The vision for the Green Wedges was driven by the then Minister for Local Government, Rupert Hamer, in the late 1960's. He directed the Metropolitan Board of Works, the planning authority at the time, that in planning for the future of Melbourne ‘…nobody could happily contemplate a future metropolis of seemingly endless suburbia spreading out to infinity’ and that ‘…It must be strongly emphasised that the future planning should take account of the surrounding countryside as a vital part of the metropolitan environment.’ This was a bold vision to contain urban sprawl, building on a highly treasured British planning tradition of urban green belts, and was incorporated in 1971 into the planning for future growth of the Melbourne Metropolitan Region.
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FOREWORD

The future of the Green Wedges is vital to the quality of life and the reputation of Melbourne as one of the world’s most liveable cities.

Yet the Green Wedges are in danger of disappearing from both the ongoing encroachment of urban development and more insidiously a gradual increase in built development under uses permissible under existing non-urban zoning. These could lead to ‘death by a thousand cuts’.

The end result if this is allowed to continue to happen will be the destruction of the vision of the urban form for Melbourne first set in place in strategic planning for metropolitan area in the 1970’s recognising the need to contain the urban sprawl avoiding a future metropolis of seemingly endless suburbia.

There have been two major planning events that have formed the shape of Melbourne in modern times. These are:

- In the 1970’s, the original vision of the Green Wedges of the Late R J Hamer and its incorporation into the Melbourne Metropolitan Strategic Plan; and
- In 2002, the formal recognition and protection of the Green Wedges in Melbourne 2030.

The Green Wedge Coalition wants to see Plan Melbourne (2106) enable the third visionary step that will see the achievement of a permanent Urban Growth Boundary, with no further provision for the expansion of the present UGB, and the revision of the Victorian Planning Provisions to ensure the maintenance and enhancement of the rural landscapes that characterises the openness of the Green Wedges as a key driver for future decisions on land use and development.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In its charter, the Green Wedges Coalition recognises that:

This vision for Melbourne, handed down by our parents’ generation, has helped make ours into one of the most liveable cities in the world. At a time of unrivalled prosperity, rising community awareness and appreciation of the value of green city spaces to our personal wellbeing, we regard maintaining the green wedges for future generations as a yardstick for our generation’s commitment to developing a sustainable city in a sustainable world.

The Green Wedge Coalition calls on all parties to protect the Green Wedges by:

- Protecting environmentally significant and viable agricultural land within the green wedges and resisting further UGB expansion;
- Restoring, maintaining and strengthening Green Wedge protection provisions;
- Refusing any further residential or industrial proposals in breach of existing green wedge planning provisions;
- Closing loopholes which permit inappropriate and over development;
- Requiring Councils to introduce Green Wedge Management Plans that comply with State green wedge protection provisions to provide for local variation and to prevent re-subdivision and construction on small lots and in old and inappropriate subdivisions where this would allow extra development.

The purpose of this paper is to identify key future directions for the Green Wedges and prepare a submission to the State Government on the development of Plan Melbourne 2016. This is done against the Green Wedge Coalition’s detailed involvement with and understanding of:

- the history of policy, strategic planning and legislation for the protection of the Green Wedges;
- extensive local experience of its strengths and weaknesses; and,
- in particular, a major concern about the impact of the encroachment of housing and commercial and industrial development on the Green Wedges.

An analysis of the land use policy in Plan Melbourne (2014) shows that key issues for the future of the Green Wedges in Plan Melbourne were identified as: recognising the need for a permanent boundary to provide a clear policy signal about long term development options and protecting non-urban land as fundamental to the future of the Green Wedges; enhancing the food production capability of Melbourne and its non-urban areas; and protecting significant water and sewerage resources.

In reviewing this policy for the Green Wedges in Plan Melbourne (2104) it is evident to the Green Wedges Coalition that the formal acknowledgement of the importance of the Green Wedges as previously recognised in strategic planning for the Melbourne, for instance in Melbourne 2030 (2002), has been largely lost.

The Green Wedge Coalition strongly asserts that what is needed in revision of Plan Melbourne for the future of the Green Wedges is:

1. Recognition of the Green Wedges as a planning entity in the strategic planning for the future of Melbourne;
2. Achievement of a permanent Urban Growth Boundary, with no further provision for expansion of the present UGB;
3. A commitment to maintaining the rural open landscape of the Green Wedges;
5. Prevention of the alienation of land used for productive agriculture and nature conservation
6. Greater recognition of the need to protect the natural and cultural resources.
7. Increase support for individual land holders and community organisations to protect and enhance the Green Wedges.
PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to prepare a submission on the Plan Melbourne Refresh Discussion Paper (October 2015) identifying Green Wedge Coalition’s key future directions for the Green Wedges.

This is an overall policy response bringing together common issues across all the Green Wedges and it is understood that each of the recommended key future directions will need to be the subject of much more detailed development by members of the Green Wedge Coalition over time with the State Government. Also Green Wedge Coalition member organisations are likely to have additional local issues that may be the subject of separate submissions to the State Government.

The closing date for submissions is Friday 18 December 2015.

INTRODUCTION

Planning, done correctly, is an evolutionary process. Presently, it is the domain of large commercial developers, which has had serious impacts on the planning decisions made at a political level. Planning has become a political football. Politicians are not planners and there has been a growing trend for Government’s in the planning decisions to place emphasis on economic development at the expense of crucial social and environmental concerns. For example, there has been widespread criticism of the rapidly increasing high rise development in the CBD without adequate consideration being given to open space, environmental and other key social infrastructure.

Similarly, increasing pressure of land speculation interests in the Green Wedges for rezoning for urban development and deregulation of the land uses in the non-urban zones is leading to both the loss of Green Wedges and the diminishing of the amenity and environmental values fundamental to the future of the Green Wedges.

Planning must be clearly seen to remain at arm’s length from developer influence, giving equal attention to social and environmental issues. In this context it is imperative that developer contributions to political parties be banned.

A consistent commitment to a planning strategy requires regular reviews, which should consider present and projected trends with regard to population, job prospects and location, family sizes, lifestyles, energy requirements, investment in commerce and industry, transport systems, land use and environment and the equitable use and distribution of community resources. Collection and analysis of this information must be done by an independent well-supported government department or agency. Planning must deliver consistency with adherence to solid planning strategies that will allow long term financial planning and commitment by all stakeholders.

Preservation of the Green Wedges depends on the commitment to ensuring no further expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary. The Green Wedge Coalition has been extremely disappointed by the incursions into the Green Wedges on misleading grounds that lacked planning strategy such as housing affordability or boundary anomalies.

Strategies can and should be put in place to reduce future pressure to expand the UGB. The 1981 MMBW Metropolitan Strategy Implementation recommendation “to optimise the use of the existing infrastructure and resources of the metropolitan area” is still relevant (p10 3.2 Metropolitan Objectives, dot point 3).

Green Wedge protection requires complementary planning policies in broader State and Federal policy areas. To cite three:

- The Green wedge Coalition does not support the unrestrained, rapid population growth currently encouraged by both State and Commonwealth Governments. We did support the prospect of growth to 4 million in the Melbourne 2030 strategy, on the understanding that planning policies in the Green Wedges and the environmental, agricultural, landscape and open space assets within their boundaries would be protected. Unfortunately this part of the bargain has not been kept, especially in the rezoning of 50,000 ha of Green Wedge land for urban growth in 2010 and 2012. Hence we signed a population charter in 2012 that would provide for a soft landing along the lines advocated by Kelvin Thomson MHR.
• There is a need to increase the density of green field and brownfield development in the urban and urban growth areas. The current Government is to be commended for now seriously looking at increased urban consolidation through 'greyfield' renewal. Doubling density within well-planned green, grey and brown-field development would double the life span of the current housing land supply available within the UGB. This would provide 50-100 years of future growth, depending on whose planning statistics are used. We do not consider this justifies opposition to urban resident action groups seeking to protect the amenity of their neighbourhoods. We consider their work the other side of the coin to our efforts to protect the amenity of the Green Wedges and maintain a policy of no trade-offs with these groups, some of whom are out members.

• There is an urgent need to restore the former protections in the Native Vegetation Management Framework and to amend or augment the provisions of the Melbourne Strategic Assessment. These were supposed to protect the environment in the land rezoned out of the Green Wedges in 2010, but are failing badly. In particular, three of the four Matters of National Environmental significance identified for special protection are now headed for regional or local extinctions. There are no reserves in any of the numerous hotspots for Striped Legless Lizard in the MSA area, and few – only 5 – lizards have been sighted in the proposed Grassland Reserves outside the UGB.

Developers have prevailed on governments to narrow the proposed habitat corridors for Growling Grass Frog and Southern Brown Bandicoot to the point where scientists warn they will not ensure the species survival.

