

Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper Questionnaire

Help Shape the Future of Reservoir

The purpose of this questionnaire is to hear your feedback and thoughts on the scenarios outlined in the **Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper**.

The scenarios pose ideas and concepts for key sites and precincts within the Reservoir MAC and intend to promote discussion within the community on the future direction of Reservoir. Council does not have a preferred position on the scenarios, therefore **we are seeking your input** to determine **how Reservoir should be planned into the future**.

The questionnaire is structured so that **you can choose your preferred scenario** for the four key opportunities, the six precincts and the numerous key sites. You can either complete the entire questionnaire or just the sections that you are interested in. All feedback will be important in developing a shared vision for Reservoir.

The questionnaire is complex therefore, it is important that you read the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper before filling in this questionnaire. Each question relates directly to the Discussion Paper.

View the Discussion Paper at www.reservoir.vic.gov.au/reservoir.

Please fill in and return this questionnaire by **14 March 2011** to:

Kylie Long - Strategic Planner
Darebin City Council
274 Gower St
PRESTON 3072
Phone: (03) 8470 8494
Email: Kylie.Long@darebin.vic.gov.au

Your Details:

Name:.....

If you would like to be kept informed about project, please fill in your details below:

Address:

.....
.....
.....

Email:.....

N.B. This personal information you provide will only be kept for the purposes of keeping you informed about this project and will not be passed on to any other individual or organisation or used for any other purpose unless required to by law.

Translations

This brochure contains important information about your area.

Linea Telefonica Multilingue: 8470 8470
Πολυγλωσσική Τηλεφωνική Γραμμή: 8470 8470
多語種專線: 8470 8470
رقم الهاتف المتعدد اللغات : 8470 8470
Повеќејазична Телефонска Линија на 8470 8470
Đường dây Điện thoại Đa Ngôn Ngữ : 8470 8470

The Key Opportunities

Key Opportunity 1- Simplifying the Reservoir Junction

Q1. Referring to Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 for 'Simplifying the Reservoir Junction' (pages 22-24 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- | | |
|--|----------|
| a) Scenario 1 – New east west link to the south | 8 of 43 |
| b) Scenario 2 – New east west link to the north | 21 of 43 |
| c) Scenario 3 – Direct link between Edwardes Street and Broadway | 14 of 43 |
- d) I support Scenario 2 but with the following changes:
- Make sure I can walk easily across the road. Slow the cars down and turn on the green man sooner.
 - Why would the Edwardes Street / Broadway link be a wide carriageway when it's linking 2 streets that have been reduced to single lane carriageways with bike lanes.
 - If Scenario 2 has stakeholder support - given that it can best deliver the vision, then it should be pursued.
 - Frees up the central heart of Reservoir Junction for high density community, public transport uses. Scenario 2 moves the road transport intersection to the north, very good.
 - Scenario 3 but create a more functional rail crossing north of Edwardes and Broadway that also helps ease congestion on Edwardes and Broadway link. Your current proposal is good for northbound Spring St traffic going onto Cheddar Rd. But it is not good at all for southbound traffic aiming to go to High St or go east down Broadway. Improve this rail crossing north of Edwardes and Broadway link by extending Cuthbert Rd to High St or alternatively White St and McMahon Rd onto High St. You get the same result as the current proposal in moving traffic onto Cheddar Rd but you also provide the same utility for southbound traffic heading east towards Boulderwood Parade.
 - Any high rise parking to accommodate additional cars coming into the area needs to be able to accommodate a reasonable car height such as 2.1m rather than 2.0m. It would be unreasonable to destroy relatively new buildings to the south.
 - Still could do with southern connecting road no matter what scenario is selected.
 - Additional pedestrian crossing at south end of Reservoir Station and additional vehicle crossing at south end of Reservoir Station.
 - Scenario 2 but keeping High St - Cheddar Rd connectivity. It is important that the traffic that is going to the Ring Rd does not detour off High St, down to Spring then back up to Cheddar again for no gain.
 - Scenario 3. But to ease the amount of south bound traffic on High St seeking to use the Edwardes-Broadway link to get to High St or head east on Broadway, create a more functional railway crossing north of the link. The one now proposed is good for northbound traffic going to Cheddar Rd but is very poor for southbound traffic wanting to go east in the Broadway direction. So create a link north of the Edwardes-Broadway link that runs onto Cuthbert Rd or alternatively onto White St and McMahons Rd. Cuthbert Rd would provide exactly the same current easterly access but reduce congestion on Broadway and the current junction and it would provide the same access you have planned for Cheddar Rd.
- e) I do not support any of the scenarios for 'Simplifying the Reservoir Junction'. I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:
- I would like to see Broadway connected to Edwardes St, whether the rail go underground or overhead. It is an important connecting road between Plenty Rd and High St.
 - My hope always was to lower the railway line and station. High St could continue thru as it does now. Edwardes and Broadway could be easily linked as a through road. This would create a new 4 way intersection of High St and Cheddar Rd and Spring St well clear of Edwardes and Broadway. A 4 way intersection is not different than most intersections in Melbourne. Its better because there is no rail crossing to gridlock it and no separate signals and waits for Spring St or for Cheddar Rd.

