the comedy "Utopia" and it may well be trying to fudge what land use will be given priority. I don't like the word "sustainable" : for whom? the farmer, the developer who wants to build a hotel out in the Wedge, or the environmental value of the land: the trees, the understorey, the grasses, the soil and river health, the native fauna? A green wedge must be about the natural environment and whatever is best for it FIRST. This is imperative because I have seen over my lifetime living in the Shire (and formally the Shire of Eltham) the gradual erosion of the Green in the Green Wedge with more and more development, land clearing, huge houses in the Wedge.etc Re O.5 part two Fire risk : I would argue that no development may be the best option in parts of the high fire risk areas as people will be put at risk no matter how much land clearing you allow around a house (and this in turn diminishes the Green in the Wedge as mentioned earlier). Objective 7. This objective is the one where an SLO as mentioned earlier, would be good to protect the aesthetic of the Green Wedge and the use of the word enhance ought not imply "increase" at the expense of natural bushland.
			Re O 5 Part 1:There are too many potential land uses allowed in the Green Wedge of our Shire (and most Green Wedges in Melbourne are completely degraded now) so in order to preserve the last remaining intact Green Wedge in Melbourne, the Planning Scheme must limit land use permits and introduce building envelopes that are enforced and not altered. Only very limited further building ought be permitted, mainly within the rural township boundaries. Once again, it is time the natural environment is put first. I would like to see the word "enhance"" used for the Natural Environment not just the Agricultural land in O.7. Re O.7 An SLO. One more thing not covered here are the rural township plans and boundaries: we must ensure they are included and not expanded, likewise that there ought to remain a hard Urban Growth Boundary: this last point is very important, in fact crucial. Thank you.
19001	Oct 06, 2021, 06:06 PM	1	
			Objective 1.Please delete the word "residences" as it is not applicable to all areas in the Green wedge. O 2. As most of our Green Wedge land is owned privately, the Objective needs to ensure that this land is included in the Objective, not just the land held by the Crown/State/Local Govts. The scheme must therefore, update it's Environmentally Significant Overlays and include a Significant Landscape Overlay applying to the Green Wedge. Local Government must be furnished with the funds to actually manage the Green Wedge land including enforcement of the provisions to protect our flora/fauna and landscapes/waterways, and help for those with rural bush properties to maintain them including weed and feral pest eradication.
			See above already stated plus we need to ensure our waterways are not further degraded: all of them including tributaries, as they are a haven for the platypus and many rare species of frog and are essential for a healthy Green Wedge. We need to make it clear that the land in Christmas Hills that Melbourne/Yarra Valley Water says they no longer need for catchment purposes is not subdivided but remains a part of the precious Green Wedge and in Government hands.
19000	Oct 06, 2021, 05:33 PM	1	
			Key Objective 1 Suggested be revised to read: Recognise the rural areas (land zoned Rural Conservation and Green Wedge) have as their primary purpose the natural environment, rural landscape, natural resource based uses and soil-based agriculture. •My first concern is that referring to ‘sites of environmental’ significance can lead to a narrow focus on Commonwealth significance under the EPBC Act or State significance under the Flora and Fauna Guarantee and the like. My experience is that will be a common default in both consideration of planning scheme amendments and VCAT cases with expert witness down playing environment significance based on may a lack of Commonwealth or State significant species. •My second concern is that reference to the Green Wedge in Nillumbik containing ‘residences’ implies that residential land use is supported in the Green Wedge zones. This is not the case in the RCZ or GWZ and to imply otherwise is contrary to the purposes of those zones. Key Objective 4 •Built form development and associated infrastructure cannot be at the detriment of natural environment and/or lead to the further loss of soil-based agricultural land. Needs to be acknowledgement that rural resident development is not supported in the GWZ or RCZ. There should be a rural building envelope to reduce the risk of fragmentation and rural land uses fundamental to the Green Wedges (e.g. the natural environment and soil-based agriculture) must always be the primary use of the land.
			•Need to ensure that the natural environment and/or existing soil based agriculture are the primary land use in the RCZ and other Green Wedge zones. •Application of design requirements where built form and associated infrastructure is subordinate to the natural environment and/or existing areas of soil based agriculture in the Green Wedges.
18987	Oct 06, 2021, 03:43 PM	1	

		<p>Objective 1: Focusing on defined areas of significance will inevitably lead to the loss of biodiversity within the Shire. All areas of vegetation/habitat are significant and must be protected.</p> <p>Objective 4: The objective should state: Ensure that land use conflict between agricultural and rural residential land will NOT fragment rural land into unviable land parcels</p> <p>Objective 6 re fire? Mitigate? How? Manage fire risk by application of 10/30 OR? Should define or may be interpreted as justification for unchecked vegetation removal.</p>	<p>The protection of the environment and biodiversity should be the priority for all planning in Nillumbik.</p> <p>Recognise Urban Growth Boundary as hard boundary</p> <p>Control invasive plant and feral animals.</p> <p>Prohibit planting of environmental weeds</p>
18986	Oct 06, 2021, 03:34 PM	1	
			<p>Consider adding an objective about recognising and celebrating the multigenerational rural residents. Rural Nillumbik has many families with multi-generational occupancy and use of rural land, mainly agricultural, lifestyle and hobby farming land, and artistic pursuits. These relationships should be encouraged, welcomed, and recognised for cultural and heritage value in rural areas.</p> <p>This theme seems to be continuing the ongoing practice of council over many years to misrepresent ground truth, perpetuate myth and selectively promote some interests over others to suit predominantly urban residents whilst ignoring rural lifestyle grazing and hobby farming residents altogether based on no evidence and for no benefit.</p>
18968	Oct 06, 2021, 08:48 AM	1	<p>Delete Key Objective 1 and replace with this objective – Private land Zoning in rural areas reflects ground truth and is fit for purpose.</p> <p>Zoning in the Nillumbik Green Wedge areas is currently not fit for purpose. Zones imposed on land do not reflect the actual settlement on the ground. 85 per cent of rural residents experience housing insecurity because of this failure. Amending the planning scheme to correct this anomaly will be welcomed by rural residents. Note the Victorian government does not support Nillumbik containing sites of environmental and landscape significance. The state requires significance sites to be identified as significant from a state-wide or regional perspective. Regional planning does not identify significance of landscapes in Nillumbik. State planning doesn't either. A current ground truth assessment would determine if Nillumbik has places with environmental and landscape significance worthy of recognition. There is no current ground truth assessment to inform this.</p> <p>Delete Key Objective 2 and replace with this objective – Nillumbik welcomes and celebrates the diversity of land use of rural green wedge areas.</p> <p>This diversity includes rural agricultural use, and rural lifestyle use including grazing and hobby farming, and bush living. About 20 per cent of Nillumbik and 25 per cent of rural Nillumbik is lifestyle grazing and hobby farming properties. About 25 per cent of Nillumbik is public land, 20 per cent is agricultural land and the balance is lifestyle properties that are bush blocks. Council has a long history of ignoring rural lifestyle grazing and hobby farming residents and the landholdings they own and live on. This does not mean these residents, and their landholdings do not exist. It just means Council would prefer we didn't. The effect of the purposeful alienation is the perception that council does not serve the needs of these residents, and council, and the planning scheme are irrelevant to these residents and their land. If council wants meaningful, equitable, acceptable, and enforceable land use planning, council should acknowledge and celebrate the diversity of land use in rural areas. The green wedge is already protected, and the Victorian government is currently taking steps to enshrine this protection. Council does not need to duplicate what Vic Gov is already doing</p> <p>Delete Key Objective 3 - this recognition serves no useful purpose and does not benefit rural residents or landholdings. It ignores the major infrastructure that is located here (Melbourne's Water purification and storage at Sugarloaf Dam, Melbourne's Power Lines, Melbourne's Water pipelines), and the state assets of significance (Warrandyte State Park). It ignores Victorian government planning to address essential communications and services infrastructure in rural areas.</p> <p>Delete Key objective 4 – there is no land use conflict in Nillumbik. There are few opportunities for further subdivision in</p>

Delete Key Objective 4 – there is no land use conflict in Nillumbik. There are few opportunities for further sub-division in rural Nillumbik. There is little risk of further residential development in Green Wedge areas in Nillumbik (with the possible exceptions of replacement housing in Christmas Hills and potentially some vacant acreage parcels – neither of which is significant). See comments for Objective 2. This objective is based on a misunderstanding of ground truth. Perpetuating the ongoing lie about land use in rural areas does not make it true, it simply perpetuates a lie.

Delete Key Objective 5 (a) – there are no issues of land use conflict, resource use and environmental management arising from diversity of uses in Nillumbik. This misrepresents the truth (again).

Amend Key Objective 5 (b) – support development and management of land in rural areas mitigating fire risk (note delete the word potential – the use of this word is misleading).

Delete Key Objective 6 – This is not a priority for the planning scheme in rural areas and its meaning and application are unclear.

Delete Key Objective 7 – It is not clear what this means. No opinion unless clarity is provided

Delete Key Objective 8 – What does this mean within the context of the planning scheme? Its purpose and application is not clear. The connection to the Green Wedge is not celebrated by rural grazing and hobby farming residents who moved here for lifestyle reasons that council does not appear to welcome, acknowledge, or celebrate. Clarify this or delete it.

			The state government requires the green wedge to cover a range of rural uses	
18956	Oct 05, 2021, 07:04 PM	1		1. That rural landholders should be supported in initiatives to reduce wildfire risk as this benefits not only residents in the rural parts of the green wedge but on the surrounding built up areas. Residents in rural parts of the green wedge should have automatic right to rebuild in the event of fire.
			There is not enough emphasis on liveability and the rights of people to live and live safely on land and in homes within the green wedge.	2. Economic development - there are many more types of economic development that could occur in the green wedge that would attract tourism and jobs without diminishing what makes the green wedge special. Tourism should be a recognised priority in the green wedge with easy approval processes.
18955	Oct 05, 2021, 06:09 PM	1		3. Infrastructure should be a further priority - safer roads, better maintained, more sealed roads (to reduce water turbidity in runoff) and clearing of vegetation along road reserves to enable safe exits for people in the event of wildfire
18950	Oct 05, 2021, 04:23 PM	1		Fails to identify nuisance noise such as uncontrolled barking dogs and noisy recreational vehicles, e.g. toy bikes causing unreasonable disturbance to neighbors and wildlife.
18948	Oct 05, 2021, 04:10 PM	1		Some recreational use, particularly using motor vehicles e.g. toy bikes, cause a high degree of noise and thus nuisance and disturbance to neighbours and wildlife. This activity can last for some hours and involve a gathering of riders
18934	Oct 05, 2021, 01:23 PM	1	It appears that there is still a risk to the integrity of the Green Wedge as it was originally envisioned unless some of these key objectives are clarified and expanded upon. What is a natural resource based activity.....it may be something which has a detrimental effect on the natural environment. The mention of residences may imply that there may be more intrusion into the Green Wedge by future housing. The recognition of the Green Wedge as a valuable and sensitive environment in the protection of native wildlife, vegetation and landscape needs to take precedence over any potential plans to introduce tourism ventures which supposedly allow more people to enjoy the area but ultimately destroy the very environment these ventures set out to encourage people to experience.	All planning in Nillumbik should have the protection of the environment and biodiversity as its overarching guide. This is alluded to in some of the key objectives here but not stated clearly enough. Incremental creep of the built form and other activities (tourism, agriculture) can erode the integrity of the Green Wedge. It is a buffer between urban and country and the Urban Growth corridor should not be allowed to expand into it. There should be an objective to state that the Green Wedge is for all and not just for the benefit of those who choose to live in it and sometimes wish to use it for their own gain. This objective needs to include the importance of preserving it for future generation also.

		<p>Objective 4 is only an acknowledgement of the conflict. For a 30 year plan the objective should outline an intention to either maintain the current balance between rural, residential and Green Wedge or other not to just acknowledge the conflict. The objective need to be more explicit about the planned outcomes for a balance.</p> <p>Objective 3 should be stronger, not just to 'recognise'. The objective should be to work with all levels of government to improve the services for the rural areas. Remembering thta this is a 30 year plan not just a 3 year plan.</p> <p>Objective 8 is too vague and unclear. What does to 'celebrate' mean? Is the Green Wedge currently accessible to all?</p>	<p>More walking tracks through the Green Wedge just as we find in the UK and Europe. These do not need to be concrete paths and not speed tracks for bike use. But for all the community to enjoy the Wedge more access needs to be available.</p>
18933 Oct 05, 2021, 01:15 PM	1	<p>There is a mix of action statements (2,5,51,6,7) and context statements (1,3,4,8) How do you measure success for the latter?</p> <p>Objective 3 how can you have a lack of existing infrastructure? Maybe it could be described "rural areas (with dispersed populations) often have limited infrastructure, including essential services, community facilities and internet coverage"</p>	
18919 Oct 05, 2021, 10:56 AM	1	<p>I agree with 7 and 8 . I believe rural land owners should be assisted by council to maintain property . Not hampered by them.</p>	<p>Yes , the way it's written is to provide a predetermined outcome. You. should work with existing land owners , not alienate them with this garbage</p>
18907 Oct 04, 2021, 10:11 PM	1		
18890 Oct 04, 2021, 05:11 PM	1	<p>Key Objective 1 - Amend to read: "Recognise the rural areas (land zoned Rural Conservation or Green Wedge) contain sites of environmental and landscape significance, natural resource-based activities, residences and diverse activities associated with rural living."</p> <p>Council also needs to acknowledge the people that live, work and play in the green wedge, their families, homes and property infrastructure, businesses, domestic animals and livestock, productive rural land and rural activity.</p> <p>Rural residents are part of the reality, identity and future of the green wedge, so need to be incorporated in this statement or have a dedicated statement recognising this.</p> <p>Key Objective 2: Protect our Green Wedge and its environmental integrity to ensure a safe haven for native wildlife, thriving biodiversity and native vegetation</p> <p>Agree, but the green wedge environment isn't just about native plants and animals and biodiversity does not solely relate to native wildlife and vegetation, it incorporates the entire variety of plants and animals outside the UGB.</p> <p>Key Objective 3: Recognise that the rural areas often lack existing infrastructure, including essential services, community facilities and internet coverage. What is the point of this Objective?</p> <p>Key Objective 4: Acknowledgment of land use conflict between agricultural and rural residential land uses and a risk that further residential development will fragment rural land into unviable land parcels.</p>	<p>ADD New Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Recognise the critical role that land in private ownership plays in underpinning the Green Wedge•Reserve rural activities including general farming, agriculture and the keeping of livestock•Respect and preserve existing use rights on rural land in the Rural Conservation and Green Wedge Zones
18886 Oct 04, 2021, 04:38 PM	1	<p>Where are the stats to justify this statement of land use conflict? How is existing rural residential land in conflict with agricultural land and as there is no provision for new subdivision in the Nillumbik Green Wedge how will it be in the future?</p>	