Lack of demand for housing in the Urban Growth Zones has caused slower growth than anticipated, leaving Government short of the offset funding needed to pay for acquisition of the new reserves, half or more of which are seriously degraded and will be expensive to restore. Some landowners, impatient of the delay, are ploughing their paddocks and destroying the grassland that is supposed to have been saved.

It is time to re-establish planning as being “above” politics. A consistent approach by all parties to the future of our city is imperative to restore certainty for all stake holders.

BACKGROUND

The 1968-71 metropolitan planning process officially established nine Green Wedges as non-urban zones between Melbourne's main urban development corridors. It outlined acceptable non-urban uses, including recreation, landscape protection, resource utilization, farming, flora and fauna and conservation.

These non-urban zones, together with metropolitan parks and other fringe areas of special significance play a vital role in protecting areas which are critical for Melbourne's future as a livable city. They have been further protected by legislative and planning provisions introduced as part of the Melbourne 2030 metropolitan strategy, which added a further three Green Wedges.

The Green Wedges were to be Melbourne's breathing spaces, to separate the urban development designed to be confined to the transport corridors. But while development spread out along the transport corridors, there was increasing pressure on municipal councils to permit the development of the Green Wedges for residential and industrial uses. Hence in May 2002, representatives of the main environment or Green Wedge defender groups in each of Melbourne's nine green wedges formed the Green Wedges Coalition to make representations to State Government for effective green wedge protection.
We now have 165 environmental and community group members, including resident, ratepayer and progress associations and strong community support, coordinated by the peak environment coalition or green wedge protection or defender group in each of Melbourne’s 12 Green Wedges. (See Appendix 1). These groups came together out of concern at the number of development and rezoning applications exhibited or approved in Melbourne’s non-urban zones in the years and months leading up to and after the release of the Melbourne 2030 Strategy.

We are of course all non-profit organisations with no vested interest in supporting or opposing these or any other green wedge development.

The principal purpose of the State Government’s green wedge policies enunciated before the 2002 election and now supported by legislative and planning provisions is to protect Melbourne’s green wedges from inappropriate uses and in particular, from subdivision below the minimum lot size specified in the schedules.

Our charter spells this out (see Appendix 2).

**Plan Melbourne (2014)**

In reviewing the policy evolution for the Green Wedges in *Plan Melbourne (2104)* it was evident that the formal recognition of the importance of the Green Wedges as previously recognised in *Melbourne 2030* and the accompanying *Implementation Plan 5 – Green Wedges* was largely lost in *Plan Melbourne (2014)*.

A summary of what is contained in Plan Melbourne (2104) concerning the Green Wedges is provided in Appendix 3. An analysis of this land use policy shows that key issues for the future of the Green Wedges in Plan Melbourne were identified as:

- The recognition of the need for a permanent boundary to provide a clear policy signal about long term development options and protecting non-urban land is fundamental to the future of the Green Wedges.
  
  It is not clear but it is interpreted that the long term development options are defined by the allowable uses either as of right or discretionary (subject to a permit application) in the Green Wedge Zone (GWZ), Rural Conservation Zone (RCZ) and Green Wedge A Zone (GWAZ).

- The need to protect non-urban land
  
  Plan Melbourne (2014) in a very general sense recognised the need to protect non-urban land, opportunities for productive agricultural land and significant landscapes.

  The objectives for the Green Wedge Zone, Green Wedge A Zone and Rural Conservation Zone described a broad range of land uses.

  The GWZ is the main zone for the Green Wedges and promotes land uses related to the protection and conservation of its agricultural, environmental, historic, landscape, recreational and tourism opportunities, and mineral and stone resources. There is a significant recognition of the role of agriculture and the need to encourage farming activities and provide for a variety of productive agricultural uses. It also recognises the need to protect and enhance the character of the open and scenic non urban landscapes.

  The objectives of the Rural Conservation Zone focus on the protecting and enhancing the natural environment and provide for land use and development, including agriculture, taking into account the conservation and landscape values. The objectives also recognise the need to conserve and enhance the character of the open rural and scenic non urban landscapes.

  Both the GWZ and RCZ have a default setting of a minimum subdivision lot size of 40 hectares.

  In addition there is the Green Wedge A Zone (GWAZ) that while having objectives in line with the general thrust of the GWZ and RCZ was introduced to ‘recognise and protect the amenity of existing rural living areas’ and has a minimum default setting for subdivision of 8 hectares.
• Enhancing the food production capability of Melbourne and its non-urban areas

Agricultural land use, based on ABS data¹, in the Green Wedges of Melbourne has a total production value of just over $1 Billion dollars, which represents some 10% of the total production value for Victoria. Agricultural land use dominates the Green Wedges and provides the rural open landscape that characterises many of these areas.

An analysis of the value of agricultural production by the Green Wedge municipalities is provided in Appendix 4.

There needs to be a qualification that the ABS data does not report the actual value of agricultural production as it is likely that there is significant under-reporting, depending as it does on individual farm entities to provide the data. One estimate is in the region of 25% under-reporting for peri-urban areas in Australia.

• Protecting significant water and sewerage resources

It is fundamental that there is a need to protect Melbourne’s drinking water quality from proposed changes in land use and development that have the potential to risk the potable drinking water storages.

Plan Melbourne Refresh Discussion Paper (October 2015)

The Plan Melbourne Refresh Discussion Paper (October 2015) follows a previous announcement by the State Government for the revision of Plan Melbourne as detailed in the Plan Melbourne refresh fact sheet (August 2015). This fact sheet identified ‘Population growth within a fixed urban growth boundary and protection of the green wedges’ as planning principles in Plan Melbourne that have broad support and should be maintained.

The Discussion Paper states in regard to the Green Wedges that:

• The existing urban growth boundary will be locked down and the planning rules for green wedges will improve protection of key values; and that;

• More attention will be given to the rural areas surrounding Melbourne to avoid negative spill over effects and to protect environmental assets and agricultural land.

The Discussion Paper highlights the view from the Ministerial Advisory Committee (MAC) Report, Melbourne Plan Review 2015, that Plan Melbourne 2016 needs to better reflect the significance of the Green Wedges and abutting peri-urban areas so their intrinsic values are not diminished.

WHAT IS NEEDED IN A REVISED PLAN MELBOURNE

1) Recognising the Green Wedges as a planning entity in the strategic planning for the future of Melbourne.

Plan Melbourne (2014) does not recognise the importance of the Green Wedges as a planning entity in its own right in the strategic planning for the future of Melbourne. There needs to be a section devoted to the Green Wedges. This was an important feature of Melbourne 2030 and a section specifically related to the Green Wedges should be reinstated. The significance of the Green Wedges in Plan Melbourne (2106) needs to reflect its importance as a fundamental part of the vision for Metropolitan Melbourne as recognised in the State Planning Policy Framework (Clause 11.04-7) on Settlement.

This section needs a clear policy statement that:

• Recognises the primary role of the Green Wedges in containing the urban sprawl of endless suburbia;

¹ ABS stands for Agricultural Bureau of Statistics and the data analysed was for the 2010-11 census.
Addresses the role of agriculture as the major land use that contributes to the open rural landscape and its economic significance;

• Protects biodiversity, natural resource and cultural heritage values.

• Supports and promotes land use and development that ensures the maintenance and enhancement of the open rural landscape character of the Green Wedges;

A map is needed in this section to clearly show the Green Wedges. Plan Melbourne (2014) has no maps specifically delineating the Green Wedges, as was a major strategic feature in Melbourne 2030. The whole emphasis in the mapping in Plan Melbourne (2014) being on the urban areas.

There needs to be a clarification of the terms Green Wedges and peri-urban. This confusion is unnecessary and confusing to the reader and acts to diminish the importance of the Green Wedges. Basically the Green Wedges by their very position on the edge of the urban growth boundary are the peri-urban areas within the Melbourne Metropolitan area. The peri-urban areas outside the Melbourne Metropolitan area may also require planning protection to prevent developers from leapfrogging the better protected Green Wedges. The deregulation of the Rural and Green Wedge zones by the previous State Government in 2013 has increased the risk of alienation of productive farmland in Melbourne’s hinterland and needs to be reversed.

Proposed actions

• Include Green Wedges as a separate section with the same status as other major factors for the Vision of Metropolitan Melbourne as identified in Clause 11.04 of the SPPF, including a map of the Green Wedges;

• Include a policy statement as detailed above; and

• Clarify the confusion of the use of the terms peri-urban and Green Wedge.

2) The achievement of a permanent Urban Growth Boundary

It was the original intention of Melbourne 2030 to establish a permanent urban growth boundary but history has shown that the UGB has expanded into the Green Wedges over the last decade. The chronology of this expansion is documented in Appendix 5. This illustrates a process of change passed through both House of the State Parliament authorising expansions of the UBG in 2010 and 2012. There was a further expansion of approximately of 8 hectares in 2013. This raises the issue of how the proposal to establish a permanent UGB can be achieved in practice?

