

From: Inquiry into the Public Housing Renewal Program [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 2 November 2017 4:12 PM
To: phrp
Subject: New Submission to Inquiry into the Public Housing Renewal Program

Inquiry Name: Inquiry into the Public Housing Renewal Program

Mr Kevin Chamberlin

T: [REDACTED]

E: [REDACTED]

Chair.

North and West Melbourne Association.

SUBMISSION CONTENT:

--

The North and West Melbourne Association (NWMA) has been established for over 50 years originally starting as the Hotham Hill Neighbourhood Association in 1966, later the North Melbourne Association and now the NWMA.

The NWMA has a long history of support for social, public and affordable/equitable Housing (lets call it social housing in this submission). It has been a leader in supporting the provision of social housing in inner Melbourne with considerable success.

Whilst it had been necessary to engage in debate and change the attitude of previous housing authorities on social housing issues, overall it has been very successful and resulted in the provision of much needed accommodation.

For example, significant parts of Capel and Hawke Streets West Melbourne has been saved and now provide high quality social housing. Many other examples exist. This is a direct result of campaigning by the NWMA predecessors.

Today, we find ourselves in a similar position.

The NWMA believes many substantial opportunities exist in our community to strategically address the social housing issue and win sustainable long term and substantial results.

However, the current process being used in respect to the Victorian Government property bounded by Abbotsford, Haines, Harker/Curzon and Molesworth Streets North Melbourne is flawed, a lost golden opportunity and unsustainable for the following reasons:

1. The sudden announcement and the appearance that it was "all stitched up" offended most of the community that would have otherwise been very supportive. They put their best supporters offside immediately.
2. Whilst the consultation process did address some of the smaller issues, it did not accommodate the need for community discussion on the major strategic issues of both urban planning and social housing.
3. The consultation process overall is regarded by a significant number of the community as a disaster and did the process tremendous damage.
4. The Victorian Government owns hectares of land in the immediate vicinity that is now being prepared for sale and residential development. The community was not able to include these properties in any strategic discussions about the social housing issues.
5. For example, no discussion was possible about the options for this and other land in the district and the

possibility of the introduction of an Inclusionary Zone in the Melbourne Planning Scheme to increase the supply of social housing.

6. URBAN PLANNING. The manner in which this proposal was managed from an urban planning perspective is appalling. The rule that urban planning is about a plan, stability in the community, built form, design and a good community outcome has been trashed by this proposal.

7. This area is medium density residential area with heritage controls in place and a very sustainable community environment. In March of this year the current Victorian Government rezoned this area and made the height limit eleven metres mandatory. The current proposal would change this significantly.

8. The scale of the buildings in the compromise proposal are still excessive and completely out of scale with the surrounding built form. Numerous problems will result from these structures for the local community as well as becoming a precedent for more rezoning and inappropriate high buildings in a low rise community. Precedent is now a very powerful argument at Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

9. The development identified above and other Victorian Government Planning Scheme proposals for North and West Melbourne will result in significant population increases (Arden Precinct alone proposes 15,000 people on vacant land owned by the Victorian Government). Publicly, no evidence was provided or any informed discussion took place, that I am aware, of the infrastructure needs of the increased population. For example, where are the schools, early childhood education centres, parks and recreations areas. What are the plans for the increased traffic volumes!!!

--

File1:

File2:

File3: