



TOWN PLANNING EVIDENCE STATEMENT

DONNYBROOK WOODSTOCK PSP

**PREPARED BY NICK HOOPER FOR
METROPOLITAN PLANNING AUTHORITY (MPA)**

MAY 2016

Table of Contents

1.0	Preliminary Information	3
1.1	Name and Address.....	3
1.2	Education and Experience	3
1.3	Area of Expertise	3
1.4	Expertise to Make the Report.....	3
1.5	Instructions	3
1.6	Report Preparation.....	3
1.7	Identity of Other Persons Relied upon in this Report.....	4
1.8	Summary of Opinions	4
1.9	Provisional Opinions Not Fully Researched	4
1.10	Matters Outside of My Expertise.....	4
1.11	Practice Note Declaration.....	4
2.0	Introduction.....	5
3.0	Amendment GC28.....	5
4.0	Planning Controls	5
4.1	North Growth Corridor Plan	5
4.2	SPPF	5
4.3	LPPF	6
5.0	Donnybrook Woodstock PSP	7
5.1	PSP in relation to the PSP Guidelines	7
5.2	Submissions.....	7
5.3	Any other matters	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.0	Conclusion	17

1.0 Preliminary Information

1.1 Name and Address

Nick Hooper, Director.

Taylor's Development Strategists 8/270 Ferntree Gully Road, Notting Hill Vic 3168

1.2 Education and Experience

My educational qualifications and membership of professional associations are as follows:

- *Bachelor Applied Science (Planning), 1991, RMIT*
- *Member Royal Australian Planning Institute*
- *Member Victorian Planning and Environmental Law Association*
- *Certified Practising Planner*

My professional experience includes 24 years experience as a Town Planner, comprising:

- *16 years, Director, Taylors Development Strategists*
- *2 years Senior Planner, Bayside City Council*
- *1 year, Town Planning consultant, Rust PPK*
- *5 years Town Planner, City of Cranbourne/Casey*

1.3 Area of Expertise

Statutory Planning in Victoria.

1.4 Expertise to Make the Report

I have considerable experience in the planning considerations associated with Growth Area Planning. I have practised as a town planner for 24 years for both Local Government and private practise.

1.5 Instructions

I was instructed by the MPA to provide my professional opinions on the following matters:

- In particular, a review of the town centre hierarchy, location of open space and community infrastructure and suitability of the road and public transport network.
- A review of the PSP with respect to consistency with the PSP Guidelines
- Review of and response to outstanding submissions, in particular a response to Whittlesea Council submissions, the Monteleone and Stockland submissions with regard to the location and size of local town centres

1.6 Report Preparation

In the preparation of this report I have:

- Reviewed the documents that form part of Amendment GC28, including the Donnybrook Woodstock PSP; Schedules to the Urban Growth Zone; the explanatory report

- Reviewed the submissions received, most notably the Submissions of Council, Monteleone and Stockland.
- Reviewed the North Growth Corridor Plan
- Reviewed the PSP Guidelines
- Policies and Zone provisions of the Whittlesea and Mitchell Planning Schemes

1.7 Identity of Other Persons Relied upon in this Report

I was assisted in the preparation of this report by additional members of staff acting under my express instructions. The opinions in this report, however, remain my own.

1.8 Summary of Opinions

It is my opinion that that Amendment GC28 is worthy of support subject to the following change:

- The deletion of Local Park LP03

1.9 Provisional Opinions Not Fully Researched

To the best of my knowledge all matters on which I have made comment in this statement have been appropriately researched or are based on my knowledge and experience. The statement does not contain any provisional opinions that have not been fully researched.

1.10 Matters Outside of My Expertise

To the best of my knowledge, none of the matters on which I have made comment in this statement are outside my area of expertise.

To the best of my knowledge the report is complete and does not contain matters which are inaccurate.

1.11 Practice Note Declaration

I have made all the enquiries that I believe are desirable and appropriate and that no matters of significance that I regard as relevant have, to my knowledge been withheld from the Panel. I have read the Guide to Expert Evidence and agree to be bound by it.

Signature:



Date: 6 May, 2016

2.0 Introduction

I have been asked by MPA to provide my expert opinion on the matters raised relating to the Donnybrook Woodstock PSP.

I have been asked to undertake:

- A review of the PSP with respect to consistency with the PSP Guidelines
- In particular, a review of the town centre hierarchy, location of open space and community infrastructure and suitability of the road and public transport network.
- A review of and response to outstanding submissions that we refer to you, in particular a response to Whittlesea Council submissions and the Monteleone submissions
- Any other matter you believe relevant to inform the Panel with regard to outstanding submissions regarding the PSP.

3.0 Amendment GC28

Amendment GC28 proposes to incorporate the Donnybrook Woodstock PSP into the Whittlesea and Mitchell Planning Schemes. It applies to 1785ha of land bounded by Donnybrook Road to the south, the proposed Outer Metropolitan Ring Road to the north and east and the Melbourne-Sydney railway line to the west.

Amongst other things, it proposes the inclusion of Schedules 4 and 6 to the Urban Growth Zone in the Mitchell and Whittlesea Planning Schemes respectively. The Explanatory Report exhibited with the Amendment describes succinctly the changes to the two Planning Schemes.

4.0 Planning Controls

4.1 North Growth Corridor Plan

The North Growth Corridor Plan nominates the PSP predominantly for residential purposes, accompanied by areas with biodiversity values, landscape values and the designation of the northern tip as being *Potential Urban*. There are no activity centres nominated within the PSP area, although the Donnybrook Principal Town Centre is nominated close by to the west of the PSP area. A modified grid arterial road structure is also nominated.

