

**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1495]  
**Date:** Thursday, 29 March 2018 5:52:27 PM

---

Name: \* cian davis

Email address: \* [cdavis@batesmart.com](mailto:cdavis@batesmart.com)

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\*

Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Tuesday 3 April 2018

Agenda item title: \* QVM Munro Site

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 Whom it may concern,  
As Studio Director at Bates Smart Architects and the lead designer for the QVM Munro Site being discussed at the FMC meeting on the 3 of April 2017, i would greatly appreciate the opportunity to address the committee, regarding the merits, community benefit and design intent of the Munro Site design.

Kind regards  
Cian Davis.

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission:

Yes

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.)* \*

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

---

**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1512]  
**Date:** Tuesday, 3 April 2018 12:13:55 AM

---

Name: \* Miriam Faine

Email address: \* [miriam.faine@bigpond.com](mailto:miriam.faine@bigpond.com)

Contact phone number (optional): 98184505

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\*

Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Tuesday 3 April 2018

Agenda item title: \* TPRM-2018-2,

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.

I would like to submit on behalf of Friends of Queen Victoria Market that elements of these plans and specifically the removal of the current carpark, are now superseded, and need to be reconsidered, in the light of HV not granting a permit.

Furthermore, in regard to TPRM-2018-2, FOQVM seeks further information with regard to the replacement of the market car parking.

In particular it seems that that only 503 of the approximately 720 car parking spaces that are currently associated with the Queen Victoria Market will be located at basement level across the whole of the Munro site.

There will also be loss of the convenience of 'at grade' compared with basement parking.

The balance of 217 spaces will apparently be relocated 'elsewhere' in the precinct (accessed via Queen Street). TPRM-2018-2 notes that 'It is understood that City of Melbourne will construct the remaining 217 spaces (approx.) on Parcel A and or D or within the wider Queen Victoria Market area'.

This is unacceptably vague, particularly as Heritage Victoria has made it clear they cannot permit the removal of the sheds to build the basement parking.

We note there are also approximately 500 on-street car parks used by market shoppers. A large number of these will be lost (according to the renewal plans), including those in Franklin St. So there will be a significant net loss of customer parking.

The core market business remains reliant on those regular customers who do a substantial family shopping trip every week. These customers came from middle suburbs as well as inner Melbourne and are reliant on their cars. The market simply cannot survive in its current form without sufficient, cheap and accessible parking.

If the current renewal plans proceed, they need to comply with Schedule 11 to the Development Plan Overlay which seeks the provision of a minimum of 720 spaces to replace

the existing QVM public car park before re developing the car park area, which falls within DOP11.

These should be additional to other existing car parking in the market area, so there is no net loss of parking, at least to 1200 spaces.

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission: Yes

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.) \**

Privacy acknowledgement: \*

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

**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1514]  
**Date:** Tuesday, 3 April 2018 12:55:38 AM

---

Name: \* Adam Ford

Email address: \* [mvha@rattlingtram.melbourne](mailto:mvha@rattlingtram.melbourne)

Contact phone number (optional): 0425320533

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\*

Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Tuesday 3 April 2018

Agenda item title: \* Ministerial Referral TPMR-2018-2, 93-141 Therry Street, 143-151 Therry Street and 128-130 Franklin Street, 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.

I write on behalf of Moonee Valley Heritage Action to express our extreme objection to the demolition of the C graded Heritage Structures fronting Thierry Street, apparently to be replaced with 2 storey brick structures "reflecting the heritage of the area".

The primary objection is that these are C graded Heritage structures, and if Council allows their demolition, it is by precedent allowing the potential demolition of all the existing C and D grade structures on its inventory. In this day and age, permission to fully demolish any listed heritage structure should only be granted in the most exceptional of circumstances, and the proposal in no way demonstrates this imperative.

To support this demolition, a clear argument needs to be made that at least the facades could not be incorporated into the new structure. Given the proposal appears to support replacing this structures with buildings of almost identical scale, form and material, there appears to be no such sustainable argument.

The proposal's assertion "Despite their grading of "C", the shops are quite unpre- possessing architecturally" is not apparently supported by any heritage professional. The first question that needs to be asked is why the heritage assessment has apparently been carried out by Bates Smart, where an independent assessment by a qualified heritage professional MUST surely be required at the very least to be even contemplating the demolition. The impression left is that they were unable to find any professional unethical enough to sanction this.