			<p>Key Objective 1</p> <p>Suggested be revised to read:</p> <p>Recognise the rural areas (land zoned Rural Conservation and Green Wedge) have as their primary purpose the natural environment, rural landscape, natural resource based uses and soil-based agriculture.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•My first concern is that referring to ‘sites of environmental’ significance can lead to a narrow focus on Commonwealth significance under the EPBC Act or State significance under the Flora and Fauna Guarantee and the like. My experience is that will be a common default in both consideration of planning scheme amendments and VCAT cases with expert witness down playing environment significance based on may a lack of Commonwealth or State significant species.•My second concern is that reference to the Green Wedge in Nillumbik containing ‘residences’ implies that residential land use is supported in the Green Wedge zones. This is not the case in the RCZ or GWZ and to imply otherwise is contrary to the purposes of those zones. <p>Key Objective 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Built form development and associated infrastructure cannot be at the detriment of natural environment and/or lead to the further loss of soil-based agricultural land. Needs to be acknowledgement that rural resident development is not supported in the GWZ or RCZ. There should be a rural building envelope to reduce the risk of fragmentation and rural land uses fundamental to the Green Wedges (e.g. the natural environment and soil-based agriculture) must always be the primary use of the land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Need to ensure that the natural environment and/or existing soil based agriculture are the primary land use in the RCZ and other Green Wedge zones.•Application of design requirements where built form and associated infrastructure is subordinate to the natural environment and/or areas already used for existing soil based agriculture in the Green Wedges.•Apply a building envelope to minimise the development footprint in rural areas for built form and associated infrastructure by minimising fragmentation otherwise caused by scattered development.•Review the application of ESO and SLO across the Green Wedge zones in line with Government policy, ensuring enforcement of protections and adequate resourcing.•Requirement for a land management plan for all proposed built developments and their associated infrastructure to ensure the primary use of the land is for natural environment and/or agriculture where cleared land is already available. This is in line with the in conjunction requirement for certain uses that should be applied to all proposed built developments.
18875	Oct 04, 2021, 03:33 PM	1		
18871	Oct 04, 2021, 03:11 PM	1		
18868	Oct 04, 2021, 03:06 PM	1		NO
18862	Oct 04, 2021, 12:08 AM	1	<p>I agree with them, but also I’d like to see a push towards Food Security for Nillumbik with managed growing land servicing the local area.</p>	
18859	Oct 03, 2021, 08:02 PM	1	<p>Objective 1: Needs re-writing so that environmental and landscape values are not minimised and localised by just referring to, "sites of significance". The whole Green Wedge has environmental and landscape significance of varying degrees and planning policies must be designed to protect and enhance the environment and landscape of the whole Green Wedge not just the narrow focus of recognising certain "sites".</p> <p>Objective 3: Needs re-writing so that ambiguity is removed. What is intended by this objective? Lack of infrastructure is what makes a rural area, rural. If the intention is to bring infrastructure provision up to an urban standard, then the potential is for there to be a loss of green wedge values. That must be avoided.</p> <p>Objective 4: Most of Nillumbik's rural land is zoned for conservation, that is why dwellings need permits which are often refused. Further residential development potentially creates conflict with both agriculture and the natural environment. The RCZ discourages rural residential uses.</p> <p>Objective 5: In the context of environmental management and sustainable land use, land management plans should be included as a tool.</p> <p>Objective 5: Development in rural areas must also protect biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective 8: Nillumbik's Green Wedge has value for anybody living outside the shire too. It is a valued resource for Melbourne because of its open space, natural environment, clean air, landscapes etc. This region-wide value must be recognised.in this objective..</p>	<p>There must be an acknowledgement of the various threats, potential and real, which challenge our Green Wedge: i.e. the threat of over-development - rural land is attractive for life-style/ rural residential purposes. There are many small lots already existing from past inappropriate subdivision which are vulnerable to residential applications by those seeking amenity benefits. Small lot development reduces open space and should be discouraged.</p> <p>There should be an objective to retain the Urban Growth Boundary in its current position in Nillumbik, including the firm intention to resist any weakening of development controls around the UGB.</p> <p>Where development is allowed, use should be made of building envelope requirements to confine the impact of development.</p>

18853	Oct 02, 2021, 02:20 PM	1	<p>Natural resource-based activities, including agriculture, must not be to the detriment of the environment, and must actively work to enhance the health and abundance of indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>Recognise that the preservation of the green wedge, protection of biodiversity, and action on climate change, hold the greatest value – and are therefore top priority - for the Nillumbik Community.</p> <p>(Consistent with the findings from the Our People, Our Place, Our Future community consultation)</p> <p>1. Natural resource-based activities, including agriculture, must not be to the detriment of the environment, and must actively work to enhance the health and abundance of indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>Recognise that the preservation of the green wedge, protection of biodiversity, and action on climate change, hold the greatest value – and are therefore top priority - for the Nillumbik Community.</p> <p>(Consistent with the findings from the Our People, Our Place, Our Future community consultation)Referring to the Green Wedge in Nillumbik containing ‘residences’ implies that residential land use is supported in the Green Wedge zones. This is not the case in the RCZ or GWZ and to imply otherwise is contrary to the purposes of those zones.</p> <p>3. Recognise that the rural areas often lack infrastructure, including essential services, community facilities and internet coverage, and explore options for enabling community connections.’</p> <p>4. Development cannot be to the detriment of the environment and/or lead to further loss of existing agricultural land.</p> <p>5. The management of conflicting land-use, resource use and environmental management, is done through the development, enforcement and ongoing review of land management plans, in conjunction with environmental protection strategies and enforcement. These processes must be adequately resourced.</p> <p>6. Development should only proceed where the proposed development meets the first principle of avoiding and minimising loss of native vegetation.</p> <p>All development in rural areas minimises potential fire risk in a way which is acceptable to, and compatible with, First Nations People’s stewardship of the land, as well as being compatible with Climate Change mitigation and preservation of biodiversity.</p> <p>8. Whilst ensuring agricultural practices employ sustainable and regenerative practices, protect the Green Wedge and reinvigorate biodiversity.</p>	
18849	Oct 02, 2021, 02:01 PM	1	<p>Most important is (2). The object of the green wedge is to prevent further loss of habitat and environment for indigenous flora and fauna.</p>	<p>Conservation of habitat is not really addressed. Conflict between rural use and residential use is considered, but not how rural and residential use can affect the preservation of endangered species in the area.</p>
18827	Oct 01, 2021, 12:20 PM	1	<p>Objective 3 written as it is can open Pandora’s box re rural development. I understand the need with working from home for better and wider intranet coverage but not for heaps of wine bars or restaurants to flood the district.</p> <p>There is nothing about illegal dumping that should be included.</p>	

		This is a deceptive documents with political speak that does not actually address what you are undertaking, namely threatening land holders with impossible restrictions. You couch in flowery language that conceals an agenda to make life miserable for land holders, and htat is shameful and dishonest	Yes. Planning permits are often dependent on a range of impossible restrictions dictated by an ultra green agenda "Sorry we wont pass that application as the proposed residence may impact the flight path of a parrot" and other such insane restrictions While at the same time you the Ultra green lobby will allow invasive species like Bergan to completely take over at the expense of indigenous species creating a massive fire hazard Meanwhile you have allocated vast sums of money to grossly over priced and ridiculous infrastructure spending
18820	Oct 01, 2021, 07:28 AM	1	
18752	Sep 29, 2021, 06:54 PM	1	Need to make sure that the Green Wedge is not reduced as it is the important area to keep the rural area
			Expanding on existing areas / pockets of natural wildlife remnants.eg Eltham copper butterfly. Regenerate areas of degraded land.
18705	Sep 27, 2021, 10:50 AM	1	Develop covenant schemes to set aside Wildlife land areas in perpetuity.
18642	Sep 26, 2021, 06:35 PM	1	Areas protected from development retaining a large green wedge. Main Road through Diamond Creek is suffering major congestion at peak hours and needs urgent attention. Current MPs ineffective. Perhaps with new eyes we may see real improvement in Diamond Creek for starters. Eltham community hospital proposed to be in an area where traffics is a nightmare during peak times.
			Additional Comments to Key Objective 1 Preservation of the Green Wedge land needs to be recognised as a top priority for Nillumbik. Any residential land use in the Green Wedge zones must not be detrimental to the stated purposes and requirements of the zones. Natural resource based activities, including agriculture, must actively work to enhance the health and biodiversity of the local environment. Key Objective 4 Any residential land use and development in the Green Wedge zones must not be detrimental to the local environment and/or lead to further loss of existing agricultural land.
18630	Sep 26, 2021, 05:15 PM	1	Preservation of the Green Wedge environment and diversity needs to be recognised as defining all related planning in Nillumbik. The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) must be locked down as a defined boundary to protect Green Wedge area from inappropriate development and uses.
			Objectives 1, 3, 4, & 8 are not objectives but statements. Objective 2 where is the protection of human life. Objective 4 - I think this objective is built on a false premise. I do not believe there is a conflict between agriculture and the majority of residents in the Green Wedge. Objective 5 - there are two objective 5's. It should be stated clearly what the perceived land use conflicts are. This is not clearly stated therefore the objective cannot be agreed or disagreed with. Objective 7 - is their a priority here ?
18368	Sep 19, 2021, 05:44 PM	1	Why is the requirement to put an email omitted from this submission?
			I only agree with objective 3. I disagree with all the others as the measures that are already in place are sufficient for our thriving green wedge
18355	Sep 19, 2021, 04:00 PM	1	How about allowing land owners to make their own property fire safe
			Land holders require a greater say as to how the land can be used and developed. Many topics touch on further development causing the green wedge to be at Risk, however we do require some better utilization of existing lot sizes so that we can increase funding to provide the infrastructure and services. example area in plenty 3090 west of Gorge, east of McClennans Road where lot sizes could be further reduced to 4000m2 to assist with greater land use while still maintaining the semi rural green wedge setting. This area is close to the current 40000m2 plenty strategic plan scheme zone so integrating the 2 areas would not be such a difficult objective.
18329	Sep 18, 2021, 02:22 PM	1	
18293	Sep 17, 2021, 01:36 PM	1	

			Recognise human induced climate change as a real current and increasing threat to the existing biological systems within the Shire and on which humans ultimately depend.
		Objective Use 6 should say 'Avoid insensitive use and development ...	Review all planning issues with the long-term view that without climate considerations climatic events of increasingly impact will render short-term planning decisions obsolete.
18274 Sep 16, 2021, 11:08 PM	1	The wording of the objectives is clearly biased and does not represent what rate payers want from the green wedge. The focus is conservation with little regard for the rights or desires of the people that live in the area and pay the rates that support it. The key objectives should be to support those living in the green wedge through the provision of services to ensure that their properties are fire safe. That erosion is limited by managing water runoff from roads before it enters private property. By enabling people to remove dead trees that are a risk to people and property without the need to pay for expensive reports and permits.	Do not confuse land clearing as being a fire mitigation measure in the long term. Excessive Clearing exacerbates climate instability. Carbon sequestration must be a suitable and measurable pursuit of all land owners through Carbon credits. Call for a National Framework for agricultural land use.
18272 Sep 16, 2021, 10:55 PM	1		
18260 Sep 16, 2021, 07:04 PM	1		
		Objective 4 is outdated as modern techniques such as hydroponic gardening can be done on much smaller sites Does not allow for solar or wind farms	Review objective 4
18231 Sep 16, 2021, 03:59 PM	1		
		There seems to be an implicit, and indeed explicit, theme that the Green Wedge will impact on future development (= subdivision). However, it is my understanding that the boundaries of the Wedge have been established within legislation. In other words, there will not be any subdivision or development within that area. Thus there will not be further fragmentation or loss of areas of environmental or landscape importance, nor will there be any future conflict between opposing interests.	It is clear that council are quite happy to promote platitudes which supposedly 'protect' the environment, its flora and fauna. However, in practice, council are quite happy to allow road development without attempting to reduce numbers of trees removed (Yan Yean Road, stage 1 redevelopment) or to 'sell' reserved parkland to the CFA for station development (the old site being an area which was to revert to parkland although council now appear to be wanting to commercialise it). Equally council are quite prepared to suggest that another government agency obtain listed parkland (presumably at a price) for building and associated areas for provision of carparks, also in the listed parkland area (VHBA proposal). Only after considerable public outcry have council now decided to further investigate the matter, even though the site selection itself was contrary to selection criteria and appropriate background information (e.g. regarding transport, traffic, parking) was unavailable (and indeed has not yet been obtained). The gap that is needed to be filled within this theme is a requirement for council to be accountable for its actions and lack of actions. Council must, having promoted parkland, make sure that development of such areas is not a random event.
18227 Sep 16, 2021, 02:48 PM	1	Yes, but for objective 7, I stand strongly for the upkeep of the remnant endemic bush land. It is a precious resource that is under threat from Weeds which are spread by horse droppings from riders using 'significant roadside' verges and increasing numbers of residents in newly subdivided lands. I must also say the newish system of walking tracks in the panton hill region is very well done. Thank-you	
18223 Sep 16, 2021, 01:40 PM	1		
		Seems limited in scope to preserve rather than expand, noting the loss of green wedges far outstrips the preservation means we are not enhancing for the future.	Ways to increase green wedge, have land limits so that a lot for agriculture must have a percentage of land with corridors preserved for green wedge purposes. Greater regulation or focus on organic agriculture
18222 Sep 16, 2021, 11:25 AM	1		
		Much of the 'rural' land is not suitable for agriculture so subdivision into smaller blocks would not have any effect.	Considered subdivision has occurred in some parts of an area but not others. Yarrambat has mixed size blocks from 1 acre through to 30 acres. When Yan Yean Road Section 2 is completed Council must look at the delayed Yarrambat Township plan.
18219 Sep 16, 2021, 11:02 AM	1		

					<p>Rural landowners look after their properties! We don't want to be told what we can and can't do on them! If I want to use round up then I ships be allowed to as it isn't a federally banned product! I think NSC is listening to city folk and greenies who want all land returned to bush! Time to sit up and listen to the people that live on the land to find out what we love about it and not look at us like we're at war!</p> <p>I spend a lot of money rejuvenating soil, weed control, preventing erosion, working on drainage, getting rid of rabbits and foxes, ensuring water for my animals as well as wildlife and caring for the area that we call home!</p> <p>Do I see council doing the same or even govt departments who contain reserves? No! They rely on us to do their work! I dig out thistles and blackberries all the time! We mow an area to keep the grass down for fire prevention on crown land, if we didn't then who would?</p> <p>There's more to us rural landowners than meets the eye! Stop wanting to control us and accept that I will have grass for my horses and chooks! But note I share the grass with the kangaroos and deer as well as rabbits! We care about our land and that's why we live here!</p>
18143	Sep 12, 2021, 05:09 AM	1			
18125	Sep 11, 2021, 12:57 PM	1			
				<p>They seem to be very restrictive and I really don't like the use of the word' conflict' as it sounds like your at war with rural landowners and it feels like it too!</p>	
18121	Sep 11, 2021, 06:46 AM	1		<p>Key object five and five. Seriously get it right, ambiguities in every statement made on this rubbish document. Stop trying to get a mandate through stealth. Give us real policy that is clear and honest in its intent.</p>	
18118	Sep 11, 2021, 06:34 AM	1		<p>Because it is unclear in its intent and out come for land owners. No details just a bunch of slogans</p>	<p>Land owners rights to exist interact and maintain a save living environment on THEIR land.</p>
					<p>The Green Wedge is but an area within the Shire and, while deserving of attention, is no different - people live, work and enjoy the space they occupy. There are environmental protection initiatives in other areas (road surfaces, kerbing, drainage, etc) that would be of benefit to protect the 'values' of the land within the wedge that can be done now if you want to protect the amenity of the area.</p>
18100	Sep 10, 2021, 02:20 PM	1		<p>Key Objective 3 Recognise that the rural areas often lack existing infrastructure. Including essential services, community facilities and internet coverage. Internet Coverage would seem a long stretch as most / all of the Shire would be either nbn Fixed Line or nbn Wireless (which means ADSL still available) with the exception of very small pockets that may be in black spots in which case there are other solutions available.</p> <p>Key Objective 4 Acknowledgment of land use conflict between agricultural and rural residential land uses and a risk that further residential development will fragment rural land into unviable land parcels. Viable implies the current landowner sees benefit in continuing his/her current activity. If that is not the case, and there is no one willing to continue the current practice, then rather than becoming fallow/unmaintained then smaller residential plots (could still be significant size, e.g., greater than 2 ha) would see, a better solution for the community and the environment.</p> <p>Key Objective 5 Manage the issues of land use conflict, resource use and environmental management arising from the diversity of uses through sustainable land use and natural resource management.</p> <p>Key Objective 5 Ensure development in rural areas mitigates potential fire risk. The greater risk is posed by the Urban interface and management should be directed more to this given the limited budget the Council have for fire mitigation activities.</p> <p>Key Objective 6 Avoid sensitive use and development on land that contains or may contain unacceptable levels of soil contamination, unless testing and necessary remedial treatment have been undertaken. Advocate to State Government to undertake Shire Wide testing and analysis of contaminated land. Would seem to be an expense the Council wish to apply to residents/users that far exceed what is expected elsewhere and there is no guidance as to the cost benefit - "or may contain" is extraordinarily wide.</p> <p>Key Objective 7</p>	

Key Objective 7
Protect and enhance agricultural land for both its productive potential and environmental value. Enhance is a vague and potentially expensive aspirational goal and open to misuse.