The exhibited PSP appears to reflect closely what is shown on the North Growth Corridor Plan.

4.2 SPPF

The State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF) sets out a range of policies that will have a bearing on an appropriate mix of applied zones for this PSP.

Clause 11 Settlement is of relevance to this matter. Clause 11.01 relates to Activity Centres and it seeks to, amongst other things, *encourage the concentration of major retail, residential, commercial, administrative, entertainment and cultural developments into activity centres which provide a variety of land uses and are highly accessible to the community.*

Clause 11.02 relates to Urban Growth. It seeks to ensure a sufficient supply of urban land implemented by structure planning to facilitate the orderly development of urban areas. It seeks to (inter alia) *develop Growth Area Framework Plans that will identify the long term pattern of urban growth and identify the location of broad urban development types, for example activity centre, residential, employment, freight centres and mixed use employment.*

It also seeks to (inter alia) *develop precinct structure plans consistent with the Precinct Structure Planning Guidelines (Growth Areas Authority, 2009) approved by the Minister for Planning to create highly accessible and vibrant activity centres and provide for local employment and business activity.*

Clause 11.03 relates to Open Space and Clause 11.04-2 relates to Housing Choice and Affordability. These matters are addressed in the Amendment and the PSP.

Clause 16 relates to Housing. It states that (inter alia):

- *Planning should provide for housing diversity, and ensure the efficient provision of supporting infrastructure.*
- *New housing should have access to services and be planned for long term sustainability, including walkability to activity centres, public transport, schools and open space.*

Clause 17 Economic Development provides matters for consideration. Clause 17.01 Commercial seeks to *locate commercial facilities in existing or planned activity centres.*

Clause 18 Transport seeks:

- *To create a safe and sustainable transport system by integrating land-use and transport*
- *To coordinate development of all transport modes to provide a comprehensive transport system.*

Clause 19 Infrastructure is of relevance given the Amendment includes measures to collect and administer Development Contributions.

4.3 LPPF

The Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF) provides a local planning policy context for decision making.

In the Whittlesea Planning Scheme, what appears to be out of date mapping in Clauses 21.03 and 21.04 makes no reference to this area as a potential growth front. The policy mapping has not kept pace with the North Growth Corridor Plan which is the key state generated growth guide. The policy base in the Whittlesea Planning Scheme provides high level or conceptual guidance (in line with well-considered planning concepts) rather than geographically specific policy guidance as to the use of land.

The Mitchell Planning Scheme is similar in that it provides no geographic guidance for this locality. The policy basis is more general.

These more general policies are reflected in the Explanatory Report.

5.0 Donnybrook Woodstock PSP

5.1 PSP in relation to the PSP Guidelines

I have been asked to review the PSP against the PSP Guidelines. I have undertaken this review and am of the opinion that the PSP is consistent with the PSP Guidelines. I have provided my detailed review at Appendix A.

5.2 Submissions Response

I have been provided with the submissions of the City of Whittlesea (8 March, 2016); Monteleone (Reports by Macroplan Dimasi dated December, 2015 and 21 December, 2015; as well as Submission 27 which appears to be from the Monteleone family; plan by Reeds Consulting ref 22769 version D dated 4/12/15); and Stockland (21 December, 2015 by Roberts Day).

The matters I have been asked to address largely relate to the retail hierarchy (with a focus on the activity centres LTC3 and LCC1), the utilisation of the Cheese Farm in the PSP, the distribution of non-residential uses, the suitability of the open space on the Monteleone land and the north-south connector road that traverses the Monteleone land.

In reviewing the PSP against the PSP Guidelines (Appendix A) I have reached the conclusion that the PSP has been well thought out in terms of the manner in which it has distributed the various components. The retail hierarchy is suitably distributed across the PSP as nominated on Plan 5 which nominates both 400m and 1km catchments from the town centres. There is limited overlap of the 400m catchments and the 1km catchments demonstrate that very few parts of the PSP are outside this walkable (for most) threshold.

Specifically I would not adjust LTC3 as it provides an important role in the central western part of the PSP. It is suitably distanced from LCC3 to the north west, LTC2 to the south west and LCC1 to the south. I see no reason to upgrade LCC1 in terms of retail floor space given the proximity to LCC2 (which is in the south west corner adjacent to the railway station) and LTC2. This would

upset the balance of supermarket distribution in the south west of the PSP. I would also not place LCC1 along the frontage to Donnybrook Road as this would reduce the accessibility of the centre to the residential catchment.

I support the use of the Cheese Farm as a part of LCC1 and note the potential that this existing business has to create a community node in this location. Notwithstanding that, I do not believe that a supermarket should be added to LCC1 for the reasons stated above.

The Monteleone family have objected to the distribution of non-residential uses, being of the view that they have been unreasonably affected. The PSP as a whole has a NDA of 56.68%. A significant amount of the non-developable area relates to the conservation area in the north of the PSP. The Monteleone properties will have a NDA percentage of about 66% (properties 9, 11 and 17). In comparative terms this is not an unreasonable impost.

From a more empirical assessment, utilising the PSP Guidelines, the general distribution of non-developable uses across the PSP appears reasonable when one takes into account the physical constraints, the arterial and connector road network and the distribution of the LTCs and the LCCs.