Furthermore there is no such thing as "despite their grading of C...". These buildings are graded and therefore PROTECTED. Councillors will be grossly negligent of their duties if they fail to uphold this.

The citation for HO7 states

"What is Significant?

... the south side of Therry Street between Queen and Elizabeth Streets (nos 97-141)." So the buildings HAVE been assessed by a heritage professional as significant, and there is no professional argument tendered to the contrary. Bates Smart and PDG apparently simply know

better than the authors of the City North Heritage Review. Councillors do not want to be adding their names to this list of the completely arrogant. Councillors must surely at the very least require a professional heritage assessment to the contrary to dismiss the findings of the City North Review, otherwise the basis of the entire review can be called in to question.

While the development proposal would have it that these buildings "make a minimal architectural contribution to the precinct", they would never have been listed if that were the case. Furthermore a building's being "unprepossessing architecturally", setting aside the utterly cretinous nature of the statement, must be countered by the absolutely established principle that – particularly for industrial structures, this is NOT the criterion by which we assess heritage. The buildings have been listed by dint of being a typology worth preserving and which contributes to the traditional market ambience that is the basis for the entire overlay. If we can start knocking over C graded buildings for not being beautiful, then Councillors are placing large swathes of the city's heritage at risk.

Which Councillor would care to stand up at VCAT and argue against the next developer who wants to knock over any one of the C graded buildings in the City North Heritage Review (most of which are industrial in nature and not very 'prepossessing') after this?

Put simply, any Councillor who votes to demolish buildings that Council itself only recently nominated as C grade structures will be tendered to the wider community as having placed the entire basis of heritage listing in peril, and find themselves positioned alongside PDG, whose brand will enter into the lexicon of troglodyte, heritage-wrecking developers.

We cannot make the point strongly enough, this is a MAJOR heritage litmus test, and it will, if allowed to proceed, set an APPALLING precedent for the demolition of listed structures. This cannot be allowed to pass without consequence.

Any Councillors who vote to demolish listed heritage structures for the benefit of their own redevelopment will most certainly find their record regarding this vote placed in the public arena.

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission:      No

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.) \**

Privacy acknowledgement: \*

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

**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1517]  
**Date:** Tuesday, 3 April 2018 7:57:47 AM

---

Name: \* Tristan Davies

Email address: \* [melbourneheritageaction@gmail.com](mailto:melbourneheritageaction@gmail.com)

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\*

Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Tuesday 3 April 2018

Agenda item title: \* 6.1 Ministerial Referral TPMR-2018-2, 93-141 Therry Street, 143-151 Therry Street and 128-130 Franklin Street, 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.

Melbourne Heritage Action continues to oppose so much demolition of an entire site of heritage listing buildings, with all of the Munro Site being given a C-grading as recently as the 2015 City North Heritage Amendment.

While we commend the retention of one rear warehouse and some facade elements on the corner, a much better solution more in keeping with heritage concerns and the market character across Therry Street should be sought, as we see no need for an entire row of intact 1940s shopfronts holding boutique and low-rent tenancies to be demolished, nor would there be need for such drastic demolition of so much industrial heritage on the site if a plan for adaptive re-use in line with the markets usage was found.

We Further wonder how any talk of this redevelopment can proceed in light of Heritage Victoria's ruling on the excavation of the QVM sheds, given that is the entire justification for this development/sale to developers.

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission: Yes

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.)* \*

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

---

**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1496]  
**Date:** Thursday, 29 March 2018 6:35:54 PM

---

Name: \* Stan Liacos

Email address: \* [stan.liacos@qvm.com.au](mailto:stan.liacos@qvm.com.au)

Contact phone number (optional): 0418 172 362

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\*

Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Tuesday 3 April 2018

Agenda item title: \* 6.2 Planning Application TP-2016-1124/A, Queen Street Road Reserve and Queen Victoria Market, 65-159 Victoria Street, 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.

I would like to make a request to be heard by the Future Melbourne Committee in regards to Agenda Item 6.2.

As CEO of the Queen Victoria Market I would like to speak in support of the proposed amendment to Planning permit TP-2016-1124, being for the project we know as the "New Market Pavilion".

I will be covering the following key points:

The proposed New Market Pavilion will be a welcome temporary addition to the Queen Victoria Market precinct, enabling the market to continue business during staged upgrades that will eventually see the entire market precinct renewed over a five year period, while also bringing a fresh new offer to the marketplace.

The New Market Pavilion in this reduced footprint will serve the market's requirement to provide a place for all traders throughout the delivery of new and improved infrastructure through the renewal program.

