

ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Inquiry into Community Consultation Practices

<https://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/consultationinquiry>

<https://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/49773f/contentassets/49e15bf7866745168ad51b367799a810/terms-of-reference-attachments/community-consultation-practices-tor.pdf>



MELBOURNE
MARITIME
HERITAGE
NETWORK

MMHN Submission Overview May 2025

This MMHN Submission addresses three specific elements raised by at the recent Inquiry into Community Consultation and specifically raises concerns over the conduct and capabilities highlighted by the State Agency, Development Victoria, within the Department of Transport and Planning Portfolio:

- *community consultation practices done by, and on behalf of, state and local government and statutory authorities, and providers of essential services such as utilities, in Victoria;*
- *standards of conduct, including preparedness, to be expected in community consultations;*
- *best practice community consultation in other jurisdictions in Australia and other comparable countries.*

MMHN, have over a number of years experienced firsthand the tokenistic approach taken to the delivery of Victoria's leading redevelopment precinct. We see significant room for improvement in the approaches and would counsel that under the current approach the Docklands community and beyond remain oblivious and disenfranchised around the future of this signature precinct.

DV have been afforded significant standalone powers to avoid typical planning pathways under the Docklands Zoning, and this position has been squandered to deliver a precinct which is the subject of international scorn and a running joke across Australia.

This approach rings alarm bells for State Government's intended approach to Activity Centres, new precinct development and delivery, the Housing Plan, and the Suburban Rail Loop.

Introduction

Melbourne Maritime Heritage Network (MMHN) is a non-political, not-for-profit, member-based Network that brings together individuals and groups drawn from diverse sectors, including maritime heritage, marine industry, recreational boating, education, tourism, corporate and community

sectors, relevant state and federal government agencies, and community stakeholder groups. All share a commitment to fostering greater recognition of, and knowledge about, Melbourne's rich maritime heritage and maritime industry sector – past, present, and future.

MMHN Perspective

MMHN has expert knowledge of, and informed interest in, the development of the Docklands Precinct. In particular, MMHN advocates for the retention of Dockland's unique and heritage-listed port infrastructure which has irrefutable significance to Victoria and its capital city..

MMHN is cognizant of the social, cultural – and importantly economic value of heritage assets preservation. Regrettably, despite its rhetoric, the Development Victoria (DV) approach to community concern and its responsibility to optimise the public benefit and value of state assets, is underwhelming. In MMHN's experience DV's approach to community engagement is disingenuous – possibly ignorant, and token. This has led to the incremental erosion of Docklands heritage-listed port infrastructure assets and a squandering of the precincts potential to leverage these assets to optimise community and economic benefit.

MMHN asserts that DV has, over many years, while ostensibly 'developing' the Docklands Precinct in fact demonstrated both a lack of appetite and ability in relation to delivering effective community consultation. In allowing unique assets to be squandered, DV has abrogated its role as responsible authority in the development of the Docklands Precinct specifically in relation to 'placemaking' resulting in a disjointed and piecemeal approach to precinct, with distinct lack of vision and purpose.

MMHN notes that DV's deficient approach has become more acute since 2019, and we are yet to see how activity and presence in DV's signature precinct is to be remedied. The MMHN obviously MMHN has a particular focus on heritage-listed Victoria Harbour and related port infrastructure, however our concerns could equally apply to the delivery of social infrastructure and the lack-lustre key assets such as the Docklands Primary School.

DV Consultation Deficiencies

Since early 2010 trawling the DV website and MMHN records reveals clearly that for 15+ years DV have effectively '*kicked the community consultation can along the road*'. DV pays disingenuous lip-service to the consultation process. Two indicative Case-studies follow:

Example A : Central Pier - Indicative Case-study

DV published rhetoric: *All key stakeholders, including the community, will have the opportunity to be involved and engaged around the future of Central Pier and adjacent waterfront. We will undertake an extensive engagement process which will include online and face to face forums and engagement activities to ensure there is widespread opportunity for feedback and input. Our aim is to provide opportunity for everyone who has an interest to contribute ideas for the future revitalisation of Central Pier and the adjacent waterfront. We aim to provide the community and*

stakeholders with clear information on how they can contribute to, and how their ideas can form part of, future plans.