- My preferred solution was always to lower the railway line and station. Create an Edwardes and Broadway link. Then create a 4 way intersection of High St and Cheddar Rd/Spring St. This would be much less congested as there'd be no delays for waiting for trains and Cheddar Rd/Spring St would not have separate lights and wait times.
- We do not want Reservoir Junction to change. We want it to stay as it is.
- The weaknesses part on the scenarios is pretty rotten the way I read it. What about pedestrians and people in wheel chairs scooters frames and elderly - think of them.
- None of the options allow a straight crossing west / east. Tram lines need more explanation / stops / traffic hazards - width of roads.
- Pedestrians and vehicle users need to be able to go between Edwardes Street and Broadway (I do), therefore the link between them must be near the centres. Prefer the rail line underground and the two streets linked - but not necessarily directly linked.
- Definitely separate road and rail sort the junction and the rest should flow - taking into account increased freight - can we divert trucks away from Reservoir?
- Scenario 1 in Opportunity 1 could create traffic related issues in Howard Street.
- Edwardes St/Broadway link should just continue the existing roads, bicycle path and footpaths and not become a wide multi lane thoroughfare - this has been talked about for 40-50 years.
- The link between High Street south and Cheddar Road should be retained.

Key Opportunity 2 - Creating a Public Transport Hub

Q2. Referring to the Scenarios for 'Creating a Public Transport Hub' (page 26 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- | | |
|---|----------|
| a) Scenario 1 - Short Term: New bus link | 7 of 41 |
| b) Scenario 2 - Long Term: Extension of 112 tram route | 20 of 41 |
| c) Scenario 3 - Long Term: Tram link to Route 86 | 14 of 41 |
| d) I support Scenario 2 but with the following changes: | |

- I thought that there was already a bus from the end of the tram route in Gilbert Road to the Reservoir Station, along Gilbert Road and up Edwardes St. If not, it would be an excellent idea, co-ordinating with the tram timetabled arrivals. A tram to the station from either direction would create traffic chaos, as there is no room on existing roads and land / home acquisitions would be unfair and drastically change a suburb that I have lived in all of my life and love the ambience and open space feel of.
- It can't do it at once - can do it over a few stages. It's really important to all the Reservoir area - it causes Reservoir dramatic change.
- Better links to Uni are essential. A tram would be nice, but might need to get the traffic jam out of Broadway every afternoon.
- I think because I catch the tram a lot we should be able to have wheelchair accessible trams and for prams with babies (you can get to the tram stop but cannot catch one).
- A tram link to La Trobe Uni would be useful for staff and students - but a tram line down Broadway would be problematic.
- Scenario 2. Consideration should be given to an extension of tram route 112 to the Gilbert Road and Edwardes Street junction to minimise cost and development effort.
- Eventual extension of 112 tram route into Reservoir Station - but there are other priorities first.
- Any of the 3 choices would be great scenario 1 is easily done scenario 2 would be great - no pollution. Scenario 3 the full monty. Start with 1 then try to get finance for 2, then eventually 3.
- The extension of the tram will unlock housing opportunities in West Reservoir and provide important access to Edwardes Lake so it can play its important role in the community more effectively. I agree it is important to have a strong transport connection with La Trobe Uni but I'm concerned about the potential impacts of the tram on Broadway.

- Provides a grand vision for an active public transport east - west corridor - to support higher density and access to facilities, employment and north south public transport.
- Scenario 2 I support this as I have lived in the city of Darebin for 48 years and it was promised in the late 1930s. I support this completely.
- Run tram onto Broadway to offer same advantages to stores there as on Edwardes St.
- I thought there already was a bus that takes you from the Gilbert Road tram to Reservoir Station eg. 553.
- This link needs to service the north western part of Reservoir which has been forgotten & currently has inadequate public transport for an aging population.
- Fall back position is for 112 to be extended to the end of Gilbert Road with 553 bus frequency extended and route altered.
- Why is there not a scenario showing the tram line entering Edwardes Street - there is a lot of anxiety around how this might happen.
- Is a tram down Broadway really the best thing for the centre? Could a bus offer the same service without the loss of parking and the trees.

Department of Transport Comments

- Scenario 2 - Tram 112 Extension (longer term). It should be noted that funding new tram infrastructure is unlikely to be a high priority. The existing system needs significant investment to provide relief from the effects of increasing traffic congestion, and to meet the access needs of people with disabilities as defined in the Commonwealth's disability discrimination legislation.
- Bus interchange improvements. It should be noted that the proposed bus route 561 extension to Coburg will hopefully commence around late April (Easter) this year. This is the first bus service that will actually run east/west through Reservoir and it will frequent the High / Spring Street crossing. Up until now all services have terminated at either side of the station. This should be kept in mind when investigating the down grade of High Street, removing lanes etc, as buses require priority to cross the rail line.

e) I do not support any of the scenarios for 'Creating a Public Transport Hub'. I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:

- No comments

Key Opportunity 3 - Planning the Central Heart

Q3. Referring to Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 for 'Planning the Central Heart' (pages 29-33 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- | | |
|---|----------|
| a) Scenario 1 – Grade Separation (lowered rail line) | 35 of 41 |
| b) Scenario 2 – Grade Separation (elevated rail line) | 2 of 41 |
| c) Scenario 3 – No Grade Separation | 4 of 41 |

d) I support Scenario 1 but with the following changes:

- The central heart precinct should be called 'Reservoir Junction'
- We should be looking at the old freight house as a short term land use opportunity - could be used for community services / activities.
- No extension of the Gilbert road tram and only 2-3 level/storey buildings - limited build heights to maintain open area / spaciousness of our suburb.
- I don't think the east west link should be in line with Bedford Street.
- Who wants a big hole in the middle of Reservoir, only if it has buildings over it. Don't make the station invisible, but hide the track with buildings like they do in Tokyo.

