

- Firstly, congratulations on the production of a recent documents that on balance better reflects community sentiment
- We are generally prepared to support Option 2, but we would like to raise some points for discussion that may lead to new amendments or a minor review of some aspects of Councils Preston Market Precinct Update.
- Option 2 states that Council should – ‘endorse the objectives and key elements with any amendments and note background reports.
- At the outset, it’s important, to highlight the bombshell (p3, dot points 3, 5 and 6) that has not been raised previously in any forum and suddenly appears in Councils Update, regarding the apparent poor condition of the market buildings; and how Council has automatically infer that the best way forward is to rebuild the market in a different location which would be best for everyone.
- We suggest this kind of assumption is a veiled threat made to unnecessarily advance the push for relocating the market buildings.
- We continue to strongly support retention of the existing market buildings in their original setting, since in our view there has been no convincing reason to change that view.
- In addition to independent experts, we think Council should approach the original architects/designers who appeared at the Heritage Hearing, to seek their professional advice on the matter.
- P61 of the Hello City Report in the #01 Key Findings states- Moving the Market Quarter will not in itself support the market’s identity. In fact, moving and rebuilding the market poses a number of risks to the identity of the market, including possible loss of the fine grain of the built form, erasure of small land titles and the historical street grid, possibility of unsuitable development or loss of character and variety caused by demolishing and rebuilding all the buildings at once.

- The RPS Engagement Report on p17 Other Comments, where a total of 36 respondents said protecting the character of the market is really important or did not want any change to the market, saying 'leave it as it is'.
- Regarding building heights, in our view the issue of over-shadowing is raised, then it is incumbent on Council to at least start the issue in terms of preferred or mandatory heights of new buildings that may negatively impact the market or open space around the market.
- In terms of the way forward, now that Council has formalised the background, listed objectives and developed copious key elements, we think that the next step is to organise these objectives so that all parties are aware of Council's priorities and preferred options, and what's non negotiable and that Council's intentions are completely transparent.
- Without this logical next step, every single thing is still up in the air, and any trade offs remain extremely rubbery!