

Draft Marysville & Triangle Urban Design Framework

Submissions to Community and Stakeholder Consultation
process held from
10 September to 10 October 2009

Summary, Response and Recommendations

October 2009



Victorian Bushfire
Reconstruction and
Recovery Authority



Index

Background	3
1. Overall vision	4
Positive comments – Like the UDF	4
Good parts of the Urban Design Framework.....	4
Negative Comments – Do not like the UDF	5
2. Built form/township character	6
Restore Marysville’s former character	6
“Innovative and contemporary architecture” is contrary to the previous look and feel of the town.....	7
Prefer a rural or country town character	8
3. Town structure	9
Main Street shops	9
Police station	10
Health centre site	11
Former museum	12
Murchison Street	13
Second river crossing.....	14
Temporary Industrial site on Marysville’s gateway (DSE Site)	15
Significant development outside existing town boundaries.....	16
Other	17
4. RAC building	18
Design and location of RAC building	18
5. Marysville proposed community hub	19
Design and construction of community hub.....	19
6. Trails and tracks	20
Concept design and construction of trails.....	20
7. Traffic and Car parking	21
Darwin Street.....	21
Car parking.....	22
Other issues	23
8. What is missing in the UDF	24
Cultural	24
Sport and recreation facilities	25
Accommodation.....	26
Tourism infrastructure.....	27
Aging population.....	28
Other	29
9. Implementation	30
Priorities in order of number of submissions.....	30
Economic and other considerations	31
UDF’s for Buxton, Narbethong & Taggerty	32
Provide more detail in the UDF	33
10. Other Issues	36
Narbethong.....	34
Underground all powerlines in Marysville	35
Noxious weeds	36
11. Authority/Agency Comments	37

Background

3. The *Marysville and Triangle Urban Design Framework* (UDF) was developed by the Victorian Bushfire Reconstruction and Recovery Authority (the Authority) and the Murrindindi Shire Council (the Council). The UDF guides how Marysville and Triangle communities can be rebuilt in a way that benefits local communities and optimises the natural and economic advantages of the region.
3. The UDF has been developed following consultation with more than 600 community members and other stakeholders through community meetings and planning sessions, including the Marysville Celebration Day and the Phoenix Workshop.
3. A draft UDF was released for community consultation and feedback from the 10th September to 10th October 2009.
3. There was a mail out to property owners, agencies and businesses inviting comment on the draft *UDF*.
3. A community display was set up in the marquee in Murchison Street with council staff, VBRRRA and the design team available on Sunday 20 September to discuss the draft UDF.
3. The draft UDF was also available on the VBRAA and Council websites for download. Copies for viewing and forms for comment were available at the Buxton and Taggerty stores, Marysville Bakery, Council office in Alexandra and the Narbethong Community Hub.
3. Community briefings included:
 - MOCA (approx. 75 people)
 - MATDG (approx. 50 people)
 - Business Owners (approx. 35 people)
 - Community Recovery Committee
 - Retirement Village (approx. 12 people)
 - Lake Mountain group
 - A steady stream of visitors to the marquee on Sunday 20 September

Total Submissions	72
Source of Submissions	
Full Time Resident	46
Part Time Resident	9
Business Owner	11
Regular Visitor	4
Other	9
Unclear or combined	8
Referral Authorities	6
<i>Note: Submitter may be in more than one category</i>	
Overview of submissions	
Generally Supports UDF	31
Generally does not support UDF	19
Unclear	15

Note: In the summary of submissions that follows, individuals may have made comments in a number of topic areas.

Some submissions raised concerns about the Marysville and Triangle Urban Design Framework consultation process including the ability of some parts of the community to participate. The UDF consultation process has aimed to be as broad and inclusive as possible.

1. Overall vision

Feedback or comment: Positive comments – Like the UDF

– 31 Submissions –

- “The ‘old’ Marysville is there”
- Reflects the ideas and wishes of the community expressed at the Phoenix workshop and Celebration day
- An excellent document that will assist in guiding the rebuilding of Marysville
- Mostly a good capturing of the unique nature of past Marysville
- Overall the design looks good
- Generally pleased with the outcomes
- Has the potential to rebuild Marysville better than before
- Very similar to what was there before
- General ideas are good
- Overall impressed with the UDF
- Commend the Shire and local residents on UDF’s development
- It will do – Marysville will develop character in time
- Appears to be ok
- Reasonable – keeps pretty much to the old footprint
- Some good ideas – some bad

