

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

We are writing this submission in regard the proposed Pakenham East Precinct, (PSP1210 Pakenham East Precinct Structure Plan). Our submission will both raises issues and objection, which we foresee as having a detrimental impact on ourselves and our lifestyle, as our property is on the west side of Ryan Rd. We will also detail positive aspects of the proposal.

The area bounded by Ryan rd east, through to the west side of Pinehill drive, including Johanna and Fairway Courts, has all been low density housing, which is why we bought and continue to live in this area, for the past 18 years. Homes in this area reflect this style of low density life style living, with open spaces, and many properties have small numbers of live stock, we are included in this. We see that the development of the east side as an obstcle to this, as we will have increased traffic, both person and vehicular on Ryan Rd. Thus, increasing the risks of keeping livestock, in my case horses, on our property. As the majority of our land, used for paddocks abuts Ryan road. With this proposal we feel, we won't be able to do this both for the fear of people tampering with my horses, increased environmental noise and the potential risk of increased motor vehicle accidents. All of these issues, will affect the welfare of the animals, leaving me in a position of selling my animals, or finding agistment for them. This, will impact on our emotional and financial well being.

There is no way of assessing the impact on the property prices of the area, with the developing of the precinct. Especially with the changing of the housing density to housing interface 2 to the east side of Ryan Rd. from the highway through to Canty Lane, and from Canty Lane to the railway line changing to housing interface 1. Furthermore, Ryan road being changed, to a connector road number 3. With all the increased traffic issues, which come with an estimated 4000 vehicles per day, as per the Victorian Planning Authority projections, using Ryan road from Canty lane to Princes hwy. This is only subjective data, as true data can't be collected. The provided information, doesn't allow for persons, finding alternative routes, if they feel other major connector roads are congested, speed limits are less, or factor in rising congestion at any point further up the Highway, hampering exiting onto the Princes Highway. Effectively, with the size of the Pakenham East Precinct, on the south side of the Princes hwy, we could be looking at triple the proposed vehicle activity on Ryan road, if residents don't follow what the Victorian Planning Authority put forward as their analogy. Increased noise, in the precinct through increased traffic and human noise, due to the higher density living, will impact on the area, which is to remain as a low density living environment.

The land included in the proposal, on the eastside of Ryan Rd, between Princes Hwy, and Canty Lane, is set on a flood plain, with a flood plain overlay, which is recognized as such in the document. Subsequently, these properties have a small building envelope because of this. We have witnessed significant flooding of the area, several times when that area did flood and come out onto Ryan rd. from overflow of Deep Creek. Many properties are known to be unable to use their land closest to Deep creek over the winter months as it's too wet.

The changing, of the density of the land, on the east side of Ryan Rd, to interface housing 2, increases the number of local roads required to move traffic out of that area, increasing the number of local roads which will be running into Ryan rd. Your document does not address, if there will be a limit on the number of locals roads coming out onto Ryan rd, between Princes Hwy, and Canty Lane. Neither does the document address whether each individual land holder, may develop individually or is required to

have a developer purchase all the individual properties and develop the area, as a whole. With ten individual properties and no clear directive, in the proposal, it is possible, that there potentially can be ten local roads coming off Ryan rd, on the east side, between the Princes hwy, and Canty lane. This, again directly impacts on the low density area that our property is zoned.

Rezoning of land on the east side of Ryan rd, appears to be inconsistent with previous council plans. June 2016, a proposal to rezone all land on the west side of Ryan road, from Princes Hwy. to the south boundary of 13 Ryan road, into 2000sq metre blocks was put forward. Then subsequently vetoed, by council., due to the area being low density. We only received an initial proposal letter, no further correspondence was provided, even that the proposal had been vetoed by council, until I phoned some 12 months later. I was informed that objections, to the rezoning were made, and the rezoning would not be going ahead. However, there was no mention, or documentation provided as to the use of an independent panel review. Yet some 18months later, we have the Pakenham East Precinct structure plan in the process of being implemented, with the land on the east side of Ryan road, being rezoned. The council and the Victorian Planning Authority would have been working together, when the rezoning to the west side of Ryan road was proposed and refused. Therefore council has not remained transparent with the process, in the full rezoning of the area.