No further expansion of the UGB and the achievement of the UGB as a permanent boundary between urban areas and the Green Wedges is the fundamental precursor to the future protection of the Green Wedges.

Proposed actions

• Establish a legislative process to achieve a permanency for the existing Urban Growth Boundary.

3) A commitment to maintaining the rural open landscape of the Green Wedges.

There needs to be recognition of the role of the Green Wedges in making a major contribution to Melbourne’s reputation as the one of the world’s most liveable cities. The Green Wedges form a vital structural element of the urban form of the Melbourne metropolitan area providing an open rural green landscape that provides relief from endless suburbia and brings the country into Melbourne.

In the UK there is a long history of formally recognising in government land use planning the importance of green belts as a major component of their planning of major cities.

It is recognised that the approach adopted for Melbourne drew on the British planning tradition. In the UK there has been a history of concern about the expansion of cities in the post industrial era and the increasing remoteness of people from the healthy influences of nature and the
countryside. These concerns were championed by leading and influential urban planners of the day and led to the concept of the green belt being introduced into urban planning as a means of containing urban sprawl and the incorporation of this concept into the Greater London Plan of 1945. The first statutory green belt in the UK, the Metropolitan or London Green belt was introduced in 1955.

Their National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies that

‘The fundamental aim of the Green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristic of the Green Belts are their openness and permanence’.

More detail on the UK approach is provided in Appendix 6.

In achieving the maintenance of the ‘openness’ of the Green Wedges there needs to be recognition of the existing and future role of extensive (soil-based) agriculture as a ‘broadacre’ land use that largely underpins the open rural landscape of private land in the Green Wedges.

Another key issue is the land use zoning and the potential for future built development either as of right or subject to permit within the existing zoning in the Green Wedges.

An issue for the future of the Green Wedges is that the major land use underpinning the Green Wedge areas is extensive ‘broadacre’ agriculture which provides most of the openness that typifies these areas. This agricultural land use is under threat and there is a need to understand the trends in agricultural land use and the potential implications for the future role and function of the Green Wedges.

Research done over the last decade indicates that extensive agricultural land use in the Green Wedges is trending from commercial agricultural to an amenity and lifestyle landscape where hobby farming is becoming increasingly prevalent. There are also major pressures from entirely non-agricultural uses such as land banking speculation for residential development and non-farm businesses.

Most Green Wedge land is privately owned and these trends reflect the potential range of future land use choices being exercised by the owners of Green Wedge land.

It can be reasonably argued with the change from what was historically an extensive commercial agricultural landscape to an amenity landscape that the future of the open rural landscape is at risk unless hobby / part-time farming can become the major alternative land use.

While the zoning objectives include an emphasis on encouraging and supporting future agricultural land use there is no evidence of any State government support in terms of incentives or technical advice for this to happen. At present it is entirely dependent on individual initiative and the quality of the hobby or part-time farming can vary from the application of sound farm practices to poor land management with the resultant weed and other sustainable natural resource management issues. Some municipalities do offer rate rebates for land used for agriculture and for nature conservation, sometimes conditional on sound land management of pest plants and animals.

Some forms of intensive agriculture land use, on the other hand, have the potential to increase the built environment and reduce openness. Intensive agriculture involves a combination of soil based and non-soil based agricultural activities. The soil based activities may involve glasshouses and the non-soil based activities may be entirely shed based (e.g. hydroponics and mushroom farms).

Any increase in non-soil based intensive agriculture will increase the impact of the built environment in the green wedges and potentially impact the open rural landscape. Hence it will be important to maintain and strengthen the constraints on intensive agriculture and factory farming in the Green Wedge and Rural Conservation Zones.

Proposed actions

- Examine the potential for application of the UK Green belt policy.
- Apply an ‘openness test’ to planning decisions for all future land use and development in the Green Wedges.
4) A review of the Green Wedge zones

There needs to be a new review of the Green Wedge, the Green Wedge A and Rural Conservation Zones to:

- Reverse the deregulatory changes made in September 2013 that undermined the protection of Green Wedges from inappropriate uses:
- Ensure the proper protection of priority values of Green Wedge that support purposes such as nature conservation and agriculture aligned with openness from land uses that reduce openness by increasing built infrastructure, including industrial-style uses, cemeteries and crematoria.
- Address the issue of how an overarching requirement for the maintenance and enhancement of the open rural landscape is incorporated into all decision making on future land use and development;

The issue is that when you get to the ‘Table of uses’ for these zones the Section 1 Uses as of right and Section 2 Uses allowable subject to a permit, the range of potential future uses is considerable and could over time lead to a progressive change from an open rural and scenic non-urban landscape to a built environment.

The table of uses for the GWZ, RCZ and GWAZ shows a wide range of potential future development options that can increase the built environment in the Green Wedges. In addition under Section 2 consideration can also be given to any other use not specified in Sections 1 (as of right) and Section 3 (prohibited uses). One recent example of these innominate uses is the proposal for a cemetery in the Kingston section of the South East Green Wedge.

This potential for an increasing built environment in the Green Wedges was considerably heightened in 2013 with the revision by the then State Government to the GWZ, GWAZ, and particularly the RCZ resulting in:

- The addition of primary and secondary schools as a use subject to permit in both zones; (while, education centres are prohibited). The Green Wedge Coalition considers that schools should be prohibited in the Green Wedges but that education centres, which in 2002 were designed to allow vignerons to be taught on vineyards and farm management to be taught on farms, should be discretionary uses;
- The removal in the RCZ for a range of uses required to be “in conjunction with agriculture” (such as freezing and cold storage facilities, group accommodation, residential hotels and restaurants) which undermines the role of the RCZ in the protection of the natural environment and of agriculture in the Green Wedges and other rural areas.
- The treatment of innominate uses in the Rural Conservation Zone as discretionary where formerly they were prohibited.

The complete tabulation of Uses as of right (Section 1), Uses subject to a requirement for a planning permit (Section 2) and prohibited Uses (Section 3) are detailed in Appendix 7, along with a standalone listing of the changes to the RCZ in 2013. For each use the table shows the likely landscape implications. The vast majority will result in an increase in the built environment. The main uses that maintain an open rural landscape relate to agricultural land use, nature conservation and possibly ‘leisure and recreation’ (with conditions).

The impact of increase in non-agricultural related development uses could result over time in the change of the Green Wedges from an open rural landscape to a landscape more typical of a built environment. The real danger is that this will happen gradually over time resulting from a cumulative impact of many small development decisions. It could be characterised as ‘death by a thousand cuts’. In this regard, attention also needs to be given to the potential impact of non soil based intensive agriculture in increasing the built environment.

Proposed actions

- Establish a process to review the Green Wedge Zone (GWZ), Green Wedge A Zone (GWAZ) and Rural Conservation Zone (RCZ), to achieve a permanent open rural landscape character for the Green Wedges.
• In this process, review the need to amend or delete existing land uses currently permitted as of right or subject to a planning permit under the zonings to ensure the built environment does not dominate by cumulative planning decisions.

• For the RCZ, as a minimum, reinstate the ‘in conjunction with agriculture’ test for future land use and development to the pre 2013 position.

5) Preventing the loss and alienation of productive agricultural land

There is an urgent need to address the potential impact of future land use and development on the loss or alienation of productive agricultural land.

The future of agricultural production in the Green Wedges needs to be considered in relation to:

• The value of agricultural production as it contributes to Victoria’s economy

The importance of the Green Wedges for agriculture is little known and appreciated. As noted earlier, the total value of agricultural production in Melbourne’s Green Wedges to Victoria’s economy is more than $1 billion a year.

In Plan Melbourne (2104) there is some policy recognition of agriculture in the Yarra Ranges and Mornington Peninsula through the proposal to develop planning statements for those areas. But this fails to recognise other important areas. Does this imply the other areas will over time see agriculture decline with increased pressures for non-agricultural development. These pressures are both direct (with land being used for other purposes) and indirect (with complaints from incoming urban landholders because of dust, odour and noise from adjoining agricultural land use).

• Food security

It is internationally recognised that agricultural land is a finite resource and that loss of productive agricultural land is a major factor for future food security. The issue for the State Government is for recognition of the high level of the contribution of agriculture from the Green Wedges to Victoria’s economy and proactively working with the farming industry to maintain this contribution.

Food that is produced close to the urban markets can also play a critical role in providing food security in the event of natural disasters.

• Food miles

The future of agriculture in peri-urban areas has also been associated with concerns about environmental sustainability including resources used for the transport of agricultural produce as typified by the ‘food miles’ movement and ‘peak oil’ issues. This is associated with reducing green house gas emissions by reducing distance that produce is transported and hence lowering fossil fuel consumption. This is a complex issue and requires consideration of economies of scale for commercially successful farms (including the horticultural industry) that provide for the demand of a city of some 4 million people and the economic and energy efficiency of the whole supply chain, including food production, packaging, marketing and consumption.