Feedback or comment: Good parts of the Urban Design Framework

- Open space
- Better use of public land
- Environmental sustainability principles
- Ability to re-establish dwellings behind shops on the main street
- Assisting return of post office, banking, etc.
- Natural environment emphasis
- Economic development priorities
- Recognition of importance of tourism
- Restoration of original town’s character
- Preserve the character and identity of the original town
- Preserving trees, gardens, streetscape, character and irregular street pattern
- Sustainable development focus
- Resort conference development
- The idea of the ‘heart’
- Tracks and trails
- Linkages and sight lines to town parks, river and surrounding hills
- Creation of a vibrant and attractive town
- Community precinct

Response

Recommendation

21. Feedback noted

1. Overall vision

Feedback or comment: Negative Comments – Do not like the UDF – 19 Submissions –

- The plan is not how Marysville should be rebuilt
- Let Marysville be the way it was
- Extremely upset by the design
- The UDF is too futuristic, and modern
- Too urban
- Too city like and modern
- “What’s wrong with what we had?”
- Whole concept ignores people who have lived in community for years
- The UDF shouldn’t judge traditional or non contemporary choices and dismiss them so rudely and flippantly
- The name ‘urban’ design framework is wrong – urban is to do with city not village atmosphere
- There is a total imbalance in the things considered important. The UDF focuses on visitors or tourist issues – natural features, trails, events, etc. and less on permanent residents interests eg. education. health, heritage
- Ignores land owners rights to develop as they wish and ‘locks up’ large land holdings for future tourist development.
- Marysville before fires had country charm

Response

- The character of Marysville will be a result of the rebuilding decisions taken by individual property owners and businesses. The UDF will not seek to control these.
- The UDF will be amended to incorporate design principles and benchmark images that reflect community aspirations for a village townscape, more familiar cottage and rural architectural styles which reference the environment, heritage and lifestyle of the area.
- Public buildings should also promote the character of the rebuilt Marysville.
- New buildings in the existing business zone will require a planning permit.
- A new primary school, children’s centre and health centre is being rebuilt as part of a community hub.

Recommendation

1. Amend the draft UDF to reflect community aspirations for a more village style architecture and town feel.

2. Built form/township character

Feedback or comment: Restore Marysville's former character

– 13 Submissions –

- Architectural fabric and design should reflect the late 19th century early 20th century character of Marysville
- Pay homage to Marysville's past
- Rebuild as closely as possible to Marysville's original style
- Marysville's is a small rural/mountain township with a village atmosphere
- Marysville had an eclectic mix of designs
- Retain low density residential zones
- Look after trees in Main Street
- Reduce extent of tree removal
- Why were all the Manna Gums felled along Steavenson River?
- Reduce salvage logging where trees are still alive
- Restore interesting and colour plantings of European deciduous trees and shrubs; birch, beech, rhododendrons, azaleas, maples etc.
- Reproduction architecture should be allowed to be built
- Front fencing shouldn't be controlled

Response

- It would be difficult to implement reconstruction in a uniform reproduction style and it is unlikely that agreement would be reached on a preferred style.
- Landscaping has been, and is likely to remain, a key determinant of the character of Marysville. The UDF provides for landscape setbacks and spaces between buildings and for the renewal of the town's landscape.
- The UDF provides a vision, encourages individuality and diversity and does not control individual decision making about preferred style of rebuilding.
- The mountain village town character could be re-emphasised in the UDF and additional images sourced to clarify that vision.
- UDF could be amended to emphasise the criteria for new public buildings.

Recommendation

2. The sub-alpine village character will be re-emphasised in the UDF and additional images sourced to clarify that vision.
3. The UDF will be amended to emphasise the criteria for new public buildings.
3. The UDF will be amended to emphasise landscaping of Marysville with both exotic European and native plantings.

2. Built form/township character

Feedback or comment: “Innovative and contemporary architecture” is contrary to the previous look and feel of the town

– 17 Submissions –

- Too modern and urban
- Don't like contemporary buildings or design
- Designs are futuristic and don't respect history of the town
- Modern architecture should not be a feature of the buildings
- Modernistic buildings proposed for the centre of town are definitely out of place
- Too much contemporary architecture will date the redevelopment and place it clearly in 2009
- 'Dinner Plain style' buildings are not the image wanted for Marysville

Response

- The UDF doesn't attempt to control the character or style of development.
- It is unlikely that agreement would be reached on a preferred style.
- The UDF simply provides a vision, encourages individuality and diversity and does not control individual decision making about preferred style of rebuilding.
- Community feedback that the architectural design of new buildings needs to be cottage, rural and alpine village style, more understated and familiar, references the local context is supported.

Recommendation

4. The sub-alpine village character will be re-emphasised in the UDF and additional images sourced to clarify that vision.
5. The UDF will be amended to emphasise the criteria for public buildings.