The New Market Pavilion will give interested market traders a chance to experience a different format of trading, explore different operating hours and market curation possibilities and, with the addition of the Greenhouse, bring a new, complementary offer into the market precinct that we believe will enhance the traditional market offer and in doing so, expand the market's customer base.

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission: Yes

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.) \**

Privacy acknowledgement: \*

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



**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1497]  
**Date:** Thursday, 29 March 2018 6:44:49 PM

---

Name: \* Mary McDonald

Email address: \* [mary@murmac.net](mailto:mary@murmac.net)

Contact phone number (optional): +61394362034

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\*

Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Wednesday 3 April 1918

Agenda item title: \* TP-2016-1124/A

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.

I have made a submission but wish to address the Committee

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission:

Yes

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.)* \*

Privacy acknowledgement: \*

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

**From:** [Mary McDonald](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** address the meeting 3 April 2018 re TP-2016-1124/A  
**Date:** Thursday, 29 March 2018 6:44:35 PM

---

Please register both Brian Murray and  
Mary McDonald to speak at the Future Melbourne Committee 3 April 2018.

Regards Mary

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1499]  
**Date:** Thursday, 29 March 2018 10:19:16 PM

---

Name: \* Bruce Pham

Email address: \* [bruce@brucegoose.com.au](mailto:bruce@brucegoose.com.au)

Contact phone number (optional): 0412220220

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\*

Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Tuesday 3 April 2018

Agenda item title: \* New Market Pavilion Permit Amendment

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.

A place for traders to have the opportunity to promote and visually merchandise their products.  
An information centre to highlight traders and inform customers of the Queen Victoria Market features.

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission:

No

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.)* \*

Privacy acknowledgement: \*

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

**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1501]  
**Date:** Sunday, 1 April 2018 1:07:37 PM

---

Name: \* Gregory Smith

Email address: \* [gregandsuesmith@iinet.net.au](mailto:gregandsuesmith@iinet.net.au)

Contact phone number (optional): +61406222020

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\* Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Tuesday 3 April 2018

Agenda item title: \* New Market Pavilion Permit Amendment

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.

I would like to support the amendment to the New Market Pavilion permit as follows –

1. The reduction in size will meet the core intent of a showcase for market activities and a place for relocating traders during site construction.
2. The plans make better use of available ground level trading space and the focus on trading activities.
3. The removal of plane trees is supported by traders and we note the intent to offset the loss of the trees with future planting within the precinct.
4. In more general terms the NMP is partly intended to house relocated traders but it also to be a showcase for what QVM can offer. While the Amazon's of this world continue their assault on retailing we can show how QVM addresses modern retail presentation and the growing demand for customer convenience.

QVM will always be about tradition but having a location (NMP) that draws a bridge between the old and the new makes a lot of sense. The NMP will showcase the best in stall presentation, and allow experimentation in trading hours and content. It could become a key to how our market relates to new consumerism. That is an exciting prospect.

Greg Smith  
Trader at Queen Victoria Market.  
Editor Of Victraders.com

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission: No

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.)* \*

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

**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1502]  
**Date:** Monday, 2 April 2018 11:29:04 AM

---

Name: \* Marshall Waters

Email address: \* [marshall@rewine.com.au](mailto:marshall@rewine.com.au)

Contact phone number (optional): 0412588440

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\*

Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Tuesday 3 April 2018

Agenda item title: \* 6.2

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

New Market Pavilion.  
This presents an opportunity to make a statement that the renewal is happening and create an opportunity to trial new trading times.

The Heritage of the Vic Market is about the people, not the buildings.

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission:

Yes

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.)* \*

Privacy acknowledgement: \*

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

**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1507]  
**Date:** Monday, 2 April 2018 7:30:12 PM

---

Name: \* Rocco Tripodi

Email address: \* [info@marketjuice.com.au](mailto:info@marketjuice.com.au)

Contact phone number (optional): 0409885951

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\*

Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Tuesday 3 April 2018

Agenda item title: \* Planning Application TP-2016-1124/A, Queen Street Road Reserve and Queen Victoria Market, 65-159 Victoria Street, 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.