The successful establishment of farmers markets provides an important alternative outlet for agricultural produce from the Green Wedges and the hinterland of the Melbourne metropolitan area.

• Directions from current research and development

An Agrifood Masterplan was commissioned by the Southern Melbourne RDA Committee in partnership with the municipalities of Casey, Cardinia and Mornington Peninsula. This comprised a two volume report:

– Volume 1 (2013) focuses on mapping the Agrifood sector in Casey, Cardinia and Mornington Peninsula; ‘and

---
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Volume 2 (2013) summarises the opportunities, challenges and major issues that confront the local Agrifood sector over the next decade, and presents a range of recommendations in the form of an Agrifood Master Plan.

There is also currently significant research being done at the University of Melbourne on Melbourne’s foodbowl and initiatives including the Greater Dandenong Regional Food Strategy, Mornington Peninsula Local Food Strategy and the South-East Food Hub.

- The need for a land audit and protection of productive agricultural land

There is a clear and urgent need for an audit of productive agricultural land to be undertaken by the Ministers for Planning and Agriculture. This audit would identify areas of agricultural land in the Green Wedges needing protection from proposals for future uses that would lead to its permanent loss and both impact on the State’s economy and reduce food security for food production into the future.

There is an equally pressing consequent need to progress the Plan Melbourne proposal for an agricultural overlay to protect land identified by such an audit.

- The need for a clear connection to Melbourne’s hinterland

See following section on ‘Melbourne’s hinterland’ for discussion of this issue.

- The need for the development of programs to assist landholders to protect, maintain and enhance agricultural land.

There is a lack of State Government initiatives or programs for agriculture and it is currently treated as totally a private landholder responsibility. If the openness of the Green Wedges is to be sustained maintaining soundly based extensive agricultural land use will be critical.

Proposed actions

- In Plan Melbourne (2106) recognise the value of agriculture in the Green Wedges to the Victorian economy.
- Review the ‘Agrifood Masterplan (2013)’ and research being done at the University of Melbourne on Melbourne’s foodbowl and initiatives such as the Greater Dandenong Regional Food Strategy, Mornington Peninsula Local Food Strategy and the South-East Food Hub.
- Institute an audit of productive agricultural land in the Green Wedges identifying areas requiring protection from proposals for future land use and development that would lead to permanent loss of productive agricultural land.
- Institute an agricultural overlay to protect land identified in the audit.
- Provide technical agricultural support services to landholders in the Green Wedges to encourage sound and sustainable farm planning and management practices
- Encourage Councils to provide rate rebates for land used for agriculture and/or nature conservation by subsidising those councils to cover part of the costs.

6) Greater recognition of the need to protect natural and cultural assets.

The stated purposes, “to protect metropolitan green wedge land from uses and development that would diminish its agricultural, environmental, cultural heritage, conservation, landscape natural resource or recreation values” are stated in Clause 57 of the Victorian Planning Provisions.

In addition, there are legislation and programs that provide complementary protection for a number of values integral to the Green Wedges.

- Native Vegetation Clearing Regulations

Clause 52.17 (the Native Vegetation Clearing Controls, formerly the Native Vegetation Management Framework.) These provisions have been seriously undermined in the transition from NVMF to NVCC. In particular:

- The goal of “Net Gain” has been watered down to “No Net Loss”
- The requirement to avoid or minimise the removal of native vegetation have been replaced in most parts of Victoria by the requirement to provide offsets;
- Bushfire exemptions have been increased.

This undermining has taken place without any research or review of whether Net Gain or its predecessor policy No Net Loss were effective and without any research or review of the effectiveness of offsets in achieving either of those stated purposes.

The current State Government was elected on a pledge to improve environmental programs including native vegetation protection. It is now undertaking a review of the Native Vegetation Clearing Controls which we hope will at least restore and if possible enhance their efficacy.

- Heritage and Cultural Heritage

Heritage and Cultural Heritage provisions have separate legislative protection. In our members’ views, neither Acts are working to protect heritage as well as they should and both need review.

- Port Phillip and Westernport Regional Catchment Strategy

The water catchments are governed by the Port Phillip and Westernport Regional Catchment Strategy, which addresses the natural resource issues of the Green Wedges that encompass: biodiversity; agriculture, ecosystem services (clean air, water, assimilation of pollutants, climatic and temperature moderation and landscape aesthetics), natural and open landscapes.

As the road and rail transport corridors have historically been constructed on high ground, the intervening Green Wedges generally include the main creeks and water catchments. The focus of the Port Phillip and Westernport Regional Catchment Strategy tends to be focussed on the protection of the water catchments and in our view asset protection related to other natural and cultural assets needs to be strengthened. The RCS is moving in this direction with the identification of assets and targets and interactive mapping for these assets.

There is also a need to better link planning policy directly with the Port Phillip and Westernport Regional Catchment Strategy to address the natural resource and social issues for the Green Wedges.

The Green Wedge Management Plans are integral to achieving this linkage. The progress with the development of these Green Wedge management plans shows that they are incomplete and that there has been a trend for individual municipalities to produce plans for their Green Wedge area or a component of it, such as in the Wyndham municipality where the focus is on the Werribee South horticultural area. This is an unsurprising development as each council is responsible for their municipal planning scheme and needs to focus its resources on land use and development within that part of the respective Green Wedge areas for which they have immediate planning responsibility.

The CMA identifies the key issue of loss of land to built development and infrastructure and the loss of capacity for support of natural ecosystems and traditional soil-based agriculture.

In the UK each local planning authority has the responsibility for producing a local plan. This and the National Planning Policy Framework form the planning structure for addressing green belt future land use planning and development. There are some sixty eight local authorities in the London Green Belt.

Proposed actions

- Review the current status of the Green Wedge Management Plans and where the GWMPs have not been completed, investigate adopting the UK approach to require each of the remaining Green Wedge municipalities to prepare a local municipal Green Wedge Management Plan.
7) Need to increase support for individual landholders and community organisations.

There is a need to increase support for individual landholders and for landcare, environment and other community groups to protect and enhance the Green Wedges.

Most of the land in the Green Wedge is privately owned and the success of the role of future land use planning in protecting the values of the Green Wedges will ultimately depend on individual landholders operating with support from the State Government and community organisations.

There is a long and successful history of this support being provided through landcare, ‘Friends of’ and other community-based environmental groups with over 200 such groups active across the Port Phillip and Western Port area. These groups are providing support to both individual landholders on private land and to projects on public land to rehabilitate and enhance the natural assets of the Green Wedges.

As identified in the Port Phillip & Western Port RCS the activities of these groups include native vegetation management, revegetation, water quality improvement, native animal care, land and soil management, coastal rehabilitation and community education. Most importantly, the collective role of these groups encompasses co-ordinated local action planning, on-ground works and building knowledge, skills and supportive networks.

The groups are often the catalyst for initiating very effective coordinated action in conjunction with local and state government bodies, sometimes by supporting Councils in defending their decisions against VCAT challenges from developers, or in advocating to State Government for necessary reforms or against destructive measures, as Mornington Peninsula Shire Council did when the former Coalition Government proposed the same undermining deregulation for the Green Wedge Zones as for the Rural Conservation Zone.

Environmental and community planning groups, including Green Wedges Coalition members, also serve a useful role in protecting environmental and other Green Wedge values by appealing unsound and or destructive council decisions at VCAT. However their ability to do so was undermined in 2013 by steep increases in VCAT charges, which are now prohibitive for many community groups. Community groups are at a disadvantage compared to ratepayer-funded Councils and developers who can deduct their VCAT expenses from their corporate taxes. The ability of community organisations to perform this socially and environmentally constructive role would be enhanced if VCAT charges could be reduced for non-profit community groups.

At the individual landholder level some municipalities offer rate rebates for land used for nature conservation and/or for agriculture which include incentive programs to encourage and reward good natural resource management. These would be more consistent and more effective if they were mandated by State Government or made a condition of State Government grants.

The State Government needs to both increase its support for these groups and work with local government to provide incentives and technical support to landholders to protect and enhance the Green Wedges.

**Proposed actions**

- Review the steep increases in VCAT charges so as not disadvantage community groups in raising sound objections to planning proposals and effectively denying natural justice because of the frequent imbalance of resources between proponents and concerned community groups.

- Increase incentives and technical support services to landholders to protect and enhance the environmental, social and economic values of the Green Wedges by State environment and agricultural agencies working with municipal Green Wedge councils.

---

3 This figures is from groups listed in the Victorian Landcare Gateway for the Port Phillip & Western Port catchment region.
MELBOURNE’S HINTERLAND

Urban planning for Melbourne needs to be extended to peri-urban areas which can spatially be considered as within the influence of the city. The extent of this influence is considerable with the ongoing improvements in the speed and capacity of regional infrastructure both in the form of road and rail transport.