- Scenario 1. I'd rather see the 'Central Heart of Reservoir' (joining Edwardes St & Broadway) develop into a great shopping hub with cafes, restaurants and parking facilities akin to Burgundy Street Heidelberg rather than congested with multi-level residential dwellings.
 - I prefer the rail line lowered (as my comments in (q1e). Yes, it will be costly which is why no Government has done it during the past 50 years or so. Now it should be done also allowing for the extra line that may be needed due to the South Morang extension.
 - This is clearly the best outcome for the centre irrespective of cost.
 - Please change the name 'central heart'. It's terrible. Please consider promoting small business, set up business enterprises with local groups eg. selling vegies from community gardens, artists workshops etc. Do not sell Council land - there isn't much left, use it for the residents - not large supermarkets or car parks
 - Provides the necessary long term solution to activate Reservoir Junction as an active urban hub. Soil is clay and could be easily activated.
 - The access to Broadway from Spring Street is a must to be changed out of all the proposals this takes my most important issue. Just by changing the traffic light setting would help short term (its a joke) when taking children to school 8.30am the train comes and the lights don't let spring street cars go high street again
 - I prefer scenario 1, however, this is presumably highest cost - good opportunity for public square.
 - This would allow traffic to flow.
 - These don't seem to be aligning with the traffic flow scenarios? None of these scenarios seem to be looking at the connectivity between Edwardes Street and Broadway. My priority is for the Scenario that I chose in the Traffic flow to be the one implemented, but what I would like to see happening in the pedestrian area is Scenario 1 with the park moved to the southern end and the future residential housing moved to the proposed park area. The southern end there is where the Melbourne Water Reservoirs are and this is some of the only treed area in this location. If this is what is mooted to be developed, instead of council retaining the land in Cheddar Rd for a park, it could sell that land to Melbourne Water for development instead and buy the MW land mooted for development and retain it as a park. Alternatively, if the land that is mooted for future development at the southern end is NOT the Melbourne Water land, it could still be the part that is turned into a park. There is NO public land available here and it is sorely needed. In Cheddar Rd where the northern park is proposed, there is already a healthy green median area for public access.
 - No square, Broadway connected to Edwards St.
- e) I do not support any of the scenarios for 'Planning the Central Heart'. I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:
- Undertake redevelopment of Reservoir Train Station to include multi storey housing as per the Richmond Train Station redevelopment recently announced (Feb) by the State Government.
 - Scenario 2 would overwhelm the Junction. It would result in a visual block between the two halves of Reservoir.
 - I do not want the Reservoir Heart project to get developed.
 - I also think elevated rail would be good. If this is cheaper and makes it possible to complete sooner then do an elevated rail.

Key Opportunity 4 - Accommodating Additional Housing in the Reservoir MAC

Q4. Referring to the Scenarios for 'Accommodating Additional Housing in the Reservoir MAC' (pages 34 and 35 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| a) Scenario 1 - Dispersed Development | 13 of 41 |
| b) Scenario 2 - Focused Development | 28 of 41 |

c) I support Scenario 2 but with the following changes:

- We need a lot more housing in the area.
- But there will be more concentrated housing development throughout the suburb anyway.
- Scenario 1 with lower scale buildings keeps the integrity of our suburb, with green spaces and daylight available (no overshadowing or 'cavern' effect with multiple stories).
- There will need to be more housing but I'm not in a position to say how and where.
- Scenario 1, but buildings must involve sustainable principles, efficient for power, water, etc. and visually pleasing! Keep existing parklands and nature strips.
- Dispersed housing is already happening and will continue to happen - we need to facilitate higher densities of housing through providing a focus for housing growth.
- Provides for more contained increase in density at better quality. Dispersed will result in more low density, poor quality design.
- Make Cuthbert Road carry more traffic as I had suggested above, and include it in the focussed development plan.
- Scenario 2 will or may create urban density with little green escape for residents to garden or relax outdoors or pets. It would be great if all major roadways are underground and the above area is walkway / cycle and emergency or residential vehicles only.
- Needs to consider an aging population as well as families who need larger spaces & community parklands within residential proximity. Designs need to be aesthetically & practically pleasing. Developers are only interested in making money, given high developmental costs & do not give consideration to the needs of various groups.
- I am property owner of 123 Edwardes St. I will like to rezone my property to Mixed use zone or residential zone. Lock the vision. It's so exciting it will be a big change for Reservoir. Edwardes Street will be more landscaped for residents and by that time it will not be good to have trucks entering the centre. It should be good for people living there. For that vision I strongly support two transport priorities. It should be connected to the Gilbert Street tram / Broadway - Plenty Road Tram - it would reduce West East Reservoir difference - not only think 2030. Also need left space for after 2030, which any planning will be make waste for after 2030. Such train station may be covered, may be some kind of building there.
- Spread the ability to have some 2 level / storey housing along the major bus / train/ tram routes within the suburb. Allow single level dual occupancy on large blocks - limit heights of buildings and encourage single level dwellings to maintain the integrity of our suburb. Extra infrastructure to support a greater population is of paramount importance as is keeping the character of our suburb.
- With incremental modifications to the adjoining areas.