I have analysed each of the open space parcels on the Monteleone land and reached the conclusion that, with the exception of LP03, each of the parcels is reasonable. LP03 does not contain any native vegetation and as such I see no need for that reserve from a distribution perspective. The other open space areas (LP05, LP30, LP31, LP32) all contain native vegetation in the form of mature river red gums, and as such are worthy of retention. SR01 is an unusual shape and will be provided in three parts (one by the adjoining owner), but its physical constraints (the stony knolls) mean that this unusual shape is justified to cater for the planned facilities. This is shown on the plan on page 70.

Given the open space impost on the Monteleone land (including LP03) is about 9.5% of the total site area (14.5% of the NDA), it is not unusual or unreasonable in my experience. Compensation provisions exist in the PSP at R48.

The north-south connector road through the Monteleone land is correctly nominated in my view. The PSP Guidelines seek arterial roads at mile intervals and connector roads at 800m offsets. Patterson Drive is the correct road to be allocated as an arterial given it will connect beyond the PSP to the north and south. The connector road in the Monteleone land terminates at Gunns Gully Road to the north and will only have a limited connection to the south. I see no reason for change in status, and as a result see no need for the road to be included in the ICP.

Whittlesea Council submissions

The City of Whittlesea wrote to the MPA in a letter dated 8 March, 2015 providing in principle support for GC28 subject to 24 matters. I have been asked to address a number of these matters and comment as follows:

	Council Submission	Response
1	That Council support the design of the future urban structure and land uses, including the distribution, hierarchy and location of the proposed local community hub configuration	The PSP has a well thought through distribution of uses that is based upon the requirements of the PSP Guidelines.
11	That Council request that the Donnybrook Cheese Farm is reflected in the future urban structure to enable creation of a cultural hub for the community	I support this general approach given the use is an ongoing operation and should fit comfortably into the new urban form. My only concern is that if this cultural hub fails to materialise that a suitable underlying use is nominated in the PSP so as to avoid the need for a further Planning Scheme Amendment.
12	That Council support the future expansion of the Donnybrook Cheese Farm into a cultural hub	I agree with this approach subject to my comments at 11, 13 and 14 in this table.
13	That Council request wording in the Precinct Structure Plan to highlight the Donnybrook Cheese Farm precinct as an opportunity to encourage innovative place creation outcomes	I agree with this approach, provided the cultural hub proceeds, and subject to my comments in 11, 12 and 14 in this table.
14	That Council request that the Metropolitan Planning Authority review the Local Convenience Centre 1 and Local Town Centre 3 Concept Plans to facilitate greater integration of the proposed cultural hub, in line with	I see no reason to change LTC3 as it will have no direct impact on the proposed cultural hub. If this request is seeking to shift the retail floor space from LTC3 to LCC1, I do not believe this would be in keeping with the PSP Guidelines, as noted in Appendix A.

	Metropolitan Planning Authority Guidelines	I do not believe this would be the optimum planning outcome. Whilst I acknowledge that it might be of benefit to that land owner, I am of the view that the long term impact on the overall catchment would outweigh any perceived benefit in locating the supermarket with the Cheese Factory in the short term. Such a change would leave the northern part of this catchment relatively remote from retail facilities and would create a lesser outcome than the distribution proposed in the PSP.
15	That Council request that the Metropolitan Planning Authority review the retail hierarchy across the PSP to ensure it is in line with Metropolitan Planning Authority Guidelines. That the review investigate the allocation of retail floorspace for these centres to determine whether they adequately cater for their catchments	As noted above, I have reviewed the PSP against the PSP Guidelines and I am of the opinion that the retail hierarchy is in accordance with these Guidelines. Whilst I defer to the evidence of Mr Brisbane on the detailed matters relating to the allocation, the distribution across the PSP appears balanced and well distrusted.
16	That Council request the Metropolitan Planning Authority investigate the potential to increase the retail floorspace allocation for Local Town Centre 3 to provide for one full line supermarket	I defer to Mr Brisbane on this question of floor space.
23	That Council support the connector road network as exhibited in the Precinct Structure Plan, with the exception of the North South connector road from Donnybrook Road to Gunns Gully Road, west of Patterson Drive, for which Council requests that the Metropolitan Planning Authority and VicRoads	Given the PSP Guidelines specify the need for an arterial road network based upon a mile grid, I see no need for the upgrade of the connector road west of Patterson Drive. Patterson Drive (800m east of the connector road) will ultimately have a function carrying traffic beyond and through the PSP, whereas the connector noted will terminate at Gunns Gully Road (but will continue to the south over Donnybrook Road in a limited manner). Patterson Drive is

	<p>undertake a review of the classification of that road and the potential for its funding to be included within the approved contributions plan</p>	<p>nominated as an arterial road in the North Growth Corridor Plan. Connector Roads are not normally included in a DCP, or in this case, an ICP.</p>
--	--	--

Monteleone submissions

The Monteleone submissions as noted above raised a substantial number of matters. I was advised that these matters had been distilled down to seventeen matters that were still in dispute. I respond to each of them below, where appropriate to my expertise:

	Monteleone Outstanding Submission	Response
1	<p>Chronology of events leading to current land use plan resulting in unequitable (sic) distribution of NDA (associated with non-NDA facilities located on Monteleone land - schools, two community activity Centres and greater than one sporting reserve on the Monteleone land) in absence of funding mechanism for shared infrastructure, parkland 'overs', land take for drainage infrastructure and other items which are ordinarily compensated.</p>	<p>I am satisfied that the exhibited PSP has achieved a balanced layout of the PSP. Whilst a reasonable distribution of facilities is something the MPA would take into account, the PSP Guidelines do not require this approach to be taken and in fact place significant weight on achieving good design outcomes to produce high quality future communities.</p> <p>I note that the Property Specific Land budget provides that 56.58% of the PSP falls into the Net Developable area. The Monteleone properties will have NDA percentage of about 66% (properties 9, 11 and 17).</p> <p>I agree that it would be desirable to have the DCP or ICP settled at this time to provide certainty to all parties, however, it is my understanding that this will be settled prior to gazettal.</p>
2	<p>Absence of justification for retail hierarchy and reasons as to why additional retail floorspace on Monteleone property is problematic.</p>	<p>Mr Brisbane will deal with the matters of detail when it comes to the retail hierarchy. However, from a planning perspective, the distribution of commercial facilities through the precinct is well balanced and meets PSP Guidelines requirements in terms of distribution and access by the future community. The provision of a supermarket at LCC2 and LTC2 provides the right balance which would be upset if a further supermarket was provided at LCC1.</p>

3	Monteleones seek to ensure that medium and higher density housing is encouraged around all local centre inclusive of LTCs and LCCs	I am of the opinion that medium density housing is a likely outcome around LCCs based upon normal planning principles. The PSP does not preclude this outcome and in providing a variety of housing types I would expect land in close proximity to a LCC would be a good candidate for medium density housing in most circumstances. I am comfortable with the way the PSP is written.
4	Drainage and GFF infrastructure and land take. Absence of funding mechanism/compensation mechanism. Matter under discussion as to alternative designs. Reference in PSP to 'waterways' incorrect in absence of existing waterways on Monteleone land. MW DSS and land take compensation.	The Melbourne Water Drainage Scheme will provide this detail. I note that the Reeds Plan proposes the drainage line to run either side of the property boundary. I am of the view that this would potentially create development issues and that it would be more suitable if it were located in one land holding. I agree that aerial photography shows there is little more than a depression or man-made channels to dams on the Monteleone land, rather than a formal waterway.
5	Plan 15 - utilities plan illustrates a wider distribution of utilities.	This matter is beyond my expertise.
6	Correct various inconsistencies/errors	Minor matters that will be dealt with by the MPA.
7	Funding of Montelone Way - serves arterial function. Also serve considerable public purpose as a reservation for the large amount of infrastructure to be accommodated within road reserve (this is related to item above). Evidence to be called before Panel is that road serves arterial function.	From a planning perspective, Monteleone Way will not serve an arterial function as it does not proceed further north of Gunns Gully Road and does not fit with the North Growth Corridor Plan nor the road hierarchy requirements of the PSP Guidelines.
8	REQUIREMENT 17: The submitter objects to the reference to "figure 2 and 3" because these figures are not detailed in the PSP document as making any reference to lots "abutting the	My understanding is that the MPA have reviewed these matters and will provide updated diagrams and references in their Part B submission.

	Sydney-Melbourne Railway". MPA has responded as follows: <i>R17 refers to the wrong cross section. This is a typographical error that will be clarified to refer to page 95 of the PSP.</i>	
9	REQUIREMENT 18: The submitter objects to this requirement because it sets a defined interface for housing against the Sydney-Melbourne Railway reserve. MPA has responded as follows: <i>R18 is required by PTV. R17 and R18 are proposed to be refined to remove inconsistencies for implementation.</i>	My understanding is that the MPA have reviewed these matters and will provide updated diagrams and references in their Part B submission.
10	LP03 - trees on part of Monteleone land	My understanding is that these trees are non-indigenous and therefore the purpose of this parcel of open space is somewhat lacking. I would recommend the deletion of this park and its addition elsewhere in the PSP perhaps where open space is identified as being needed.
11	Size of LP05	The open space for the whole of the PSP meets the 10% requirement for active and passive POS. LP05 and SR01 are an unusual configuration, but this appears to be due to the stony rises that are indicated on the plan where the localised peaks are indicated (based upon the plan at 4.3.1 on page 70).
12	LP 30 (0.55 Ha), LP31 (0.98 Ha) and LP 32 (0.30) as shown on Plan 17 of the Donnybrook PSP 1067.	It is my understanding that these reserves are there to preserve river red gums and have been designed into the LTC3 layout. They provide east west pedestrian movement through the LTC and are therefore suitably designed into the concept plan.
13	Location and layout of SR 01 (8.08 Ha) as it is not clearly	As noted above, SP01 is an unusual shape but has been designed and sized to take into account the stony rises. Whilst not ideal, I am of the

	defined and straddles neighbouring landholdings.	opinion it will be resolved at permit and plan of subdivision stage.
14	REQUIREMENT R 40: The submitter suggests the reference to “table 5” should read Table 6. The submitter objects to this requirement and in relation to LP 05 requests R40 is read in conjunction with R21 and where R21 applies it takes precedent in the size and location of the LP where it is centred around public transport route, constructed waterway, major boulevard road, school facility and medium density housing.	I was not able to ascertain what the objection was in this matter as R40 seems to have no relationship to R21.
15	RECOMMENDATION R48: The submitter objects to the wording of this requirement in terms of the methodology for public open space contribution. Results in inequitable payment as result of disproportionate NDA. Also uncertainty as to how POS proposed to be dealt with.	R48 appears to be the usual manner in which POS is compensated for. I see no reason to change it given it has been adopted in other PSPs.
16	Section 3.4 - submitter objects to graphical depictions of vegetation and retention/removal policy. Also these plans would need to be updated depending upon outcome of drainage/GGF discussions	The graphical depiction appears quite appropriate to me. I do not understand their concern.
17	Funding of culverts	My understanding is that these matters will be settled prior to gazettal.

