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On behalf of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan Implementation Committee, we present the 2014-15 Annual Report, highlighting the key achievements of the IMAP Special Committees in their ninth year of operation.

The Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) is the successful collaboration between the cities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Yarra, Stonnington and the Maribyrnong City Council, working together on inner city regional issues to help make Melbourne one of the world’s most liveable cities.

During 2014-15 the IMAP Implementation Committee has seen excellent progress continuing to be made by teams developing projects as varied as the Visitor Wayfinding Signage Master Style Guide, stage 2 of the Community Land Trust project, data modeling for the Distributed Energy project and negotiating solutions for the Melbourne Official Visitor Map and Sustainable Design Factsheets with external partners.

IMAP’s Growing Green Guide for the development of green roofs, also continues to gain acclaim being awarded the 2014 Victoria Landscape Architecture Award for education.

In addition, the Committee has overseen the review of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan itself, looking forward a further 10 years to identify where IMAP’s unique Council partnership can make a positive contribution. Following consultation across the five partner councils, the draft plan is soon to be considered by the IMAP Implementation Committee, with review by a wider audience to follow. IMAP Councils make up Plan Melbourne’s Central Subregion, uniquely positioning IMAP to have an ongoing role in the development of inner Melbourne.

We also take this opportunity to recognize the commitment of the many council officers and representatives from partnering organizations who continue to work collaboratively to deliver the IMAP projects.
The Inner Melbourne Action Plan

The Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) sets out 11 regional strategies and 57 actions to address one simple objective: to make the Inner Melbourne region more liveable. The IMAP region hosts the capital city of Victoria, incorporating the major financial, administrative, retail, cultural, and entertainment functions of the State.

The Inner Melbourne Action Plan is unique in bringing key government stakeholders together to develop and deliver regionally based actions within an effective governance framework. IMAP strategies and actions are identified as key areas for regional cooperation within the central city.

For nine years, Melbourne’s inner Metropolitan Councils - the cities of Melbourne, Yarra, Stonnington, Port Phillip and, more recently, Maribyrnong City Council - have worked together to develop and implement the strategies and actions set out in the Inner Melbourne Action Plan. Their aim is to strengthen the liveability, attractiveness and prosperity of the region and respond to growth and changes occurring in the inner city.

The IMAP projects have been successful in fostering ongoing cooperation, goodwill and active participation between IMAP stakeholders. IMAP is uniquely positioned to have an ongoing role in the development of the inner Melbourne region.

With the inclusion of the Maribyrnong municipality in 2013, and the publication of the State Government’s Plan Melbourne strategy, the IMAP partner Councils are undertaking a review of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan to identify our priorities for the next 5-10 years.

Vale: Cr Adrian Stubbs

Cr Adrian Stubbs passed away on 21 June 2015. He was elected in November 2012 to the City of Stonnington Council and served one term as Mayor in 2013-14, during which time he was a member of the IMAP Implementation Committee. We would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge Adrian’s contribution to this Committee and to the community.
Highlights of the Year

IMAP completed two actions in 2014-15. Some additional activity to complete the communication strategy and formally launch the projects will continue into 2015-16. The following summarises the achievements of these project teams:

**Strategy 9: Substantially improve the environmental performance of the inner Melbourne region**

**Action 9.2 Environmentally sustainable design**

A suite of 10 Sustainable Design factsheets has been jointly developed by the IMAP Councils and made available to the public since their launch in May 2012, providing detailed advice on sustainable building design requirements that should be addressed during the early design process and when lodging a planning permit application. Since then the factsheets have been licensed for use by other Councils outside the IMAP area.

This year five additional sustainable design factsheets have been created, largely completing this project for IMAP. The additional factsheets include:

- Melbourne Climate
- Site Permeability
- External Shading
- Green Walls and Roofs
- Rating Tools.

The factsheets are substantially completed having undergone a rigorous process of reviews and edits. The final round of minor edits is due to take place at the beginning of the 2015-16 financial year, with the launch of the five additional factsheets to follow. The Council Alliance for a Sustainable Built Environment (CASBE) has been working with the IMAP Councils to explore future licensing and other options. The objective is to ensure that one single, consistent set of factsheets is adopted by all councils that implement the Sustainable Design Assessment in the Planning Process (SDAPP) framework.

TheBuiltEnvironment Sustainability Scorecard (BESS), a new online sustainable design assessment tool, was launched in May this year. The key assessment categories in the BESS online tool relate to nine out of the ten original IMAP sustainable design factsheets (all except factsheet 5.0 Building Materials). The BESS tool and the sustainable design factsheets are complementary, which enhances consistency of messaging and ensures that consistent sustainable design standards are applied by participating Councils.

The factsheets are intended to be planning scheme reference documents for the six Councils that have lodged planning scheme amendments for Environmentally Sustainable Design (ESD) local planning policies, in accordance with the Ministerial Advisory Committee (MAC) and Panel Report recommendation (April 2014). This year the ESD policy councils continued to advocate for the approval of these planning scheme amendments to the new Minister for Planning. As part of this process, Council officers attended a meeting with the state government (DELWP) to present the BESS tool and to highlight the links between the sustainable design factsheets, BESS and the objectives of the ESD policy.

External Partners: The factsheets are currently being promoted by the following Councils in addition to the IMAP councils: Knox, Kingston, Darebin, Nillumbik, Whitehorse, Whittlesea, Banyule, Hume, Moreland - and CASBE [Council Alliance for a Sustainable Built Environment]. Copies of the Sustainable Design Factsheets are available on the IMAP and Council websites. Council enquiries are welcome.
Action 9.4 Green demonstration projects

Distributed energy

The IMAP Energy Map was developed in partnership with the CSIRO and four of the IMAP Councils – the Cities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Stonnington and Yarra. The project has developed an energy demand map of the city, identifying energy consumption trends resulting from growth and development.

The distribution of energy consumption has been modelled at 5 year intervals and models expected growth rates in energy consumption based on population growth and urban development. Importantly, the energy demand model also identifies opportunities for energy efficiency, demand reduction and opportunities for distributed generation. The project will identify the energy savings that can result from a variety of solutions.

This growth and demand reduction model will be able to inform decisions about electricity network planning, strategic city planning, and the design and development of energy efficiency programs and renewable energy programs delivered by councils or other agencies.

The study also identifies how energy consumption can be reduced by implementing various energy efficiency initiatives.

The buildings energy demand model was developed utilising census data and buildings and property data collected from participating Councils. Data from utilities was used to validate the energy demand model. Various energy saving intervention scenarios were developed and modelled. A mapping model was also developed to create a visualisation model for the data.

The data set will be made available through the IMAP website and City of Melbourne open data platform.

External Partner: CSIRO.
Strategy 2: Effectively link transport routes so that the inner Melbourne region is accessible throughout by walking, cycling and public transport

Action 2.2 Wayfinding signage

Good wayfinding signage is key to encouraging people to walk more. Good wayfinding signage in other cities has been shown to deliver health and economic benefits, as well as lead to improvements to the public realm and journey time savings.

In 2010-11 the City of Melbourne worked with VicRoads, Metlink (now Public Transport Victoria) and Tourism Victoria to explore wayfinding signage improvements to assist visitors orient themselves on arrival in Melbourne and explore the city on foot and by public transport. Initially, the four authorities collaborated on a visitor-focused audit of wayfinding signs within the Melbourne municipality, and from Melbourne Airport to the city centre.

Following the audit, the project was expanded to incorporate the rest of IMAP and Wyndham municipalities.

In late 2012, the Melbourne Visitor Signage Coordinating Committee was established to build ‘common threads’ between roads, public transport, pedestrian and cycling signage systems within Melbourne. It was proposed that the common threads include agreed signing principles and guidelines, language and infrastructure, and coordinated placement of signs to assist people move easily between transport modes.

During 2014-15, the committee’s work covered the following:

1. Development of a Visitor Signage Master Style Guide

Through a series of workshops, committee members developed key elements of the draft style guide.

The first complete draft of the Master Style Guide will be submitted in December 2015 to the nine participating authorities for their consideration. The draft guide will include the following:

- The vision for wayfinding signage in Melbourne
- The case for good wayfinding signage
- Signing principles for Melbourne’s wayfinding
- Wayfinding signing guidelines
- Eligibility and selection criteria for signing
- Naming conventions
- Symbols and arrow
- Frequency and siting (placement) of signs
- Wayfinding signage infrastructure.
2. Building a good wayfinding signage system: learning from the best

In April, Coordinating Committee members participated in a series of workshops led by Paul Street, Programme Manager Legible London, Transport for London’s (TfL) acclaimed pedestrian wayfinding system. Paul’s workshops over a 12 day program focused on TfL’s wayfinding strategy (its objectives and development), the system design process (map principles and signs), roll-out of Legible London and user evaluation results.

Following the Transport for London visit, the Coordinating Committee considered a two-pronged approach to its next steps:

› **Strategic level**: developing a wayfinding signage system that could be adopted across Melbourne. This approach would involve:
  - Establishing a formal collaboration between State and Local Government
  - Building the business case for improving wayfinding signage in Melbourne
  - Engaging with metropolitan councils
  - Creating a basemap for use in wayfinding signage across municipalities and transport modes
  - Developing a consistent style of pedestrian wayfinding signage infrastructure

› **Collaborative projects**: continuing to collaborate on a number of projects. During 2015-16, these will include:
  - Wayfinding signage infrastructure: design and prototype
  - Pilot project: an opportunity to link pedestrian and public transport signage systems, and test the approach proposed in the draft style guide. City of Melbourne will conduct a pilot in North Melbourne and the central city. The City of Port Phillip, in collaboration with PTV, Yarra Trams and Port of Melbourne Corporation, are proposing to develop a pilot for Station Pier (budget dependant). A second possible test site for integrated public transport signage has also been identified at the tram stop upgrade outside Balaclava Station in St Kilda.
  - Evaluation framework: the pilot projects will also be an opportunity to test the new sign design with users: to understand users’ wayfinding needs and to build a robust evaluation framework for shared use.

External Partners: The Coordinating Committee comprises representatives of IMAP councils, City of Wyndham, Public Transport Victoria, VicRoads and Tourism Victoria.

Enquiries from other councils are welcome.
Action 2.3 Bicycle network legibility
The State Government and local Councils have been working collaboratively to put together a Strategic Cycling Corridor Map for inner Melbourne during the past 12 months.

The 19 routes have been refined in late 2014-15 with a revised map due out shortly. The aim is to provide continuous cycling corridors across the city that have consistent high quality and safety along the entire route.

These cycling corridors have been planned to provide a geographic spread, located on routes that are able to be upgraded, tie into activity centres and provide links between the routes.

External Partners: Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources; VicRoads.

Action 2.5 Bicycle network
The IMAP councils have been working hard in the last 12 months to deliver a variety of route improvements on local streets, off-road trails and end of trip facilities.

Traditional bike lanes, buffered bike lanes and separated Copenhagen lanes have been used to improve safety and separation of cyclists throughout the IMAP councils region.

The City of Melbourne has implemented infrastructure projects through $3.0 million funding in 2014-15 and will continue to implement projects from its Bike Plan 2012-16. In addition to projects funded from the 2014-15 capital works program, carry forward funding from 2013-14 was utilised in order to complete the installation of the William Street bike lanes and the construction of a ramp to connect cyclists and pedestrians between the Capital City Trail and Morrell Bridge which will enable cyclists to transition between the trails on each side of the Yarra River.
### Cycling initiatives in 2014-15

Major projects implemented in 2014-15 include the following:

**Yarra**

- Wellington Street between Gipps and Victoria Parade – Construction of physically separated Copenhagen bicycle lanes.
- Elizabeth Street at Hoddle – Reconfiguration of the Elizabeth Street intersection to improve safety and facilitate reconfiguration of Albert Street.
- Capital City Trail and St Georges Road – Signal improvements and a bicycle hook turn facility.
- Drummond Street and Rathdowne Street, Carlton North – Installed buffered bicycle lane to protect cyclists from moving vehicles and doorings.

**Melbourne**

- Flemington Road, North Melbourne – Upgrade existing bike lanes.
- Installation of bike hoops – Approximately 80 installed.
- Gisborne Street, East Melbourne – Upgrade existing bike lanes.
- Dynon Road, North Melbourne – Upgrade existing on and offroad bike facilities.
- Spring Street, Melbourne – Upgrade existing bike lanes.
- Wreckyn Street, North Melbourne – Upgrade existing bike lanes.
- Turner Street, Port Melbourne – Install onroad bike lanes.
- Elizabeth Street & Chelmsford Street, Kensington – Install contraflow bike lanes.
- The Avenue, Parkville – Install contraflow bike lane.
- Leveson Street, North Melbourne – Upgrade existing bike lane.
- William Street, West Melbourne – Upgrade existing bike lane.

**Maribyrnong**

- Ashley Street, Braybrook – Construction of shared bike path from Rupert Street to South Road.
- Birmingham Street, Yarraville – Construction of kerb outstand to accommodate Parkiteer cage at Yarraville station.
- Whitehall Street, Footscray between Lyons Street and Youell Street – Duplication of shared path to eliminate conflict point.
- Maribyrnong River Trail, Maribyrnong – Installation of deluxe bike repair stand and pump.

**Stonnington**

- Church Street Bridge – Reconstruction of the Capital City trail Church Street bridge underpass.
- Capital City trail – Stage 3 of the Yarra River Biodiversity Linkages project, including the widening and realignment of the Capital City trail.
- Sir Zelman Cowen Reserve, Kooyong – Reconstruction and widening of the shared path at Sir Zelman Cowen Reserve.

**Port Phillip**

- Marine Parade – Point Ormond Road to Shakespeare Grove – On-road painted bike lane.
- Hotham Street – Brighton Road to Glen Eira Road – On-road painted bike lane.
- Cowderoy Street – York Street to Canterbury Road – On-road painted bike lane.
- Greeves Street – Vale Street to Inkerman Street – Contraflow bike lane.
- Broadway – On-road painted bike lane.
- Blessington Street – Installation of kerb extension and bike hoops to replace parking space.
- Carlisle Street – Westbury Street to Hotham Street – On-road painted bike lane.

*External Partner: VicRoads.*
Strategy 5: Plan to accommodate 90,000 more dwellings by 2030.

Action 5.2 Affordable Housing –

The overall project’s primary aim is to undertake research on Community Land Trust (CLT) options in the Australian context, to identify issues for developing CLTs and provide feasibility studies and models for implementation. The project also focuses on making this material openly available to the emerging sector and on enabling governance of the work by partner organisations.

In Phase 1 of this project, a research team led by Dr Louise Crabtree at the University of Western Sydney undertook research on CLTs, leading to the release of the Australian CLT Manual in February 2013. The Manual can be accessed online and includes an overview of CLTs in the US and UK, their relevance and potential in Australia, tax issues for organisations considering CLT housing, possible organisational structures, preliminary financial modelling, two possible legal mechanisms (long-term leaseholds and modified shared equity) and a model long-term lease, co-ownership deed and constitution.

Phase 2 of the project will involve two research tasks.

The first involves working with banks and other lending institutions to develop appropriate loan products for CLT residents. This includes identifying the criteria and conditions that would enable lending to households without exposing the household or the housing organisation to unacceptable risk. It is intended that the work will include the creation of an acceptable pro forma lending instrument.

Since commencing in November 2014, the project team is preparing a ‘risk matrix’ to identify how risk will be managed to assist financial institutions in their consideration of this proposal.

The second task involves working with organisations with a commitment to implementing CLT housing. This task involves the completion of up to four in-depth case studies, with a diversity of sites, organisational structures and market conditions. These will involve financial modelling, as well as identification of the appropriate legal mechanism and governance concerns.

External partners: University of Western Sydney; University of Sydney; St Kilda Community Housing; Mount Alexander Community Land Ltd; Hobart Ecovillage; SEMZ Property group; Tasman Ecovillage; Committee for Lorne.
Action 5.5 Infrastructure Development

The IMAP Implementation Committee was briefed in May 2015 on a new proposal for a joint regional planning study for the provision of open space and recreational facilities to cater for active and passive recreation which will accommodate current and projected future demands. The Committee provided support in principle for the more detailed work to develop the brief to be undertaken.

Council officers from each of the five partner Councils met in May to share current challenges in the provision of active and passive recreation spaces across inner Melbourne, and discuss working together on the proposed study. Faced with growing pressure on facilities and space as a result of population growth in the city centre, there has been significant support for further collaboration.

External partners: Metropolitan Planning Authority.
Strategy 7: Promote the inner Melbourne region as an investment location for knowledge rich business sectors.

Action 7.2 Supporting creative businesses – Urban Manufacturing

Melbourne’s future vibrancy, competitiveness and jobs growth will benefit from new research geared toward improving opportunities for small-scale urban makers.

IMAP Councils, together with the University of Melbourne, are undertaking a study aimed at promoting centre-city economic development and guiding rezoning.

Through participation with local businesses and creative specialists operating in this exciting and innovative space, the study will guide strategic decisions about rezoning of urban commercial and industrial-zoned land in the IMAP area.

There is great value to the urban economy in preserving a place for small, high-value added, highly-innovative urban makers and innovators in the central city and immediate inner suburban areas.

This project aims to examine the competing needs for industrial and commercial land in central cities and the shift with small producing firms innovating toward being more service-oriented and no longer needing to be housed exclusively on industrial-zoned land.
To understand the complex urban systems underlying small urban manufacturing, the study will examine:

› A land perspective – examining what’s currently happening in industrial/commercial zoned land.
› A sector perspective – ensuring the survival, growth and capacity to innovate
› An economic perspective – investigating the ongoing economic benefits to the inner Melbourne region.

Understanding these three areas will help determine the implications for planning controls and design in inner city industrial and commercial zones.

Engaging businesses, makers and creative specialists as a central source of information for the research and how high-value central locations impact on small urban makers will be through an online engagement space portal.

The research will open a new front in domestic urban research with implications for government programs dealing with balanced labour markets, social inclusion and environmental sustainability.

The Project Team anticipates the study to have an immediate impact on planning policies for key employment and urban growth areas. It will provide evidence to support decision making about if and when employment areas should be ‘protected’ from property market pressures or how to leverage off investment to create value adding employment opportunities. The same insights may support the development of more nuanced and innovative planning mechanisms and design models to accommodate the needs of contemporary manufacturers, promote business development and profitability, strengthen positive interaction between industrial and non-industrial uses, and promote industry-university partnerships.

External Partners: The University of Melbourne; Metropolitan Planning Authority; Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning; Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources.
Strategy 9: Substantially improve the environmental performance of the inner Melbourne region

Action 9.4 Green Demonstration Projects - ARC Linkage grant: ‘Mimicking natural ecosystems to improve green roof performance’

IMAP councils together with Melbourne Water and the Australian Research Council are funding a three year University of Melbourne project designed to improve the hydrological and energy performance of green roofs by learning from natural ecosystems that occur in similar harsh environments, to that found on rooftops. It is hoped that improving the stormwater capture and cooling functions of green roofs will increase their uptake in medium density areas such as Melbourne’s inner city.

The research team, led by Dr Nicholas Williams, started the project in mid-2014. The first year has been spent planning the research program and establishing the green roof module irrigation, weighing, stormwater collection and instrumentation infrastructure as well as finalising the instrumentation of the University’s research green roof, where the modelling results will be validated. The research team completed one of the project’s major experiments which aimed to identify plant species that require either less fertiliser input or have high nutrient uptake rates if nutrients are in excess. This is important because there is increasing international realisation that due to the high mineral content of their substrates, green roofs can sometimes act as nutrient sources. The second major experiment is designed to test the effect of green roof plant diversity on hydrology and thermal performance.

The University have three PhD students working on the project which has significantly increased the research capacity and scope of the ARC Linkage project. Andrea Pianella is quantifying the effects of substrate, soil moisture and the vegetation on the thermal performance of green roofs in south eastern Australia. He has completed a set of experiments in conjunction with CSIRO researchers that determined the R value of the 3 substrates developed by the Burnley green roofs research team at various water contents.

Zheng Zhang is investigating the role of diverse versus simple green roof planting palettes on the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff and nutrient uptake rates.

Joerg Werdin will continue the development of green roof substrates by investigating if biochar can improve their runoff quality, water holding capacity and plant survival and whether grey water can be used to irrigate green roofs.

External Partners: The University of Melbourne; Melbourne Water; Australian Research Council.
Progress 2013-14
Strategy 11: Promote the Inner Melbourne Region as a tourism destination

**Action 11**
Regional Tourism Program

2014-15 was the second year of the current three-year Tourism Strategic Plan for IMAP. The purpose of the IMAP Tourism Working Group (TWG) is to work collaboratively to:

- Influence visitors and locals to choose Inner Melbourne as a place to visit, explore and return; and
- Make it easy for visitors and locals to explore and engage with Inner Melbourne.

The major focus in year two was to

1. develop a proposal and business case for a digital presence to promote Inner Melbourne as a visitor destination; and
2. to ensure that the trial of a single visitor map, being the Official Visitors Map as managed by Destination Melbourne, was working and beneficial to IMAP and visitors.

Highlights of 2014-15 included:

- **Options for a digital presence to promote Inner Melbourne to visitors**: A business case is currently being developed and discussions are under way with Destination Melbourne as a possible host for an Inner Melbourne presence in the new Melbourne Now website. This will be finalised in 2015-16.

- **The single Inner Melbourne map trial with Destination Melbourne**: The Inner Melbourne map production was handed over to Destination Melbourne (DML) for a year to reduce duplication and cost. The TWG is satisfied that, at this time, a single Official Visitor Map (OVM), incorporating IMAP TWG requirements, is meeting the needs of the IMAP Councils and visitors. This has also resulted in a rationalised distribution with the need for only 1 million maps to be printed in total – a saving for both organisations. DML produced a media release on the incorporation of the Inner Melbourne Map into the OVM.

A new online system for updating the map was also introduced.

- **AIDS 2014**: IMAP was involved in the cultural program for the AIDS2014, including the lighting of various buildings red and a number of key events within a number of the IMAP Councils.

*External Partners: Destination Melbourne Ltd; VTIC; Tourism Victoria.*
IMAP Review

In February 2014 the IMAP Implementation Committee adopted the project plan to review the Inner Melbourne Action Plan. The IMAP Executive Forum continues to review progress on the draft plan and provide guidance to the working group.

Following a literature review and survey analysis, consultants were appointed in June to progress plan development. During July/August, workshops were held for staff and external representatives, Councillors and executives to determine priorities for the plan. Following that, 5 staff reference group workshops were held in October to identify potential strategies to address the key goals.

The consultant presented the first draft of the full plan in March 2015. This was circulated across staff of the 5 councils for further input by early April, and, during July, to groups of senior staff likely to be tasked with implementing each goal. This assisted in narrowing the strategic priorities for IMAP and involved key staff at an early stage in its development.

Following its vigorous review stage, it is expected that the draft plan will be considered by each of the IMAP Council’s during the 2015-16 year, prior to an open consultation stage and adoption.
Membership of the IMAP Implementation Committee

The Cities of Melbourne, Yarra, Stonnington, Port Phillip and the Maribyrnong City Council have each established identically constituted section 86 Special Committees, in accordance with the Local Government Act 1989. These Committees meet as one, and provide a coordinated decision-making process to facilitate the implementation of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) dated January 2006, as adopted by member Councils in December 2005. Maribyrnong City Council established its Special Committee in June 2013 to come into effect on 1 July 2013.

The Committee consists of members, being one councillor and the Chief Executive Officer (or specified Executive Director) from each of the municipalities.

Committee Members: 1 July 2014 – 30 June 2015

- **Cr Ken Ong**
  Chair Future Melbourne (Planning)
  Committee, City of Melbourne
  (1 July 2014 – 30 June 2015)

- **Mr Geoff Lawler**
  Director City Operations,
  City of Melbourne
  (1 July 2014 – 30 June 2015)

- **Cr Jackie Fristacky**
  Mayor, City of Yarra
  (1 July 2014 – November 2014)

- **Dr Phillip Vlahogiannis**
  Mayor, City of Yarra
  (November 2014 – 30 June 2015)

- **Ms Vijaya Vaidyanath**
  Chief Executive Officer, City of Yarra
  (1 July 2014 – 30 June 2015)

- **Cr Adrian Stubbs**
  Mayor, City of Stonnington
  (1 July 2014 – November 2014)

- **Cr Melina Sehr**
  Mayor, City of Stonnington
  (November 2014 – 30 June 2015)

- **Mr Warren Roberts**
  Chief Executive Officer,
  City of Stonnington
  (1 July 2014 – 30 June 2015)

- **Cr Amanda Stevens**
  Mayor, City of Port Phillip
  (1 July 2014 – 30 June 2015)

- **Ms Tracey Slatter**
  Chief Executive Officer,
  City of Port Phillip
  (1 July 2014 – 30 June 2015)

- **Cr Grant Miles**
  Mayor, Maribyrnong City Council
  (1 July 2014 – November 2014)

- **Cr Nam Quach**
  Mayor, Maribyrnong City Council
  (November 2014 – 30 June 2015)

- **Mr Nigel Higgins**
  Acting Chief Executive Officer,
  Maribyrnong City Council
  (1 July 2014 – October 2014)

- **Mr Stephen Wall**
  Chief Executive Officer,
  Maribyrnong City Council
  (October 2014 – 30 June 2015)

Associate Committee Members

The Terms of Reference provides that representatives from the following associate partner organisations are invited to attend the meetings of the IMAP Implementation Committee.

- Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) – 2 representatives;
- Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources (DEDJTR) – 2 representatives;
- Metropolitan Planning Association – 1 representative;
- VicRoads – 1 representative.
IMAP Reporting

Executive’s Forum

The Executive’s Forum is a leadership meeting of IMAP’s senior executives, aimed at determining and driving regional priorities and programs, identifying synergies and opportunities and providing support to the IMAP Executive Officer. Forums are held as the need arises. Outcomes of the IMAP Executive’s Forums are reported back to the IMAP Implementation Committee in formal minutes as an agenda item for discussion and ratification.

10 September 2014

Key items on the agenda were:

› IMAP Review – format of the draft plan, consultation and approval process
› Regional Management Forum – project funding

Minutes were tabled and ratified at the 28 November 2014 IMAP Implementation Committee meeting.

14 November 2014

Key items on the agenda were:

› IMAP Review – discussion with the working group on content
› Three Year Implementation Plan – funding approach for new proposals

Minutes were tabled and ratified at the 28 November 2014 IMAP Implementation Committee meeting.

IMAP Implementation Committee Meetings

29 August 2014 (Host: City of Yarra)

Key items on the agenda were:

› Action 2.2 Visitor Signage Project: Update from the Coordinating Committee
› Action 7.2 Support Creative Businesses: Urban manufacturing project proposal
› Action 9.2 Environmental sustainable design: Final report outlining agreement with CASBE
› Action 9.4 Distributed Energy Project: ‘Final Report’ distributed
› Action 11 Regional Tourism: Annual report; VTIC media release on IMAP work at the International AIDS conference 2014; agreement with Destination Melbourne on distributing the Official Visitor Map
› Draft IMAP Annual Report 2013-14 and summary
› IMAP Review update
› Communications: Noted conference promotion of the Growing Green Guide (Action 9.4); VTIC media release on International AIDS conference (Action 11)

Minutes were tabled and ratified at the 28 November 2014 IMAP Implementation Committee meeting.

28 November 2014 (Host: City of Melbourne)

Key items on the agenda were:

› IMAP Executive Forum: Minutes approval
› Action 7.2 Urban manufacturing: Progress report
› IMAP Three Year Implementation Plan: review of the 3 year budget, including RMF project funding
› IMAP Review update
› Communications: Noted AILA award for the Growing Green Guide (Action 9.4); and Destination Melbourne’s official Visitor Map media release (Action 11)

Minutes were tabled and ratified at the 13 February 2015 IMAP Implementation Committee meeting.
13 February 2015  
(Host: City of Stonnington)

Key items on the agenda were:

› Action 2.2 Wayfinding: Visitor signs master style guide – Legible London visit
› Action 7.2 Supporting creative business: Finalising the Urban Manufacturing project scope, staging and funding in conjunction with Carlton Connect
› Action 8.1 Freight movement: Presentation by VicRoads on the Inner West Freight Update
› Action 9.4 Green Demonstration projects: Growing Green Guide Project – establishing a policy group
› Action 9.4 Green Demonstration projects: Presentation on the University of Melbourne: ’Mimicking natural ecosystems to improve green roof performance’ project (ARC Linkage Grant partner)
› Communications: Noted VicRoads Road Use Hierarchy map; CLT Project Agreement with University of Western Sydney (Action 5.2)

Minutes were tabled and ratified at the 29 May 2015 IMAP Implementation Committee meeting.

29 May 2015  
(Host: Maribyrnong City Council)

Key items on the agenda were:

› Action 5.2 Affordable Housing: CLT research update
› Action 5.2 Affordable Housing: Forum proposal
› Action 5.5 Infrastructure development - Joint planning study proposal for the provision of active and passive recreation spaces
› Action 9.4 Green Demonstration Projects: Energy Mapping communications plan and action plan
› IMAP Review update
› Communications: noted Transport for London representative’s visit and workshops (Action 2.2); priority cycling corridors meeting with state government (Action 2.3); ARC linkage grant and Canopy meetings with staff (Action 9.4); Urban manufacturing stakeholder workshop (Action 7.2).

Minutes were tabled and ratified at the 29 August 2015 IMAP Implementation Committee meeting.
Promotion and communication of IMAP projects

The work of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan was publicised as follows during the year:

**Governance**

- Circulated the IMAP Annual Report 2013-14 to federal, state and local government contacts, IMAP councillors and staff in October 2014.
- IMAP Review: In 2014, consultation workshops were held with councillors, executives, staff and external representatives; five Reference Group workshops were held, the Executive Forum and senior staff consultation also undertaken. In 2015 staff were surveyed for comments on the first draft; the IMAP Committee and the IMAP Councils were briefed on content in May through to July.

**Housing**

- The Community Land Trust Agreement for Phase 2 of this project was finalised by IMAP and a number of external partners with the University of Western Sydney.

**Sustainability**

- The Growing Green Guide has received promotion through:
  - Regular meetings of ‘Canopy’, Melbourne’s green roof public forum,
  - A paper delivered at the 7th Liveable Cities conference NSW July 2014
- The Growing Green Guide was awarded the AILA Victorian Landscape Award in 2014 in the education category.

**Regional development**

- A VTIC media release on IMAP’s work at the International AIDS conference 2014;
- A media release publicised the agreement reached with Destination Melbourne on distributing the IMAP tourism map as the Official Visitor Map. One million copies were printed for distribution during the year.
- Continued to licence the IMAP Tourist map for use in regional publications
- IMAP continued to liaise with the Wyndham Council, Tourism Victoria, Public Transport Victoria and VicRoads on the Master Style Guide being developed through the Visitor Signage Coordinating Committee
- A representative from Transport for London visited Melbourne to assist the IMAP councils and the Visitor Signage Coordinating Committee with wayfinding, based on their Legible London experience
- The Urban Manufacturing project is being undertaken in conjunction with The University of Melbourne. The first stakeholder workshop was well attended by over 60 people, including local creative business owners.
Governance

IMAP Governance
IMAP will work to implement the projects and actions contained in the rolling IMAP 3-year Implementation Plan and ensure systems are in place to engage staff, and meet budgets, grant funding requirements and timeframes to complete projects on time.

IMAP will continue to develop its effectiveness on behalf of the 5 member councils, to improve governance across the inner Melbourne region and nurture the relationships that underpin IMAP.

IMAP Communications & Advocacy

› IMAP will continue to partner with key stakeholders to deliver on key issues affecting the liveability of the inner Melbourne region.

› IMAP will continue to build on the IMAP website, Wiki and Growing Green Guide website as a communication tool and document repository.

› IMAP will communicate the status of current Actions, partnerships and successes widely to promote the benefits of regional collaboration across the inner Melbourne Region.

› IMAP will progress the development and use of the IMAP GIS (Geographic Information Systems) to provide an Inner Melbourne region mapping base for the IMAP projects.

› IMAP will consult widely across the five IMAP Councils on the IMAP Review project to develop a plan which reflects the priorities of the inner Melbourne region councils.
Financial statement

Total income for the 2014-15 financial year to the Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP), derived from IMAP partner Councils and IMAP map licensees was $395,410. This includes the IMAP partner Councils’ annual project contribution of $175,000, and $100,000 for the regional tourism projects undertaken by IMAP. This year IMAP collected an additional $100,000 in council contributions for the Regional Management Forum projects, undertaken jointly with the state government. The City of Wyndham also contributed $20,000 towards the IMAP wayfinding signage project, as an equal contributor on the coordinating committee. No Victorian government grants were received directly by IMAP.

The total expenditure for the 2014 -15 financial year for professional services, website administration and sundry items relating to IMAP Actions was $371,900. This results in a positive balance to the IMAP account in the financial year of $23,509. Retained Earnings carried forward from the previous financial year as at 1 July 2014 was $409,557. Therefore the Accumulated Surplus for the year ending 30 June 2015 was $433,066. These funds have been allocated to current and new projects approved in the 3-Year Implementation Plan in November 2014 and will be carried forward. The positive balance in the account is due to the timing in implementing these projects.

IMAP Financial Statement as at 30 June 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual IMAP Council Partner contributions</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual IMAP Council Tourism contributions</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other contributions</td>
<td>120,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Council contributions to Regional Management Forum Projects</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Action 11 – IMAP Map Annual License fees</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Action 2.2 – City of Wyndham project contribution</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>395,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Management Forum Projects contribution from IMAP Councils</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>185,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Action 2.4 Wayfinding Signs: Visitor Signs project</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Action 5.2 Affordable Housing: CLT project</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Action 7.2 Support Creative Business: Urban Manufacturing project</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Action 9.2 Environmental Sustainable Design: Factsheets project</td>
<td>2,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Action 9.4 Green Demonstration Projects: Growing Green Guide</td>
<td>3,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Action 9.4 Uni of Melbourne ARC Linkage Grant contribution</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Action 11 Regional Tourism</td>
<td>111,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Annual Report 2013-14</td>
<td>5,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Website &amp; GIS Administration</td>
<td>10,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Review</td>
<td>62,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Expenditure</td>
<td>6,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>371,901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Profit for Year Ending 30 June 2015  23,509
Retained Earnings Carried Forward (2013-14)  409,557
Accumulated Surplus for Year Ending 30 June 2015  433,066

Notes: The IMAP Executive Officer position has been hosted by the City of Stonnington with the IMAP councils each contributing a quarter of the operational costs annually from 2010/11. This contribution is not indicated above.
**Statement of attendance**

**From 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee member</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>IMAP Implementation Committee Membership dates to 30 June 2014</th>
<th>Meeting Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Jackie Fristacky</td>
<td>Mayor, City of Yarra</td>
<td>Jul 2014 – Nov 2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Phillip Vlahogiannis</td>
<td>Mayor, City of Yarra</td>
<td>Nov 2014 – Jun 2015</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Amanda Stevens</td>
<td>Mayor, City of Port Phillip</td>
<td>Jul 2014 – Jun 2015</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Adrian Stubbs</td>
<td>Mayor, City of Stonnington</td>
<td>Jul 2014 – Nov 2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Melina Sehr</td>
<td>Mayor, City of Stonnington</td>
<td>Nov 2014 – Jun 2015</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Ken Ong</td>
<td>Chair, Future Melbourne (Planning) Committee, City of Melbourne</td>
<td>Jul 2014 – Jun 2015</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Grant Miles</td>
<td>Mayor, Maribyrnong City Council</td>
<td>Jul 2014 – Nov 2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Nam Quach</td>
<td>Mayor, Maribyrnong City Council</td>
<td>Nov 2014 – Jun 2015</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Vijaya Vaidyanath</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, City of Yarra</td>
<td>Jul 2014 – Jun 2015</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Tracey Slatter</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, City of Port Phillip</td>
<td>Jul 2014 – Jun 2015</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Warren Roberts</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, City of Stonnington</td>
<td>Jul 2014 – Jun 2015</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Geoff Cockram</td>
<td>Acting Chief Executive Officer, City of Stonnington</td>
<td>Aug 2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Geoff Lawler</td>
<td>Director, City Operations, City of Melbourne</td>
<td>Jul 2014 – Jun 2015</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Alistair Miller</td>
<td>Acting Director, City Operations, City of Melbourne</td>
<td>Aug 2014</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Nigel Higgins</td>
<td>Acting Chief Executive Officer, Maribyrnong City Council</td>
<td>Jul 2014 – Oct 2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Stephen Wall</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, Maribyrnong City Council</td>
<td>Oct 2014 – Jun 2015</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Associate Partner Representatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associate Member</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Meeting Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Adrian Salmon</td>
<td>Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning [DELWP]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Rod Anderson</td>
<td>Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning [DELWP]</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Rebecca Collins</td>
<td>Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources [DEDJTR]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Sasha Yarwood</td>
<td>Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources [DEDJTR]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Jay Meek</td>
<td>Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources [DEDJTR]</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Steve Booth</td>
<td>Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources [DEDJTR]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Annick Philipsz</td>
<td>Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources [DEDJTR]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Patricia Liew</td>
<td>VicRoads</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Adam McGuire</td>
<td>VicRoads</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Nick Fisher</td>
<td>VicRoads</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Jane Monk</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Authority</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Progress Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage</strong></td>
<td>1.1 Heritage statement of significance</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Public realm infrastructure standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Built form controls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Boulevards &amp; major roads</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Key urban squares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link Transport Routes</strong></td>
<td>2.1 Regional physical infrastructure</td>
<td>Completed/Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Wayfinding signage</td>
<td>Completed/Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Bicycle network legibility</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Pedestrian priority areas – Greenlight project</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 Bicycle network</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 Tram &amp; Rail network</td>
<td>Ongoing advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Congestion</strong></td>
<td>3.1 Commuter car use</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Roads as Places</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Regional parking management</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 40% by 2020</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 Reduced through traffic</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Transport</strong></td>
<td>4.1 Travel Smart</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Street design standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Think Tram</td>
<td>Ongoing advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Enhanced bus priority</td>
<td>Ongoing advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 Improved public transport infrastructure</td>
<td>Ongoing advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6 Public transport pricing</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7 Improvements to public transport services</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Increase</strong></td>
<td>5.1 Regional housing statement</td>
<td>Ongoing advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Affordable housing</td>
<td>Completed/Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Integrating public housing</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4 Social infrastructure &amp; services</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5 Infrastructure development</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity Centres</strong></td>
<td>6.1 Activity centre local policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 Activity centre public environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3 Managing conflicts</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4 New cultural facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5 Activity centre services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge Rich Business Sectors</strong></td>
<td>7.1 Government industry links</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2 Support creative businesses</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3 Improved information</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4 Regional economic development statement</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 Wireless broadband</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.6 Exporting health services</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7 Universities &amp; regional development</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freight</strong></td>
<td>8.1 Priority for freight movement</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2 Improved links to the port</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>9.1 Regional sustainability targets</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2 Environmental sustainable design</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.3 Water sensitive urban design</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.4 Green demonstration projects</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.5 Community capacity for sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.6 Recycled water for open space</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Open Space Network</strong></td>
<td>10.1 Regional open space &amp; trail network</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.2 Physical infrastructure needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.3 Open space links</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.4 Riparian open space project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.5 Wild life links</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.6 Foreshore open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.7 Waterways planning &amp; management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Tourism</strong></td>
<td>11.1 Inner Melbourne map</td>
<td>Completed/Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.2 Regional tourism programme</td>
<td>Completed/Current</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For further information, please contact:
Elissa McElroy
IMAP Executive Officer
Officer Location – City of Stonnington
Malvern Town Hall
Cnr Glenferrie Road & High Street, Malvern Vic 3144
PO Box 21 Prahran Vic 3181
Telephone: 8290 1110
Mobile: 0404 248 450
Email: emcelroy@stonnington.vic.gov.au

www.imap.vic.gov.au

Inner Melbourne Action Plan
‘Making Melbourne More Liveable’
IMAP Progress Report August 2015

The Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) identifies 57 actions within 11 regional strategies to help build the inner Melbourne region to embody creativity, livability, prosperity and sustainability across a range of diverse neighbourhoods.