In the original draft proposal which was sent out a few years ago, the land on the east side of Ryan rd, between the Princes Hwy. and Canty lane was not included in the proposal. We feel this would be our preferred outcome, as it allows for the whole area to remain low density. However if this is not possible we would like to see it maintained at Housing interface 3, which we understand to be a minimum of 2000 square metres, with 20 metre setbacks, and single storey.

In relation to the proposal of the changing of the density on the east side of Ryan rd, We would like the setback of the dwellings to be changed from the stated 6 metres, to 10 metres, to maintain a more open outlook, with no carports, garages or other out buildings allowed in this setback. Furthermore, we would like dwellings facing onto Ryan rd, remain as single storey dwellings, with covenants addressing façade types.

We find the proposed changing of Ryan Rd, to a connector road 3, with a 24 metre wide surface, to be totally inappropriate. We understand from your diagram on page 88, of the proposal that the road will be 2 lanes with bike path, foot path and parking bays running both east and west sides of the road. In your diagram, on page 88, there is no mention of which way the diagram is positioned. We fail to understand why there needs to be footpath and bike path on both sides of the road. More importantly however is the inclusion of the parking bays, both sides. Firstly, our property is in the low density area, and parking bays certainly don't fit with this. Secondly, as per the diagram, we will have the footpath directly on our fence line as the current width from our front boundary to the opposite front boundary is 24metres. The appearance of the streetscape appears harsh, and needs to be softened. Thirdly, it indicates that the proposal doesn't address that most households will have 2 cars, and hasn't made provision in the planning to allow for sufficient parking requirements on the persons own property. The proposal doesn't indicate if the local roads, running off Ryan road on the eastside, will be wide enough to allow for parking in front of their own properties. In the document there is no mention, if there is to be any types of traffic speed reduction devices to be used. Nor is there any mention on the speed designation of the road. Furthermore, with all the increased traffic issues, we have raised in regard to Ryan rd, we feel will negatively impact our access to our property, at all times and be totally untenable at peak periods.

The Ryan road streetscape needs to be considered much more, as you are proposing to merge high and low density living together, using a major road way. Thus, in its current form the proposal has not taken into account our low density life style property and area. Therefore, we are suggesting, removing the parking bays from the west side. Enforce no standing zones completely along the west side. To prevent the front of the low density properties, looking like a high density area. Remove all trees, especially the large pine trees, which are considered to be a noxious species, along the west side nature strip. Following the removal, and earth works to make the ground more suitable to a softer interface, plant trees, more in keeping with a lush boulevard style. Each property on the Westside of Ryan rd, should be offered replacement front boundary fencing, more in keeping, with being forced to be on a connector road in a high density area. This cost should be born, by the developers.

The Pakenham East Precinct structure plan, provides guidelines for wetland habitat and species connected with this. However, the document does not reference or highlight any impact on native flora and fauna, which are not wetland species, either in the proposal zone or in the areas surrounding the proposal zone. The area as a whole has been farming, or low density housing. There is significant bird life in the area. This includes many species of parrots, kookaburras, owls, and the tawny frog mouth, which is on the list of species at risk. On our property, we regularly have the above mentioned bird species. We are wondering, with the proposal, what effect it will have on the native fauna that visit our property. As a large area, is being opened up to habitat destruction, without any meaningful address to this very important and significant issue.

We however do feel that the proposal does take into account the need for public spaces, and this appears to have been addressed. Public spaces, eg football ovals etc. should be made to have a lights out time, in keeping with the area and ensure the low density area, is not impacted by the illumination of the public spaces. There is a great positive, in the creation of a small shopping precinct, as this allows for increased employment in the area, which is always a good thing for the community. We do like that there is plans for both government and non government schools in the area. We see this as a progressive step, as choice of schooling is important.

In conclusion of our submission, we would hope that our lifestyle, and property values are both protected. We hope that the concerns about the road interface bounding our property and the changing of the housing density on the east side of Ryan road are taken seriously, and more satisfactory outcomes are reached. If the precinct is to go ahead, in its current form, then we feel that the west side of Ryan rd. from Princes Hwy, through to the train line, including Pine hill drive, Johanna and Fairway courts, should be included in an amended proposal, allowing for potential smaller lot subdivision. Thus , giving us more scope. Due to the nature of this proposal our lifestyle choice is being taken from us, without any form of remuneration. Basically, we are being forced to live in low density housing, in a high density area.

Regards