Early 2020, after decades of neglect by DV this heritage-listed ‘eyesore’ in the prime Docklands Precinct location in October 2022, Heritage Victoria approved a permit application to remove the pier structure from Victoria Harbour. Demolition works were completed in February 2025 - **Six years later.** During this period, MMHN and other stakeholders in the Docklands community pressed DV for progress reports and, taking the DV community engagement rhetoric seriously, made submissions on the future form of Central Pier.

DV appealed for community engagement: *Central Pier and waterfront re-vitalisation.. Help us create a vision for Central Pier and the adjacent waterfront area in Docklands.* Community engagement campaign about the future redevelopment of Central Pier runs from October to December 2022. However it is clear that DV and their ‘expert panel’ (MMHN not included) already had their own ‘vision’.

DV presented their simplistic diagrammatic rendering: *Feedback from online community engagement workshop on 6 December 2022*



DV rhetoric: *Development Victoria will continue to work closely with Heritage Victoria, the City of Melbourne, the community and other key stakeholders to identify opportunities for the revitalisation of Central Pier and adjacent waterfront along Harbour Esplanade to create a vibrant waterfront destination.*

<https://www.development.vic.gov.au/projects/central-pier?page=overview>

DV rhetoric continued. In August 2024, DV released yet another expensively produced document entitled: *Community sets out vision for Central Pier and waterfront’s future announcing that It will stimulate further ideas and opportunities with community and the private sector as we work together to create a destination where people can connect, reflect, and celebrate.*

Further: *The Vision and Place Principles have been developed in consideration of the local, city and Victorian context. We have also responded to the views of the community, gathered through extensive consultation and we have undertaken research into the values and attributes of other successful waterfronts around the world.*

<https://www.development.vic.gov.au/news/community-sets-out-vision-for-central-pier-and-waterfronts-future>

As it stands, and despite repeated pressure, MMHN has not seen nor been made aware of any new detail attached to the development of the public consultation statements into a possible vision for the redevelopment of Central Pier nor the adjacent Harbour Esplanade. We would certainly have expected clearly defined timeframes, and a clear 'statement of intent' on DV proposals to secure next steps.

It is instructive to note that over the period between the closure of Central Pier and its demolition, DV, without community consultation but obviously with engagement with the private sector, has managed the following outcomes excluding community input.

- Docklands ferry terminal – Port Phillip Ferries
- Home Build to rent development – Home
- DV – AFL Joint Venture Planning Harbour Esplanade
- Lend Lease - North Wharf
- Gurner – Elysium Fields

Example B. Victoria Harbour – March 2025 latest Indicative Case-study

In March 2025 MMHN was contacted as a matter of urgency by members of the Heritage Fleet berthed on North Wharf in Victoria Harbour. They were appealing for MMHN advocacy support in the face of DV, without consultation, simply announcing its intention to evict the all three members of the Heritage Fleet, within one month.

Despite the Heritage Fleet being based in Dockland Precinct for many years enjoying the strong public support of all stakeholders DV provided no warning and no viable re-location option for the vessels to enable their effective relocation.

MMHN held discussions with the Heritage Fleet, the *Alma Doepel* and the *Wattle* which confirmed that the berths and adjacent Shed access was critical for a further two years in order that the vessels become operational. The *Enterprize* is also reliant upon the Shed access for on-going maintenance in order to remain operational.

These are all long-term volunteer-led restoration projects nearing completion, and the impact of this DV eviction caused immense distress within the Heritage Fleet and the Docklands Community at large.

DV Heritage Fleet Promotion: DV's own documents refer to the importance of retaining these Heritage vessels in Victoria Harbour. Residents and businesses have invested in this precinct

because of its unique maritime characteristics. Despite this public statement, MMHN discussions with the DV Project Team members revealed a blinkered approach to pursuing a construction target, while ignoring all broader implications for the community and Docklands Precinct. This once again highlights that DV were oblivious to the issues raised; adamantly while pursuing a develop at all costs agenda without regard to impacts and issues. Related to this unique Precinct. Despite the significance of this Heritage Fleet matter and the far-reaching implications of disrupting the restoration projects at this point. DV chose to proceed without respectful consultation on this matter the Heritage Fleet or interested parties and community stakeholders.

Facing this DV initial intransigence, after to MMHN advocacy pressure, DV disingenuously claimed that it was responding to development pressures from Lendlease. DV exhibited a staggering lack of transparency to the Heritage Fleet and other stakeholder assigning the responsibility for the looming Heritage Fleet eviction with Lendlease. MMHN and the Heritage Fleet met independently Lendlease who revealed that DV were, in fact, both responsible and able to deviate from the Development Agreement. It is inconceivable that DV were not aware of the emerging Development time pressures and that proactive actions to work with the Heritage Fleet to secure a more measured approach to relocation could have been prioritised.

Following intense public pressure, DV to an extent relented. DV indeed found that the eviction deadline could be delayed 6 months. DV insisted,, and persisted in re-iterating clearly unviable relocation options for the Heritage Fleet which remains without a future, temporary or permanent, home.

In response to community and heritage stakeholder angst, and in the face of DV intransigence. MMHN stepped in to assist the Docklands Community by convening a Community Forum. MMHN designed this event as an opportunity to canvas viable re-location options and/or solutions to the problem facing the Heritage Fleet. We were taken aback by the level of community and stakeholder interest. **70 people attended representing residents, community groups, heritage fleet members and interested parties.** Regrettably, despite multiple invitations from MMHN to many staff, DV refused to attend the Forum. Although MMHN repeatedly invited senior DV senior staff, specifically responsible for triggering this distressing action on North Wharf, to the Forum. DV disappointingly elected to ignore the opportunity. Nor did they tender any reason for the absence of DV representation or engagement. Given that this Forum presented a timely opportunity for DV HF and to collaborate with the HF when dealing with an immense challenge, the rationale for this DV this approach was not explained prior to the Forum and still remains unclear.

This DV stance was inexplicable, dispiriting and indeed, contrary to the DV's stated aim to "*create vibrant communities that enrich the local area with diverse and affordable homes, outdoor spaces and community facilities tailored to meet local needs.*" Instead, in DV we face the State responsible agency that is only prepared to operate '*behind closed doors*' making a mockery of the community consultation an, in this instance, its needs.

MMHN captured comment at the Forum and in the next few days compiling this valuable information in the Summary document (attached). Much of the comment referred to community and heritage stakeholder dissatisfaction with DV over many years.

Note that this document was immediately sent to DV to inform their deliberations- and to the wider community. DV officers nor the Chair of the DV Board have since contacted MMHN.

This Heritage Fleet eviction incident epitomises the incompetent disengaged conduct of DV in the development of the Docklands Precinct It reflects the DV deficient approach to community engagement.

Conclusion

MMHN notes with dismay and chagrin that after the retirement of the person who as CEO presided over the incompetence of DV in Docklands Precinct was appointed by the State government as Chair the DV Board.

Dr Jackie Watts OAM

Chair, Melbourne Maritime Heritage Network
Board Member, Off-Shore and Specialist Ships Australia
Advocate - Australian Heritage Advocacy Alliance
Mobile 0400 305 323
Email jwatts2248@gmail.com

DV publicity Time line :

- November 1991 <https://www.development.vic.gov.au/projects/docklands?page=overview1>
 - 2010 City of Melbourne and Places Victoria (successor to Vic Urban) embarked on a community engagement program to determine and test the community priorities for development during Docklands' second decade. The community's input, together with in-depth planning and design studies, helped shape the **shared vision for Docklands' future, to create a place for people**; a place where liveability is a priority, made possible by quality community infrastructure, welcoming open spaces, interactive street frontages and a vibrant waterfront destination for recreation and leisure
 - 2018 <https://www.development.vic.gov.au/news/milestone-in-docklands> .
 - 2019 <https://www.development.vic.gov.au/projects/docklands?page=overview> *Today, the precinct continues to emerge as an innovative and dynamic community*
 - 2020 *Central Pier was permanently closed in early 202*
 - March 2024.**DV rhetoric** *Development Victoria will continue to work closely with Heritage Victoria, the City of Melbourne, the community and other key stakeholders to identify opportunities for the revitalisation of Central Pier and adjacent waterfront along Harbour Esplanade to create a vibrant waterfront destination. [Find out more about Central Pier](#)*
 - August 2024<https://www.development.vic.gov.au/news/community-sets-out-vision-for-central-pier-and-waterfronts-future>
 - NOVEMBER 2024 – On retirement the CEO of DV, having consistently performed without regard for the community engagement, was inexplicably appointed Chair of the DV Board.
-

MMHN HERITAGE FLEET FORUM March 25/2025

At Library at the Dock. Docklands Precinct.