d) I do not support any of the scenarios for 'Accommodating Additional Housing in the Reservoir MAC'. I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:

- As has just been demonstrated in the problems of food supply after the floods in Qld; higher water bills to pay for a desalination plant we didn't ask for to support a population and housing increase we didn't want; and the danger Japan is facing after the recent earthquake; the consequences of bowing to self-interested demands to increase population are increasingly unacceptable risks, as well as the loss of local character, personal lifestyle and natural beauty. Local properties should have enough ground space for plants to offset residents' carbon emissions. THE INCREASED HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS ON HIGH ST WOULD RESULT IN US SPENDING MUCH OF THE DAY IN SHADE, AND BEING COLDER IN WINTER (we live just west of High St) Victoria is the only main state in Australia without a Corruption Commission - there is no reason for Darebin bowing to pressure and destroying its urban landscape when the people demanding more housing may conceivably be found to have acted corruptly.
- I would like to see public housing mixed up with the private housing, there are some people in public housing that really look after their houses.

Precinct 1 - The Central Heart

The Land Use Approach

Q5. Referring to Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 for 'The Land Use Approach' (page 38-41 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- | | |
|---|----------|
| a) Scenario 1 – A Civic and Community Focus | 15 of 23 |
| b) Scenario 2 – A Retail Focus | 7 of 23 |
| c) Scenario 3 – An Office Focus | 1 of 23 |
- d) I support Scenario 1 but with the following changes:
- All of the above scenarios close in the existing open spaces and destroy the openness of our suburb. Make the area attractive with seating and garden beds. Some single storey retail could be involved or single storey community use buildings, but no multiple storey development, civic and community form but not multiple storey buildings.
 - Scenario 1. Avoid or reduce number of multi-level dwellings for residential housing focusing instead on creating a central retail hub with cafes and restaurants and a community square with green spaces.
 - Reservoir lacks a community focus - this scenario provides an opportunity to fill this gap.
 - Best multi-uses. provides additional community spaces at centre of Reservoir - activates Reservoir Junction
 - Lower building heights than proposed - again, it's stupid to increase population re: major retail development - these add NOTHING to community activity (what community activities take place inside Northland & Sumerhill? - nothing).
 - All of the above are important - a balance is required if Council is to support the needs of all the community i.e. recreation, social & work (decentralisation). The focus can vary between North, south, east & west. There is no need to focus on one if the objective is to retain & attract various group to Reservoir.
 - There is scope to balance civic and community focus with office, retail and residential.
 - This is my preference due to the associated renewal potential- would also like to see some good arts / community space incorporated.
- e) I do not support any of the scenarios for 'The Land Use Approach'. I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:
- No responses.

Built Form in the Central Heart

Q6. Referring to the Scenarios for 'Built Form in the Central Heart' (pages 42-44 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- | | |
|---|----------|
| a) Scenario 1 - A human scale built throughout the precinct | 10 of 20 |
| b) Scenario 2 - Increased building heights in focused areas | 10 of 20 |
- c) There were no preferred scenarios.
- The site has so few constraints and will function as a landmark with increased heights.
 - Allow some higher rise closer to the heart.
 - To preserve the environment I think the only option is to increase building heights but it needs to be done in a sustainable way, and also it needs to have aesthetic qualities and probably the best way to that is to incorporate 'green walls' that is walls that have eco-systems.
 - As the population grows, there will be limited space to service various needs, therefore with careful planning & aesthetically pleasing buildings, increased building heights may be required.
 - While supporting scenario 2 - I do so with some reservation which is mainly around the public transport offering. My experience in the west where this development is encouraged (Footscray etc) is that despite what is considered as a good public transport offering (I would say the same about Reservoir) allowing more

density with less car parking the reality is that people, despite their best intentions, are often unable to give up their cars due to chronic overcrowding, disruptions and feeling unsafe. In Reservoir this will be further exacerbated by people driving from areas further north for the Zone 1 ticket price reduction

- The mid point between Scenario 1 and 2 would be best, i.e. 3-6, 3-6, 4-8.
- W LOW HEIGHT DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE RETAINED THROUGHOUT THE PRECINCT WE DO NOT OWE IT TO SELF-INTERESTED PARTIES AND CORRUPT PLANNING MINISTERS TO BECOME A LOWER-SCALE CBD WITH CONCRETE AND RUBBISH FOR A SOUL I DO NOT WANT TO SPEND OUR MORNINGS IN COLD SHADE FROM HIGH ST DEVELOPMENTS, AND EARLY EVENINGS WITHOUT SUNSETS FROM DISPERSED HGIH RISE.
- We do not support building the Central heart at all.
- In my opinion 2-5 storeys is not keeping a 'human scale' but making our suburb a multi-rise, congested suburb. Keep building heights to single level, wheel chair accessible, attractive design (not just boxes) in keeping with the existing buildings. Some housing - single storey units, but as far away from train line as possible (health and safety of occupants).
- With up to six storey buildings set back appropriately.