Key Objective 8
Our connection to the Green Wedge is celebrated by all who live, work or enjoy their time in it.
Such a motherhood statement should apply to all areas of the Shire, not simply the Green Wedge, as there are publicly accessible areas everywhere for "enjoying their time"

		No positive objectives exist for human inhabitants of the Green wedge I am talking about the long suffering humans that have been custodians of the Green Wedge since its inception We who have battled with vermin such as rabbits, deer, blackberry, NZ tea trees and cape weed which we did not introduce Due to restrictions on culling tea trees because they were wrongly assessed as being native we now face hectares of tea trees just waiting for an inferno. No help from the Nillumbik council yet our rates are astronomical.	Existing residents of over 30 years are faced with limitations that were not present when they purchased pre 1990 It's all well and good to accept the new limitations if you are buying into the area. If you don't like it don't buy in. However what about existing owners who bought when restrictions were much laxer. Sure we can sell and move but at a deflated price. Our properties have been devalued by the restrictions imposed. These restrictions were largely imposed on us without regard for our financial welfare.
18080 Sep 09, 2021, 09:44 PM	1		
			Cap green wedge landowners rates. Acreage is expensive to maintain and rates have become exorbitant as land value increases. All residents enjoy the green wedge environment but the land owners pay for that attraction mostly without getting any financial income from their property.
18078 Sep 09, 2021, 07:04 PM	1		
		2, 4, 5 & 7. Objective 5 is duplicated. Council should focus on existing residents and not make conditions more challenging to people that currently live in the green wedge.	Quality of life and conditions for current residents without changes that are onerous and change the fundamentals of why people chose to live where they do.
18073 Sep 09, 2021, 04:48 PM	1		
		4 - we pay the highest rates in Victoria to live in Nillumbik yet objective 4 appears to enshrine those in the rural areas with 'what the Green Wedge is about'. The rest of us in Eltham and built up areas apparently can pull our heads in and live with development as I read the objective.	There should be options for planned large lot residential development anywhere in the shire.
18068 Sep 09, 2021, 02:41 PM	1		

Heritage, Arts And Culture

Title/Question: Heritage, Arts and Culture
 Tool Type: Form
 Activity ID: 315
 Report Date Range: 9 Sep 2021 - 21 Oct 2021
 Date Exported: 26 Oct 2021 10:09 am

Contribution ID	Date Submitted	Do you agree with the identified key objective? If not, which objective(s) and why?			With consideration of objectives in the other themes, can you identify any gaps in this theme that the MPS should consider?
		Yes	No	Unsure	
19310	Oct 21, 2021, 11:14 PM		1		I cld like to see an inclusion of Aboriginal participants in arts programs giving opportunity for Aboriginal voices to be a significant part of arts and culture programs. Recognition and protection of archaeological sites is important but the meeting of our community with Aboriginal people is essential to us belonging to the present and future engagement with First Nations.
19304	Oct 21, 2021, 09:20 PM		1		
19276	Oct 21, 2021, 01:13 PM			1	Key objective 4 needs to be our Key objective 1 It is important that we pay respect to original aboriginal custodians of the Nillumbik region which we do. However looking to the future we need to be more inclusive and the overarching importance is for ALL our community members to share in our celebration of the arts in all its forms music, painting, sculpture and dance etc . Those identifying as aboriginal would no doubt be encouraged to participate and be celebrated. I fully support the PALS submission
19205	Oct 19, 2021, 08:37 AM				For far more than 50 years Nillumbik has 'free loaded' upon the efforts especially of one private arts endeavour - Montsalvat. Nillumbik already has a well located central site - the former Eltham shire offices which, being close the library is eminently suitable to form the key focus for our shires arts and cultural activities going forward into the next 50 years. I call upon our Council to undertake a feasibility study to investigate how Nillumbik's own arts centre might be achieved.

19172 Oct 14, 2021, 10:03 PM	1	<p>1 & 2. Suggest rewording and use as overarching objective: Recognise the land, waterways and all life they sustain are central to the cultural values of First Nations Peoples. As such, their value must be recognised and protected throughout the Shire, not just in specific sites.</p> <p>3. Suggest this objective is listed first</p>	<p>Suggested overarching objective that recognises the land, waterways and all life they sustain are central to the cultural values of First Nations Peoples. As such their value must be recognised and protected throughout the Shire. Consideration of heritage includes natural heritage. Succession tree planting must be a vital consideration. It makes visible the course of time, it sustains our cultural values and identity, the aesthetics of nature enriches quality of life and connection between people.</p> <p>All Council arts collections reflect the diversity of the community.</p> <p>Alternate building materials that are environmentally sensitive and reflect the character of Nillumbik, such as mud bricks, should be protected and encouraged.</p> <p>Buildings that reflect history and local values are maintained, celebrated, and heritage listed.</p>
19072 Oct 07, 2021, 11:48 PM		<p>Although long overdue, do have concerns regarding the focus on Aboriginal heritage in objectives 1,2 & 3. Believe that sites of significance need to be fully explored and acknowledged, whilst balancing the heritage significance to post-colonial communities in the Shire. ie. the promotion of one should not be at the detriment of another.</p> <p>1 Key objectives 4 & 5 are more inclusive of our community.</p>	

19071 Oct 07, 2021, 11:25 PM		<p>Struggle with the first 3 objectives, as think this is a very personal journey for people and that State Planning and existing planning ensures sites of Aboriginal significance are identified and protected. Not sure how MPS can do more. Objective 2 is very broad and potentially has huge ramifications. Objective 3 is impossible for majority of people to understand and honestly take on board. Not sure how this fits in with MPS.</p> <p>Objective 4 - "shared heritage" difficult concept - none of us have identical heritage - does this strengthen our community? Think at best we can appreciate the heritage, history and artistic culture of Nillumbik - we might even enjoy it!!!</p> <p>Objective 5 - great - but where can we go? and how is planning going to help this? eg I would like to open a gallery in my shed on my rural property, I have parking and a toilet, is it a goer? or I want to make baskets in my shed and sell</p> <p>1 them to public, will planning help me?</p>		
		<p>Suggest objective 3 is listed first and takes primacy over the others</p> <p>Suggest rewording of current Objective 1 and use as overarching objective: Recognise the land, waterways and all life they sustain are central to the cultural values of First Nations Peoples. As such, their value must be recognised and protected throughout the Shire, not just in specific sites.</p>	<p>Other suggestions for consideration as objectives Consideration of heritage includes natural heritage. Succession tree planting must be a vital consideration. It makes visible the course of time, it sustains our cultural values and identity, the aesthetics of nature enriches quality of life and connection between people.</p> <p>All Council arts collections reflect the diversity of the community.</p> <p>Alternate building materials that are environmentally sensitive and reflect the character of Nillumbik, such as mud bricks, are be protected and encouraged.</p>	
19066 Oct 07, 2021, 10:00 PM	1	<p>Obj 2 Again not just limit to specific sites.</p> <p>Key Objective 1, 2 and 3 is already achieved through the application of aboriginal heritage overlays across much of the shire. It is not required.it should be mentioned Key Objective 4 – is nice but does not say anything much and has no place in the planning scheme. Key Objective 5 – agree – and again, it’s nice – but it has no place in the planning scheme</p>	<p>Buildings that reflect history and local values are maintained, celebrated, and heritage listed.</p>	
18977 Oct 06, 2021, 09:06 AM	1		<p>this statement is supposed to describe the area and it's priorities and heritage to inform planning permit applications</p>	

18954 Oct 05, 2021, 05:12 PM	1	<p>There need to be further inclusions. Aboriginal culture could be taught in our local schools. Performing Arts are important. There needs to be just as much money and emphasis put on performing arts....music, drama, as there currently is on sporting facilities in the Shire.</p> <p>More information is needed about all our artists, past and present , literary, visual, performing.</p>	<p>There needs to be readily available information about all our heritageFirst Nations and settlers. Natural environment and its inspirations for artistshence another reason to protect and preserve our native fauna and flora.</p>
18942 Oct 05, 2021, 02:34 PM	1		
18932 Oct 05, 2021, 12:37 PM	1	The acronym OPOPOF should be spelt out	
18911 Oct 04, 2021, 10:28 PM	1		
18899 Oct 04, 2021, 06:25 PM	1		
18894 Oct 04, 2021, 05:18 PM	1		
		Additional Comments to	
		Key Objective 2 to instead read: Ensure new use and development do not impede on or detract from all sites of heritage significance, including sites and features of Aboriginal cultural heritage and archaeological significance.	
		Key Objective 4 Actively promote valuing of all of our local history, including the study of cultural and social past events in a local context. 1,2 and 3 are already being covered. Now you've changed the recognition speech with such violent language I disagree to it being spoken everywhere like it is now.	
18840 Oct 01, 2021, 04:59 PM	1		
18364 Sep 19, 2021, 04:29 PM	1		<p>There could be greater emphasis on supporting new art in developments and upgrades (e.g. murals in retaining walls at new footy facility).</p>
18349 Sep 18, 2021, 11:12 PM			<p>I firmly believe that architecture is art and the objectives could include an objective to encourage more architecture and landscape architecture in the shire. There are SOOOOO many very average housing developments going up (and a few better ones) and I think that with higher quality architecture the housing stock of the shire could be elevated which would have creative benefits for residents.</p>
18241 Sep 16, 2021, 04:24 PM	1		<p>Support the local arts, crafts and artisan industries wherever possible</p>

Housing

Title/Question: Housing
Tool Type: Form
Activity ID: 309
Report Date Range: 9 Sep 2021 - 21 Oct 2021
Date Exported: 26 Oct 2021 09:44 am

Contribution ID	Date Submitted	Do you agree with the identified key objectives?			If not, which objective(s) and why?	With consideration of objectives in the other themes, can you identify any gaps in this theme that the MPS should consider?
		Yes	No	Unsure		
19300	Oct 21, 2021, 08:57 PM			1	<p>All of them. This is all worded towards sub divisions of existing properties. I don’t agree with this. Higher density development is not an ideal way forward and does not get my approval.</p> <p>I have reservations about the words "medium density housing". If there is a need for more housing in the residential areas, not too far away from the shops etc, I would encourage in-fill, ie a second dwelling built in what could have been the back garden of the original house. This would need to be in keeping with the height & style of the neighbourhood properties. I heard recently that there was a proposal to build many units on a block in Taylor Street Eltham, even up to 3 storeys. This was quite unacceptable as the houses in that street are either single or double storey, not 3 storeys.</p> <p>Key objective 3 is very important. The lovely Eltham character must be maintained - leafy, green, low rise. If there is a need for more housing, it should be a very modest increase. Liveability is very precious & can be easily lost by inappropriate & excessive development.</p>	<p>Where is the discussion about parks, gardens, wildlife corridors or schools. Bus routes, footpaths and all the other things the shore needs.</p>
19292	Oct 21, 2021, 05:34 PM			1	<p>Key Objective 3 states ensuring a ' considered approach'....etc.. What exactly does this really mean?.</p> <p>Council has often promoted that it encourages and supports mud brick home construction to blend with its natural environment. Does it really?</p> <p>In reality Council officers have for more than 20 years actively discouraged this practice from ratepayers first contact at the counter..</p> <p>Ratepayers attending Council have repeatedly been told that they would never receive a building permit using mud brick construction as it would never receive an adequate energy rating.This advice is incorrect as using such means as double glazing,high performance insulation,gap sealing etc.an acceptable energy rating can be achieved.</p> <p>Council has also pursued one of only two Nillumbik mud brick makers from site to site from Hurstbridge to Christmas hills insisting it was not a permitted 'industry'. He has ceased making bricks and very few mud brick houses have been built in Nillumbik over the past 20 years..</p> <p>Nillumbik mudbrick association can elaborate further.</p>	<p>Council planners need to have both planning qualifications and practical experience (not just a knowledge of regulations and controls,) and are prepared to work with ratepayers to achieve their goals. More cooperation is needed.</p>
19287	Oct 21, 2021, 03:28 PM			1		<p>Maybe look to attract younger people (say, 18-35) to Nillumbik so there's more diversity in our population. This isn't just housing per se, but it's good to keep demographics in mind.</p>
19284	Oct 21, 2021, 02:19 PM		1			<p>Accessibility and disability also seem to be missing from these themes, or at least, aren't playing a big enough role as they should be.</p>
19199	Oct 19, 2021, 08:27 AM				<p>i fully endorse the PALS submission</p>	<p>We should understand by now that disability and accessibility cannot be an afterthought.</p>
19166	Oct 14, 2021, 09:37 PM			1	<p>2. If the intention is to retain vegetation which creates local character, housing growth must not only be directed to activity centres, but restricted to these.</p> <p>Note: As currently expressed, the objectives do not address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the need to protect and increase the urban tree canopy in urban areas to mitigate the impact of increasing temperature with global warming, and ongoing loss to date. <p>There needs to be an urgent focus on residential areas where consolidation and subdivision of large lots and increasing density of dwellings is taking place and tree cover, mid storey vegetation and herbaceous ground cover is being lost. (see also Climate Change Theme)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The need to avoid housing growth and sensitive land uses within and in proximity to bushfire prone areas. <p>This is Strategy 87 in the draft Regional Northern Metro Land Use Plan and goes on to say: In order to prioritise the protection of human life from bushfire, population growth and development should be directed to low risk locations and areas that can be safely evacuated.</p>	<p>Planning for housing within ALL of Nillumbik, the Green Wedge Shire, requires retention and increase of indigenous tree canopies and understorey.</p> <p>(Reflecting the community priorities as defined in “Our People Our Place Our Future”)</p> <p>Suggested additional objectives</p> <p>In urban areas, introduce ‘Biodiversity Sensitive Urban Design.</p> <p>Development of an overall Nillumbik Urban Forestry Strategy that looks at residential, parks, streetscapes, industrial and commercial areas. Noting that urban in this context refers to the whole of the municipality not just the areas zoned urban in the planning scheme. This is consistent with Living Melbourne that was followed by an Urban Forest Strategy for the whole Greater Melbourne Metropolitan Area and is referenced in the draft Regional Northern Metro Land Use Plan.</p> <p>Any increases in building density around activity centres are not to the detriment of environmental values, require significant plantings of indigenous flora, and are ‘offset’ by a decrease in what is permissible in the suburban context around those centres, so as to be able to retain and maintain tree canopy for a sustainable future.</p>