The following Actions have been COMPLETED:
Action 1.1 Inner Melbourne Statement of Significance
Action 2.2 Co-ordinated pedestrian and public transport Signage – Wayfinding signs
Action 2.3 Bicycle Network Legibility – Priority Bicycle Network Report
Action 2.4 Walking links and pedestrian priority areas - Greenlight project
Action 3.3 Regional Parking Management - Report on Parking; Car sharing
Action 3.5 Reduced through traffic – Development of a Through Traffic model
Action 5.2 Affordable Housing - Needs Website (May 08); planning overlay, Australian CLT Manual
Action 5.3 Integrating Public Housing Estates – Collaborative framework report
Action 6.3 Activity Centres - Cumulative Impact Assessment tools; Local planning amendments
Action 7.7 Universities and Regional Development – Student placement processes, publication
Action 9.1 Regional Sustainability Targets – Audit of IMAP Councils
Action 9.2 Environmental Sustainable Design (Part) – design of 15 Sustainable Design Factsheets
Action 9.3 Water Sensitive Urban Design - Model Guidelines and Local Planning Amendment approvals
Action 9.4 Green Demonstration projects (Part) - Water Sensitive Cities Report
Action 9.6 Use of Recycled Water in Open Space – Technical Notes
Action 11.1 Inner Melbourne Map – Inner Melbourne Visitor Map (extended to Footscray), Volunteer Families, Skybus videos
Action 11.2 Regional Tourism Program – Research & Itineraries, Conference sponsorship

Other Achievements

The Growing Green Guide (Action 9.4) won the ‘research and communication” category in the Victorian branch of the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects (AILA) awards, November 2014.

University of Western Sydney 2013 Partnership Award – for the Australian Community Land Trust (CLT) Manual
Merit Award for Regional Action in Water Sensitive Urban Design at the Stormwater Victoria Awards
IMAP Bicycle Network - Presentation at the Bike Futures 2009 Conference
Presentation to Planning Students at Melbourne University 2009 & 2010

Governance
- Annual Reports
- Goods & Services Procurement Policy and MoU
- Governance & Relationships Report
- IMAP Plan Review 2010; Financial Review 2010
- Memorandum of Understanding – Intellectual Property
- IP Licence Agreements – ESD Factsheets, IMAP Regional Tourism Map

Communications
- IMAP Geographic Information System (GIS)
- IMAP Website and GrowingGreenGuide.org website
- Club IMAP
- Council Briefings

Advocacy
- Ministerial Briefings – Ministers Wynne, Madden, Kosky, Plibersek, Powell
- IMAP acknowledgements:
  - State Government’s Cycling Strategy
  - Interdepartmental Committee (Department of Justice)
  - Melbourne Water (WSUD)
  - Department of Transport Wayfinding Signs Guide
  - Department of Transport and VicRoads – Greenlight Project

Action 1.4 Boulevards and Major Roads
Preliminary work – ON HOLD

The IMAP Implementation Committee keeps a watching brief on work by VicRoads on the Hoddle Street Study. Awaits state government decisions.

Action 2.2 Co-ordinated pedestrian and public transport signage system
IN PROGRESS - Initially completed in 2010, this project has been reactivated, focussed on visitor signage.

In December 2012, the IMAP Implementation Committee approved IMAP councils participating in the Melbourne Visitor Signage project and the coordinating committee was established to guide its work. The Committee seeks to:

- Build common threads between roads, public transport, tourism, pedestrian, cycling and street directional signage systems across the inner Melbourne region.
- Shared symbols and terminology will be applied across these key signage systems; and
- Coordinated responses to signage requests by tourist attractions, precincts and major developments provided.

The Melbourne Visitor Signage coordinating committee comprises representatives of the five IMAP councils, City of Wyndham, Public Transport Victoria, VicRoads and Tourism Victoria.

The committee is to build a Master Style Guide setting out agreed signing principles, guidelines and language (the ‘business rules’) to be adopted by collaborating authorities. The guide will comprise two sections: Strategy and Implementation. The draft Strategy section was completed in June 2014 - drawing significantly on Legible London as an exemplar of a good wayfinding system and on its user-focused signing principles.

The committee is currently working on the Implementation section.
In April 2015 Paul Street, the Program Manager of Transport for London’s *Legible London* wayfinding system visited for 12 days providing workshops on best practice examples, implementation processes and structures and a methodology for roll out of a comprehensive system.

Following the TIL visit, the committee structured its work into two streams:

1. **Collaborative projects**
   - *Master Style Guide*. The first draft of the guide will be completed by December 2015. The guide will outline an agreed approach to content: signing principles, eligibility and selection criteria, naming conventions, symbols and arrows, placement and location criteria, and ‘gateway’ signage.
   - *Wayfinding signage redesign*. IMAP councils and City of Wyndham will work together to design pedestrian wayfinding signs that are more visible; cheaper to produce, install and update; perform well environmentally; and carry a two-map system. PTV will participate in the design and prototyping process.
   - *Pilot projects (North Melbourne, central city, Balaclava Station and Station Pier)*: an opportunity to link pedestrian and public transport signage systems, to explore shared signage infrastructure, and apply the content proposed in the draft style guide.
   - *Evaluation*: the pilot projects will test the new sign design, content and placement with users: to understand their wayfinding needs and to build a robust evaluation framework.

2. **Strategic approach**
   - Using free, open data, the proposal is to build a *single base map of metropolitan Melbourne* for use by councils for wayfinding signage and other purposes. The base map would comprise agreed layers and design, would provide consistency of information for visitors and deliver cost savings. The proposal is to form a sub-committee of GIS staff to create the base map - its layers, data sources, language, operation and design.
   - Commission a *business case* on the benefits of improved wayfinding signage in Melbourne. A workshop run in June by SGS Economics and Planning for the committee identified a number of potential benefits of improved, consistent wayfinding signage in Melbourne. Workshop participants proposed meeting with the state government to discuss undertaking formal Investment Logic Mapping (ILM) to test the need for further wayfinding development.

**Action 2.3 Bicycle Network Legibility**

**IN PROGRESS** – Initially completed in 2008, this project has been reactivated.

In March 2013, the IMAP Implementation Committee agreed to review and update the Priority Bicycle Network Map; to coordinate bike lane development priorities and capital projects by the 5 IMAP Councils and VicRoads across the inner Melbourne region.

Work to date has included:

- October 2013: An initial meeting of the Working Group to scope the project.
- November 2013: a workshop held in conjunction with State Government representatives started the collation of data on Council cycling initiatives, current and planned.
- February 2014: DTPLI presented to the IMAP Committee on integrating the state and local government work through a coordinated series of additional workshops to establish key cycling corridors.
- Joint workshops were held between April-June 2015 and feedback sought from the State Government on funding.
- 4 May 2015: the State Government hosted a workshop on Priority Cycling Corridors.
- The project team identified priority council cycling works for inclusion in the IMAP Review process.
**Action 2.5 Bicycle Network**

IN PROGRESS - Implementation of Priority Routes

Action 2.3 delivered the Priority Bicycle Network Map for IMAP (January 2008) forming the basis for the implementation of Action 2.5. Focus is on the high bicycle usage routes or those routes which have the potential to carry significantly increased bicycle volumes. Further reporting on progress with targeted works awaits the outcome of Action 2.3.

**Action 3.2 Roads as Places**

ON HOLD

A Briefing paper was prepared for consideration by the IMAP Implementation Committee in February 2010 and revised February 2012. This project is on hold pending the completion of the IMAP Review.

**Action 5.2 Affordable Housing**

COMPLETED – Stage 1: Planning mechanisms

IN PROGRESS - Stage 2: Community Land Trust Research

**IN PROGRESS – Phase 1**

- “Affordable Housing Development Models” prepared by Affordable Housing Solutions [AHS] was made available by the City of Port Phillip to the IMAP councils in March 2011 for consideration.
- Research undertaken on Community Land Trust models and their application in Australia is published in The Australian CLT Manual (refer copies held online).
- IMAP and the City of Port Phillip were awarded the University of Western Sydney 2013 Partnership Award for their involvement in this project.

IN PROGRESS – Phase 2

Key research questions of this phase relate to:

- **identifying and researching appropriate financial products** for the establishment of CLTs in Australia: The team will work with banks and other lending institutions to develop appropriate loan products for residents looking to buy a leasehold or shared equity interest in CLT housing.
- **perform in-depth case studies.** This task will involve the completion of up to four in-depth case studies in a range of locations and scenarios.

Progress to date:

- February 2014: The Scope of Work for Phase 2 was reported to the IMAP Committee meeting and advice that funding raising had been successful.
- November 2014: the first meeting for Phase 2 was held to discuss the next stage.
- March 2015: the UWS Partnership Agreement was finalised.
- An update on the CLT work was provided to the Committee at their meeting in May 2015.

- A Housing Forum proposal has been agreed by the Committee and is to be run by the City of Yarra in November.

**Action 5.4 and 5.5 Social Infrastructure and Services/Infrastructure Development**

ON HOLD - Investigating the capacity of social services
An initial project brief to undertake research to identify the capacity of social services currently provided to social housing developments was approved at the November 2011 Committee meeting. Further development of this project awaits completion of the IMAP Review.

**CURRENT - Open Space and recreation facilities:**

Following work being undertaken by the Metropolitan Planning Authority and Sport and Recreation Victoria to plan for future requirements for open space, the Committee considered a proposal at the May 2015 meeting to investigate recreation facilities and open space requirements across the IMAP region, in response to future growth. A further report and a detailed brief will be considered at the August 2015 meeting.

**Action 6.3 Managing Conflict in Activity Centres**

**CURRENT**

A submission to address the disparity between planning and liquor licensing Definitions in the legislation with the Department Environment Land Water and Planning (DELWP) has been proposed by the IMAP Implementation Committee. An initial meeting to discuss the approach to be taken was held on 5 February 2015.

**Action 7.2 Support Creative Industries**

**ON HOLD - Creative Industries**

An initial meeting was held in December 2012 to scope this project. An inventory of current programs being undertaken by the IMAP councils was prepared and considered in September 2013. A number of “quick wins” and research areas were identified for further work.

- The City of Port Phillip’s research and the City of Melbourne Knowledge sector review have contributed to this work.
- A definition of “Creative Industries” has been agreed and the need for an IMAP Creative Business policy identified.

**CURRENT - Urban Manufacturing**

In a separate initiative, representatives of the IMAP Councils and University of Melbourne are investigating urban manufacturing in the Inner Melbourne region.

The IMAP Committee considered the initial brief and recommendations at the November 2014 and February 2015 meetings to finalise the funds, timeframe and objectives for this project.

The following approach has been proposed for this project:

- Phase 1 (7 months) – Existing Resources, Pilot Study, and Definition
- Phase 2 (6 months) - Major survey and preliminary economic analysis.
- Phase 3 (3-5 years) – Economic Impacts.

**PHASE 1 - PROJECT UPDATE**

- A stakeholder workshop was held on 28 May 2015. Participants communicated the need to broaden the project to include Moreland Council region and explore a technological method for conducting the survey.
- The IMAP Implementation Committee approved the Agreement between IMAP and the University of Melbourne.
- The project team confirmed the information required to examine a complete picture of all three approaches – land, sector, and economic; is currently not in existence for Victoria to provide key data for the analysis of economic development in small manufacturing sectors.
- The Project Management Team and Steering Group agreed:
  - to approach Moreland Council for involvement in the project and a funding contribution.
• to support the development of an online geographical mapping survey of makers across the IMAP area and surrounds to examine clusters, supply chains, customers and movement of makers over the life of the project.

➤ An update to the Steering Committee on 11 June 2015 identified that the Project should move straight to an application for ARC Linkage Grant funding. As a result of the impending application, the Steering Committee instructed that Phase 1 & 2 be combined to complete the online survey and ensure sufficient evidence of the research is available to report back to the IMAP Implementation Committee for endorsement and continuation of the project, prior to any application for ARC Linkage Grant funding.

➤ Originally the Phase 1 report was due in late October 2015, however, due to the updated schedule for Phase 1 and to meet the ACR Linkage Grant funding application deadline of September 2015, a draft report will be considered by IMAP on 28 August 2015.

A comprehensive draft report ‘The Dilemma of Urban Employment Land – An Inquiry into the viability of small urban manufacturing in Inner Melbourne’ has been submitted outlining findings from the analysis of existing data, inception workshop, and framing of the qualitative and quantitative studies that comprise the research. The report summarises the original project proposal and several strategic decisions modifying the scope and path of the research.

**Action 8.1 Priority for Freight Movement**

**ON HOLD**

This project will be led by the Maribyrnong City Council. Staff from VicRoads presented an update on inner west freight studies at the February 2015 meeting.

**Action 9.2 Environmentally Sustainable Design – commercial buildings**

**COMPLETED** Stage 1

Work commenced in December 2010 to identify ESD topics to be written up in the form of Factsheets for publication.

➤ The Factsheets pack was formally launched at the City of Melbourne on 11 May 2012 with the first 10 topics now available on Council and the IMAP websites. The Factsheets have been licensed for re-badging and use by 8 other Melbourne Councils

➤ Topics include:

1.0 Indoor environment quality  2.0 Energy efficiency  
3.0 Water efficiency  4.0 Stormwater management  
5.0 Building materials  6.0 Transport  
7.0 Waste management  8.0 Urban ecology  
9.0 Innovation  10.0 Construction and building management

**COMPLETED** Stage 2

➤ Additional topics recently completed include:

4.1 Site Permeability  
2.1 Sunshading  
8.1 Green roofs, walls and facades  
Melbourne’s Climate (including adaptation)  
ESD Tools

• The Working Group reported in May 2014 that the 10 original fact sheets, designed to support the SDAPP framework, have since become reference documents for the six local governments who had adopted the proposed local planning scheme amendment for ESD.
In August 2014 the working group proposed a governance approach to managing the Factsheets by encouraging Councils to adopt the factsheets through engagement with CASBE, who will oversee the ESD standards and improve consistency.

The working group is finalising the factsheets and preparing for a launch of the series.

Action 9.4 Green Demonstration Projects

**CURRENT - Green Roofs Research Project - Australian Research Council Linkage Grant**

In 2013 the IMAP Implementation Committee partnered in an ARC Linkage Grant with the University of Melbourne and Melbourne Water for further research on the measurable impacts of green roofs: “Mimicking natural ecosystems to improve green roof performance”. The research project outcomes will provide:

- Design, monitoring and management recommendations for Green Roofs, particularly in relation to stormwater quality and quantity, temperature (building energy efficiency) and improved biodiversity.

The research team are now well into their first year and have provided an update on progress to IMAP representatives.

Dr Nick Fisher, University of Melbourne updated the IMAP Committee on their research at the February meeting. Work continues to further promote green roofs, walls and facades since the completion of the IMAP Green Roofs project (Action 9.4).

**COMPLETED - Distributed Energy Mapping –**

The Distributed Energy project undertook an analysis of the potential for distributed energy in the IMAP area (district scale cogeneration, renewable and energy efficiencies) and developed a predictive model for managing and implementing commercially viable distributed energy systems in Melbourne.

Work has focussed on:
- extracting relevant Council data for the CSIRO modelling
- engaging the relevant utilities to participate and provide data.
- meeting with representatives from CSIRO to finalise data access arrangements

Progress has been as follows:

- August 2013: The energy modelling was demonstrated at the IMAP Implementation
- October 2013 and February 2014: Workshops helped identify how the information should be delivered to stakeholders and progress was reported to the IMAP Committee.
- May 2014: CSIRO representatives met with the project team to determine final changes to the mapping projection scenarios. Information on the projected growth areas was then sourced to ensure the model allows for future changes predicted across the region.
- August 2014: The (nearly) Final Report was provided to the IMAP Committee. Subsequently work has progressed developing a communications strategy and action plan, and arranging for the data models to be run on council computer systems to complete the project.

➢ The Communications Plan and Action Plan were approved at the May 2015 meeting of the IMAP Committee and are currently being implemented.

Action 10.1 Regional Open Space and Trail Network

**ON HOLD – Open space and trails**

- August 2009: the working group presented a draft Project Plan to the IMAP Committee
- February 2010: the working group detailed the timeframe of the stages, desktop audit, engagement of partners and the development of an Implementation Plan,
- May 2010: the Committee noted how the project is integrated into actions being undertaken by state government agencies.
- February 2011: GIS staff initiated the collation of land information across the 4 councils onto a base map. November 2013: the new IMAP Geographic Information System (GIS) was used to load the open space data as a test case. The project is currently on hold awaiting completion of the IMAP Review.
CURRENT - Investigate recreation facilities and open space requirements

- Following work being undertaken by the Metropolitan Planning Authority and Sport and Recreation Victoria to plan for future requirements for open space, the Committee considered a proposal at the May 2015 meeting to investigate recreation facilities and open space requirements across the IMAP region, in response to future growth.

➤ The detailed project brief is to be considered at the August meeting.

Strategy 11 – Regional Tourism

ONGOING

A 3 year strategy was adopted in May 2013 inclusive of a detailed Action Plan for the financial year. To date the working group has;

- Renewed licensing of the IMAP map to tourism peak bodies.
- Placed map and video material on the IMAP website for IMAP Councils to link with.
- Evaluated the Skybus Campaign, completed in August 2013.
- Changed the IMAP map to include Footscray, Maribyrnong.
- Undertaken joint research with DML to gauge feedback on the contents and presentation of the Official Visitor Guide and the IMAP tourist map.
- Collated IMAP expenditure on the Tourist Map to evaluate alternatives to printing and distributing the map and options for distribution of the tourist maps.
- The IMAP Map was included in the 15,000 AIDs conference delegate’s pack – the cover modified to include the cultural program link.

In August 2014 the project team updated the Committee on the agreement reached with DML for printing and distribution of the IMAP map through the Official Visitors Map. Following ratification of the Agreement, the IMAP Map has been included in the latest upgraded OVM publication.

The Annual report of activities undertaken during 2014-15 by the tourism group will be considered at the August Committee meeting; along with the Action Plan proposed for 2015-16.

IMAP Review

CURRENT

The development of a new Inner Melbourne Action Plan is underway. Consultants were appointed in June 2014 to write the plan.

➤ Following staff and councillors workshops in July/August 2014, 5 half-day Reference Group workshops were facilitated by consultants under the topics: Environmental Sustainability, Economy, Communities, Transport, and Neighbourhoods and Places during October.

➤ A first full draft of the plan was prepared by the end of December and, following input from the working group, was circulated for staff comment at the 5 councils during March.

➤ The document was redrafted for review by senior staff in July and the IMAP Executive Forum in August. The draft plan will be presented to the IMAP Implementation Committee in August for consideration.

The IMAP projects continue to add value, deliver stronger relationships, practical solutions and strategic directions, and influence the liveability and sustainability of the inner Melbourne region.
28 August 2015

IMAP Implementation Committee

Briefing Paper

Action 11
Destination Melbourne
Destination Management Plan and Local Government Visitor Program Proposal

BACKGROUND

1. Destination Melbourne is an independent not-for-profit organisation, dedicated to building and elevating Melbourne’s tourism industry and the visitor experience.

2. In April 2015, Destination Melbourne launched its new three year Strategic Plan with its vision to maximise Melbourne’s visitor potential by championing visitor needs, the visitor experience and the visitor industry.

3. As part of the development of its new Strategic Plan, Destination Melbourne met with 45 key industry stakeholders to gain their opinions in regards to gaps and development opportunities in relation to Melbourne as a visitor destination.

4. One strategic initiative identified during this process is that Melbourne does not have its own Destination Management Plan, which clearly articulates the city’s strategic vision for the future development of its visitor economy.

5. The other gap that was identified during Destination Melbourne’s stakeholder consultation program is that metropolitan Local Councils are seeking greater support from Destination Melbourne in relation to product development, industry development and visitor strategies.

DISCUSSION

6. Destination Melbourne’s Chair Sarah Seddon and Chief Executive Laura Cavallo will present their plan to:
   a. Develop a comprehensive Destination Management Plan in the aim to grow Melbourne’s visitor economy over the next 10 to 15 years.
   b. Launch a local government visitor program to support local councils with bespoke product and industry development programs and strategic visitor support.

7. To implement these strategic initiatives Destination Melbourne is seeking to secure funding support from across metropolitan Local Councils to:
   a. develop the Destination Management Plan by 2016-17
   b. launch the three year Local Government Visitor Program.

8. Funding levels will be presented to the IMAP Implementation Committee on Friday 28 August.

RECOMMENDATION

9. That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:
   a. endorse and fund Destination Melbourne for the development of the Destination Management Plan and the overall three year Local Government Visitor Program.

Report prepared by: Laura Cavello, DML
Inner Melbourne Action Plan

Briefing Report

Strategy 11 Promote the inner Melbourne region as a tourism destination


Purpose

1. To update the IMAP Implementation Committee on the annual activity of the IMAP Tourism Working Group (TWG) in 2013-14.
2. 2014-15 was the second year of the new three-year Tourism Strategic Plan for IMAP.
3. The purpose of the IMAP Tourism Working Group (TWG) throughout the life of the Strategic Plan is to work collaboratively to:
   a. Influence visitors and locals to choose Inner Melbourne as a place to visit, explore and return; and
   b. Make it easy for visitors and locals to explore and engage with Inner Melbourne.

Discussion

4. No specific Action Plan was prepared for Year 2. The major focus in year two was to:
   - develop a proposal and business case for a digital presence to promote Inner Melbourne as a visitor destination: and
   - to ensure that the trial of a single visitor map, being the Official Visitors Map as managed by Destination Melbourne, was working and beneficial to IMAP and visitors.

Options for a digital presence to promote Inner Melbourne to visitors

Due to significant changes in the composition of the TWG, with a number of members either leaving or unable to attend meetings, this project was delayed until later in 2014-15. A business case is currently being developed and discussions are underway with Destination Melbourne as a possible host for an Inner Melbourne presence in the new Melbourne Now website. This will be finalised in 2015-16

The single Inner Melbourne map trial with Destination Melbourne

a. The Inner Melbourne map production was handed over to Destination Melbourne (DML) for a year. The purpose of this was to reduce duplication and the increasing costs of printing 1 million maps per annum while DML was also producing another 750,000. Significant work in 2013-14 meant that the transfer and production ran smoothly and that the TWG is satisfied that at this time a single OVM, incorporating IMAP TWG requirements, is meeting the needs of the IMAP Councils and visitors. This has also resulted in a rationalised distribution with the need for only 1 million maps to be printed in total and a saving of $20,000 for IMAP over the previous year. DML’s media release noted the incorporation of the Inner Melbourne Map into the OVM.

b. A new online system for updating the map was also introduced, making it much easier for TWG members to provide timely updates to the base map held by Visual Voice.

5. All well as these activities, highlights of 2014-15 included:

   IMAP Review: Members of the Tourism Working Group participated in the:
a. Staff and externals Workshop on 16 July 2014  
b. Economy Reference Group Workshop on 13 October 2015  
c. Providing comments on the first draft of the IMAP review in March/April 2015  
d. Economy Working Group to review and prioritise detailed strategies in the second draft in July 2015

**AIDS 2014:** IMAP involvement in the cultural program for the AIDS2014, including the lighting of various buildings red and a number of key events within a number of the IMAP Councils. The VTIC media release noted the IMAP involvement during AIDS2014.

6. The financial report for the tourism working group is attached – refer Attachment 10a. A surplus of $57,133 will be transferred to the 2015-16 year for the tourism projects.

7. The Action Plan for the third year of the new three-year Tourism Strategic Plan for IMAP setting out the proposed activities of the working group for 2015-16 is attached – refer Attachment 10b.

**Recommendation**

8. That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:
   a. **note** the continuing work of the IMAP Tourism Working Group.
   b. **approve** the IMAP Tourism Working Group to update the schedule of MELBOURNE OFFICIAL VISITOR MAP – PRODUCTION & DISTRIBUTION AGREEMENT between the IMAP Councils and Destination Melbourne Ltd for another twelve months: and  
## IMAP Tourism Working Group

Operating Statement for period ended June 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Codes</th>
<th>R0403</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Balance of IMAP Account</td>
<td>68,096.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2800 Sundry Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Tourism contribution CoY</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Tourism contribution CoS</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Tourism contribution CoPP</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Tourism contribution CoM</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Tourism contribution CoMar</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity Press licence fee</td>
<td>410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sundry income</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,410.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,506.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4130 Advertising</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP banner - AIDS conference</td>
<td>410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Advertising</strong></td>
<td><strong>410.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4131 Promotional Publications</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Map - OVM contribution</td>
<td>45,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Map - OVM contribution</td>
<td>46,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Promo Pubs</strong></td>
<td><strong>91,350.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4150 Consulting Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP brochure redesign - AIDS conference</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map amendments</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP map updates 2014</td>
<td>8,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP map - slippy map version for online</td>
<td>1,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slippy map feedback form</td>
<td>1,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slippy map November update</td>
<td>375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP map November updates</td>
<td>1,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP map A3 and A4 changes</td>
<td>1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoM - contractor to manage map changes</td>
<td>3,088.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Consulting Fees</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,613.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>111,373.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Surplus** | **57,133.00**
Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP)
Tourism Working Group

Action Plan
2015- 2016

Prepared
July 2015
Our Purpose
To Drive and Communicate the Inner Melbourne Experience

IMAP Vision
Making Melbourne More Liveable

Communication

Our Goal
Destination Marketing

Our Goal
Destination Development

Review
### Goal - Destination Marketing

#### Strategy
Visitor Journey Points: Position Inner Melbourne marketing messages and materials along the key points of the visitor journey

#### Measure of Success
- Inner Melbourne product online presence
- Inner Melbourne marketing presence at key points of arrival (e.g. airport, cruise ship terminal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Critical Tasks</th>
<th>Who Leads</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Partner With</th>
<th>Completed by</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Continue to work with Destination Melbourne to produce a single visitor map for Inner Melbourne | - Confirm ongoing arrangement for another year  
- Budget confirmed  
- Annual review undertaken | CoMB/ CoPP | CoM tourism volunteers  
Budget | $50,000 | DML | June 2016 | • Just in time map production  
• Feedback from industry and visitors  
• Production and distribution costs reduced | - |
### Goal - Destination Marketing

**Strategy**

Visitor Journey Points: Position Inner Melbourne marketing messages and materials along the key points of the visitor journey

**Measure of Success**
- Inner Melbourne product online presence is fully integrated with up-to-date information on what to see and do across all IMAP Councils
- Increased online presence of Inner Melbourne
- Visitation to digital marketing platform is trending well
- Online content is current and engaging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Critical Tasks</th>
<th>Who Leads</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Partner With</th>
<th>Completed by</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Conduct a feasibility study to identify the most efficient process for IMAP Councils to provide content for digital marketing platform | Prepare a project scope  
Source consultant  
Undertake audit/mapping exercise and prepare recommendations  
Determine budget for implementation  
Presentation of recommendation to IMAP executive  
Go/no go date | CoS  
Consultant | $30,000  
DML or other destination organisation | 30 June 2016 |  
• Brief prepared  
• Consultant engaged  
• Audit conducted  
• Fully costed recommendations presented to IMAP TWG  
• Ready to commence implementation in 2016 |
### Goal - Destination Development

#### Strategy

#### Measure of Success
- Visitors and locals perceive that Inner Melbourne is accessible and easy to navigate
- Visitors and locals perceive that Inner Melbourne is welcoming
- Delivery of a Destination Management Plan that incorporates the inner Melbourne region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Critical Tasks</th>
<th>Who Leads</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Partner With</th>
<th>Completed by</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Contribute to Destination Melbourne’s metro Destination management Plan project | - Confirm IMAP interest and involvement.  
- Confirm / negotiate budget.  
- Investigate the best delivery model.  
- Participation on the study working / steering group.  
- Work to achieve delivery of a Destination Management Plan. | CoM/ CoY       | Budget   | TBC (up to $50K) | TBC          | June 2016     | - Contribute to development of the plan  
- Delivery of the plan | - |
### Goal - Destination Development

**Strategy**
Connectivity & Amenity: Contribute to activities that improve the connectivity and amenity of Inner Melbourne

**Measure of Success**
- Visitors and locals perceive that Inner Melbourne is accessible and easy to navigate
- Our activities positively influence pedestrian flow, dispersal, and comfort
- Visitors and locals perceive that Inner Melbourne is welcoming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Critical Tasks</th>
<th>Who Leads</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Partner With</th>
<th>Completed by</th>
<th>KPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Undertake feasibility study for an Inner Melbourne tourist bus that connects key destinations within IMAP under one service | - Source consultant  
- Undertake study including demand modelling and stakeholder engagement  
- Report back to IMAP TWG  
- Decision to proceed | All | Consultant  
| | | | TBC  
| | | | $30k+  
| | | | NA  
| | | | June 2016 | | • Procure consultant  
| | | | | | • Gather data  
| | | | | | • Engage relevant stakeholders  
| | | | | | • Delivery of study | - |

Notes: -
### Criteria for Project Initiative Evaluation

- Mutually beneficial to all in IMAP TWG
- Only IMAP TWG can do – beneficial to undertake on a regional basis
- IMAP TWG can contribute/influence
- IMAP TWG adds value to visitors, council, industry
- Delivers on three year strategic plan
- Adds value/return on investment
- Evidence of demand and opportunity
- Within Budget
- Measurable
- Supports Visitor Journey cycle

### Project Scope for Initiatives

- Evaluation
- Evidence
- Alternatives
- Alignment to strategic plan
- Resources
- Identification of stakeholders
- Key performance indicators
- Communications plan

### Budget Summary for 2015-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to work with Destination Melbourne to produce a single visitor map for Inner Melbourne</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a feasibility study to identify the most efficient process for IMAP Councils to provide content for digital marketing platform</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to Destination Melbourne’s Melbourne metro Destination management Plan project</td>
<td>TBC – up to $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake feasibility study for an Inner Melbourne tourist bus that connects key destinations within IMAP under one service</td>
<td>TBC – $30,000+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMAP Implementation Committee

Progress Report – Melbourne Visitor Signage project

Strategy 11: Promote the inner Melbourne region as a tourist destination
Action 2.2: Coordinated pedestrian and public transport signage system

PURPOSE
1. To update IMAP Implementation Committee on the work of the Melbourne Visitor Signage Committee.

BACKGROUND
1. In 2012, the CEOs of the Melbourne Tourism Partnership\(^1\) established the Melbourne Visitor Signage Coordinating Committee\(^2\) to improve wayfinding signage used by visitors in Melbourne.
2. Improved wayfinding signage is expected to enhance the visitor experience as well ensure local businesses, attractions and precincts benefit from the visitor economy.
3. The committee’s work has drawn on the design principles and processes developed by Transport for London (TfL) when building the acclaimed Legible London pedestrian wayfinding system.

DISCUSSION
4. In April, TfL’s Programme Manager Legible London visited Melbourne for a 12-day program of meetings, workshops, presentations and on-site visits. The visit was jointly funded by the IMAP councils, City of Wyndham and PTV. Amongst other things, the Programme Manager reviewed the committee’s current work and provided advice on its future direction.
5. Following the TfL visit, the committee has structured its work into two streams:

6. Collaborative projects
6.1. Master Style Guide. The first draft of the guide will be completed by December 2015. The guide will outline an agreed approach to content: signing principles, eligibility and selection criteria, naming conventions, symbols and arrows, placement and location criteria, and ‘gateway’ signage.
6.2. Wayfinding signage redesign. IMAP councils and City of Wyndham will work together to design pedestrian wayfinding signs that are more visible; cheaper to produce, install and update; perform well environmentally; and carry a two-map system. A consistent design is expected to improve users’ journeys and deliver cost savings. PTV will participate in the design and prototyping process.
6.3. Pilot projects (North Melbourne, central city, Balaclava Station and Station Pier): an opportunity to link pedestrian and public transport signage systems, to explore shared signage infrastructure, and apply the content proposed in the draft style guide. Wyndham City Council is considering participating in the prototyping process.
6.4. Evaluation: the pilot projects are also an opportunity to test the new sign design, content and placement with users: to understand their wayfinding needs and to build a robust evaluation framework.

7. Strategic approach
7.1. Using free, open data, the proposal is to build a basemap of metropolitan Melbourne for use by councils for wayfinding signage and other purposes. The basemap would comprise agreed layers (including waterways, roads, streets, public transport, places and parks) and have an agreed design (colour palette, symbols, features, etc). Councils would be able to adapt and update the basemap in-house. A single basemap for Melbourne would provide consistency of information for visitors and could

\(^1\) City of Melbourne, Tourism Victoria, Victorian Major Events Company, Melbourne Convention Bureau, Public Transport Victoria and Destination Melbourne.

\(^2\) The committee comprises representatives of each of the Inner Melbourne councils, City of Wyndham, Public Transport Victoria (PTV), VicRoads and Tourism Victoria.
deliver cost savings. The proposal is to form a sub-committee of GIS staff to work with the committee to create the basemap - its layers, data sources, language, operation and design.

7.2. Commission a business case on the benefits of improved wayfinding signage in Melbourne. A workshop run in June by SGS Economics and Planning for the committee identified a number of potential benefits of improved, consistent wayfinding signage in Melbourne. These benefits include easier multi-modal journeys and improved health, economic, environmental, economies of scale and governance. Workshop participants proposed that CEOs of the member authorities meet with the state government to discuss undertaking formal Investment Logic Mapping (ILM) to test the need for further development of wayfinding signage in Melbourne. The ILM would define the presenting problems more precisely and scope solutions that might be worthy of government consideration.

RECOMMENDATION

8. That IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the report of the Coordinating Committee’s work, and endorse the strategic approach being proposed.
Purpose

1. To update the Committee on progress with the IMAP Review.

Background

2. Progress with the review of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan has been as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt project plan</td>
<td>Literature Review, Survey Analysis &amp; stats update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two workshops: staff and councillors</td>
<td>5 staff Reference Group workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Executive Forum re goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. At their meeting on 7 August with the IMAP Review Working Group, the IMAP Executive Forum’s decision was that the EF:

a. **endorses** the Draft Plan *(inclusive of any recommended amendments)*; and

b. **refers** the Draft Plan to the IMAP Implementation Committee for consideration; and

c. **recommends** the five member councils be briefed on the Draft Plan.

Development of performance indicators

4. Subsequently work has been undertaken to edit the document and develop performance indicators for consideration along with the draft plan.

Please find attached a first draft set of performance indicators for IMAP.

5. The consultants have not attempted to write ‘the definitive list of liveability indicators’ but rather have drafted indicators which relate to the specific outcomes set out in the draft IMAP strategy. The indicators are worded in a deliberately general way at this stage (ie ‘increase in the percentage of all trips undertaken by…’ as compared to ‘50% of all trips undertaken by…’).
6. It is suggested the IMAP councils start with this approach so that there can be agreement about:

   a. what is going to be measured and
   b. what the general direction of change is expected to be in relation to things like transport, affordable housing, greenhouse, etc.

   It is also suggested that, once the general indicators are agreed, then work can subsequently be done to embed targets in the indicators.

7. There are 28 indicators. This number could readily be expanded or contracted. Consideration has been given to draft measures that can actually be measured – however all of these will have a resource implication (someone has to collect, analyse and report on the data for the entire region). There are a few that will be challenging to measure – for example 2.4, 2.5, 4.5, 5.5; and some feedback is sought from the councils as to whether these should be included.

8. The IMAP councils will need to do more work on refining these performance indicators – to confirm what are the most important things to measure, to verify that it can be measured, and to ensure that a system/resources are put in place so that measurement actually occurs.

Next steps

9. The draft plan has been developed following initial guidelines from councillors and senior staff. It now requires the IMAP Implementation Committee to endorse the draft plan and recommend each of the IMAP councils be briefed on the contents of the plan through a round of Council Briefings.

10. Once general support for the plan from all five Council Briefings has been achieved, the draft can be finalised for open online consultation and returned to the Councils for their formal approval.

11. Formal approval from all partner councils is required before it can be returned to the IMAP Implementation Committee for implementation.

Recommendation

12. That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:

   a. **Endorse** the Draft Inner Melbourne Action Plan (*inclusive of any recommended amendments*); and
   b. **Recommend** the five member Councils be briefed on the Draft Plan.
   c. That the IMAP Implementation Committee note the current progress on the IMAP Review project.
IMAP – Performance Indicators *(FIRST DRAFT)*

**Goal 1 - A globally significant, strong and diverse economy.**

1.1 Increase in Inner Melbourne’s share of the nation’s knowledge economy (GDP, jobs and businesses)

1.2 Increase in the number of jobs and businesses engaged in the following sectors:
   - Health;
   - Education;
   - Medical research;
   - Creative industries ((advertising, architecture, arts, design, film and television, music, software development and electronic publishing);
   - Freight and logistics;
   - Tourism and retail;
   - Urban manufacturing;
   - Finance and commerce.

1.3 Increase in the number of visitors from interstate and overseas.

**Goal 2 - A connected transport network that provides real travel choices.**

2.1 Increase in the percentage of all trips undertaken by walking, cycling and public transport.

2.2 Activity centres, urban renewal precincts, employment and tourism nodes have direct access to frequent (<10 min frequency) public transport services.

2.3 Households and workplaces in inner Melbourne are within 400m of frequent (<10 minute) public transport services.

2.4 Reduction in through traffic volumes across inner Melbourne.

2.5 Reduction in the freight delivery costs per km across inner Melbourne *(alternative performance measures - delivery time, delivery cost, average vehicle speed, congestion, greenhouse gas emissions)*.

**Goal 3 - Diverse, vibrant, healthy and inclusive communities.**

3.1 Increase in the percentage of housing stock in inner Melbourne that is affordable to people on low-middle incomes.

3.2 Increase in the number of social housing units in inner Melbourne.

3.3 Increase in the provision of community services across inner Melbourne, including local or regional community centres, libraries, kindergartens, childcare centres, recreation facilities and open space.

3.4 Increase in the percentage of residents who live within 20 minutes (by public transport, walking or cycling) to regional open space, sport and recreation facilities, health and education facilities.

3.5 Increase in the percentage of residents who report feeling safe in their neighbourhood.

---

1 The measure affordable housing for low and moderate income households is housing costs that are less than 30% of income for metropolitan Melbourne households in the bottom 40% of household incomes.

2 The measure of provision of such services is: floor area per head of population for community centres, libraries and recreation facilities; floor area per infant/child for child care centres/kindergartens, and; area of open space per head of population for open space.

*Report prepared by:* Elissa McElroy, IMAP Executive Officer
3.6 Decrease in the number of crime offences recorded across inner Melbourne.

Goal 4 - Distinctive, high quality neighbourhoods and places.

4.1 Increase in the total amount of public open space across inner Melbourne.

4.2 Increase in the percentage of residents and workers who can access open space within 400m from their place of residence or work.

4.3 Increase in the amount of stormwater that is captured, treated and reused across Inner Melbourne.

4.4 Maintenance of pedestrian amenity across all streets and public spaces across inner Melbourne (*very difficult to monitor and measure*)

4.5 Creation of urban renewal precincts that have direct access to public transport services, local open space, convenience shops, leisure, health and community services.

4.6 Increase in the capacity and accessibility of major public event spaces and cultural/sporting precincts across inner Melbourne.

Goal 5 - Leadership in achieving environmental sustainability and climate change adaptation.

5.1 Reduction in the consumption of potable water across Inner Melbourne.

5.2 Reduction in stormwater runoff volumes and the associated loads of pollutants in waterways.

5.3 Reduction in greenhouse gas emissions associated with activities in Inner Melbourne.

5.4 New commercial and residential buildings are designed to achieve a minimum environmental rating.

5.5 Existing commercial and residential buildings are being rapidly retrofitted to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions.

5.6 A significant amount of the building energy consumed in Inner Melbourne is sourced from renewable energy sources.
DRAFT (AUGUST 2015)

Inner Melbourne Action Plan
Making Melbourne More Liveable
Preamble

“The map of our urban futures is a source of optimism and anxiety, excitement and reflection, vision and uncertainty. As this century of cities evolves, the essential requirements of city competitiveness, those of growth, skills, enterprise and trade have now been coupled with the need for sustainability, resilience and liveability; transparency and governance; innovation, culture, distinctiveness, and adaptability, amongst the many more qualities that we demand of the city in order to shelter, entertain, inspire and encourage us.”

The ability of cities to attract investment, manage their growth, and deliver quality of life will define the character and ultimately the success of the ‘metropolitan century’.

Rosemary Feenan, Head of Global Research Programmes, JLL Cities Research Centre; and Greg Clark, Chairman: The Business of Cities 2015

Melbourne – a liveable city
Liveability, in its broadest sense, refers to the sum of the factors that add up to a community’s ‘quality of life’. Liveable communities are regarded as safe, attractive, socially cohesive and inclusive, and environmentally sustainable, with affordable and diverse housing linked via public transport, walking, and cycling to employment, education, public open space, local shops, health and community services, and leisure and cultural opportunities.

For some years, Melbourne has remained at or near the top of the globally significant league table of ‘world’s most liveable cities’. It is clear that Melbourne’s liveability starts from a high base, and undoubtedly has exemplary characteristics and investments that realise ‘liveable city’ attributes. However, it cannot support liveability in the longer term while it remains one of the world’s highest CO2 emitters per capita. All tiers of government, corporations and the private sector have a definitive responsibility to support initiatives to deliver a low carbon society.

The challenge for the inner Melbourne region is to maintain the liveability whilst accommodating high levels of growth. The Inner Melbourne Councils need to collaborate to both anticipate and respond to the changes that lie ahead. Managing the delivery of physical, social and environmental infrastructure for inner Melbourne under increasing growth and demographic change requires new and innovative models which maximise efficiencies in land use, design and cost of services, and respond to changing community expectations.

Respecting Inner Melbourne’s established urban structure and character
Melbourne is a constantly evolving city. New enterprises, transformative land uses, emerging technologies, and incremental urban renewal are reshaping substantial areas across the inner city.

Twenty-first-century inner Melbourne retains the ‘subtle layering’ of many of its formative 19th century characteristics. This includes established residential neighbourhoods, valued heritage places, and urban structure comprised of ‘main streets’, local streets and laneways. Many architectural eras have been preserved within this structure, and within a sequence of larger and smaller public spaces that tie it all together.

This enduring urban structure comprises remarkably stable precincts that interact to create the region’s familiar yet distinctive features, giving inner Melbourne its special character, authenticity and significance. These consistent architectural, social and cultural patterns make inner Melbourne internationally recognisable, and this identity continues to influence the activities, development and people’s perception and enjoyment of the city. These prevailing characteristics include:

• The fine grain of the inner urban subdivision pattern which provides a highly walkable intricate structure that subtly contrasts with larger scale elements, such as the major park systems and bays;

---

1 How Liveable is Melbourne? Conceptualising and testing urban liveability indicators, Research Paper 3, Badland et al, McCaughey VicHealth Community Wellbeing Unit, February 2015
2 Measured through the Mercer Quality of Living Survey and the Economist Intelligence Unit’s Liveability Survey
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• Major streets and boulevards which set up the valuable proximities between the city centre, rivers, public parks, streets and activity centres that are essential components of Melbourne’s connectivity;

• ‘High streets’ along local transport spines which support diverse and distinctive strip development with retail, commercial and service activities, providing a framework for co-existing, mixed use economic and social activity and access throughout the region;

• Local streets and laneways that are significant for their varying orientation, scale and complexity on a local basis, and which further subdivide the street blocks, providing more frontages to smaller properties and a finer grain of access routes;

• A diverse architectural legacy comprising both heritage precincts and contemporary urban developments;

• A network of activity centres supported by transport routes that form the focus for more intense activity and greater development density, enabling the ‘green suburbs’ behind them to retain much of their characteristic streetscapes and scale;

• The expansive parks and gardens which are renowned for their environmental integrity, scale and diversity, landscape character and recreational provision; and

• The waterfronts of Port Phillip Bay and Hobson’s Bay and the Yarra River and Maribyrnong River corridors, now treasured for their civic-oriented frontages and recreational assets.

**Inner Melbourne – Planning for the next decade and beyond.**

Inner Melbourne’s fantastic physical, economic, cultural and social attributes will need to be adapted as the city faces ongoing growth. The city structure, its infrastructure and its people will need to be highly resilient both to the pressures of higher urban densities and to changing social, economic and environmental circumstances. For the inner city region to maintain and improve its world-renowned ‘liveability, it will be necessary to:

• Deliver supportive social infrastructure for urban growth;

• Direct urban consolidation around transportation networks, and increasing capacity and connections;

• Develop a sustainable public realm that supports more intensively inhabited and mixed-use environments;

• Work together to manage transitions in the regional economy; and

• Ensure that development is undertaken from the perspective of creating great places, with strong identity, local economies and diverse, connected communities;

By taking actions that are both creative and integrated across the inner Melbourne region, we will be able to preserve, repair and create new urban forms and activities that strengthen inner Melbourne’s character, economy and society.

---

3 Modified extracts from *Liveable, Walkable Melbourne*, 2006
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1.0 About IMAP

1.1 What is the Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP)?

The Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) is unique in bringing local councils and government stakeholders together to develop and deliver regionally based actions. The municipalities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Stonnington, Yarra and Maribyrnong are the partner Councils that make up the membership of the IMAP group.

IMAP sets out five goals that the inner Melbourne Councils have collectively agreed need to be realised to:

- improve inner Melbourne’s liveability;
- respond to the challenges of rapid growth; and
- ensure Melbourne continues to be an internationally renowned, global city.

IMAP seeks to respond to the long term directions set out in the State Government’s Metropolitan Planning Strategy, Plan Melbourne. Whilst IMAP has a particular focus on actions that can be completed within the next 5-10 years, the goals set out in this plan are necessarily ones which will take a longer timeframe to be fully realised.

The first Inner Melbourne Action Plan was adopted by IMAP members in December 2005. Through the structure of the IMAP Implementation Committee, a special committee established under section 86 of the Local Government Act, the five councils have worked together to pursue a range of actions aimed at making Melbourne more liveable.

This new Action Plan was prepared by the IMAP Councils in 2015, following a review of the previous plan and taking into account the significant changes to the social, economic, environmental and policy context that have occurred since IMAP was first created a decade ago, together with consideration of the likely challenges and opportunities facing the region in the coming decades.

The overall vision of this Plan is to make the inner Melbourne region more liveable. This plan sets out a series of outcomes that the IMAP Council believe will need to be achieved in order for this goal to be realised. The plan sets out five goals and twenty seven strategies all of which are geared towards realising the vision and outcomes. The IMAP Councils will vigorously pursue these strategies over the coming decade, as well as advocating with one voice on common issues facing inner Melbourne.

IMAP principally focuses on regional actions that deliver agreed regional outcomes. Through IMAP, each stakeholder is expected to receive benefits that they could not achieve by acting alone. Elements of the IMAP program will rely on partnerships with the State Government, government agencies or private providers of public services such as public transport companies. This collaborative approach will continue to challenge existing structures of government, administration and resourcing arrangements.

IMAP’s partnership approach builds on the existing goodwill between inner Melbourne Councils and other stakeholders who are all collectively working to ensure Melbourne responds positively to the challenges of growth and improving the quality of life for residents, workers and visitors alike.
1.2 What area does IMAP cover?

The IMAP area covers the municipalities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Yarra, Stonnington and Maribyrnong. It is aligned with the Central Melbourne subregion identified in Plan Melbourne (refer figure 1).

Figure 1 – The IMAP region.
2.0 The Metropolitan Policy Context

2.1 State Government Policies

Melbourne’s metropolitan plan (Plan Melbourne) sets out the longer term directions for the future growth of our city. It is a ‘whole of government’ plan that is intended to set the agenda for the forward planning of all of government programs and services, as well as set priorities for state investment.

Plan Melbourne provides an overarching framework which will be given effect through a variety of means such as:

- Determining state priorities for infrastructure investment (for example the ‘Getting On With It’ infrastructure program);
- Providing overall direction to all State government departments and agencies for their forward planning and budget prioritisation purposes;
- Providing an overarching spatial framework to guide how all metropolitan planning schemes should facilitate changes on land use and development across the city;
- Providing direction for the use of government owned land and co-ordination of urban renewal programs;
- Establishing sub-regions of Local Government to work with the State to help drive delivery of the plan.

Plan Melbourne foreshadows significant population and economic growth in central Melbourne in the coming decades. It identifies congestion, affordability, accessibility and climate change as amongst the greatest and increasing pressures facing the entire city, especially central Melbourne.

The Central subregion of Melbourne (i.e. the IMAP region) is expected to accommodate at least one million jobs and one million people over the next 40 years, and Plan Melbourne emphasises the importance of getting the planning of this central region right:

‘To ensure Melbourne’s expanded central city becomes Australia’s largest business centre, we will need to connect, manage and grow the existing and emerging high-density, mixed-use neighbourhoods within the Central Subregion. This subregion warrants a specific approach in order to capture benefits from agglomeration, while at the same time managing the costs of growth.

These neighbourhoods, although clearly distinct from each other and from the central city, form a key part of the Central Subregion and are an essential part of the ‘Melbourne experience’ for visitors and locals.4

The key elements of Plan Melbourne that have shaped the priorities of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan are set out below:

Delivering jobs and investment.

Plan Melbourne supports a concentration of jobs and economic productivity in central Melbourne via expansion of the central city and development of employment nodes in:

---

• The Parkville national employment cluster;
• A series of health and education precincts,
• The Footscray Metropolitan Activity Centre;
• The Port of Melbourne, and;
• The state-significant Western industrial precinct.

Housing choice and affordability.

Plan Melbourne promotes the following housing outcomes:
• High density housing across an expanded Capital City Zone as well as substantial new housing in urban-renewal precincts, activity centres, employment clusters and near railway stations.
• Improving the quality and amenity of residential apartments;
• Delivering ‘world’s best’ urban renewal;
• Increasing housing choices for older people, families and key workers by facilitating growth in the social housing sector;
• Accelerating investment in affordable housing.

A more connected Melbourne.

Plan Melbourne identifies the creation of sufficient commuter capacity on public transport and road networks as a significant challenge for Melbourne’s transportation system. It identifies that public transport will continue to be the best means of getting increasing numbers of people to work and other activities in the central city.

The following outcomes are promoted in Plan Melbourne:
• Moving towards a metro-style rail system;
• Improving tram travel times, capacity and reliability;
• Extending the tram network into urban renewal areas;
• Strengthening bus services in and around central Melbourne;
• Maintaining freight and logistics capacity, whilst balancing this with the need to protect local amenity and liveability;
• Supporting walking and cycling in central Melbourne;
• Strategic removal of level crossings;
• Making neighbourhoods pedestrian-friendly;
• Creating a network of high quality cycle links.

Liveable Communities and Neighbourhoods.

Plan Melbourne emphasises the quality of our city’s buildings, streets and places as essential components of Melbourne’s liveability. It promotes:

• Creation of neighbourhoods in which a range of local services may be accessed within 20 minutes of home;
• Creation of more public open spaces, and increased vegetation cover - particularly in suburbs that are expected to experience population growth;
• Protection of Melbourne’s heritage urban character and waterways;
• Strengthening the City’s cultural and architectural identity, including boulevards, cultural and sporting precincts;
• Planning for social infrastructure to meet the needs of growing communities.

Environment and Water.

Plan Melbourne seeks to transform Melbourne into a more sustainable city. The following outcomes are promoted in Plan Melbourne:

• The protection and restoration of biodiversity values;
• Protecting the waterways and Port Phillip Bay;
• Integrating whole-of-water-cycle management into urban development;
• Reducing energy consumption and transitioning to clean energy.
2.2 The local policy context.

Each Council-member of IMAP works within a common integrated planning framework which has the following elements:

The Council Plan (including a strategic resources plan) – A four-year plan that sets the outcomes that Council aims to achieve during its electoral term, and the resources that are required to achieve these outcomes.

The Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS) – Part of the municipal planning scheme, the MSS sets the strategic land use planning objectives for the municipality. The MSS must give effect to State planning policy (including Plan Melbourne) and provides the broad local policy basis for making decisions under a planning scheme. It also provides the strategic basis for the application of zones, overlays and particular provisions in the municipal planning scheme.

The Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan – A municipal plan which outlines action to prevent or minimise public health dangers, as well as to enable people living in the municipality to achieve maximum health and wellbeing.

Other strategic plans and policies – Each council prepares a suite of plans and policies that are specific to a particular service, neighbourhood and/or local priority. These might take the form of a local structure plan, a
plan for specific infrastructure (open space or cycling for example) or a specific service plan (youth or aged care for example).

**Annual budgets** – Each municipality is required to prepare and adopt an annual plan and budget which describes the services, initiatives and major initiatives to be funded including service performance outcome indicators for monitoring performance.

**Annual reports**: The annual report outlines the council’s performance for the year as measured against the council plan and budget.

(*A number of IMAP councils also have a Community Plan which takes an even longer term view of the municipality and its priorities. Such plans describe the community’s longer term vision and aspirations and these plans are used to inform priorities in the Council’s short and medium term planning and budgeting processes.*)

The Inner Melbourne Action Plan sits alongside and complements this local planning framework. These various local plans will inform, and be informed by the activities of IMAP over time. For example, the IMAP program relies upon resources allocated by each Council through its planning and budgeting process, and in turn the outcomes of the IMAP project are given effect through subsequent actions via budget decisions, planning scheme amendments, etc.
3.0 Our Challenges – Protecting and enhancing inner Melbourne’s liveability

Managing the impacts of population growth and urban renewal across the Inner Melbourne region will be the single biggest challenge facing inner Melbourne over the coming decades.

Inner Melbourne is expected to accommodate at least one million jobs and one million people over the next 40 years. Managing this growth in a manner that enables our city to function efficiently whilst also protecting and enhancing its liveability will require the following to be addressed:

- Improving the diversity, design and affordability of housing across the region;
- Improving public transport, walking and cycling, reducing congestion and the impact of freight activities;
- Achieving a thriving, resilient and sustainable economy that is competitive on a global scale.
- Fostering jobs and investment in the knowledge economy and creative industry sectors, and in activity centres outside the CBD;
- Promoting Melbourne’s tertiary sector to overseas students;
- Encouraging visitors to the region;
- Increasing the provision of health, education and community infrastructure to meet future demand;
- Enhancing quality of life and wellbeing of residents and workers in inner Melbourne – via means such as community support programs, sport and recreation, arts and culture;
- Planning for diverse and changing community needs – including young adults, older residents, people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, etc.;
- Protecting, enhancing and funding improvements to open spaces and the public realm;
- Tackling environmental sustainability and climate change adaptation.
4.0 Our Vision

Inner Melbourne will continue to improve its internationally-renowned liveability whilst responding to the challenges of rapid growth. This will be achieved by promoting the following goals:

- A globally significant, strong and diverse economy;
- A connected transport network that provides real travel choices;
- Diverse, vibrant, healthy and inclusive communities;
- Distinctive, high quality neighbourhoods and places;
- Leadership in achieving environmental sustainability and climate change adaptation.

5.0 Our Mission

The IMAP Implementation Committee and their respective Councils will pursue the following mission to achieve IMAP’s vision and goals:

- We will have one voice in respect to our shared priorities and projects.
- We will pursue projects of regional scale and significance.
- We will undertake research and development on issues facing our region.
- We will share resources.
5.1 How we will achieve our Mission and Goals

The IMAP Councils have a clear vision and goals that we want to achieve for inner Melbourne to both respond to growth challenges and enhance the social economic and environmental wellbeing of the inner Melbourne community. We will achieve this mission and goals by working together and with others.

We will advocate for a range of actions including:

- Developing progressive urban renewal strategies that address the liveability outcomes set out in this plan;
- Enhancing the transport system so that it meets the access and mobility needs of residents, workers and visitors;
- Improving a range of State and Federal government policies, legislation, funding, programs and services.

We will collaborate to deliver strategies, policies and regional scale projects that benefit inner Melbourne. By working together and with others, the IMAP Councils can bring together considerable collective expertise to undertake projects that benefit the whole of inner Melbourne in an efficient and cost-effective way. This will occur in a number of ways, including:

- Preparing regional plans on capital investment issues that cross municipal boundaries – for example community and recreational services, wayfinding, walking, cycling, public transport, waterways, open space networks, etc.;
- Establishing common planning and design standards for a range of land use, transport, community, economic and environmental issues. This will be particularly important in relation to ensuring that the potential benefits of urban renewal are achieved;
- Creating pilot projects to test new ideas and ways of doing things – trying new ideas and sharing our knowledge.

We will undertake research and development initiatives and gather data that will improve how we understand, plan, and manage the inner city. We will partner with State and Federal Government, Universities and other research organisations in this pursuit. This work will challenge current practices as well as create efficiencies and reduce duplication across organisations. It will also enable new ideas and initiatives to be incubated, to the benefit of not only inner Melbourne but other Councils and regions.

We will share resources. This will occur in a number of ways, including:

- Creating common research platforms, ‘think tanks’, data sets and monitoring programs for a range of economic, social and environmental indicators. This could range from extending the Census of Land use and Employment (CLUE) through to data capture on issues such as environmental trends, housing and homelessness; and combining to monitor community opinion, etc.;
- Identifying regional delivery models that could be utilised by the partner Councils
- Exploring opportunities for IMAP Councils to improve efficiency and reduce duplication through sharing staff, systems, facilities, programs and services.
6.0 How we would like inner Melbourne to be in ten years’ time?

The IMAP Councils will pursue strategies which contribute towards improving the liveability of inner Melbourne over the coming decade. We will strive to help realise the following outcomes for inner Melbourne:

**GOAL 1**
A globally significant, strong and diverse economy.

Inner Melbourne has a growing 'knowledge economy' sector which is of international significance.

(Refer Strategy 1.1)

A series of distinct and specialist economic clusters operate across inner Melbourne making a significant contribution to the nation's GDP and intellectual capital.

(Refer Strategy 1.2)

Inner Melbourne is internationally recognised as one of the world’s best tourism and major events destinations

(Refer Strategy 1.3 and 1.4)

**GOAL 2**
A connected transport network that provides real travel choices.

The growth in Inner Melbourne is supported by the delivery of transport infrastructure that increases accessibility, supports sustainable travel behaviour and is integrated with urban development.

(Refer Strategy 2.1)

The public transport network is modernised and integrated together to maximise people’s ability to access opportunities across Inner Melbourne.

(Refer Strategy 2.2)

Inner Melbourne is an internationally renowned cycling and walking region that is well connected by a network of convenient, comfortable, safe and direct walking and bike riding routes.

(Refer Strategy 2.3 and 2.4)

The impact of through traffic on Inner Melbourne’s road network has been substantially reduced.

(Refer Strategy 2.5 , 2.6)

Freight movements are confined to a discrete network of routes which accommodates growing freight needs without the need to travel on the broader road-based transport network, particularly residential neighbourhoods.

(Refer Strategy 2.7)
GOAL 3
Diverse, vibrant, healthy and inclusive communities.

The supply of affordable housing has increased substantially in inner Melbourne.
(Refer Strategy 3.1)

Apartments and all new/refurbished homes in inner Melbourne offer high quality, environmentally sustainable and diverse housing options.
(Refer Strategy 3.2)

Community infrastructure, open space, regional sporting and recreation facilities and services have been substantially enhanced and developed to meet the needs of a rapidly growing resident and working population.
(Refer Strategy 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5)

Residents, workers and visitors in inner Melbourne report a strong sense of safety, health and social connection and inclusion.
(Refer Strategy 3.6)

GOAL 4
Distinctive, high quality neighbourhoods and places.

Inner Melbourne enjoys an enhanced, integrated, high quality public space network that builds on the region's open space legacy, creates social connections and access to nature and serves the growing population.
(Refer Strategy 4.1)

Inner Melbourne's enhanced network of park, public spaces and streets provide an essential element of the inner city's sustainability and liveability.
(Refer Strategy 4.2)

New urban development across inner Melbourne sets benchmarks for its design quality, innovation, contribution to the public realm and its high standard of amenity that is internationally recognised.
(Refer Strategy 4.3 and 4.4)

Inner Melbourne's major public spaces and waterfront destinations project a positive and distinctive image of inner Melbourne, are well designed to accommodate significant visitation and major events and are well served by transport infrastructure that connects them into the city.
(Refer Strategy 4.5)

Inner Melbourne's existing heritage fabric and distinctive precincts have been protected and enhanced to contribute to a strong sense of place and identity for the region.
(Refer Strategy 4.6)

GOAL 5
Leadership in achieving environmental sustainability and climate change adaptation.

Inner Melbourne is a 'water sensitive' city with substantial reduction in potable water consumption and substantially improved quality of water entering our waterways.
(Refer Strategy 5.1 and 5.2)

Inner Melbourne is a national leader in achieving greenhouse gas emission reductions, with average emissions across the region reduced each year.
(Refer Strategy 5.3 and 5.4)

The inner Melbourne community is resilient to the impacts of climate change.
(Refer Strategy 5.5)
7.0 Governance

7.1 The IMAP implementation framework

Implementation of IMAP is overseen by a special purpose ‘IMAP Implementation Committee’, supported by an Executive Forum, working groups and project teams. The focus of this Committee is to oversee the implementation of the IMAP, so that the five member-councils can effectively collaborate to pursue agreed goals and outcomes. This model will result in a sharing of leadership, expertise and resources, as well as significantly reducing duplication of effort across the region.

7.1.1 The IMAP Implementation Committee

The Committee meets regularly to provide a coordinated decision-making process to facilitate the implementation of IMAP. The Committee comprises an elected member and senior executive from each of the 5 Councils. It provides:

- Regional decision-making necessary to implement agreed IMAP actions, which is binding on the member Councils; and
- Impetus for the coordination and commitment of all partner organisations; and
- Prioritisation, review, budgeting and approval of actions that relate to the Goals and Strategies in IMAP.

The IMAP Implementation Committee has established a rolling three year program of actions (i.e. the IMAP Implementation Plan) which it reviews annually.

Information on IMAP Councils’ annual funding contributions and staff resourcing requirements for specific IMAP working groups and project teams will be provided to the IMAP Councils for inclusion in Council Annual Plans. This is to ensure the IMAP Councils make provision for this work in their staff work programs and budgets. It also ensures that expenditure is monitored and reported through Annual Reports.

7.1.2 The IMAP Executive Forum

The Executive Forum is made up of senior executives from each of the IMAP Councils. The role of the Executive Forum is to assist the Committee through determining the annual priorities program; overseeing project financing and project review and any governance matters as required.

---

5 The Cities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Stonnington, Yarra and Maribyrnong have each set up identically constituted special committees, in accordance with the Local Government Act 1989.
This implementation framework is summarised by the diagram below.

**IMAP Governance**

**Reporting**
- Five Inner Melbourne Councils
- Minister for Planning – Plan Melbourne
- Metropolitan Planning Authority / Regional Management Forums

**Leadership**
- IMAP Executive Forum
- Mayors Forum
- State Government and Agencies: Partnerships/Engagement

**Management**
- Section 86 Special Committees: "IMAP Implementation Committee"
  - 5 Councillor reps
  - 5 Senior Officer reps
  - Associate Partner reps

**Coordination/Project Management**
- IMAP Executive Officer
- Working Groups (for each of the 5 Goals)
- Project Teams

**Monitoring/Resourcing**
- Council Annual Plans/Annual Reports
7.2 IMAP Working Groups and Project Teams

Working Groups will be established for each of the five goals of the IMAP vision to oversee their progressive implementation.

These Working Groups will be the caretakers of each goal in the IMAP plan, and they will be responsible for:

- Providing peer/technical support to the IMAP Implementation Committee in developing and delivering IMAP actions.
- Identifying and prioritising potential projects and/or actions for consideration by the IMAP Implementation Committee. This will include preparation of business cases for specific projects and/or actions for consideration by the IMAP Executive Forum and the IMAP Implementation Committee. Each business case will be assessed against the project criteria set out in this Plan (refer overleaf).
- Delivering projects and actions agreed to by the IMAP Implementation Committee as part of its annual business plan and rolling 3 year plan.
- Forming smaller Project Teams to enable greater focus on specific projects and actions, identifying and exploiting potential external partnerships, funding opportunities etc. that might arise from time to time that might be capitalised upon in the pursuit of the IMAP vision and goals.
- Establishing working partnerships with external agencies as agreed by the IMAP Implementation Committee as part of its endorsement of the business plan.
- Preparing annual (and “as required”) reports on progress towards realising the goal and its associated strategies;

The ongoing involvement and oversight by a Working Group of experts from across the IMAP councils, addressing a particular goal, has proven to be an effective approach under the previous IMAP. It ensures relevant and innovative projects can be identified over time within the broad parameters provided by the IMAP goals and strategies. This enables the plan to remain current and provides flexibility while still addressing IMAP’s priorities.

This approach will be adopted across all Goals in this plan. The strategies contained in this plan reflect a number of ideas that have been suggested for future IMAP work. The development of detailed actions to implement these strategies will be the responsibility of each Working Group.
7.3 Selecting future IMAP projects

7.3.1 Project Criteria

The IMAP Implementation Committee will prepare an annual action plan each year as part of its rolling Three Year Implementation Program. This plan will be endorsed by the Committee in November of the preceding year, so that the budget and resource implications of the plan can be considered by each member Council (and by external funding parties) as part of their own business planning and budgeting process.

Each IMAP working group will submit business cases for proposed IMAP projects and actions for consideration by the IMAP Executive Forum and IMAP Implementation Committee. Each business case will be assessed against the following project criteria:
PROJECT CRITERIA

ALIGNMENT

Alignment with the IMAP vision -
• Will the strategy/action demonstrably enhance the liveability of inner Melbourne by delivering the defined outcomes?
• Does the strategy/action align with potential programs and/or funding opportunities within the state or federal government, or elsewhere?

Regional benefit -
• Will the strategy/action’s benefits accrue to a broader region (i.e. more than just one local authority)?
• Is there sufficient agreement amongst the IMAP members to undertake the strategy/action?

DELIVERABILITY

Shared resources -
• Are there opportunities for resource sharing and/or economies of scale?

Innovation and Leadership -
• Does the strategy/action present opportunities to find new or better ways to address issues/challenges facing inner Melbourne?
• Does the strategy/action advance broader community understanding about making cities more liveable?

Focus on results -
• Can the expected results of the strategy/action be clearly defined?

Timeliness -
• Can the desired result be achieved within a 5-10 year period?

VALUE

Effectiveness -
• Do the expected outcomes warrant the expected investment of time and resources?

Value add -
• Does the strategy/action overlap or duplicate other strategies/actions being undertaken elsewhere?
• Can the strategies/actions be incorporated into each Council’s Annual Plan

7.3.2 Business case template

A standard business case template will be used for proposing IMAP projects, and it will address the following:
• Alignment with IMAP Strategy;
• Investment logic analysis (eg what are the problems, benefits, potential strategic responses and solutions)
• Project scope, cost & timeframe;
• Funding sources;
• Sponsor organisation & potential partners;
• Assessment against IMAP project criteria;
• Recommendation.
7.4 Monitoring and reporting on Liveability Indicators.

The IMAP outcomes, strategies and associated programs will be monitored and reported to the IMAP Implementation Committee on an annual basis.

IMAP will work with the State Government to develop and collate data against a set of ‘liveability’ performance measures in order to be able to measure progress towards the achievement of the IMAP Vision and outcomes.

These measures will be selected to enable monitoring and evaluating community wellbeing and liveability, with a view to the measures helping to inform service delivery within the Inner Melbourne region.
8.0 Our Plan – Goals, Outcomes and Strategies.
ECONOMY
Goal 1 - A globally significant, strong and diverse economy.

The context

Inner Melbourne makes a major contribution to the Victorian and national economy6. It is a major destination for tourists and visitors, and it possesses many of the key infrastructure and organisations that characterise a ‘knowledge city’ with the support of appropriate secondary industries and services to enable it to function and develop. This includes seven universities located within the inner region, together with a range of specialist research facilities. Inner Melbourne has recognised strengths in fields such as advanced manufacturing, biotechnology, creative industries, event management, financial services, healthcare, higher education, information communication, technology and sustainability7.

Promoting and strengthening this knowledge sector that has developed in inner Melbourne will benefit the whole of the Melbourne and Victorian economy.

Melbourne is developing a global reputation as a knowledge city, which in turn is expected to attract more students, teachers, researchers, professionals and specialists to live, work, and network in the city. Entrepreneurs and businesses are expected to be attracted to Inner Melbourne in order to capitalise on the knowledge created, leading to the growth of existing businesses and the creation of new ones. However, the realisation of these benefits is dependent on Melbourne being recognised locally, nationally and internationally as a knowledge city.

Inner Melbourne’s already strong ‘creative industry’ sector includes architecture, arts and culture, design, film and television, music, software development and electronic publishing enterprises. A wide variety of creative industries and urban manufacturing businesses have successfully established in inner Melbourne. These enterprises not only support local artists, niche producers, service providers and entrepreneurs, but they showcase inner Melbourne and the business opportunities available here. The existence of these enterprises is an important source of employment and competitive strength for Victoria. The creative industries sector requires nurturing and support in order to continue to thrive in inner Melbourne.

The tourism industry contributes significantly to the Victorian economy, as well as providing employment opportunities and contributing to the region’s cultural vibrancy. International visitors cite inner Melbourne as one of the top ten tourist destinations in the world because of its evolving calendar of world-class events and attractions8, ease of access, atmosphere and culture. Nearly one-fifth of all Victorians employed in the tourism industry work in inner Melbourne, and in 2006, four out of every ten tourist dollars in Victoria was spent in inner Melbourne.

The retail and hospitality sector makes a substantial contribution to Melbourne’s reputation as a vibrant, richly diverse and welcoming city. These sectors alone comprised 10% of the City of Melbourne’s $86.7 billion economy in 20129. The urban form of inner Melbourne already has many of the attributes that attract tourists as well as knowledge workers and ‘the creative class’; a vibrant and diverse street life; compact, distinctive and authentic neighbourhoods with a diversity of buildings; a finely meshed street pattern; diverse retail precincts and pedestrian-friendly public spaces.

---

6 cite reference
7 cite reference
8 The City of Melbourne’s Knowledge City Strategy defines knowledge cities as ‘urban areas that base their ability to create wealth on the generation and exchange of ideas and the leveraging of knowledge networks. They are cities in which both the private and public sectors value and nurture knowledge, invest in supporting knowledge dissemination and discovery (i.e. learning and innovation) and harness knowledge to create products and services that add value and contribute to prosperity’ (Page 4, City of Melbourne., Knowledge City Strategy., 2014-18).
9 ACIL Tasman., City of Melbourne knowledge sector study – final report., February 2013
10 cite reference
11 cite reference
Melbourne’s historic buildings and urban environment is a key factor in its attractiveness to visitors and to its cultural and creative vitality. It has evolved into one of Australia’s cultural hotspots because of its distinctive architecture, as well as its art, restaurants, bars and music scene.

Some precincts in inner Melbourne are already well established with a specialist ‘knowledge economy’ focus (Parkville and Carlton for instance) and others are emerging (Fisherman’s Bend, Arden Macaulay, Cremorne and others). These locations will be the focus for urban renewal and economic development over coming decades.

**How Inner Melbourne will be different in 10 years’ time**

*Inner Melbourne has a growing ‘knowledge economy’ sector which is of international significance.*

Inner Melbourne’s share of the nation’s knowledge economy jobs and businesses has grown and is of national and international significance. It will have recognisable strengths in the ‘creative industry’ sector, including advertising, architecture, arts, design, film and television, music, software development and electronic publishing.

(Refer Strategy 1.1)

*A series of distinct and specialist economic clusters operate across inner Melbourne making a significant contribution to the nation’s GDP and intellectual capital.*

Inner Melbourne has a series of specialist economic clusters, with a focus on industry sectors such as health, education, medical research, freight and logistics, tourism and retail, creative industries, urban manufacturing, finance and commerce.

Each of the distinct specialist economic precincts in inner Melbourne is prosperous and growing by capitalising on the competitive strengths of its location and workforce.

(Refer Strategy 1.2)

*Inner Melbourne is internationally recognised as one of the world’s best tourism and major events destinations.*

Inner Melbourne offers a series of diverse and well-connected shopping and entertainment precincts that are world-renowned for their quality and vitality. The region produces a world-class events calendar which provides residents and visitors with opportunities to experience an expansive offering of ‘Melbourne life’ right across the inner region. Inner Melbourne’s entertainment precincts are regarded by visitors as safe, accessible, interesting and vibrant places.

(Refer Strategy 1.3 and 1.4)
Strategies to achieve this goal.

Strategy 1.1 We will work with others to foster growth in job rich 'knowledge economy' and creative industry sectors in inner Melbourne.

The following industry sectors will be a focus for research, promotion and development:

- advanced manufacturing;
- biotechnology;
- creative and design industries;
- education;
- financial and professional services;
- health;
- information and communication technology;
- research and science;
- retail and entertainment.

Strategy 1.2 We will work with others to promote public and private sector investment in a range of specialist economic clusters across Inner Melbourne.

The following locations will be a focus for promotion and development:

- Parkville, Victoria St (Fitzroy) – Health, education and medical research;
- Arden-Macaulay, Fisherman’s Bend, Tottenham, other - Urban manufacturing;
- Port of Melbourne – Freight and logistics;
- Cremorne, South Melbourne, Gipps St, Arden Macaulay - Creative industries;
- CBD, activity centres, other - Tourism and retail;
- CBD, Docklands, St Kilda Road - Finance and commerce.

We will undertake planning and development in each precinct so that it has the physical and social infrastructure necessary to support existing and emerging business clusters. Improving the quality transport choices and creating a high standard of urban amenity will be a priority in most of these locations.

Other opportunities include:

- Delivery of a joint regional program of key note speakers and networking events which build on Melbourne’s brand as a knowledge city.
- Investigating mechanisms to prevent residential development from replacing commercial activity in mixed use and renewal areas and ensure affordable spaces for micro and start up businesses.

Strategy 1.3 We will market inner Melbourne as a world-class tourism destination, and promote visitation across the region.

Opportunities include:

- Strengthening IMAP’s existing partnership with tourism organisations to promote the region;
- Raising the profile of inner Melbourne’s Tourism and its economic contribution and potential for the State;
- Leveraging visitation from major events;
- Increase advance marketing of inner Melbourne internationally;
- Leveraging Melbourne’s global reputation as a knowledge city.
Strategy 1.4  We will work to ensure that Inner Melbourne’s activity centres and entertainment precincts are regarded by visitors as safe, accessible and vibrant places.

Opportunities include:

• Creating an annual calendar of events across the region that attracts higher visitation to entertainment precincts across the year;
• Working with businesses, residents and police to improve the safety (and perceptions of safety) within entertainment precincts;
• Working with public transport operators to improve late-night public transport choices within entertainment precincts;
• Undertake research into the future of retailing (particularly high street retailing) and develop programs with local business to improve the retail performance of inner city activity centres;
• Improving visitor information and way-finding to and within precincts.
Goal 2 - A connected transport network that provides real travel choices.

The context

The IMAP region forms an integral part of the Melbourne transport network; it comprises not only a major point of trip origin and destination but it also accommodates significant through movements of traffic, public transport and freight.

The community’s travel patterns and choice of mode to and from inner Melbourne have changed significantly over the past decade. As Melbourne’s overall population has grown significantly, so too has the number of jobs and activities in central Melbourne. This growth in population and jobs has resulted in a significant increase in road congestion and demand on public transport services. These trends, combined with factors such as increases in fuel prices has led to significant travel behaviour changes, with many more people now seeking alternative travel options to the private motor car, including public transport, walking, cycling, carshare, etc.

The public transport system in inner Melbourne has undergone significant growth in patronage in the past decade. There was an unprecedented 70% growth in train patronage across the Melbourne metropolitan area during 2002-2012. Whilst some investment in new transport infrastructure has occurred over this time, the growth in demand has generally outpaced the capacity of the public transport system.

This growth trend is expected to continue - transport modelling undertaken by Public Transport Victoria (PTV) shows that overall public transport boardings are expected to increase strongly over the next two decades, with weekday patronage more than doubling from 1.8 million to 3.8 million. Average weekday boardings on metropolitan trains are expected to more than double to 1.7 million by 2031, while tram and bus boardings will both be near one million per day by 2031. Annual patronage across all public transport options is forecast to grow from 517 million passengers in 2010-11 to more than one billion passengers in 2031 (Public Transport Victoria, 2012).

Inner Melbourne’s transport system will need to be planned as a single system performing multiple tasks rather than as separate transport modes. The focus for transport planning will need to be on integration of modes, recognising the critical role the transport system plays in meeting the social, economic and environmental needs of a rapidly growing city.

There is a pressing need to plan for significant improvements to capacity within the IMAP region and across Melbourne while strengthening the network as a whole to meet the overall growth in demand. Significant challenges lie ahead if the transport network is to meet the current and future travel needs of a rapidly growing inner city and to service the city’s future urban renewal areas, such as Fishermans Bend, E-Gate, Southbank, Docklands, City North and Arden-Macaulay, St Kilda Road, South Yarra, Footscray and links to the airports and inner west.

In planning the broader transport network and infrastructure to meet the future growth demands within the region, it is important that the IMAP councils also respond at the local level to accommodate the needs of neighbourhoods and the existing community in relation to:

- local accessibility, safety and amenity;
- making best use of existing infrastructure;
- improving opportunities for reverse trips at peak periods;
- improving linkages between modes and encouraging off peak trips;
- cycling and walking to ‘live, work and shop local’.
How Inner Melbourne will be different in 10 years’ time

Growth in Inner Melbourne is supported by the delivery of transport infrastructure that increases accessibility, supports sustainable travel behaviour and is integrated with urban development.

All residential, employment and visitor precincts across inner Melbourne are within walking distance of quality public transport services. Walking and cycling networks across inner Melbourne have been substantially upgraded. All of the major destinations in inner Melbourne (including the CBD, activity centres, employment, health and education precincts) are well connected to one another and to residential areas by public transport, walking and cycling routes.

Future urban development has been concentrated in locations that are well supported by public transport. The development densities and mix of land uses in these locations mean that a high proportion of trips can be made by walking, cycling or local public transport services rather than by private motor vehicle. The delivery of new transport infrastructure has been sequenced to catalyse development in urban renewal areas.

This has made it much easier for people to get to and around inner Melbourne, to the extent that residents, workers and visitors in inner Melbourne no longer need access to a private motor vehicle to go about their daily activities. Residents, workers and visitors now prefer to travel by public transport, walking or cycling; as a result there has been a 20% growth in the share of trips now made by these modes since 2015.

As a result of these improvements, travelling between major destinations across inner Melbourne by public transport, cycling and walking are realistic choices - they are safe, efficient, convenient and comfortable for users.

(Refer Strategy 2.1)

The public transport network is modernised and integrated together to maximise people’s ability to access opportunities across Inner Melbourne.

There has been a significant investment in new public transport infrastructure in inner Melbourne, and the frequency of services has been increased to the point that users can now ‘turn up and go’.

The land-use development system has been revised so it is intrinsically linked to a future Transport Planning system, such that development is deferred until transport infrastructure is available.

(Refer Strategy 2.2)

Inner Melbourne is an internationally renowned cycling and walking region that is well connected by a network of convenient, comfortable, safe and direct walking and bike riding routes.

Cycling and walking infrastructure has been substantially improved and many more people incorporate walking and cycling into their daily travel. Increases in the mode share for cycling and walking is reflected in decreases in car usage. Cycling routes along inner Melbourne’s busiest transport routes are protected from car lanes, are safe and well lit.

(Refer Strategy 2.3 and 2.4)

The impact of through traffic on Inner Melbourne’s road network has been substantially reduced.

The use of road-space in the CBD, activity centres and the major tourism, education, health and employment precincts gives priority to public transport, walking and cycling. These places now have much higher local amenity and are very accessible by public transport, walking and cycling. The conversion of road space for through traffic in these locations means that traffic congestion still exists, but with a broader range of travel choices available to community, there is less reliance on these car travel routes as through traffic routes to other locations.

(Refer Strategy 2.5 and 2.6)
Freight movements are confined to a discrete network of routes which accommodate growing freight needs without the need to travel on the broader road-based transport network, particularly residential neighbourhoods.

Upgrades at the Port of Melbourne (including Webb Dock and Swanson Dock upgrades) have resulted in the Port of Melbourne’s container trade increasing by over one million containers per annum. New road links now directly connect Webb Dock to the West Gate Freeway and beyond.

The freight task across inner Melbourne (both to and from the Port, the CBD and other business precincts) has been managed in such a way that freight movement is handled efficiently without the need for freight traffic to travel through residential neighbourhoods. Priority freight routes have been identified and upgrades have been made to ensure that they provide efficient access to the Port and the surrounding freeway and arterial road network. The amenity and safety of residential areas across inner Melbourne is no longer compromised by freight traffic because key freight routes have been allocated with curfews and/or land use buffers where necessary.

Air quality in Inner Melbourne has significantly improved with the introduction of a Clean Truck Program and higher air quality standards introduced by the Federal Government’s National Clean Air Program in 2016. Noise levels in Inner Melbourne associated with through truck traffic has been significantly reduced with the introduction of mandatory vehicle noise compliance standards.

(Refer Strategy 2.7)
**Strategies to achieve this goal.**

**Strategy 2.1**  
We will work with others to ensure that all activity centres, urban renewal precincts, employment and tourism nodes are supported by excellent walking, bike riding and public transport options as part of an integrated and connected regional transport network.

Opportunities include:

- Supporting design and delivery of critical new city-shaping transport infrastructure across the region
- Developing integrated access plans for activity centres, urban renewal precincts and employment and tourist nodes (as part of any structure and precinct plans)
- Improving access to the walking and cycling networks of neighbouring municipalities.
- Improving interchanges between public transport and walking and bike riding at transport nodes
- Undertaking research on development in the region and the impact of building design, car and bike parking rates, end of trip facilities etc. - on mode share and trip generation.

**Strategy 2.2**  
We will advocate for improved accessibility, frequency, capacity and connectivity of public transport across Inner Melbourne.

Opportunities include:

- Supporting improvements to on-road public transport frequency and speed, including upgrades to stops to provide level access as well as separation of trams and bus services from car traffic on particular routes/corridors
- Advocating for 24-hour public transport services
- Advocating for greater investment in the delivery of E-Class tram fleet and bus routes to increase the carrying capacity of tram routes
- Improving central Melbourne’s public transport connections to Melbourne Airport
- Extending existing tram lines and other public transport services in urban renewal precincts and other locations
- Working with the State government to capitalise on the legacy of the Melbourne Metro Rail stations and realise opportunities for place-making and enhanced walking and bike riding connections.