The State Planning Policy Framework Clause 11.04-6: A State of cities recognises this need to control and plan for this increasing influence of Melbourne on the hinterland by:

- Delivering a permanent boundary around Melbourne; and
- Integrating metropolitan, peri-urban and regional planning implementation.

There is concern that without adequate attention in Melbourne’s strategic planning, the expansion of the influence of the city will have detrimental impacts on our natural assets of soil, water and vegetation, including loss of productive agricultural land and reduced water quality in catchments for urban water supply.

In addition, planning for agriculture needs to extend to the peri-urban areas abutting Green Wedges, those areas that are integrally linked with Melbourne as both a consumer and exporter of agricultural produce. As such, the audit of agricultural land (proposed in Recommendation 5 above) needs to include these areas in the hinterland. One of the significant planning issue for these rural farmlands is the potential detrimental impact for agriculture of changes to the Rural Conservation Zone (RCZ) and the Farm Zone (FZ) introduced in September 2013 that saw the removal of the ‘in conjunction with agriculture’ test a range of land uses (Appendices 7 & 8 respectively. These changes could lead to significant loss or alienation of productive farmland.

This further highlights the need for the audit of productive agricultural land and the need for its extension to Melbourne’s hinterland.

Proposed actions

- For the Rural Conservation and Farm Zones reverse the changes introduced to the VPPs in 2013 and reinstate the ‘in conjunction with agriculture’ test to all the land uses where it applied prior to September 2013.
- Review with key state government, local government and community stakeholders the adequacy of strategic planning for the protection of our natural assets of soil, water and vegetation including protection of productive agricultural land and water quality in catchments for urban water supply.
APPENDICES
Appendix 1: Green Wedge Coalition Constituent Membership List

Member groups and their constituents

The Coalition is represented by the lead environment organization or by a green wedge defenders or protection group or coalition in almost all of Melbourne’s 12 green wedges. Constituent groups include those who accepted an opt-in option offered by established environment organizations, eg WREC, who belong to green wedge protection or defender groups, and/or who signed the Green Wedges Charter developed by the Green Wedges Coalition in 2002 and updated in 2006, 2010, 2012, 2014 and 2015.

1. & 2. Western Plains and Werribee South Green Wedges

Represented by Western Region Environment Centre

Councils: Wyndham, Melton, Brimbank

Features: River/catchments – Little and Werribee Rivers

Contact: Harry van Moorst 9731 0288, harryvm@envirowest.org.au; Colleen Miller, 0401 645 468;
Constituent groups:
- Pinkerton Landcare & Environment Group
- Werribee Catchment Management Protection Association
- RATWISE: Residents Against Toxic Waste
- Werribee River Association
- Friends of Skeleton Creek

3. Western Plains North Green Wedge Coalition Group

Council: Melton, Brimbank

Features: Catchments/rivers – Werribee Catchment - Djerriwarrh Creek, Toolern Creek, Kororoit Creek

Contact: Daryl Akers daryljakers@gmail.com; 0438 277 252
Constituent groups:
- Australian Plant Society (Melton & Bacchus Marsh Inc.)
- Australian Plant Society (Keilor Plains Group.)
- Bullengarook Landcare
- Caroline Springs on grass
- Friends of Kororoit Creek
- Friends of the Lerderderg Inc.
- Friends of the Melton Botanic Garden Inc
- Friends of Norton Road Reserve
- Friends of Pyrites
- Friends of Toolern Creek
- Gisborne Bushwalkers
- Macedon Ranges Residents Association
- Melton Bushwalkers
- Melton Environment Group
- Woodend/Gisborne Bird Observers

4. Sunbury Maribyrnong Valley Green Wedge Defenders
Council: Hume, Brimbank
Features: River/catchments Jacksons Creek, Deep Creek, Emu Creek, Maribyrnong catchment
Contact: Arnie Azaris, 9744 7992, 0419 547 807 arnie_azaris@bigpond.com

Constituent groups (total membership 1200)
- Sunbury Conservation Society Inc.
- Wurundjeri Kurung Willam Bulluk Inc.
- Sunbury Residents Association
diggers rest.com
- Friends of the Maribyrnong Valley*
- Friends of Attwood Creek, Westmeadows
- Merlynstone Creek Environment Broadmeadows
- Friends of Emu Bottom Wetlands Reserve, Sunbury
- Friends of Grasstrigger Plant Broadmeadows
- Residents of Greenvale
- Friends of Jacksons Creek, Sunbury
- Friends of Melba Creek, Sunbury
- Friends of Sacred Kingfisher, Westmeadows
- Tullamarine Live Steam Society, Bulla
- Friends of Upper Moonee Ponds Creek, Westmeadows
- Maribyrnong Valley Preservation Coalition Inc.
- Friends of Organ Pipes National Park Inc.
- Greening of Riddell, Riddells Creek
- Attwood Progress Association
- Friends of Moonee Ponds Creek
- Moonee Ponds Creek Coordination Committee
- Friends of Woodlands Historic Park
- Avondale Heights and East Keilor Residents’ Association

5. Whittlesea Merri Creek Green Wedge, represented by Friends of Merri Creek

Council: Whittlesea, Hume
Features: River/catchments – Merri Creek
Contact: Ray Radford, secretary FoMC 0422 989 166,

Constituent groups:
- Friends of Moonee Ponds Creek
- Friends of Latrobe Wildlife Reserve
- Friends of Darebin Creek
- Friends of Craigieburn Grassland Flora & Fauna Reserve
- Plenty Valley Conservation Society

6. Nillumbik Yarra Valley Green Wedge – Green Wedge Protection Group

Council: Nillumbik,
Features: River/catchments – Yarra River, Plenty River, Diamond Creek
Contact: Kahn Franke 9710 1340 or (w) 9710 1044 tellkahn@gmail.com;
Constituent groups:

Friends of Nillumbik
Smiths Gully Landcare
St. Andrews Landcare
Eltham Gateway Action Group
Wattle Ward Landcare
Panton Hill Bushland Reserve Committee
Panton Hill Bush Ramblers
Bend of Islands Conservation Association
Nillumbik Rural Ratepayers
Friends of St. Helowit Bush
Christmas Hills Landcare
Green Wedge Farmers
Cottles Bridge Landcare
Friends of Stony Creek Catchment
Queenstown Cemetery Trust
Dunmoochin Landcare
Nillumbik Landcare Network
Friends of Diamond Creek
Montgomery Field Naturalists
Kangaroo Tower Advisory Committee
Eltham District Historical Society
Eltham Book Group
Green Thumbs Gardening Group
Willis Nature Park Management Committee
Panton Hill Walkers
Friends of Wattle Ward
Friends of Kinglake National Park
Top End Community Fireguard Group
Allwood Neighbourhood House Management Committee
Friends of Watery Gully
Watts Farm Committee Management
Friends of Warrandyte State Park
Friends of Koornong
North Warrandyte Landcare Group
Sloans Hill Landcare Group
Friends of Blooms Road
Coalition of Friends & Landcare
Hamilton Landcare
K G Road Landcare
Friends of Hundred Steps
Friends of the Goat Track
Mid Watsons Creek Landcare
Friends of Pigeon Bank Creek
Eltham Basketmakers
Koornong Landcare Group
Friends of Hurstbridge & Diamond Creek
Friends of Aqueduct Road
Nillumbik Conservation Group

Council: Manningham
Contact Jonathan Upson: vice-president 9844-1436; 0400-501 676 jonathanu@iprimus.com.au;
Constituent groups:
  Warrandyte Community Association
  Wonga Park Residents’ Association
  Friends of the Island

8. Southern Ranges Green Wedge – Knox Environment Society
Council: Knox, Yarra Ranges, Casey
Features: Lysterfield, Cardinia Creek and Dandenong Creek Valleys
Contact: Darren Wallace, info@kes.org.au.
Johanna Selleck 0419 107 308, johannaselleck@optusnet.com.au;
Rosalie Counsell 9796 8568 rbcounsell@gmail.com;
Constituent groups:
  Save the Casey Foothills
  Friends of Glenfern Green Wedge Inc.