19126	Oct 11, 2021, 11:45 AM	1	As currently expressed, the objectives do not address: <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The need to protect and increase the urban tree canopy in urban areas to mitigate the impact of increasing temperature with global warming, and ongoing loss to date. There needs to be an urgent focus on residential areas where consolidation and subdivision of large lots and increasing density of dwellings is taking place and tree cover, mid storey vegetation and herbaceous ground cover is being lost. (see also Climate Change Theme)•The need to avoid housing growth and sensitive land uses within and in proximity to bushfire prone areas. This is Strategy 87 in the draft Regional Northern Metro Land Use Plan and goes on to say: In order to prioritise the protection of human life from bushfire, population growth and development should be directed to low risk locations and areas that can be safely evacuated.	Planning for housing within ALL of Nillumbik, the Green Wedge Shire, requires retention and increase of indigenous tree canopies and understorey. (Reflecting the community priorities as defined in “Our People Our Place Our Future”)
			Why reduce house sizes? Some people like to live on a bit of land to get away from all of the stressors in life. Reducing house sizes will only make the Nillumbik Shire just like every other estate. Boring houses with no freedom	Leave the houses
				Encourage minimum 2 bedrooms for accessible medium density accommodation. People with disability or who are frail often need a room for carers and family support
19110	Oct 10, 2021, 01:30 PM	1		
19075	Oct 08, 2021, 07:36 AM	1		Note: As currently expressed, the objectives do not address: <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The need to protect and increase the urban tree canopy in urban areas to mitigate the impact of increasing temperature with global warming, and ongoing loss to date. There needs to be an urgent focus on residential areas where consolidation and subdivision of large lots and increasing density of dwellings is taking place and tree cover, mid storey vegetation and herbaceous ground cover is being lost. (see also Climate Change Theme)•The need to avoid housing growth and sensitive land uses within and in proximity to bushfire prone areas. This is Strategy 87 in the draft Regional Northern Metro Land Use Plan and goes on to say: In order to prioritise the protection of human life from bushfire, population growth and development should be directed to low risk locations and areas that can be safely evacuated.
19055	Oct 07, 2021, 07:05 PM	1	Obj 2 If the intention is to retain vegetation which creates local character, housing growth must not only be "directed" to activity centres, but restricted to these.	Suggest an additional overarching objective Planning for housing within ALL of Nillumbik, the Green Wedge Shire, requires retention and increase of indigenous tree canopies and understorey. (Reflecting the community priorities as defined in “Our People Our Place Our Future”)
				Suggested additional objectives In urban areas, introduce 'Biodiversity Sensitive Urban Design. Development of an overall Nillumbik Urban Forestry Strategy that looks at residential, parks, streetscapes, industrial and commercial areas. Noting that urban in this context refers to the whole of the municipality not just the areas zoned urban in the planning scheme. This is consistent with Living Melbourne that was followed by an Urban Forest Strategy for the whole Greater Melbourne Metropolitan Area and is referenced in the draft Regional Northern Metro Land Use Plan.
				Any increases in building density around activity centres are not to the detriment of environmental values, require significant plantings of indigenous flora, and are 'offset' by a decrease in what is permissible in the suburban context around those centres, so as to be able to retain and maintain tree canopy for a sustainable future.
19044	Oct 07, 2021, 06:31 PM	1	Objectives 1 2 & 3: medium density housing should be kept to a minimum where possible; development density should be controlled to preference small projects rather than larger 1 or multi-story developments	Aging in place should be considered
19033	Oct 07, 2021, 05:12 PM	1	Objective 1. Given the pandemic and the huge rise in house prices in Melbourne, I would query the assumptions behind the call in this section to allow for more medium density. Many households I am aware of are filled to the brim with adult children (and their partners at times) as the cost of housing is beyond the young. Building more apartments in Eltham and Diamond Creek will not alleviate this trend as they are always too costly. Social housing (government housing) is going to have to become a part of the mix. It is true that some older people want to move into smaller dwellings, but most want to remain where they are.	-The interpretation of the current scheme has allowed for a higher density within 500 metres of the Main Road through Eltham to the north of the Activity Centre. To the south of the Activity Centre the road and development along it, is somewhat protected by the Gateway provisions and I would like similar consideration to be given to Main Road to the north or we are going to bleed into Research and the treed nature of Eltham is under constant threat in this area.
			O.2. Another weasel word "Direct" housing growth to Activity Centres, doesn't prevent rampant growth elsewhere and we must make sure in this MPS, that there really is a meaningful tradeoff that we were promised when we agreed to Activity Centre Zones with greater density/height than we'd ever seen, that we really will limit development outside those areas.	-Signage is but one aspect along this stretch of road that needs to be put under the same rules as the Gateway. It is such an unaesthetic look arriving back in Eltham from a drive up to Kangaroo Ground and does nothing to lure tourists. -Tree protection in the MPS for the large remaining trees along Main Road Eltham and other roads in the Shire. -Developments ought not be permitted to build on more than 50% of a block, rather than the current 60%, to enable some garden and tree space. -An 8 metre setback from the frontage ought to apply regardless of whether the existing house that may be pulled down, is closer than that to the front. -Activity Centre development frontages ought to be increased.
				Its great to build new houses in an area like wattle glen this area must change from looking old, poor, dark unsafe, bush like an old school town huge development required
19024	Oct 07, 2021, 03:00 AM	1		

					New housing construction to be subject to ESD principles.
				Objective 2 - expressly add that housing growth to be directed AWAY from vegetated suburban and rural areas where loss of vegetation (for aesthetic and habitat reasons) would occur as a result of increase in housing density.	Limited housing with NO parking requirements should be permitted within the activity centres to allow for better building design on very small lots, thus catering for the future where automated motor vehicles might be shared/hired.
					Emphasis needs to be on diversity - meeting the needs of the community (e.g. supply of 1-2 bedroom dwellings).
19009	Oct 06, 2021, 08:34 PM	1			New housing to be integrated with indigenous vegetation and a program of succession planting.
					Housing should be expressly directed away from rural areas and towards denser urban areas at the scale of medium density infill housing, to prevent urban sprawl, which is bad for the environment and will also worsen traffic. Biodiversity sensitive urban design is implemented and trees and flora are protected and proliferated - this is very important and not yet addressed in the objectives. ESD principles are always applied to housing (passive design, renewable energy, low-embodied energy materials, etc.) Parking is reduced and minimal.
19008	Oct 06, 2021, 08:32 PM	1			<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Need to protect the urban tree canopy in urban to mitigate the impact of increasing temperature in urban areas with global warming, with an urgent focus on residential areas where consolidation in existing urban areas where subdivision of large lots and increasing density of dwellings is taking place and treecover is being lost. .•Development of an overall Nillumbik Urban Forestry Strategy that looks at residential, parks, streetscapes, industrial and commercial areas. Urban in this context refers to the whole of the municipality not just the areas zoned urban in the planning scheme. This is consistent with Living Melbourne that was following by an Urban Forest Strategy for the whole Greater Melbourne Metropolitan Area and is referenced in the draft Regional Northern Metro Land Use Plan (p123).•Need to avoid housing growth and sensitive land uses within and in proximity to bushfire prone areas. This is Strategy 87 in the draft Regional Northern Metro Land Use Plan and goes on to say: In order to prioritise the protection of human life from bushfire, population growth and development should be directed to low risk locations and areas that can be safely evacuated. Development within areas of the highest bushfire risk must achieve acceptable levels of risk reduction. These areas should be avoided for development that will accommodate more vulnerable populations, such as elderly or very young, that may have difficulties evacuating in the event of bushfire.
18990	Oct 06, 2021, 03:48 PM	1		This is all urban and is irrelevant to rural areas and residents. Rural housing needs are not considered by Council in this, or any other council document. Note this reinforces the perception that council is unable to acknowledge and serve the needs of rural communities, and specifically rural lifestyle grazing and hobby farming communities and agricultural communities. If council were to decide it had an interest in serving rural communities, consideration of existing and historic multi-generational land management and use would require council to acknowledge these communities, and their need to accommodate secondary dwellings to facilitate growing and ageing in place options, and ongoing needs for property management in bushfire prone areas and areas covered by bushfire management overlay. This would be welcomed by these communities.	There is a gap in the MPS which is providing housing security and sustainability of rural lifestyle grazing and hobby farming residents or demonstrating any ability to recognise or accommodate long term multi generational land occupancy here - council does not serve the needs of rural communities at all well
18971	Oct 06, 2021, 08:53 AM	1			
				Objectives seem ok but the devil is always in the detail and how Council goes on interprets an objective will be to their agenda. If you use the legal assumption as a reasonable person thinks then it should be balanced and not favouring any one lobby group i.e pro developer pro green.	Why is there no mention of rural residential development in this theme?.It is in the MPS under 'housing" and incorrectly states "Residential settlement in rural areas is usually based on an appreciation of the bush and often a willingness to revegetate previously cleared areas" where is the data to support this statement? it needs to be removed unless it can be proven. A simple phone call to local estate agents would disprove this statement. Truth being people are moving to rural Nillumbik for various reasons some want a bush blocks, other want pastured properties for rural lifestyle and hobby farms. The MPS should be a document of facts that can be backed with data not unfounded statements. "There is also ongoing land use conflict between agricultural and rural residential land uses and a risk that further residential development will fragment rural land into unviable land parcels" Again what are these conflicts name them, be specific. The GW is already protected with State laws land can only be subdivided as policy states. Nillumbik may want to retain larger blocks but if it is not viable to farm at that scale then just wishing it doesn't make it so. Grazing is near impossible in Nillumbik due to the large kangaroo population. and the soil types will tell you what can be grown.
18945	Oct 05, 2021, 03:34 PM	1		There is no mention of retention of tree canopy. This is important to consider and to allow for the planting of new canopy trees in any development, particularly in medium density and apartment style buildings. As Nillumbik is a low growth area the opportunity to provide good design should be paramount. Also as it is a low growth area ,housing growth should mainly be restricted to the activity centres where any current vegetation should be retained and new vegetation planted and its upkeep rigorously monitored.	Any new housing has to have a meaningful landscape plan which is enforced and includes canopy trees and understorey. Neighbourhood character needs to be considered . Subdivisions and subsequent loss of vegetation must be tightly controlled. Trees cannot be cleared to make way for subdivision, particularly in the more urban areas . This results in changing the neighbourhood character markedly and leads to loss of biodiversity of both flora and fauna.
18944	Oct 05, 2021, 03:08 PM	1		Objective 2 "Direct housing growth and diversity to activity centres....."maybe "Encourage increased residential capacity and diversity in activity centres...."	Backyard -scape is just as important as streetscape and should be considered in planning application approvals.
18925	Oct 05, 2021, 11:57 AM		1	How does this sit with the identified growth corridors?	

18889	Oct 04, 2021, 05:05 PM	1		<p>Gaps:</p> <p>There's a need to protect and expand the urban tree canopy to retain character, provide wildlife habitat and mitigate the impact of increasing temperature from climate change. With increasing housing density and the consequent loss of traditional 'backyards', a program of street tree plantings using locally indigenous trees would compensate for trees unavoidably lost to development. This could be part of an Urban Forestry Strategy as referenced in the draft Regional Northern Metro Land Use Plan.</p> <p>•Need to protect the tree canopy in urban areas to mitigate the impact of increasing temperature in urban areas with global warming, with an urgent focus on residential areas where consolidation in existing urban areas where subdivision of large lots and increasing density of dwellings is taking place and treecover is being lost. .</p> <p>•Development of an overall Nillumbik Urban Forestry Strategy that looks at residential, parks, streetscapes, industrial and commercial areas. Urban in this context refers to the whole of the municipality not just the areas zoned urban in the planning scheme. This is consistent with Living Melbourne that was following by an Urban Forest Strategy for the whole Greater Melbourne Metropolitan Area and is referenced in the draft Regional Northern Metro Land Use Plan (p123).</p> <p>•Need to avoid housing growth and sensitive land uses within and in proximity to bushfire prone areas. This is Strategy 87 in the draft Regional Northern Metro Land Use Plan and goes on to say: In order to prioritise the protection of human life from bushfire, population growth and development should be directed to low risk locations and areas that can be safely evacuated. Development within areas of the highest bushfire risk must achieve acceptable levels of risk reduction. These areas should be avoided for development that will accommodate more vulnerable populations, such as elderly or very young, that may have difficulties evacuating in the event of bushfire.</p>
18883	Oct 04, 2021, 04:07 PM	1		
18873	Oct 04, 2021, 03:31 PM	1	<p>The assumption made which I believe to be wrong is that the ageing population need to down size. What a load of rubbish. Many are content to remain in their homes that along with government services. It also assumes that all occupants will be of an older age again an erroneous assumption. I am opposed to medium density housing in this area</p>	<p>We must ensure we protect and increase the urban tree canopy in urban areas to mitigate the impact of increasing temperature with global warming.</p> <p>There needs to be an urgent focus on residential areas where consolidation and subdivision of large lots and increasing density of dwellings is taking place and tree cover, mid storey vegetation and herbaceous ground cover is being lost.</p> <p>We must prioritise the protection of human life from bushfire, population growth and development should be directed to low risk locations and areas that can be safely evacuated.</p>
18846	Oct 02, 2021, 10:15 AM	1	<p>Additional Comments to</p> <p>Key Objective 1</p> <p>The impetus to provide for some medium density housing as an alternative housing choice should not be at the expense of reducing urban tree canopy as is currently occurring, particularly in residential areas, where developers are clear felling housing blocks to maximise higher density development.</p> <p>Key Objective 2</p> <p>An effective, strong and responsive Neighbourhood Character Policy is required to control urban design outcomes in activity centres, residential areas and townships. This policy should not support the type of non Nillumbik styles of recent developments that do not comply with earlier neighbourhood character controls. Accessible housing should comply with universal design principles to maximise use by people of all abilities and ages.</p> <p>Key Objective 2</p> <p>Such a considered approach should maximise the retention of identified neighbourhood character and canopy tree cover.</p> <p>Objective 2 is another Pandora’s box - very broad and open to Philadelphia lawyer interpretation, or VCAT, enlarging activity centres to fit the housing.</p> <p>I certainly don’t want to live in a small housing development that then enlarges over time.</p>	
18834	Oct 01, 2021, 02:42 PM	1		
18830	Oct 01, 2021, 12:33 PM	1	<p>Remember, we are NOT Banyule!</p> <p>Key objective 1. Sounds like it's written by a developer.</p> <p>Medium density leads to high density. Medium density spreads block by block. Split blocks are an eyesore and detract from Eltham's look, feel and amenity. Medium density housing also leads to more traffic, congestion and fewer trees. We need to protect Eltham's livability.</p> <p>Need to stop the overdevelopment of the residential areas of Eltham, Eltham North,</p> <p>1 Research and the rural areas</p>	<p>Focus on protecting the way Eltham is now. Keeping the tree lined streets, and protecting the suburb from developers and builders wanting to split blocks. Eltham has so far avoided what has happened in other eastern suburbs. The transport hub is not as necessary now that most people will be working more from home.</p>
18816	Sep 30, 2021, 10:09 PM	1		
18756	Sep 29, 2021, 06:59 PM			
18733	Sep 29, 2021, 05:15 PM	1		