Precinct 1 - The Central Heart (continued)

The Public Realm

Q7. Referring to the 'Potential Public Realm elements' and 'Pedestrian and Cycle Opportunities' for Precinct 1 – The Central Heart (page 45 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- a) I support the potential public realm elements and pedestrian and cycle access opportunities for Precinct 1 - The Central Heart 19 of 22
- b) I support the elements and opportunities with the following changes:
- No multi-storey buildings, public square idea is good, but not enclosed by scaled multi rise buildings. Public art and green elements are excellent ideas, as is parkland with kick about spaces and play equipment and intergenerational spaces and Wi-Fi, easy pedestrian and cycle access is essential. Keep our existing trees and plant more shrubs - greater aesthetic value and more oxygen for the planet.
 - More combination (connection) with Edwardes Lake Precinct.
 - With a balance between pedestrian priorities and vehicle queues.
 - You make it easy for family's to ride around reservoir, then a lot more family's would get out and about.
 - The retail mix needs to be addressed and the space needs to be "GREEN" not the current "sandy desert" look around the station.
 - This is a very exciting scenario - is what Reservoir needs.
 - We don't need a veggie garden here, there are other less urban sites in the area where these can be developed.
 - In regards to the elements in the public realm, I want to stress the value of incorporating urban food production as this ties in with the natural values of the residents of Reservoir and can provide a 'brand' in which to market Reservoir. It is also an ideal opportunity to be innovative in the area of urban food production, and set an example for other local governments to consider food growing in urban development as is being done internationally.
 - The space released by reorganising the railway crossing should be used for green open space rather than yet more housing - I note the areas marked "POTENTIAL FUTURE DEVELOPMENT" are NOT itemised in the Potential Public Realm Elements - these areas should NOT be handed over to developers for yet more housing that we all have to pay for the infrastructure of for the rest of our lives (like the desalination plant).
 - Where the public can cross the railway lines with ease, also cross the road at the lights without stopping in the middle of the road.

- c) I do not support the public realm elements and access opportunities for Precinct 1 – The Central Heart. I would like to describe my alternative elements and opportunities as follows:
- Pedestrians and bicycles do not mix. Should be pedestrian only.

Precinct 1a - Melbourne Water Land

Q8. Referring to the Scenario for Precinct 1a - Melbourne Water Land (pages 46-47 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- a) I support the Scenario for the creation of water education and research facility 22 of 22
- c) I support the Scenario but with the following changes:
- Council needs to be engaged with Melbourne Water about this scenario - I'm excited by it but it seems pretty pie in the sky to me.
 - Need to see if it is feasible. Need to keep security of the reservoirs in mind - major priority. Keep existing open spaces and do not build on them. We are losing a whole lot of our open spaces eg. All along Plenty Road - we used to have total green space from Dunne Street to nearly Greenwood Dr.
- d) I do not support the scenario for the Melbourne Water land. I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:
- Leave it as it is.

Melbourne Water comments

As discussed, in response to your above Discussion Paper (pages 46 and 47) which relates to Melbourne Water's Preston Reservoir Site the following comments are made:

The proposed circular trail around our two operating basin reservoirs on the eastern side of High Street is not acceptable. The reservoirs in question are an integral part of our water supply transfer system and therefore must be retained as a non public area.

The Melbourne Water land between the railway line and to the west of High Street is also not available for public use. There are integral parts of our transfer system located in this area which must be protected. These parts include an office block containing a computer network to operate our water supply system, a new pumping station, maintenance sheds, plus large water mains, cross connection pipe work and valves and an abandoned basin reservoir.

Precinct 2 - Reservoir Village

Improving the Supermarket Offer in Reservoir Village

Q9. Referring to Scenarios 1 and 2 for 'Improving the Supermarket Offer in Reservoir Village' (page 50 and 51 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- a) Scenario 1 – Expand existing Coles Supermarket 13 of 21
- b) Scenario 2 – Develop a supermarket on the Ralph Street car park site 11 of 21
- c) There was no preferred scenario
- We already have 2 functional supermarkets each offering different services. Allow Coles to incorporate a 2nd level if desired, or expand into car park as long as underground car parking replaces and expends car spaces lost in the development. Parking is always at a premium in Reservoir Village Precinct.
 - Retain the car parking.
 - Any increase in scale of Coles should be accompanied by a chance for IGA to increase in size, BUT Coles does need to have a broader range than it does (maybe IGA does as well) * if Coles were to shift to Ralph St, it would be inevitable that a high-rise monstrosity would be built on the old site.
 - I think a community should have diversity. The major supermarkets are not about diversity.

- Have some competition in the supermarket lines.
- Expansion of Coles on current site allows co-existence with existing IGA. This also allows the activity centre to be larger.
- Either scenario would be ok. However there needs to be careful planning with lift access & adequate parking facilities i.e. Aldi site at Sydney Road, Brunswick caters for walking traffic, lift, easy trolley drop off & visitors by car.
- We do not support developing a supermarket on the Ralph street car park site at all.
- Consolidate the Edwardes Street retail. Existing Coles suited to less frequent visits i.e. a hardware shop types of use.
- This is tricky, leave it where it is and it sucks the life out of the centre - move it to the Ralph Street car park and it competes unfairly with the IGA and does not serve the community - this site could be used in a better way - supermarkets are not a sustainable business model.
- Introduction of good competition will improve the shopping experience in Reservoir and give locals the opportunity of choice NOT Aldi but IGA or a Leos.