Purpose: The Forum was convened in response to serious disquiet and distress, raised with MMHN after recent Development Victoria (DV) action on North Wharf widely perceived as detrimental to sustaining the heritage fleet presence in Victoria Harbour. This Forum also presented an opportunity for the Heritage Fleet to forge collaboration when dealing with an immense challenge. This Report will be sent to the Acting CEO of DV, Chair of the DV Board, Minister Harriet Shing for DV (Docklands Precinct) relevant State government representatives.

Report Content: This Forum Report includes comment expressed at the Forum as well as additional comments emailed to MMHN by concerned community and heritage stakeholders since the Forum.

Participants: On Tuesday, 25 March 2025, MMHN hosted the Forum attended by 70 people: multiple representatives from the Heritage Fleet (HF) @alma, @Wattle and @Enterprise, members of the Docklands Precinct community, maritime heritage enthusiasts and members of maritime heritage stakeholder groups brought together the first time since the Development Victoria (DV) announced the imminent eviction of the Heritage Fleet (HF) from their berths and from Work Shed on North Wharf Victoria Harbour. The Forum was convened as an opportunity for the Docklands Precinct and Maritime Heritage Communities at large to voice their concern around the proposed eviction by DV of the Heritage Fleet, offer any solutions to mitigate the impacts to the HF and gauge community views on the presence of the HF long-term – in Victoria Harbour.

Development Victoria: Although MMHN repeatedly invited senior DV senior staff, specifically responsible for triggering this distressing action on North Wharf, to the Forum. DV disappointingly elected to ignore the opportunity. Nor did they tender any reason for the lack of representation or engagement. Given that this Forum presented a timely opportunity for DV HF and to collaborate with the HF when dealing with an immense challenge, the rationale for this DV this approach was not explained prior to the Forum and still remains unclear.

This DV stance was inexplicable, dispiriting and indeed, contrary to the DV's stated aim to "*create vibrant communities that enrich the local area with diverse and affordable homes, outdoor spaces and community facilities tailored to meet local needs.*" Instead, in DV we face the State responsible agency that is only prepared to operate '*behind closed doors*' making a mockery of the community consultation and, in this instance, its needs.

Forum Discussion: To open the Forum MMHN invited a representative member from each heritage vessel project to present an update on current situation as experienced by the three HF members, identify the impacts of the looming eviction, share particular challenges and specific on-going project requirements. Such shared information formed a basis for the discussion from which comments would flow around viable 'options' for the HF and next steps in addressing seemingly intractable issues with DV.

Participation in the discussion was broad, 'animated', lively, inclusive and positive. For the first time since the DV eviction notification, members of the HF were able to actually discuss the challenge of eviction, the specific needs of each project as well as any shared concerns in relation to

the eviction threat to include developing a coordinated HF response. To conclude the Forum, participants were requested to note their comments via *post-it notes* before leaving the Forum or send any after-thoughts to MMHN via email later. Further in-put was invited through MMHN Docklands News Column and MMHN Monthly Update. The intent being to canvass views on this challenging matter widely and, hopefully identify a viable solution going forward in negotiations with DV.