18708	Sep 27, 2021, 10:58 AM	1	<p>You will turn Eltham into Greensborough through higher density housing near Eltham town centre.</p> <p>Acknowledge that there are higher density housing within 10kms and don't try to build it here.</p> <p>I would like to see how this will applied in the blue lake ward. It is clear that planning is disproportionate across the council with some areas catered to well and others not.</p> <p>For example, Brown's lane involves new, lar g e estates yet community facilities are lacking, including paths, sealed rds, a business precinct, public open spaces. The most dangerous part of Brown's lane is not sealed is irregularly graded and is currently a mess. I have be advised by council it will never be fixed because there are no residence to charge.</p> <p>Furthermore, if I did agree, there would need to be fourth object - community consultation. Currently the old CFA building is being kept after it is clear the people don't want it because we lost environment and want it replaced. This is key objective 3. You will never know how many people disagree because you conduct convenience sampling, which means it does not represent the whole community.</p>	
18471	Sep 23, 2021, 09:46 AM	1	<p>As currently expressed, the objectives do not address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The need to protect and increase the urban tree canopy in urban areas to mitigate the impact of increasing temperature with global warming, and ongoing loss to date. There needs to be an urgent focus on residential areas where consolidation and subdivision of large lots and increasing density of dwellings is taking place and tree cover, mid storey vegetation and herbaceous ground cover is being lost. (see also Climate Change Theme)•The need to avoid housing growth and sensitive land uses within and in proximity to bushfire prone areas.In order to prioritise the protection of human life from bushfire, population growth and development should be directed to low risk locations and areas that can be safely evacuated.	<p>Planning for housing within ALL of Nillumbik, the Green Wedge Shire, requires retention and increase of indigenous tree canopies and understorey. (Reflecting the community priorities as defined in “Our People Our Place Our Future”). In urban areas, introduce ‘Biodiversity Sensitive Urban Design" as an overarching concept.</p> <p>Development of an overall Nillumbik Urban Forestry Strategy that looks at residential, parks, streetscapes, industrial and commercial areas. This is consistent with Living Melbourne that was followed by an Urban Forest Strategy for the whole Greater Melbourne Metropolitan Area and is referenced in the draft Regional Northern Metro Land Use Plan.</p> <p>Any increases in building density around activity centres are not to the detriment of environmental values, require significant plantings of indigenous flora, and are ‘offset’ by a decrease in what is permissible in the suburban context around those centres, so as to be able to retain and maintain tree canopy for a sustainable future.</p>
18439	Sep 22, 2021, 10:48 AM	1		
18437	Sep 22, 2021, 07:19 AM	1		
18436	Sep 22, 2021, 07:14 AM	1		<p>Many of us live on large rural properties as as we age we cannot continue to maintain land etc. However we do not want to end up in high density housing developments like Doreen. We would like to retire and live in the same area with our beautiful surrounds. Mixed density or specialist retirement properties to allow us not to have to move away from where we live to find suitable housing. Really glad this is being considered. Also our children have limited housing options as well as it’s so expensive. We are in Yarrambat. Thankyou</p>
18434	Sep 21, 2021, 09:58 PM	1	<p>The Shire will not experience a reduction in household size due to an ageing population. The estimated state growth contradicts this key objective.</p> <p>One of the key characteristic of living in the shire is the large allotments and the feeling that were not living in top of each other despite holding a secure semce of community. I feel it would detract significantly from the feeling of the shire as well as cause a reduction in value of property to introduce more medium density housing.</p>	<p>Look at covenants for new buildings being developed. How many developers. Minimise medium to high density, as it is not practical or safe for the small community streets.</p>
18433	Sep 21, 2021, 09:43 PM	1		
18430	Sep 21, 2021, 08:38 PM	1		
18429	Sep 21, 2021, 08:32 PM	1		
18428	Sep 21, 2021, 08:06 PM	1		<p>Create community township precinct for the forgotten Yarrambat suburb.</p>
18425	Sep 21, 2021, 06:45 PM	1	<p>It is unclear on how these objectives will be met. What will be the benefits and costs to meeting these objectives.</p> <p>Objective #1. Whilst I agree with the expected reduction, I do not agree that this means that we need more medium level density housing! Some of our more rural suburbs need to remain that way. We do not need more houses on small lots. It is not in the character of the rural suburbs.</p>	
18424	Sep 21, 2021, 06:41 PM	1		<p>I am unsure because I feel the most important perspective with which to view this should be providing housing that is focused on the health and wellbeing of those who live in it.</p> <p>Nillumbik provides a lot of great green areas and open spaces which is great, but the increase in the density of housing creates the possibility that the actual living spaces will become unhealthy environments because they dont allow for connection with nature. Biophilic design is a proven evidence based practice that shows the increase in wellbeing when considering these principles is significant.</p> <p>For me, when considering future housing options the idea of biophilic design philosophy and understanding how nature can be integrated into the modern built environment is essential.</p> <p>It is becoming more and more prevalent in architecture and many certifications are now requiring it. ie the living building challenge and the WELL institute rating.</p> <p>Interaction with nature and natural elements and even simulated nature and organic shapes should be considered in approving housing design and density in the future or nillumbik will be soon fall behind in this innovative new approach to creating homes that build wellbeing through their design.</p>
18385	Sep 19, 2021, 08:41 PM	1		
18358	Sep 19, 2021, 04:11 PM	1	<p>Disagree with ageing population. A lot of young families are moving here</p>	<p>Make the rural township zone larger to provide more housing</p>

				<p>The second object doesn't really make sense. Needs to be edited. I also think there needs to be more included.</p>	<p>Residential areas beyond but close to activity centres, and which are not too sloped, should be favoured for unit development that would be appropriate for aged and disabled occupants. Housing affordability needs to be addressed. There should be disincentives for overly large and inefficient housing development. New developments should be compelled to have indigenous gardens. There should be better protection for existing historic and interesting (e.g. mid century, artists residences) houses (FYI two miners cottages in Bible St have been demolished in recent years - there aren't many left!)</p>
18345	Sep 18, 2021, 10:43 PM	1			
18327	Sep 18, 2021, 02:13 PM	1		<p>2: Not all development needs to be close to activity centers. many people wish to live in quieter settings, yet smaller lot sizes.</p>	<p>I believe we should allow smaller subdivision lots in areas around plenty 3090, that will provide opportunity for a balance of medium density housing as well as in a secluded semi rural setting. There are many property's east of the gorge and west of Mcleelans Rd, that could be allowed to subdivide into 4000sq2 lots or smaller that can accommodate such requirements.</p>
18321	Sep 18, 2021, 08:11 AM	1		<p>I agree with most of the key objectives , but I think that it is incorrect that there should be only housing growth in Diamond Creek and Eltham activity centres as there is only a limited amount of space whereas I think some of the other townships with good access to public transport , good roads , schools and shops should also be utilised .</p>	<p>I think that there should be more housing diversity . I think that there should be an independent body set up, free of politics and shelf interest to proceed with future housing, as at the moment every 4 years the housing policy changes due to the newly appointed councillors pro development or extreme conservation bios . I think there should some more supermarkets in particular , an Aldi in Plenty or Yarrambat , as this would help alleviate a lot of traffic concerns .</p>
18296	Sep 17, 2021, 01:58 PM	1		<p>Key Objective 1 Whilst the Shire's population may be ageing, it seems logical that at some stage older residents will move into aged care, downsize, or will pass. With the improvements in infrastructure currently underway, I can imagine this will attract younger families to the Shire.</p>	
18283	Sep 17, 2021, 10:27 AM	1		<p>Key Objective 1 - don't assume that just because people get older that they want to sell the house they've lived in for years to move to a unit. People live in Nillumbik because of the open spaces and rural communities. It is not suburban and should remain not suburban.</p>	<p>Ensure new housing is environmentally responsible and sympathetic to the land.</p>
18261	Sep 16, 2021, 07:10 PM	1		<p>Key objective 3 should be #1. Also, I am unsure how ageing populations necessarily corroborate a need for developing medium density housing. Who and what does the research say? What ageing dwellers living in Nillumbik do? Do they downsize in the area? Do they relocate somewhere else for another family to move in their property? Do they sell and divide?</p>	
18234	Sep 16, 2021, 04:09 PM	1		<p>In line with objective 1, diminishing household sizes should be supported by preference being given to new single level housing stock to allow empty nesters to downsize and remain in the area</p>	<p>Review objective 1 as described above</p>
18220	Sep 16, 2021, 11:08 AM	1		<p>The jump from no new subdivisions to medium housing is enormous. While some many want medium housing most would like to stay in their homes on a smaller lot. An intermediate step before medium is needed.</p>	<p>Medium housing usually means units or some type of seniors multi accomodation. Council needs to consider 1 or 2 ha before that. Not everyone wants to move into a retirement home.</p>
18204	Sep 15, 2021, 04:45 PM	1		<p>As the shire identifies as a green wedge shire, I think allowing smaller subdivisions is a contradiction of this concept. Rather than developing any further in rural areas, or allowing existing larger properties to be subdivided, perhaps redevelopment in urban areas is the way to meet this perceived need.</p>	<p>Urbanisation should be restricted to current urban areas. Inadequate public transport, combined with the hilly terrain of much of Nillumbik, means that areas which do not have good public transport should not be considered for further development.</p>
18202	Sep 15, 2021, 03:55 PM	1		<p>I disagree with the premise in KO1, I am surrounded by young couples with small children in the existing 3/4 acre approx block houses. Young couples will always want more space for their young children as we did. There is no need to degrade the quality of life and value of existing houses by allowing a reduction in block size and higher density housing. Why do we, as a shire, have to provide medium density housing? We are in the green wedge and under no circumstances should this be further eroded by allowing unscrupulous developers to build future slum housing in our shire. KO2 seems to assume that just because we currently live near a station or shopping area we should put up with unreasonable development of existing housing blocks. No, there are plenty of new suburbs and estates further north on un or underdeveloped land, the developers in those areas should also pay for the infrastructure required for those developments. Those of us that choose to live and buy houses in established areas, should not have to put up with our land being devalued by ugly medium to high density housing. In Diamond Creek we already have a number of unsightly, poorly planned and unnecessary estates, we do not need any more. KO3 is paramount, should be the first priority. It seems KO1 and KO2 actively contradict KO3. A considered approach would be to ensure the council looks after it's existing rate payers, not use their position to seek more and more by allowing an increase in the density of housing.</p>	<p>Overall there seems to be an acceptance of the need for higher density housing, this is wrong, in as much as it affects Nillumbik. It is not incumbent on the rate payers or their representatives; Nillumbik Shire Council, to facilitate this in our shire. This is the green wedge, the lungs of Melbourne, even in the largest cities in the world there is a recognition that there has to be undisturbed areas on the outskirts of a city to provide the psychological break in the urban landscape. We are it, do not wreck this.</p>
18128	Sep 11, 2021, 01:01 PM	1		<p>#3... and protect the Green Wedge</p>	
18084	Sep 10, 2021, 08:42 AM	1		<p>Partially agree, though there is also an increasing trend towards multi generational housing. Considerations for larger houses, extensions, and granny flats should be included.</p>	

Infrastructure

Title/Question: Infrastructure
 Tool Type: Form
 Activity ID: 312
 Report Date Range: 9 Sep 2021 - 21 Oct 2021
 Date Exported: 26 Oct 2021 09:59 am

Contribution ID	Date Submitted	with the identified If not, which objective(s) and why?			With consideration of objectives in the other themes, can you identify any gaps in this theme that the MPS should consider?
		Yes	No	Unsure	
19308	Oct 21, 2021, 10:36 PM	1			<p>We are particularly concerned about Key Objective 5. What has triggered this statement that so clearly infers that rural lots are breaching the laws in the area of effluent management? Is this a not-so-subtle attempt to make rural living even more challenging in Nillumbik? We understand that some urban areas of Nillumbik remain without sewerage connection, and given the population density in such areas, surely this is a much greater concern?</p> <p>I fully support the PALS recommendation</p>
19202	Oct 19, 2021, 08:33 AM				
19169	Oct 14, 2021, 09:53 PM	1			<p>3. Strengthen this statement to become an objective where: Vigorously promoting significant reduction in consumption and waste throughout the Shire - in private, public and commercial spaces - will ease pressure on infrastructure services which are particularly limited in rural areas, and will yield positive outcomes for carbon emission reductions. (e.g. implement a trial of pay per kg for the red landfill bin; promote downsizing to the 80-litre mini-bin)</p> <p>Effective reductions of consumption and waste and implementation of recycling are vital throughout the Shire. (e.g. implement composting toilets and send humanure to local farms)</p> <p>4. Consideration of renewable energy systems and local waste recycling.</p> <p>Greater emphasis must be placed on local renewable energy systems including community battery storage. Develop systems for innovative and eco-friendly use of waste from farms, local grocers, other businesses, council, community</p>
19132	Oct 11, 2021, 05:56 PM	1			<p>I am a resident of Yarrambat. I regularly walk, run and cycle through different areas in Nillumbik and Whittlesea Council. There are great connecting pathways in most areas including Plenty but in Yarrambat there is a total lack of pathways for accessing bus stops, commuting on foot to the school, post office and sports precinct . It is not always safe running, walking or cycling along busy Roads such as Kurrak , Yan Yean and Iron Bark Roads in Yarrambat as there are very few pedestrian paths and as a result you often need to walk on the gravel edge of the road. I would prefer not to see concrete pathways in our beautiful rural setting but asphalt or compacted gravel paths would blend in and be fantastic for the community.</p>

19129 Oct 11, 2021, 12:05 PM	1	<p>I would like to include:</p> <p>Vigorously promoting significant reduction in consumption and waste throughout the Shire - in private, public and commercial spaces - will ease pressure on infrastructure services which are particularly limited in rural areas, and will yield positive outcomes for carbon emission reductions.</p> <p>Effective reductions of consumption and waste and implementation of recycling are vital throughout the Shire.</p> <p>Key objective 5 - This makes no sense. How does the size of the lot relate to containing effluent on site? These two things are unrelated. I have no objections to containing effluent on site (isn't this a requirement?). I have strong objections to consolidation of rural lots into larger lots, if the council wants to pursue this there needs to be consultation on this item alone, without confusing the matter with effluent</p>	<p>Greater emphasis must be placed on local renewable energy systems.</p> <p>Develop systems for innovative and eco-friendly use of waste from farms, local grocers, other businesses, council, community</p>
19082 Oct 08, 2021, 10:54 AM	1	<p>Obj 3</p> <p>There is a significant and ongoing reduction in consumption and waste throughout the Shire - in private, public and commercial spaces - (This will ease pressure on infrastructure services which are particularly limited in rural areas, and will yield positive outcomes for carbon emission reductions. Effective reductions of consumption and waste and implementation of recycling are vital throughout the Shire.)</p>	
19062 Oct 07, 2021, 09:50 PM	1	<p>Obj</p> <p>This objective needs to recognise that there are wider reasons for consolidation of rural lots to increase their size, not least of which is preservation of habitat. This is in keeping with the recommendation that all Themes and their objectives recognise that Nillumbik is first and foremost a conservation Shire - as described by the Local Government Board and supported by residents eg through Our People, Our Places, Our Future consultation process, to name one.</p>	<p>Greater emphasis must be placed on local renewable energy systems.</p> <p>Develop systems for innovative and eco-friendly use of waste from farms, local grocers, other businesses, council, community</p>
19048 Oct 07, 2021, 06:44 PM	1	Aim 1: does not go far enough	Work out a way of making Eltham township generally more inviting.