Stockland submissions

The Stockland submission effectively seeks the reduction of the retail floor space from 21,500sqm to 7,000sqm. The key mechanism would be Table 2 at Clause 2.5 of UGZ6 which limits each centre to a certain floor space without the need for a planning permit. This has the effect of being a 'soft cap' subject to the words in the PSP itself.

The PSP sets out at Table 3 the Retail Floorspace Square Metres for each centre. R22 at 3.2.1 then states that *Local Town Centres may be developed in the location shown on Plan 6 and must be consistent with the role and function guidance provided in Table 3*. No timing is provided as to what stage of the centres development that the centre must be consistent with the role and function (ie the first stage of development?)

I do note that the North Growth Corridor Plan provides no guidance as to whether this form of centre is or is not appropriate in this location. The PSP Guidelines do not provide any guidance. Clause 11.01 Activity Centres provides no guidance, nor does the Activity Centre Design Guidelines (2005) which is a reference document.

It would therefore appear to me that these considerations are done on empirical basis, and in that regard I defer to Mr Brisbane to provide his opinions on this issue.

From a planning perspective, if R22 is capable of being achieved in stages over time (which I think it must be given the long term nature of the PSPs and the fact that activity centres need to evolve over time), then the floor space figure is not mandated and forms more of an allowance that may be achieved.

6.0 Conclusion

It is my opinion that Amendment GC28 is worthy of support subject to the following change:

- The deletion of Local Park LP03

NICK HOOPER

Taylors

November 2015

APPENDIX A – REVIEW AGAINST PSP GUIDELINES

Part One – Overview of Planning New Communities

Part One sets out a range of high level objectives for Growth Area Planning. In my opinion, the exhibited PSP satisfies the objectives as follows:

- The PSP will establish a sense of place and community. The neighbourhoods are safe and compact, the public spaces and community facilities have been well designed.
- The PSP provides for residential development at a range of densities, with higher densities located around activity centres and open space.
- The Activity Centres are highly accessible and have the potential to be vibrant, with a clear hierarchy, a mix of uses and the capacity for change over time.
- Local employment is catered for in the activity centres, with other opportunities in other nearby PSPs
- Transport choice is provided via the train line and the bus network along the planned arterial roads.
- Climate change and environmental sustainability are catered for via protection of key environmental features and a neighbourhood design that minimises car usage and increases opportunities for renewable transport.
- Community infrastructure is provided in an integrated and accessible manner.

Part Two – Preparing the PSP

Part Two provides a range of more detailed requirements for the Responsible Authority to consider.

3.0 Create the Structure		
The preliminary and future urban structure should respond to the following standards:		
	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Response in the PSP</u>
S1	1.6 km road grid for arterial roads with safe and efficient connections to the arterial road network, adjusted where necessary to reflect local context (see figure 2). See Clause 56.06-4.	A modified mile grid has been achieved utilising existing and proposed road reserves, whilst responding to the physical constraints of the land.
S2	Activity centres and hubs of community facilities are located to maximise access to	The LTCs are located on arterial roads which will include bus transport.

	public transport services. Principal and major activity centres are located on the PPTN (both bus routes and railway stations), and neighbourhood activity centres are served by local bus routes (see figure 3). See Clauses 56.03-2 and 56.03-3.	
S3	Neighbourhood activity centres are located on connector streets with direct access to at least one arterial road (see figure 3). See Clause 56.03-2.	The LCCs are located on either arterial or connector roads, with the latter having good access to arterial roads.
S4	A network of open space is provided across the precinct that connects to regional open space networks. See Clause 56.05-2.	Well distributed open space is connected to other key activity centres, and connects to regional open space via the road network.
S5	The location and scale of open space responds to existing drainage channels, landforms, biodiversity areas and cultural heritage values. See Clause 56.05-1.	Open space has a variety of functions and responds to waterways, key vegetation, stony knolls and heritage sites.
S6	Large areas of open space (generally above 1ha, including any co-located with schools) are located outside or towards the edge of the walkable catchment of activity centres (see figure 3). See Clause 56.05-2.	Sporting Reserves have been located in this manner.
S7	Hubs of community facilities are co-located with district parks (incorporating ovals) in order to enable sharing and integration between schools and active recreation space. See Clause 56.05-2.	The LTCs and LCCs co-locate sporting reserves and schools to achieve sharing where required.
S8	Off-road pedestrian and cycle paths are integrated with the open space network and link activity centres, community facilities, employment areas and other destinations within the precinct and surrounding area.	As per Plan 13 a combination of on and off road paths connect the precinct within and beyond its boundaries.

4.0 Make the Place – Integrated Precinct Design
The design of the precinct is informed by the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Image and character;

- Housing;
- Employment and activity centres;
- Community facilities;
- Open space and natural systems;
- Transport and movement; and
- Utilities and energy.