**Strategy 2.3**  
We will make Inner Melbourne a ‘cycling friendly’ region by creating a continuous network of on and off road cycling routes.

Opportunities include:

- Developing a business case for the design and implementation of the complete central sub-region cycling network
- Improving connectivity and quality of cycling and walking networks in the inner west, inner south and inner southeast.

**Strategy 2.4**  
We will make inner Melbourne a great place for walking by substantially improving amenity, wayfinding, safety and connectivity along key routes across the region.

Opportunities include:

- Implementing a regional wayfinding visitor signage suite and style guide
- Collaborating with state government to develop a single base map for wayfinding signs
- Implementing the Greenlight for Pedestrians Program at a regional scale, making it easier and safer to cross busy intersections
- Developing recommendations for inclusion within VicRoads traffic engineering guidelines and practice notes on optimising signal operation to make it easier and safer for pedestrians to cross declared road intersections.
Strategy 2.5  We will work with others to reduce the impact of through traffic across Inner Melbourne - particularly through the CBD, activity centres and major tourism, education, health and employment precincts.

Opportunities include:

- Reducing the number and duplication of parallel roads and streets identified within the State Governments Principal Traffic Flow Network
- Advocating for greater investment in public transport in outer suburbs, to ensure that such services meet demand associated with population growth in these locations.
- Exploring and promoting the trial of new transport demand management measures-- e.g. road pricing, congestion levy, tele-commuting etc.
- Creating behaviour change and promotional programs which create a shift in people’s travel choices for walking and cycling and public transport travel. This includes promotion of buses and cycling as a travel choice, and provision of cyclist safety education and cycle time information.

Strategy 2.6  We will advocate for re-prioritised road space which allocates and gives priority to walking, bike riding and public transport on selected regional and local roads across inner Melbourne.

Opportunities include:

- Developing prioritised road space strategies in conjunction with the state government
- Promoting a consistent approach to the expansion of car share opportunities to reduce car ownership and car travel
- Undertaking shared travel behaviour change programs and research on pedestrian / bike safety with the focus of prevention through better design.

Strategy 2.7  We will work with others to delineate a priority freight network to meet the needs of the increased freight task which does not require travel through residential neighbourhoods.

Key opportunities include:

- Removing all through truck traffic in residential areas
- Minimising freight transport through the inner city particularly during peak hours
- Restricting truck sizes allowed in the inner city to reduce maintenance demand on road infrastructure and reduce pollution
- Advocating to get freight onto the freeways and highways, through inner city connectivity
- Advocating for all diesel freight trains to be retrofitted with electric capability
- Working with port operators, freight companies and the State Government to address significant air and noise quality issues around the Port of Melbourne.
COMMUNITIES
Goal 3 - Diverse, vibrant, healthy and inclusive communities.

The context

The population of Melbourne’s central subregion is forecast to increase by as much as 60% over the period 2014-2031. The existing population of 485,000 people is expected to grow to 765,000 people over this time period, and circa 145,000 new dwellings will be required to meet this growth.

The vast majority of this housing will be in the form of apartments located in the expanded inner city and designated urban renewal areas. Meeting this future housing demand presents many challenges. The cost of renting or purchasing housing in inner Melbourne is already unaffordable for a large percent of people wishing to work, study and live in the region.

The supply of affordable housing stock in the inner region needs to be improved if Melbourne is to avoid the emerging scenario where people and key workers on lower incomes can only afford to live in outer Melbourne, and are forced to commute long distances to access employment, education and other services.

Future housing in inner Melbourne must be:

- Located to be accessible to public transport services and jobs;
- Affordable for a cross section of the community to access;
- Diverse enough to meet the needs of different household types (singles, couples, group households, families, elderly, disabled etc.), and;
- Designed to provide a high standard of internal amenity and achieve minimum environmental standards.

The current and future population of inner Melbourne will require access to a wide range of health, education and community services. Responding to this demand will not be the responsibility of any one agency, organisation, or level of government. Meeting the community needs for social infrastructure will require greater research coordination, and partnership between each level of government, their agencies, developers and the private sector to facilitate unmet need and alleviate pressure on existing services and infrastructure.

Community infrastructure requirements are expected to include:

- Hospitals and health centres
- Aged care services and facilities
- Primary and secondary schools, as well as other learning and training spaces
- Aquatic facilities, sport & recreation facilities and spaces that facilitate recreation;
- Community meeting spaces
- Child care, maternal and child health services
- Libraries, arts and culture venues
- Youth spaces
- Disability services
- Neighbourhood houses
- Parklands, playgrounds and community gardens

The demand for local community infrastructure in Inner Melbourne is not solely driven by the resident population. A very significant worker and visitor population also has a need for access to services such as childcare, health services, and open space and recreation facilities. In addition, Victoria’s major hospital and sporting facilities, which serve the whole region, are located in the central city. Funding models need to take into account these unique service characteristics.

Delivering community infrastructure in inner Melbourne can be far more expensive than in other settings due to the cost of both land and development, and funding maintenance and renewal of legacy infrastructure. Land is not always available in suitable locations or at the time it is required. While inner Melbourne benefits
from communities that have built up an infrastructure base over many decades, through both public and private provision, elements that impact on costs include community expectations for higher quality, new technologies, evolving legislative requirements and the demand for best practice in facility design and construction. For these reasons, it is necessary to consider different models of supplying such services.

The following approaches will need to be taken to funding the delivery of new infrastructure and services:

- Making more efficient use of existing facilities, including improving existing state and local infrastructure, as well as accessing surplus or underutilised government land;
- Delivering new community facilities in the expanded central city, urban renewal areas and other areas of population growth;
- Encouraging co-location and shared use of complementary facilities;
- Opening up new funding sources, including ‘shared beneficiaries’ funding models and reforming development contributions. As planning schemes open up new opportunities for more intensive forms of urban development, there is a need to ensure that such redevelopments make a fair contribution to the associated cost of delivering new community services and facilities.

The forecast significant growth in residents, workers and visitors will place many social pressures on our city, and a particular focus is needed on creating healthy and inclusive communities across inner Melbourne. Issues such as violence, public safety, homelessness and substance abuse all need to be actively addressed as the city grows and becomes more intensively occupied.

**How Inner Melbourne will be different in 10 years’ time**

The supply of affordable housing has increased substantially in inner Melbourne.

There has been an overall improvement in the affordability of housing in inner Melbourne. Development in the nominated urban renewal areas is delivering new affordable and social housing stock as a result of new planning requirements and incentives. The supply of social housing in inner Melbourne has increased, and remains at 6% of the total housing stock in inner Melbourne. A range of innovative affordable housing products (for rent and purchase) are being delivered by government, the community housing, philanthropic and private sectors.

(Refer Strategy 3.1)

Apartments and all new and refurbished homes in inner Melbourne offer high quality, environmentally sustainable and diverse housing options.

The design quality and amenity of new apartments and all new and refurbished homes has substantially improved.

New apartments meet minimum floor area standards, have better access to daylight and sunlight, as well as better thermal comfort, visual and acoustic privacy. Apartment towers are appropriately separated and the preferred building heights, separations and densities across inner Melbourne have been set in place in each municipal planning scheme.

There has been an increase in the diversity of housing types built across inner Melbourne, including an increase in apartments suitable for families, as well as adaptable and flexible housing designs that support work from home and ageing in place.

(Refer Strategy 3.2)

Community infrastructure, open space, regional sporting and recreation facilities and services have been substantially enhanced and developed to meet the needs of a rapidly growing resident and working population.

Residents and workers within existing and new growth neighbourhoods have convenient local access to a full range of basic, and essential services such as local or regional community centres, libraries, kindergartens,
childcare centres, recreation facilities and open space. This has been achieved by making the most efficient use of existing community infrastructure as well as creating new infrastructure (funded either by government, private or not for profit providers) where required.

Regional infrastructure such as regional open space, sport and recreation facilities, health and education facilities have been delivered to meet the needs of the increased resident and worker population. Each facility is highly accessible by public transport, walking and cycling to residents across the entire inner Melbourne area - now no-one has to travel more than 20 minutes to be able to access such facilities.

Social and health services are in place to allow inner city residents to choose to stay living within their community as they get older or as their needs change over time.

The provision of public primary and secondary schools in inner Melbourne has kept pace with population growth, and is sufficient to enable families to establish and continue to live in the inner city. A mix of public and private schools offer quality local education choices for families living in inner Melbourne that didn't previously exist.

(Refer Strategy 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5)

Residents, workers and visitors in inner Melbourne report a strong sense of safety, health and social connection and inclusion.

Inner Melbourne is recognised for the wellbeing and safety it offers its residents, workers and visitors. Our high needs and vulnerable communities have strong support services and homelessness levels have reduced. There are lower levels of violence and other forms of crime. Inner Melbourne's roads are safe for pedestrians and cyclists, and the community perceives that their neighbourhoods are safe and welcoming.

(Refer Strategy 3.6 )
**Strategies to achieve this goal**

**Strategy 3.1** We will work with others to create a substantial increase in the supply of affordable housing in Inner Melbourne.

Opportunities include:

- Working with research, industry and government partners to establish new mechanisms for the delivery of affordable housing by the private, philanthropic and community housing sectors
- Advocating to grow the capacity of the community housing sector to deliver and manage new affordable housing
- Advocating to maintain existing public housing stock levels
- Advocating for a spectrum of affordable housing products for different housing market segments and a broad demographic – low to moderate income households (rental and home purchase) e.g. key workers and their families, students, immigrants; etc.

**Strategy 3.2** We will advocate to achieve improved design quality, internal amenity standards, environmental sustainability and diversity of apartments in all new and refurbished homes in inner Melbourne:

Opportunities include:

- Implementing new residential apartment guidelines
- Working with industry to address barriers to achieving market delivery of more diverse housing products.

**Strategy 3.3** Work with others to plan and deliver regional and local community infrastructure and services to meet the needs of a rapidly growing resident and worker population.

Opportunities include:

- Better integration of community services planning across all IMAP Councils
- Establishing innovative models for the design and delivery of community hubs
- Developing new funding and financing mechanisms for new community infrastructure
- Developing new models for private sector delivery of infrastructure
- Working with the Stage Government’s Regional Management Forum to complete the ‘Integrated Delivery Models for Social Infrastructure’ project.
- Advocating the for utilisation of surplus government land for community infrastructure

**Strategy 3.4** We will work together to deliver accessible regional sporting and recreation facilities which offer a diversity of sporting and recreational opportunities

Key opportunities include:

- Undertake a regional sport and recreation study across the IMAP Councils including a gap analysis, consideration of active and passive needs, and the diversity of needs:
  - To allocate land for built facilities as additional to parks, to adequately provide for active and passive recreation.
  - To cater for the specific needs of children and young people growing up in densely settled areas
  - To address the lack of female focussed areas and facilities
**Strategy 3.5** We will work in partnership with the State government and non-government education providers to develop new educational facilities and services in the IMAP region, in locations that meet forecast local education needs and in ways that allow for shared use by local communities.

Opportunities include:

- Advocating for the delivery of new education facilities in urban renewal areas
- Working with others to increase the availability of lifelong learning facilities and programs for local communities.

**Strategy 3.6** We will implement programs to improve the health, wellbeing and safety of the Inner Melbourne community.

Opportunities include:

- Delivering road safety programs;
- Improving the coordination of accommodation and social support services for homeless people;
- Applying Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) approaches in Urban Renewal areas and other neighbourhoods;
- Working with others to deliver drug & alcohol programs;
- Delivering family violence prevention programs;
- Delivering neighbourhood planning and ‘community connections’ programs.
- Undertaking joint research to develop new approaches for promoting healthy living.
NEIGHBOURHOODS AND PLACES
Goal 4 - Distinctive, high quality neighbourhoods and places.

The context

Inner Melbourne is renowned for its distinctive historic suburbs, green and leafy character, and the high-quality design of buildings, streets and places. Protecting and enhancing these characteristics as large-scale urban redevelopment continues to occur across inner Melbourne will be a major challenge facing our city in the coming decades.

Melbourne’s CBD and inner suburbs have experienced substantial change over the past 20 years. The fundamental qualities that Melbourne is renowned for have largely been preserved as the city has continued to evolve. Our Victorian architectural heritage has remained largely intact and our streets and public spaces are legible and well designed. At the same time, we have embraced bold contemporary architectural design in our major civic and institutional buildings and places.

Precincts such as Southbank, Carlton South and Docklands have grown from former industrial and port precincts into substantial precincts for commercial, residential and institutional activities. Many lessons about the redevelopment of such areas can be taken from this experience and applied to future urban renewal areas such as the Fishermans Bend, E-Gate and Arden Macaulay precincts.

Many local neighbourhoods have experienced intensive residential redevelopment, and a number of the inner city strip shopping centres have been transformed by high density commercial and apartment development.

There have also been major upgrades to major public spaces such as the Yarra River, Swanston Street, Port Phillip Bay foreshore and the Sports and Entertainment Precinct, and new public spaces have been created at Birrarung Marr, Federation Square and Docklands.

Ongoing development pressure across inner Melbourne requires Councils to provide leadership and a stronger focus on the design of buildings and the creation of high quality public spaces in the future in order to ensure that our streetscapes and public spaces maintain their distinctive qualities. A higher density city will mean that:

- More local open space and recreation facilities will need to be created so that residents and workers have walkable access to such amenities;
- New buildings must leave a positive legacy to Melbourne’s public domain. As a minimum, they must be designed so that they don’t create streets which are overshadowed, windy and dominated by blank walls and podium car parks;
- Our streets, parks and public spaces will need to incorporate greater vegetation cover and water sensitive landscape features;
- Our major public spaces and waterfront must have the capacity to accommodate much higher levels of visitation and activity.

How Inner Melbourne will be different in 10 years’ time

Inner Melbourne has a high quality public space network that provides convenient local access for a growing residents, workers and visitor community.

New public spaces have been created to meet the needs of a fast growing population of residents, workers and visitors. New linkages to parks and public spaces have been created which are convenient, safe and have high amenity. People are able to easily walk to open space within 400 metres (approximately a 5 minute walk) where they can relax, play, be active, socialise or meet their neighbours. There is no need to cross significant barriers such as major roads or railway lines to reach local open spaces, so children, young people and those with limited mobility are able to safely and easily access these spaces.

(Refer Strategy 4.1)

Inner Melbourne’s enhanced network of park, public spaces and streets provide an essential element of the inner city’s sustainability and liveability.
There has been a substantial increase in vegetation cover in open space areas across inner Melbourne—resulting in a significant contribution to biodiversity, mitigating the urban heat island effect, and creating healthier ecosystems. Substantial trees and vegetation have been established in a variety of ways across inner Melbourne including in streets, parks, gardens, plazas, campuses, river and creek embankments, wetlands, railway corridors, community gardens, green walls, balconies and roofs.

Parks and public spaces have been redesigned to integrate water sensitive urban design – vegetation in parks and streets is irrigated by stormwater that is collected in nearby urban areas and treated in our parklands.

This urban forestation, water harvesting and reuse program has resulted in multiple social and environmental benefits including shading and cooling, reduced stormwater flows and nutrient loads, reduced air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, providing habitat and enhanced levels of biodiversity. It has improved the local identity of neighbourhoods, as well as encouraged higher levels of outdoor activity amongst residents and workers.

(Refer Strategy 4.2)

**New urban development across inner Melbourne sets benchmarks for its design quality, innovation, contribution to the public realm and high standard of amenity that are internationally recognised.**

Melbourne continues to have a high quality public domain, even with the substantial increases in urban density associated with the growth in residents and workers in inner Melbourne. Buildings contribute to pedestrian amenity and safety at the street level by providing good through-block pedestrian connectivity, street activation (including the use of 'vertical zoning'), surveillance and weather protection. Melbourne's streets and public spaces are protected from unpleasant shadow and wind effects associated with high rise buildings.

Urban renewal areas are delivering higher density development within walking distance of public transport, plus a vibrant mix of retail, commercial and community activities at street level. They are safe, walkable neighbourhoods each with an identifiable 'village heart' and local open spaces where residents and workers can gather and access convenience shops, leisure, health and community services. Local streets have a high amenity comprising street trees to provide shade, safe walking and cycling infrastructure, and places to gather (such as public squares or plazas).

Inner Melbourne is experienced as a series of diverse and distinctive precincts, villages and neighbourhoods within a recognisably Melbourne character. Efforts have been made to successfully extend the distinctive features of inner Melbourne to our urban renewal areas.

(Refer Strategy 4.3 and 4.4)

**Inner Melbourne’s major public spaces and waterfront destinations are well designed to accommodate significant visitation and major events and are well served by transport infrastructure.**

The continued growth in residents, workers and visitors in inner Melbourne has meant that there are many more people in our city streets and spaces. Major public spaces and routes that attract large visitation rates have been redesigned to cater for their more intensive use. The capacity of, and access to, such spaces is now considerably better than in the past, and these spaces are able to cope with increased pedestrian activity.

Examples of public spaces include Swanston Street, the St Kilda Road Arts Centre precinct, the University of Melbourne and the Hospital Precinct (Swanston Street north, Grattan Street), the Flinders Street and Sport & Entertainment precinct corridor, and the waterfronts of the Yarra River, Docklands, Maribyrnong River and Port Phillip Bay.

Footpaths have been widened in such locations, and public spaces have either been created or made larger. Infrastructure has been installed to cater for greater visitation, including upgraded public transport stops, cycling racks, seating, shade trees, drinking fountains, toilets, etc.

These public spaces are programmed and actively managed so that they deliver maximum benefits to the Victorian community and visitors alike. State Government and local Councils coordinate their efforts to ensure that these major public spaces are well maintained, vibrant and safe.

(Refer Strategy 4.5)
Inner Melbourne’s existing heritage fabric and distinctive precincts have been protected and enhanced to contribute to a strong sense of place and identity for the region.

Melbourne’s heritage has been protected – and the distinctive character of the various historic residential neighbourhoods across inner Melbourne remains a major part of Melbourne’s architectural and cultural identity.

Many of the heritage buildings in the main shopping precincts have been rejuvenated as a result of the business support and creation of community hubs, and through promotion and improved local access by walking, cycling and public transport. New developments reflect and complement the distinctive character of these neighbourhoods, adding to the amenity of the public realm. Many of Inner Melbourne’s landscapes feature substantial tree canopies, habitat features, green roofs, walls and facades, and urban waterscapes to create distinctive high quality places and a water sensitive city, which positively contribute to the local neighbourhood.
Strategies to achieve this goal.

Strategy 4.1 We will plan and deliver an integrated open space network for Inner Melbourne that is diverse, connected and of high quality.

Opportunities include:
- Improving connections through an improved network of off-road and on-road walking and cycling trails
- Creating new open spaces in urban renewal areas to cater for the growth in resident and worker populations.
- Connecting existing open spaces and key destinations such as linking the Yarra and Maribyrnong Rivers to the Bay.
- Collaborating with others to identify opportunities to use streets and street spaces to create green spaces.
- Utilising surplus state government land assets for parkland - permanently vested in municipal authorities
- Identifying new funding methods, better use of existing assets, and greater sharing of spaces as a way of addressing increased demand

Strategy 4.2 We will work together to integrate water sensitive landscapes, substantial tree canopies, biodiversity and habitat into the design of all parks and public space (i.e. streets) areas right across Inner Melbourne.

Opportunities include:
- Collaborating to implement urban forest strategies to increase the shading by tree canopy cover and associated green infrastructure
- Increasing biodiversity through new management protocols for street and park vegetation that prioritises habitat value and improves soil health

Strategy 4.3 We will establish design standards which seek to ensure new urban development protects and enhances the appearance, vitality and amenity of Inner Melbourne.

These standards will ensure that new development sensitively addresses public realm quality issues such as overshadowing, sunlight to public spaces, wind weather protection, crime prevention through urban design, etc.

Strategy 4.4 We will work with the State government to establish urban renewal plans that create distinctive high quality local neighbourhoods and promote positive development outcomes in medium and higher density environments.

Opportunities include:
- Developing innovative mechanisms for public and private sector funding and delivery of new infrastructure and community services
- Preserving culture, heritage buildings and places in urban renewal areas
- Providing for different building types, styles and densities in urban renewal areas
- Creating innovative, high quality public spaces
- Maintaining and enhancing the fine grain subdivision pattern and permeability (e.g. laneways) across renewal areas
- Creating new activity centres and community hubs in urban renewal areas to provide a neighbourhood focus

Strategy 4.5 We will work with the State government to improve the planning, design and management of significant public spaces, waterfront destinations and waterways across Inner Melbourne to ensure they:
- Are designed to a high standard and appropriate to their purpose
• Form a part of a broader open space network
• Cater for a significant growth in visitor activity as well as the local population

Opportunities include:

• Lobbying the State Government to create a single authority for the Yarra River
• Linking public spaces, waterfront destinations and waterways as part of the wider open space network
• Maintaining key natural habitats where they exist, and pursuing greening opportunities where appropriate.
ENVIRONMENTAL LEADERSHIP
Goal 5 - Leadership in achieving environmental sustainability and climate change adaptation.

The context

It is widely acknowledged that the world is warming and it is becoming an increasing imperative for cities to prepare for the impacts of climate change. Cities responding early to climate change are most likely to better withstand its impacts and maintain a platform for health and prosperity (IPCC 2007). Cities are likely to be affected by climate change in three key ways:

- Impacts on resource productivity or changes in market demands for goods and services;
- Performance of physical infrastructure and industries directly affected by changed climate conditions or damaging extreme events; and,
- Populations affected by extreme weather, scarce resources, health status, changed economic conditions or migration (IPCC 2007).

Regardless of future emissions, the greenhouse gas concentrations already in the atmosphere commit us to a likely range of climate change impacts in the near future. 12 By 2030 Melbourne is expected to be significantly affected by warmer temperatures and heatwaves, lower rainfall, intense storm events and flash flooding (CSIRO 2007). To minimise or avoid the effects of these impending impacts, effective and prompt adaptation is imperative.

The need to build capacity for greater resilience will require the IMAP region to develop strategies for coping with the future shocks and stresses to urban infrastructure systems associated with climate change.

The IMAP region will also have to find ways to significantly and urgently reduce dependence on oil and other fossil fuels - to find ways to become more self-sufficient and energy efficient in the face of economic realities of energy scarcity and energy transition. Effective urban planning and building design will play an important role in facilitating the development of a greater capacity for future resilience.

An important consideration for IMAP is the role of integrated water cycle management in achieving climate resilience. As the climate changes and we have less but more intense bursts of rainfall, the region needs to ensure that water is used for the appropriate purpose, while minimising flood risk. The need to maintain Melbourne’s liveability is another key challenge making integrated water cycle management vital.

The impact of flooding has necessitated upgraded drainage infrastructure and increased community resilience. The need to better manage water has led to some ingenious and cutting-edge water capture and recycling techniques being implemented by the private sector, government, residents and local authorities.

The future success and liveability of the IMAP region will be reliant upon coordinated environmental management, a commitment from all Councils to prioritise climate change resilience planning and advocacy for ongoing research and innovation in this sector.

How Inner Melbourne will be different in 10 years’ time

Inner Melbourne is a ‘water sensitive’ city with substantial reduction in potable water consumption and substantially improved quality of water entering our waterways.

Inner Melbourne has an improved liveability through the use of irrigated landscapes that contribute to cooling a city; development of ecological landscapes including green roofs, vertical greening, urban food production and habitat.

12 City of Melbourne Climate Change Adaptation Strategy (City of Melbourne, June 2009) and ‘Zero Net Emissions by 2020’ (City of Melbourne, 2014)
The city’s identity has evolved around water sensitive design - including water in the streets as design features - fountains, play areas, and urban design elements.

Sustainable watering systems are installed to ensure city vegetation, trees and boulevards can endure extreme heat and drought over long periods.

The daily per capita consumption of potable water across Inner Melbourne has been considerably reduced from 2015 levels, and there has been an increased use of alternative local water sources. As a result, wastewater flows and stormwater runoff volumes have been reduced. Pollutant loads (particularly nitrogen) entering the waterways and Port Phillip Bay have also been substantially reduced.

(Refer Strategy 5.1 and 5.2)

Inner Melbourne is a national leader in achieving greenhouse gas emission reductions, with average emissions across the region reduced each year.

The emission of greenhouse gases associated with urban activities across Inner Melbourne has been substantially reduced. New commercial and residential buildings are now designed to achieve best practice energy/greenhouse and sustainability ratings, and existing commercial and residential buildings are rapidly being retrofitted to reduce their environmental impact.

A significant amount of the energy consumed in Inner Melbourne is now sourced from renewable energy sources.

The five IMAP Councils are committed to achieving carbon neutrality and reducing operational greenhouse gas emissions by 10 per cent by 2018. A common green building and infrastructure guideline is now applied across all of the IMAP Councils’ capital works programs.

State-wide building and planning regulations now address a broader range of environmental design features including energy efficiency, water conservation and reuse and waste management;

(Refer Strategy 5.3 and 5.4)

The inner Melbourne community is resilient to the impacts of climate change.

Inner Melbourne is now well prepared to deal with the impacts of climate change, and Council buildings, infrastructure and services are designed and maintained to withstand extreme events and longer term climatic changes. Broad-scale tree planting and stormwater harvesting has meant that our streets and public spaces have more stable and cooler temperatures and this has made a substantial difference to Inner Melbourne’s resilience to deal with climate change impacts.

Business and residents are aware of the impacts of climate change on their activities, and protocols are in place for dealing with extreme weather events such as storms, flash floods, heatwaves, etc.

(Refer Strategy 5.5)
Strategies to achieve this goal.

Strategy 5.1 We will establish a water program across Inner Melbourne in collaboration with the State Government to achieve the following:

- A reduction in consumption of potable water per capita;
- An increase in the use of alternative water (non-potable) sources;
- A reduction in the amount of total nitrogen contributed to the waterways from the inner Melbourne catchment

Opportunities include:

- Requiring the use of third pipe connections or other alternative water recycling technologies in Urban Renewal Areas.
- Rolling out joint local/state government projects for water capture and storage
- Undertaking research and development into new methods for reducing potable water consumption
- Advocating for more stringent stormwater capture and treatment standards as part of developments in areas adjacent to rivers and creeks, to reduce pollutant runoff.

Strategy 5.2 We will develop regional approaches to flood mitigation including advances in the following:

- Working with the State Government to progress mapping and modelling of integrated flood modelling
- Increasing the use of on-site detention and integrated water system technologies in new developments
- Reducing stormwater quantity from the public and private realm to reduce flood risk in extreme rainfall events

Strategy 5.3 We will implement a program to reduce total greenhouse gas emissions, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with all of our Councils’ operations.

Opportunities include

- Designing new Council buildings to be ‘off-grid’
- Creating of Zero Carbon vehicle fleet
- Pursuing Environmental Upgrade Agreements (EUAs) as a key financing mechanism for improving energy efficiency of existing building stock and increasing uptake of renewable energy generation
- Promoting Council supply chain ‘green purchasing’ policies across the IMAP councils
- Pursuing a joint approach to infrastructure provision to support alternative transport such as electric vehicles
- Facilitating incentives and advocacy for state funding for renewables and the green business sector to drive economic growth in high tech industries within inner Melbourne.
- Managing soils and vegetation to increase soil organic matter and carbon sequestration

Strategy 5.4 We will increase the uptake of environmental sustainable design (ESD) outcomes across the local government, development and community sectors

Opportunities include:

- Demonstrating leadership by ensuring that Council capital works programs include ESD outcomes
- Creating demonstration and education projects for sustainable building and green infrastructure provision, including green roofs and vertical greening.
**Strategy 5.5** We will establish a program to improve community and Council resilience to impacts of climate change in inner Melbourne

Opportunities include:

- Creating a consistent ‘cool-spaces strategy’ across the IMAP region
- Collaborating with relevant state agencies such as the SES to build community capacity to respond to extreme weather events
BACKGROUND

1. At the IMAP Implementation Committee meeting of 13 February 2015 Mr Cameron Brenton, Coordinator City Business, CoPP provided an update on the Urban Manufacturing project. Key points included:
   1.1. IMAP funding needed to be spread across the 3 stages of the project on a dollar for dollar basis with funding partners
   1.2. Carlton Connect funding was under review resulting in Stage 1 of the project to be re-scoped
   1.3. Stage 1 outputs included:
      - Definition of urban manufacturing
      - Location
      - Significance of sector to economy
      - Need/justification for next steps
      - survey

2. The IMAP Implementation Committee resolved to:
   2.1. Approve the scope and funding of the revised Stage 1 Urban manufacturing Project, comprising $20,000 funding from Carlton Connect (out-of-round funding) and $20,000 from IMAP in 2014/15.
   2.2. Note the intention to submit a full funding application to Carlton Connect for subsequent stages of the Urban Manufacturing project, and that any decision to proceed with subsequent stages will be contingent on the outcomes of Stage 1. The potential funding approach comprises:
      2.2.1. Release of further funds within the approved IMAP budget for the Urban Manufacturing Project, as required, for any subsequent stages (i.e. $50K, being the balance of the approved $90K);
      2.2.2. Potential contributions from State Government departments, and
      2.2.3. Matching of any further IMAP and State Government funding by Carlton Connect
   2.3. Approve the updated IMAP Three Year Implementation Plan and changes to the current year’s budget to incorporate the Urban Manufacturing project funding over 3 stages.

PHASE 1 - PROJECT UPDATE

3. A stakeholder workshop was held on 28 May 2015 comprising local, state and federal government, industry leaders and associations, makers and education providers. While the workshop provided a platform to inform stakeholders of the project, valuable insights were gained. Participants communicated the need to broaden the project to include Moreland Council region and explore a technological method for conducting the survey.

4. The IMAP Implementation Committee approved the Agreement between IMAP and the University of Melbourne and authorised the CEOs to sign the agreement on behalf of the IMAP Implementation Committee.

5. As first hypothesized in the original proposal, the information required to examine a complete picture of all three approaches – land, sector, and economic; is currently not in existence for Victoria to provide key data for economic analysis of economic development in small manufacturing sectors. Each dataset provides significant data, however no dataset provides comprehensive and consistent data across each approach. (refer 7.1 attached report)

6. The Project Management Team and Steering Group continue to meet and assess each stage of Phase 1 and agreed to approach Moreland Council for involvement in the project and a proposed $10,000 contribution. The Steering Group also resolved to support the development of an online geographical mapping survey of makers across the IMAP area and surrounds to map examine clusters, supply chains, customers and movement of makers over the life of the project. The mapping is through a crowd source platform conducted by CrowdSpot and Harvest Digital Engagement.

7. An update on the review of Carlton Connect funding was provided to the Steering Committee on 11 June 2015 by the University of Melbourne and Carlton Connect. It was conveyed to the Steering Committee that in light of any projected timeline of available funds under the review of Carlton Connect that the Project should move straight to an application for ARC Linkage Grant funding. As a result of the impending application, the Steering Committee instructed that Phase 1 & 2 be combined to complete the online survey and sufficient evidence of the research is available to report back to the IMAP Implementation Committee for endorsement and continuation of the project, prior to any application for ARC Linkage Grant funding.
ISSUES

- Unforeseen circumstances are the result of changing funding options from the Carlton Connect Initiative Fund (CCIF). One of the conditions of continued IMAP funding for Phase 2 was matching funding to be provided by an additional CCIF applications. However, the CCIF program is currently under review by its funders, and as a result of this, the funding scheme which would have provided matching funding for Phase 2, has been suspended.
- The project continuance is now provisional on IMAP reviewing the funding alternative and realigning Phase 2 & 3 with an application for ARC Linkage Grant funding which requires 25% matched funding. It is not envisaged any additional funds above the allocated $90,000 would be required and financial partnerships with state government and Moreland Council of $10,000 each would be secure. MPA have already committed to $10,000 and have indicated a further contribution to the project in Phase 2 & 3.
- The online mapping survey component of Phase 2 has been incorporated into Phase 1 and as a result only a pilot number of clipboard surveys have taken place and included in the draft Phase 1 report.
- Originally Phase 1 report was due in late October 2015, however, due to the updated schedule a Phase 1 and to meet the ACR Linkage Grant funding application deadline of September 2015, a draft report is required for consideration by IMAP at the 28 August 2015 meeting.

PROJECT OUTCOMES

8. A comprehensive draft report (Attachment 13a) ‘The Dilemma of Urban Employment Land – An Inquiry into the viability of small urban manufacturing in Inner Melbourne’ has been submitted outlining findings from the analysis of existing data, inception workshop, and framing of the qualitative and quantitative studies that comprise the research. The report summarises the original project proposal and several strategic decisions modifying the scope and path of the research.

RECOMMENDATION

9. That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to;
   9.1. Accept the draft Phase 1 report and agrees to a revised integration of Phase 2 & 3.
   9.2. Endorse the continuation of the Urban Manufacturing Project and instructs the Steering Committee to apply for ARC Linkage Grant funding in September 2015 in line with the original IMAP resolution of matched funding.
   9.3. Accept the Steering Committee’s recommendation to request Moreland Council as a partner in the project.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This report describes the progress made in Phase 1 of the IMAP/University of Melbourne study of small urban manufacturers to the economies of the IMAP area. The core purpose of this report is to detail the findings to-date from Phase 1. A second but important purpose is to provide sufficient information to enable the Steering Committee and the funders to make a decision as to whether the project should move ahead into further funding phases, and whether the team should advance an ARC Linkage Grant in November with IMAP commitment and funding contributions.

Further to these objectives, this Executive Summary and report describe the progress of, and findings from, the research to-date, including:

1. Findings from the analysis of existing data
2. Findings from the Inception Workshop
3. Framing of the qualitative and quantitative studies that comprise the research
4. Survey development and sampling framework.

This Executive Summary and report also describe several strategic decisions that we have made that have somewhat modified the scope and path of the research, including our proposed future actions arising from these developments. These changes include:

1. Expanding the project scope to include Moreland
2. Creating an electronic survey and project site that also provides a visible symbol of makers’ participation in the project
3. Preparing an ARC Linkage grant application, due November 2015
4. Amending some of the project timelines, including the submission of the Phase 1 report on 12 August rather than in late October, so that IMAP can consider joining the Linkage Grant application. These include
   a. Moving the survey forward into Phase 1
   b. The Phase 1 report (this report) is submitted early, in Month 6 instead of Month 7
   c. Phase 1 is extended to December 2015; this extension replaces Phase 2
5. Phase 2 funds will not be expended in 2015, but rather will be used as commitment to the ARC Linkage grant, should IMAP make the commitment.

Summary of Study Objectives

The core goal of this study is to deliver policy-relevant findings that can guide the IMAP councils in making strategic decisions about the use of employment land in the IMAP area. Underlying the core inquiry of this project is our over-arching hypothesis that small, high-value added, highly-innovative urban manufacturers in Melbourne can benefit significantly from the agglomeration economies associated with inner-urban locations, and that there is great value to the urban economy in preserving a place for manufacturing innovators in the central city and immediate inner suburban areas.

Our interaction with local government strongly suggests that local government is well aware of the potential downsides of losing industrial land. The challenge is an absence of a robust evidence base to enable them to argue for retention of industrial areas in strategic locations. It is in generating this evidence base that this project can add the most value. We take a multi-faceted approach designed to address several dimensions of the urban employment problem:
1. **The land approach** (understand how employment land in inner Melbourne is currently being used)
2. **The sector approach** (understand the value of central locations for businesses in the small manufacturing sector)
3. **The economic approach** (Understand the economic impacts and contributions of small urban manufacturers (the economic approach))

The over-arching goal of generating understanding in these three areas is to extract the implications for policy, planning controls and design in inner city industrial zones. Key outputs of the study include:

- Systematic capture of value chain data for delivery planning, covering in-bound logistics, operations, outbound logistics, marketing and sales, after sales service, strategic management, human resources, technology and procurement.
- Exploration of barriers to entry or growth for urban manufacturers, for example, accessing finance or government assistance
- Further mapping of select firms’ spatial linkages with suppliers, collaborators, workers, distributors, customers and retailers with a view to understanding economies of scale and scope attaching to agglomerations
- Estimation of agglomeration economies effects for the IMAP region and the State of Victoria, for urban manufacturers, differentiated by location (urban versus suburban)
- Estimation of lost innovation and value added due to displacement effects.

**Findings: Analysis of Existing Data**

As we hypothesized in the original proposal, the several datasets currently in existence for Victoria that each provide key data for economic analysis of economic development in small manufacturing sectors, but none of them provide a complete picture for all three approaches – land, sector, and economic – analysed for small manufacturing firms. Some existing datasets provide spatial information – such as land use zoning and VicCLUE data – but do not combine it with sector data about firms occupying the spaces that is specific enough for economic analysis. These datasets can tell us something about where to find industrial-zoned land in the IMAP region, but do not provide us with information about how small makers are distributed in this space (the land and sector approaches), or how being located within this space affects their productivity and innovation (the economic approach). Finally, none of the existing data tell us anything about why firms leave the IMAP region – either via relocation or firm death – and where they go if they do relocate (the economic approach). Section 7 of this report explores what kinds of analysis and conclusions are possible using these existing datasets.

**Findings: The Inception Workshop**

The Inception Workshop confirmed that our proposed research path is considered by government and makers to be viable and important. Additionally, it created new insights to inform the study, and helped us to establish additional networks and partnerships to assemble data for the project analysis. The major conclusions were:

* **Makers endorse the work because it empowers them, and because we have identified issues that reflect their experience.** One clear message from the workshop is that our approach adds value for many stakeholders, at least in part because it draws attention to the issues the face in dealing with their local governments.

---

Government partners are interested, in part because of the enthusiasm of makers. The workshop generated several potential new partners and datasets, including the Australian Business Register and the Minister for Planning’s office.

Makers want a technological symbol of their participation and our commitment. One major lesson with which we left the workshop, is that the project team’s initial thinking about data collection was in need of updating. Our plans initially included standard, clipboard-based survey data collection methods. The makers responded strongly and negatively to this approach on a number of levels. Also, they argued, they want a tangible symbol of their participation in the project.

Moreland Council Should Be Included as a Study Partner. Our makers from Moreland strongly recommended that we engage Moreland Council to join the project team. After consultation with the Steering Committee, we engaged the head of economic development in Moreland Council and secured both partnership and a proposed $10,000 partner contribution for Phase 2 from Moreland.

Pilot Projects and Survey

Section 6 of this report describes three pilot projects that comprise Phase 1, and which are currently underway. Each of these projects is headed jointly by Jennifer Day and a Master of Urban Planning student from the University of Melbourne, as part of her/his thesis project. They address the three approaches (land, sector, and economic). There are two qualitative and one quantitative inquiries.

In order to respond to makers’ request for a visible symbol of their participation in the project, the Project Management Team has decided to implement a combined survey and makers map will as part of Phase 1. This is possible using existing project funds. The Steering Committee has agreed to move the survey and analysis forward to Phase 1. The full project survey (in draft form) is provided in Appendix A.

Moving toward an ARC Linkage Grant Application

The Project Management Team has decided to seek Steering Committee and IMAP approval to develop an ARC Linkage Grant application in the upcoming months, to continue the project work. This issue will be raised with the IMAP leadership in the August IMAP meeting. This change arises from a number of developments in the project, including changing funding options from the Carlton Connect Initiative Fund (CCIF) in combination with lessons learned from the Inception Workshop held on 28 May.

One of the conditions of continued IMAP funding for Phase 2 was matching funding to be provided by an additional CCIF application. However, the CCIF program is currently under review by its funders, and as a result of this, the funding scheme which would have provided matching funding for Phase 2, has been suspended.

To continue the work, the PMT proposes that we submit an ARC Linkage grant application in November with a total project budget of around $300-400,000. ARC Linkage grants are grant schemes wherein industry or government partners join with a University-led team to produce research for their mutual benefit. In this scheme, industry partners must make financial and in-kind contributions to the project. Generally, successful applications have cash contributions from partners totalling a minimum of 25 percent of the project budget. This implies that $75-100,000 needs to come from the industry partners. If the IMAP allows us to apply its $20,000 allocated for Phase 2 toward this financial contribution, we intend to generate the rest from other industry partners.

These timeline changes introduce another variation in the original project timeline. We note that
our Phase 1 reporting schedule is modified over the original schedule, give the need for IMAP to consider funding Phase 2 in advance of the November deadline for ARC Linkage grants. Originally, the Phase 1 report was set to be due in late October 2015. However, due to the updated schedule, the Phase 1 report must be made available to IMAP on 12 August. This is why the findings for the three pilot projects described in Section 6 are not yet ready.
1. INTRODUCTION

This report describes the progress made in Phase 1 of the IMAP/University of Melbourne study of small urban manufacturers to the economies of the IMAP area. We describe the framing of the project, which has advanced significantly since the previous report. We also describe the progress of, and findings from, the research to-date, including:

5. Findings from the analysis of existing data
6. Findings from the Inception Workshop
7. Findings from the qualitative studies
8. Survey development and sampling framework.

