

Pakenham East PSP - Amendment C234

Submitter #	67
Agency	Taylor on behalf of SR Holdings Investment Group Pty Ltd
Contact name	Nick Robins
Position title	Senior Planner
TRIM reference	

Sub. #	LUB Reference	Submission	Change to the amendment requested ?	Topic Category	VPA response / proposed outcome	Action	Status
67.1		<p>The proposed statutory status of the Heritage Study is vague as Amendment C234 doesn't introduce the study into the scheme as a reference or incorporated document. The Heritage Study should be included as a reference document in Clause 21.02-6 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide information to understand the background and reasons for applying the heritage overlay. 2. Clarify the statutory weight that will be given to the Heritage Study and citations in the assessment of permit applications. 3. Ensure users of the Planning Scheme can easily locate the relevant citations. 	Yes	Heritage	The heritage study informs the PSP, but does not become a reference or incorporated document. The heritage study will remain on the VPA website for individuals to refer to.		Not agreed to make change to amendment documentation

67.2	Heritage Overlay 275 should be deleted from the Edwardian building and the former milk shed for the following reasons: 1. The buildings are small in scale and are not of architectural merit, while adding little to the public realm. 2. The buildings have been substantially altered and are not intact. 3. There are better examples of historical farm houses already protected or soon to be protected within the PSP area. 4. It's difficult to trace the history of the Edwardian dwelling and milk shed into their current context. 5. There were many pastoral run properties and settlers within the locality. John Dore is not of elevated interest and the Edwardian building was constructed by Frank Dore.	Yes	Heritage	<i>Context</i> performed a heritage assessment of significance and found this property to have local significance based on the local 'tests' development using the HERCON criteria. The criteria applicable to the property are criterion A, D, E and H.	Not agreed to make change to amendment documentation
67.3	36 The development guidance for 32 Mount Ararat South Road at section 4 of the Heritage Study is inappropriate and should be deleted. This is because the permit application stage is the best time to assess any application within the Heritage Overlay to allow the decision maker to undertake a considered assessment of all relevant factors and balance competing issues, including issues such as structural integrity. The Heritage Overlay also contains appropriate mechanisms to assess demolition, subdivision and new development.	Yes	Heritage	The development guidance in this section of the report is only 'guidance', and will be further assessed at the permit application stage.	No action required
67.4	The guideline that a single title be retained over the entirety of the Heritage Overlay effectively prohibits subdivision, an inappropriate control as the Heritage Overlay doesn't prohibit subdivision.	Yes	Heritage	This guideline is not included in the PSP, only in the background document which informs the PSP.	No action required
67.5	The guideline that no development should occur within the Heritage Overlay extent is inappropriate in the absence of a development proposal as the Heritage Overlay already provides appropriate tests to assess any future application.	Yes	Heritage	This guideline is not included in the PSP, only in the background document which informs the PSP.	No action required
67.6	The suggested 10m setback from the Heritage Overlay is arbitrary and not justified.	Yes	Heritage	This guideline is not included in the PSP, only in the background document which informs the PSP.	No action required

67.7	It's likely that a road will be required south of the Edwardian building due to the existing roads access points and setbacks of the Edwardian building from the Princess Highway.	Yes	Heritage	This guideline is not included in the PSP, only in the background document which informs the PSP.	No action required
67.8	In the event that HO275 is retained, the development guidance in Section 4 of the Heritage Study should be deleted.	Yes	Heritage	This guideline is not included in the PSP, only in the background document which informs the PSP.	No action required