We write in support of the amended new market pavilion. We are a second generation business having traded in fruit and vegetables for more than 50 years. Having seen the decline in trade first hand, we are keen to see our workplace reinvigorated. The market needs to change and adapt to suit today's shoppers, remembering that the much loved heritage sheds were designed and built 140 years ago to accomodate horse and cart and a much different shopper. Importantly, we need to compete with other retail offerings on our doorstep. The new pavilion provides us with the opportunity to trade in a different format and to attract todays shopper, whilst keeping the sheds in place. There is already trade on this proposed section of Queen st and we believe that not only will it attract more customers, it will provide a new and improved working environment for us. We see the building as a positive step forward in the renewal of the precinct. We need to move swiftly, as we are currently in a holding pattern and this is placing further pressure on struggling businesses.

Thank you

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission: No

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.)* \*

Privacy acknowledgement: \* 

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



**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1506]  
**Date:** Monday, 2 April 2018 4:52:54 PM

---

Name: \* James Brady

Email address: \* [ajbrady@optusnet.com.au](mailto:ajbrady@optusnet.com.au)

Contact phone number (optional): 0422 566 184

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\*

Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Tuesday 3 April 2018

Agenda item title: \* Amendment to Permit Application TP-2016-1124/A

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission:

Yes

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.)* \*

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

---



**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1503]  
**Date:** Monday, 2 April 2018 7:45:33 PM

---

Name: \* Charles Sowerwine

Email address: \* [c.sowerwine@gmail.com](mailto:c.sowerwine@gmail.com)

Contact phone number (optional): 0414 250-046

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\*

Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Tuesday 3 April 2018

Agenda item title: \* Planning Permit Application: TP-2016-1124/A

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



[planning\\_committee\\_submission\\_18.04.03.docx](#)

15.61 KB · DOCX

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission:

Yes

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.)* \*

Privacy acknowledgement: \*

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

Submission to Future Melbourne Planning Committee Meeting 4 April 2018

Agenda Item 6.2, Planning Permit Application: TP-2016-1124/A

Submitted by Emeritus Professor Charles Sowerwine on behalf of the Royal Historical Society of Victoria (Heritage Committee)

The RHSV notes that Council officers recommended approval of this revision of the original permit for the glasshouse or pavilion intended as a temporary structure during the planned excavation works.

The RHSV submits that in the light of Heritage Victoria's refusal to grant a permit for the works as planned the Future Melbourne Planning Committee should defer consideration of this revision pending Council's revision of its plans for the Market.

The Heritage Victoria decision in no wise precludes structural renovation. It precludes the planned excavation and the construction of massive modern intrusions. Dismantling and reconstruction where necessary for conservation are not at issue.

The Council will therefore have to develop an alternative plan. It is unlikely to involve a massive temporary facility since renovation can now progress by stages. Therefore the pavilion will not be necessary and further consideration would be irrelevant.

The RHSV notes further the removal of seven major London plane trees which are a major feature at the heart of the market. These play a major role in the character of the market as well as in providing shade. The RHSV objects strenuously to proposals for their removal.

The Committee can play an important role in bringing Council to revise its plans and progress this important issue positively by deferring Planning Permit Application: TP-2016-1124/A.

**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1513]  
**Date:** Monday, 2 April 2018 9:44:05 PM

---

Name: \* Miriam Faine

Email address: \* [miriam.faine@bigpond.com](mailto:miriam.faine@bigpond.com)

Contact phone number (optional): 0408184505

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\*

Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Friday 3 April 2018

Agenda item title: \* TP-2016-1124/A

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.

I would like to talk to previous submission from FOQVM as follows:

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



[pavilion\\_amended.docx](#)  
124.32 KB · DOCX

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission:

Yes

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.)* \*

Privacy acknowledgement: \*

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

TP-2016-1124/A

1. Friends of Queen Victoria Market Inc. (FOQVM) represent over 4,000 Melbournians who are concerned about CoM's redevelopment plans for our market.

We submit that Council MUST NOT continue to hear this application for the following 2 principle reasons.

**2. The justification for the pavilion was to accommodate stallholders so they could continue to trade within the market while works were carried out. However, Heritage Victoria has rejected the proposed works. Under these circumstance, to proceed with this pavilion is unnecessary and inappropriate.**

3. In any case the CoM is required by its own Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment to pass this application onto the Planning Minister for assessment.

Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C245 (approved on 11/7/2017) ruled that 'The Minister for Planning assume the status of Responsible Authority for approval of any Development Plan or planning permit application under Development Plan Overlay Schedule 11.'

