

Our File: HCC06/42 (IN2008/24834)  
Enquiries: Shannon Davies  
Telephone: 9205 2200



1079 PASCOE VALE ROAD  
BROADMEADOWS  
VICTORIA 3047

Postal Address:  
PO BOX 119  
DALLAS 3047

Telephone: 03 9205 2200  
Facsimile: 03 9309 0109  
[www.hume.vic.gov.au](http://www.hume.vic.gov.au)

Wednesday 25 February 2009

Mr John Ginivan  
Executive Director  
Planning Policy  
Department of Planning and Community Development  
GPO Box 2392  
Melbourne VIC 3001

Dear Mr Ginivan

**RE: HUME CITY COUNCIL SUBMISSION TO RETAIL POLICY REVIEW  
DISCUSSION PAPER**

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission to the Retail Policy Review Discussion Paper (October 2008).

Council has reviewed the Discussion Paper at its meeting of 23 February 2009 and generally supports the 'Guiding Principles', 'Issues and Challenges' and 'Proposed responses' detailed in the Discussion Paper. At this meeting Council also resolved to forward a submission to 'the Review'.

Council considers that there are opportunities to improve 'the Review' by addressing issues experienced within Victoria, particularly around the emerging trend of Direct Factory Outlet retailing on Commonwealth zoned land. These issues are further explored within Council's submission which forms an attachment to this letter.

We hope that you will not only note Hume City Council's position but will be able to utilise our submission in order to make improvements to your policy document.

Council officers would welcome the opportunity to discuss these issues with you in more detail prior to the finalisation of the Retail Policy Review.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'D. Isola', is written over a light blue horizontal line.

**DOMENIC ISOLA  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

Encl



## **Submission**

# **Retail Policy Review Discussion Paper**

February 2009

# RETAIL POLICY REVIEW – DISCUSSION PAPER

Hume City Council Submission: February 2009

## OVERVIEW OF KEY POINTS

---

### Hume City Council Response:

- a. Hume City Council supports the Retail Policy Review's ('the Review') proposed response (2). In particular, Council believes that it is important for DPCD work with municipalities to develop and agree upon the parameters to be used for Regional Retail Assessments.
- b. The Review should acknowledge that in some instances Councils' will require assistance in preparing municipal strategies that provide for future retail growth, as well as, the potential consolidation of retailing.
- c. The Review should outline a better understanding of the role and function of smaller activity centres particularly, neighbourhood activity centres. They are an important element of the overall network which are often overlooked.
- d. DPCD needs to provide more commentary regarding retailing within smaller centres i.e. Neighbourhood Centres. Council requests that there be further identification, review and publication of best practice examples within growth and established areas, to better guide the design and function of similar centres.
- e. Council supports the need for better aligned planning tools. It is suggested that these tools should allow for Council's ability to encourage or discourage certain types of uses. This may be achieved through the use of more flexible business zone scheduling to address a wider range of uses than currently allowed.
- f. Council believes that the Review omits discussion surrounding retail within mixed use developments.
- g. Council supports the recommendation of the Review to allow for appropriate adjustments of the Business 1 Zone, however, this should be extended to be applicable for the entire suite of business zones (B1Z, B2Z, B3Z, B4Z and B5Z).
- h. Council believes that the Review further highlights a need for a new/future review into what are the most appropriate types of retailing within industrial zones.
- i. Without the abovementioned review, Council does not feel comfortable supporting the DPCD's proposal to amend the industrial zones for the prohibition of Restricted Retailing (proposed response 9). Nor can Council support the recommendation to develop transitional arrangements (proposed response 10).
- j. While Council supports the merit in developing and implementing a Retail Assessment Criteria, it cannot entirely support the proposed model whereby the document will sit as a general practice note.
- k. Council anticipates that an existing retail strategy will be central to effectively using Retail Assessment Criteria. Therefore, DPCD should provide further advice about what information is crucial to the formulation of retail strategies.
- l. The key message and proposed responses in this section should also be tied in some way to the earlier idea of working with Councils and Industry to develop Regional Retail Assessments. It is critical that Councils are consulted in the formulation of the criteria.
- m. Council encourages DPCD to adopt a single retail planning document which should reduce ad hoc approaches to retail planning, as well as ensure there is a consistent approach to retail planning.

# RETAIL POLICY REVIEW – DISCUSSION PAPER

Hume City Council Submission: February 2009

## OVERVIEW OF KEY POINTS CONTINUED...

---

- n. Council advocates that DPCD adopt a flexible approach to retail planning when determining a minimum floor area.
- o. Council also believes that the Department of Planning and Community development needs to clarify its policy statement with regards to its preferred form of retailing in context of the "main street" vs "big box" debate. This must include a detailed definition of the concept of "main street".
- p. Council believes that as part of the Review, DPCD should acknowledge the impact of retailing, located on Commonwealth and Crown land – particularly airports – throughout Victoria.
- q. Council recommends that DPCD clearly state their policy for planning adjoining these airports, and how, planning should be undertaken.
- r. Given the timing of the Review, Council believes it is essential for the DPCD to better define and explore the multifaceted issues raised by the introduction of Factory Outlet retailing
- s. Council would like to reinforce the importance of the finalisation of the Review of Parking Provisions in the Victoria Planning Provisions, August 2007. This ancillary review is essential to a streamlined approach to assessment of retail development proposals

# RETAIL POLICY REVIEW – DISCUSSION PAPER

Hume City Council Submission: February 2009

## INTRODUCTION

Hume City Council is located approximately 20 kilometres north-west of the Melbourne City centre and is one of Melbourne's key gateways, providing a vital transport network that leads to Australia's eastern seaboard. Hume City has an area of 504 square kilometres and is bound by the Merri Creek, Maribyrnong River, Western Ring Road, Calder Freeway, Jacksons Creek and the foothills of the Macedon Ranges. Hume City is one of the fastest growing municipalities in Victoria and is designated as one of five growth areas in metropolitan Melbourne.

Hume City has three designated principle population centres at Sunbury, Broadmeadows and Craigieburn. Within Hume City, Melbourne 2030 identified the following activity centres within the classifications (refer below):

### Principal Activity Centre (Central Activities District)

- Broadmeadows Activity Centre

### Major Activity Centre

- Gladstone Park
- Sunbury
- Roxburgh Park

### Specialised Activity Centre

Melbourne Airport

Given the nature of growth occurring within Hume City Council there are a number of future activity centres to be determined. In particular it is anticipated that Craigieburn Town Centre will need to be recognised as a Principal Activity Centre in the future.