There are also several strategic decisions that we have made that have somewhat modified the scope and path of the research. This report also describes these developments and the proposed future actions arising from these developments. These changes include:

1. Expanding the project scope to include Moreland
2. Moving the survey forward into Phase 1
3. Creating an electronic survey and project site that also provides a visible symbol of makers’ participation in the project
4. Moving toward an ARC Linkage Grant application, due November 2015
5. Amending some of the project timelines, including the submission of the Phase 1 report on 12 August rather than in late October, so that IMAP can consider joining the Linkage Grant application.

The vast majority of this report provides new information, content, and findings. For the sake of clarity, there is some content in this report that is summarised from the original project proposal. We do this for readers who have not read or would like to be re-briefed on the proposal language. For readability and to facilitate quick digestion for all readers, we provide signposts along the way to ensure the familiar reader can skim that content.

The IMAP area includes the Cities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Stonnington, Yarra and Maribyrnong that have prepared the Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP). The core goal of this study is to deliver policy-relevant findings that can guide the IMAP councils in making strategic decisions about their policy strategies related to urban industrial-zoned land in the IMAP area. Underlying the core inquiry of this project is our over-arching hypothesis that small, high-value added, highly innovative urban manufacturers in Melbourne can benefit significantly from the agglomeration economies associated with inner-urban locations, and that there is great value to the urban economy in preserving a place for manufacturing innovators in the central city and immediate inner suburban areas. We hypothesize that the potential loss of urban manufacturing from central locations would come at greater costs to the Melbourne community than simply displacing some jobs to outlying suburbs. We suspect that this loss would include loss of innovation from the overall economy, loss of agglomeration economies, and other economic losses.

Right now, as part of the review and implementation of Plan Melbourne, urban policy is being formed and implemented in the IMR that will directly impact the capacity of urban manufacturers to remain in central locations. The purpose of this study is to help the local governments participating in IMAP to develop informed strategies as they make decisions about whether there is value in preserving industrial-zoned land in Melbourne’s inner suburbs, and also about the possible impacts of using the various policy levers available to government. As industrial uses compete with housing in a city where housing is among the most expensive in the world, now is the time to generate the new knowledge necessary for local governments to make informed decisions about how to manage the industrial land in their jurisdictions.
The above-described inquiries are aligned with IMAP’s *Investment Logic Map*, which identifies competition for space and a loss of economic diversity as major challenges for the IMAP area. In our original proposal, we proposed a research program that develops strategic responses that are specifically-targeted to the IMAP area, to address these challenges for the IMAP area, with particular respect to the small manufacturing sectors. We are seeking to deliver policy-relevant findings in the short term (one year), medium term (18 months) and long-term (five years) in a research program that addresses the challenge of creating and maintaining jobs by fostering small urban manufacturers and their supporting industries, and by examining the economic impacts of doing so.

Our interaction with local government strongly suggests that local government is well aware of the potential downsides of losing industrial land. The challenge is an absence of a robust evidence base to enable them to argue for retention of industrial areas in strategic locations. It is in generating this evidence base that this project can add the most value. Phase 1 of this project was designed to provide the base analysis to substantiate the need we assert for this evidence base.

This report describes the progress made thus far in Phase 1. The main conclusion from Phase 1 is that the findings are as we expected when we wrote the project proposal: existing data are not sufficient to explore our core inquiries farmed around the land, sector, and economic approaches, described in Section 3 below. Compilation of new data is required if we are to understand the queries we set out to address.

Figure 1 shows the IMAP area situated in the Greater Melbourne Metropolitan Region.

![Figure 1. IMAP Area Situated in the Greater Melbourne Metropolitan Region](image-url)
2. BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

This section provides a very brief conceptual backdrop for examining the above-described queries. A fully-cited discussion of the content summarized here appears in our original project proposal.

Empirical evidence in the United States strongly suggests that there has been a revival in small scale, local, and distinctly urban manufacturing in metropolises characterised by their knowledge-intensive activities (The Pratt Center, 2014). The latter include a growing interest in one or more of: fair trade, sustainability, local product orientation, health of the local economy, and/or product customisation. Driven by these underlying economic forces, the manufacturing that has remerged in US cities is high value-add, either because it is ‘high-tech’, or because it is ‘high-touch’ – capitalising on a host of competitive advantages including sophisticated design and astute market insight.

In Melbourne, the empirical evidence of such activities is limited at best: the actual structural changes in the manufacturing sectors are not well understood. There is some anecdotal evidence supporting the emergence of these trends here, but we strongly suspect that Melbourne’s public policy climate tracks that of the United States in its tendency. In short, while manufacturing may have changed considerably in Melbourne, the sector is still conceptualised by some in politics, public policy, planning and the general public as a relic of the city’s industrial period. While the conventional wisdom is that manufacturing is no longer suited to the inner city, some in local government in Australia do consider manufacturing a vibrant and important part of the local economy. This work challenges those that see manufacturing as a relic and provides the evidence for action and decision-making to support the making sectors.

A first step in our proposal is to refine currently-available data to take the investigation of small urban manufacturers beyond the anecdotal. Current publically and council-available data such as that from the Census and the Australian Business Register, are currently not suitable for an analysis of spatial distribution or sectoral character of small manufacturing firms in the IMAP region. Because of this, economic analysis of Melbourne’s small manufacturers – their contributions to the local, state, and national economies in terms of short-term jobs and longer-term innovation – are currently not possible. Nor is spatial analysis of where firms locate and how they use central locations toward the generation of efficiencies and innovation, possible.

What we do know is that industrial land across inner Melbourne is under considerable pressure for rezoning to so-called higher and better uses. Furthermore, we anticipate the possibility of a vicious cycle, with a lack of long term vision and zoning uncertainty leading to disinvestment that in turn results in underutilisation and strengthened pressure for rezoning. We contend that there is ample opportunity to realign the land concerns of councils and the industrial activities in Melbourne. Manufacturing and its supporting activities no longer exclusively require large workshops and warehouses housing a single firm. New manufacturing sectors compete with commercial and other uses in small home-based businesses and on commercial and mixed-use zoned lands. The needs of high-service, “high touch” producers in the manufacturing area are not well understood in Melbourne.

Undoubtedly, there is strong latent demand for housing in central-city areas. Residual land values for industrial properties are likely to be significantly higher under most housing redevelopment scenarios compared to continued use as ‘employment land’. However, property market valuations do not factor in the wider economic, social and environmental benefits attaching to retention of a diverse pool of employment generating land uses in the inner city. Left to its own devices, the market may well be generating inefficient outcomes in these areas and for the metropolis as a whole. But the evidence to judge this in either direction is currently not available.
Given the lack of substantive research to the contrary, the popular conceptualisation of industrial lands located in the inner Melbourne as ‘no longer fulfilling their function’ may be ill-informed and outdated, resulting in the unnecessary suppression of economic activity and job creation. As the eminent economic geographer, Saskia Sassen, observes, new manufacturing is not well-understood by “....economic development experts and planners, or misunderstood as an anachronism because its connection to the advanced knowledge sectors is not noticed”. In short, an important source of worthwhile work lying between that undertaken by ‘symbolic analysts’ and that transacted by ‘in person service workers’ may be foregone, adding to the hollowing out of the labour force.

Moreover, this unwitting displacement of existing and latent manufacturing activity may be eroding cities’ environmental sustainability. For example, locally produced goods can be more environmentally sustainable due to reduced material-intensity, orientation towards local markets reducing total vehicle kilometres, sensitivity to subtle changes in client demand leading, and reduced waste and excess production. More generally, in the absence of propitious spaces for this locally focussed and customised production, environmental entrepreneurship and leadership may be dampened.

---

2 Plan Melbourne (2014) Initiative 1.6.1, page 49
3 Sassen, S. (2014) Jane Jacobs revisited: the link between older material economies and today’s knowledge economy. http://www.thecitiescafe.com/?page_id=47. This source is no longer available online, but was accessed on 10 March 2015.
4 Here, we use the typology of occupations developed by Robert Reich in the “The Work of Nations” (1991)
3. EMPIRICAL APPROACHES: LAND, SECTOR, AND ECONOMIC

This section briefly describes the analytical approach that we expanded upon in the original project proposal. Toward understanding the complex urban systems underlying small urban manufacturing, this research examines the issue from three angles: a land perspective, a sector perspective, and an economic perspective. Scholars and practitioners interested in urban economies are aware that the land, sector, and economic approaches are actually heavily interdependent and endogenous. However, for analytical purposes, it is useful to distinguish the three areas. This is because the theoretical concerns, research approaches, and practical policy realities for land use, sector activity, and economic outcomes are often very different, and each must be fully considered. The overarching goal of generating understanding in these three areas is to extract the implications for planning controls and design in inner city industrial zones. The content-driven objectives of this study are to:

1. Understand how industrial zoned land in inner Melbourne is currently being used (the land approach)
2. Understand the value of central locations for businesses in the small manufacturing sector (the sector approach)
3. Understand the economic impacts and contributions of small urban manufacturers (the economic approach).

Phase 1 funding supports development of a base of evidence that cuts across all three of these approaches in the short term, and treats them all more thoroughly in the longer term. Future ARC or other grant funding will support deeper inquiry across all objectives, but more heavily focused on Objective 3. The remainder of this section describes these approaches and explains our rationale for including each. Section 3 describes the proposed phased implementation of the research program.

3.1 THE LAND APPROACH

The primary activity in the land approach would be a cataloguing and analysis of the economic activities occurring in industrial-zoned areas. The land approach is crucial for two reasons. First, urban policy is currently being formed that will heavily influence the use of a significant amount of industrial-zoned land – and other land that houses industrial uses – in the IMR. Second, local governments participating in the IMAP are seeking updated information to inform their decisions about whether there is value in preserving industrial-zoned land in the IMR, and in using the available policy levers to facilitate urban making on other types of lands such as commercial and mixed use. There is currently a possibility for divergence from the dominant paradigm of housing being the highest and best use of the industrial land. Now is the time to generate the new knowledge necessary for local governments to make informed decisions about how to use the industrial land at their disposal. Second, the impacts of urban manufacturing extends far beyond the trade-off between industrial and residential zoning. Urban manufacturers may not be primarily located on only industrial land – and instead may be using commercial and mixed-use office spaces, particularly for the non-manufacturing parts of their businesses.

The land approach creates the possibility of a renewed understanding of what constitutes manufacturing in today’s service-oriented economy. Industrial zoning is based on notions of manufacturing as land-intensive, machinery-intensive processes that are not appropriate for contemporary central cities because of their polluting smokestacks, noise concerns, and warehousing requirements. As evidence from New York suggests, new urban manufacturing no longer necessarily comes with these concerns. Just-in-time shipping reduces the need for large warehouses that store weeks or months’ worth of supplies. Many small urban manufacturers are actually hybrid entities of sorts, concurrently providing a product and a service. Some of these concurrent products and services are very high-end, such as $12,000 custom bicycles that come with...
a two-day experience of visiting the factory to be fitted and meet the craftsmen who will produce the bicycle. Our questions are in whether these uses can benefit from central locations in terms of the capacity of inner cities to develop agglomeration economies among small manufacturers. It is time to rethink urban manufacturing and its role in the central city, and the following questions query this hypothesis:

1. What kinds of economic activities are being conducted on industrial-zoned urban land in inner Melbourne?
2. Are manufacturing activities occurring on other types of lands, such as mixed-use and commercial zoned lands? Is there a particular type of manufacturing that is suitable for these types of lands?
3. Is there evidence of a high-innovation, high-value-added manufacturing sector developing in the inner region?
4. What other uses are occurring on industrial-zone urban land? Is the land being used largely by entities that comply with the industrial zoning requirements?
5. Are new types of manufacturers, with economic scopes different to those of traditional manufacturing, emerging in the IMR? Do we have reason to rethink how we define urban manufacturing and support its presence in inner cities?

3.2 THE SECTOR APPROACH

The sector approach examines the interactions of inner-city land uses with the requirements of firms to survive, innovate, grow, and prosper. Concerned with the needs that firms have in order to continue carrying out their core business, this line of inquiry examines the barriers and impediments that occupancy of high-value, highly-accessible urban land provides – if any. The activities and questions in this approach are informed by economic theory on agglomeration economies and innovation.

Agglomeration economies are the productivity benefits that firms receive from being located in close proximity to concentrations of firms and people. They are often differentiated into two sub-categories, urbanization economies and localization economies. Urbanization economies are the productivity effects of being in a large labour market featuring a large concentration of readily accessible firms across a variety of sectors, while localization economies are the productivity benefits associated with being near firms that are involved in similar or complementary industries. Both are what economists call positive externalities.

The reliance by small firms on agglomeration economies is well-documented. Small firms tend to be at the forefront of innovation, and thrive in the presence of other innovators. As firms grow, their processes become standardized and established, and they tend to become less innovative. They also become less reliant on the positive externalities associated with highly urbanized, fertile central-city environments. A good example of this effect is Microsoft, which moved away from Silicon Valley when its Windows operating system became established as the industry leader.

In Melbourne, it is possible that displacement of urban manufacturers from central cities could have a stifling effect on innovation, creation, growth, and prosperity of individual firms. It is also possible that, rather than merely relocating, firms that are forced to leave the inner suburbs simply close, removing their value added and their innovative capacity from the pool of Australian industries. Crucial to understanding whether preserving industrial land uses is necessary, and whether allowing development of making on other types of land zones, is an understanding of how these small manufacturers interact with each other, learn from each other, and grow from that experience. Crucial also is an understanding of the barriers and impediments that stifle that innovation and growth. Toward this end, this line of inquiry examines the needs of small manufacturers in the IMR according to the following questions:
1. Is the central location required for these firms to survive, grow, and prosper?
2. Are we seeing evidence of agglomeration economies forming among small manufacturers in the IMR?
3. What factors do firms consider when deciding to locate in an inner city?
4. What types of local firm interactions are important for firm growth? What kinds of linkages do they exploit? Ignore?
5. What are the growth goals of inner-city manufacturing firms?
6. What are the major impediments to growth, e.g., space, regulatory environment, rents?
7. Are strong links to universities compelling small manufacturers to locate in central cities?
   What is lost when they move away from the university environment?
8. Why do boutique manufacturing firms leave the inner city? Is it because they have graduated to a more mature stage of development, or do they leave while still in stages where proximity to other firms is crucial? Where do they go? Do they survive?

3.3 THE ECONOMIC APPROACH

The economic approach examines the impacts that small urban manufacturers exert on the urban economy, including the effect on wages, jobs, and innovation in the region. We hypothesize that impediments experienced by small manufacturing firms can have a stifling effect on the entire economy. Conversely, that these small firms can exert positive influences on their own and other related and supporting sectors. If small, high-value manufacturing creates positive effects for the urban economy, and if the contributions of this sector can be made more productive through public policy initiatives or investments, then policy makers would surely want to know this. The questions below are indicative of the queries that we would make through the economic approach:

1. What would be the overall economic cost (local, state, and national) of continued loss of urban industrial land in terms of jobs, value-added, and innovation, within the small urban manufacturing sectors?
2. Are there demographically-differentiated economic costs associated with loss or movement of small manufacturing firms, e.g., loss of modest-wage jobs or jobs for the young and recent university graduates?
3. Do small manufacturers support other sectors, e.g., legal and accounting services? What fertile effects would occur outside of the manufacturing sector?
4. What components of the industrial value chain are suffering the most from land restrictions? (informed by input-output analysis)
5. How do Australian and Victorian macro-economic trends and restrictions affect local manufacturing outputs?
6. Is council assistance in the form of start-up grants or business incubation, associated with firm longevity and value-added over the medium term?
7. Are universities exerting significant influence on creating fertile environments for firm growth in the small manufacturing sectors?
8. Is firm birth, growth, and innovation limited by the diminishing quantity of industrial-zoned land in the IMR? (this question is related to both land and economic approaches, and will build on the land approach)
4. WHAT MAKES A MAKER? DEFINITION OF THE SECTOR

This section has two purposes. First, we describe why it is necessary to delay a precise definition of “high-value, highly-innovative urban maker.” Second, we review the literature that will ultimately inform how we define our makers and the scope of our study. Third, we make some concluding remarks about how we will move forward.

4.1. THE ISSUE OF DEFINITION

Many of our government partners, along with a significant number of Workshop 1 participants, have stressed a need for a definition of what we mean by “maker.” Definition is a complex issue which we address in this section.

Certainly, for the purposes of statistical analysis, it was necessary to define key terms like “small” and “manufacturing.” Creating a precise definition is sometimes necessary; for instance, when using the CLUE data, to establish cut-offs between small and very small businesses, or to establish which ANZSIC codes to explore.

However, the exploration of the definition is built into this project. We have known from project conception that the state of knowledge about what Melbourne’s makers do and who they are, is limited. For this reason, one of our first tasks has been to explore the field of makers using two types of in-depth qualitative analysis, which is also described later in this report.

We must, then, be careful not to settle on definitions too early. This would engender unnecessary false precision. While we generally acknowledged that a definition is needed to allow for analysis of the sector and subsequent action, the definition of the ‘urban manufacturing’ or ‘urban makers’ sector depends on what question is being asked, or the policy challenge that is attempting to be addressed, in addition to being reliant on the actual profile of makers in the IMAP and Melbourne areas.

There are many ways we could define the sector, but they depend on what purpose the definition is serving. With this study at an exploratory stage it would be unwise to define the sector too tightly when it is not yet known what exactly we’re looking at. For similar reasons, we have also decided to hold off on deciding whether to include the level of innovation and value-added of individual makers in our project scope.

Our definition, therefore, is intentionally broad at the moment, will be tightened as we extract findings from the qualitative analysis that is currently underway, and will be finalized before the final survey is put into action. Further tightening will depend on purpose. We do know that the final definition that emerges will need to be flexible and considered in the Melbourne/Australian context. Our preliminary work suggests that the definition will need to encompass a diverse range of production activities. The following examples of actual firms provide a preliminary glimpse of what a definition must consider:

1) A fashion designer who produces clothing prototypes onsite but manufactures at scale elsewhere
2) A production company that produces commercials/tv shows/movies
3) A software company that makes video games on-site but only sells them electronically
4) A bicycle company that produces bicycles on-site but achieves a large amount of its value-added from the service component of its business, i.e., the experience of having a $12,000 bicycle fitted to the individual.
5) A sales showroom for electric cars designed and manufactured elsewhere.
A tofu maker that makes tofu locally according to standard processes that have remained virtually unchanged for more than 30 years, but has innovated in the sales and marketing of tofu.

4.2. MAKING VERSUS MANUFACTURING

Thus far, we have not taken care to distinguish “makers” from “manufacturers.” As above, this is intentional at this point in the project. Part of the reason for this lack of distinction is as above: that we are uncertain about the composition of the maker/manufacturer community in Melbourne, and do not wish too-preliminarily to disregard firms from the analysis that could be instructive in addressing our research and policy questions.

The USA based Urban Manufactures Alliance differentiates makers from manufactures based on scale, with makers becoming manufactures when their products are made at scale (Urban Manufacturers Alliance, 2015). Both makers and manufacturers typically have the same land use requirements, using the same type of zone. However, “maker” businesses typically don’t create a lot of jobs or provide jobs for populations that are low income, new immigrants, or have limited English skills (Friedman & Byron, 2012). That said, makers are particularly useful in a zoning and land use discussion as they are typically more visible than traditional manufacturing and provide good examples of innovative businesses.

4.3. USING INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATIONS TO DEFINE THE SECTOR

Despite the intentional broad nature of the initial definition, is instructive to understand how the other thinkers have conceptualized small makers for their research and policy analysis.

One way to consider defining manufacturers is via their ANZSIC codes. In considering the activities that predominately occupy industrial land, at a broader level the industrial sector is commonly defined through the use of Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification codes (ANZSICs). These classifications are required by the Australian Business Register for any firm turning over more than $75,000 per year and meeting certain commerce requirements. In practice and for research, they provide one indicator of the primary function of a business.

Box 1. An Overseas Classification System

New York City defines “Industrial” uses as manufacturing, transportation and warehousing, construction, wholesale retail, and film. A business is defined as belonging to one of those sectors according to what their self-identified NAICS (North American Industrial Classification System) is. NAICS are equivalent to Australia’s ANZSIC.

There are a number of benefits and challenges associated with using ANZSIC codes to define makers. In theory they allow for consistent identification over geography and time. Since each firm must report under an ANZSIC code, we have information for all firms.

One major advantage of ANZSIC codes is that they are very clear about distinguishing firms that produce something from firms that primarily market, warehouse, or engage in service activities. However, the accuracy and relevance of ANZSIC codes in representing industries, evolves as those industries evolve. This is particularly the case for smaller and micro firms that undertake a range of activities across industrial classification codes (for example designing, manufacturing, marketing, and sales all on the one premise). Generally, a firm is classified under only one code, and firms tend to not shift their ANZSIC code even if the focus of the firm changes.

5 While the New York City government includes film NAICS in their definition of industrial, this is often excluded from definitions of urban manufacturing.
Additionally, not all businesses that categorise themselves as manufacturing actually manufacture at scale themselves. This is common in the fashion and apparel industry, and other industries where prototyping then contract manufacturing is normal practice. Furthermore, there are some industry classifications that produce products but are listed in the ANZSIC codes outside of manufacturing; for instance, in Printing and Publishing. Whether to include these types of firms in a definition again depends on the purpose of the definition.

One way in which to cast a wide net to define the sector broadly but retain some level of differentiation between the types of manufactures and how 'core' making is to their business, is to compliment Industry classifications with Occupation classifications (ANZSCO). Such a process, developed by the ARC Centre of Excellence for Creative Industries & Innovation (Higgs, Cunningham, & Pagan, 2007) for assessment of the creative industries, would allow for both the primary function of the business (ANZSIC) to be considered in conjunction with the primary function of employees (ANZSCO). This would account for production related employees working in a non-manufacturing or industrial business, and vice versa.

Table 4.1 illustrates how the combination of industry and occupation data could allow for the development of a matrix for determining employment within the urban manufacturing sector. It would differentiate between:

- Urban Manufacturing Occupations within the core Urban Manufacturing Industries ('Specialist');
- Those in the Urban Manufacturing Occupations in employment in other industries ('Embedded'); and
- The non-urban manufactures management and support occupations that are employed within the specific Urban Manufacturing Industries ('Support').

Table 4.1. Trident Method for Determining Employment within the Urban Manufacturing Workforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Manufacturing Occupations</th>
<th>Employed in Other Industries</th>
<th>Total Employed in Urban Manufacturing Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialists urban manufactures “Specialist”</td>
<td>Embedded urban manufacturers “Embedded”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Support Staff “Support workers”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Creative Industries Trident (Higgs et al 2007)
4.4. EXISTING DEFINITIONS USED IN PRACTICE

Governments and industry groups provide insight into how making and manufacturing are defined in Melbourne and other settings. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) through the Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification (ANZSIC) codes defines manufacturers as *units mainly engaged in the physical or chemical transformation of materials, substances or components into new products (except agriculture and construction)* (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2015).

Importantly 'units', while commonly described as plants, factories or mills that characteristically use power-driven machines and other materials-handling equipment, also includes the transformation of *materials, substances or components into new products by hand, or in the home* (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2015).

Additionally, the ABS definition allows for units primarily engage in physical or chemical transformation to also undertake activities incidental to their primary manufacturing role, including selling product direct to consumers from the same premises as it is made. This allows for bakeries, custom tailors, and so on to be included in the manufacturing sector (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2015). If units also sell other products that they did not manufacture themselves, then the rules for the treatment of mixed activities is applied and their classification is based on their predominant activity.

The ABS definition of manufacturing includes the assembly of component parts of manufactured products. These can be either self-produced or purchased from other manufacturers (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2015).

Similar to the ABS definition, a manufacturing firm in the United States is defined as a firm *engaged in the mechanical, physical, or chemical transformation of materials, substances, or components into new products*. As in Australia, the assembly of component parts of manufactured products in considered manufacturing, as is the development of new products by hand or in a workers home (United States Census Bureau, 2015).

In the United States a similar industrial classification system to Australia's ANZSIC codes is used, known as NAICS (North American Industry Classification System).

Part of the challenge with existing industrial classification codes such as ANZSIC and NAICS is that they may fail to accurately account for the increasing breadth of activities that are being undertaken within the manufacturing sector (NYCEDC, 2013). Global operations have broadened the scope of manufacturing, with the value derived from customers broadening from the good alone to also include services and knowledge associated with the good (Fleury et al., 2007). This has been acknowledged by some government bodies, with the European Commission (2004) "Manufuture Vision for 2020" calling for a transition in the manufacturing sector:

- from resource-based to knowledge-based manufacturing;
- from linearity to complexity;
- from individual to system competition; and
- from mono-disciplinarily to trans-disciplinarily

Acknowledging these transition challenges, the United States based Urban Manufactures Alliance (UMA) defines urban manufacturing as all production that occurs in urban areas (with urban defined as Metropolitan Statistical Areas with populations greater than 100,000). This includes the production of products for use or sale through the use of machines, tools, chemical, biological processing, or formulation (Urban Manufacturers Alliance, 2015). The UMA distinguishes urban
manufacturers and makers from hobbies and crafts when product begins to be made at scale (Urban Manufacturers Alliance, 2015).

4.5. EXISTING DEFINITIONS USED IN RESEARCH AND POLICY ANALYSIS

This section describes how some of the issues around our problem are operationalized in policy analysis and scholarship. We include how authors differentiate makers from manufacturers as they operationalize research, how they use industrial classification codes, how studies of small makers and manufacturers define thresholds like small, innovative, or high-value added. This section also situates our project in the international literature that seeks to understand the land, sector, and economic dimensions of urban making.

Firm size is clearly an important feature of urban makers and manufactures, particularly when differentiating them from the traditional, large scale manufactures that have more historically dominated the manufacturing sector. Differences in productive technologies, capital intensities, and scale economies influence an industry’s technological firm size (Beck, Demirgüc-Kunt, Laeven, & Levine, 2008).

As noted, urban makers and manufacturers tend to be small and micro businesses, however finding a definition of what constitutes a small and micro business is challenging. As noted by Storey (1994) there is no single, uniformly acceptable, definition of a small firm. Employment numbers and sales turnover are generally used as an indicator of business size, however what constitutes a small business in one sector or industry within a sector may not be considered small in another sector or industry within a sector.

For example, a retail store with 100 employees is, within the retail sector, relatively much larger than a manufacturing firm with 100 employees is within the manufacturing sector. Additionally, within a sector such as manufacturing a ‘small’ business in the petrochemical industry is likely to be a much larger in absolute terms than a ‘small’ car repair business.

As such, Storey (1994) notes that business size definitions at a sectorial level which are based on objective measures, such as number of employees or sales turnover may result in all firms may be regarded as small in some sectors, while in others, no firms may be classified as small. This is illustrated in the definition applied by the U.S. Government Small Business Administration, in which a small business in the manufacturing sector is, for the most part, considered to be a business of less than 500 people (Small Business Administration, 2015). Based on 2010 data, this threshold results in 99 per cent of U.S. manufacturing businesses being considered small ([Mistry & Byron, 2011], see Table 4.3).

With this in mind, Storey (1994) goes on to note that debates about definition turn out to be sterile unless size is shown to be a factor which influences the ‘performance’ of firms (pg. 16).

In attempting to determine what constitutes a small business base on performance, Bolton (1971) and later Aitkinson and Meager (1994) highlight that the management structure of a business, and how it changes with business size is generally a good indicator in which to separate micro, small and medium businesses. Small, and particularly micro businesses are generally characterised by the absence of a formalised management structure, with the owner-manager having a heavy influence on the daily decisions of the business. Management in small firms is generally informal, personal, with the character and preoccupations of the manager significant influences (Wright, 2012).

Aitkinson and Meager (1994) identify that when business reach a size of between 10 and 20 employees, managerial appointments generally occur, and as such the owners are no longer the
exclusive source of managerial decisions. The move from less than 10 to more than 10 employees therefore appears to mark an important break from micro to small businesses.

These ‘break points’ in the management structure of small and micro businesses are reflected in the European Commission definitions of micro and small business within the broader Small Medium Enterprises (SME) grouping.

The European Commission use three main factors to determine business size – number of employees and either turnover or balance sheet total. It is compulsory to respect the staff headcount thresholds (includes full-time, part-time, seasonal, casual, and owner-managers), but an SME may choose to meet either the turnover or balance sheet ceiling, and may exceed one of them without losing its status. The break points between business size categories are illustrated below.

**Table 4.2. European Commission SME Size Thresholds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company category</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
<th>or</th>
<th>Balance sheet total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium-sized</td>
<td>&lt; 250</td>
<td>≤ € 50 m</td>
<td>≤</td>
<td>€ 43 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>&lt; 50</td>
<td>≤ € 10 m</td>
<td>≤</td>
<td>€ 10 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>≤ € 2 m</td>
<td>≤</td>
<td>€ 2 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: European Commission (2012)

Analysis of manufacturing business sizes in the United States in 2010 reveals that a majority (around 70 per cent) of manufacturing businesses employ fewer than 20 people. In America’s major cities the percentage of businesses with less than 20 employees is even higher, particularly in New York (82.7 per cent of manufacturers employ less than 20 people), Los Angeles (80.3 per cent), and San Diego (74.7 per cent) (Mistry & Byron, 2011).

**Table 4.3. U.S. manufacturing businesses by size (2010)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of employees</th>
<th>Percentage of manufacturing establishments in the US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-49</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-499</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-499</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000+</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NIST/ Hollings MEP (2010) in Misty and Byron (2011)

Beyond business size, overseas literature on urban makers and manufacturers has also focused on the level of innovation and value-add exhibited by manufacturing businesses.

Manufacturing is the turning of ideas into products and services, and in a highly competitive global market, relies heavily on innovation in order to generate value. Value can be created in a number of ways, including through unique production processes, high brand recognition, rapid delivery times, or highly customised services (Livesey, 2006).
This broader recognition of value-add is reflected in the work of (Friedman & Byron, 2012) who identify “high-value / high-performance” subsectors of manufacturing that include makers of both “high-tech” and “high-touch” products. High-touch manufacturing refers to production that relies on a high level of human interaction that results in high levels of market insight and customisation. With this appreciation of value-add both technologically advanced goods and those made by traditional processes are included.

The Institute of Manufacturing (in Livesey 2006) developed a framework for analysis high value manufacturing. This framework categorises manufacturers into one of four types, all of which can be high value-add depending on the context and capabilities of individual businesses. The four manufacturer types include:

- **Service led producers** who provide customers with services based on a significant production capability. These businesses are strongly based around production, but derive a substantial proportion of their revenue from services.
- **Product manufacturers** who focus on generating value through production. These are the more traditional manufacturers with the majority of their costs in production and a majority of their revenues from selling products.
- **Service manufacturers** who have little or no production and generate value from services which are based around a product. They sell products but a majority of their costs are not associated with production. This includes businesses that build one-off specialist products that requires significant R&D and design input.
- **System integrators** who control the channel to customers and manage an external production network. These are generally companies that once produced but have detached from production and now entirely provide services.

Figure 4.1 presents a matrix of how these four manufacturing types derive revenue from products or services, and incur costs on production and non-production.

**Figure 4.1. Framework for analysing types of manufacturers**

![Diagram](source: Livesey 2006)

4.6. DELAYING DEFINITION

For the moment, as we describe above, we use the above literature and working definitions to inform our work. However, how we eventually define the small, high-value making/manufacturing sector for our study area will emerge from the upcoming empirical work.
However, the review above does highlight some important considerations as we explore this definition. We will continue to consider these as the project progresses. One major task of our data-collection processes, described below and currently underway, will be to observe the composition of construction of the making/manufacturing sectors. This empirical approach will allow us to explore whether our hypothesis that Melbourne is trailing the USA experience, has some foundation. It will also allow us to explore how Melbourne’s industry is unique or different from that experience, thus exposing the particular contributions of local conditions and policy to the making sectors.
5. DEVELOPMENT AND MODIFICATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH

The purpose of this section is twofold. First, this section briefly describes the implementation approach that we expanded upon in the original project proposal. Second and importantly, this section describes some of the changes that the Steering Committee has decided are appropriate given the findings to-date, and which have thus been integrated into the project workflow since the original project proposal was submitted. This section describes the major amendments to the project timelines that arise out of the work we have completed to-date. This section largely summarizes the major action items that are described in more detail and justified in previous sections.

This section provides a high-level overview of the project approach. We operationalize this approach in three pilot projects. Sections 6 and 7 below describe in more detail the Phase 1 sub-projects, which are currently underway.

This core purpose of this report is to detail the findings from Phase 1. A second purpose is to convince the Steering Committee and the funders that the project is worthwhile moving ahead into further funding phases, particularly an ARC Linkage Grant. Phases 2 and 3 are mentioned in this section to frame the future of the project, but they are not part of the core purpose of this report. This section details the approach that we have taken for Phase 1, and describes Phases 2 and 3 in less detail.

From the beginning of the project, we have envisioned a multi-phase project implementation wherein each phase cross-cuts the three approaches we describe above, with ongoing reflection on the public policy implications of the findings. The short-term funds would fund Phases 1 and 2. Future funding, either via an ARC Linkage Grant or Centre of Excellence, would fund further investigations of these issues, perhaps on a national scale. In this section, we describe the three research phases, including a brief overview of the methods of data collection and data analysis that we would employ in each. In the foregoing sections, we also describe some expected observations and outcomes in the ongoing reflection during the project.

Table 5.1 below shows the original project timeline. Table 5.2 below shows the new project timeline, which reflects the changes we describe in this section. The core differences between the original and the updated timeline are:

1. The Phase 1 report (this report) is submitted early, in Month 6 instead of Month 7
2. Phase 1 is extended to December 2015; this extension replaces Phase 2
3. Phase 2 funds will not be expended in 2015, but rather will be used as commitment to the ARC Linkage grant, should IMAP make the commitment
4. The timeline reflects the ARC Linkage projected application deadline of November; this may be adjusted again as new information emerges and deadlines are set by the ARC.

5.1. PHASE 1 DEVELOPMENTS

This section describes the modifications to Phase 1 arising out of the project workflow thus far. In the original project proposal, the core tasks for Phase 1 were:

1. Leveraging existing data – describing the lessons that an be learned from existing data, and what questions cannot be addressed
2. Qualitative inquiries – using qualitative exploration to explore the issues facing the IMAP’s urban makers
3. Survey development and piloting – using the qualitative inquiry to inform the design of a survey instrument to address some of the economic approach questions, which would then be piloted.

All of these objectives are on track for on-time completion by the original Phase 1 report deadline of October 2015. These were to be reflected in the Phase 1 report as originally conceived. As we describe below, due to changes in funding conditions, we have modified the timeline for some of these components – particularly, the qualitative inquiries and the survey development.

**Leveraging Existing Data**

This area or inquiry has been completed according to the original workflow plan; we present the findings in Section 7 below. We propose no modifications to this component of the workflow.

There are several datasets currently in existence for Victoria that each provide key data for economic analysis of economic development in small manufacturing sectors, but none of them provide a complete picture for all three approaches – land, sector, and economic – to be analysed for small manufacturing firms. Some datasets provide important spatial and sector data, but do not provide it at a fine-enough information on employment to isolate small makers. For instance, Industry Atlas data provide sector information by LGA, highlighting success cases such as the large and growing machinery and medical technology sectors in Yarra. However, the data in their current format do not allow for the isolation of small and very small manufacturing firms (fewer than 20 employees, fewer than five employees). Similarly, existing Australian Business Register data are available to the IMAP councils in geocoded (or geocodable) format. However, this data does not include firm size or other critical data such as value added and capital investment. These data could provide a spatial picture of how industrial-zoned land is used in in the IMAP region (the land approach), but do not allow us to discover the sector-based economies and constraints that exist for the makers occupying these spaces (the sector approach).

Some existing datasets provide spatial information – such as land use zoning and VicCLUE data – but do not combine it with sector data about firms occupying the spaces that is specific enough for economic analysis. These datasets can tell us something about where to find industrial-zoned land in the IMAP region, but do not provide us with information about how small makers are distributed in this space (the land and sector approaches), or how being located within this space affects their productivity and innovation (the economic approach). Finally, none of the existing data tell us anything about why firms leave the IMAP region – either via relocation or firm death – and where they go if they do relocate (the economic approach). Section 7 of this report explores what kinds of analysis and conclusions are possible using these existing datasets.

**Qualitative Inquiry**

This section first describes the qualitative inquiries as originally conceived, and subsequently describes how the timelines for the qualitative inquiries have changed. This includes an explanation of why the findings from the qualitative inquiries are not included in this Phase 1 report.

One significant finding of this report is that even a compilation of all available data from the ABR, Census JTW, VicCLUE, Valuer General, and other relevant datasets, there are still significant gaps in our understanding of how small manufacturers derive their economies of scale, capitalise on information networks, and leverage their location and proximity for growth (the economic approach). More fundamentally, there are also significant gaps in our understanding of what it means to be a small manufacturer, how manufacturing functions integrate with service and other functions to create service-oriented production like high-end bicycles, three-dimensional printing, and biotechnology products with strong service dimensions (the sector approach). Even more
fundamentally, there are still be significant omissions in our understanding of how urban land is used in the IMAP region (the land approach).

The qualitative inquiries that we undertake as part of Phase 1 have been designed to inform the development of the survey while increasing our understanding of causal effects and nuanced forces acting on small urban makers. We expect to find a significant number of non-complying, non-industrial uses, including music venues, cafes, live/work artists lofts, midnight bakers that supply the local cafes, and maybe even squatters. The presence of a high concentration of actual industrial uses, or alternatively, a high concentration of industrial uses that do not align with traditional manufacturing definitions as defined in the ANZSIC codes. Whether we, in subsequent phases, ignore the non-complying uses or integrating them into the complex narrative that we will probably uncover, is dependent on us first knowing that they are there. Sections 6 describes the two qualitative inquiries in detail.

The understanding we have developed from the qualitative inquiries about small urban makers in the Melbourne region has helped us to deepen our theory base and is now at work informing the economic hypotheses that we describe above, around the economic approach. At the outset of the project, we did not have enough understanding of the current business climate in the IMR to settle on this or some other specific hypotheses as the important ones to test, and the dynamics of small, high-value added urban manufacturing is not well-understood. Because of the qualitative inquiries, we are now in a better position to develop and validate hypotheses to be tested with the survey, regarding kinds of uses occurring in firms located on industrial-zoned lands in the IMAP area (the land approach), the factors that facilitate firm survival and prosperity decline and demise (the sector approach), and the local, state, and national economic impacts of these small firms (the economic approach).

In the original workflow plan, the qualitative inquiries were to be completed by October 2015 and the findings included in the Phase 1 report. However, the Steering Committee has decided that an ARC Linkage Grant application will be developed in the upcoming months. This issue will be raised with the IMAP leadership in the August IMAP meeting. This development introduces a variation in the original project timeline. We note that our Phase 1 reporting schedule is modified over the original schedule, give the need for IMAP to consider funding Phase 2 in advance of the November deadline for ARC Linkage grants. Originally, the Phase 1 report was set to be due in late October 2015. However, due to the updated schedule, the Phase 1 report must be made available to IMAP on 12 August. This is why the findings for the three pilot projects described in Section 6 are not yet ready.

Survey Development: Testing Hypotheses on the Land and Sector Approaches

In the original project description proposed to and approved by IMAP, the survey was only to be developed and piloted in Phase 1. Implementation of the survey on a large scale was to be part of Phase 2. However, due to unforeseen circumstances, which this section describes, the Steering Committee has decided to move the survey implementation ahead into Phase 1. We see this as a positive development: the survey is largely read for implementation, and we have generated synergies that make it more efficient to start the survey earlier.

The survey design is integrated with both the qualitative findings and international evidence from places like New York, so that it can include hypotheses that can test for possible future scenarios that may emerge in Melbourne.

The survey is designed to be an electronic land-use survey and business inventory of firms on lands in the IMAP area, and also a sample of firms located outside the IMAP area. A survey of firms located outside the IMAP area will allow us to address hypotheses about why firms leave the IMAP
area and whether agglomeration effects are real in the IMAP area. A sampling framework is currently being devised to reflect both the land and sector approaches. Survey strata reflecting the land approach will sample firms operating within the IMAP region, in order to develop a picture of how industrial-zoned land is used in the region, and how small manufacturers situate themselves spatially. The land approach sampling strata will be spatial, reflecting industrial-zoned land and other land that could house industrial uses, e.g., mixed-use zoning or zoning code exceptions. Survey strata reflecting the sector approach will target particular firms within certain manufacturing sectors. These strata would come from ABR data on small manufacturers, and would target particular sectors.

This survey is designed to collect data on products and services, firm size, output, employment, growth and location history, and organizational structure (non-profit, etc.). It will collect information on non-manufacturing activities being conducted as part of the firm’s activities, the amount of innovation investment that the firms make, firms reliance on central locations for growth and innovation, considerations that firms make when choosing inner city locations, firm interactions and linkages, growth goals, links to universities and government, major impediments to growth, e.g., space, regulatory environment, rents, why boutique manufacturing firms leave the inner city, and when they do, where they go and whether they survive.