9. Westernport Green Wedge – Cardinia Environment Coalition
Council: Dandenong, Casey, Cardinia
Features: Rivers/catchments – Cardinia, Yallock and Kooweerup Creeks, Bunyip R.
Contact: Gloria O’Connor 0414 270 564 glorocon@yahoo.com.au;
Constituent groups:
  Deep Creek Catchment Landcare Group
  Cardinia Creek Landcare
  Toomuc Landcare
  Friends of Mount Cannibal
  Bessie/Ararat Creek Landcare
Friends of Cardinia Creek Sanctuary  
Cardinia Hills Ragwort and Landcare Group  
Friends of Kennedy Creek

10. South East Green Wedge – Defenders of the South East Green Wedge  
Council: Kingston, Frankston, Dandenong  
Features: Dandenong & Eumemmerring Creeks, Ramsar-listed Seaford Wetlands.  
Contact: Trevor Shewan, president, 0417 127 197,  
Barry Ross, secretary, 9598 6266 barrywlross@gmail.com;  
Constituent groups:  
Kingston Conservation & Environment Coalition  
Mordialloc-Beaumaris Conservation League  
Studio Park Committee of Management  
Langwarrin Bush and Parklands Group Inc  
Mt. Eliza Association for Environmental Care  
Greater Dandenong Environment Group  
Dandenong Residents Association  
Friends of Edithvale-Seaford Wetlands  
Friends of Belvedere Bushland Reserve  
Friends of Seaford Foreshore Reserve  
Friends of Chicquita Park  
Friends of the Pines Flora and Fauna Reserve  
Frankston Beach Association  
Kananook Creek Association  
Aspendale Gardens Residents Association  
KRAMMED  
Kingston Residents Association  
Dingley Village Community Association  
Friends of Rowan Woodlands  
Friends of Braeside Park  
Friends of the Grange

11. Yarra Valley and Dandenong Ranges Green Wedge  
Upper Yarra and Dandenongs Environment Council Inc.  
Council:  Yarra Ranges  
Features:  Yarra and Dandenong Ranges  
Contact: Louis Delacretaz 9755 1148 m 0407 358 699,  louis@softbyte.com.au  
Dandenong Ranges Southern Foothills Association  
Emerald and District Conservation Society  
Friends of Glen Harrow Heights Reserve
Friends of Hoddles Creek
Friends of the Helmeted Honeyeater
Friends of Minak Reserve/Selby Community House
Friends of the Mt Evelyn Aqueduct
Friends of Picnic Hill
Friends of Sassafras Creek
Group for the Lilydale & District Environment
Healesville Environment Watch
Menzies Creek & Emerald Tourist Track Inc
Montrose Environment Group
Mt Evelyn Environmental Protection & Progress Association
Save the Dandenongs League
Save Our Sherbrooke Association
Southern Dandenongs Community Nursery
Stop the Assault on the Yarra Valley Environment
Yarra Ranges Environment Coalition
Yarra Valley Winegrowers Association
Yarra Valley Tree Group

12. Mornington Peninsula Green Wedge
Westernport & Peninsula Protection Council
Council: Mornington Peninsula
Contacts: Jan Oliver, 0417986077; David Harrison, 0458 892 222, 5989 2285;
Cape Schanck Residents Group
South Peninsula Indigenous Flora & Fauna Association
Mornington Environment Association
Mount Eliza Association for Environmental Care
Friends of Wayside Roads Foreshore
Friends of Flinders Foreshore
Kangerong Ward Action Group
Flinders Community Association

Total groups at December 2014 (165)
History and purpose

The green wedges are a community asset of incalculable value to the people of Greater Melbourne. The Victorian Government has the prime responsibility for protecting them on our behalf.

The 1968-71 Melbourne metropolitan planning process officially established nine green wedges as non-urban zones for open space or parkland between Melbourne's main transport corridors. It outlined acceptable non-urban uses, including recreation, landscape protection, resource utilization, farming, flora and fauna and conservation.

The green wedges were to be Melbourne's breathing spaces: for the leisure, recreation and enjoyment of residents of the inner city as well as those who live in bush surroundings; for future as well as present generations. They were designed to separate the urban development along the transport corridors, to protect the catchments of our creeks and rivers and to link the city with the country, and with a more distant green belt of state forests and national parks.

The green wedges include the lands of the Wurundjeri, Bunurung and Wathurong traditional owners. Within their boundaries, substantial areas of environmentally significant indigenous grasslands, forests, remnant vegetation and wildlife habitat corridors have been protected. Within their boundaries, some of the most fertile land in the state has been conserved for agricultural purposes. Close to the city, market gardens are more sustainable, requiring less irrigation and lowering transport costs and greenhouse gas emissions.

This vision for Melbourne, handed down by our parents' generation, has helped make ours into one of the most livable cities in the world. At a time of unrivaled prosperity, rising community awareness and appreciation of the value of green city spaces to our personal wellbeing, we regard maintaining the green wedges for future generations as a yardstick for our generation's commitment to developing a sustainable city in a sustainable world.

Yet by 2002, Melbourne's green wedges were on the brink of destruction. While development had spread out along the transport corridors, there was increasing pressure on municipal councils to allow development of the green wedges for urban, residential and industrial uses. Rates on green wedge farmers and conservationist landholders were becoming prohibitive as market valuations increasingly reflected their development potential and as speculators bought in, closing down farms and other non-urban enterprises.

Recent history and policy

Green wedges were a Hamer Government legacy and the Liberal Party still has policy to protect them. The Kennett Government, however, deregulated planning in the green wedges by removing prohibitions on commercial, retail, industrial and other urban uses in rural zones and allowing these uses subject to permit.

The Bracks Government was elected in 1999 on a pledge to preserve the green wedges, along with the rest of the City's parks and open spaces. Labor's Greener Cities policy criticised the Kennett Liberal Government for initiating "an unprecedented assault on Melbourne's green spaces that have been protected from subdivision since 1970. Green belts, the Dandenong Ranges and the Mornington Peninsula are all being carved up."

Before the 1999 election, Labor promised to give "local municipalities greater power to protect the heritage and amenity of local communities", but some Councils did not exercise this power to protect residents' wishes and interests in maintaining green wedges. Instead they facilitated developers' proposals to alienate our green wedges.

Labor promised to "put the protection and enhancement of the natural and urban environment at the forefront of planning decision-making," to control "the carve up of agricultural land areas near Melbourne," and to "introduce effective legislation to control the ad hoc subdivision and inappropriate development of Melbourne's green belt" But with the devolution of planning powers to local government, the erosion of Melbourne's parks, open spaces and green wedges continued.

Concern at the number of development and rezoning applications going through municipal councils during the development of the Metropolitan Strategy brought together environment and
community groups from Melbourne’s green wedges, the Mornington Peninsula and Yarra Ranges to draw up the first draft of this charter for the protection of the green wedges in 2002.

We called on the Government to incorporate into the Metropolitan Strategy a broader vision for the people of Melbourne, for a city with green open spaces, so we do not end up with wall-to-wall urban sprawl. We noted the need for vision and policy coordination to protect the green wedges across road, transport, housing, population policy and local government as well as planning and the environment.

In the light of Labor’s promises to assess the environmental impact of all cabinet submissions, we asked the Government to consider the impact of State and municipal infrastructure projects on the integrity and purpose of the green wedges. We called on the State Government and the Opposition to provide permanent protection for Melbourne’s green wedges and areas of special significance.

Green Wedge Protection

In September 2002, the Bracks Government responded with a package of legislative and planning measures to protect the green wedges as part of Melbourne 2030. The Opposition supported the green wedge protection legislation (which required a vote of Parliament for any further subdivision in the green wedges) when it was introduced to Parliament soon after.

The green wedge package incorporated our main charter points by:

- Preparing legislation to protect the non-urban zones in Melbourne’s green wedges and environmentally important fringe areas;
- Putting a halt to the rezoning of green wedge land until the legislation was adopted;
- Defining and legislating boundaries to include all of what is left of Melbourne’s green wedges;
- Resisting further rezoning of non-urban green wedge land for residential or industrial subdivisions or for the reduction of allotment sizes;
- Introducing new green wedge zoning to protect against accepted rural uses such as service stations and other commercial or industrial enterprises.

Our broader charter points still stand as a call to present and future governments to stem the development pressures on the city’s remaining green wedges:

- Co-ordinate policy to protect the green wedges across transport, roads, housing, population policy, agriculture and local government portfolios as well as planning and environment;
- Reform rural subsidy and rating policies so that green wedge councils receive pro rata rural subsidies to be passed on as rate rebates to protect green wedge landholders from excessive rates and to compensate them for conservation costs;
- Review the impact of all State and municipal infrastructure projects on the integrity and purpose of the green wedges, consider alternatives before such projects can proceed and refrain where impacts would be adverse;
- Continue the principle of green wedge protection by developing linear parks along watercourses and preserving and extending adjacent wetlands all the way to the sea;
- Encourage better transport planning based on European models for improving public transport and existing road systems, instead of freeways which attract new residential and industrial development to the green wedges;
- Review the performance of current infrastructure and planning authorities.

The Government’s green wedge protection provisions largely protected the green wedges from the residential and industrial subdivision threats of 2002 until 2009. Until then, only one housing development was approved, as part of a marina development at Wyndham Cove.

However, the Urban Growth Boundary was altered in 2005 to increase the growth corridors by 11,500 hectares and loopholes emerged, partly through pressure from tourism and industry on the 2003 submission process, lax administration and VCAT decisions which ignored green wedge
protection provisions. The four most serious loopholes were reformed in 2006 but threats continued of:

- Inappropriate commercial and industrial approvals such as a sawmill and a concrete batching plant.
- Large scale accommodation and other commercial developments such as restaurants; hotels, etc.,
- Over-development of tourist uses, e.g. by the exploitation of “in conjunction with agriculture”;
- De facto residential development in the form of caravan parks offering cabins on small sites.
- Re-subdivision and construction on small lots and in old and inappropriate subdivisions previously protected by tenement controls.