2. Built form/township character

Feedback or comment: Prefer a rural or country town character

– 9 Submissions –

- Designs should be more subtle and blend with the landscape
- Designs should be more rustic and alpine
- Designs should be more 'Australiana' with a nice country feel
- Unique buildings, chalet style and country cottage feel
- Traditional /familiar design
- Prefer rustic heritage design
- Mountain village charm
- Redesign visitor information centre to reflect timber industry heritage
- School/community hub and RAC buildings are ugly and too ultra modern
- VBRR and the council should give a commitment that public buildings will be built using the design principles in the UDF
- Provide more direction on design of public and commercial buildings

Response

- The UDF does not attempt to control the character or style of development.
- It is unlikely that agreement would be reached on a preferred style.
- The UDF simply provides a vision, encourages individuality and diversity and does not control individual decision making about preferred style of rebuilding.
- The mountain village town character could be re-emphasised in the UDF and additional images sourced to clarify that vision.
- UDF could be amended to emphasise the criteria for new public buildings.
- Individual landowners will largely be able to determine the style of development on their own land.

Recommendation

6. A sub-alpine village character will be reemphasised in the UDF and additional images sourced to clarify that vision.
7. The UDF will be amended to emphasise the criteria for public buildings.

3. Town structure

Feedback or comment: Main Street shops

– 15 Submissions –

- Main street proposal is good
- Concerned that top end of Murchison Street will still be 'dead'
- Retain general store, hardware' petrol station in their original locations
- Appears to be an increase in the number of shops
- The businesses that were operating before the fires were sufficient
- Attract the niche shopping by providing a nucleus of high class shops to attract day trippers
- Mixing retail and residential uses was a good feature of former town centre
- Link to open space may be too open - the former police station, kindergarten, and tourist information provided activity to that side of the street
- Conference centre doesn't have to be on Main Street
- Leaving large sites vacant and fenced off for next 5-10 years would detract from image of main street. Landscaping should be considered.
- Move the conference centre out of the Main Street
- Too many shops that will be untenanted with no one to operate them because the community is small
- Retail site north east of realigned Darwin Street should become parkland

Response

- The UDF indicates possible building footprints along Murchison Streets. It encourages active frontages along the street, but does not specify what these uses should be.
- Individual business investment decisions will determine the types of stores established and the retail mix in Murchison Street.
- Business investment and viability is a decision of individual property owners and business operators.
- A larger conference and accommodation venue needs to be located on or close to Murchison Street to provide benefits to other businesses and help to re-establish the local economy.
- Transferring retail or commercial sites to parkland will depend on availability of funding to purchase sites.

Recommendation

8. The UDF will be amended to encourage temporary landscaping of vacant sites in Murchison Street.

3. Town Structure

Feedback or comment: Police station

– 10 Submissions –

- Relocation of police station is supported
- Police station should stay where it was in centre of town
- Police Station should stay on the highway in Buxton

Response

- Location of police station will be a decision of the Victoria Police.
- UDF seeks to locate new police station in the centre of Murchison Street.

Recommendation

8. No change to UDF

3. Town Structure

Feedback or comment: Health centre site

– 1 Submission on behalf of a number of residents –

- Community health facility should be rebuilt adjacent to the retirement village for ease of access and emergencies
- The health centre land was bought through donations from the Marysville community –
- Any development of this land will have to be controlled to prevent noisy restaurants or late night venues impacting on the adjacent retirement village

Response

- The former Mechanics Institute was acquired, and adjoining land purchased for use as a community care centre in 1977. Therefore, the former health centre site is Council land.
- A decision on the redevelopment of community health services will be a decision of Alexandra District Hospital.
- The UDF recognises benefits of co-location in terms of convenience, sharing resources and service viability.
- Any redevelopment of sites on Murchison Street will require a planning permit.

Recommendation

8. No change to UDF.

3. Town Structure

Feedback or comment: Former museum

– 3 Submissions –

- Use former car museum as a community centre, cultural events and market
- Alleviates the need to build the “Marysville Heart”
- Solid plan on future use after temporary retail uses ceases
- Develop front of site for cafes, markets, buskers, exhibitions, etc.

Response

- The former Car Museum has been purchased by the Victorian Government to support the rebuilding of the Marysville community. In the short term it will house local businesses, including Foodworks. It will be used for community development purposes (still to be determined) in the longer term.
- The *Rebuilding Together Plan* includes:
 - Fit-out of the Marysville Motor Museum as an interim business/retail hub (\$2.4 million).
- The Marysville heart is a new public open space linking to Gallipoli Park and a site that could be developed for cultural or commercial uses that would attract people to Marysville and be of benefit to the local community.