Element One – Image and Character

The Precinct Structure Plan should respond to the following standards:

	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Response in the PSP</u>
S1	Landscape and topographical features (including water bodies and waterways) and the visual and historical/cultural characteristics of the precinct are used to guide the pattern of streets and public spaces and incorporated into views where appropriate. See Clauses 56.01-1, 56.03-4 and 56.05-1.	As per Plan 2, the key features of the precinct have been identified and incorporated where appropriate.
S2	Identify gateways and focal points for future landmark sites, squares, landscape features and/ or public art. See Clause 56.03-4.	Focal points such as Hayes Hill, the creek environs and the substantial vegetation in the northern part of the PSP have been identified and included in the PSP.
S3	A range of development densities is provided across the precinct with the majority of highest densities located within and adjacent to an activity centres and along routes of the Principal Public Transport Network (both bus and rail). (see figure 5)	Plan 5 nominates suitable areas for higher density housing, with statements at R20 and R21 providing strong guidance. G8 sets the base of a precinct wide minimum of at least 15 dwellings per net developable hectare.
S4	The plan should provide for future redevelopment sites to achieve higher densities in the longer term. In the short term these key strategic sites could be developed for other uses that do not preclude redevelopment for higher densities in the future. See Clause 56.04-1	The two sites are the existing and proposed station will accommodate higher densities as specified in the PSP.

S5	Homes designed to accommodate working from home are concentrated adjacent to activity centres. See Clause 56.04-1	Higher density housing will achieve the potential for this form of housing.
----	---	---

Element Two - Housing

The precinct structure plan should respond to the following standards:

	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Response in the PSP</u>
S1	<p>Housing across a precinct structure plan should achieve an average density of at least 15 dwellings per net residential hectare, which will be achieved by providing a range of lot sizes. Higher densities should be focused in and around activity centres and public transport based on the following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within an activity centre, homes should be high density. • Within the walkable catchment of an activity centre, homes should be medium or high density. • The precinct structure plan should identify opportunities for medium to high density housing close proximity to a PPTN stop or station, a local bus stop, community facilities or open space. <p>The precinct structure plan should accommodate a range of housing products which, when averaged, provide a density of at least that referred to above.</p> <p>See Clause 56.03-1</p>	The Housing Section at 3.1.2 achieves all of these outcomes.
S2	A range of densities that enable a mix of housing types and sizes are provided across the precinct. See Clause 56.04-1	This is nominated at Table 2 on page 17.
S3	The precinct structure plan can identify opportunities for affordable and social housing in and around activity centres. See Clause 16.05	The PSP does not have the power to mandate this outcome but it can be achieved in the areas for higher density housing.

S4	Any retirement villages or residential aged care facilities should be located within an activity centre or within 400 metres of an activity centre and public transport stop. Permeability and accessibility through these areas is encouraged. See Clauses 56.03-1 and 56.04-1	No specific mention but any proposals would meet the high density test in the PSP.
----	---	--

Element Three – Employment and Town Centres

Employment

The precinct structure plan should respond to the following standards:

	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Response in the PSP</u>
S1	Employment uses that have a high employment density and/or frequent visitors (e.g. offices, retailing, and some community facilities) are located in activity centres. The more substantial office developments, retailing and community facilities should be located in principal and major activity centres.	The Activity Centres will contain these uses. There are no higher order activity centres in this PSP. The LTCs and LCCs will contain these uses given the remainder of the PSP is largely residential use.
S2	Major employment areas are connected to other employment areas (including activity centres) in the region by arterial roads, public transport and freight networks, as appropriate.	Major employment areas in the broader region are easily accessible via the existing and proposed arterial road network.
S3	Land shown as employment on the Growth Area Framework Plan is primarily used for commercial and industrial employment uses; however complimentary residential neighbourhoods may also be included where appropriate.	Not applicable in this case.
S4	The employment area incorporates open space (that links to the open space network) for the benefit of workers, local residents and visitors to the employment area.	The Activity Centres have open space within the centres and good connection to other open space further afield. This is demonstrated in the concept plans in the PSP.
S5	The employment area incorporates services for the benefit of workers, local residents and	These services will be integral to the activity centres. They will be provided more

	visitors to the employment area within an activity centre. Service facilities may include education facilities, medical centres, child care facilities, post offices, banks and retail/entertainment services.	commonly in the LTCs which have a larger retail floor space component. The distribution of the LTCs is well balanced across the PSP to minimise travel distances for the majority of residents.
S6	Mixed use employment areas that include housing are designed to ensure residents have access to public transport, local community services and open space.	The Activity Centres will achieve this. Each centre is located on a bus capable arterial or connector road and has community facilities and open space designed in.

Town Centre Design		
The precinct structure plan should respond to the following standards in association with the design suggestions set out in the Activity Centre Design Guidelines:		
	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Response in the PSP</u>
S1	Activity centres and land within the walkable catchment of activity centres incorporate mixed use development. See Clauses 56.03-2 and 56.04-1	The GRZ will provide limited opportunities for a mix of uses close to the Activity Centres. The use of the RGZ would provide greater opportunity for this to be achieved.
S2	Activity centres have a variety of land uses and a range of business sizes that have main street frontage. This includes a mix of retail, office (including home-office and other administration uses), housing, recreation and entertainment, community services and civic uses.	Each Activity Centre achieves this as nominated by the concept designs.
S3	80-90% of households should be within 1km of an activity centre of sufficient size to allow for provision of a supermarket.	This requirement is achieved. The land in the northern tip of the PSP, as well as the land north of Gunns Gully Road, east of Patterson Drive is more remote than the 1km threshold, but is less than 20% of the PSP. On this basis I would not recommend any change to the location of the Activity Centres nor the supermarkets.

