



# Legislative Council Environment and Planning Committee

**Inquiry:** Inquiry into Climate Resilience

**Hearing Date:** 20 November 2024

**Question[s] taken on notice**

**Directed to:** City of Melbourne

**Received Date:** 30 January 2025

## 1. **David ETTERSANK, page 6**

**Question Asked:**

Tiffany, could I ask you: if we think about the built environment climate change adaptation action plan of the state government, has there been much direct engagement with the government and particularly with DEECA or DTP over the rollout of that action plan with the City of Melbourne?

**Tiffany CRAWFORD:** I will take that on notice.

**Response:**

We have not had any direct engagement with DEECA about the roll out of the Built Environment Adaptation Action Plan

## 2. **David ETTERSANK, page 6**

**Question Asked:**

Do you get any feedback from the Department of Transport and Planning or DEECA as to why there would be such delays with those planning scheme amendments?

**Tiffany CRAWFORD:** There are, I believe, various reasons. I am not always the one having those communications, and I am unable to talk to the reasons for those. That would be a matter for the department and the minister's office.

**David ETTERSANK:** We will be asking that, but perhaps I could ask you to take that on notice. If it means that you need to talk with planning within City of Melbourne or suchlike, it would be greatly appreciated to try and understand why those delays were just so extreme from the City of Melbourne perspective. We will be talking to DEECA this afternoon.

**Tiffany CRAWFORD:** Sure. Noted..

**Response:**

In the case of Amendment C384 Inundation Overlays, the delays were not caused by the Department but rather due to the legal proceedings, which are not common practice. The Department provided their authorisation and final approval within short

timeframes, The Department also met with us to discuss final drafting of the controls and provided regular updates regarding progress of approval.

For Amendment C376 Sustainable Buildings, a heavily conditioned authorisation letter was initially issued by the Department, as the amendment in its original form was not supported by DTP officers/management. However, City of Melbourne was not prepared to drastically change the amendment as requested by DTP and therefore, following discussions higher up (and potential political pressure), a new authorisation letter with very few conditions was issued two years after the initial request was made.

### 3. **Melina BATH, page 11**

#### **Question Asked:**

I might just say to Tiffany: if you do not mind taking this on notice, you can provide the same context in terms of Melbourne city and its coastal erosion?

Question: what is most at risk in the built environment in the Mornington shire in terms of coastal erosion, and what support do you need from state government in addressing and mitigating those impacts?

Also provide hazard maps.

#### **Response:**

For City of Melbourne, coastal flooding resulting from sea level rise is more of an issue and coastal erosion. An asset vulnerability assessment completed in 2020 for City of Melbourne owned assets found that sea level rise is likely to impact significant portions of roads, streetlights, bridges, wharves and 8% of City of Melbourne buildings (44 buildings). The most impacted regions are Docklands, Southbank, West Melbourne, Kensington, and the CBD.

The support we need to address the impacts of sea level rise is:

- Clarity from State Government about mechanisms planned to address sea level rise in the medium term (by 2050) and long term (by 2070-2100).
- Collaboration between different levels of Government to plan for and to address sea level rise e.g. policy intervention for development, physical infrastructure, and financial mechanisms.