

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

*

Name: * Tony Penna

Email address: * president@southbankresidents.org.au

Date of Council meeting: * Tuesday 31 August 2021

Agenda item title: * 6.2 Proposed discontinuance and sale of part of Riverside Quay Melbourne, and sale of part of Riverside Quay Melbourne

*

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. We encourage you to make your submission as early as possible.

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



[council_meeting_no._09_6.2_proposed_discontinuance_and_sale_of_part_of_riverside_quay_melbourne_a](#)

104.85 KB · PDF



PO Box 1195 South Melbourne VIC 3205
Phone: 03 9028 2774
ABN 58 986 783 321 Cert. of Inc. A0036364B
info@southbankresidents.org.au
www.southbankresidents.org.au

Submission to Council

Council Meeting No. 09, Tuesday 31 August 2021

Melbourne Town Hall

6.2 Proposed discontinuance and sale of part of Riverside Quay Melbourne, and sale of part of Riverside Quay Reserve

The Southbank Residents' Association, in principle, supports item 6.2. However, the whole process has not been ideal.

In the original application for the development of the Esso site, this parcel of land was referred to as a 'land exchange', but there was no mention in the application that it was subject to the approval of the land exchange. Instead, it assumed the land exchange was a fait accompli.

There has been substantial community interest in the development of the Esso site, with numerous submissions to council Future Melbourne Committee when this item was being considered. So, it is somewhat surprising that during the notice period the City of Melbourne did not reach out to those who previously made submissions on this development and engage with them to explain the rationale, especially the context of the agenda item, minor though it is.

Instead, relying on old-fashioned public notices in newspapers and a notice on the door of a vacant building during lock-down is not effective communication.

Southbank Residents Association is an active contributor to this Council, and it is well-known we are an active and engaged community group. We are bamboozled that at minimum Council never considered to at least inform us. But sadly, judging by past actions, we should not have considered it surprising.

Yours sincerely,

Tony Penna
President
Southbank Residents Association

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

*

Name: * Judith Smart

Email address: * judithsmart@ozemail.com.au

Date of Council meeting: * Tuesday 31 August 2021

Agenda item title: * 6.3

*

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. We encourage you to make your submission as early as possible.

On behalf of the Royal Historical Society of Victoria I wish to protest about the inadequacy of the QVM Precinct Renewal Program Quarterly Report. The Royal Historical Society of Victoria functions both as the peak body for 340 local history societies and as the historical society for central Melbourne. In the first capacity, the RHSV seeks to support the conservation of heritage across the state, including its capital city Melbourne. In the second, the Society seeks to preserve the heritage of the city and its inner area. The Queen Victoria Market is one of the most important aspects of this heritage.

This report is inadequate and written in advertorial rhetoric that is impossible to understand. In particular the expenditure statement tells us nothing about what has been done and how the very large amounts of money have actually been spent. We request a detailed breakdown of expenditure so that the works undertaken are open to closer scrutiny.

We also request that the report be written in plain English so that we know precisely what is being done or planned. In particular 3.5 is incomprehensible to us and we suggest most readers. We request a plain English translation of 'activation area offering a fully flexible testing ground for a range of unique place-making opportunities to drive

visitation and and economic activation across the across the precinct and surrounds seven days a week.' It is not only incomprehensible but ungrammatical.

Council – and the public –deserves better from QVM Pty Ltd.

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

*

Name: * Jennifer McDonald

Email address: * jenniferem@bigpond.com

Date of Council meeting: * Tuesday 31 August 2021

Agenda item title: Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C278 Sunlight to Public Parks

*

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. We encourage you to make your submission as early as possible.

To the Lord Mayor and Councillors

I wish to comment on this Report and take the opportunity of the delay in presentation to the Future Melbourne Committee to do so.

The Amendment C278 to the Melbourne Planning Scheme Sunlight to Public Parks is timely and welcome.

I support all the new mandated controls to prevent overshadowing of the Parks, the inclusion of State and smaller community parks equally in the controls in relation to sunlight access, the increased time for protection of sunlight for most of the Parks, and the new baseline for protection, the winter soistice, a most vulnerable time for reduced sunlight to Parks.

Sunlight to the Public Parks of the City is a most important issue.

Melbourne is a City of wonderful and distinctive Parks, green spaces and trees. They are an essential part of Melbourne's best assets and we have an obligation to preserve and look after them.

The Report has well documented the sanctuary of a healthy Park, the visual appeal, the benefits to physical and mental well being of the City's Public Parks.

I would like to comment on 2 concerns.

1.The Report describes a balanced approach to limiting overshadowing from new development and the protection

of sunlight access to the Parks. However in recent times and the challenges of the pandemic and climate change there appears to have been a rebalancing of the interests of development intensification and maintaining the vitality of our Parks. The high value of the health and environmental advantages of green space has been accentuated. Momentum for high growth in the City has stalled, demand has fallen and there have been high and unpopular costs such as unattractive high rise buildings on small blocks. High growth at high cost in inner and greater City areas seems dated.

2 Type 3 Parks and I refer to Fawkner Park and Domain Parklands have reduced hours of protection 10am until 2pm rather than 3pm because there is significant overshadowing now after 2pm. It has been decided correctly that no allowable shadow will be permitted beyond existing shadow in these Parks. However between the hours of 2pm to 3 pm is there still the possibility of further shadow over these Heritage listed Parks than exists presently?

It is high priority that no further shadowing occur in these Parks of high significance. There are magnificent and impressive trees on the Western perimeter of Fawkner Park and the St Kilda Rd area of Domain Parklands which may be impaired by a decrease in winter sunlight. Also for new plantings in the future to replace old trees there needs to be the sunlight for the continued healthy growth of the present wide variety of trees. If there is new overshadowing on these Parklands between 2pm and 3pm by high rise buildings the extra height of these buildings need to be reduced. I believe the preservation of these precious Parks is more important than extra height on buildings in very particular locations of St Kilda Rd and the City.

Yours sincerely, Jennifer McDonald

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

*

Name: * Mary-Lou Howie

Email address: * howie.marylou@gmail.com

Date of Council meeting: * Tuesday 31 August 2021

Agenda item title: * 4. Matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting

*

Please write your submission in the space provided below and submit by no later than 10am on the day of the scheduled meeting. We encourage you to make your submission as early as possible.

“On 17 August 2021, the Future Melbourne Committee (FMC) was unable to attain a quorum when considering item 6.2 ‘Planning Scheme Amendment C278 Sunlight to Parks – Introducing new planning to protect winter sun in all parks’, due to the number of Councillors declaring a conflict of interest. ... this has led to the need to establish a delegated committee, as outlined in this report, consisting of non-conflicted Councillors”.

In the interest of transparency, I respectfully request that the Lord Mayor and all the councillors concerned who declared a conflict of interest due to financial or donations in this matter, let the residents and community know the nature of their donation, how much money was involved, from whom the money was received &/or to whom the money was given?

Could the Lord Mayor and the councillors please provide this information during the meeting and/or in the minutes?

Thank you.