Built Form in Reservoir Village

Q10. Referring to the Scenarios for 'Built Form in Reservoir Village' (pages 52-54 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- a) Scenario 1 - Moderate increases in building height throughout the precinct 11 of 22
- b) Scenario 2 - Allow for increased building heights in targeted areas 11 of 22
- c) There is no preferred scenario
- With maximum height reduced to 6 levels.
- d) I do not support any of the scenarios for 'Built Form in Reservoir Village'. I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:
- Do not introduce high density housing into our suburb, with all of its social problems and parking implications eg. Visitor cars, tenant cars. If I wanted to live in a multi rise suburb I would have chosen to live in Collingwood, or Richmond or Carlton or Flemington. Leave the human face of Reservoir.
 - A street building height of single storey or at most double storey with 3 storeys away from the street, keep the community feel of our suburb and don't build it in - feeling of enclosure.

Precinct 2 - Reservoir Village (continued)

The Ralph Street Car Park

Q11. Referring to Scenarios 1 and 2 for the Ralph Street car park (page 55-59 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- a) Scenario 1 – Supermarket and Residential Focus 17 of 22
- b) Scenario 2 – Commuter Car Park, Retail and Residential Focus 5 of 22
- c) I support Scenario 1 but with the following changes:
- We need to build up Reservoir and need more people.
 - The main retail strip should be along Edwardes Street & Broadway. Ralph St should be developed with underground car parking facilities to support access to cafe and shopping district. Use of multi-level (>3) dwellings should be minimised.
 - I don't like the layout of the uses, but the mix seems right - social housing should be considered.
 - Noise would be a problem in retail area & residential would only cater for limited population groups as these spaces are likely to be small.
 - We do not support building on the Ralph street car park at all. It should be left as it is.

- There Definitely needs to be car park availability with the development of Ralph St Car Park
 - The MAC needs an early years hub and the Ralph Street car park is the best location.
- d) I do not support any of the scenarios for the Ralph Street car park. I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:
- Use the area for car parking (it is a problem in Reservoir) and beautify it, some green/garden space / mini seating area for workers to eat lunch / have a coffee - artwork - just a small area eg. 1/2 size of existing library. No extra housing in this area. Could be some extra retail along the east or west side.
 - None of the above appeal but I would hope that it would be something the whole community can use.
 - both options presented destroy the open vista in the shopping precinct.

The Civic Centre Site

Q12. Referring to the Scenario for the Civic Centre site (pages 60-61 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- a) I support the Scenario for the Strengthening the Community Hub 20 of 20
- b) I support the Scenario but with the following changes:
- I like the idea of the entertainment precinct - what about community services in Broadway.
 - I think bringing the Library into the Civic Centre might be trying to get too much out of one building, and finishing up with nothing being done well.
 - Wouldn't it be better to have services on either side of the railway line.
- d) I do not support the Scenario for the Civic Centre site. I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:
- The library (which I use regularly) is in a perfect position already, as it has easy access via a quiet street, plenty of parking and could just us an upgrade / possible expansion and landscaping as part of an attractive precinct. It would make Edwardes Street more congested and it is already often impossible to get a car park there. The premise that there is a large car park located behind the centre allowing for future expansion is correct but it is already very well utilized. It is difficult to get a park there. Also the library used to be in the civic centre 40 years ago and moved to the existing site. Now you are proposing to move it back to an already crowded area. Please leave it where it is accessible. Improve access from Edwardes Street.

Precinct 2 - Reservoir Village (continued)

Edwardes Street Streetscape

Q13. Referring to the Scenario for the Edwardes Street Streetscape (pages 63 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- a) I support the Scenario for the Edwardes Street Streetscape 17 of 17
- b) I support the Scenario but with the following changes:
- Keep buildings low, with possible one residential layer above. Problems with parking, garbage removal, emergency vehicle access if the area is overdeveloped.
 - Ensuring replacement of parking spaces. Avoiding kerb extensions of intersections if capacity is reduced.
 - Not kerb build outs.
 - Some nice plants, trees and a general cleaning would make a huge difference.
 - How will the tram be accommodated in the streetscape? Should this have been an alternative scenario???
 - What about treatments of corners (Edwardes and Spring)- this is very important - and the treatment of Spring Street as the gateway to centre.
 - How does the tram fit in??

- Lower housing height above the shops - the streetscape should not be overpowered by concrete walls, - nor should it spend its days in cold shade and acting as an east-west wind-tunnel (which would destroy the point of trying to activate the streetscape).
 - Consideration needs to be given to tram extension.
- c) I do not support the Scenario for the Edwardes Street Streetscape. I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:
- Have more room for scooters and wheelchairs on the footpaths. Also, they need to be able to enter all of the shops.

Precinct 3 - Broadway

Built Form in Broadway

Q14. Referring to the Scenario for the Built Form in Broadway (pages 66-67 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- a) I support the Scenario for the built form in Broadway 14 of 15
- b) I support the Scenario but with the following changes:
- Possible 2 level car park on existing Bernard Street car park area. Maximum of 2 levels of any building in Broadway to maintain open air feel of the area. Housing - one level over the existing shops. Anymore is out of keeping with our suburb and would close in the space.
 - Reduce Bedford to 4 stories only.
 - Building heights could be taller.
 - Providing this is not Government housing and only private dwellings.
 - Angle car parking may increase the frequency of car crashes and bicycle accidents.
 - Five stories is too high.
 - I think that there is a wonderful opportunity to really improve the public realm in this precinct and link access to the Reservoir Leisure Centre. Regeneration throughout should be encouraged with limited social housing - only as there is an oversupply and cluster in this area - there are opportunities for social / affordable housing dispersed throughout the Edwardes St precinct. It's disturbing to see yet again public housing being built in the high rise form on this side of Cheddar Rd. The area could benefit from a serious look at the streetscape and appropriate plantings (though the blossoms in Strathmerton St were beautiful. albeit short lived).
 - Increased heights will destroy the natural vista.