Recommendation

8. No change to UDF

3. Town Structure

Feedback or comment: Murchison Street

– 5 Submissions –

- Close Murchison Street to traffic to make a pedestrian area
- Swale requires maintenance collecting leaves and litter
- Grass plantings in swale attract snakes
- Crossovers do not align forcing pedestrians to jay walk
- Create focal point/attraction to attract pedestrian movement east along Murchison street
- Redesign swales as they haven't worked

Response

- A landscape master plan is to be prepared for Murchison Street. The plan will provide the basis for works to restore Murchison Street and will provide guidance for infrastructure, landscape, future maintenance, car parking and pedestrian movement.
- It is considered important that Murchison Street is open to passing traffic so that local businesses are supported. The benefits and costs of allowing street closures at some times could be considered when undertaking the landscape masterplan.
- A focal point/attraction is proposed in the Marysville 'heart' area which includes new public open space and development opportunities for activities that would benefit Triangle communities.

Recommendation

8. No change to UDF

3. Town Structure

Feedback or comment: Second river crossing

– 8 Submissions –

- May remove passing trade from main street
- Perhaps only open on busiest days for day trips to lake Mountain
- Is likely to be contentious
- Good idea
- Object most strongly to using Racecourse Road as the route. Traffic and pedestrian conflicts are likely due to houses in the area.

Response

- The secondary crossing would be only a local road for local traffic and would not seek to divert passing trade from Murchison Street. It is intended to be convenient for local people and emergency vehicles. The route for the crossing has not been determined and will be subject to a feasibility assessment.

Recommendation

8. No change to UDF

3. Town Structure

Feedback or comment: Temporary Industrial site on Marysville's gateway (DSE Site)

– 6 Submissions –

- Unattractive use of previous rural/public land
- Is not consistent with promoting Marysville as an attractive tourist destination.
- Relocate the industrial building storage site or any industrial activity away from the gateway into Marysville
- Relocate the industrial building storage close to tip
- There are other sites available for this sort of activity, whether at Narbethong, the old quarry off the Buxton-Marysville Rd, in the area previously used as industrial land in Marysville or in other locations.
- Explore the heritage based tourism opportunities of the old mill and artefacts.

Response

- There is a need for a storage site to assist rebuilding. The site is presently on a two-year lease.
- A temporary industrial site is proposed for 2 – 5 years to assist with storage of building materials and concrete batching. It is important that a convenient and appropriate site is found.
- Other site options have various issues in terms of ownership, amenity impacts, traffic impacts and the investment required especially where the site is not owned by DSE or government.

Recommendation

9. Amend the UDF to note the need for a temporary storage site to assist rebuilding rather than designate a specific site. Council to investigate other potential sites for temporary industrial uses as soon as possible.
9. General provision added to UDF that any temporary uses must be screened or landscaped.
10. Alter the UDF to emphasise importance of the DSE site as a future gateway into town, and the need to identify an appropriate future use of the land.

3. Town Structure

Feedback or comment: Significant development outside existing town boundaries – 11 Submissions –

- The temporary village and the Golf Club should be recognized as part of the township and their business development anticipated in the UDF
- A number of operators need to restructure their activities to ensure long term sustainability
- The golf club is one of six important tourist assets
- Extend the zoning regulations to include the golf club and enable development
- Ensure that the UDF doesn't stifle current operators from developing their businesses
- There is no need to rezone land for 'resorts' or for housing – both functions are adequately met within the existing town boundaries
- There are a number of potential negative effects of allowing development outside of Marysville's town boundary
- Consider the full range of Marysville community /social, environmental needs - not just those of the Golf Course
- Rezoning of cheap land out of town lowers in-town property values.
- Housing development out of town extends services provision rather than concentrating it.
- "Out of-town' development creates two community identities
- The need is to rebuild with locational, financial and social advantage within a compact walkable (existing) town.
- Facilitate rebuilding of Marysville Trout & Salmon Ponds
- Include properties such as the Trout and Salmon Ponds in the UDF as having the opportunity to be rezoned to facilitate business uses
- Enable development of any operating business which would enhance the tourist experience
- An embargo on any development of a large conference facility outside the town would put in jeopardy developments that are also of value
- Historical zoning aberrations should be addressed

Response

- The principle of encouraging redevelopment firstly within the town boundaries is important to providing a critical mass of activity to support local businesses re-establishing along Murchison Street and creating a viable town. This principle should be strongly emphasised in the UDF.
- Existing Planning Zones are being maintained and any development proposals outside the town ship boundaries will be assessed on their merits relative to the UDF principles and within the requirements of the planning scheme.
- The Marysville Trout and Salmon farm and Golf and Bowls Club are currently able to rebuild and expand their businesses including accommodation, hospitality and agricultural activity within the current planning scheme which allows for recreational uses (subject to a planning permit).
- Any planning scheme amendments for land outside the Marysville town limits will need to demonstrate how they support the economic revitalisation of Marysville.

