

East Pakenham Submission

Project Name / Number - Draft Pakenham East Precinct Structure Plan - Amendment C234 to the Cardinia Planning Scheme

amendments@vap.vic.gov.au



Attention Project Manager
Ben Hawkins

RESPONSE

Builds on Natural Landscape

The pathways / footpaths / trails stick to the traditional structure of residential development. While this supports “normal development process”, the design does not appear to show a link within the linear creek pathway or look to develop direct linkages between space such as other estates, transport such as railways, Community hubs and recreation areas (reserve etc). – The design relies on traditional pathways that follow roads.

To encourage different modes of transport then the response cannot continue to endorse traditional solutions to improving use of pathways. Design needs to create interest and shorten routes and look to embrace transport links within the built form. EG: Town centres should be located by transport links for easy access and use and utilise access to open space / parklands.

Open Space links – Integrated open space and trail paths – this plan is deficient in the very aspect it is promoting. Plots of land allocated and surrounded by residential development, that will have small allocated Personal Open Space. The estates links need to show regard to easy clear access and use of Passive and Active Open Space – this design continues to build on deficient standard response.

Sporting Reserves - The precinct identifies 2 reserves and knowing the expectations of these sites, the sites cannot meet the expectations of the Shires requirements. Sites at 12 or less hectares being able to accommodate the need of the space requirements for multiple ovals, pitches and netball courts, a Pavillion, parking and all associated infrastructure cannot be met on these sites.

Cardinia currently has a problem in meeting the Sport (active) and Recreation (passive activities) needs of the community with adequate land lacking in accompanying established estates.

While Developers are adding to growth the carving up of land highlights maximum return with poor community outcomes. Open space that is useful needs to be given proper consideration and not only the “leftover “ land by creeks or land bordering inclines or declines.

The parcels of land being offered, reserves and other, for community, recreation and sport requires extensive Shire investment to make poor parcels of land “useable”.

The site selection for open space by Developers continues to focus on return on investment while the community continues to pay the high costs to establish the site and then place the relevant infrastructure on the same sites.

Planned sites that can adequately provide for the needs of the community need to be a priority in planning our new cities if we are to meet the Melbourne 2030 requirements, encourage 20 minute cities which encourage different modes of transport needs to include walking and riding.

Land that requires extensive works would be better suited for residential growth where the costs can be embraced within the infrastructure costs and creates opportunity for varying residential site features and housing costs.

The continued and ongoing poor land allocation for open space is a deficiency which continues to be a precedent in town planning in the growth corridor. This plan highlights the deficient and poor land allocation offered for both Passive, (recreation) and Active, (sports) activities.

As described earlier, sites selected for Sports Reserves that are under 12 hectares cannot cater adequately for the demands of the community. These sites when developed do not appear as sporting Reserves but sporting precincts compromising up to 70% infrastructure with only the ovals featuring as the green aspect of the sites.

“The Food and Agricultural Organisation of United Nations argues that evidence of the unsustainability of most cities growth, increasing inequity and gap between rich and poor centres and peripheries are now drawing the attention on the need to focus efforts towards a resilient sustainable and equal development of urban regions. Coherent investments by communities and governments in the protection and restoration of urban forests and green areas make a real contribution to the creation of a healthy and resilient environment” (Greening Urban Growth, 12th February 2018, Scietech Europa: Simone Borelli)

Example if Council are seeking to place 2 Ovals and some Multi Use courts there is need for additional parking and supporting infrastructure such as a Pavilion. Placement of all the required features becomes difficult and once all the features are placed on the site it is over developed providing little flexibility for good design outcomes and meeting current parking and infrastructure outcomes.

The recreation facilities need to have good pathway networks and not be stand alone, embracing the community to be part of the estate, not out of view from the community.

Extensive research, along with Infrastructure Australia, (February 2018) have identified that current planning practice is not building for the future and is working on catchup. Pakenham East is an opportunity to consider the demands and pressure that exist in getting the green space right. Return on Investment is AND can measured regarding health and community benefit. Financial gains for the Developer can be achieved with good community design by adding to better health and overall community outcomes.

The allocation of well placed and adequate green space is critical to the ongoing development of the growth corridor. This land needs to add to greater use, be visually identified and seen as benefit for the community not another cost to be carried by the community, (rate payers)

Access to employment opportunities
Economic Development CI 21.04

The planning scheme is intended for mostly retail / commercial (retail and small business) opportunities. Given the expected growth and the Melbourne growth strategies, Example: 20 minute communities, Melbourne 2030, the scheme as it stands is relying on other areas for providing jobs.

Jobs growth should be about large cohorts, not only small business, which can have limited capacities within the proposal. Retail / Commercial and schools where 1300 jobs from 7,000 homes, (conservatively approximately 8,000 working age adults). This still puts a large portion of the community into cars or trains to commute to inner suburbs for work.

Given this scenario the roadways are limited in carrying the anticipated increased flow and design does not appear to allow for increased road capacity as it cannot expand or offer alternative driving access while public transport infrastructure is under developed.

Alternative road options are not available for flow and the Town Centre design - one way in / out will serve to act as a congestion point as the estate grows. Placement of town centres continues to focus on a central point instead of approaching Transport nodes such as rail, bus meeting points and not utilising the opportunity to develop a plazas, (meeting points).

Amendment will have minimal impact on resources (administrative costs)

Current demand on resources is stretched in meeting Developer demand and while I appreciate the same resources are to be used to undertake the approval process for developments in this Shire as exists in other Local Government Centres attracting Planners to these roles continues to be difficult, not able to meet the demand.

The change in work load increases as new estates come on line and it could be anticipated that additional demands on the same resources does place increased pressures on the work force.

Does the Shire have costs allocated against the workload?; Or, will resource workloads require higher volume output. This approach generally results in inferior results for design outcomes, inadequate or unrealistic time is allocated to process applications and adds to poorer outcomes for community development.