Bernard Street Car Park

Q15. Referring to Scenarios 1, 1a, 2 and 3 for the Bernard Street car park (page 69-72 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- a) Scenario 1 – Small format supermarket and integrated housing 6 of 21
- b) Scenario 1a – Small format supermarket and integrated housing 6 of 21
- b) Scenario 2 – Housing focus 4 of 21
- b) Scenario 3 – Commuter car parking node 5 of 21
- c) There is no preferred scenario:
- Only 2 levels of car parking so that the Bedford Street residences are not overshadowed and they keep the visual aspects of the area. Parking is often at a premium in Broadway and this space is necessary. Improved access to Broadway would be beneficial.
 - Reduce to 4 levels in total, I do not support the multi level car park.
 - With small supermarket / express supermarket to allow travellers to buy goods when collecting vehicle.
 - Council's data shows that the majority of Reservoir is poor access to fresh food (i.e. access to supermarkets or green grocers). We also have one of the highest rates of food insecurity in Victoria with 17% of residents

reporting that there are times they go without food because they cannot afford more, with the majority of food insecurity found in the northern suburbs in Darebin. It is essential that as part of this restructure plan, that we include the provision of food access and new supermarkets to the area particularly in view of the projected population increase for the area.

- Hard to decide between scenario 1 and 1a. Consider incorporating the other land on the north side of Bedford Street.
- d) I do not support any of the scenarios for Bernard Street car park. I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:
- I don't know if the land use mixes are quite right - commuter car parking is important as is the supermarket - at grade car parking is silly in a future plan - yes the site provides a great opportunity for housing but the other two uses are most important. What about number 6-18 Bedford Street - shouldn't these properties be considered with the Bedford Street site - the housing is to low density and is in need of replacing anyway.
 - There already seems to be shops serving as small format supermarkets in Broadway.

Precinct 3 - Broadway (continued)

Broadway Streetscape

Q16. Referring to the Scenarios for Broadway Streetscape (pages 74-75 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- a) Scenario 1 - Central parking retained

11 of 17

- b) Scenario 2 - Angled parking

6 of 17

- c) I support Scenario 1 but with the following changes:
- Upgraded footpath surfaces. Possible addition of small, attractive artwork eg. Sculptures / figures eg. Notable local people from the areas history, with small written explanations of their life significance.
 - Keep the existing well established gum trees and add further greenery to beautify our shopping area. Improved walkways - attractive groundwork. If we get 3-5 - 8 - 9 storey buildings there will be a lack of space to dispel all of the carbon monoxide fumes from busy traffic. Also need to keep the islands / parking in the middle of the road so that in non-peak times and night it is easy to safely cross the road without having to disrupt traffic and use the one set of pedestrian lights. At present, you can safely cross over from one side to the other (but not at peak times). The layout works ie. is practical.
 - But if tram down Broadway???
 - Not kerb build outs.
 - Angle parking is safer also, as Broadway has a housing focus, central parking will no longer be required. The aesthetics will be important.
 - (Couldn't find this topic in the document, but...) the central parking interspersed with trees provides an open, relaxed feel to Broadway.

Vic Roads Comments

It is noted that the document presents two options for parking in Broadway. One is the continuation of the existing 90 degree centre of the road parking and the other is kerb side angled parking. In this respect it is important that the pavement width of Broadway is not compromised by the adopted parking arrangement as this road is a bus priority route with a bike lane in each direction. Our preferred position is the retention of the centre of the road parking option as vehicles can enter and leave the parking bays in a forward direction. Kerb side parking involves vehicles reversing into the main traffic stream causing more disruption to through traffic. The document also presents an option of extending the route 112 tram route along Broadway to link up further along to the route 86 in Plenty Road. This will have obvious repercussions on both on-street parking options for Broadway.

- d) I do not support any of the scenarios for the Broadway streetscape. I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:
- Remove central car parking and replace with line of trees akin to Edwards Street. Remove existing eucalypt trees.
 - Could be 3-4 stories. 2 is not enough.
 - Have the footpaths cleared a little so that wheelchairs and scooters are able to travel along them.

Precinct 4 - High Street North

Land Use Opportunities

Q17. Referring to the Scenario for the land use opportunities (page 78 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- a) I support the Scenario for the land use in Precinct 4 - High Street North 16 of 16
- b) I support the Scenario but with the following changes:
- Only 2 levels of buildings eg. Lower level business / office and upper level housing or a maximum of 3 levels with 2 being for housing. However, this would have a marked effect on support services eg. Rubbish removal, sewerage, car parking spaces would need to be provided.
 - 3-4 storeys, 2 is too low.
- c) I do not support the Scenario for land use in Precinct 4 - High Street North. I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:
- KEEP THE EXISTING LAND USE AND HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS I DO NOT WANT TO LOSE THE EARLY DAYLIGHT AND WARMTH I DO NOT WANT TO LOSE THE LATE DAYLIGHT AND SUNSET.
 - I would like to see more housing built for public housing.