18974	Oct 06, 2021, 09:01 AM	1	<p>Key objectives 1, 2 and 4 are irrelevant to rural residents.</p> <p>Delete or rewrite Key objective 3 – amend see earlier comments about Victorian Government planning to improve communications infrastructure in rural areas.</p> <p>Delete Key objective 5 – it is factually incorrect - all lots are capable of containing effluent on site regardless of their size. This is a function of engineering design and execution. We know this because areas like St Andrews and many other rural areas in Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia, Northern Territory, Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania have lots smaller than a quarter of an acre with on-site effluent containment. This stated purpose is therefore demonstrably false. Do not under any circumstances support the consolidation of rural lots. It is neither desirable, or practical, and is unfunded. If council proceeds with this proposed objective, be aware that the likely cost to council of consolidating rural lifestyle grazing and hobby farming lots can be expected to be more than \$2.4 billion. To publish this is to signal to the market the intention to engage in property speculation and devalue the local property market. This action by council appears to be in breach of several laws. Is council planning to fund this? Suggest seeking legal advice.</p> <p>All properties have a septic system to contain effluent.</p> <p>You cannot get a planning permit with out one.</p>	<p>Consolidating lot sizes to contain effluent????? Really????? 85 per cent of lots in rural areas are smaller than the zone imposed on them. How many do you plan to consolidate to contain effluent? How is this going to be funded? It is unlawful for council officers and council to act in ways that cause speculation in the property market and the alteration of the property risk profile - you are aware of that aren't you? rural lifestyle grazing and hobby farming residents economic loss under this type of rubbish will be in the vicinity of \$2.4 billion - where is council going to find the money to fund this?</p>
18958	Oct 05, 2021, 07:12 PM	1		
18928	Oct 05, 2021, 12:19 PM	1		
18913	Oct 04, 2021, 10:51 PM	1		<p>Local renewable energy systems should be supported consistent with habitat and biodiversity protection.</p> <p>Local waste composting/re-cycling systems should be supported where consistent with environment protection.</p>
18877	Oct 04, 2021, 03:38 PM	1	<p>Rural areas by nature do not require a full range of infrastructure and should only have a limited physical infrastructure because they are rural. At what point do the rural areas cease to be rural and become metropolitan?</p> <p>Additional Comments to</p>	
18837	Oct 01, 2021, 03:33 PM	1	<p>Key Objective 5</p> <p>In doing so ensure there is consistent protection of waterways and tree canopies to provide preservation of habitat.</p>	
18361	Sep 19, 2021, 04:21 PM	1	<p>How do u achieve 5?☹️</p> <p>Objective 3 and 4 seem to conflict. One says that dispersed low-density residential areas are difficult to provide infrastructure while the second says it will provide it efficiently. How can you you provide efficient infrastructure when it is inherently inefficient. I think this confusion should be rectified.</p>	Get infrastructure out to rural areas
18346	Sep 18, 2021, 10:57 PM	1		
18238	Sep 16, 2021, 04:16 PM	1		

18205 Sep 15, 2021, 04:47 PM	1		As a resident of Plenty, I cannot see any effort being expended in attempting to build Plenty as a community. It is just a blip on a motorist's radar as they speed along Yan Yean Road. Perhaps some effort could be expended into establishing groups in our sole community space (the Hall) to try to bring the community together.
		To me, "recognise" doesn't really seem very active/proactive. So you recognise something... so what?	
18131 Sep 11, 2021, 01:10 PM		No mention of infrastructure to support safety for flooding, bushfire, or 1 severe storms/wind/weather.	

Natural Environment

Title/Question: Natural Environment
Tool Type: Form
Activity ID: 307
Report Date Range: 9 Sep 2021 - 21 Oct 2021
Date Exported: 26 Oct 2021 09:47 am

Contribution ID	Date Submitted	with the identified I			If not, which objective(s) and why?	With consideration of objectives in the other themes, can you identify any gaps in this theme that the MPS should consider?
		Yes	No	Unsure		
					Key Objective 1 references the need to control pest plants and animals, and we support this strongly across all areas of the shire, both rural and urban. However, we question the reference to large numbers of threatened species and have not been provided with the evidence to support this statement. Key Objective 4 refers to threatening processes and again we have not been provided with the evidence to support this statement. For our understanding, what is the definition of threatening processes? In the absence of further information and genuine independent supporting data, we do not support these objectives and question their intent.	
19303	Oct 21, 2021, 09:19 PM			1		
19301	Oct 21, 2021, 09:09 PM			1		I would like to see the Wurundjeri Woiwurrung heritage of care of the land acknowledged with intention to use consultation with Narrap team when possible
19279	Oct 21, 2021, 01:32 PM			1		Important to create, improve and maintain access to public environment (i.e trails), as well as the environment around town centres (i.e. ensuring appropriate tree cover of streets and roads).
19197	Oct 19, 2021, 08:15 AM			1	I support the PALS descision on this	
					1. This objective needs to recognise the habitat corridors identified in the NEROC and State of Environment reports and support extending and reinvigorating them. Noting the importance of establishing and connecting the potential corridors as identified in the State of Environment report. Suggest an additional objective to acknowledge the essential value of waterways as wildlife corridors and the need for enforced planning controls to protect them. 2. Replace the Plenty River with “all waterways in Nillumbik.”	Note: As currently expressed, the objectives do not sufficiently: • highlight the overall need to maintain and enhance the overall diversity of indigenous flora and fauna as identified in Plan Melbourne. • Support the need to achieve net gain (rather than no net loss) in the quality and quantity of native vegetation as also identified in Plan Melbourne.
19163	Oct 14, 2021, 09:31 PM			1		

			<p>As currently expressed, the objectives do not sufficiently:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Highlight the overall need to maintain and enhance the overall diversity of indigenous flora and fauna as identified in Plan Melbourne.•Support the need to achieve net gain (rather than no net loss) in the quality and quantity of native vegetation as also identified in Plan Melbourne.	<p>Potential additional objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The rights of nature must be recognised in the application of all planning decisions as enacted by Blue Mountains City Council. This extends the principle demonstrated when the Yarra River was declared a living entity in 2017.- Protect and enhance indigenous vegetation communities for fauna habitat of all indigenous species.- Promote and protect indigenous vegetation and connectivity within and between urban areas and townships.- Planning permit conditions to promote wildlife-friendlier fencing.- The essential value of waterways as wildlife corridors is acknowledged and enforced planning controls protect them.- Land management plans protecting indigenous vegetation are required where hard hoof grazing is proposed.- “Biodiversity urban sensitive design” is a requirement in urban areas, in line with contemporary practice such as those described by RMIT and University of Melbourne.- The weaknesses within the environmental enforcement system are identified, addressed and appropriately resourced.- Council structures require environmental officer input to all planning decisions that have environmental impacts and in areas of biodiversity, prioritising areas where there is an Environmental Significance Overlay (ESO) & Bushfire Management Overlay (BMO) <p>Suggest the following be considered in the preamble for this theme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Melbourne 2030 identifies the Nillumbik Green Wedge as being of social, economic and environmental value because of the following features: environmental and landscape quality (particularly the Yarra River and surrounds); river red gums and other habitat areas; national parks; metropolitan water storages. <p>Value of cleared grazing land and hobby farms for kangaroos and birds who prefer open habitats. Role of dams for amphibians and all wild-life during drought.</p>
19124	Oct 11, 2021, 11:38 AM	1		
19093	Oct 09, 2021, 10:12 AM	1	Objective 1 - remove 'occurring' in threats 'occurring' to those species.	
19061	Oct 07, 2021, 09:44 PM	1		

Key Objective 1

Given the large number of threatened native species and threats occurring to those species in the Shire, Planning needs to protect and conserve biodiversity, provide habitats for native flora and fauna, and control pest plants and animals. Is this true? Evidence would suggest that most populations that survived the millennium drought are actually stable, relevant to their their own population and enviromental demands.

Planning already requires numerous ecological and specific frog, owl and orchid reporting to be done. There is obviously conflict between Bal clearing requirements for developments and removal of vegetation, however, offsets are surely a State sanctioned way of mitigating any losses. Council should consider having more local offset sites, so that some development can occur, yet offsets be held in Nillumbik. Also where possible on-site offsets should be encouraged. Again these "threats" are not articulated, does it mean those who own land and pay rates, and our able to legitimately apply for a planning permit. Yes, we need to conserve biodiversity etc. but existing planning overlays are more than adequate. Controlling weed and pest species is not likely to be achieved through the planning scheme. Existing land management plans are not useful and have limited application. More likely local law and landcare groups can tackle this.

Key Objective 2

Consideration of environmental values and the facilitation of drainage and sewerage in urban growth areas is particularly important, given their proximity to the Plenty River. Use and development have the potential to affect stormwater quality

and adversely affect downstream areas.
Why the Plenty River? What about the Bend of Islands settlement so close to the Yarra River, or those in North Warrandyte, or South Eltham. Think this should be a general statement with regard to drainage and sewerage in all areas.

Key Objective 3

Discourage development, including vegetation removal that degrades stormwater quality and increases potential risk of soil erosion, expansion and landslip or other hazards. Agree that mass denudation of landscape degrades stormwater quality, but that not all development does so, if planting and landscaping is done appropriately.

Key Objective 4

Address threatening processes associated with the loss and degradation of the natural and built environment in order to maintain the landscape values in the Shire.
Not sure how this would play out in the planning scheme, already have house colours and fence types, siting of houses and outbuildings, how does improve planning outcomes, or is it a romantic view of what the Shire should look like.

As I am going to say on all of my responses
This is not completely a question of yes or no, but as there are suggestions for most of them I have selected no.

Obj 1
This objective needs to recognise the habitat corridors identified in the NEROC and State of Environment reports and support extending and reinvigorating them. Noting the importance of establishing and connecting the potential corridors as identified in the State of Environment report.

Obj 2
Replace the Plenty River with “all waterways in Nillumbik.”

1. This objective needs to recognise the habitat corridors identified in the NEROC and State of Environment reports and support extending and reinvigorating them. Noting the importance of establishing and connecting the potential corridors as identified in the State of Environment report.

Suggest an additional objective to acknowledge the essential value of waterways as wildlife corridors and the need for enforced planning controls to protect them. See also in gaps, below

1 2. Replace the Plenty River with “all waterways in Nillumbik.”

Key Objective 2 and 3) All Nillumbik's waterways are important, and the vegetation along their corridors provide vital habitat which need to be protected. Densification of development and reduction of open space for stormwater absorbtion result in an increase in stormwater flow and degradation of its quality.

Note: As currently expressed, the objectives do not sufficiently:
•Highlight the overall need to maintain and enhance the overall diversity of indigenous flora and fauna as identified in Plan Melbourne.
•Support the need to achieve net gain (rather than no net loss) in the quality and quantity of native vegetation as also identified in Plan Melbourne.

In their current form the aims objectives do not give enough emphasis on achieving NET GAINS in the quality and quantity of native vegetation.

Connectivity is important but respect for environment must guide and caution the development of new bicycle and horse trails in areas of significant landscape and cultural importance. Horses and bikes compact soil and destroy vegetation.

			<p>All of them because it sounds like c81 and c101 all over again. There's a balancing act of keeping or removing vegetation to ensure bushfire safety or to have enjoyment of the land we own and leaving habitats and the green view that most of us live here for. I don't think council needs to change anything to be honest.</p>	
19015	Oct 06, 2021, 09:37 PM	1	<p>Objective 2 All rivers and tributaries, not just the Plenty River.</p> <p>O.3. Once you start saying "discourage development "including"..." the clause could be interpreted as allowing development in other areas of the Green Wedge as long as they don't effect water quality. It must be made clear that this is not the case, that the word development ought be used with caution really as this is not what the Green Wedge ought to be focusing on and the Objectives ought mainly be about how to preserve and enhance our last intact green wedge and its environmental/biodiversity health.</p> <p>The word "discourage" .is not a strong enough word to prevent inappropriate development i fear.</p> <p>It is time an MPS had teeth and says "prevent" development because the Green Wedge cannot take much more.</p>	See above.
19002	Oct 06, 2021, 06:17 PM	1	<p>Objective 1: Needs additional recognition of value of habitat corridors, both vegetation and waterways</p> <p>Objective 2: Should be all waterways in Nillumbik.</p>	<p>Requires objectives which are more specific to the natural environment.</p> <p>Requirements for wildlife-friendly fencing.</p> <p>Include waterways as wildlife corridors with appropriate protection.</p> <p>Resourcing and enforcing the environmental enforcement system.</p>
18991	Oct 06, 2021, 03:53 PM	1	<p>Key Objective 1</p> <p>In Line with Plan Melbourne, needs to be revised to highlight the need to maintain and enhance biodiversity of the indigenous flora and fauna for the whole of Nillumbik</p> <p>Also, as spelt out in Plan Melbourne, needs to support the need to achieve net gain (rather than no net loss in the quality and quantity of native vegetation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •In urban areas, promote 'Biodiversity Urban Sensitive Design' such as described by RMIT and Melbourne University. •Recognise the essential value of waterways as wildlife corridors. •Recognise the need to provide wildlife/biolink corridors for native flora and fauna to both increase habitat and enable species to move in response in response to climate change. •Promote the protection and enhancement of indigenous vegetation communities for fauna habitat of native species. •For planning permits and planning scheme amendments (particularly any proposes to review the ESOs) that have potential environmental impacts to be referred to the appropriate Council environmental officer(s) for the opportunity to review and advise the planning department of issues.
18988	Oct 06, 2021, 03:46 PM	1	<p>Amend Key Objective 1 – Planning decisions should balance the need to protect and conserve biodiversity, provide habitats for native flora and fauna, control pest plants and animals, and manage bushfire risk. The biggest threats to the natural environment is fire, then weed and pest species, then drought, then erosion.</p> <p>Delete Key Objective 2 – Nillumbik does not have an urban growth area</p> <p>Delete Key Objective 3 or rewrite – encourage development and vegetation removal that plans for and accommodates stormwater quality, reduces soil erosion, expansion, and landslip, and manages hazards.</p> <p>Delete Key Objective 4 – write this in plain English or delete it. Refer earlier comments, the landscape values of the shire are unknown and much land use is not acknowledged by council – so any objective mentioning it is meaningless.</p> <p>.</p>	these objectives are nonsensical and not based on ground truth or reality
18969	Oct 06, 2021, 08:49 AM	1		
18957	Oct 05, 2021, 07:09 PM	1	Objective 4 this appears the try and restrict the use of rural under the guise of protecting habitat.	