1. Comments directly related to Eviction by Development Victoria

- Serious concern about the short notice to vacate
- We need 1 year extension of lease [2026] for the three vessels then discuss long-term future
- At least 1 year more extension
- We need a clear proposal [from DV]
- We need a fit for purpose facility for Heritage Fleet in Victoria Harbour
- We need a purpose-built dock / floating maritime working museum (long term benefit to all)
- DV suggested temporary relocations are not considered appropriate
- The site/shed below/inside the Bolte Bridge is a possibility the bridge but 2 years off and was too low for the Alma
- ATET Pontoon proposal has possibilities but dependent on issues of ownership, who bears the cost, technical feasibility and operational life span
- DV to rent/ purchase a large commercial barge and permanently moor it off North Wharf
- A barge or place on a wharf to build a permanent Boat Shed that can be converted into a facility with good volunteer access and public visibility for Docklands Community and the public also providing berthing for at least 3 heritage vessels with access to Port Phillip
- Locate the Heritage Sheds removed by DV and stored somewhere nearby.
- DV could re-erect heritage Sheds somewhere on harbour wharves – Harbour Esplanade
- ATET barge proposed – ownership, size, stability considerations (need for 2 years only)
- A larger barge be obtained – floating out from Harbour wharf which would not take-up real estate which has more \$ value. (Could accommodate three ships would have space without the problem of the cost of the real estate for a Shed.)
- A pontoon or barge could be put in place - Two locations were suggested: Against the current North Wharf location and the strip of land (which is currently available) across Victoria Harbour near Ron Barrassi Park
- DV should investigate Space south of Ron Barassi Snr Oval [MAB] could be made available- to erect shed /moor barge
- Accelerate Project completion - Funding Target billionaires. Contact Canon Brook for money! For Environmentally Sound" aspect
- A barge or space place on a wharf to build a permanent Boat Shed that can be converted into a facility with good access and visibility to volunteers and Docklands Community whilst also providing berthing for at least 3 heritage vessels with access to Port Phillip
- Lendlease is contracted to DV – KPI's are in place enforced by DV. Any changes to plans are lengthy, complex and entirely subject to DV. Not Lendlease.
- DV conceded a 6 month extension of eviction –
- Question arises - why not a 18 month adjustment?
- ATET barge was proposed – ownership, size, stability considerations (2 years of use only)

- Why can't the demolished Heritage Sheds now removed from Central Pier or Harbour Esplanade be re-erected for the HF on the Harbour Esplanade or New Quay
- Presence of an operational Heritage Fleet in Victoria Harbour is a significant tourist attraction to local, interstate & overseas visitors, if the vessels can remain until all become operational.

2. Comments related to Development Victoria *Place-Management* responsibility (ie beyond real estate development)

- Serious concern about the long-term presence of HF in Victoria Harbour as stated per DV own documents
- Why does DV not recognise that ALL major port cities in Australia and internationally, support and foster a Heritage Fleet?
- Could DV propose to Lendlease that the names of the new Towers refer the Heritage Fleet – *ST Wattle* . *Alma Doepel* and the *Enterprise* ?
- Heritage Fleet should be recognised by DV as having differing needs but with common requirements in order to become or remain operational
- Need for Master Plan (one for Victoria Harbour Waterways)
- The non-consultative role of Development Victoria in the development of plans and actions for the site, particularly in the early stages before site preparation commenced.
- Contact other groups similarly impacted / treated poorly by Development Victoria, to join forces and put similar pressure on DV together (suggestion of other heritage sites / groups)
- What happened to the approved Lendlease 2017 plans showing a Boat Shed and gym/pool in their devlpt on midway along North Wharf?
- On Harbour Esplanade build a building for workshop facilities for all HF
- A prominent and accessible Heritage Fleet attracts tourism would attract tourism
- Need for DV to recognise the historical importance of Victoria Harbour (Dock) to the development of Victoria. But (sigh) that is probably another issue
- DV have managed the North Wharf project without regard for heritage fleet over many but too few years for major vessel restorations
- Development Victoria has neglected its 'Place-Making' responsibility in relation to maritime heritage. eg. neglect /demolition of Central Pier and now Heritage Fleet
- Ultimately DV should seriously maintain Victoria Harbour environment including vessels
- Could the M Pavilion be re-located to Harbour Esplanade from d Victoria Gardens – an architectural attraction as well as useful to Heritage Fleet
- Useful to talking to the heads of Owners Corporations before sending HF away
- Heritage Sheds were removed by DV and stored in Bolte West Precinct. could be re-instated along Harbour Esplanade
- Public visibility and easy access is critical
- Enlist help/support from Owners Corps in the entire Precinct
- Positive action towards Maritime Precinct
- We need a public face - Promenade and a building on it for workshop facilities for all ships – that the public can see
- Long term wharf place- Where do the three ships go in Victoria Harbour once Operational – working space is necessary
- Public awareness - The need for vessels to have wharf and shed spaces and to be in the public eye

- Need to recognise of the historical importance of Victoria Harbour (Dock) to the development of Victoria
- Permanent home for all heritage vessels with suitable back of office facilities to do all manner of maintenance required on Heritage Vessels and with a front of office berthing facilities with easy public access and visibility
- Heritage Vessels and with a front of office berthing facilities with easy public access and visibility
- Create an Annual Waterways event that activates the harbour. eg An Open Day to showcase the fleet to get artists involved to activate
- Keep actions environmentally sound
- Promote Magnet Gallery's 1999 photos of New Quay [later in 2025)