Recommendation

11. The 5 year restriction on development in the UDF will be removed. Current Planning Scheme Zone will remain and the principle of supporting the re-establishment of Murchison Street through attracting investment in larger accommodation and conference facilities is a priority. Development proposals outside the town should be assessed against this objective and will need to demonstrate the benefits to the town.

3. Town Structure

Feedback or comment: Other

– 6 Submissions –

- Dislikes proposed sculpture in kid space
- 'Kidspace'? intrudes into proposed memorial gardens location
- Why is swimming pool being redesigned as it wasn't damaged by the fire
- Supports relocation of Kindergarten
- The 'Heart' should encompass both sides of Murchison Street and extend to Lyell Street
- Ensure that 'Open Space' facilities can be seen and readily supervised

- Amphitheatre
 - Don't need a Myer music bowl
 - Good to see there is a sound shell proposed

Response

- Whilst the idea of an amphitheatre has been suggested for events in the park, there does not appear to be strong support for expensive formal infrastructure. The Gallipoli Park Masterplan Reference Group is considering the most appropriate infrastructure to support events in the parks.
- Community consultation will be undertaken as part of the development of Gallipoli Park master plan.
- The swimming pool is not being re-designed. Infrastructure damaged in the fire is being repaired.

Recommendation

11. No change to UDF

4. RAC building

Feedback or comment: Design and location of RAC building **– 5 Submissions –**

- A building of that size is not needed
- Contemporary design of VBRAA building is out of character
- Site should be used for parkland not information centre
- Was imposed on community – don't proceed with it
- Future uses of RAC?
- Building design needs to be carefully thought through
- Locate RAC temporarily in former car museum

Response

- A decision to build an information centre to assist rebuilding on the site of the former Visitor Information Centre has been made. Construction is soon to commence. The building will be integrated into the Gallipoli Park through landscaping treatments.
- The building and the services that will be provided in it are an important resource to facilitate the reconstruction and rebuilding of Marysville.
- The building will be a future asset for tourism information of similar uses.

Recommendation

11. No change to UDF

5. Marysville proposed community hub

Feedback or comment: Design and construction of community hub

– 9 Submissions –

- Proposed facilities are too large for the towns population
- Create a space in the community hub where people can go on 'code red days' and still carry out some normal functions.
- Space could include internet connection, play area and kitchen and provide a viable alternative to staying home and still getting things done.
- Looks terrible
- Don't like a huge complex combined with the school
- Should be separated and on previous site
- The school looks too far away from the pool
- The facility is not located well in terms of allowing viewing of activity on the oval. The building should be moved further around to the Falls Road centre wing position. In its current location it will not be fully utilised as spectators will gravitate towards the location mentioned above
- Ensure that the facility meets the appropriate AFL facility requirements
- Will support plan of reintroducing high standard of football activity.
- Community health facility should be rebuilt adjacent to the retirement village for ease of access and emergencies
- Site is too small to accommodate all the facilities
- Privacy is an issue for visitors to the health centre when it is combined with other uses
- We don't have the population to maintain a lot of community buildings

Response

- The first stage of the Community Hub Project is the Early Learning Centre (Primary School, childcare, maternal and child health). This stage is to commence construction in November.
- A masterplan indicating the whole of site layout for the Community Hub has also been prepared in the first stage.
- Co-location benefits are the key drivers of the design of the Community Hub facilities.
- Design is yet to commence on Stage 2 of the Community Hub (Community Health Clinic, multipurpose community space and recreation centre), this will commence in November and involve consultation with community. Work to date has focussed on functional requirements and some concept ideas.
- The size and type of health facility within the Community Hub is a decision of Alexandra District Hospital
- Hub development is being undertaken in consultation with community stakeholders and Department of Education and Early Childhood Development.

Recommendation

11. No change to UDF

6. Trails and tracks

Feedback or comment: Concept design and construction of trails

– 21 Submissions –

- Like the increased opportunity for walking and cycling
- Linking the Triangle towns via walking/cycling paths – fantastic!
- Trail network design suggestions
 - Join trail to proposed Alexandra rail trail rather than Warburton
 - Extend trails to include other areas
 - Encourage Lake Mountain bike riding opportunities
 - Bushfire memorial walking trail with small dedications evenly spaced, similar to Kokoda Memorial Trial
 - Bird watching walks
 - Bush regeneration walks
 - Mountain bike course
- Trail network construction
 - Should be sealed - not gravel given high rain fall in area
 - Too make them safe ensure tracks are separated from roads –not just a sealed shoulder
- Feasibility study and cost benefit study should be undertaken as trails will be expensive to build and maintain and are unlikely to bring the benefits set out in the UDF

Response

- The Triangle Trail idea will be subject to a feasibility study to assess the costs and benefits of the proposal and options for routes and infrastructure.
- The *Rebuilding Together Plan* includes:
 - Construction of a Triangle Walking and Cycling Trail connecting communities in the Marysville area.