18951	Oct 05, 2021, 04:29 PM	1		Plan identifies value of habitat for threatened species. This should be extended to wild life in general. However pest species should be discouraged.
			<p>The wording is not strong enough. Instead of discouraging , key objective 3 should state preventing development. There needs to be consideration given to preserving and creating not only habitat but corridors along which wildlife can traverse safely. Habitat could mean just small pockets of vegetation without any connection to other pockets. The biodiversity of flora is important for these reasons too.</p> <p>All waterways need to be included in the objectives. They are all under threat from stormwater, householders illegally disposing of effluent and rubbish into the waterways , and land degradation from works on properties.</p>	<p>Planning permits need to place more emphasis and importance on providing, preserving and enhancing the landscape and vegetation. This needs to be enforced rigorously in order to preserve the environment, particularly the canopy tree cover. Part of providing corridors is to permit wildlife friendly fencing only, even in the more urban areas as more native wildlife is seeking food and shelter in the urban environment.</p> <p>Meaningful fines need to be introduced and enforced for those who are degrading the landscape in any way.....tree removal, discharge into waterways, clearing vegetation, land excavation etc.</p>
18939	Oct 05, 2021, 02:12 PM	1	<p>Key objective 2 refers to proximity of urban growth areas to Plenty River....</p> <p>Facilitation of drainage and sewerage in existing (unsewered) residential areas is also relevant for downstream impacts on Plenty and Yarra rivers</p> <p>Management/ oversight of the adequacy and effectiveness of private water treatment installations (including septic tanks) in semi-rural and rural locations is</p>	
18921	Oct 05, 2021, 11:37 AM	1		
18908	Oct 04, 2021, 10:15 PM	1	Written for a pre determined outcome.	Environment , needs pest control , weed control and support for land owners . Not the touchy feely rubbish you've written.
18891	Oct 04, 2021, 05:12 PM	1		
			<p>Key Objective 1</p> <p>In Line with Plan Melbourne, needs to be revised to highlight the need to maintain and enhance biodiversity of the indigenous flora and fauna for the whole of Nillumbik</p> <p>Also, as spelt out in Plan Melbourne, needs to support the need to achieve net gain (rather than no net loss in the quality and quantity of native vegetation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •In urban areas, promote ‘Biodiversity Urban Sensitive Design’ such as described by RMIT and Melbourne University. •Recognise the essential value of waterways as wildlife corridors. •Recognise the need to provide wildlife/biolink corridors for native flora and fauna to both increase habitat and enable species to move in response in response to climate change. •Promote the protection and enhancement of indigenous vegetation communities for fauna habitat of native species. •For planning permits and planning scheme amendments (particularly any proposes to review the ESOs) that have potential environmental impacts to be referred to the appropriate Council environmental officer(s) for the opportunity to review and advise the planning department of issues.
18880	Oct 04, 2021, 03:48 PM	1		
18869	Oct 04, 2021, 03:07 PM	1		no
				<p>Natural environment. I wish to emphasize the importance of connecting isolated pockets of natural vegetation to form wildlife corridors across the shire. This includes private and public land. And Yes compensation might have to be considered. Why does this keep coming up over many years and nothing happens?</p> <p>Another matter I did not hear voiced is the proven health benefits to community and visitors whether living or visiting the rural areas of our shire.</p>
18863	Oct 04, 2021, 10:20 AM	1		

			<p>Objective 1: Should be amended to include the need to protect/enhance wildlife corridors which often link areas of habitat importance. Planning initiatives to conserve/enhance biodiversity must include both strategic (i.e. new ESOs) and statutory planning.</p> <p>Objective 2: Should be amended to include the need to protect/enhance all water courses in Nillumbik, including their vegetation, as wildlife corridors, not just the Plenty River..</p> <p>Objective 3: Should be amended to include the need for net gain in vegetation, not just protect against removal of vegetation.</p> <p>There must be recognition of the importance of rivers and streams and there vegetation, in both urban and rural areas, as habitat and wildlife corridors.</p> <p>There needs to be recognition of the need to control grazing by requiring land management plans so native flora is not destroyed.</p> <p>There needs to be an intention to address weaknesses in the environmental enforcement regime. Strategic planning provisions (including new overlays such as SLOs) must address landscape protection in rural areas.</p>
18860	Oct 03, 2021, 11:56 PM	1	<p>The rights of nature must be recognised in the application of all planning decisions as enacted by Blue Mountains City Council. This extends the principle demonstrated when the Yarra River was declared a living entity in 2017.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protect and enhance indigenous vegetation communities for fauna habitat of all indigenous species. - Promote and protect indigenous vegetation and connectivity within and between urban areas and townships. - Planning permit conditions to promote wildlife-friendlier fencing. - The essential value of waterways as wildlife corridors is acknowledged and enforced planning controls protect them. - Land management plans protecting indigenous vegetation are required where hard hoof grazing is proposed. - “Biodiversity urban sensitive design” is a requirement in urban areas, in line with contemporary practice such as those described by RMIT and University of Melbourne. - The weaknesses within the environmental enforcement system are identified, addressed and appropriately resourced. - Council structures require environmental officer input to all planning decisions that have environmental impacts and in areas of biodiversity, prioritising areas where there is an Environmental Significance Overlay (ESO) & Bushfire Management Overlay (BMO) <p>Suggestion that the following be considered in the preamble for this theme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melbourne 2030 identifies the Nillumbik Green Wedge as being of social, economic and environmental value because of the following features: environmental and landscape quality (particularly the Yarra River and surrounds); river red gums and other habitat areas; national parks; metropolitan water storages.
18854	Oct 02, 2021, 02:29 PM	1	
18850	Oct 02, 2021, 02:02 PM	1	
18828	Oct 01, 2021, 12:21 PM	1	
18753	Sep 29, 2021, 06:55 PM	1	
			<p>1. This objective needs to recognise the habitat corridors identified in the NEROC and State of Environment reports and support extending and reinvigorating them. Noting the importance of establishing and connecting the potential corridors as identified in the State of Environment report.</p> <p>An additional objective is to acknowledge the essential value of waterways as wildlife corridors and the need for enforced planning controls to protect them.</p> <p>2. Replace the Plenty River with “all waterways in Nillumbik.”</p> <p>As currently expressed, the objectives do not sufficiently:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • highlight the overall need to maintain and enhance the overall diversity of indigenous flora and fauna as identified in Plan Melbourne. • Support the need to achieve net gain (rather than no net loss) in the quality and quantity of native vegetation as also identified in Plan Melbourne.
			<p>Additional Comments to Key Objective 1</p> <p>It is important to recognise and define the essential value of waterways as wildlife corridors and ensure appropriate controls are in place and can be enforced to protect these valuable natural assets.</p> <p>Key Objective 2</p> <p>Need to identify that drainage and sewerage in urban growth areas impacts on the water quality and health of all waterways in Nillumbik and downstream areas. Don't understand why only the Plenty River has been mentioned.</p>
18633	Sep 26, 2021, 05:29 PM	1	<p>This addresses some concerns in the Green Wedge theme.</p> <p>All planning decisions and conditions need to recognise the importance of protecting and encouraging the use of indigenous vegetation and protection of local wildlife.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protect and enhance indigenous vegetation communities for fauna habitat of all indigenous species. - Promote and protect indigenous vegetation and connectivity within and between urban areas and townships that is, 'corridors' - Planning permit conditions to promote wildlife-friendly fencing where practical - The essential value of waterways as wildlife corridors is acknowledged and enforced planning controls protect them. - Land management plans protecting indigenous vegetation are required on all agricultural landholdings - “Biodiversity urban sensitive design” is a requirement in urban areas - The weaknesses within the environmental enforcement system are identified, addressed and appropriately resourced moving forward - Council structures require environmental officer input to all planning decisions that have environmental impacts and in areas of biodiversity, prioritising areas where there is an Environmental Significance Overlay (ESO) & Bushfire Management Overlay (BMO)
18438 Sep 22, 2021, 10:43 AM	1	<p>As currently expressed, the objectives do not sufficiently:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlight the overall need to maintain and enhance the overall diversity of indigenous flora and fauna as identified in Plan Melbourne. • Support the need to achieve net gain (rather than no net loss) in the quality and quantity of native vegetation as also identified in Plan Melbourne. 	
18369 Sep 19, 2021, 05:50 PM	1	<p>Objective 2 is a statement and not an objective.</p> <p>Objective 4 - what are the 'threatening processes' ? This should be clearly stated in order for the objective to be understood, as it stands it is too open ended.</p>	
		<p>How about drainage and sewer in rural parts of the shire!</p> <p>What in danger rd species?</p> <p>The planning process protect the environment already!</p>	<p>Roadside cleanups of fire fuel is required to protect the community against devastating fires</p>
18356 Sep 19, 2021, 04:05 PM	1		
			<p>Re Objective 2 I think that the impetus to use water sensitive urban design should be stronger. I think that all larger subdivisions and developments in the shire should ensure appropriate storm water run-off not just in the Plenty River catchment.</p> <p>Objective 1 and 3 are potentially in conflict if there are existing weed species for removal. Removal of weeds and replacement with indigenous species should always be preferred over retention of weeds (FYI we have a planning application and the council planner was reluctant to let us remove a weed tree - as two qualified forest scientists we were appalled by his ignorance!). I feel like this entire theme is a bit light-on regarding retaining and reestablishing indigenous canopy trees in the landscape. Large indigenous canopy trees are the backbone of native vegetation coverage and this should be acknowledged. The impetus to establish and enhance areas of indigenous vegetation should be strengthened.</p>
18343 Sep 18, 2021, 10:22 PM	1		
18317 Sep 17, 2021, 09:09 PM	1	<p>Key Objective 4: This needs to not only "address threatening processes" but needs to reduce the risk of loss and degradation of the natural environment, natural vegetation, and threatened native species in order to maintain the landscape values in the Shire.</p>	
18294 Sep 17, 2021, 01:42 PM	1		<p>Unsure as to how you achieve all the stated objectives in regards to fire risk reduction, in conjunction with some of the objectives stated above.</p>

18286 Sep 17, 2021, 10:41 AM		Nillumbik needs to recognise that due to changes in the environment and climate, wildlife is moving closer to populated areas. Any tree removal should be discouraged even if not in a designated area with an overlay. Building into the side of hills should be discouraged as it destroys the land.	
18232 Sep 16, 2021, 04:03 PM	1		Thought should be given to preserving natural habitat such as nesting tree hollows and supplementing these with built nesting boxes for birds and possums
18228 Sep 16, 2021, 03:21 PM	1		Pest control including weeds. Are you looking into non chemical use to eradicate weeds? Indian minor birds are one example of out of control breeding. What action is being taken in this area. Also educating our community to take responsible action within their own backyard.
18126 Sep 11, 2021, 12:59 PM	1	Would like more detail on the "threatened native species" and which ones are vital and which are not. This would also help prioritise how and where funding was spent and also if it was worth the expense compared to other initiatives.	
18120 Sep 11, 2021, 06:40 AM	1	This is not a water catchment area, you are pushing the boundaries of classifying what a green wedge is. it's not National Park. It's not water catchment. It's a low development area of diverse living apart from high destiny human sprawl. No more Acknowledge land owners and their rights. no less	
		Key Objective 2 Consideration of environmental values and the facilitation of drainage and sewerage in urban growth areas is particularly important, given their proximity to the Plenty River. Use and development have the potential to affect stormwater quality and adversely affect downstream areas. The focus largely on the Plenty River; ignoring the significant interaction Nillumbik Shire has with the Yarra River and the feeders to that is unbalanced and seems to ignore the significant body of work already in place as part of Parks Vic and its Plenty River Trail.	
		Key Objective 3 Discourage development, including vegetation removal that degrades stormwater quality and increases potential risk of soil erosion, expansion and landslip or other hazards. No indication of any balance in this - fire mitigation, access and protection of heritage values etc	
		Key Objective 4 Address threatening processes associated with the loss and degradation of the natural and built environment in order to maintain the landscape values in the Shire. Doing nothing also leads, by default, to degradation	
18102 Sep 10, 2021, 02:41 PM	1		

Open Space

Title/Question: Open Space
 Tool Type: Form
 Activity ID: 313
 Report Date Range: 9 Sep 2021 - 21 Oct 2021
 Date Exported: 26 Oct 2021 09:57 am

Contribution ID	Date Submitted	with the identified If not, which objective(s) and why?			With consideration of objectives in the other themes, can you identify any gaps in this theme that the MPS should consider?
		Yes	No	Unsure	
19302	Oct 21, 2021, 09:11 PM	1			I would like to see an intention to acknowledge Wurunjeri Woiwurrung heritage through signage, plaques, art works etc in parks, reserves and playgrounds.
19296	Oct 21, 2021, 06:26 PM	1			
19203	Oct 19, 2021, 08:34 AM				
19170	Oct 14, 2021, 09:54 PM	1			<p>1. Note that enhancement needs to be consistent with the value of greatest priority as expressed by the community in Our People, Our Place, Our Future ie preservation of the green wedge, protection of biodiversity, & action on climate change</p> <p>2. Open space development prioritises protection of indigenous flora and fauna.</p> <p>5. Needs to be expanded to include reference to development of accessible, high quality [environmentally sensitive] and local open space networks at the regional level with adjoining municipalities.</p> <p>Suggested overarching objective that recognises the land, waterways and all life they sustain are central to the cultural values of First Nations Peoples. As such their value must be recognised and protected throughout the Shire.</p> <p>Open space development prioritises protection of indigenous flora and fauna.</p> <p>Support for community gardens and productive streetscapes</p> <p>Nillumbik has an integrated open space network that includes supporting access to other types of public land such as waterways, school grounds and utility easements.</p>
19130	Oct 11, 2021, 12:06 PM	1			<p>Could you recognises the land, waterways and all life they sustain are central to the cultural values of First Nations Peoples. As such their value must be recognised and protected throughout the Shire.</p> <p>Open space development prioritises protection of indigenous flora and fauna.</p> <p>Support for community gardens and productive streetscapes</p> <p>Nillumbik has an integrated open space network that includes supporting access to other types of public land such as waterways, school grounds and utility easements.</p>