S4	Street blocks should be highly permeable and enable people to access goods and services safely. See Clause 56.06-2.	The modified grid of arterials and collector roads provides highly permeable access.
S5	Buildings on landmark sites within activity centres are multi-storey. See Clauses 56.03-4.	Upper level development along main streets specifically encouraged in the Draft Concept Plans and Design Guidelines for Local Town Centres (4.2)
S6	Buildings within activity centres address the street and public spaces and have 'active' ground floor uses. See Clause 56.03-2 and Element 3 in the Activity Centre Design Guidelines.	R29 deals with this requirement as do the Draft Concept Plans at 4.2.
S7	Pedestrian movement is prioritised over vehicle movement within activity centres including along the main street.	Specifically noted in 4.2
S8	All activity centres should contain town parks/squares and multi-purpose urban spaces should be provided for meeting places, local markets and community events or other gatherings. See Clause 56.05-2.	Specifically noted in 4.2
S9	Larger format restricted retail stores are located within activity centres, but away from the highest intensity uses.	None included in this PSP.
S10	Opportunities are provided for small business in and adjacent to activity centres, including in conjunction with a dwelling.	This will be capable of being achieved within the activity centres as part of detailed design. Adjacent to the centres this will be able to be achieved in either the GRZ or the RGZ, but with greater capability in the latter.
S11	Civic buildings are placed in prominent locations, usually next to town squares.	Specifically noted in 4.2
S12	Local centres are located on connector streets carrying an existing or proposed public transport route, and include a viable	All of the LCCs are located on a connector street that is bus capable. I defer to Mr Brisbane on the capability of any given

	convenience store.	convenience store.
--	--------------------	--------------------

Element Four – Community Facilities

The precinct structure plan should respond to the following standards:

	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Response in the PSP</u>
S1	<p>Community facilities (e.g. schools, community centres, active open space) are generally collocated with each other, and located either close to a neighbourhood activity centre or with good visual and physical links to a neighbourhood activity centre.</p> <p>Lower density community uses (e.g. active open space) should generally be further from the activity centre than higher density community uses (e.g. childcare and community centres).</p> <p>See figure 8. See Clause 56.03-3.</p>	<p>Each Activity Centre complies with these requirements as shown in the concept plans for the LTCs and the LCCs.</p>
S2	<p>Primary schools (both government and non-government) are located on connector streets carrying a local bus service, with a bus stop at the school boundary. See Clause 56.03-3.</p>	<p>Each school provided with connector street frontage.</p>
S3	<p>Secondary schools (both government and non-government) are located on connector streets with direct access to the PPTN (rail and/or bus based), where possible.</p> <p>See Clause 56.03-3.</p>	<p>Each school provided with connector street frontage with bus capability.</p>
S4	<p>Community facilities, and schools in particular, are linked to the cycling and walking network, and the local and regional public transport network.</p>	<p>The cycling and walking network is comprehensively provided and will link all relevant aspects.</p>
S5	<p>Where health services are needed, they are provided as part of either the community hub or activity centre.</p>	<p>Complies.</p>

S6	<p>Emergency services provided should be located with easy access to the arterial road network. Any justice services provided should be located with easy access to the principal public transport network. These should be provided as part of either the community hub or activity centre where appropriate.</p>	<p>It is my understanding that no emergency services are required in the PSP.</p>
----	--	---

Element Five – Open Space and Natural Systems		
The precinct structure plan should respond to the following standards:		
	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Response in the PSP</u>
S1	<p>Provide a network of quality, well-distributed, multi-functional and cost effective open space, catering for a broad range of users that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local parks within 400m safe walking distance of at least 95% of all dwellings; • Active open space within 1 kilometre of 95% of all dwellings; • Linear parks and trails, most often along waterways, but also linked to vegetation corridors and road reserves within 1 kilometre of 95% of all dwellings. See Clause 56.05-2 	<p>Plan 7 nominates compliance with this requirement through the use of dotted lines (400m from local parks) and dashed lines (1km from sports reserves). The cumulative effect shows that very limited parts of the PSP are not within these thresholds.</p>
S2	<p>In residential areas, approximately 10% of the net developable area as total public open space, of which 6% is active open space. In addition, residential precincts should contain active indoor recreation facilities that are co-located and/or share space with schools and integrated community facilities. This should result in an active indoor sports provision of approximately 5 hectares per 60,000 residents.</p>	<p>These figures have been achieved as noted in 4.1 Property Specific Land Budget.</p>
S3	<p>In major employment areas, approximately 2% of net developable area as public open space, usually with a passive recreation function.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>

S4	<p>In meeting standards S2 and S3, encumbered land should be used productively for open space. The network of local and district parks should be efficiently designed to maximise the integration and sharing of space with publicly accessible encumbered land. Encumbered land usually includes land retained for drainage, electricity, biodiversity and cultural heritage purposes.</p> <p>The parkland created by such sharing and integration should be suitable for the intended open space function/s, including maintenance.</p> <p>In this way encumbered land will be well utilised, while the total amount of open space can be optimised without adversely impacting on the quality and functionality of the network.</p>	<p>Unencumbered POS either adjoins or integrates with encumbered open space, the latter generally being in the form of creeks and waterways.</p>
S5	<p>Active open space should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • of an appropriate size, i.e. sufficient to incorporate two football/ cricket ovals, but small enough to enable regular spacing of active open space provision across the precinct. This configuration would generally require at least eight hectares; • appropriate for its intended open space use in terms of quality and orientation; • located on flat land (which can be cost effectively graded); • located with access to, or making provision for a recycled or other sustainable water supply; • designed to achieve sharing of space between sports; and • linked to pedestrian and cycle paths. 	<p>Each active open space area has been suitably sized to cater for its intended function (Table 6). This is demonstrated by the concept plans for each of the LTCs and LCCs which include these active open spaces.</p> <p>The diagrams utilise the contours to demonstrate the land is reasonably flat and shows how facilities are capable of being shared.</p>
S6	<p>All public open space areas should be designed to maximize passive surveillance. See Clauses 56.04-4 and 56.05-2</p>	<p>This is nominated through the concept plans and will be enacted via Clause 56 at permit stage.</p>
S7	<p>The public open space network is combined</p>	<p>The open space network has been</p>