With the insights gained from the qualitative studies, we will continue to refine the existing survey instrument to reflect the particular local conditions that we encounter. We will generate a dataset of a statistically valid sample of firms within the IMAP area and also at strategically-selected areas outside of IMAP (for control and comparison), designed to understand business structures, processes and linkages, as well as additional hypotheses we generated during the Inception Workshop (described below). Sampling will be designed to allow for spatial representativeness of the data and appropriate statistical power.

5.2. NEXT STEPS – EXTENDING PHASE 1

The aforementioned, unforeseen circumstances are the result of changing funding options from the Carlton Connect Initiative Fund (CCIF) in combination with lessons learned from the Inception Workshop held on 28 May. One of the conditions of continued IMAP funding for Phase 2 was matching funding to be provided by an additional CCIF application. However, the CCIF program is currently under review by its funders, and as a result of this, the funding scheme which would have provided matching funding for Phase 2, has been suspended.

Fortuitously, a development during the Inception Workshop underscored the need to change the project phasing. The workshop findings are described in detail in Section 8 below, but we briefly summarize here. In short, the project team has decided that, in order to respond to makers’ request for a visible symbol of their participation in the project, a combined survey and makers map will be implemented electronically in Phase 1. This is possible using existing project funds. The Steering Committee has agreed to move the survey and analysis forward to Phase 1.

Also, the Project management Team has decided to seek Steering Committee and IMAP approval to develop an ARC Linkage Grant application in the upcoming months, to continue the project work. This issue will be raised with the IMAP leadership in the August IMAP meeting. This development introduces another variation in the original project timeline. We note that our Phase 1 reporting schedule is modified over the original schedule, give the need for IMAP to consider funding Phase 2 in advance of the November deadline for ARC Linkage grants. Originally, the Phase 1 report was set to be due in late October 2015. However, due to the updated schedule, the Phase 1 report must be made available to IMAP on 12 August. This is why the findings for the three pilot projects described in Section 6 are not yet ready.
The ARC Linkage grant application will be completed with the University of Melbourne in partnership with IMAP using existing committed IMAP funds, and seeing additional state government partners (MPA has already made a commitment). The ARC partnership would move forward to test the larger economic questions as outlined above. These questions include impacts that small urban manufacturers exert on the urban economy, including the effect on wages, jobs, and innovation in the region. Underlying this approach is our hypothesis that the impediments experienced by small manufacturing firms can have a stifling effect on the entire economy, and conversely, that these small firms can exert positive influences on their own and other related and supporting sectors. The products of this grant could include the following:

- Analysis of value chain data for each enterprise, covering in-bound logistics, operations, outbound logistics, marketing and sales, after sales service, strategic management, human resources, technology and procurement.
- Exploration of barriers to entry or growth for urban manufacturers, for example, accessing finance or government assistance.
- Further mapping of select firms’ spatial linkages with suppliers, collaborators, workers, distributors, customers and retailers with a view to understanding economies of scale and scope attaching to agglomerations.
- Estimation of agglomeration economies effects for the IMAP region and the State of Victoria, for urban manufacturers, differentiated by location (urban versus suburban).
- Estimation of lost innovation and value added due to displacement effects.

5.3. ARC LINKAGE GRANT – PARTNER EXPECTATIONS

The IMAP made very clear when it committed funding for Phases 1 and 2, that it would not commit additional funds beyond Phase 2 for the project, and that the $40,000 it committed ($20,000 for Phase 1 and an additional $20,000 for Phase 2) must be matched by the University of Melbourne. Given the explanation we provide in the previous section, the matching funding for Phase 2 is not forthcoming. For this reason and the others also described above, we have decided to extend Phase 1 and seek to apply Phase 2 funds to an ARC Linkage grant.

ARC Linkage grants are grant schemes wherein industry or government partners join with a University-led team to produce research for their mutual benefit. In this scheme, industry partners must make financial and in-kind contributions to the project. Generally, successful applications have cash contributions from partners totalling a minimum of 25 percent of the project budget.

We expect to submit an ARC Linkage grant application in November with a total project budget of around $300-400,000. This implies that $75-100,000 needs to come from the industry partners. If the IMAP allows us to apply its $20,000 toward this financial contribution, we intend to generate the rest from other industry partners.

The current list of promising partners for the ARC Linkage grant are:

- IMAP Councils
- The City of Moreland
- The Metropolitan Planning Authority (MPA)
- The Australian Business Register
- DEDJTR
- Bank of Melbourne
Table 5.1. Original Timeline for Phases 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month 1</th>
<th>Month 2</th>
<th>Month 3</th>
<th>Month 4</th>
<th>Month 5</th>
<th>Month 6</th>
<th>Month 7</th>
<th>Month 8</th>
<th>Month 9</th>
<th>Month 10</th>
<th>Month 11</th>
<th>Month 12</th>
<th>Month 13</th>
<th>Month 14</th>
<th>Month 15</th>
<th>Month 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team assembly</td>
<td>Ethics approval</td>
<td>Inception Workshop</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1 Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissemination Workshop #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2 Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Depending on funding begin date and ARC application timelines*
### Table 5.2. Updated Project Timeline: Phases 1, Extension of Phase 1, and ARC Linkage Grant Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar-15</td>
<td>Team assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-15</td>
<td>Ethics approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-15</td>
<td>Inception Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>Phase 1 (original)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Phase 1 Report to IMAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-15</td>
<td>IMAP Commits to Linkage Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-15</td>
<td>Phase 1 (extended): qualitative studies; survey design, data collection, and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>Engagement Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Dissemination Workshop #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Extended Phase 1 Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-16</td>
<td><em>Depending on funding begin date and ARC application timelines</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Depending on funding begin date and ARC application timelines*
6. PHASE 1 DETAILED APPROACH, PILOT PROJECTS

This section summarizes three pilot projects that comprise Phase 1, and which are currently underway. Each of these projects is headed jointly by Jennifer Day and a Master of Urban Planning student from the University of Melbourne, as part of her/his thesis project. These students are listed as report authors.

This section first describes two qualitative approaches that will inform the third, quantitative inquiry. None of these projects is currently advanced sufficiently that we can report substantive findings at the time of this report.

We submit this Phase 1 report without these findings included. We note that our Phase 1 reporting schedule is modified over the original schedule, give the need for IMAP to consider funding Phase 2 in advance of the November deadline for ARC Linkage grants. Originally, the Phase 1 report was set to be due in late October 2015. However, due to the updated schedule, the Phase 1 report must be made available to IMAP on 12 August. This is why these project findings are not yet ready.

6.1 LAND: CREATIVE CLUSTERS IN YARRA

Background and motivation

The last fifty years has seen urbanisation emerge as a dominant demographic trend (Xing, Horner, El-Haram, & Bebbington, 2009). Urbanisation has highlighted not only the strengths of cities but also their weaknesses. There is growing concern regarding the future of cities and how they can continue to accommodate growing populations. This challenge becomes particularly daunting when discussed within the framework of sustainability and liveability. Within policy and academia there is growing support for the “compact city” as an urban form, which in theory could minimise environmental degradation and greenhouse gas emissions while also providing more housing (Jenks & Jones, 2009). Features of the “compact city” include higher density development, increased mixed use and renewal of under-utilised urban areas, such as docklands and old industrial areas (Jenks & Jones, 2010). Concurrently these older and under-utilised areas of Fordist production are becoming more popular as places to live with people attracted to their central locations, alternative living spaces and possibility for live/work scenarios (Hamnett & Whitelegg, 2007).

These features and preferred development patterns have affected city development policies in a number of ways, including a growing pressure on local governments to consolidate under-utilised urban land in their jurisdictions and rezone to residential to accommodate higher density development. However there are issues associated with the drive for urban consolidation, one of which is the rezoning of industrial and commercial land to mixed or residential use. Governments are hesitant to make these changes in light of issues regarding local employment and economic development (City of Yarra, 2010). There is a push to protect land for industries that favour/service the inner city environment and are creative and innovative in purpose. It is believed cities will be more resilient if they can grow and foster their creative industries and knowledge economies (Landry, 2012). As creative industries become a more important part of the urban economy governments are increasingly keen to know where creative industries are, how they operate and how they can be fostered (Gibson & Brennan-Horley, 2009).
The City of Yarra’s newly released Yarra Economic Development Strategy 2015-2020 identifies the creative sector in Yarra as containing important and emerging creative industries. The creative sector in Yarra represents 11% of total employment in the LGA and 21% of all businesses. With in the creative industries Architecture, Design and Visual Arts, Software and Interactive Content and Advertising and Marketing are highlighted as employing the most workers. Two areas have been highlighted as Creative Clusters, the Gipps Street Precinct and Cremorne. These two precincts have also been highlighted in Plan Melbourne as Urban Renewal areas. Plan Melbourne does not clearly define “urban renewal” but if residential development is expected to occur in these areas The City of Yarra states that it must not compromise economic function (City of Yarra, 2010). This conflict between increasing housing and protecting economic vitality is a local manifestation of the development tensions discussed above.

Currently zoning is the predominant mechanism employed by the City of Yarra to protect and foster economic development in the Gipps Street and Cremorne precincts. The commercial two zone (C2Z) that prohibits residential development has been applied over both areas. This is in response to concerns regarding the impacts residential development may have on land prices and land availability which in turn will affect the viability of the area as a creative precinct and employment hub (City of Yarra, 2010). A number of researchers have observed how residential development can affect the landscape of employment districts; see for example, (Hamnett & Whitelegg, 2007; Zukin, 1989). While positives are associated with the arrival of permanent residents, especially if the area is suffering from high vacancy rates and deterioration, it can put pressure on existing businesses by increasing land prices. However prohibiting residential development also has negative side effects as land owners may sit on property waiting for rezoning to occur, leading to disinvestment and poor amenity.

This thesis will look at the Gipps Street and Cremorne precincts in the City of Yarra and hopes to add some clarity to the development versus conservation argument by finding out what is occurring in these areas. Before a decision is made regarding their future it is important to understand more clearly what is happening within their boundaries. Can the firms in these areas be classified as creative? Has the City of Yarra been accurate in it’s labelling of these two areas as Creative Clusters? If so is the best way to foster these clusters through the restrictive zoning policy? Why are firms choosing these locations and how does this affect future policy decisions? What do firms enjoy about these spaces and areas? Ultimately this paper will aim to shed some light on how firms function in these areas and on their locational decision. If there is evidence the firms in these areas are gaining a competitive advantage from their location then it may be pragmatic to support the Yarra’s current prohibitory zoning.

**Research questions**

In order to ascertain whether or not creative clusters are present in Collingwood and Cremorne a key question to ask that stems from the literature is: Are vertical and horizontal linkages present between firms? It would also be beneficial to understand if firms are choosing to locate in these precincts in order to take advantage of these linkages. It is the aim of this thesis to gain further understanding of why firms choose to locate in the precincts and if there’s evidence to support Michael Porter’s cluster theories, discussed below.

---

7 Council’s economic development unit also support business/ economic development by linking businesses with potential clients/ customers as well as providing skill development and networking opportunities.
The overarching research question is as follows:

Are creative firms locating in the Gipps Street and Cremorne precincts in order to benefit from the competitive advantages associated with clusters?

This will research will broken down into two key questions:

Are firms locating in these areas to be in close proximity to local suppliers and customers?

Are firms locating in these areas to access local knowledge networks?

It is the hypothesis of this thesis that clustering benefits are not the main draw cards for firms who choose to locate in Gipps Street and Cremorne. It is likely that there are other factors such as rental prices and building typology that have a larger influence. However if these hypothesis is supported it does not necessarily mean these areas aren’t providing valuable spaces for Melbourne’s creative industries.

**Theoretical and Empirical Framing**

A significant amount of literature has been written on the Post-Fordist city and the way in which changing production and consumption patterns are impacting the urban economy. The Fordist economy aimed to take advantage of economies of scale through the standardisation of products that appealed to mass markets (Scott, 1997). Manufacturing in the Post-Fordist economy however has seen more producers creating smaller, specialised batches of output that cater to niche markets (Scott, 1997). This change in production has expressed itself on the city, changing spatial patterns, demographics and economies (Hutton, 2000). As many cities in the developed world deindustrialise and lose their large manufacturers attention has been drawn to those cities that have been able to successfully navigate these changes (Landry, 2012). There has been increasing attention paid to the role of culture and creativity and the potential of these areas to address a number of concerns regarding economic development and deindustrialization (Bagwell, 2008). In policy creative industries are often seen as sources of innovation, providing a limitless supply of new ideas which in turn help to stimulate economic growth, mitigating the effects of deindustrialisation and building a cities “knowledge economy” (Bagwell, 2008).

Not only has the scale of production changed but also the type of goods that are produced and how they are marketed to the customer. Hutton (2000) discusses the rise of creative services in the post modern city, a reflection of the growing demand for goods that provide the consumer with distinctive, unique products, reflecting their personal preferences. There are now more consumers who are willing to pay for designer and bespoke goods, services and experiences, which has contributed to the rise of the creative sector (Evans, 2009). Products are not simply about functionality but are now seen as extensions of ourselves and the persona we want to project. Scott (1997) discusses how increasingly the cultural geography of place is intertwining itself with the economic geography of production. Every city and country wants that competitive advantage that comes from being “known” for a certain product or service, for example the Danish and furniture, or the Italians and leather products. Where and how a commodity is produced can add to the imagery surrounding the product and in turn helps to brand and differentiate the area it was made (Heebels & van Aalst, 2010). This type of recognition, this successful commodification of creativity, talent and culture, is seen as being key in the resilience of urban economies (Scott, 1997).
The growth of creative firms has also expressed itself spatially on cities and found expression in the emergence of new production spaces (Hutton, 2006). These production spaces are generally found in the inner city and the CBD fringe, in converted industrial and warehousing spaces (Heebels & van Aalst, 2010; Hutton, 2006). Some argue that the rise of creative industries has helped to resuscitate the inner city and renew degraded industrial areas. Florida (2005) writing on the “creative class” has been extremely influential. His argument is that talented people seek out cities and this individual talent is converted into economic opportunity which in turn supports and feeds back into the home city. Globally there is a growing belief that attracting talent and mobilising creativity can transform economies and communities (Foord, 2009). This belief is shown in the number of cities that have creative strategies: Creative New York, Creative Berlin and Creative London to name a few (Foord, 2009). It is also evident in the growing competition between cities to be seen as liveable, offering a high quality lifestyle which is aimed at attracting the creative classes.

A number of articles address how to define what a “creative” businesses or industry is. Some institutions such as the World Bank argue creative industries produce something that is protectable under intellectual property law (Foord, 2009). The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development states creative industries derive value from copyright and distributing creative content (Foord, 2009). Bagwell (2008) who examines British creative policies found activities which have their origin in individual creativity and talent tend to be considered creative. What often links creative industries is that a high degree of individual skill is needed to create the product/service and firms tend to be small and medium sized enterprises (Bagwell, 2008). In the Australian context the Australian Centre of Excellence for Creative Industries and Innovation has developed six creative industry groupings: music and performing arts, film and television, advertising and marketing, software and interactive content, writing, publishing and print media, architecture, design and visual arts (Foord, 2009). The New Zealand Institute of Economic Research has developed a similar list: advertising, software and computer services, publishing, television and radio, architecture, design, designer fashion, music and performing. Both these lists have been developed by attempting to capture locally significant IP through patents, trademarks, copyrights and design rights (Foord, 2009).

A key feature of creative businesses and workers is that they can often operate at the edge of the formal economy (Gibson & Brennan-Horley, 2009). Creative workers take many forms including freelancers, hobbyists, workers from home and it cannot be assumed that they’re all working in a formal space from nine to five. Importantly it is hard to understand exactly what creative people do, where they are and how they operate from a purely quantitative stance. Because of this, Gibson & Brennan-Horley (2009) argue undertaking ethnographic studies of creative workers is key in uncovering how they use and shape the city. Discussing the post modern city, Hutton (2000) argues there are unifying characteristics of creative firms and workers, including they tend to: create small specialised outputs, converge together into agglomerations, often on the CBD fringe and depend on the ability to tap local sources of value adding externalities. What they produce also tends to function in part as “personal ornaments, modes of social display or aesthetised objects (Scott, 1997)”. As such a competitive advantage generally stems from being able to cater specifically to the consumers needs, which can change quickly and are often influenced by external trends and values. As creative firms often require quick access to suppliers, sub contractors and customers clustering is another defining characteristic of creative industries (Scott, 1997).

(Porter, 1998, p. 10) defines a cluster as “a geographic concentration of interconnected companies, specialised suppliers, service providers, associated institutions and firms in related industries.” Martin and Sunley (2003) who critically discuss Porter’s theory state two core
The characteristics of clusters are that firms are linked, either vertically or horizontally and that these linkages involve relationships or networks that produce benefits. This is reiterated by Heebels & van Aalst, (2010) who state that firms that cluster experience a competitive advantage due to their close proximity to suppliers and customers and the knowledge exchanges that come out of casual encounters. In 2004 the United Kingdom’s Department of Trade and Industry developed A Practical Guide to Cluster Development in which they pinpoint “the presence of functioning networks and partnerships” as the key identifier of a successful cluster. After a review of a number of creative cluster policies Foord (2009) found that a “creative cluster” was generally taken to mean a grouping of creative industries, firms or activities that are spatially concentrated. (De Propris, Chapain, Cooke, MacNeill, & Mateos-Garcia, 2009, p. 11), list four key characteristics of creative clusters, they are: a community of creative people, a catalysing place, a place that offers diversity, stimuli and freedom of expression and a place that provides an ever changing network of interpersonal exchanges that nurture uniqueness. The rationale behind the adoption of creative cluster policies is endless with justifications including: economic development, regeneration, city branding, education and training, social access, improved amenity, preservation of heritage buildings, more balanced development patterns, growth in employment and high value output (Hutton 2000, Foord 2009). Proponents argue that clusters are particularly valuable as they can help smaller firms obtain external economies of scale, strengthening their competitive ability (McDonald, Huang, Tsagdis, & Josef Tüselmann, 2007). Smaller firms which may struggle working in isolation are supported by the cluster. The importance of clusters in the transmission of tacit knowledge is reiterated by a number of researchers (Bathelt, Malmberg, & maskell, 2004; O’Connor, 2004). The transmission of tacit knowledge is particularly important for creative firms who often “learn by doing” and their skill is tangible one, tied to place (O’Connor, 2004).

However, a number of researchers including Heebels & Aalst (2010) and Darchen and Tremblay (2014) question the assumption that there is direct link between creative industries and economic development or that creative firms do benefit from agglomeration. Heebels & Aalst (2010) studied the creative quarters of Prenzlauer Berg and Kreuzberg in Berlin. Their focus is on the production side and understanding how local networks and learning contribute to innovation. Simultaneously they are interested in understanding how much urban amenity and the visual landscape contributes to locational decisions. They argue that “zooming in” on particular clusters and the contained firms can help to answer questions regarding knowledge exchange in clusters and its importance. Overall they concluded that face to face contact was not considered overly important to entrepreneurs in creative services and predominantly saw other firms as competitors. Darchen & Tremblay (2014) focus on the video game agglomeration in Melbourne’s CBD to see if it showed characteristics of a cluster such as cross fertilisation and interaction with other creative industries. They conclude that the agglomeration could not be considered a cluster as different agencies had very little to do with each other or other creative industries. They had all chosen the CBD has a location simply due its accessibility to public transport and supporting institutions. This research shows that while creative firms may locate close to one each other this does not mean that they are “clustering” and benefiting from each others presence.

**Methods**

Two case studies, Gipps Street and Cremorne in the City of Yarra, are the focus of this research. As described above these two locations were chosen as they have been designated as Creative Clusters in The City Of Yarra’s Economic Strategy.
(Merriam, 2014) discusses the case study approach in Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation. Case studies are an appropriate approach when one wants to understand phenomena that are complex and consist of multiple variables. They provide a holistic account and can help advance a field’s knowledge base. The case study approach is appropriate in this case as this thesis is predominantly concerned with ascertaining why firms are choosing these locations and locational choices may be affected by many variables. In order to attempt this research within the scope of a masters thesis it is also prudent to concentrate on two, relatively small and somewhat defined areas. While the results will only be applicable to two rather small locations it is hoped the findings can help to advance the knowledge base in this area.

Qualitative research will make up the majority of the research phase and will be based predominantly on conducting interviews with firms located in the two case study sites. As the research is concerned with creative industries, these are the firms that will be targeted. Firms will be selected via online searches, referrals, and firm listings collated after site visits. That the firm falls under a creative industry is the only filter that will be applied, no limit will be put on firm size, as it may offer up interesting insight into the makeup of firms in the areas. Interviews will be conducted face to face and should take no longer than an hour. Questions will be aimed at understanding how the firms interact with other firms in the clusters, with their customers and suppliers.

How to define Creative is still a work in progress however the Australian Centre of Excellence for Creative Industries and Innovation’s categories will most likely be used as they closely reflect the categories adopted by the City of Yarra. These groupings are: Music and performing arts, Film and television, Advertising and marketing, Software and interactive content, Writing, publishing and print media, Architecture, design and visual arts.

Similar methods were employed by Heebels & Van Aalst (2010) and Smit (2011) when they wanted to understand why entrepreneurs were attracted to certain geographical locations. Heebels & Van Aalst (2010) undertook 40 semi-structured interviews with owners of micro enterprises (5 employees or less). The purpose of the interviews was to enhance understanding regarding the location decisions of entrepreneurs. Smit (2011) had a similar objective and conducted 63 interviews with entrepreneurs in order to better understand their location decisions. Smit (2011) began the interviews with two open ended questions regarding location decisions and concluded with more direct questions regarding their chosen district.

Interviews carried out as part of this research will also take a semi structured form and will be a mixture of open ended and more structured questions. This format has been chosen as I’m interested in learning about issues I may not have considered but also would like information on specific factors, such as how often they have face to face contact throughout the day (Merriam, 2014).

Some empirical research will also be undertaken to ascertain what is happening in both precincts. The aim of the empirical research is predominantly to gain an understanding of the local amenity and morphology, and to build on the data regarding what firms are in the areas. Local amenity and building type have been highlighted by a number of researchers, with Hutton (2006), Smint (2011), Heebels & Van Aalst (2010) the key draw cards for creative industries. Observations regarding precinct amenity could help inform future strategies concerned with infrastructure and service provision and urban design.
6.2 SECTOR: QUALITATIVE STORYTELLING APPROACHES

Background and motivation

The location of industrial land and their effect on shaping the urban form and communities have been the subject of a considerable number of studies. In the recent years Manufacturing is pushed out of cities because of rising cost of land and increasing environmental awareness. The ongoing process of globalization seems to speed up this shift and transfer of industrial land to residential and mixed-use development.

In recognition of the importance of future of manufacturing within the inner cities and the significant and ongoing challenge that the manufacturing sector is facing globally, the sector approach aims to examine the relation between inner city presence and requirements for firms to survive. The geographical scope chosen for this study is “IMAP area” which includes Cities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Stonington, Yarra and Maribyrnong. This study is focused on the inner city due to social and cultural conditions that are associated with the inner city which are difficult to replicate elsewhere. Through this study we aim to understand what motivates the small manufacturers to choose and stay in their inner city location and how it would affect their business if they have to relocate to outer suburbs. In some cases the inner city location is vital for small manufacturers and they may decide to close down the business if they are forced to move or pushed out of cities.

One of the factors that may have direct effect on the importance of inner city location for small manufacturers is the shift from traditional manufacturing to a more service oriented manufacturing. While the share of manufacturing has declined in large cities in developed countries, the share of services has grown. The increasing growth in services and the manufacturer’s willingness to add service to their product calls for a more in-depth study of “new manufacturing” and “urban manufacturing.”

The sector approach aims to gain understanding of the changing face of the Australian manufacturing sector by investigating the characteristics of “urban manufacturing”. The focus will be on small/innovative/urban manufacturing, which is different from traditional manufacturing and hence has different requirements and deals with different constraints.

Research questions

Sector approach aims to add to the literature on the subject of urban manufacturing by examining the requirements of urban manufacturers/firms to survive.

This exploratory research primarily asks, “Does being servicized create different ways of operation, different needs and different constraints for inner city presence of small manufacturers in Melbourne?” In addition, this research aims to answer the following sub-questions:

- What is the level of service component in “new manufacturing” firms and how that works spatially?
- What are the methods of innovation used in small firms?
- What are the specific ways in which the firms produce and package products and services
- How important is the Inner City location for small firms?
According to literature one of the main characteristics of urban manufacturing is the added service component of it compare to traditional manufacturing. Saskia Sassen has written series of articles about the changes in manufacturing sector. Sassen (2009) defines “urban manufacturing “as a type of advanced manufacturing that services the service sector. She claims that “A particular type of manufacturing is very much part of today’s urban economies, including the most advanced ones. I like to call this “urban manufacturing”” (Sassen, 2006). In her article, “Urban manufacturing: economy, politics and space in today’s cities, Sassen (2006) mentions the following characteristics for urban manufacturing:

1) It is networked and, therefore, needs an urban location.
2) It is quite customized and needs to be in proximity to its customers
3) It inverts the historic relation between manufacturing and services

Moreover Sassen criticises the long-time ignorance of the urban manufacturing sector by policy makers because the policy was oriented towards retaining the big, standardized manufacturers. She points out the fact that these “big manufacturers didn’t need to stay in the city because they didn’t need the urban economy with its multiple supplier and contracting chains and diverse craft talent pools”(Sassen 2009). This research will identify urban manufacturers based on the characteristics mentioned by Sassen and will examine those characters and aims to add to it by conducting in depth interviews with the manufacturers.

Theoretical and Empirical Framing

Values and constraints that inner city presence brings for firms can be investigated from various perspectives. There has been an increasing interest in the concept of industrial clusters and firms’ willingness to be concentrated in certain urban locations. The existence of industrial clustering was acknowledged by Weber and Friedrich (1929b) and the first attempt to explain why firms tend to cluster together was made by Marshall in 1925 [ebook published in 2013; (Marshall, 2013)]. Marshall proposed three reasons for this behaviour by firms. The reasons related to the development of a local pool of specialised labour, the increased local provision of the non-traded input specific to an industry, and the maximum flow of information and ideas.

It is important to clarify that the notions of ‘knowledge’ vary in the literature. Following Maskell (2001) this study is more focused on the Tacit dimension of knowledge. Gertler (2003) defines Tacit knowledge by explaining that there are many tasks that involves skills and collaborations that cannot be written down on paper or presented in a formal conference. He explains that this type of knowledge can only be shared effectively between people who share a common social context, language and culture. Tacit knowledge is, therefore, dependent on face-to-face contact and close spatial proximity.

Sociological literature attempt to find a relation between, social networks, communication and the process of innovation in firms (Granovetter, 1985). Gordon and McCann (2007) report that firms in a social network tend to show “trust-based” behaviours. They mention three key features of this behaviour: “the first is that firms within the social network are willing to undertake risky co-operative without fear of opportunism; the second is that firms are willing to reorganise their relationships without fear of reprisals; and the third is that firms are willing to act as a group in support of common mutually beneficial goals”.

Studies prove that firms benefit from agglomeration economies. Two different types of agglomeration economies discussed in the literature; location externalities and urbanisation
externalities. According to the location externalities, knowledge spillover occurs between agents within an industry. Based on localisation economies, Carlino (2001) reports that the proximity of firms within a common industry often facilitates innovation and growth. The urbanisation externalities looks at knowledge spillover occurring between firms from different industries (Jacobs, 1969, 1986).

However, Literature is not consistence in accepting the argument that tacit knowledge requires spatial proximity. Zucker, Darby, and Armstrong (1998) argue that Knowledge Sharing is less likely in industries with a rapid pace of technological change. Another interesting argument is raised by Boschma (2005) that claims “physical proximity does not imply social proximity”. Boschma doesn’t believe in necessity or sufficiency of spatial proximity for learning. However, he reports that “it may facilitate learning by strengthening the other dimensions of proximity, namely cognitive, organizational, social and institutional proximities “ (Boschma 2005).

Although a wide body of literature states that industry clusters can offer numerous benefits for firms within those clusters, Audia and Rider (2010) argue that cluster location seems to be very disadvantageous for companies in declining industries. Interviews with small firm manufacturers within the inner city Melbourne will help us to understand if spatial proximity and being close to centres that produce knowledge is important for them or not. Another interesting outcome from interviews would be to understand how much these firms interact with their customers and how important is it for them to be close to inner city amenities.

In terms of spatial proximity and innovation, Literature shows that geographical proximity facilitates localised knowledge spillover between innovative firms and research institutes. Malmberg, Maskell, and Uppsala universitet (2006) report about the benefits of regular face-to-face interaction in the process of localized learning. Innovation can take many forms, literature distinct between incremental and radical innovation. For the purpose of this report, we chose to examine the incremental innovation rather than radical innovation. The reason is that incremental innovation is driven more by market-pull than technology-push. Since we are dealing with a sector that is adding service to its offer, we estimate that firms in this sector would be influenced by market challenges and customer demands and involved in incremental innovation by continually re-develop their offer.

Constraints related to innovation are generally categorized under the following factors: finance, management and marketing, skilled labour, and information. Through interview with firms we would be able to understand if these are applicable to small urban manufacturers.

In order to be able to measure innovation in firms this project adopts the framework introduced by Koberg, Detienne, and Heppard (2003), this framework has a softer approach towards measuring innovation and uses the following factors:

- “Procedural (management-determined innovations in rules and procedures)
- Personnel-related (innovations in selection and training policies and in human resource management practices)
- Process (new methods of production or manufacturing)
- Structural (modifications to equipment and facilities and new ways in which work units are structured).”
We will adopt this framework and consider firms as innovative if within the past two years they had introduced innovations in at least two of the four areas identified by Koberg et al.

The focus of this study will be on the changing face of manufacturing which is more service oriented compare to traditional manufacturing. In a manufacturing context the term “servitization” was introduced by VanDerMerwe and Rada (1988). They report that there is clear evidence that manufacturing firms are “servitizing” by adding services to their product. Scholars have used different terms to describe this new generation of manufacturing. Drucker (1990) used the term “New Manufacturing” for the first time and since then it has been adopted by some scholars and analysts. Marceau, Cook, Dalton, and Wixted (2002) explain the recent growth in service industries by arguing that it is not a sign of the arrival of ‘service economy’ or ‘post-industrial’ society. Rather, it suggests the growth of what they call “new manufacturing” in which manufacturers are increasingly incorporating services into their offerings to customers. Their study suggests the growth of a multiplicity of competitive strategies in which:

- As an essential part of what has been called ‘new manufacturing’, manufacturers are increasingly incorporating services into their offerings to customers,
- Service firms are increasingly adding a range of services to products produced by others.
- Project-based firms are linking services and products to services.

The most important overall message from their study is that “manufacturing is clearly not in decline”. They argue manufacturing is in a process of transformation to meet the demands of new markets.

**Methods**

A qualitative methodology has been adopted to investigate the research question through interviews with manufacturers. The activities and the methods applied at this part are informed by reviewing literature on urban manufacturing, industrial cluster, knowledge slipover, innovation and sevicization.

“Urban manufacturers” are an unknown sector, they are new and they have their own unique characteristics. In order to get the most out of the interviews and to give the opportunity to the makers to tell us about what we don’t know, a story telling interview approach has been adopted following Snowden (1999) and Sandelowski (1991). Sandelowski (1991) reports that in the shift from positivism towards interpretation in social science, researchers began to pay attention to the narrative nature of human beings.

Snowden (1999) refers to story as “a valuable tool to understand our current situation, anticipate possible futures and to prepare the organisation for action” and storytelling as a powerful mechanism for the disclosure of intellectual or knowledge assets and transferring complex tacit knowledge.

Based on the storytelling approach introduced in the literature, the interview questions are designed in a semi-structured format. Through these semi-structured interviews we want to query the following questions:

- What challenges do service-oriented makers face in their current locations?
- How important is an Inner city location for their business.
- Innovation through serviscisation, Is there a competitive advantage?

**Selection of firms**

Selection of firms for interview is of outmost important. The study is designed for urban manufacturers and we need to make sure that the firms that we choose meet the criteria of “urban manufacturers”, Sassan’s description of urban manufacturing will guide us in this part. Firms will be chosen from the “IMAP area” which includes Cities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Stonnington, Yarra and Maribyrnong.

In terms of firm’s size, we have identified and limited our study to the following description of firm size:

- Very small: 1-5 employees
- Small: 1-20 employees

We have investigated the ANZSIC code to recognize the sector/sectors that have the highest number of very small and small firms, According to (ANZSIC), 2006 the category that we are interested in has the most representatives in “other manufacturing” sector. This section contains the following subsection:

- Class 2591 Jewellery and Silverware Manufacturing
- Class 2592 Toy, Sporting and Recreational Product Manufacturing
- Class 2599 Other Manufacturing n.e.c.

Hence, our sample firms will be chosen from the geographical area of IMAP and within the subsections of “other manufacturing”.

6.3 **ECONOMIC: QUANTITATIVE INQUIRY**

**Background and motivation**

Land use pattern and its change lie at the heart of modern thinking of urban development, as land use deals with the spatial aspects of human activities and the way it is adapted, or could be adapted, to serve human needs (Best, 1981).

In the current context of metropolitan growth and economic development, policy debates over land management and zoning depend upon the forces governing the geographic relationship of different land use types. While there is a national census that details the demographic status of population and housing, there is no consistent census on land use, employment and employers.

Being a generally lower order land use, manufacturing land lies central to decision making on land use change, with pressure for change to higher order uses. However, small urban manufacturing continues to emerge as a more intense, smaller land requirement and service orientated land use that has become more interactive with other land uses. But how have SUM come to establish within the inner urban context, and what are the key driving factors for their location choice?
Within the literature, there is a fairly developed understanding of manufacturing firm’s decision making for large scale producers that require vast land quantities with a primary location decision making based on outer suburban areas with sound transport access due to logistics, land costs and the availability to large lower skilled labour markets. However, the understanding of SUM within an inner urban environment is not understood.

Research questions

This pilot project seeks to contribute to our understanding of a lessor studied urban spatial structure of small urban manufacturing, by empirically investigating the location decisions that impact on the employee and employer for small urban manufacturing within inner Melbourne.

Small urban manufacturing firms have established as a genuine and valid economic input for consideration, protection or incubation, but is the inner Melbourne location required for these firms to establish, grow and prosper?

Historically other land uses were not overly compatible with industrial and manufacturing firms, with specific zoning required to protect the externalities from production. However, existence of high valued SUM firms within inner city Melbourne may lead to other land uses being more compatible, hence considering a policy response from the Local Government Authority (LGA) and the Melbourne Planning Authority (MPA) on the broader land use mix may now be appropriate.

What is challenging to understand for small urban manufacturing firms within the inner metropolitan context is the divergence away from location theory being central to the reduction of costs rather than the labour market factors.

If SUM in inner urban locations are centred on high valued manufacturing, and the labour force required is more highly qualified then a lack of support for these uses in inner urban location may push these manufacturers to outer urban locations or cease to exist at all in the local market. Hence, an understanding of the potential ramification of relocation from a stated preference perspective within the survey is required. This methodical step will test any economic loss that may be resultant from location pressure being placed on SUM firms.

Crucially, if the location decision of SUM is driven by access to labour markets, say over clustering potential, the result of this land use change pressure away from inner urban locations may result in detriment to both the industry, the labour market and the economy.

Methods

A quantitative methodology has been adopted to test the primary driver of location choice for SUM, with additional support from qualitative location based employee information, such as ABS journey to work data. There is a finer grain of detail required to understand the location decisions for SUM, which generally encompass five (5) major decision making factors:

- **ACCESSIBILITY** – Transport, proximity to the airport, freeway / highway, Melbourne CBD, Port of Melbourne, road Infrastructure, rail Infrastructure, public transport and retail.
- **ACCESSIBILITY** – to markets, suppliers, customers, competitors, service sector (legal, finance etc.) or materials.
• LABOUR - Access to a skilled or un-skilled workforce
• CAPITAL - Cost of land / rent, Access to capital, New facility, Existing facility
• LAND - appropriate planning zone, proximity to owners residential location or mixed use residential areas and access to large landholdings
• INNOVATION – Proximity to creative spaces, peer firms, innovative communities or local technology.

The survey was designed to gain data on the relationship between businesses and their location decision with respect to each of the identified decision factors. The survey allows some prime facie conclusions in regard to SUM decision-making process and consequences in light of pressure for re-location out of the inner Melbourne area. These spatial consequences have often been ignored (McMillen, 1989), resulting in limited available valid data or improper statistical inference. The unit of observation considered was each SUM firm, whilst the behaviour of these firms are considered a binary choice with each location factor providing an explanatory variable as the primary reason or next valid reason to locate within inner Melbourne.

Out of the five (5) factors identified, the labour market is likely to have the strongest local economic input within the inner urban context, providing the strongest connection between the SUM industry and the community. Other factors such as innovation and accessibility to customer / supplier markets are also likely to be encouragement factors for SUM to locate in inner Melbourne. However, capital and land factors appear likely to discourage SUM from locating within inner Melbourne given higher costs of land and limited land availability.

Underlying this approach is that the knowledge and experience required within SUM firms is considerably different to traditional large format industry / manufacturers. Hence, a different policy response may be required from a land use perspective.

**Theoretical and Empirical Framing**

There is a fair level of existing literature on location theory to understand the criteria for site selection, such as labour, access and the availability of resources. The most prominently and clearly defined papers are by Weber (Weber, 1909; Weber & Friedrich, 1929a, 1929b), Marshall (1920) and (Moses, 1958), who consider a historic approach based on the principle of profit maximisation. For these theories to hold in the context of SUM within inner Melbourne, each firm must prioritise accessibility, labour, innovation over the land and capital costs, i.e. a firm will pay a higher property costs (be it either purchase or rent), which is offset by a stronger desire to be located within inner Melbourne. Bartik (1985) follows a similar cost benefit analysis assuming revenue opportunities across locations are similar but allows for a variation in costs in determining the location decision. Once again, this explanation does not appear to validate the location decision of SUM to be within inner Melbourne.

Perhaps contrary to the establishment of SUM in inner Melbourne, Erickson and Wasylenko (1980) notes the manufacturing sector tends to be more cost-oriented and sensitive to location variance, in comparison to population driven services such as retail that are revenue sensitive.

The literature generally identifies that firm choices, in particular where they have clustered together, are complex and multi-dimensional in terms of their geographic location. It then focuses to measurable outcomes in an attempt to understand the changes, which is what is being proposed within this pilot survey of the key five (5) factors of location decision.
Historically, manufacturing firms were located primarily in industrial zonings, which are quite restrictive for mixed land uses but made sense to firms because of distribution and transport network. However, with the increasing globalisation and mobility of goods metropolitan, nationally and internationally, the location of where and why firms choose to locate within an inner urban locations is not as clear.

Kohlhase and Ju (2007) form a view that the source of labour was a key factor in location choice, with firms likely to pay a premium, such as rent and congestion, for higher costs of locating in locations that were labour rich, or where specialist labour skills were required. Whilst they did not consider SUM in particular, the location of SUM within an inner urban context may be driven by the population and activity density, access to labour and other physical factors that an inner urban context offer.

C. Mills (2004) forms a different view arguing the need for physical communication will drive a firm’s location choice, considering that a firm’s production must rely on the physical communication, otherwise the location decision is null and void. If manufacturing firms do not require this communication, they will not pay a premium to locate in the inner urban areas regardless of the density. It is not clear if the need for physical communication is less relevant for manufacturing firms, or if advances in technology within supply chain networks and distribution allow firms greater choice to their location.

Freestone and Murphy (1998) form a similar view, considering the location of firms is influenced by the wider structure of planning controls and infrastructure. In the context of rezonings and other higher valued uses encroaching on land suitable for manufacturing, their conclusion would be a probable outcome but their review does not necessarily analyse the decision making process but rather the outcome of policy leading to favourable or unfavourable outcomes.

What is clear from the literature on firm location decisions is that there are a myriad of important and influencing factors, such as cluster potential, planning controls, infrastructure and a firms need for communication that are most dominant. However, the location of SUM within the inner urban context moves away from price sensitive and transport measures and may be more intertwined with how SUM’s have evolved over time.

Once it has been established that firms are locating within an urban context, equally relevant is the development policy response that either supports their development or attempts to development economic advantage. Doeringer and Terkla (1995) highlight the improper use of development policy which are poorly implemented and/or not commercially relevant. C. E. Mills (2000) contends that a structural response occurs between firms, residents and the labour market given the changing technology and preferences. This is particularly relevant if SUM in inner urban Melbourne have become more efficient over time, or are choosing to locate in inner urban locations for lifestyle or other preferences.

