

Preston Market Planning Controls Review



Community Reference Group (CRG) – Meeting #4, 8 August 2018

Summary Notes

Time	Item	Details
6.00pm	<p>Welcome</p> <p><i>Amy Hubbard, Capire Consulting Group</i></p>	<p>AH welcomed members to the fourth meeting and provided an Acknowledgement of Country.</p> <p>AH asked everyone in the room to introduce themselves. She then explained the purpose of the CRG Meeting #4 was to discuss the recommendations and responses, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results from Public engagement • Comments from Darebin and VPA • Comments from Architectus <p>AH expressed to the CRG members that the purpose of the meeting was not to debate the recommendations and that the members would be given an opportunity at the end of the meeting to provide their individual feedback on the recommendations.</p> <p>AH reinforced that the CRG members are to engage in respectful and constructive discussions with their fellow CRG members and the project team.</p>
6.05pm	<p>CRG member check in</p> <p><i>Amy Hubbard, Capire Consulting Group</i></p>	<p>AH check in with the CRG members as to whether they would like to ask questions, raise a matter or provide their reflections before the meeting commenced. The following are reflections made by several CRG members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was great to see the different views of the community in the broader engagement. • Not all members were aware that the broader community would be given the opportunity to comment on the work of the CRG. • There are subjects that feel unresolved, for example, the heritage and significance of the structure. • What will happen to the CRG, in terms of this groups and their knowledge? Will it continue in some form? • What is covered in the planning scheme and urban design framework? How is this going to be dealt with, for example, what will public open space or the building look like? <p>Concern was raised that the CRG had not done anything to actually save the Preston Market, to which AH and JC responded that the remit of the CRG</p>

Time	Item	Details
		<p>was to create a set of recommendations to inform the planning control review for the whole Preston Market site.</p> <p>AH reflected that the message from this group throughout this process has been to save the Preston Market – may be this should read: <i>‘that the message from this group throughout this process has been to retain a market on site’</i>.</p>
6.15pm	<p>Activity #1</p> <p><i>Amy Hubbard, Capire Consulting Group</i></p>	<p>AH introduced the broader community engagement findings on the CRG draft recommendations and invited the CRG members to provide their initial reflections. The engagement findings presented were predominately the online survey responses. AH acknowledged that analysis of the face-to-face engagement activities had not been completed.</p> <p><i>Draft CRG recommendation discussed: To provide affordable housing on the site.</i></p> <p>Several CRG members were very surprised by the broader communities’ responses to the recommendation for affordable housing. They thought that the broader community would be more supportive of the recommendation. Capire and VPA responded that they did not believe the results reflected the responses from face-to-face participants and agreed that more analysis was needed.</p> <p><i>Draft CRG recommendation discussed: To review the location of the Preston Market building within the site to better align with the planning principles proposed by the CRG (i.e. Market as the heart of Preston; Market as a destination; continuation of operation for existing traders).</i></p> <p>The recommendation to review the location of the market was raised by several CRG members. The initial reflection was that it was not clear how the recommendation would support the CRG principles. This led to a discussion regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the size of the market • refurbishing the market and compensating traders during this time/ decanting of traders for minimal disruption • lease agreements • necessity of carparking for the market and housing development. <p>Comments from John Casey, Victorian Planning Authority</p> <p>AH invited JC to provide his reflections on the recommendations and broader community engagement. JC shared the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserving the Preston Market is an outcome the VPA want to champion.

Time	Item	Details
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The level of support from online survey participants for the recommendation for affordable housing was confusing, particularly with the positive responses towards this recommendation at drop in sessions and pop up stalls. Overall, the feedback on the recommendations has been very positive. In terms of saving the market, supporting the market as a community space and to support diversity, the VPA is exploring mechanisms to address the commercial realities. They not only want to address this through planning controls but explore other mechanisms that can address these realities, both long term and short term. <p>Comments from Rachel Ollivier, City of Darebin</p> <p>AH invited RO to provide her reflections and thoughts to the CRG. RO shared the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What Council are trying to achieve is to ensure that the market thrives in the future and that there is an extensive community engagement process. Council want to begin to address how the recommendations are going to look and teasing out the nuances of the recommendations. The broader community engagement findings show clear support for many of the recommendations and therefore reinforce what the CRG have been discussing. <p>Comments from Greg Burgon, Architectus</p> <p>AH invited GB to provide his reflections on the recommendations. GB shared the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendations are a good framework for a brief to design the site. The recommendations put in parameters to ensure that the market is in the right place. More could be provided on the Built Form, for example, housing for the site and what form that should take. It is evident that the recommendations are focussed on the market itself, but we need to turn out thoughts to the rest of the site and provide more guidance. The recommendation for affordable housing needs to be clarified.

Time	Item	Details
		<p>AH then invited the CRG members to ask questions and provide their further reflections.</p> <p><i>CRG member: The heritage of the market does not seem to come out here at all, what are your thoughts in terms of the architecture?</i></p> <p>GB: In terms of the heritage, I would refer to other experts. I do think there are elements from an architecture perspective, elements that work well and elements that don't work well. For example, elements that work well are the wide thoroughfares, natural light and air flow and the elements that do not work well are generally outside of the market, the lack of identity from the street and bad pedestrian connection and the loading bays.</p> <p><i>CRG member: My understanding of where we got to with the recommendations is not being explicit that their needs to be an overlay or that a building has to stay so not to limit the opportunity for the market. However, understand there are differing views in the group.</i></p> <p>GB: If there was to be an overlay over the building then everything has to happen around it, and is that the best for the market? There is also concern that traders may be lost during the refurbishment process and we want to retain the traders. If you were to relocate the building on the site, you would want to do it in one go.</p> <p><i>CRG member: But the community is saying we want to hold onto the market exactly as it is, the structure and all. Is it possible to make all the improvements to the market and still keep the structure?</i></p> <p>GB: The next stage should be looking at options and not pre-determining where the market should be. However, keeping the market as it is limits what can be achieved.</p> <p>There were mixed views regarding the recommendation to review the location of the market. There were two main cohorts in the CRG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • one cohort does not agree with the recommendation and does not want the market moved • one cohort agrees with reviewing the location of the market to ensure opportunities are not limited.
<i>BREAK</i>		
7.20pm	Activity #1, continued <i>Amy Hubbard, Capire Consulting Group</i>	<p>AH invited Tess Pickering from the VPA to provide some comments about the engagement process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The VPA were asked by the Minister for Planning to review the current planning controls of the Preston Market site and to do so