Recommendation

11. No change to UDF

7. Traffic and Car parking

Feedback or comment: Darwin Street

– 7 Submissions –

- Supports realignment
- Realignment will alter development opportunities on adjacent land
- Abutting owners need certainty on whether road realignment will occur so that they can proceed with rebuilding
- Darwin Street to be sealed
- Concerned that a new parking area in Darwin Street may be the precursor for closing down the Council carpark in Murchison Street
- Darwin Street should be upgraded
- Darwin Street should not be realigned
- Diversion of traffic will reduce customers to businesses at the top end of Murchison Street as they will not walk back up the hill
- Introduce changes as an interim change to enable the impacts on business to be assessed

Response

- It is important to provide certainty for adjacent landowners regarding the realignment of Darwin Street. A feasibility assessment, including discussions with the owner of 4 Murchison Street, is currently underway with a view to providing a recommendation to the s86 Committee of Council.
- It is not intended to divert traffic to Darwin Street, but to upgrade the street and provide for parking.
- VicRoads advises that there is no need for a traffic impact assessment.
- The UDF recommends that parking is retained on sites, sitting in behind buildings where possible.

Recommendation

11. Results of feasibility study on the Darwin Street realignment will be incorporated into the UDF

7. Traffic and Car parking

Feedback or comment: Car parking

– 7 Submissions –

- Provide more car parking
- Should be doubled
- Provide car parking away from Murchison Street
- Property owners shouldn't be compelled to use their own private property for public car parking.
- Council owned car parks should be retained in Murchison Street
- Car park next to Tower Motel to remain as a car park and not be developed

Response

- Car parking is proposed to be retained in Murchison Street.
- Additional car parking will be available in Darwin Street. Encouraging walkways from Darwin Street to Murchison Street as proposed in UDF will enhance overall car parking provision.

Recommendation

11. No change to UDF

7. Traffic and Car parking

Feedback or comment: Other issues

– 2 Submissions –

- Prohibit log trucks from driving through Marysville between 10.30pm and 7.30 am
- Upgrade the highway through the Black Spur
- Upgrade the road from Narbethong to Marysville
- Object to Racecourse Road being used as an alternative truck route

Response

- These matters are outside the control of the UDF
- It is not proposed that Racecourse Road is an alternative truck route.

Recommendation

11. No change to UDF

8. What is missing in the UDF

Feedback or comment: Cultural

– 20 Submissions –

- Russell Crowe performance arts centre
 - A vital catalyst project for the rebuilding of the town
 - Need an attractor as cannot rely on natural beauty for short term future tourism
 - Has the potential to attract visitors and support other businesses
 - Creates jobs
 - Events coordinator needed - to help facilitate the rebuilding and improvements in this area
 - Needs to be near car parking

- Arts precinct/building
- Workshop for visual arts
- Space for rural drama/music camps
- Museum – fire, car or venue for private collectors
- Historic and cultural representations in public open spaces
- Public area for historical society
- Support Bruno's sculpture garden
- Some form of education centre – TAFE, Hospitality or Cooking College
- Bushfire Museum Education Centre
- Learning Village concept

Response

- Feasibility, maintenance and ownership of facilities need to be considered to ensure that proposals are proven, viable and investment has been committed.

Recommendation

12. Amend the UDF to include a range of possible catalyst projects to assist the economic and cultural revival of Marysville and Triangle communities including a performing arts centre. Future development of these projects will be subject to their feasibility, long-term viability and availability of finance (either through private investment or government or donor funding).

8. What is missing in the UDF

Feedback or comment: Sport and recreation facilities

– 15 Submissions –

- Indoor heated swimming pool
 - Would provide year round swimming facilities for Alexandra, Thornton, Eildon and Triangle area
 - Would facilitate recovery sessions for local football clubs and sports groups
 - Provides aquatic physiotherapy for senior citizens
 - Provides more recreation activities for children and visitors to Marysville
- Trevor Harrow Oval sports viewing area (est. 1931) needs to be on wing of football ground. The best area for viewing sport on any football oval is from an elevated wing
- Club rooms and pavilion at the oval
- An arcade for the kids
- Gym
- Bike racks
- Playground
- Development of the golf course
- Sealed path around oval and Gallipoli Park for cycling, roller-blading, ski training etc.
- Children's play space
- Land on Pack Road and Falls Road included in park

Response

- It is possible for some facilities, such as a heated indoor pool, to be contained in private developments.
- Feasibility, maintenance and ownership of facilities needs to be considered
- Community consultation will be undertaken as part of the development of Gallipoli Park master plan.