**It is invalid for council to be assessing its own application, and this is the same basis on which planning for the broader redevelopment was handed off to the Minister. It was clearly the intention of the C245 Panel to ensure that CoM as planning authority cannot assess an application such as this, when it is also the developer.**

4. The CoM have failed to explain why this amendment to the original is required. The documentation provided merely states that "In summary, the proposed amendment to the approved development is necessary to reduce (approximately halve) the scale of the temporary market facility. To this end, the conclusion of an planning assessment has to be that the smaller temporary facility will have less consequence on local amenity and the general area.'

and

"It is acknowledged that there are a number of relatively minor design changes within the smaller facility, however it is our submission that the overall integrity of the architecture is not compromised, and the various innovations associated with the 'sustainability' of the project are maintained."

There is considerable public expenditure involved and oddly the cost has now risen from \$5 million to \$7.4 million, although the structure is shorter than one the council approved last year - it will be 111 metres long, not 264 metres. However, we were informed the structure had been ordered some time ago (and indeed was supposed to be installed by the end of 2017).

The public has the right to know

- what is the exact reason for the change

- what are implications of the cost change

5. The original design was highly acclaimed by the former Lord Mayor and Councilors, and the proposed changes to that design (which are far from minor) reflect poorly on their effusive endorsement of the original, and on the extravagantly hyped documentation that accompanied it.

We submit these new changes reflect the general confusion and lack of transparency associated with the entire QVM redevelopment.

6. The 'temporary' pavilion was designed to rehouse displaced traders during the proposed underground excavation of A, B, C & D sheds, which is yet to be approved by Heritage Victoria. This application is therefore premature.

It is also unnecessary, because the proposed underground service area is unworkable and destructive of the heritage of the market.

Nor does CoM yet have approval for the proposed market car park on the Munro site.

7. We note that the CoM has recently advertised for expressions of interest to manage the 'temporary' pavilion and provide tourist related attractions and dining concepts (instead of housing existing traders). We wonder if the responses to this (or lack of responses) are what is informing the current design change?

8. The proposed pavilion should also not be built for the following reasons:

- a. The proposed structure conflicts with existing market activities
- b. There has been little consultation with traders and none with market customers as to the suitability or purpose of this structure. Traders consulted were not enthusiastic.
- c. It divides the market in two, separating the fresh food stalls from the meat and fish market and the deli, and will be highly inconvenient for customers, thus further threatening the viability of the traditional market trading
- d. It is not clear how the traders will be able to access the pavilion in order to stock their stalls – no information on this was provided with the original design
- e. The cost of \$5.5 million dollars seems extraordinarily high for a temporary facility, and it seems possible that the true intention is to make this pavilion a permanent facility, perhaps to house the fresh produce section of the redeveloped market. As well, some traders believe the purpose is to cherry pick traders for the new market.
- f. The drawings suggest fixed lock up stalls, which is a complete change to the traditional market trading operations.
- g. The proposed trading areas in the pavilion will have little natural sunlight or airflow.

- h. Extensive use of glass on the top storey means the facility will have to be air conditioned. It is arguable whether it will actually be sustainable at all, as there will be massive energy costs in constructing, maintaining and running it.
- i. There is no detailed design documentation for the pavilion, only a schematic design, which is vague in the extreme, especially the mooted 'greenhouse' in the sky. This 'greenhouse' has no value to the market traders or fresh produce customers.
- j. Planning documentation is also incomplete, as no traffic engineers report has been submitted. This seems an extraordinary omission for a structure, which is being built on a public roadway.
- k. There will be a permanent loss of approximately 100 car parks in Queen St essential to customer convenience during the week, including disabled parking places.
- l. There will be a net loss of loading zones and trader parking for fruit, vegetable, meat, fish and deli
- m. The proposed pavilion's contemporary design is completely out of character with the heritage character of the market

9. In addition the loss of seven mature trees, which provide valuable shade and character at the heart of the market, is unacceptable, especially when the stated intention of the pavilion is to raise environmental awareness

**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1518]  
**Date:** Tuesday, 3 April 2018 8:07:47 AM

---

Name: \* peter langtry

Email address: \* [peterlangtry@bigpond.com](mailto:peterlangtry@bigpond.com)

Contact phone number (optional): 0408529158

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\*

Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Tuesday 3 April 2018

Agenda item title: \* New Market Pavilion Permit Amendment

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.

1. As the first new substantial building erected at QVM since 1928 all be it temporary, the erection of 'The Glasshouse' sends a message to the people of Melbourne that the council and the renewal team is determined to move forward with the renewal and has not being daunted by recent adverse reaction to what is a highly credible and well designed project.
2. The 'Glasshouse' will also reassure traders that the council is sensitive to the needs of traders who may be temporarily displaced during the renewal.