19094 Oct 09, 2021, 10:16 AM	1		Ensure that areas once zoned as PPRZ remain that way (e.g. Apollo Parkways). Increase parkland when opportunity arises (e.g. Old Plenty CFA site).
19070 Oct 07, 2021, 11:07 PM	1		
		Key Objective 1) Should include the words in capitals "Ensure the planning, maintenance and enhancement of public open spaces " USING INDIGENOUS PLANTS AND TREES TO INSPIRE, ENABLE AND ENCOURAGE "safe, healthy and active lifestyles."	
		Key Objective 4) Should include the words in capitals "In rural areas the emphasis is towards developing key regional and district recreational areas WHILE protecting native flora and fauna, and developing a comprehensive regional based trail network WHILE TAKING CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SENSITIVITIES INTO CONSIDERATION."	
19065 Oct 07, 2021, 09:56 PM	1		None of the objectives include Nillumbik's bushland reserves and wetlands which need to be protected from any encroaching development and enhanced and conserved. They are important public open spaces needing ongoing maintenance.
		This is not completely a question of yes or no, nor am I unsure, but as there are suggestions for most of them I have selected no.	
		Obj 1 Note that enhancement needs to be consistent with the value of greatest priority as expressed by the community in Our People, Our Place, Our Future ie preservation of the green wedge, protection of biodiversity, & action on climate change.	
		Obj 2 Any development of open space needs to prioritise reinvigoration of indigenous flora to support habitat and wildlife corridors.	Suggested overarching objective for this Theme that recognises the land, waterways and all life they sustain are central to the cultural values of First Nations Peoples. As such their value must be recognised and protected throughout the Shire.
		Obj 5 Suggest that this objective is expanded to include reference to development of accessible, high quality [environmentally sensitive] and local open space networks at the regional level with in partnership with adjoining municipalities.	Addition of an objective to support community gardens and productive streetscapes
19053 Oct 07, 2021, 06:56 PM	1		Nillumbik has an integrated open space network that includes supporting access to other types of public land such as waterways, school grounds and utility easements.
19050 Oct 07, 2021, 06:50 PM		Issue is access to open space. Note I should probably made this 1 comment elsewhere.	Ensure that people of all abilities can access open space and undeveloped green wedge areas. Preserving the green wedge is one thing but people of all abilities should also be able to enjoy it. Primary objectives must clearly state that at all times the natural environment is protected and enhanced.
18994 Oct 06, 2021, 04:21 PM	1		

18975	Oct 06, 2021, 09:02 AM	1	Objectives 1 – 4 and 5 are irrelevant to rural residents. Key Objective 4 needs to be reviewed and amended – the emphasis in rural areas is on local open space that serves the needs of local rural residents, open space that serves, supports, and compliments rural economic development, tourism and visitation to rural areas, and developing comprehensive multi use trail networks to link to those in Yarra Ranges, Murrindindi, Whittlesea, Manningham and Banyule. (note that regional cross over does not incorporate all surrounding local government areas)	open space in rural areas needs to fulfill rural local needs as well as other needs - this is ignored
18952	Oct 05, 2021, 04:44 PM	1	The objectives do not state the importance of retaining the existing vegetation or enhancing it with appropriate indigenous species. The provision of accessible and equitable space should not be at the expense of the natural environment.	Protection of the native flora and fauna is paramount when designing and planning open space use. This includes the waterways areas. Passive recreation such as walking through bushland should not be sacrificed for formal sporting and playground use.
18929	Oct 05, 2021, 12:25 PM	1		Objective 5 would benefit by clarification of of the "network across the shire" (e.g. trails, shared bicycle/pedestrian paths ?)
18914	Oct 04, 2021, 11:02 PM	1		Melbourne Water is currently working towards selling off large parcels of land in Christmas Hills. There is great potential here for adding to the shire's environmental and recreational reserves, particularly with regard to the future of the land known as "Wanaroo Farm" This could become a regional recreation park with parking, picnic facilities, walking/cycling/equestrian trails etc. This would make a good objective.
				Amend Key Objective 4 to read: In rural areas the emphasis is towards developing key regional and district recreational areas, protecting native flora and fauna as well as developing a comprehensive off-road shared trail network.
18909	Oct 04, 2021, 10:18 PM	1		Including the wording 'off-road shared' is an accurate description of the shire's existing regional trails.
18897	Oct 04, 2021, 06:22 PM	1		Need more walking and bike paths.
18893	Oct 04, 2021, 05:16 PM	1		
18878	Oct 04, 2021, 03:39 PM	1		

Additional Comments to		
<p>Key Objective 2</p> <p>Make it a priority to protect and retain public open space and don't allow public open space to be considered as an opportunity to undertake further development of these areas. Public Open Space is Public Open Space. Recognise there is a community benefit in retaining and valuing public open space for both general active and passive relaxation purposes.</p>		
<p>Key Objective 5</p> <p>Add after Shire 'and connecting with trail networks in adjoining municipalities.'</p> <p>Objective 2 needs qualification. For example, it is not "safe" for "All members of the community" to access Yarrambat Golf course, if they are not playing golf.</p>		
18838 Oct 01, 2021, 04:23 PM	1	
18823 Oct 01, 2021, 09:37 AM	1	Objective 2 is not being met now, for example, Eltham Tennis Courts are locked and open only to Club members,
18362 Sep 19, 2021, 04:24 PM	1	Disagree with 4
		Why flies and fauna in rural only ?
		Maintain rural areas
		Native flora and fauna are very reliant on our open spaces, even in fairly urbanised areas (for example along the diamond creek corridor in Eltham). Retention and enhancement of habitat should also be an objective for open space.
18347 Sep 18, 2021, 11:01 PM	1	
18316 Sep 17, 2021, 08:57 PM	1	
18299 Sep 17, 2021, 02:06 PM	1	

			<p>In relation to Key Objective 2, I strongly believe that Nillumbik needs to consider opening up the parklands as shared use spaces. We have a very large community of dog owners, and the current handful of off lead dog parks are not enough. If you look at Banyule, the parks are all off lead (except where otherwise signed) and this results in the grounds being better maintained (as the foot traffic is spread) and there being almost no dog waste left on grounds (each ground has a bin and dog poo bags provided). The parks then become a wonderful meeting space for the wider community, as well as being used for sporting groups on weekends and during training times. A quick visit to Anthony Beale reserve will provide a good insight to how well this model works.</p> <p>Encouraging/supporting dog ownership in this way also encourages a more healthy and active lifestyle for the community. Too often people become cut off from their community as they age, but having a dog and walking the dog easily in nearby parks (that don't require one to drive to reach them as is currently the case) increases people's engagement and positive health outcomes, both physically and mentally.</p> <p>It would also be wonderful if there was a labyrinth in one of the green spaces along the trail between the Men's Shed and the Frog Reserve in Eltham North. There are a few green spaces that currently just have grass, and a labryinth for people to walk around would be fantastic. (Eg: https://labyrinthsociety.org/about-labyrinths)</p>
18292	Sep 17, 2021, 01:12 PM	1	
18239	Sep 16, 2021, 04:19 PM	1	<p>Consideration should be given to the needs of an aging population</p> <p>Promotion of local areas for eco tourism should take place</p>
18132	Sep 11, 2021, 01:12 PM		1 #2... does "equitable and accessible" mean financially as well?

Transport

Title/Question:	Transport
Tool Type:	Form
Activity ID:	311
Report Date Range:	9 Sep 2021 - 21 Oct 2021
Date Exported:	26 Oct 2021 09:58 am

Contribution ID	Date Submitted	with the identified I If not, which objective(s) and why? Yes No Unsure	With consideration of objectives in the other themes, can you identify any gaps in this theme that the MPS should consider?
19306	Oct 21, 2021, 10:12 PM	1	
19295	Oct 21, 2021, 06:17 PM	1	
19201	Oct 19, 2021, 08:32 AM	1	
19168	Oct 14, 2021, 09:43 PM	1	

			Traffic calming methods are used at wildlife crossing points.
			Nillumbik implements a trial of “on demand” public transport.
19128 Oct 11, 2021, 11:54 AM	1		Support for electric vehicles – pubic, private, Council.
19077 Oct 08, 2021, 08:07 AM		In general terms, the objectives are good. But specifically, transport options need to be increased outside of 9 to 5 Mon to Fri. This is needed for young people, for those with disabilities and for other reasons where people are unable to drive. Extension of transport 1 beyond Hurstbridge is critical for these cohorts.	No
		Obj 1 Should include reference to school communities	
		Obj 2 Add...key activity centres....and all schools throughout the Shire	
		Obj 3 Add..... increased public ... and active transport	
		Obj 4 Add ... but not to the detriment of the environment, and with the urgent need to achieve significant reductions in carbon emission as priority.	
19057 Oct 07, 2021, 07:17 PM	1	Obj 5 Note that road developments need to be consistent with the values of greatest priority as expressed by the community in Our People, Our Place, Our Future ie preservation of the green wedge, protection of biodiversity and action on climate change.	Suggested additions Traffic calming methods are used at wildlife crossing points.
19046 Oct 07, 2021, 06:41 PM		Do not overemphasise the cycling/walking thing in Nillumbik because 1 the terrain will make this difficult for many older people	Nillumbik implements a trial of “on demand” public transport.
19012 Oct 06, 2021, 09:12 PM			Support for electric vehicles – pubic, private, Council.
18973 Oct 06, 2021, 08:57 AM		Key objectives 1 (or 2a) through 4 are irrelevant to rural residents except for the ability to travel to and from activity centres and park when we get there. 1 Key objective 5 – support the principle – noting that it is poorly written	Maintain good road networks supported with adequate parking, perhaps rationed with parking fees. More advocacy for public transport in the rural areas of the shire, ie no public tranport past Hurstbridge or Kangaroo Ground

18947 Oct 05, 2021, 03:52 PM 1

Key Objective 5 needs to respect the environment. The road network has to respect the environment and ambience of the area. Bigger roads is not the answer to every traffic problem. The opposition to the Fitzsimons rd roundabout is surely telling the authorities that other environmental things are more important. The physical aspects that make Nillumbik different should be respected and emphasised.

18935 Oct 05, 2021, 01:35 PM 1

There is one objective missing, and is to ensure safe access for an ageing and disabled population, in relation to foot public transport, car traffic . The City of Melbourne has already done this, including requiring level entry into shops and doors wide enough to enable wheel chair access etc. Further and eg. The crossing opposite the fire brigade on Main Rd in Eltham, is confusing. Most people think it is a pedestrian crossing which it is not. But being opposite a popular coffee shop and the hotel is is used as such and dangerously. I'm not sure if Eltham Railway station is being rebuilt to accommodate for better wheelchair, walker and disabled access including the toilets. Council should be lobbying the State Govt to achieve this, if not part of the current improvements.

I note cycle trails are mentioned to reduce greenhouse gases. The trails may have to be shared with road use and not shared with pedestrians or walkers. Bike etiquette is appalling and dangerous, speeding is a problem. In Europe with huge cycle popularity people cycle on roads, and through towns etc. Speed and long distance appears to be on roads.

I would also like to see an objective that could encompass bike parking access in the shopping precincts and within our parks . Why drive just for a coffee when you could cycle. Health benefits as well as reducing green house transmission.

In short this 30 year objective could be broadened to achieve more. Ther ewould be so many more benefits and Europe has many good examples to study.

18927	Oct 05, 2021, 12:17 PM		Objective 1: (amend) Add schools. Objective 2: (amend) Add schools. Objective 3: (amend) Add, "and active transport". Objective 4: (amend) Add, 'consistent with environment protection and reducing carbon emissions'. Objective 5: (amend) Add, "road links are to be consistent with preserving the Green Wedge; protection of biodiversity and action on climate change".		The (in)efficiency of transfer between transport modes is a key consideration in people's choice of (non) use of public transport options: e.g. walk to bus stop (wait for late bus in rain, hail or sun) arrive at station and wait for next train e.g cycle to bus stop (where to leave bicycle securely?) or cycle to station (where to leave bicycle securely?) e.g. drive to local station or bus stop (where to park vehicle securely for extended period?) An additional objective could be: Provide facilities which improve the efficiency, amenity and safety of multi modal trips (including secure bicycle parking, bus stop shelters, car parking) and liaise with public transport providers to align service timetables to minimise intermodal waiting times. (This is also applicable to Theme 8 Infrastructure)
18912	Oct 04, 2021, 10:32 PM	1			Nillumbik should work to make wildlife crossing points safe for wildlife wherever possible. Nillumbik to implement a trial of 'on demand' public transport. Support for electric vehicles.
18905	Oct 04, 2021, 10:08 PM	1			Amend Key Objective 2: Further development of off-road shared trails to link the key activity centres is a priority to encourage safe access for all residents.
18876	Oct 04, 2021, 03:36 PM	1	Adding more roads does not help the environment it only encourages people to use cars which opposes objective 3 ie to increase public transport use. congested roads will lead to people using public transport		This amended wording is more inclusive as it covers all users.
18836	Oct 01, 2021, 03:26 PM	1	Additional Comments to Key Objective 2 This development objective also should include effective way finding and information provision to enable pedestrians and cyclists to know where they are, and where they can go. Provide support facilities within key activity centres to encourage walkers and cyclists to spend time and money with local traders. Need to stop the overdevelopment of the train lines and parking		
18758	Sep 29, 2021, 07:00 PM		1 localities		
18377	Sep 19, 2021, 06:28 PM	1			
18360	Sep 19, 2021, 04:19 PM		Disagree with 4 Rural residence need some public transport		Get some public transport to research, panton hill, bottles bridge, St. Andrews, kangaroo ground

18298 Sep 17, 2021, 02:05 PM	1		
18237 Sep 16, 2021, 04:14 PM	1		
18206 Sep 15, 2021, 04:49 PM	1	<p>There is no consideration to the loss of amenity suffered by residents who face daily rat runs by non-residents. A lack of planning or retrospective action means that we live on short cut roads that have become dangerous. Why encourage pedestrians or cyclists when the roads are so unsafe?</p>	<p>Some effort being put into trying to solve some of the issues around rat running. Painting a white line down the centre of a road on a crest of a hill does not count.</p>
18201 Sep 15, 2021, 03:27 PM	1	<p>Key Objective 5 The St Andrews and Smiths Gully areas have not had road upgrades for years. Some dirt roads have become connector roads or short cuts to the ever growing residents who use them. Some are not safe with over hanging trees and trucks having to drive in the middle of roads to miss their limbs. A survey of the area needs to be done and not just talked about but action.</p>	No
18130 Sep 11, 2021, 01:06 PM	1	<p>There is no mention about unsealed roads, which there are many in the more rural parts of the Shire. The reality is that many/most people will need a car to get around the Shire and beyond, and yet there is very little attention paid to this in the objectives.</p>	
		<p>Key Objective 2 Further development of pedestrian and cycle trails to link the key activity centres is a priority to encourage safe pedestrian access for residents. Council need to manage / invest in the current trails they have provided - we continually see people using trails for purposes for which they were not intended - e.g., trail bikes</p>	
		<p>Key Objective 3 Facilitate increased public transport usage to aid in issues such as increased greenhouse gas emissions and traffic congestion. Not sure this is effective use of \$ in COVID times as we see considerable attention to social distancing - this is unlikely to significantly change.</p>	
18105 Sep 10, 2021, 02:48 PM	1	<p>Key Objective 5 Facilitate safe and efficient roads and road links within the municipality and to the wider region that cater for all users given that the majority of residents travel to employment outside the Shire. Agree but there seems to be remarkable reluctance to do this - hence the limited crossings of the Yarra and the resultant risk in times of evacuation</p>	