Recommendation

12. No change to UDF

8. What is missing in the UDF

Feedback or comment: Accommodation

– 12 Submissions –

- Backpacker type accommodation
- Rebuilding of guest houses
- 400 beds required and could be achieved through holiday homes, guest house, bed and breakfast operators
- Facilitate and encourage rebuilding holiday houses
- Provide practical encouragement and support for rebuilding of holiday rental houses, self caters and bed and breakfast operators
- Catalyst project should include an incentive for tourist accommodation managed by small operators to rebuild

Response

- Provision of tourist accommodation is a private investment decision.
- The UDF supports provision of a range of tourist accommodation as important to the economic rejuvenation of Marysville.

Recommendation

12. The UDF will be amended to acknowledge the important and complementary role of small and micro businesses in the local economy.

8. What is missing in the UDF

Feedback or comment: Tourism infrastructure

– 8 Submissions –

- Skyrail to Lake Mountain
- Public toilets are important to tourist/visitor traffic
 - State of the art 'green' system
 - Perhaps include changing rooms
- Major tourist attraction
- Competition track for inline skate/ski training for during winter
 - Most of the time could be for general pedestrian use
- Community market

Response

- A range of options, including the proposal for a Skyrail to Lake Mountain, exist for tourism infrastructure that could support the revitalisation of the Triangle economy. The need for tourism infrastructure is supported in the UDF, however tourism proposals will require significant levels of investment and community support to be realised.
- Public toilets will be included in the Rebuilding Advisory Centre on Murchison Street.

Recommendation

12. No change to UDF

8. What is missing in the UDF

Feedback or comment: Aging population

– 1 Submission on behalf of a group of residents –

- Consider 'the elderly' in the Urban Design Framework
- Provide facilities for the elder community

Response

- UDF based on principle of designing for universal access.
- Pedestrian links provided in UDF.
- UDF encourages re-establishment of retirement village.

Recommendation

13. Amend the UDF to re-emphasise that designing for universal access is important and make reference to the needs of older citizens in terms of design of public realm, provision of housing and services.

8. What is missing in the UDF

Feedback or comment: Other

– 14 Submissions –

- Pub
- Supermarket
- Irrigation works for the town
- Parkland buffer around town
- Building code for domestic housing
- Input from churches
- Retreat for residents in case of bushfire
- Consideration should be given to the long term use of the car museum as part of the UDF
- Botanical gardens
- Ensure that empty blocks are made and kept attractive.
- What about the falls?
- The previous service locations should be highlighted – mobile library, waster transfer, bus stops, medical, community assembly points. etc.
- Iconic gateway
- Clearance of vegetation within 20 metres of a water course should allowed in urban areas where fire safety is desired
- Use of green energy
- Large community Christmas tree
- Gardens, sculpture and play space on the former kinder site

Response

- Steavensons Falls will be redeveloped as a key tourism site for economic recovery.
- The *Rebuilding Together Plan* includes:
 - Redeveloping and upgrading Steavensons Falls (\$2.6 million) as well as infrastructure linking the Falls to Marysville, Keppels Lookout and Lady Talbot Scenic Drive.

Recommendation

14. Amend the UDF to identify safe community place.

9. Implementation

Feedback or comment: Priorities in order of number of submissions

– 57 Submissions –

- Primary School
 - Will help keep families in the area and encourage rebuilding
- Main street shops
- Accommodation
- Police station
- General store
- Super market
- Trail construction/upgrade
- Tree planting and landscaping
 - Mass plantings of mature deciduous trees
 - Encourage replanting of lots with rhododendrons, azaleas, Japanese maples, etc.
 - Landscape Main street
 - Landscape and beautify entrances to town
- Medical centre
- Petrol station
- Community facilities
- Small business support
- Conference centre or resort facilities needed
 - However resort struggled to find personnel and may draw business away from small business
- Kindergarten/ Day-care for children
 - Will encourage young families into town
- Russell Crowe performance arts centre
- Public toilet block
- Post office
- Hotel
- Chemist
- 'Heart of town'
- Newsagent
- Bushfire education centre/global learning village
- Major visitor attraction
- Basic infrastructure – drainage, footpaths, power
- Clear access and fix up Stevensons Falls
- Clear scenic drive routes
- Reinstate bush walking trails
- Marysville Visitor Information centre
- Hardware store
- Facilities activities for children
- Amphitheatre
- Rotunda
- Barbeque area
- Banking facilities
- Darwin street upgrade
- Sports pavilion
- Health Centre
- Arts/heritage centre
- Swimming pool
- Bruno's sculpture garden
- Remove cyclone fences in Main street
- Ski hire
- 'Niche' for music and the arts
- River and gardens close to Main street
- Kids spaces
- Visitor centre
- Second river crossing
- Playground
- Community sculpture and landscaping
- Subsidised sustainable energy for homes
- Additional parkland
- Realignment of Darwin Street