**Backdown: Urban encroachment into green wedges and our response**

In 2007 we submitted to a Melbourne 2030 Audit process, which reaffirmed the importance of holding firm on the Urban Growth Boundary and in a 2008 report stated that there was no need to review the UGB. In December 2008, the Brumby Government substantially undermined its Green Wedge Protection policy and credentials by announcing a 50,000 ha investigation area to provide for urban growth. We strongly opposed this plan, through submissions, lobbying the Planning Minister and Opposition spokesman and MPs and joining other planning and landholder groups in public demonstrations.

In July 2010, the Government and Opposition ignored community concerns voted together to approve the expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary (VC68) to take 43,600 ha of green wedge land for urban development. Only the Greens MPs were steadfast in opposing this unsustainable exercise in suburban sprawl.

The director of the Growth Areas Authority Peter Seamer announced in 2011 that there was enough land to last for 25-50 years. But the newly-elected Baillieu Government was already working on its “Logical Inclusions” process and proceeded in 2012 to take a further 6000 ha out of the Green Wedges for urban development. (We saw them as Illogical Incursions.)

The Baillieu Government then threatened Non-Growth as well as Growth Councils with proposals to change the Green Wedge and Rural Conservation Zones to allow a plethora of urban uses and to take us back to the Kennett-era deregulation and further. Non-growth Councils were also invited to expand their UGBs by rezoning “anomalies” out of the Green Wedge, though only one or two councils voted to pursue this option and then only on a small scale. The Planning Minister decided not to proceed with deregulating the Green Wedge Zones, apart from allowing schools and places of assembly, but proceeded to allow a plethora of urban uses in the Rural Conservation Zone and to remove the “in conjunction” rule.

Fortunately, the ALP in opposition and now in government has returned to their former strong support for Green Wedges. In opposition, Labor voted with the Greens MLCs against the “Logical Inclusion” amendments and they have been elected to government on a pledge to protect and enhance the Green Wedges and to “lock down” the Urban Growth Boundary. The Liberal Party, in Coalition Government, also returned to policies for protecting Green Wedges by pledging a permanent UGB as part of the Plan Melbourne strategy.

We call on all parties to protect the green wedges by:

- Protecting environmentally significant and viable agricultural land within the green wedges and the expanded Urban Growth Boundary and resisting further UGB expansion;
- Restoring, maintaining and strengthening green wedge protection provisions;
- Refusing any further residential or industrial proposals in breach of existing green wedge planning provisions;
- Closing loopholes which permit inappropriate and over development;
- Requiring Councils to introduce Green Wedge Management Plans that comply with State green wedge protection provisions to provide for local variation and to prevent re-
subdivision and construction on small lots and in old and inappropriate subdivisions where this would allow extra development.
Appendix 3: What Plan Melbourne (2014) said about the green wedges

Plan Melbourne (2104) defined the green wedges as:

open landscapes around Melbourne’s outskirts, originally set aside in the 1970s to conserve rural activities and significant natural features from Melbourne’s outward growth. Green wedges are defined in the Planning and Environment Act 1987 as land outside the Urban Growth Boundary, as described in a metropolitan fringe local government planning scheme.

This definition does not recognise the primary original purpose to contain the urban sprawl.

Plan Melbourne (2014) identifies locking in an urban boundary as crucial to securing the future of the green wedges and the peri-urban regions for agriculture and agribusiness, biodiversity recreation and open space, tourism, heritage and landscape conservation. It specifically addresses the green wedges under:

**Direction 5.3: Enhance the food production capability of Melbourne and its non-urban areas**

The Plan placed high value on Melbourne’s green wedges as being well placed to take advantage of the opportunities to meet the fast growing markets for in the middle classes of Asia for high quality agricultural products. It identified some areas around Melbourne as having very fertile soil that is essential for highly productive agriculture and under threat from competing land uses such as urban encroachment and rural residential development. It also identified the need to support other efficient and resilient food production techniques such as intensive green house agriculture that can be both soil and non soil based. It identified a need to protect strategically significant agricultural land so that it is not permanently lost. In the short term it proposed the following initiatives:

- proposed investigation of a high value agricultural food overlay for use to protect high value agricultural land;
- preparing and implementing planning provisions to better identify, protect and manage strategically significant agricultural land and that these provisions should acknowledge different land management requirements and food production methods; and
- the preparation of localised planning statements for Mornington Peninsula, Macedon Ranges and Yarra Valley as important food production areas.

**Direction 5.6: Protect our significant water and sewerage assets**

This direction recognised the risk to Melbourne’s drinking water quality from changes in land use and development and that these risks may apply to drinking water storage such as Greendale, Silvan and Cardinia reservoirs local within the green wedges.

In the short term to:

- Work with water authorities to determine land area and buffer requirements for significant water and sewerage infrastructure and review planning provisions to ensure the ongoing protection of public health and safety.

**Direction 6.1: Deliver a permanent boundary around Melbourne.**

In the preamble to this direction, the Plan recognised that Melbourne 2030 introduced the Urban Growth Boundary to limit urban growth expansion and the role that a permanent boundary will perform in providing a clear policy signal about long term development options and protecting non-urban land, opportunities for productive agricultural land and significant landscapes. In Initiative 6.1.1 it proposed in the short term to:

- Confirm a mechanism to lock in a permanent settlement boundary around Melbourne’s built up metropolitan area: and
- Establish a permanent metropolitan boundary to replace the Urban Growth Boundary having regard to input from local governments, the report of the Logical Inclusions Advisory Committee (2011), Melbourne’s natural values and topographical features and boundaries formed by major infrastructure.
## Appendix 4: Value of agricultural production by green wedge municipality

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics census 2010-11 (value in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green Wedge Municipalities</th>
<th>Interface Councils</th>
<th>Broadacre Crops</th>
<th>Horticulture</th>
<th>Livestock</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Top 3 commodities by value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brimbank City</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Vegetables - other (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinia Shire</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>116.2</td>
<td>150.4</td>
<td>271.3</td>
<td>Asparagus (20%) Whole milk (15%) Slaughtered cattle and calves (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey City</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poultry slaughtered (27.5) Vegetables - other (23.4) Cut flowers - undercover (9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston City</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poultry slaughtered (38%) Cut flowers (21%) Nurseries (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Dandenong City</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poultry slaughtered (49%) Cut flowers (20%) Eggs for human consumption (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobsons Bay City</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume City</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Mushrooms (31%) Slaughtered cattle and calves (25%) Slaughtered sheep and lambs (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston City</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eggs (32%) Nurseries (32%) Poultry slaughtered (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox City</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vegetables - other (42%) Whole milk (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manningham City</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurseries (41%) Blueberries (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroondah City</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton City</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Poultry slaughtered (67%) Wool / Slaughtered sheep and lambs / vegetables - other (each 6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mornington Peninsula Shire</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>126.1</td>
<td>203.1</td>
<td>Poultry slaughtered (59%) Vegetables - other (9%) Strawberries (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nillumbik Shire</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Apples (25%) Slaughtered cattle and calves (22%) Pears (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittlesea City</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>Mushrooms (71%) Eggs for human consumption (12%) Poultry slaughtered (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>Broccoli (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wyndham City</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>235.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>260.8</td>
<td>Nurseries (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yarra Ranges Shire</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>235.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>260.8</td>
<td>Nurseries (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>645.5</td>
<td>422.6</td>
<td>1079.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: UGB Ministerial planning scheme amendments history

An urban growth boundary was introduced as part of Melbourne 2030 by the then State Government in 2002. At that stage it was an interim urban growth boundary (UGB) with a view to a permanent boundary to be adopted after consideration of public comments. The purpose of the UGB was stated as to better manage outward urban expansion in a way that facilitates a more compact city, directing growth to areas best able to be supplied with the appropriate infrastructure and services, and by protecting other valuable land urban development pressures.

Any amendment to the urban growth boundary requires the approval of the Minister for Planning and once approved by the Minister requires the ratification of both Houses of Parliament. The amendments are then listed for gazettal in the Government gazette. This was seen as a major safeguard for the maintenance of the UGB.


2005 – The State Government appointed a Smart Growth Committees to undertake a review of the interim growth boundary and make recommendations for changes based on provision of maintaining a 15 year minimal land supply for housing and industrial development. The changes were undertaken by amendments to individual planning schemes and approved and subsequently gazetted in 2005 (e.g. Cardinia Planning Scheme Amendment C81).

2010 (VC068) – Amended the Casey, Hume, Melton, Mitchell, Whittlesea and Wyndham planning schemes to expand the UGB.