3. Comments relating to the Heritage Fleet as a Docklands Precinct Entity

- Goodwill from the City of Melbourne towards the heritage fleet staying in Victoria Harbour - pleasing
- Each ship could nominate a person to represent them and form a cooperative committee with MMHN to further the issue
- Any meaningful dialogue/negotiations with DV would be much better served if the Heritage Fleet presented as a united front to DV as it is evident that whilst the members of Heritage have differing project needs, they must be unified in their requirements and it was asked what these might look like.
- Given they are responsible for planning the Precinct DV must have noted other comparable cities actually sustain evidence of maritime heritage
- A petition, collect signatures at events – eg Boat Show.
- Notably the CoM rep. participated and was open to discussion
- Call us the Heritage Fleet Precinct
- Make a podcast on Vic Harbour VMC has a commercial edit suite (offered by Wyuna)
- URGENT!! We are the 'Heritage Fleet Precinct'!
- Get Stage a pirate festival; draw the crowds
- Owners Corporation Manager email list to communicate with residents - who are invested in the Harbour as a maritime precinct
- Common document is needed for three ships that describes the HF needs – consistent messaging
- Heritage fleet must balance its differing needs and unite the message / demands
- Strength in numbers
- Presenting united Heritage Fleet agreed position.
- Common document for three ships - possibly also *Grower, Lady Cutler*
- Contact ABC – 'Australian Story' proposal
- MMHN advocacy to represent the Heritage Fleet to balance the different needs and unite the message / demands
- Keep the 3 ships together and emphasise their common goals and potential
- Focus on key / common aims / needs
- Change from the perceived reluctance to commit, to a cooperative HF approach - either as a three ship group or in conjunction with MMHN
- Talk to Heritage Victoria re missing Heritage Sheds

- Podcast featuring all three vessels trying to resist eviction
- Valuable to talk to the heads of Owners Corporations – Do owners support the HF presence
- Alma's Shanty song - looking to government; look to the public for support verses for other vessels)
- Determine and Presenting united Heritage Fleet agreed position.
- MMHN to contact Tourism Victoria regarding the potential of the Heritage Fleet to attract extra visitors?

4. State Government Engagement and Action:

- Use Parliamentary question time
- Educate/Inform polities – they don't know what they don't know. eg. what is being squandered
- Major Port cities of the world actually foster and support maritime heritage vessels,.
- Lobby MPs
- Hopefully the State Govt. will understand this current situation
- Demonstrate the economic value brought to the area from maritime tourists compared to Sydney
- Gain acknowledgement that the presence of an operational Heritage Fleet in Victoria Harbour would be a significant tourist attraction to local, interstate & overseas visitors, if the vessels can remain & all become operational in Victoria Harbour.
- Hopefully the State Govt. can understand this DV situation.
- Why does State Govt focus on regional tourism and ignore Docklands?
- 3AW News 26/3- Overseas tourism to Victoria has increased and consequently Tourism Victoria is going to establish more regional events to attract more visitors to our state.
- Liberal Candidate Stephanie Hunt should be e approached about support.

Media: Comment :

The Age : <https://www.theage.com.au/national/victoria/famous-heritage-boat-fleet-gets-eviction-notice-from-docklands-for-new-apartments-20250312-p5lj1h.html>

Docklands News : <https://www.docklandsnews.com.au/development-victoria-how-has-it-come-to-this/>

Docklands News: <https://www.docklandsnews.com.au/future-of-docklands-heritage-fleet-still-under-threat-despite-six-month-extension/>

WA Today : <https://www.watoday.com.au/national/victoria/famous-heritage-boat-fleet-gets-eviction-notice-from-docklands-for-new-apartments-20250312-p5lj1h.html>

Reddit:

https://www.reddit.com/r/melbourne/comments/1jgr6a7/famous_heritage_boat_fleet_gets_eviction_notice/?rdt=50050

MMHN captured comment expressed at the Forum and comment emailed in the next few days.

We compiled this valuable information in the Summary document (attached). Much of the comment referred to community and heritage stakeholder dissatisfaction with DV over many years.

It is important to note: This Summary document was immediately sent to DV in order that it to inform their deliberations and also sent to the wider community. Yet, neither DV officers or the Chair of the DV Board have responded or contacted MMHN.