Response

- Useful list to set priorities for implementation

Recommendation

14. Noted

9. Implementation

Feedback or comment: Economic and other considerations

– 10 Submissions –

- Need to encourage business growth
 - UDF puts emphasis on big business and doesn't mention small business
 - Concern over lack of funding to small business
 - Concern that Marysville will not have enough capacity to grow into the amount of business zoned area.
 - Need significant business as an attractor
 - Public toilets are important to tourist/visitor traffic
 - Small business recovery should be an additional catalyst project
 - Need to also promote retail /commercial centre at the corner of Murchison and Lyell Street
- Build on tourism potential
 - Tourism will bring employment
 - Support providing year round attractions at Lake Mountain
- Create employment opportunities
- Public transport to Melbourne
- Internet access
- 'Weekenders' have been forgotten and many will not rebuild.
 - Due to financial loss, increased costs, insurance issues, new buildings regulations etc.

Response

- An Economic Development Leadership group has been formed to work on strategies for economic renewal in the Triangle Communities. Private investors, government and Council will all have a role to play in helping to regenerate the local economy.
- The *Rebuilding Together Plan* includes:
 - Restoration of lake Mountain Alpine Resort as a major summer and winter destination. (\$9.2 million)
- The *Rebuilding Together Plan* includes a number of other reconstruction and recovery initiatives that will boost the local economy and employment through construction activity. These projects include the Marysville Community Hub, Marysville Police Station, Marysville Rebuilding Advisory Centre, and various track and trail constructions.
- Economic matters are generally beyond the scope of the UDF.
- Public toilets will be included in the Rebuilding Advisory Centre on Murchison Street.

Recommendation

14. No change to UDF.

9. Implementation

– 2 Submissions –

Feedback or comment: UDF's for Buxton, Narbethong & Taggerty

- Should also be reviewed as part of this process
- Provide a timeframe for completion of the UDFs for all towns
- Concern that Marysville is receiving all of the attention/money and Narbethong missing out

Response

- A landscape design for the highway and public reserve in being prepared for Narbethong.

Recommendation

15. VBRRA and Council to provide a response on the need for UDF's for Buxton and Taggerty.

9. Implementation

Feedback or comment: Provide more detail in the UDF

– 8 Submissions –

- Generally more detail is needed
- More detail should be provided on the river parkland space, including the integration of the land purchased by government between the car museum and the river into the existing river reserve
- Develop an Implementation plan with dates
- Get on with development quickly

Response

- The UDF is intended to provide the broad principles and direction for rebuilding Marysville and Triangle communities. Further more detailed work is required on major initiatives including: Gallipoli Park, Murchison Street, Community Hub.
- This more detailed work has commenced with the community and stakeholders.

Recommendation

16. Note this next stage of detailed planning and in the implementation section of the UDF.

10. Other Issues

Feedback or comment: Narbethong **– 8 Submissions –**

- Narbethong has not been consulted on proposed industrial land and may not want it.
- Light industrial land is needed. It is critical to the redevelopment of the triangle that such land be made available sooner rather than later

Response

- There is a need for land that can accommodate smaller 'industrial' type uses such as mechanical repairs, local trucking, machining and tooling. There is an absence of appropriately zoned land for these types of uses.
- Options to provide appropriate employment/industrial land should consider options both inside and outside Marysville.
- Consultation will be an important and necessary next stage in an assessment of options for employment/industrial land.

Recommendation

17. Amend the UDF to note the need for employment and industrial land in the Triangle region and that all options need to be identified and assessed in consultation with local communities.

10. Other Issues

Feedback or comment: Underground all powerlines in Marysville – 2 Submissions –

- Would make Marysville less venerable to power outages
- Would enhance the ‘mountain village’ atmosphere and remove the visual blight of overhead lines
- Would allow trees in the streetscape to grow without lopping

Response

- Agree that this is a good idea, but is subject to government funding being available.

Recommendation

18. Amend the UDF to include opportunity of seeking government funding to underground all powerlines in Marysville.

10. Other Issues

Feedback or comment: Noxious weeds

– 1 Submission –

- Facilitate removal of noxious weeds and correct references in vegetation protection overlay

Response

- Amend the vegetation protection overlay in the planning scheme documentation so that the permit exemption for noxious weeds includes restricted category of noxious weeds.

Recommendation

18. Planning scheme documentation to be amended

DRAFT

11. Authority/Agency Comments

Feedback or comment:

- Authority comments are supportive of the Marysville and Triangle UDF.
- The objectives of environmental sustainability were noted by authorities and agencies.
- Where culture concerns or referral may be required was also identified.

Response

Recommendation

21. Noted

DRAFT