Much of the literature on location decisions for small urban manufacturing tends to restrict analysis to a total employment aggregate, or limits its manufacturing sector review to broad categories (Lopez & Olivera, 2005). Evidence that the manufacturing sector should be maintained within the inner urban environment is harder to come by, especially if the sector is highly price sensitive and maximises distribution efficiencies. Although Guillain, Le Gallo, and Boiteux-Orain (2004) suggest inner urban employment may be associated with sector specialisation for firms that innovate and are more technically advanced.
The differing of opinion, evidence and literature interpretations confirm the complexity in understanding location decisions related to manufacturing, particularly within the inner urban environment. To firstly understand the location decision of SUM, will then give a greater understanding to the economic impacts should these firms be placed under pressure to relocate due to policy implications. In a data poor environment, it is not clear what would be the outcome of SUM if they are driven out of the inner urban area due to pricing or zoning changes.
7. PHASE 1 FINDINGS, EXISTING DATA

The project team has analyzed existing data sources and found what we expected: they are insufficient to address the land, sector, and economic questions that we raise in this project. This section describes firms in the IMAP area using the available data, and critiques the data sources against the project objectives.

7.1 DATA SOURCES

This section provides some summary statistics of the outputs from the available data for small urban manufacturing (SUM) firms. The outputs allow consideration for survey questions and can be used as key parameters for model testing. Data on each chosen industry sector is also required to address specialisation for SUM in comparison to other manufacturing firms.

We began the project activities by reviewing the datasets that the IMAP councils routinely develop, buy, or acquire from other government agencies. The Cities of Melbourne and Port Phillip provided the University team with a thorough list of their datasets, which number in the dozens. From those lists, we were able to see that there are only a handful that had data applicable to our inquiries. In the remainder of this section, we describe these datasets and their capacities and limitations, and we provide an illustration of these capacities and limitations.

Each dataset provides an insight into some aspects of the economic, land or sector approaches. However, no dataset provides comprehensive and consistent data across each approach. The datasets we describe in this section, and review in forthcoming sections, include:

- City of Melbourne Census of Land Use and Employment (CLUE) survey
- Australian Business Register (ABR) data.

This section additionally addresses the issue of why we have not developed descriptive statistics from some of the various other business datasets available in Australia.


The Census of Population and Housing “Census” from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) provides information on population and is a geographically-comprehensive source of population and employment profile data. The data is undertaken at a person and household level but reported in Census geographies.

In addition to demographic and household data, journey to work information can also be derived from the ABS Census. The data profiles the location and occupation of workers and details the number of jobs by industry. The Census provides is with employment statistics by location, ANZSIC code (three digit), and occupation in reasonably-large geographies called Destination Zones.

The Journey to Work data does not link employer information, akin to other international examples of employee-employer datasets in the international literature, e.g., (Jensen, 2010;
Lane & Stephens, 2006), but matches the employee survey response with the workplace location.

For our project purposes, there are a few notable shortfalls with the JTW data including:

- The large geographic area the destination zones encompass. In the 2011 Census, for instance, the Melbourne CBD was a single destination zone, as was each of the other IMAP LGAs. These broad geographies do not allow analysis of clustering and small-area nuance.
- The data does not specify a particular industry, i.e. one can not attribute employee data specifically for SUMs.
- The lack of consistency of DZ with other reports geographic levels from the Census. The DZ are a unique geography, which compares to the majority of other Census geographic areas which are combined from a base Statistical Area 1 (SA1) or Census Collection District (CCD).
- The lack of consistency in DZ boundaries between each census period. This is particularly problematic given the time-series nature of the investigation, one can not confirm the extent the boundary changes has impacted the economic outcome.

Destination Zones are not inter-related with Planning Zones, and can contain a variety of land uses that may not be economic activity generators, such as residential land and public open space. This is problematic when comparing employment between DZ’s within a single census year or over a time series. For example if a public open space accounts for a considerable proportion of a particular DZ, then the data may be skewed to a lower employment density relative to other DZ’s.

Another problematic issue with this data are the timeframes (5 year interval), which may not allow the explanation of the true situation in regard to firms and their interaction with the labour market, particularly where major global and local economic factors, such as the Global Financial Crisis, have occurred.

By far the most important and limiting aspect of the Census for this study is that it does not provide information on firm sizes. This is not a flaw of the dataset: it is not meant to provide economic data. There are other purpose-built datasets in Australia whose purpose is to provide this data, but as we will demonstrate, this data is also not useful for this study because it lacks crucial information.

Given the above, we can use the Census data to estimate the size of a sector, i.e., how many people work in certain kinds of industries and in certain kinds of jobs, which we do below. However, the Census gives us no way of knowing whether those people work in small, medium, or large firms.

**City of Melbourne Census of Land Use and Employment (CLUE) Survey**

The City of Melbourne has prepared the Census of Land Use and Employment (CLUE) survey, which provides comprehensive information about firms (identified within CLUE as ‘Establishments’) within the City of Melbourne. The CLUE is prepared by undertaking a physical inspection of these firms within the entire City of Melbourne area which is broken into a city block geographic level. Figure 1 shows the CLUE area. The key data variables recorded of particular relevance in the reviewing the labour market within SUM firms includes:
- industry structure and type (ANZSIC code and number of establishments or business locations).
- floor space type and use (office, retail, industrial, accommodation, entertainment, office vacancy rates).
- employment type and status (full time, part time, casual, contractor, male and female).
- building information (number of floors, year of construction, gross floor area, lettable area).
- venue and capacity measures (ie. off street car parking spaces, bicycle and shower facilities, conference and meeting seats etc.).

Figure 7.1. CLUE Area
[Source: CLUE small area and block maps, (City of Melbourne, 2015)]

In addition to the firm data variables, the floorspace is also identified in terms of how it relates to parts of floors for individual businesses, such as manufacturing, workshop / studio and other storage measures. A total of 13 standard defined small areas are publically available from the City of Melbourne based on official suburbs including Melbourne Central Business District (CBD), Melbourne (remainder), Southbank, Docklands, West Melbourne (residential), West Melbourne (industrial), Parkville, East Melbourne, Port Melbourne, South Yarra, Carlton, North Melbourne and Kensington.

Unlike the JTW data, the CLUE data provides information of firm size, in addition to providing many other important indicators and a firm’s precise location. The CLUE has been collected since 1962, and has been regularly collected – every two years – since 2000 (City of
Melbourne, 2014). The dataset thus provides useful longitudinal picture of land use and employment in the City of Melbourne.

The major drawbacks of the CLUE data for this project’s purposes are:

1. The dataset is available only for the City of Melbourne, and not for the other IMAP councils. Some CLUE-type censuses have been attempted in other Victorian localities such as Whittlesea and Geelong, but these have been sporadic both geographically and temporally.
2. The dataset is not set up to track individual firms from census to census.

**Australian Business Register data (ABR)**

ABR data provides a measurement on all registered businesses, which are required to formally register for taxation purposes. Firm characteristics available of relevance for this project include entity name, business name, main business address, additional business location address and ANZSIC code. Whilst limited data is released at a firm level, the comparison and understanding that the ABR data provides at an industry level provides a guide to the number of firm births, firm deaths and net position. Around 80 percent of the addresses for these firms have been geocoded, and these geocoded files were made available for the research team. This gives the actual location of each firm, which is valuable information in studies of sector and economic effects. This geocoded ABR data is available for all of Australia, so comparisons of the IMAP area with other parts of the Melbourne region are possible with the dataset.

Despite the fine-grained detail and wide scope of the ABR data, there are significant limitations that prevent it from being useful for our study. Most notably, the data that the ABR provides currently for most research does not provide information that can inform research about firm productivity, growth, or size. This makes it impossible for small makers to be identified from the dataset.

Interestingly and recently, the ABR purged around two million registered firms from their rolls, on the grounds that the firms did not meet the criteria for engaging in commerce. Many of these were hobbyists. These purged firms may contain some small makers. We expect our qualitative research to address the issues of some firms that were dropped from ABR rolls.

**Other Employer–Employee Datasets**

One of the challenges when reviewing industries and how they operate is the data limitations from both an employee and employer perspective, with the ABS not undertaking employment level data at an employer level, considering only the Census user survey responses. This challenge is cited most notably by Rosen (1985), stating:

“on the empirical side of these questions the greatest potential for future progress rests in developing more suitable sources of data on the nature of selection and matching between workers and firms. Virtually no matched worker-firm records are available for empirical research, but obviously are crucial for the precise measurement of job and personal attributes required for empirical calculations”
Australia does not have a consistent or comprehensive employee-employer dataset. In 1995, the Australian Workplace Industrial Relations Survey attempted to sample employer information from an industrial relations perspective but is not widely used and is dated (ALMEIDA-SANTOS & Mumford, 2004).

Employee – Employer datasets are increasing being used at an international level within New Zealand, United States and other countries. One of the key benefits of these datasets is the ability to track employees and firms over a time series, particularly with regard to understanding a firm location decisions should a firm relocate, but also other factors such as skill level change, wage levels and the interactive role the labour market places on firms. In the remainder of this section, we review of employee-employer datasets to inform the survey questionnaire for SUM firms.

One of the most comprehensive employee–employer databases is the Norwegian LEED which provides data on employees (including demographic data on age, gender, education levels), employee jobs (including data on wages, hours worked, position, benefits) and firms (including data on industry). Similar to the CLUES database, a discrete number is allocated to each individual and firm to allow tracking over a time series (Hunnes, Møen, & Salvanes, 2007).

A large employee-employer dataset used for the manufacturing sector is established within the United States and is named the Worker Establishment Characteristics Database (WECD) – refer attachment 1 for survey variables. This dataset enhances the U.S Census with a range of other datasets (Carrington & Troske, 1998). WECD contains a significant dataset of 16,000 manufacturing firms with around 200,000 manufacturing employees and matches workers to establishments within a standardised geography and industry code. The Japanese Matched Employer–Employee Database (MEED) undertakes a similar approach to the US, but only considers firms with 30 or more employees.

Even with such significant employer-employee datasets, direct measures of worker productivity and qualitative factors are challenging to obtain within empirical research.

In the remainder of this chapter, we illustrate the kinds of outputs that are possible with the CLUE, ABR, and JTW datasets. We conclude that the accuracy and scope of each data set and any correlation that can be made between the data sets is problematic for the analysis of SUM firms. There are several explanations for this, but the over-arching lesson is that the existing data are insufficient to address our questions. A new quantitative data-collection instrument is needed.

One of the key challenges with the data is the compilation of a comprehensive data set that encompasses all data elements from each of these data sets, but relevant and descriptive of SUM. Whilst some international examples have progressed to comprehensive employee and employer data sets to understand movements over time, the available data within the Australian and inner Melbourne context offer limited guide to SUM.

7.2 WORKING DEFINITIONS

As we describe in Section 4, future project work will see finer definitions of some key terms emerge from empirical and qualitative analysis. However, for this preliminary data analysis, it was necessary to make some determinations about firm size so that statistics could be reported.
The following categories were developed for data sources where employee numbers were available.

- Very Small: 5 or fewer employees
- Small: 6-20 employees
- Medium: 21-50 employees
- Large: >51 employees.

Other variable that could be used to define SUM include economic output or floorspace requirements, but these variables are not reported with confidence.

In addition to firm size, it was necessary for the statistics below to be specific about which industrial categories were to be included. At this stage, as per the “What makes a maker” section above, we did not wish to be too prescriptive about what kinds of firms should be included as makers. We are still asking important questions of the data, such as whether tofu makers and other producers of relatively standard products are engaged in innovative activities.

For this reason, the results shown below reflect all ANZSIC codes that indicate that a made product is the central focus of the business. In short, we allowed all of the firms listed under the “Manufacturing” category in to be included. Additionally, outside of the manufacturing sectors, there are ANZSIC categories for firms engaged in activities that result in made products. These largely correspond to print media, film, and television products such as printing and publishing, studio and set design, and other similar categories. These additional categories, about 10 ANZSIC codes, were also included in the statistics generated below. We used three-digit ANZSIC codes because the categories reflected, e.g., textile product manufacturing or motor vehicle manufacturing, are specific enough to be comprehensible to a general audience and meaningful for analysis, but not too specific that the number of makers engaged in those categories is very few.

### 7.3 CENSUS JOURNEY TO WORK DATA

The journey to work data allows for a shift share analysis to understand the comparative advantage / dis-advantage of industries by ANZSIC code for a given area relative to the wider area, in this case the inner Melbourne area relative to metropolitan Melbourne. This analysis confirms the role inner Melbourne plays within each specialist industry for producing a good or service. The purpose of analysing shift share analysis is to:

- Identify industries in which the inner Melbourne location has sustained a comparative advantage, allowing for a deeper understanding of industries than are positive in policy making.
- Confirming industries that offer a relative dis-advantage, to consider industries that may need further review or industries that may not be appropriate in the spatial context.

Using historical Journey to Work data by industry between the previous two census periods (2006 and 2011), the change in local employment for the manufacturing workforce, we seek to understand:
▪ How much change is attributed to the wider Metropolitan Melbourne growth overall? (National growth effect)
▪ How much change was attributable to the overall performance of manufacturing industry in Metro Melbourne? (Industry mix effect)
▪ How much change can therefore be attributed to Inner Melbourne’s competitive performance in the manufacturing industry relative to the rest of metro Melbourne? (Regional competitive effect)

When considering the results of the shift share analysis, it is important to note the growth of employment within certain locations does not necessarily result in a replica of existing or moved facilities (Guillain et al., 2004). They can either operate autonomously by complementing firms or result in a loss of existing facilities.

They extend this point further by considering the type of service that drives geographic proximity. For example, manufacturing firms may not have strong linkages to other manufacturing firms, but may benefit from proximity to common suppliers, whilst service sector firms such as legal have strong linkages.

Melbourne Employment overview

Given the high land values within the inner urban area of Melbourne there appears to have been a movement towards specialisation in a number of industries, suggesting these firms may be attracted to a local economy and any benefits these may allow for. For example, Collingwood appears to have a high concentration of furniture, clothing and fabric manufacturers.

The ABS census across 2006 and 2011 shows us that the number of employed people in metropolitan Melbourne has increased from 1.5 million to 1.7 million over the five years. The five largest industries were health care & social assistance (12%) retail trade (11%), however, manufacturing was the only industry that recorded a significant decline in employment with small declines seen in the agriculture and wholesale trade industries.
Growth in total employment across Melbourne between 2006 and 2011 was 9%. Over the same period employment across the manufacturing industry in Melbourne has declined by 9%. This is consistent with manufacturing within inner Melbourne which has declined by 7% over the same period. This translates to 1,996 less people working across the manufacturing industry in Inner Melbourne.

While many of the sub-sectors within manufacturing industry decreased employment, a number of sub-sectors actually increased, the largest being pharmaceutical and medicinal products followed by professional and scientific equipment. The following chart shows the highest and lowest absolute changes in employment for the sub categories (ANZSIC 3 digit) across the manufacturing industry within inner Melbourne between 2006 and 2011.

For the same sub manufacturing industries the following chart illustrates the growth or decline in comparison to the wider Metropolitan Melbourne. Generally speaking, the inner Melbourne area observed more substantial growth and more severe losses for each sub-sector compared to metropolitan Melbourne.
The purpose of this shift-share analysis seeks to determine the manufacturing industries growth by establishing:

- **National Growth Effect** – 27,021 (2006 Study Area Manu) * 9% (total employment growth Melbourne) = 2,406 jobs are attributed to the Metropolitan Melbourne growth in general.

- **Industry Mix Effect** – 27,021 (2006 Study Area Manu) * -9% (manufacturing growth Melbourne) = -2,365 (expected growth) then subtracting – 2,406 (national growth effect) = -4,771. This decrease of employees can be attributed to the fact that the manufacturing industry performance is worse than metropolitan Melbourne economy performance overall.

- **Regional Competitive Effect** – -1,996 (total regional growth) – -2,365 (expected growth) = 369 employees in the manufacturing industry in inner Melbourne that can be attributed to advantages the industry has in the local area.

Considering this employment change as a percentage compared to metropolitan Melbourne, the manufacturing sub-sector industries have a dynamic mix of performance outcomes, with the following chart illustrating the growth or decline in comparison to the metropolitan Melbourne for small and larger firms within each ANZSIC.

Another way to understand industry potential is to create a four-quadrant sector classification system, wherein all firms are categorized according to their industry size and recent performance. Using the JTW data, we classify sectors as one of the following, in terms of employment numbers:

- large and growing
- large and declining
• small and growing
• small and declining

We define “large” to be a sector one with more than 200 employees in the metropolitan area. While this cut-off is reasonably arbitrary, the distinction matters little to the interpretation of the data, as we can see in Figure 7.3. This figure shows the distribution of sectors in each of the four quadrants, and clearly indicates that there are many more small sectors than large ones, as expected. Figure 7.4 is much more interesting. It shows only small sectors (less than 200 employed in the metropolitan area), and indicates that there are many more small and declining sectors than small and growing sectors.

Figure 7.3. Manufacturing Employment Change by Sector and Industry Size, Small and Large Sectors, 2006-2011
(Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics Journey to Work Data, 2006 and 2011)
When focusing in further detail within the inner Melbourne study area to consider each of the five (5) municipalities and the four shift share components, manufacturing recording higher employment growth across each sub area despite lower than average employment growth in the metropolitan Melbourne.
Less than half (41%) of the manufacturing industries recorded positive employment growth between 2006 and 2011. The overall employment growth of metropolitan Melbourne contributed -115% of employment reductions, while factors unique to the study area contributed 22% of employment growth. These declines were also impacted by declines in employment attributed to changes across each industry sector.

As a whole, pharmaceutical and medicinal product manufacturing (592 jobs), professional and scientific equipment manufacturing (270 jobs and “other food product” manufacturing (202 jobs) received the greatest benefits as a result of regional competitive effect. To assist in understanding the shift share analysis by industry sub-sector, the manufacturing industries have been broken into four different types:

- **Type 1**: includes industries benefiting from metropolitan wide economic and industry growth as well as experiencing regional competitiveness causing them to experience more substantial growth. Across the study area these industries include a number of food and beverage industries as well as professional and scientific equipment which could be experiencing benefits from access to transport networks, supportive services nearby, access to skilled workers etc.

- **Type 2**: These are industries that are underperforming compared with wider metropolitan growth. Industries such as basic chemical product manufacturing have the potential to contribute substantially to employment growth locally. Identification of factors influencing the disadvantage to inner city locations could assist in improving the performance in this sector (e.g. skills shortage, limited transport infrastructure, industry linkages).

- **Type 3**: These industries represent mostly declining industries across metropolitan Melbourne where businesses should focus on finding new opportunities or markets. This is the most common category across inner Melbourne and include industries such as motor vehicle and motor vehicle part manufacturing, printing and printing support services.

- **Type 4**: These are industries benefiting from regional competitiveness despite the metropolitan decline and should identify their competitive advantages and use to drive further growth. A good example of this is the pharmaceutical and medicinal products industry which experienced job reductions across the metropolitan area while Inner Melbourne attracted an increase of 569 jobs.

**Summary by Industry across LGA’s highlighting any key growths/declines**

At the manufacturing industry division level (3 digit ANZSIC code), many industries showed negative employment growth between 2006 and 2011. A summary of results is:

- **Food manufacturing**: generally increasing with strong increases in both dairy and fruit moving into Melbourne. Sugar and confectionary is made a significant exit from Port Phillip LGA with a 274 job decline.

- **Beverage manufacturing** grew across each LGA, especially Melbourne which increased by 243 jobs, except Yarra (120 job losses).
Clothing, textiles and footwear manufacturing has experienced significant (and often the highest) job losses as these industries are typically moving to international countries with a cheaper labour force.

Wood product manufacturing declined nationally and locally.

Pulp, paper and converted paper manufacturing declined except within Port Phillip which remained stable.

Basic chemical and chemical product manufacturing: This industry produced a growth industry in pharmaceutical and medicinal product manufacturing, particularly across Melbourne LGA (292 jobs) and Yarra (300 jobs).

Polymer product and rubber manufacturing is declining nationally and within the study area.

Non-Metallic mineral product manufacturing: Maribyrnong has growth in the glass product manufacturing field with 136 jobs while cement, lime, plaster and concrete product manufacturing showed a 213 job increase in Melbourne.

Fabricated metal manufacturing, had one sub industry that experienced decline in Maribyrnong LGA which was the other fabricated metal product manufacturing with 152 jobs lost.

As expected the motor vehicle manufacturing industry experienced declines across the study area and wider metropolitan and this business is expected to move operations to international countries. The biggest impact was in Melbourne with a 1,139 job decline between 2006 and 2011. However, most of the manufacturing firms within this sector are likely to be large format / scale manufacturers.

Machinery and equipment manufacturing: This industry had mixed results across the sector except in the professional and scientific equipment manufacturing industry which recorded a large growth in Melbourne (210 jobs) and Yarra (90 jobs).

Furniture and other manufacturing: experienced mostly declines across the metropolitan and locally within LGA’s.

**Type 1: Regional competitiveness and metropolitan growth**

There are 8 industries where the local industry is growing at a faster rate than the Metropolitan Melbourne industry levels.

**Table 7.1. Fast Growth of Local Industry, 2006-2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fruit and Vegetable Processing</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakery Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage and Tobacco Product Manufacturing, nfd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage Manufacturing</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Product Manufacturing, nfd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertiliser and Pesticide Manufacturing</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Scientific Equipment Manufacturing</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Other Manufacturing, nfd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics Journey to Work Data, 2006 and 2011)

**Type 2: Local disadvantage but metropolitan growth**

There are 7 industries that experience negative local impact on employment despite strong industry performance across Metropolitan Melbourne.
Table 7.2. Slow Growth of Local Industry, 2006-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Product Manufacturing, nfd</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Chemical and Chemical Product Manufacturing, nfd</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polymer Product and Rubber Product Manufacturing, nfd</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Metal and Metal Product Manufacturing, nfd</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Non-Ferrous Metal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing, nfd</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Equipment Manufacturing, nfd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics Journey to Work Data, 2006 and 2011)

**Type 3: Local businesses underperforming in low growth industry**

The most common situation across the manufacturing industry this category has 30 industries recording slower than average employment growth both locally and across the region.

Table 7.3. Slow Growth of Local and Regional Industry, 2006-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing, nfd</td>
<td>-417</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and Fat Manufacturing</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain Mill and Cereal Product</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar and Confectionery Manufacturing</td>
<td>-237</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile, Leather, Clothing and Footwear Manufacturing, nfd</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather Tanning, Fur Dressing and Leather Product Manufactur</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>-366</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and Footwear Manufactur</td>
<td>-327</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Sawmilling and Timber Dressing</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulp, Paper and Paperboard Manufactur</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converted Paper Product Manufactur</td>
<td>-142</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing (including the Reproduction of Recorded Media), nfd</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Printing Support Service</td>
<td>-399</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>-511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction of Recorded Media</td>
<td>-68</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum and Coal Product Manufactur</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Polymer Manufactur</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning Compound and Toiletity Preparation Manufactur</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Rubber Product Manufactur</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Metallic Mineral Product Manufactur, nfd</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Metal Product Manufactur</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Container Manufactur</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheet Metal Product Manufactur (except Metal Structural or Architectural)</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fabricated Metal Product Manufactur</td>
<td>-226</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle and Motor Vehicle Part Manufactur</td>
<td>-1,261</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>-1,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Transport Equipment Manufactur</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery and Equipment Manufactur, nfd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Equipment Manufactur</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Appliance Manufactur</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump, Compressor, Heating and Ventilation Equipment Manufactur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialised Machinery and Equipment Manufactur</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Manufactur</td>
<td>-129</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics Journey to Work Data, 2006 and 2011)

**Type 4: Local businesses outperforming in low growth industries**

The second most common category with 24 of the manufacturing industries have shown employment strength despite lower than average industry growth recorded across wider Metropolitan Melbourne.

Table 7.4. Strong Growth of Local Industry, 2006-2011
As discussed above in Section 7.1, and as this section demonstrates, the JTW data has no capacity to inform us about small manufacturing firms, or about the innovation practices and capacities of firms. However, it does provide some interesting insights into the state of manufacturing overall.

### 7.4 ABR DATA

As with the Census JTW data, the ABR in its current format does not provide access to firm size or other characteristics of firms that might allow us to identify makers that are small, innovative or both. However, the ABR data do provide some interesting lessons, particularly with reference to the limitations of the dataset for our purposes.

#### Overall Trends

One thing that the ABR data allows us to do is form an image of the growth of different sectors, as identified by ANZSIC codes. As with the JTW data, the ABR data uses ANZSIC codes. Unlike the JTW data, however, the ABR data is reported at the firm level. This allows us to see how many firms are active in a particular sector, rather than how many people are working in a sector. This gives us access to understanding the net position for the total number of firms within each ANZSIC, and conclusions can be drawn as to growing or declining industries within the manufacturing sector. The ABR data also allows us to see firms that have been established and dissolved, so we can get a sense of Figures 7.5 and 7.6 show those manufacturing sectors that are growing and declining in the Melbourne Metropolitan area, by total firm size, for 2010 to 2014.

### Table 7.5 Growing Manufacturing Firms – by Total Firms, 2010-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>National Regional Effect</th>
<th>Industry Mix Effect</th>
<th>Regional Competitive Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meat and Meat Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafood Processing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Food Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarette and Tobacco Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Manufacturing</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knitted Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Wood Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulp, Paper and Converted Paper Product Manufacturing, nfd</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Chemical Manufacturing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical and Medicinal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Basic Chemical Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polymer Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass and Glass Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement, Lime, Plaster and Concrete Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non Metallic Mineral Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Ferrous Metal Manufacturing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Ferrous Metal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Non-Ferrous Metal Manufacturing</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron and Steel Forging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and Electronic Equipment Mining</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Machinery and Equipment Manufacturing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Manufacturing</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics Journey to Work Data, 2006 and 2011)
Perhaps the most noteworthy take-away from these tables is what a sizeable proportion of the firms are classified as “other” manufacturing. ‘Other Manufacturing” appears as one of the most rapidly growing industries, with clothing the most declining industry, which appears consistent with a transfer of low skilled clothing labour typically to Asian countries. We return to this issue in the next section.

Unfortunately, current ABR data does not provide employment, turnover, or other relevant indicators of economic output or productivity. An astute observer might query why we do not somehow combine the JTW data and the ABR data to achieve both jobs and firm numbers. Unfortunately, there is no way to do this, as one dataset is collected from firms and the other from Census respondents. They are simply not compatible.

**Firms by Land Use**

Another area of interest for our study is in the distribution of firms by land-use classifications. The ABR data, because much of the data (around 80 percent) is spatially geocoded, allows us to match the data with land use zones to observe what kinds of activities are occurring on which kinds of land. Figures 7.6 through 7.11 illustrate the number of firms with a manufacturing ANZSIC code, located in each type of land use zone in the five IMAP councils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>ANZSIC</th>
<th>Number (2014)</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Dissolved</th>
<th>Net Births Deaths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakery Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>1,898</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>1,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Manufacturing</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat and Meat Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Metal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2,699</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage Manufacturing</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2,262</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning Compound and Toiletry Preparation Manufac</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Manufacturing</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>3,108</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Printing Support Services</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4,813</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Wood Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>2,889</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Food Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: ABR 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>ANZSIC</th>
<th>Number (2014)</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Dissolved</th>
<th>Net Births Deaths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and Footwear Manufacturing</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>5,916</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>1,791</td>
<td>-454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass and Glass Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knitted Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and Electronic Equipment Manufacturing</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Sawmilling and Timber Dressing</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafood Processing</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Non-Ferrous Metal Manufacturing</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather Tanning, Fur Dressing and Leather Product Mfg</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Ferrous Metal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: ABR 2014)
All of the figures are drawn with the same Y-axis scale so that the numbers can be compared across graphs.

It is noteworthy how few firms, relatively, are actually located in industrial zones. There are many more firms in the manufacturing codes located in mixed-use, business, and even residential zones. Although this is an interesting conclusion, as above, it does not provide much insight into our target small firms.
Unlike the ABR and JTW datasets, it is possible with the CLUE data to isolate small and very small firms. Figure 1 shows the distribution of the ten sectors with the largest representation of small makers in the City of Melbourne by ANZSIC (3 digit) code. This figure underscores how little we know about small makers, even when very fine-grained datasets like CLUE are available. At the three-digit level, the vast majority of very small firms in the making categories are classified simply as “Other.” This is clearly problematic in data analysis and policy response, as it is difficult to target policies at sectors when those sectors are not known.
Table 7.7 presents the same data but compares each of the sectors to medium and large firms incidences. The CLUE data suggests that there are far fewer medium and large firms in the categories where small and very small firms are prevalent (City of Melbourne, 2012). This is indicative of general firm distributions, where there tend to be many more small firms than large ones. However, this could also suggest that the kinds of firms that tend toward small sizes are fundamentally different than those that grow large. Further investigation below addresses some of this ambiguity using sector-based employment rather than firm distributions.
The CLUE data also allows us to identify sector size by number of employees. Table 7.8 presents the ten sectors identified in the previous figure and table according to the number of total full-time equivalent (FTE) employees in the “small” and “very small” categories. This table indicates that that small and very small manufacturers are strongly over-represented in some categories; notably, “other” manufacturing, clothing and footwear, baking, and furniture. The table also indicates that small makers are under-represented in some ANZSIC codes such as computers and electronics, and food production. The table further indicates that distributions of small and very small, versus medium and large, makers are more balanced in some industries such as professional and scientific equipment and printing and printing support.

Table 7.8. Employment in Small and Very Small Firms in the City of Melbourne, by Sector, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>ANZSIC3_ CODE</th>
<th>Very Small</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>FTE Employees (no.)</th>
<th>Percentage of total employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Printing Support Services</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>3,149</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Manufacturing</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Scientific Equipment Manufacturing</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and Footwear Manufacturing</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakery Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialised Machinery and Equipment Manufacturing</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Manufacturing</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and Electronic Equipment Manufacturing</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3,034</td>
<td>3,149</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Food Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment (all Manufacturing)</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>11,782</td>
<td>14,807</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CLUE 2012

Overall, this data suggests that there is significant inter-firm variation, even within sectors. This supports our argument, given above, that it is too soon to narrow in on specific sectors, since no sector has no representation of small firms.

The CLUE data are also instructive in what it cannot provide: it cannot provide indications of whether smaller firms are more innovative or more dependent in central locations for networking, shared suppliers, access to labour force, or other key economic contributions. The CLUE data does not collect information on firm innovation, so the contributions of innovation to firm productivity and the local, state, and national economies, is also not possible with the CLUE.
7.6 NEXT STEPS

Some new opportunities have arisen through this work to work with government agencies, particularly the ABR, to generate an ABR dataset that can allow us to more data such as firm size and turnover, that could be important to our project. The next section describes how a new relationship with the Australian Business Register arose from the Inception Workshop.
8. PHASE 1, FINDINGS FROM THE WORKSHOP

This section describes the format, processes, rationales, and findings from a half-day workshop, held on Thursday, 28 May from 8:30am to noon at the Melbourne Town Hall.

In summary, the workshop confirmed that the proposed research path is considered by government and makers to be viable and important. Additionally, it created new insights to inform the study, and helped us to establish additional networks and partnerships to assemble data for the project analysis.

8.1 WORKSHOP FORMAT

Attendees were seated at 10 round tables, with each table having at least one participants from academic institutions and state or federal government, and at least two participants from local government and the making community (including peak bodies). Interactions were designed so that makers and policy makers could engage together in productive conversation, with the dual objective of facilitating dialogue and creating networks.

The objectives of the workshop were twofold: first, we wished to communicate the objectives and to-date findings of the study to the stakeholders, to encourage their participation in the study, elicit their cooperation, and generate potential new partners. For makers, participation would mean providing their data in the form of interviews and survey responses. For state and federal government participants, our hope was that participation could mean providing data, joining as a partner for future funding efforts for the project, or endorsing the project. As it turns out, the workshop generated enthusiasm and promises of cooperation from state and federal agencies, which we discuss below.

The second objective of the workshop was to seek the input of participants about our approach: is the approach viable from their perspective? For government, is the approach likely to yield results that are relevant and valuable to their policy-making needs? For makers, does the study have the capacity to address some of their concerns as they interact with government? If the scope and approach currently falls short of achieving these objective, what additions can be made to make it a more viable process for all stakeholders?

We began and ended the workshop with two networking sessions, a breakfast starting at 8:30am and a morning tea to punctuate the workshop. In-between these two social and networking events, we ran a 15-minute session to introduce the project and approaches, and then ran three 20-minute modules to seek structured input. Each module consisted of 10 minutes of table discussion followed by each table providing brief feedback to the large group. Note-takers captured the verbal notes, and participants were encouraged to write their thoughts on large sheets of paper, all of which were collected and collated after the workshop. The categorized findings below represent the lessons generated from the verbal discussions, workshop notes, and participant notes.

The first module asked participants to comment on the importance of urban manufacturing from their perspective. They were asked to provide feedback on two questions:

1. What are your top three benefits of a thriving urban manufacturing sector?
2. What are the key influences on urban manufacturing?
The second module asked participants to comment on the study approach according to the following specific queries:

1. 1-3 positives of the approach
2. 1-3 Improvements or challenges of the study design
3. Important questions that we have missed
4. Important places that we should include.

The third module asked participants to describe how they and their organizations can contribute to the study, and what would compel them to stay involved. Tables responded to two queries:

1. Name 1-3 ways your organisation can contribute to the project
2. What would motivate you to stay involved?

### 8.2 ATTENDANCE

Attendance at the workshop was varied and well-rounded. Of the 68 people who RSVP’d, 61 attended on the day. Academic participants came from Melbourne University (4 participants), the Australian Urban Research Infrastructure Network (AURIN; housed at Melbourne University; 2 participants, including the director), the Academy of Design (1 participant), and the University of Wollongong (1 participant). One key federal government representative attended: Sandee Harris from the Australian Business Register, whose contributions will be discussed below. From state government, representatives were present from the Department of Treasury and Finance (1 participant), the Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport, and Resources (DEDJTR; 1 participant), the office of the Minister of Planning (1 participant), and the Metropolitan Planning Association (MPA; 1 participant). Local government representatives (21 participants) included staff from all IMAP councils and the City of Dandenong.

Makers attended whose businesses are located all IMAP councils, and also from the City of Moreland. Overall, 23 makers attended from firms dealing in baking, IT, design and construction, fashion and apparel, textiles, coffee roasting, digital textile printing, drafting, framing, glass and woodworking, jewellery making, and film and television set production.

In addition to the members of the Steering Committee, and additional 20 people – mostly makers, and also notably, a representative from ABR – stayed behind to participate in the Steering Committee meeting that occurred immediately after the workshop. During the Steering Committee meeting, these makers continued to participate enthusiastically in the discussion during the Steering Group meeting.

### 8.3 ADDITIONAL FINDINGS FROM WORKSHOP-RELATED INFORMAL INTERVIEWS

Also, as a result of the recruiting for the workshop, Dr. Jennifer Day was contacted by a number of makers who wished to contribute to the workshop and research but could not attend for a number of reasons. These makers included a tofu maker in Richmond, a software engineer in Moreland, and several others. The findings presented below also contain the lessons learned from these makers.
8.4 WORKSHOP FINDINGS

We present the workshop findings here thematically, around the major lessons and takeaways, rather than organized by the questions that were asked. We do this for a number of reasons. First, not all of the workshop findings are the result of the answers that attendees gave to particular questions. Rather, some are observations on the general tone of the morning and the enthusiasm and collaboration which the participants displayed in various ways. Most importantly, the thematic presentation conveys the same findings as would a more-linear reporting format, but in a less compelling, interesting way.

Makers endorse the work because it empowers them.

One clear message from the workshop is that our approach adds value for many stakeholders, at least in part because it draws attention to the issues the face in interacting with their local governments. Makers are – to varying degrees and sometimes acutely – aware of different planning mechanisms and how they can affect their business, for example changes in zoning and urban renewal plans. Despite this knowledge, makers have felt disempowered in dealing with their local governments. Some reported distrust resulting from what they see as pointless fees paid to local government business development groups. These fees are mandatory, some makers reported, but they never see benefits such as marketing materials or maps. Some people from councils conceded that these body corporates are outsourced and ineffective.

Most makers had never had the opportunity to sit down with people in government and have their concerns heard. They found the experience of round-table discussions with those working on their behalf in the policy arena, both empowering and reassuring. Many makers left the workshop with a positive feeling about future interactions with government. The enthusiasm for the project was at least partly based on the idea that it is collaborative. Makers felt they were heard. This is evidenced by the 20+ makers that stayed on for the Steering Committee meeting.

Moreland City Council is a notable exception to this pattern of makers feeling isolated from their local government counterparts. Makers from Moreland noted that people from their local government know them by name and felt that their concerns were of central importance to the local government.

Makers are enthusiastic about the project because our scope reflects their experience.

A number of makers commented that we have addressed a lot of relevant, pertinent issues for them in the project scope. One repeated point of common concern was displacement due to rezoning. Some makers are already leaving inner-urban areas because of pressures from surrounding land uses (change in zoning), expensive utilities, and compromised access to their facilities. For instance, our Richmond tofu maker noted that the blocks surrounding his have been rezoned, and that rezoning has removed businesses that once complemented his. Therefore, he is considering closing because there is not enough foot traffic to sustain his business.

Other markers are choosing not to locate in central areas due to space and tenure security concerns, despite that they list accessibility as a key issue in their work. One example of this is Holger Deilenberg, a wood craftsman who recently founded Space Tank Studio in North Coburg. He would have liked to locate Space Tank in Melbourne or an IMAP council, but was
concerned about rezoning and the security of his tenure. Matt and Ilija Minic and Matt Rowbottom, who together do a large part of the organizing of the Footscray Maker Lab cooperative, note that they will very likely move outward out of Maribyrnong Council when their eviction due to upzoning is carried out later this year.

**Government partners are interested, in part because of the enthusiasm of makers.**

The project team gained support from each local government in the IMAP area, across a number of departments in including leadership. Representatives from other councils heard about the workshop and wished to attend.

Makers from Moreland strongly recommended that we engage Moreland Council to join the project. After consultation with the Steering Committee, contact was made with the head of economic development in Moreland Council to secure both partnership and a $10,000 partner contribution for Phase 2.

As a result of the State Governments attendance at the workshop, the Victorian Minister of Planning’s office asked the Project Team to contribute in the Victorian government’s plans for the Fisherman’s Bend area in the upcoming review of Plan Melbourne. Similarly, a representative from the MPA reported at a subsequent steering committee meeting feeling inspired and having made commitments for continued partnership and future funding, and also recommended that we become involved in the Plan Melbourne review.

A Federal government representative attended from the Australian Business Register and reported having some scepticism initially however was now convinced about the viability of the project and offering to facilitate making more ABR data available to the project through a special arrangement. Both representatives reported that their response was in part driven by seeing how well makers responded to the project.

**Makers want a technological symbol of their participation and our commitment.**

One major lesson with which we left the workshop, is that the project team’s initial thinking about data collection was in need of updating. Our plans initially included standard, clipboard-based survey data collection methods. The makers responded strongly and negatively to this approach on a number of levels.

First, they argued, they want a tangible symbol of their participation in the project. Some have previously been involved in economic development and engagement schemes run by their councils, and many reported that those plans lost momentum and eventually petered out. Others were enthusiastic but somewhat apprehensive about what this project can do. They had left previous experiences having given their time and resources in the form of responding to surveys and participating in interviews, and had seen very little benefit from participating. They argued strongly that we should provide them with some value-added as part of their participation, in order to assuage their fears about the work resulting in no benefit to them.

Second, they noted that we might struggle to recruit makers with a clipboard army. Third, they argued that they have neither the time nor the patience for a clipboard survey. With all of the available technology, could we not arrange something online?

This input has resulted in exploration of a combined website that both creates a map and a searchable profile of participating makers, and allows them to complete an extensive online
survey. The Steering Committee, in subsequent meetings, has endorsed this idea. Harvest Digital Planning, a local software start-up that has had successful client relationship with the City of Melbourne and the City of Maribyrnong has been engaged to develop the online survey platform after demonstrating similar product.

The Harvest Digital Planning platform would deliver both the visible, technological representation that the makers asked for, and would also deliver the data we need to complete the project. However, having a Harvest Digital Planning site built presented a problem in the project timing: the survey was not scheduled to be rolled out until Phase 2. However, the Steering Committee has since agreed to bring forward the survey timeline to be part of Phase 1. This was seen as an efficiency for the project in that it responds to what the makers have requested and advances the survey to an earlier stage.

Appendix A contains a concept note containing a working draft of the survey and an explanation of some of the underlying logic.

For nearly everyone, how we define key terms is important.

One repeated issue that the workshop participants – both in government and among makers – raised was the issue of definition. Many seemed to be concerned about the study scope and that we did not yet have a working definition of what we mean by “small” makers, or “high value” makers, and “highly innovative” makers, or “urban” makers, or a distinction between making and manufacturing.

As a result of these discussions, we have placed a good deal of emphasis on researching appropriate definitions. However, as we note in Section 4, we do not wish to create false precision by settling on definitions too soon, before the qualitative work can inform these terms in the particular Melbourne context. As a project team, we are still working to unpack these key issues and will continue to refine them over the next two months.