Time	Item	Details
		<p>with the community, which has been done through broader community engagement and the CRG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This process has been invaluable and will only make the recommendations better. • This process of engagement will end here and the VPA will submit the recommendations to the Minister. • The next step will be a detailed planning stage and it is the VPA's view that the community need to be involved in this. • The VPA invites the CRG members to consider how they would like to be involved in this next stage. <p>AH reflects, the CRG are now considered community experts and their active participation moving forward is encouraged.</p> <p>The discussion of the recommendations continued, with one member reflecting on the two cohorts of thought regarding the location of the market.</p> <p><i>It has become apparent that there are two schools of thought, but as a group the things we value most are the essence of the market and the community. It's important that the language in the recommendations is open so we can get a better outcome but still maintain the essence of the market.</i></p> <p><i>The concept of the single level didn't shine through in the recommendations. It was not reflected in the market building recommendation, to keep the Preston Market as a standalone building with good daylight, as was discussed in the meetings.</i></p> <p><i>A building with good daylight is subject to the size of the building also.</i></p> <p>JC: asked the CRG whether the recommendation re the market needed to be amended to include reference to having a market on site that incorporates space of a similar size as the current market.</p> <p><i>Do we want to have something in the recommendation around minimum size? Support for words in the recommendations around meeting community needs or retaining a similar variety of stores.</i></p> <p>This was generally accepted by the broader group. The CRG meeting then went on to discuss the issue of underground loading and parking in the recommendations.</p> <p><i>The recommendation, to provide underground loading and servicing to the Market and future residences, should be clearer in including underground parking.</i></p> <p>Suggested words: <i>sufficient parking for all users.</i></p>

Time	Item	Details
		<p>AH invited the CRG members to ask VPA, Darebin or Architectus any final questions relating to the draft recommendations.</p> <p><i>CRG member: How can we stop the developer from demolishing the market overnight?</i></p> <p>JC: Firstly, they would need to go through a permit process for the demolition of the market. Secondly, we're going through this process. Realistically, if this process is going to provide a solution to protect the market and allow development, why would they? The commercial reality is that they would not be able to do anything for a long period of time, they are locked as to what they can do now.</p> <p><i>CRG member: We have gone through a complex process to achieve these recommendations, we then hand these over to the VPA to make recommendations to the Minister, how will this hold tight? How will this ensure the developers do what we are recommending?</i></p> <p>JC: There is a robust strategic framework that links to planning controls. The essence in terms of the market, development, open space and key connections can be locked in with planning controls.</p> <p><i>CRG member: What will go to the Minister?</i></p> <p>JC: The recommendations from the CRG and the VPA's principles, which are aligned with what has been heard from the broader community. The next phase will be how the principles turn into planning controls.</p> <p>RO: the next question that's clear from this discussion is will be how this will look and turning the principles and recommendations into options for the site.</p> <p><i>CRG member: here does not appear to be anything in the draft recommendations that reflects sustainability. With the focus groups we did work regarding sustainability on the site. This needs to be more explicit in the recommendations.</i></p> <p><i>CRG member: Traffic management is also missing from the recommendations.</i></p> <p>One member wanted it noted that he represents many culturally diverse community groups and they do not want the location of the market reviewed.</p> <p>There was also a discussion regarding developer contribution into the process. One member would incorporate a developer contribution into the recommendations.</p> <p><i>CRG member: The CRG need to consider what they want the developer contribution used for.</i></p>

Time	Item	Details
		<p>JC: We need to flesh out what are some of the obvious community benefits that we can deliver.</p> <p><i>CRG member: We need to be clearer about community purposes on the site, is it a place where people can gather and spend money, or does it mean community as a place where people gather and don't need to spend money?</i></p> <p>The CRG agreed that this was something that would need to be explored further.</p>
8.10pm	<p>Activity #2</p> <p><i>Amy Hubbard, Capire Consulting Group</i></p>	<p>AH invited the CRG members to individually reflect and complete the recommendation questionnaire. The questionnaire posed the question, 'do you support this recommendation' and included space for CRG members to provide their comments.</p>
8.20pm	<p>Plenary and Next Steps</p> <p><i>Amy Hubbard, Capire Consulting Group</i></p>	<p>AH posed one final question to the CRG, is there a role for broader community engagement moving forward, and if yes what should this look like?</p> <p>The following are suggestions from members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the same process but with more translators for the broader community. • Provide community options they can give feedback on. • Set the right expectations of what the outcomes can and will be. • Visit and engage migrant communities where they are located and reach out to community leaders. • Whatever the final document is, you do not want to choke the developer. Involve the developer in the conversation. <p>AH thanked the CRG members and acknowledged their work through this process. AH explained the information from the evening would be collated and documented per the meeting notes.</p> <p>JC and R thanked the CRG members on behalf of the VPA and Council and acknowledged their contributions and hard work.</p>
8.40pm	CLOSE	AH closed the meeting.