2012 – Following a change in State Government a review of the UGB was undertaken. Known as a ‘Logical Inclusions’ review, the process resulted in the addition of 5958 hectares to the UGB. The changes were made via individual planning scheme amendments to the planning schemes for Cardinia, Casey, Hume, Melton, Mitchell, Whittlesea and Wyndham.

2013 – Following a ‘Review of Urban Growth Boundary Anomalies Outside Growth Areas’ the Minister for Planning made a number of minor changes to the UGB.
Appendix 6: UK Green belt land

In the UK there is a long history of formally recognising in government land use planning the importance of green belts as a major component of their planning of major cities.

It is recognised that the approach adopted for Melbourne drew on the British planning tradition. In the UK there has been a history of concern about the expansion of cities in the post industrial era and the increasing remoteness of people from the healthy influences of nature and the countryside. Ebenezer Howard, a leading advocate of this concern for cities to maintain a connection with nature in the nineteenth century, developed an influential Utopian vision for ‘Garden Cities of Tomorrow’ that combined the advantages of both the town and country in urban form. In the early twentieth century concern was raised about population growth resulting in urban settlements merging one into the other. These concerns championed by leading and influential urban planners of the day led to the concept of the green belt being introduced into urban planning as a means of containing urban sprawl and the incorporation of this concept into the Greater London Plan of 1945. The first statutory green belt in the UK, the Metropolitan or London Green belt was introduced in 1955.

UK National Planning Policy Framework

Their National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies that

‘The fundamental aim of the Green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristic of the Green Belts are their openness and permanence’.

The NPPF (Clause 89) requires that local planning authorities should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are tabulated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildings for agriculture and forestry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clause 90 states that the following forms of development are not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. These are tabulated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mineral extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Renewable energy projects are specifically mentioned as being “inappropriate” for green belt development and developers are required to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed. Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.

Housing is also a major issue and the NPPF Planning Practice Guidelines state that the Framework makes it clear that, once established, Green belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The NPPF identifies that such
‘very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green belt by reason of its inappropriateness is clearly outweighed by other circumstances.

**The extent of Green Belts in the UK**

The extent of the designated Green Belt in England in 2013/14 was estimated some 1.6 million hectares, around 13% of the land area of England.

**Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)**

The Campaign to Protect Rural England is a major community based organisation which has been in existence for some 80 years and advocates strongly and actively to protect the values of green belt areas and the rural countryside in general. Their strategic aims are to:

- Promote and enhance the character of the countryside;
- Defend the countryside from damaging development;
- Increase and harness support for the countryside; and
- Develop the resources to undertake this work.

The CPRE focus on and have an expert knowledge of the planning system.
## Appendix 7: Land uses by zone and landscape impact

### Zoning provisions: As gazetted September 20103 (‘C’ indicates that conditions apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GWZ</th>
<th>RCZ</th>
<th>GWAZ</th>
<th>Main landscape impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C/Equest</td>
<td>C/Equest</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Other than Animal keeping, Apiculture, Intensive animal husbandry, Rice growing and Timber production

5 Other than Indoor recreation facility, Informal outdoor recreation, Major sports and recreation facility and Motor racing track

6 Other than Indoor recreation facility, Informal outdoor recreation, Major sports and recreation facility and Motor racing track
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity / Use</th>
<th>GWZ</th>
<th>RCZ</th>
<th>GWAZ</th>
<th>Main landscape impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing sales</td>
<td>C/Ag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials recycling</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk depot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of assembly (other than Carnival and Circus)</td>
<td>C?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of worship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant nursery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure boat facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary produce sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse disposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable energy facility (other than wind energy facility)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and development centre</td>
<td>C/Ag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research centre</td>
<td>C/Ag</td>
<td>C/Ag</td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential building (other than Residential hotel)</td>
<td>C/Ag</td>
<td>C/Ag</td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential hotel</td>
<td>C/Ag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>C/Ag</td>
<td>C/Ag</td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted place of assembly</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice growing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural industry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural store</td>
<td>C10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid fuel depot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber production</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer station</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility installation (other than Minor utility installation and Telecommunications facility)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind energy facility</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other use not in Section 1 or 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built/Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 3**

Abattoir

Accommodation

---

7 Other than Carnival, Circus, Exhibition centre, Function centre, Hall, Nightclub, Place of worship and Restricted place of assembly

8 Other than Abattoir or Sawmill

9 Other than Abattoir of Sawmill

10 If the Section 1 condition is not met

11 Other than Camping and caravan park, Corrective institution, Dependents person’s unit, Dwelling, Group accommodation, Host farm, and Residential building

12 Other than Dependent’ person’s unit, Dwelling, Group accommodation, Host farm and Residential hotel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GWZ</th>
<th>RCZ</th>
<th>GWAZ</th>
<th>Main landscape impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amusement parlour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema based entertainment facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education centre</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway service centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral parlour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive animal husbandry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and recreation (over than Informal outdoor recreation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor racing track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of assembly</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail premises</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice growing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saleyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawmill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport terminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Other than Camping and caravan park, Dependent person’s unit, Dwelling, Group accommodation, Host farm and Residential building
14 Other than primary or secondary school
15 Other than primary or secondary school
16 Other than primary or secondary school
17 Other than Materials recycling, Refuse disposal, Transfer station, Research and development centre, and Rural Industry
18 Other than Rural industry
19 Other than Rural Industry
20 Other than Carnival and Circus
21 Other than Carnival, Circus, Exhibition centre, Function centre, Hall, Place of worship, and Restricted place of assembly
22 Other than Manufacturing sales, Market Plant nursery, Primary produce sales, and Restaurant
23 Other than Landscape garden supplies, Market, Primary produce sales and Restaurant
24 Other than Market, Plant nursery, Primary produce sales and Restaurant
25 Other than Freezing and cool storage, Milk depot, Rural store, Solid fuel depot and Vehicle store
26 Other than Freezing and cool storage, and Rural store
27 Other than Freezing and cool storage, Rural store, and Vehicle storage
### Appendix 8: Changes to the Farming Zone in 2013

Zoning provisions (August 2013 – pre revision) and revision gazetted September 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1</th>
<th>FZ</th>
<th>AUGUST 2013</th>
<th>SEPT 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (other than Animal keeping, Apiculture, Intensive animal husbandry, Rice growing and Timber production)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal keeping (other than Animal boarding)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and breakfast</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle feedlot</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent’s person unit</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling (other than Bed and breakfast)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal outdoor recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor utility installation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary produce sales</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural industry</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural store</td>
<td>C/Ag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber production</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tramway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any use listed in Clause 62.01</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abattoir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal boarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broiler farm</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping and caravan park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle feedlot</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crematorium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle feedlot</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent person’s unit</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling (other than Bed and breakfast)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency services facility</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway service centre</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 Other than Abattoir and Sawmill

29 If the Section 1 condition is not met

30 If Section 1 condition is not met

31 If Section 1 condition is not met

32 If Section 1 condition is not met

33 If section 1 condition is not met

34 If section 1 condition is not met
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Section 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freezing and cool storage</td>
<td>FZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group accommodation</td>
<td>C/Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry (other than Rural industry)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive animal husbandry (other than Broiler farm and Cattle feedlot)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape gardening supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and recreation</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing sales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of assembly (other than Carnival and Circus)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary produce sales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable energy facility (other than wind energy facility)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential hotel</td>
<td>C/Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>C/Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice growing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saleyard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawmill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store (other than Freezing and cool storage and Rural store)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber production</td>
<td>C³⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade supplies</td>
<td>C³⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility installation (other than Minor utility installation and Telecommunications facility)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse (other than Rural store)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind energy facility</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winery</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other use not in Section 1 or 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other use listed in Clause 62.01 if any requirement is not met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3

| Accommodation                                                      | 41        |

---

35 *Other than informal outdoor recreation and Motor racing track*

36 *Other than Informal outdoor recreation*

37 *Other than Amusement parlour, Night club, Carnival and Circus*

38 *If the Section 1 condition is not met*

39 *If the Section 1 condition is not met*

40 *Must meet the requirements of Clause 52.32*

41 *Other than Dependent’ person’s unit, Dwelling, Group accommodation, Host farm and Residential hotel*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amusement parlour</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema based entertainment facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education centre</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor racing track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail premises</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Any other use not in Section 1 or 2**

---

42 Other than Bed and breakfast, Camping and caravan park, Dependent person’s unit, Dwelling, Group accommodation, Host farm and Residential hotel

43 Other than primary or secondary school

44 Other than Rural Industry and Transfer station

45 Other than Community market, Manufacturing sales, Primary produce sales, and Restaurant

46 Other than Market, Landscape gardening supplies, Manufacturing sales, Primary produce sales, Restaurant and Trade supplies

47 Other than Store
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