There is indeed further scope that we could consider.

In addition to the insights about process and viability, as we report above, the makers also raised some key additional content areas where we could consider exploring. These additional considerations have subsequently informed all aspects of data collection for Phase 1, including the target of query in the qualitative analyses and some of the survey questions. Some of these ideas have been built into the project since the 28 May workshop.

Some additional areas we are considering are:

Non-Local Issues

- Intellectual property. The role of the Federal government in protecting intellectual property and encouraging innovation

Builders and Landowners
- The role of builders, including how building practices can introduce inappropriate facilities in new buildings, was a big issue for our makers. e.g., lack of concrete floors or no three-phase power
- Landlords’ role and incentives to allow making. There is a particular interest in the role of land owners, including how they contribute to and constrict making.

Innovation and Economic Development

- Skills losses from the economy. Makers reported a lack of skilled makers and technicians. For makers who design, they sometimes find it hard to find someone with the skills to prototype or mass-produce product. For instance, one maker reported on a friend, a high-end bathroom fixture designer, who could not find anyone with the appropriate brass-working skills in Australia to prototype her designs and therefore had to have it done in China.
- Would-be makers. Most makers described how hard it is to make a small business profitable, and described how they know many people who were discouraged from entering the making fields because of land restrictions, rents, incomes, and lack of capacity. A representative from ABR also noted that the ABR has recently purged 2 million “hobbyists” from their rolls, and rescinded their Australian Business Numbers (ABNs). These hobbyists could represent makers that never actualize as businesses, therefore never contributing their training, innovation, and economic productivity to the making economy.

8.5 STRATEGIC DECISIONS AND ACTION ITEMS

This section summarizes the key action items and decisions that arose from the workshop. The Steering Committee has also agreed to these changes:

1. Inclusion of Moreland council
2. Survey moved up to Phase 1 and moved to a platform that combines a tangible, technological presence for participating makers with our data collection needs.
3. Engagement of Harvest Digital Planning to develop the maker map and survey site.
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This appendix describes the logic and content that we currently plan to integrate into the online survey currently being developed by cooperatively by the project team, Harvest Digital Planning and Crowdspot.

We stress that this survey is still in draft form, but is nearing completion. The reader may see some evidence of the drafting process, including questions in the text.

**What purpose does the platform serve?**

The online platform will serve as a vehicle for mapping of select firms, spatial linkages with suppliers, collaborators, workers, distributors, customers and retailers with a view to understanding economics of scale and scope attaching to agglomerations. The immediate purpose is threefold:

1. To develop a spatial understanding of small makers in the study area
2. To provide a visible symbol of makers’ participation in the project, as per their request at the 28 May workshop
3. To gather the data required for the quantitative work we outline earlier in this report.

In the future, the platform could serve multiple purposes, which could change over time as the broader project evolves and increases in scope (with subsequent funding rounds). The table overleaf (Table A.1) illustrates the various purposes the platform could serve over various time horizons. At this stage we would only require a platform that can fulfil the purposes stated as ‘initial’, however it would be good to understand if and how the platform could be developed to allow for a broader range of purposes over time.

**Platform Logic**

The site is currently being developed to facilitate all of the above objectives. Makers will go onto the site and go through a validation process, wherein they are screened for their eligibility and develop a registration. In this process, they provide information on their firm. This information goes into developing a maker page that is visible on a map. They can provide information on the firm and a website, which is viewable and searchable by any member of the public. Some private, back-end information is also gathered in this process, such as firm size. This gets us a spatial representation of our firms, a qualitative overview of what these firms do, and some basic data about them. The firms get a presence on the site.

After the respondent has registered and been validated, the next phase is a survey. We have decided to split the survey into two parts, in order to facilitate getting the most important information first and avoiding survey fatigue. A respondent who is willing goes on to Survey – Part 4 after finishing Survey – Part 3. Thus, the first component of the survey contains the most crucial information for our study; the second component contains important but less crucial data. All of this survey information is private and is not shared with the public.

The specific questions that we ask for the validation, registration, and survey phases are described and illustrated after Table A.1. Figures A.1 through A.3 illustrate this process with prototypes developed by Harvest Digital Planning.
Ongoing Issues

There are a number of ongoing issues about the data that we need to work through. Harvest/Crowdsport will host this site for one year. After that, the site needs a new owner to maintain it if it will continue. This is important but not pressing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Initially</th>
<th>Possible near-term</th>
<th>Possible longer-term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maker networking and promotional site</strong></td>
<td>The display page should announce that these firms are working in collaboration with IMAP and Melbourne University on the Urban Manufacturing project, and give background information on the UM project. (and state government and neighbouring participating Councils??). Also refer to more detailed fact sheet and references etc. Allow participants to publically show a range of information that serves promotional purpose (list on previous page). I imagine these details popping up once you click on the business pin/name on a map</td>
<td>Expand to include many more participants. Allow comments to be made about products and businesses (would probably need to be moderated) Allow shopper (i.e. non-makers) to enter their experience of engaging with local makers (including who, where, why) Allow businesses to edit/update/remove information (would require log in). Would need a terms and condition and also the ability to moderate before live in case you get some out of the box obscene entries. (it does happen believe me). There probably needs to be an ‘all rights reserved’ as the length of the project and</td>
<td>Be integrated into broader website that deals with a host of urban manufacturing issues (may be a different platform, but same data set)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maker promotional and research site (I think it would be good to be clear that makers taking part in the site may at various times be required to take part in the research over the 3-5 years)</strong></td>
<td>(Note: a mapping site in South Australia <a href="http://www.investnorthernadelaide.com.au/map/">http://www.investnorthernadelaide.com.au/map/</a> providing a brief description of the business and their website (note these businesses are large companies to attract investment for supply networks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.1. Platform Logic in Various Time Horizons
Would be also good if we could have the businesses able to be shown in list form (organisable by category type - example here)

Need to think about home businesses, as we wouldn't want people listing their home address publically. Actually some businesses might not want to specifically list their location publically. If Homebased businesses are placing a pointer to their location there could be an opt out selection on displaying the address and only list phone number and business name.

Ability to enter data from smart device. Field surveyors may have tablets.

Must be visually pleasing enough for participants to feel enticed into entering details.

I assume we'd want to maintain the ability to edit and/or remove information.

funding and on-going commitment to the site (just in case)

Maybe a statement that it is a research site with a promotional benefit to the small maker that will potentially have an on-going benefit to small makers in the future
| **Data collection tool** | In addition to the information collected and made public above, there are a number of other questions we would want to ask participants. Completing the survey should not be a condition of appearing on the site. Makers can register and post their company information on the site, and come back later to fill in the survey. (this could tie in with the phase 2 stage and while they are able to register some basic information they would receive a reminder to complete the more detailed survey otherwise they face the risk of their information being hidden and not remaining a part of the research??) | Track linkages between makers and their customers, collaborators, suppliers, financers, etc. (It'd be great if we could have this in the initial stage, however I think it would require too much time. Could be an optional section to complete) |
| Study progress information dissemination site (optional) | Include information about the study, links to partner sites (IMAP and Councils), progress to date (and state government and any relevant resources) |  |  |
Survey logic – Mapping Melbourne’s Makers

Preamble

As a small manufacturer and maker you have an opportunity to contribute and shape the way the inner Melbourne area is focusing on small makers. Through research conducted by the University of Melbourne and the IMAP Councils we are investigating the role played by small manufactures and makers in the inner Melbourne area. While a host of business types locate in industrial zoning, the focus of this study is on local businesses that make a physical product (including prototypes) in Melbourne and have fewer than 100 Employees.

Urban Manufacturing Project

Survey Design

Part 1 – Are you a small maker? (validation)

Introduction and additional eligibility criteria

- What does your business make? Please list up to five things.
- How many employees does your business employ (FT/PT/casual)?
- In what suburb and state is your business located?

Notes:
- Firms with 100 or fewer employees will be allowed to register
- Firms anywhere in metropolitan Melbourne will be allowed to register
- We will also include a checkbox for agreement with the terms and conditions, terms of use, etc. This will outline what is visible, not visible, etc.

Part 2 – Register you business

About your business:

1. What is the name of your business?

2. What is your firm address? (Note: this will be shown publicly on the map)

3. Please select the types of goods you produce (choose all that apply):

   a. Food or beverage
   b. Furniture, floor coverings, or housewares
   c. Textiles
   d. Clothing, footwear and personal accessories
   e. Wood products (aside from furniture, floor coverings, or housewares)
   f. Glass and glass products
   g. Ceramic, clay, or concrete products
   h. Metal products (excluding jewelery)
   i. Plastic products
   j. Jewelery
   k. Motor vehicle parts
l. Electrical and electronic goods, including computing products
m. Hardware, building and garden supplies
n. Recreational goods
o. Pharmaceutical products and toiletries
p. Scientific or biotechnical
q. Chemicals, fertilizers, and cleaning products
r. Paper or paper products
s. Printing, publishing, screenprinting, or typesetting
t. Reproduction or publishing of recorded media, including software publishing
u. Sounds recording and music publishing
v. Installation art or sculpture
w. Set and prop production
x. Other (please specify): ___________

Notes:
- We can also in include sub-categories once user click on the categories (if required – I don’t think there is a need - JD)

4. Tell us the story of your business, what you make, etc. (Note: this description will appear on your profile on the website)

5. Your website (if applicable) (Note: this description will appear on your profile on the website)

Contact details:

6. Name
7. Email
8. Phone
9. Password

Notes:
- After registration submission our concept was to prompt people to complete the short survey. The strategy was to initially draw in as many people as possible while reducing the attrition rate. As discussed, as we include more question there is greater risk of people dropping off.
- If we want to include more research questions before making the business visible on the website we can either:
  o Include additional questions in the registration; and/or
  o Instruct the business to complete the short survey before they can be visible - ‘Great, thanks for registering. Your nearly visible on the site... all you have to do is complete this short 10min survey’.

Part 3 – Take the short survey to help with our research

You appear to be one of Melbourne's small urban makers! We'd like to collect some more information from you to assist in our study of the sector. We'd also like to give you a platform in which to present your product and be 'put on the map' of Melbourne's maker community. Thanks in advance for your time!
The following details will **not be public and are purely for the purposes of our study** into the contribution made by Melbourne's small urban manufacturers and makers.

**About the Respondent**

1. What is your role in the business (check all that apply)?
   a. Founder
   b. Founding Partner
   c. Sole Owner
   d. Manager
   e. Non-founding Partner
   f. Other

**About the Business**

2. When did you start producing in your current location?

3. If applicable, where did you previously produce this product?

4. At your production site at xxx (automatically fills from past question), what other business activities do you undertake? *Multiple tick box with following options*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product design</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Direct to public sales</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Warehousing / storage</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Product service

5. How much production space and office space do you occupy at your current premises (square metres)?

6. Where/how do you sell your product (please select all applicable):
   a. Onsite (i.e. at the point of production)
   b. At stores in Melbourne
   c. At stores outside of Melbourne but in Australia
   d. At overseas stores
   e. Online (through third party websites)
   f. Online (through own website and email requests)
   g. Other

**Firm Location Choice**

7. Do you own or rent your premises?

8. Within the next five years do you expect to relocate your firm?:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>No – wouldn’t consider relocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Yes – to expand operations in other location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Yes – potential forced relocation by landlord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Cease Operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

    Where - suburb option

    Why – drop down box of options

If “Yes” to relocation, where would you consider your new location to be?

within Inner Melbourne
9. Are there any threats in 2015-2016 to the continued operation of your business? (top three or list) (2016 will be here and gone before we know it, do we want to extend out to 2017 considering the study will be 3-5 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End of lease or lease termination</th>
<th>Product failure</th>
<th>Inadequate space for production</th>
<th>Poor facilities</th>
<th>Cost of rent</th>
<th>Cost of regulatory compliance</th>
<th>Availability of labour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. I WOULD LIKE A QUESTION ON HOW OFTEN FIRMS USE LOCATION-BASED SERVICES. I ENVISION ANOTHER QUESTION, SOMETHING LIKE THE FIRST FEW LINES OF THE ATTACHED TABLE, BUT OF COURSE IN THE NECER CROWDSPOT FORMAT. JD
How many times in the past month have you accessed the following resources for business purposes, and how did you access them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Times in past month</th>
<th>% on the phone</th>
<th>% by email</th>
<th>% in person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A freeway/highway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sea port</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers in the Melbourne CBD and inner suburbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer firms in the Melbourne CBD and inner suburbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers in the Melbourne CBD and inner suburbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (eg legal, finance) in the Melbourne CBD and inner suburbs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business support services (eg. Incubators) in the Melbourne CBD and inner suburbs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers elsewhere in Melbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer firms elsewhere in Melbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers elsewhere in Melbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (eg legal, finance) elsewhere in Melbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business support services (eg. Incubators) elsewhere in Melbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers elsewhere in Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer firms elsewhere in Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers elsewhere in Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (eg legal, finance) elsewhere in Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business support services (eg. Incubators) elsewhere in Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers overseas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer firms overseas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers overseas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business support services (eg. Incubators) overseas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate close to peer firms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 4 – Remaining research survey questions

About the Respondent

1. What is your sex?
2. What year were you born?
3. In what country were you born?
4. Where do you live now? (Country, State, Suburb)
   a. Education
   b. Academic
   c. Small Business
   d. Large Corporate Business
   e. Government
   f. Non-Profit/NGO
   g. Other
5. What is your educational background?
   a. High school diploma
   b. Some university
   c. Undergraduate degree
   d. Post-graduate certificate
   e. Post-graduate degree
6. If applicable, what discipline(s) did you study in university? _________

Firm Location Choice

If “Yes” to relocation, estimate what proportion of your employees do you think would be willing / able to access you new potential location?

11. Do the team members / staffing at your location effect your decision on which location you choose?
   Yes
   No

12. If you had to speculate on your business plans over the next year, do you :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V.   Expect to grow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.  Expect to stay the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Expect to decline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firm Outputs

7. What was your business turnover in:
   a. 2014-2015
   b. 2013-2014
   c. 2012-2013
8. What was your investment in capital in:
   a. 2014-2015
   b. 2013-2014
   c. 2012-2013
   d. 2011-2012
   e. 2010-2011

9. What was your investment in land in:
   a. 2014-2015
   b. 2013-2014
   c. 2012-2013
   d. 2011-2012
   e. 2010-2011

10. How many employees did your firm have in
    a. 2014-2015
    b. 2013-2014
    c. 2012-2013
    d. 2011-2012
    e. 2010-2011

11. What was your investment in labour in:
    a. 2014-2015
    b. 2013-2014
    c. 2012-2013
    d. 2011-2012
    e. 2010-2011
FIGURE A.1. SEARCHABLE MAKERS MAP
WANT TO BE ADDED TO THE MELBOURNE MADE LIST?
Adding your company will help you get exposure and connect with other companies in your area. To get started, let’s see if you’re eligible.

Enter your address (primary place of production)

How many employees do you have?

Do you make physical items?

CONGRATS!
You are eligible to be listed on our site. Please press next to register your business details.

FIGURE A.2. SAMPLE VALIDATION PROCESS
CONTACT DETAILS
Tell us the best ways to get in touch with you.

Your business website
Contact Name
Contact Number
Contact Email

SUBMIT YOUR LISTING FOR APPROVAL

THANKS FOR YOUR REGISTRATION
We will review your submission and should approve it shortly. In the meantime, you can help us understand your industry better by filling out a short survey.

TAKE THE SURVEY  No Thanks

FIGURE A.3. SAMPLE REGISTRATION PAGE
IMAP Implementation Committee

Briefing Paper

Action 5.5 Infrastructure Development

Purpose
To inform the IMAP Implementation Committee on the progress of the proposed approach to a joint regional planning study for the provision of open space to cater for active and passive recreation to accommodate current and projected future demands.

BACKGROUND

1. In March and May 2015, the City of Melbourne presented information to the IMAP Implementation Committee regarding a joint planning study for the provision of active and passive recreation spaces to accommodate current and projected future demands.

2. Officers from each of the five partner Councils; Melbourne, Yarra, Port Philip, Maribyrnong and Stonnington have continued to work jointly on the refinement of the draft brief, after previously expressing unanimous support for such collaboration. The draft brief is attached for your information however feedback that may result in further refinement work being carried out is still to be received from all parties.

DISCUSSION

3. This proposed planning study relates to the Inner Melbourne Action Plan action 5.5 Infrastructure Development, around planning and funding models for the provision of social and physical infrastructure to service increased population in the Inner Melbourne Region, including but not limited to sport and health.

4. The brief, once final refinement work has been completed, could be used in the market place to determine the funding required to engage a suitably qualified and experienced consultant, or consultants, to undertake this work. This would inform the funding requirements for the project and discussions on funding contributions from 2016-17 budgets from each stakeholder.

5. It is also proposed that this process includes an option for the consultant, or consultants, to separately price the first three study objectives:

   a) To quantify the current supply of sporting assets within the study area, and to understand the collective capacity and load potential of these assets;
   b) To research and collate all existing information that informs the planning for the provision of community sporting facilities and open space throughout the study area, including State and municipal Council planning reports and policy; and
   c) To review and analyse demographic data for the inner region of Melbourne, particularly population forecasts and profiles of communities to 2041, and the implications for the provision of sporting assets and open space.

   This could enable the first part of the project to commence in the current financial year if the cost is acceptable and within each party’s budget.

6. It is proposed this project would be guided by a transparent governance framework that would include establishing a Project Control Group and Project Working Group. The Project Control Group would oversee the planning, funding and delivery of the project. The Project Working Group would monitor progress, offer technical advice, and provide information and input required to successfully complete the project. It is further proposed that City of Melbourne, Libraries and Recreation branch would fulfil the day to project administration function.
7. At this stage, officers from the five Councils have expressed a clear desire for the IMAP Councils to retain full ownership of the project. Accordingly agencies such as the Melbourne Planning Authority and Sport and Recreation Victoria have been identified as key stakeholders, and will be invited to participate via the governance framework.

RECOMMENDATION

8. That the IMAP Implementation Committee notes:

   (a) That the final draft brief is to be agreed by all councils by the end of September 2015;
   (b) That the City of Melbourne, as lead council of the project to date, intends to seek expressions of interest that nominates a price to complete work to achieve the first three study objectives as listed above and a separate price that costs the entire project.

9. That this information is presented to the November 2015 committee meeting.
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1. Introduction

Study Overview

Public open space is land set aside for recreation, passive outdoor enjoyment and gatherings, and nature conservation. Whilst open space may mean different things to different people, its importance and value to communities are consistent: improves physical and mental health and wellbeing; facilitates social connectedness; enhances cultural heritage and character, contributes to biodiversity; mitigates urban heat; and can be a place for events and arts.

Melbourne City Council, on behalf of the Cities of Port Phillip, Stonnington, Yarra, and Maribyrnong, is seeking to appoint a suitably qualified consultant to undertake a comprehensive assessment of options for the future provision of regional open space within the inner region of Melbourne, an area that extends beyond the City of Melbourne municipal boundaries. The open space will be required to provide for a range of sporting and passive opportunities and pursuits to accommodate current and projected demands by an increasing population.

The study is commissioned in the context of:

- the strong population growth projected for Melbourne City and for the neighbouring inner municipalities,
- the current high utilisation of existing sports grounds and other sporting assets situated in the inner region of Melbourne,
- the general lack of capacity of most of these assets to absorb any further demand, and
- the ongoing pressure to convert existing passive open spaces into active spaces.

The study will be undertaken collaboratively by the Cities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Stonnington, Yarra, and Maribyrnong, being the five member councils of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) group (refer Appendix 1 for more information about IMAP). The study area will generally be the inner region of Melbourne, as defined by the combined municipal area of the IMAP group of councils.

There are six key outcomes of the study:

1. Understanding the current supply and utilisation of sporting assets within the study area.
2. Collation of information informing the planning for the provision of sporting assets and open space throughout the study area.
3. Evidence-based analysis of the demand for sporting assets and open space within the inner region of Melbourne.
4. Agreed principles and policies for the future planning, funding and provision of sporting assets and open space within the inner region of Melbourne.
5. Agreed approach to optimising the use of existing sports assets within the inner region of Melbourne, with consideration of seasonal allocations and shared use.
6. Options for the future provision, funding and management of sporting assets and open space within the inner region of Melbourne.

The study will also investigate the optimal Governance framework for the management of sporting assets and open spaces within the inner region of Melbourne, as councils and other authorities currently have different policies, procedures and practices for managing community land.
Study Area

The study area will generally be the inner region of Melbourne that incorporates the combined municipal areas of the Cities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Stonnington, Yarra, and Maribyrnong. However, open space and sporting assets available just beyond the area defined by the IMAP councils (or with potential to become available) should be considered where regional opportunities for use could be substantiated.

The following table shows the estimated current population of the IMAP councils, and the forecast population to 2031. The data shows that an additional 225,000 residents are projected to live in the study area by 2031¹.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Estimated Population 2013</th>
<th>Forecast Population 2031</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Melbourne</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>218,000</td>
<td>98,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Port Phillip</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Yarra</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Maribyrnong</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>493,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>718,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>225,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Victoria in Future 2014, Department of Transport, Planning and Local Infrastructure.
2. Study Background

Melbourne City Council and some of the other inner Melbourne councils have been challenged for some years to accommodate all requests by sporting groups and residents for access to playing fields for training and competition activities. Initially, the main reason for demand exceeding supply was the impact of the 2000’s drought, which severely impacted the capacity of sporting grounds to cater for matches, let alone training needs.

The introduction of new technology and methods to construct and maintain sports grounds with a reduced dependency on water, improved the playability of grounds during this period and beyond. However, just as the City was recovering from the effects of the sustained period of drought, a second contributor to increased demand for access to sports grounds was emerging – increased growth of the inner City residential population. The impact of the 1990’s City of Melbourne policy, Postcode 3000, has been the progressive increase in the number of people residing within inner Melbourne. Today more than 100,000 people call the City of Melbourne home, compared to less than 50,000 people in 1995. With that increase in population comes a proportionate increase in the demand for services, including sport, recreation and open space.

The forecast population growth to more than 180,000 people by 2031 will mean more people living and working in higher density neighbourhoods within the City of Melbourne. Increasing urban densities will result in more people needing to use open space to maintain their physical and mental health and wellbeing. This will place additional demand on existing open spaces and will create the need to provide additional open space.

A study commissioned by the City of Melbourne in 2012, the Sports Facility Provision Analysis, provided hard evidence to confirm that Melbourne City had fewer sporting assets than required to adequately meet the sporting and active recreation demands of its resident population. The study concluded that there was a shortfall of 12 sports ovals within the City of Melbourne to meet the demands of the projected 2031 population, and a shortfall of 12 soccer fields, one bowling green and 10 indoor sports courts.

Compounding this projected shortfall is the ongoing demand for use of sporting assets located within the City of Melbourne by non-residents. Recent research undertaken by the Council has identified that as few as 25-30% of all participants in organised sporting activities taking place throughout the municipality are City of Melbourne residents. Whilst this statistic may provide some justification for Council to introduce guidelines to restrict the access of non-residents to those sporting assets managed by Council, such a policy position would be difficult to enforce and does not recognise the varied reasons why people choose to become members of sporting clubs and associations. That is, people rarely consider municipal boundaries when accessing opportunities to participate in their preferred sport and recreation activities and pursuits.

Conversations with neighboring municipalities confirm that the Cities of Yarra, Port Philip and Stonnington are also reaching the point where demand for sporting facilities is beginning to exceed supply. Yarra is experiencing considerable population growth, with it’s population forecast to increase by 40% over the next twenty years. Yarra is also experiencing an increase in high-density housing, and this combined with population growth will result in greater competition for limited open space. Participation in sport in Yarra has increased by 43% between 2006 and 2013, however, many of Yarra’s sports assets are currently being used at their maximum capacity, in particular natural grass sports grounds.

Stonnington has the second lowest amount of public open space of all Victorian municipalities at 6.7%, and with the population increasing, the rate of open space per person is continuing to decline. Whilst the City of Maribyrnong is not currently experiencing a problem of unmet demand, urban renewal projects taking place within the inner Melbourne region are expected to begin to place pressure on supply. The Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal project, which will result in an estimated 60,000 new residents, will further compound the problem of supply
of sporting and recreation assets for the Cities of Melbourne and Port Phillip.

Whilst some capacity may exist for the City of Melbourne to develop new indoor and outdoor sporting assets by utilising brown field sites associated with large urban renewal projects (such as E-Gate), the total land available for both active and passive recreation is unlikely to be sufficient to meet all projected demands for additional sporting assets. Conversely, for the neighbouring councils of Yarra and Stonnington, there will be little opportunity for the development of new field-based sporting facilities within their respective municipalities in the future, despite projected increased populations.

With similar issues being experienced by the inner Melbourne region councils of a current or projected shortfall in the quantum of sporting assets and regional open space, it is timely that the LGAs are now collaborating under the auspice of the IMAP group to investigate the issue of adequate future supply from a regional perspective rather than a municipal perspective.

The Regional Active & Passive Open Space Planning Study is being commissioned to quantify the issue of the likely shortage of sporting assets and regional open space to meet demand, and to investigate possible solutions and scenarios in a regional context. The successful consultant will be expected to identify and investigate what opportunities might exist by adopting traditional methods of provision of facilities and spaces, but to also identify and investigate opportunities that might be possible from "left field" thinking, such as utilising roof tops for sporting assets, establishing arrangements whereby the temporary use of selected spaces is permitted, utilising sporting assets for competitions at non-traditional times, and further exploring the use of synthetic sports surfaces, collaborations with non-Council owned stakeholders, and inventive scheduling. It will be important to remove the pressure to convert existing passive spaces to active spaces.

**Basketball**

An example of a sport that would benefit from a regional approach to facility provision is basketball. Currently, the Melbourne Sports & Aquatic Centre provides the main venue for basketball within the inner Melbourne region. It has 10 courts and is located within the City of Port Phillip. Its junior and senior domestic competitions draw from a catchment that is not exclusively Port Phillip, and the courts are at capacity for basketball use.

The City of Melbourne has only two indoor courts that are Council-owned and fully accessible by the public, whilst there is restricted community access to the remaining four courts, which are located on school land and at the North Melbourne Recreation Reserve. All are single court facilities and their value for competition use is significantly compromised due to their geographic distribution. High-level benchmarking suggests that up to 10 courts would be required to meet the demands of the current population of the City of Melbourne.

Within the inner Melbourne region, there are other similar demands being placed on basketball associations and facility providers. Single court facilities in disparate locations create significant challenges for associations to conduct competitions efficiently and effectively, which has the flow-on effect of programs and competitions not meeting all user needs or those of potential users.

Indoor high-ball sports stadiums are extensive to build and require a generous land parcel to accommodate both the sports stadium and the associated car parking (say 8,000-10,000sqm for a four court stadium). A regional approach to the planning and provision of indoor sports courts across the inner Melbourne region would have the following benefits:

- Better match provision to catchment areas.
- Would create venues that could better sustain competitions.
- Providers could capitalise on economies of scale (critical mass of courts in one location).
- Cost savings through shared resources from multiple council partnerships.
3. Study Aim

The Aim of the study is to develop a framework for the provision and allocation of sporting assets and spaces within the inner region of Melbourne that will respond to the community sporting and recreational demands of an increasing population of inner Melbourne.

The study will need to consider such issues as the geographic distribution of assets and spaces and the capability of communities to access them, the capacity of existing and future assets and spaces to absorb additional use, the role of passive space and the need to generally protect existing provision, the need for a diversity of sporting and recreational opportunities being available, the level of access to non-Council owned land and any conditions associated with approved access, the cultural and socio-economic diversity of the population and the rights of all to have the opportunity to utilise facilities and spaces available, and the equitable allocation of sporting assets to the diverse range of users.

4. Study Objectives

The Objectives of the study are:

1. To quantify the current supply of sporting assets within the study area, and to understand the collective capacity and load potential of these assets.

2. To research and collate all existing information that informs the planning for the provision of community sporting facilities and open space throughout the study area, including State and municipal council planning reports and policy.

3. To review and analyse demographic data for the inner region of Melbourne, particularly population forecasts and profiles of communities to 2041, and the implications for the provision sporting assets and open space.

4. To engage and consult with all relevant stakeholder organisations that have a role and responsibility for the planning, provision and management of publicly accessible sporting facilities and open space in the inner region of Melbourne, including state and local government authorities and agencies, and other public and private landowners and managers.

5. To undertake an evidence-based analysis of the demand for access to community sporting assets and open space within the study area, and quantify such demand.

6. To develop a set of ‘principles of provision’ of sporting assets that advocates maximising the use of available assets.

7. To develop a policy direction for the future planning, development, use, allocation and management of sporting assets and open space within the inner region of Melbourne, that is underpinned by a set of agreed principles and values.

8. To identify options for the future provision of community sporting assets and open space within the study area.

9. To investigate Governance models for the future management of sporting assets and open space within the study area, particularly the method of allocation and use, user fees and charges, maintenance levels and costs, and capital investment.

10. To assess the cost of providing sports facilities (capital and operating) and to identify the revenue generated by this infrastructure.

11. To identify a shared vision for facilities in the inner region of Melbourne to inform planning and facility needs of state sporting associations.
5. Study Scope

The study scope includes:

1. All sports, including outdoor and indoor sporting facilities, facilities with restricted community access (e.g. tennis courts and bowling greens), and aquatic facilities.

2. Regional open space areas set aside for passive recreational use only.

3. Other open space areas that have the capability to accommodate unstructured and informal sporting activities (e.g. basketball pads, tennis hit-up walls).

4. Non-council owned sporting assets and open space that are currently being accessed by the public, or have the potential to be with approved access arrangements (e.g. assets on education or university land, and privately owned indoor sports centres).

5. Selected water based sports of rowing and yachting.

Sporting or physical activities not included within the scope of this study include other water based sports (e.g. boating, fishing, paddle sports and life saving), equestrian sports, and sports that are traditionally provided by the private sector and for which a fee or admittance charge is payable to play (e.g. ten pin bowling, squash and go-kart racing).

Open space areas not included within the scope of this study include the Port Phillip Bay foreshore, bicycle and walking paths, local (pocket) parks and other similar sized local urban spaces, and other play spaces and parks provided primarily to service a local resident catchment.

(See Appendix 2 for a list of sporting and recreation activities included within the scope of the study).

6. Challenges to be Considered

Some of the critical challenges or issues to be considered during the study (but not limited to) are:

- The inner region of Melbourne is experiencing population growth and increased demand for access to community sporting and recreation assets, evidenced by:
  - Melbourne City’s population is projected to increase by an additional 98,000 people to 2031, and recent research identifies a shortfall of more than 10 ovals, 12 soccer fields, and 10 indoor sports courts to meet future demand.
  - Yarra City is experiencing considerable population growth, with the population forecast to increase by an additional 30,000 people to 2031. Participation in sport increased by 43% between 2006 and 2013, and on top of this increase there is a further demand for other participation opportunities.
  - Port Phillip City is under pressure for the demand/supply of sporting assets and is experiencing increases in club membership. Council regularly receives requests from new clubs and other clubs historically based in other LGAs to access assets in the City of Port Phillip. The development of Fishermans Bend will exponentially increase the demand for community sporting and recreational assets.
  - Due to the high density of development at the western end of Stonnington City, the majority of Council’s sport and recreation assets are located at the eastern end. Demand for the use of sports grounds exceeds the capacity of existing grounds in Stonnington, and there is little opportunity available to increase the number of sports grounds.

Forecast population growth and change will be significant in some parts of
Maribyrnong City, including in Footscray and Maribyrnong. There is a need for additional open space in the City to meet the sporting and recreational needs of the projected population, with two new Municipal open spaces planned to meet the projected increased sporting demand by residents to 2031.

- Completing the audit of the number, type, distribution and utilisation of existing sporting and recreation assets within the inner region of Melbourne.
- The capability to calculate the actual capacity levels of the same or similar sporting assets located within different LGAs.
- The relationship between the areas projected to experience most residential growth and the location of existing sporting assets.
- The large number of stakeholder organisations that have a planning, provision and management role for publicly accessible sporting assets and open space within the inner region Melbourne.
- The different management arrangements that exist between different LGAs for sporting assets, including tenancy periods, fees and charges, and maintenance responsibilities and standards.
- The need for the provision of sporting and recreation assets to support a diversity of activities and pursuits, and not just accommodate the demands of the high participation/popular sports.
- Season creep, as a result of state sporting association strategies, and the ability for councils to provide facilities that meet the needs of the user groups.
- The increased level of participation of girls and women in sport.
- The increasing popularity of informal/social sporting participation compared to organised and traditional club sporting participation.
- The application of relevant benchmarks of provision based on population ratios and ones based on the percentage of total open space that should be allocated to physical activity (sport) versus passive pursuits.
- Introduction of rate capping, and the resultant impact on councils’ capacities to contribute in the future to capital and operational funding, therefore the sustainability of existing services.
- The challenges of securing funding sources to develop new or redevelop existing sporting and recreation assets for cross-region and multi-sport benefits.
- Investigating non-traditional approaches to providing sporting and recreation assets, including locations, facilities mix, multi-use, surfaces, and times of use.
- The need to consider appropriate transport links and access overlays when planning for new and expanded sporting and recreation assets.
- The nexus between the use of open space for sporting and recreational pursuits, and the environmental, biodiversity and cultural outcomes from the same spaces, that is, ensure that the planning for new and upgraded regional open space is consistent with Council’s public space philosophy and management strategies and programs.

7. Study Budget

A budget of up to a maximum of $XX has been allocated to this study. This sum will cover all project costs, including the Consultant’s fee, plus any additional incidental costs or disbursements.
8. Study Timelines

The desired timeline for the study is completion within 18 months of appointment, inclusive of a three month public exhibition period. An indicative timeline is set out below:

- Call for tenders opens x month year
- Closing date for tenders x month year
- Interviews for short listed consultants x month year
- Consultant appointed x month year
- Project commencement x month year
- Discussion & Directions Paper x month year
- 1st draft Study Report x month year
- Endorsed Draft Study Report x month year
- Public Exhibition of Draft Study Report x month year
- Final Study Report / Project Completion x month year

9. Management of the Study

The study planning process will comprise the following framework.

**Project Control Group**

**Function**

The Project Control Group (PCG) will oversee the planning, funding and delivery of the study, and will monitor the study’s completion in accordance with an agreed methodology, outcomes, timeframes, budget and quality parameters.

**Membership**

The membership of the PCG will include:

- Director, Melbourne City Council
- Manager Recreation Services, Melbourne City Council
- Director, Yarra City Council
- Director, Port Phillip City Council
- Director, Stonnington City Council
- Director, Maribyrnong City Council
- IMAP Group (2 x committee reps)
- IMAP Executive Officer
- Metropolitan Planning Authority representative
- Department of Health & Human Services representative
- VicHealth representative
Project Working Group

Function
The role of the Project Working Group (PWG) will be to provide technical advice on the study, ensure all relevant technical issues are considered, guide the work of the consultant and review information provided by the consultant.

Membership
The membership of the PWG will include:

- Manager Recreation Services, Melbourne City Council
- Manager Recreation & Open Space, Yarra City Council
- Manager Health & Wellbeing, Port Phillip City Council
- Manager Leisure Libraries, Stonnington City Council
- Manager Leisure Services, Maribyrnong City Council
- IMAP Executive Officer
- Parks Victoria representative (in lieu of the importance of Albert Park and Yarra Bend Park as community sports precincts)
- Recreation Planner Melbourne City Council
- Senior Parks Planner Melbourne City Council

Project Manager
The Project Manager and key contact will be XX, Melbourne City Council’s Recreation Planner, who will provide day-to-day support, advice and guidance to the Consultant.

10. Key Stakeholders
Groups to be consulted include (but are not limited to):

- Melbourne City Council
- Yarra City Council
- Port Phillip City Council
- Stonnington City Council
- Maribyrnong City Council
- Inner Melbourne Action Plan Group
- Parks Victoria
- Melbourne Olympic Park Trust
- Metropolitan Planning Authority
- VicHealth
- Relevant government departments, such as Sport and Recreation Victoria, Health and Education
- Regional Sporting Associations
- Selected State Sporting Associations
• Selected education institutions
• Community sporting clubs located in the inner Melbourne region (as required)
• Private providers of sporting assets (as required)

The consultant will be responsible for organising all meetings and interviews with stakeholders, and for documenting and compiling meeting minutes and findings.

11. Study Outcomes

The consultant will provide the following reports:

1. Discussion and Directions Paper (to become the Study Background Report)
2. 1st Draft Report
3. Final Report (incorporating an Implementation Plan and Study Background Report)
4. Executive Summary

In summary, the key outputs from the study include:

• Literature review of relevant documents, strategies and plans.
• Inventory of all sporting assets and active open spaces available in the inner region of Melbourne, including location, ownership/management, standard of provision, usage profile, actual and maximum load capacity, and potential for additional use. (Mapping out to support the inventory, which can be uploaded into the respective GIS systems of each IMAP group member council).
• Completion of an inclusive consultative process with representatives from the five IMAP group member councils, Parks Victoria, other inner Melbourne region sporting facility and open space providers/managers, and other stakeholders.
• Detailed understanding of the current and likely future gaps in the provision of sporting assets and regional open space within the inner region of Melbourne.
• Recommended policy direction (including endorsed Values and Principles) for the future planning, development, use, allocation and management of sporting assets and open space within the inner region of Melbourne, which has IMAP group member council endorsement.
• Recommended suite of proposed new, upgraded and enlarged sporting facilities and open space areas, which are required to meet the sporting and recreational demands of an estimated projected future population of 718,000 by 2031, or 225,000 additional residents.
• Preparation of a strategy and action plan for the incremental implementation of the study findings and recommendations, including prioritisation of actions, assignment of responsibility, cost estimates and timing.
• Recommended Governance framework for the future provision and management of the community sporting assets and regional open space, including process and responsibility for monitoring the implementation of the study recommendations.
• Comprehensive study report, including associated technical/background report(s) and Executive Summary report.

Whilst it is expected that some critical issues will be assessed and resolved during the study and strategy development process, it is acknowledged that the study may need to recommend additional planning/investigation to fully resolve some issues or fully explore and scope some opportunities.
12. References

Council will provide the Consultant with the following reports and documents as background information for the completion of the project (but not limited to):

- Melbourne Open Space Strategy 2012
- Urban Forest Strategy 2012
- Melbourne Sports Facility Provision Analysis 2012
- Water Front City Indoor Sport Court Feasibility Update Report (2012)
- *Draft* Yarra Sport and Physical Activity Strategy (2014)
- *Draft* Port Phillip Sport and Recreation Strategy 2014
- *Draft* Port Phillip Public Space Strategy 2015
- Stonnington Recreation Strategy 2014-2014
- Stonnington Public Realm Strategy 2010
- Stonnington Creating Open Space Strategy 2013
- Maribyrnong Sustainable Surfaces Feasibility study (2013)
- Maribyrnong Recreation Strategy (2009)
- All relevant Structure Plans from inner Region councils
- Exercise in Recreation and Sports Survey (ERASS), or similar research data
- All relevant Acts and Regulations
- Any other relevant documents
Attachment 1

About IMAP

Melbourne’s inner councils of the Cities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Stonnington and Yarra, worked together and in partnership with VicUrban to develop the Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP), which was adopted in December 2005. On 1 July 2013, the Maribyrnong City Council became a full member of IMAP, following a period as an associate partner.

IMAP is unique in bringing key government stakeholders together to develop and deliver regionally based actions. This new approach challenges existing structures of government, administration and resourcing arrangements. The collective vision of the IMAP councils to strengthen the liveability, attractiveness and prosperity of the Inner Melbourne Region.

IMAP sets out 11 regional strategies and 57 actions. These strategies and actions were developed following:

- A review of existing strategies related to Inner Melbourne.
- A review of current planning scheme policies.
- A series of stakeholder forums to explore issues where an immediate common response was not evident from stakeholders.

The forums addressed issues including:

- Public environment and urban structure.
- Strengthening business clusters.
- The visitor domain.
- Transport.
- Open space.
- Strengthening Melbourne communities.

IMAP explores the actions that councils within the Inner Melbourne Region may collectively need to implement to achieve the aims of Melbourne 2030. It concentrates primarily on actions that can be completed within 5-10 years.

Many of these actions require the cooperation of the State Government, government agencies or private providers of public services, such as public transport companies. Other actions recommend changes to planning schemes, requiring statutory approval processes.
Attachment 2

List of Sports Included Within the Study Scope

Sports and recreational activities to be included in the study (but not limited to) include:

- Athletics (track and field)
- Badminton
- Hockey
- Rugby league
- Rowing
- Swimming
- Volleyball
- Australian Rules football
- Cricket
- Lawn bowls
- Rugby union
- Soccer
- Table tennis
- Touch
- Basketball
- Gymnastics
- Netball
- Skateboarding/inline skating
- Softball
- Tennis
- Modified sports, such as AFL 9s, small-sided soccer and cyclacross
- Some other sports may be included after participation data is collected from each of the participating councils and analysed