Yours sincerely  
PETER LANGTRY  
Prop Polish Deli  
Trader Rep Committee Member – Dairy Hall

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission: Yes

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.)* \*

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

**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1519]  
**Date:** Tuesday, 3 April 2018 9:13:45 AM

---

Name: \* Tim Moore

Email address: \* [tamjewellery@gmail.com](mailto:tamjewellery@gmail.com)

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\*

Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Tuesday 3 April 2018

Agenda item title: \* Planning Application TP-2016-1124/A, Queen Street Road Reserve and Queen Victoria Market,

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.

How the glass house will have a negative effect on the market, it's totally out of character and the ridiculous costing for something that is temporary.

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission:

Yes

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.)* \*

Privacy acknowledgement: \*

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

---



**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1520]  
**Date:** Tuesday, 3 April 2018 10:22:45 AM

---

Name: \* Charles Sowerwine

Email address: \* [c.sowerwine@gmail.com](mailto:c.sowerwine@gmail.com)

Contact phone number (optional): 0414 250-046

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\*

Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Tuesday 3 April 2018

Agenda item title: \* Agenda item 6.1 Ministerial Referral: TPMR-2018-2

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



[rhsv\\_statement\\_munro\\_site\\_3\\_april\\_2018.docx](#)

33.36 KB · DOCX

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission:

Yes

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.)* \*

Privacy acknowledgement: \*

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



## ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF VICTORIA INC.

239 A'Beckett Street, Melbourne 3000

Tuesday, 3 April 2018

### **RHSV Statement regarding**

**Melbourne City Council, Future Melbourne Planning Committee, 3 April 2018**

**Report to the Future Melbourne Planning Committee Agenda item 6.1**

**Ministerial Referral: TPMR-2018-2**

The Royal Historical Society, peak body of 340 Victorian local historical societies, urges Melbourne City Council to face the music. Heritage Victoria has rightly ruled out that the proposed plan to underground facilities and construct aggressive modern intrusions throughout the historic sheds. The Planning Committee should defer any consideration of plans pending revision of plans for the whole site in the light of the Heritage Victoria ruling.

The RHSV is particularly concerned at the proposal to demolish heritage buildings on Therry Street. As the report notes (§ 5.6, p. 59), 'the Therry Street interface has the most sensitive heritage values, and is fundamental to the experience of the character, charm and amenity of the QVM'. That is why a heritage overlay applies to the row of inter-War, double-storey brick shops fronting Therry Street, opposite the historic deli and sheds. Nevertheless, the report casually proposes demolition of these shops. At the very least, the Planning Committee should refer the proposed demolition of heritage buildings to the Council's Heritage Committee.

The RHSV is also concerned that the report continues the discredited 'fixed trading' / reduce service intrusions' strategy (§ 1.4, p. 16, Q2). This is code for a sanitized, characterless set of built in stalls, more resembling a food hall than a market. Community outrage over this transformation of the market's character forced Council to retreat from this strategy in its PR, but it remains the aim.

The RHSV is further concerned that parking will be reduced: 'the balance of existing customer car parking (217 spaces) will be relocated elsewhere in the precinct' (§ 4.2, p. 40). Elsewhere? The only proposed parking elsewhere is in the underground service area, which will now not proceed (and which in any case would be taken up by traders' vehicles).

(Professor) Charles Sowerwine,  
Chair, Heritage Committee,  
Royal Historical Society of Victoria.

**From:** [Wufoo](#)  
**To:** [CoM Meetings](#)  
**Subject:** Council and Committee meeting submission form [#1521]  
**Date:** Tuesday, 3 April 2018 11:04:56 AM

---

Name: \* Jennifer Pyke

Email address: \* [jennypyke@yahoo.com.au](mailto:jennypyke@yahoo.com.au)

Contact phone number (optional): 0419879102

Please indicate which meeting you would like to make a submission to by selecting the appropriate button:  
\*

Future Melbourne Committee meeting

Date of meeting: \* Tuesday 3 April 2018

Agenda item title: \* 6.2 Planning Application TP 2016-1124/A

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.

The objection has already been submitted, I am requesting to speak to my submission

Please indicate whether you would like to address the Future Melbourne Committee or the Submissions (Section 223) Committee in support of your submission:

Yes

*(No opportunity is provided for submitters to be heard at Council meetings.)* \*

Privacy acknowledgement: \*

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