Built Form Opportunities

Q18. Referring to the Scenario for the built form opportunities (page 78 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- a) I support the Scenario for the built form in Precinct 4 - High Street North 17 of 17
- b) I support the Scenario but with the following changes:
- Multi level buildings will greatly impact on the visual persona of Reservoir, and the feeling of spaciousness. Maximum of 2-3 levels in the business areas and 2 levels in housing areas. If implemented all along the main roads, train, bus and tram routes, it should offer greater housing options.
- c) I do not support the Scenario for built form in Precinct 4 - High Street North . I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:
- I like the low buildings just the way they are.

Precinct 5 - High Street South

Land Use Opportunities

Q19. Referring to the Scenario for the land use opportunities (page 80 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

15 of 15

- a) I support the Scenario for the land use in Precinct 5 - High Street South
- b) I support the Scenario but with the following changes:
 - Have some more preschools being built, so that it is cheaper for the people who are on lower incomes.
 - The mix of uses looks good.
 - Multi level buildings will greatly impact on the visual persona of Reservoir, and the feeling of spaciousness. Maximum of 2-3 levels in the business areas and 2 levels in housing areas. If implemented all along the main roads, train, bus and tram routes, it should offer greater housing options.
- c) I do not support the Scenario for land use in Precinct 5 - High Street South. I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:
 - There are potential issues with traffic approaching from the south into this area.

Built Form Opportunities

Q20. Referring to the Scenario for the built form opportunities (page 80 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- a) I support the Scenario for the built form in Precinct 5 - High Street South 14 of 14
- b) I support the Scenario but with the following changes:
 - Keep building levels to 1 or 2 stories and retain the human face or scale of the buildings in our suburb. Support dual occupancy throughout the suburb - but 2-3 dwellings per large house block, as infrastructure drains, roads, waste disposal, gutters and wastewater problems (roads that semi flood in downpours) will not support high density housing plus it will drastically change the community if there is multi-storey residential living.
 - It will neck when traffic from south side coming.
 - 4 stories maximum.
 - Should be some sort of plan for streetscape here given the importance of strip as gateway to centre.
- c) I do not support the Scenario for built form in Precinct 5 - High Street South. I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:
 - Leave built form as it is.

Precinct 6 - Surrounding Residential

Built Form

Q21. Referring to the Scenarios for Precinct 6 - Surrounding Residential Areas (pages 82-83) of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- a) Scenario 1 - Focused housing change along main roads 11 of 19
- b) Scenario 2 - Focused housing change throughout the precinct 8 of 19
- c) There was no preferred scenario

Note: An additional 85 submissions were received in response to the precinct scenarios. The submissions did not vote on the scenarios.

- More housing.

- But buildings could be higher.
- Density will bring benefits to the centre.
- Scenario 2. The closer to the heart allow more focused housing change but not only on main roads. Less focused housing change even on main roads further from the heart.
- Apartment style developments are happening around Broadway - the market is already deciding that the area is ready for more intensive development.
- Retain essentially single storey buildings in the interests of air quality and the character of the area.
- 3-4 levels. I would like to see a more refined proposal that is somewhere between scenario 1 and 2. Scenario 2 would require further site analysis.
- No change to housing height and density.
- With building levels at 1-2 stories.
- Scenario 2 of Precinct 6 does not value the existing neighbourhood character (Californian bungalows and immigrant gardens):
 - The scenario will place pressure for demolition of heritage building stock
 - Undermines efforts to develop transport corridors and main roads
 - Will increase property prices and price out average families
- Precinct 6 Scenario 1:
 - This scenario will strengthen transport hubs
 - Increased heights and setbacks should be guided by detailed design guidelines
 - Consolidate the residential areas as the green wedge of Reservoir which collect and purify storm water, generate renewable energy, provide habitat for native birds, productive back yards to reduce overall ecological footprint.
 - Broadway and Edwardes Street should have considerable traffic calming treatments.
- Support urban consolidation however, allowing intensification of development in Precinct 6 will undermine efforts for greater densities along main roads - Scenario 2 allows developers to pick the lower hanging fruit
 - Support Precinct 1 - focused housing change along main roads
 - the surrounding residential areas in Precinct 6 could play an important role in making Reservoir more environmentally sustainable - native bird habitat, solar panels, rain and storm water collection, productive backyards.
- In Ashley Street there are 3 bird species - sparrows, pigeons (introduced species) and magpies - plant indigenous species to bring back bird life to the suburb - bird surveys in Edwardes Lake Park have noted 23-33 bird species depending on the day.

Open Space Provision

Q22. Referring to the Scenario for the open space provision in Precinct 6 - Surrounding Residential Areas (page 84 of the Vision Scenarios Discussion Paper), I choose the following scenario (choose only one):

- a) I support the Scenario for the open space provision in Precinct 6 - Surrounding Residential Areas
- b) I support the Scenario but with the following changes:
- Further work identifying open space is needed. Concept plans for Cheddar Road could be provided.
 - The difficulties of meeting the target of open space outlined in the document demonstrate the stupidity of ever-increasing urban density.
- c) I do not support the Scenario for built form in Precinct 5 - High Street South. I would like to describe my alternative scenario as follows:
- No responses.