	with techniques for managing urban run-off and biodiversity. See Clauses 56.05-1, 56.04-4, 56.05-2, 56.07-4	designed in conjunction with the drainage network.
--	---	--

Element Five – Biodiversity Management

The precinct structure plan should respond to the following standards:

	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Response in the PSP</u>
S1	The government’s approach to native vegetation precinct planning and urban development is achieved (refer to PSP Note).	Native vegetation is being retained as appropriate, often in substantial tracts of land, especially in the northern section of the precinct.
S2	Appropriate transitions and buffers are provided between areas of high conservation value and urban land uses.	Plan 7 nominates public road frontage to the waterways and conservation sites.
S3	Areas set aside for biodiversity protection are planned as part of the precinct’s open space network or otherwise appropriately managed in the long-term in an urban context. See Clauses 56.05-1 and 56.05-2	Table 6 nominates the responsible authority for each conservation area.
S4	Areas set aside for biodiversity protection are sustainable for an urban context in the long term in terms of their size and their connection to other natural areas. See Clause 56.05-1	The waterways have been provided with adequate width and the conservation area is suitably large for an urban context.
S5	Net impacts on matters of national environmental significance under the EPBC Act are not significant.	Conservation areas and tree retention have been considered from an EPBC Act perspective and substantial areas of vegetation have been protected under the BCS.

Element Five – Heritage Management

The precinct structure plan should respond to the following standards:

	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Response in the PSP</u>
S1	The government’s approach to heritage planning is achieved. (refer to PSP Note)	Heritage features have been nominated on Plan 2 and covered by R10.
S2	Areas set aside for heritage protection are	Two heritage places have been nominated

	planned as part of the precinct's open space network or built environment, as appropriate. See Clause 56.05-1	on Plan 5.
S3	Appropriate transitions and buffers are provided between areas of significant Aboriginal cultural heritage value or, where appropriate, post contact heritage value, and urban land uses.	It is my understanding that there are no areas of significant Aboriginal cultural heritage in the PSP. The two key post contact sites have been shown as being suitably protected.

Element Five – Integrated Water Cycle Management

The precinct structure plan should respond to the following standards:

	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Response in the PSP</u>
S1	Urban run-off management systems are integrated into the overall plan and incorporated into the open space network, ideally by avoiding alteration of the natural drainage network and limiting the amount of cut and fill required. See Clauses 56.05-1 and 56.07-4.	The drainage system has been integrated into the open space network as per Plan 7.
S2	The urban run-off system is designed and managed in accordance with the requirements of the relevant water authority (Melbourne Water for catchments greater than 60 hectares; local council for smaller catchments). See Clause 56.07-4.	Melbourne Water are finalising the Drainage Strategy.
S3	Existing natural waterways, wetlands and their riparian vegetation are incorporated into urban run-off systems where appropriate. See Clause 56.05-1 and 56.05-2.	Melbourne Water are finalising the Drainage Strategy.
S4	Development is designed to ensure that the health of the downstream waterway does not decline as a result of urban development. See Clause 56.07-4.	Melbourne Water are finalising the Drainage Strategy.
S5	Artificial lakes, ponds or other permanent water bodies provide a water management	Melbourne Water are finalising the Drainage Strategy.

	function in an urban context, protect and enhance natural systems and are cost effective.	
S6	Development sensitive to flood risk is not sited on significant flood risk areas. Flood storage areas are utilised as features and used for less sensitive uses such as active or passive public open space. See Clause 56.07-4.	Melbourne Water are finalising the Drainage Strategy.
S7	Adjustments to the stream or floodway only occur if it is necessary, cost effective, does not increase flood risk elsewhere, and minimises environmental impacts.	Melbourne Water are finalising the Drainage Strategy.
S8	Large areas of open space are located where they enable the capture of stormwater for watering.	Melbourne Water are finalising the Drainage Strategy.

Element Five – Fire and Bushfire Management		
The precinct structure plan should respond to the following standards:		
	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Response in the PSP</u>
S1	Any fire or bushfire management planning policy of the Victorian State Government is taken into account in planning the precinct. See also Clause 44.06-2.	R55 and R56 cover these requirements.
S2	Buildings should be separated by an appropriate buffer (which could include a roadway) from bushland, grassland or other areas of vegetation that present a fire risk.	Road reserves are proposed around the large conservation reserve which would be the key fire threat.
S3	Alternative access routes are provided for fire fighters and residents in bushfire prone areas.	The road layout provides ample opportunity for alternative access.

Element Six – Transport and Movement		
The precinct structure plan should respond to the following standards:		

	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Response in the PSP</u>
S1	Arterial roads spaced at approximately 1.6 kilometre intervals and connector streets spaced at approximately 800 metre intervals, having regard for existing and proposed land uses, public transport and property access requirements. See Clause 56.06-4	Whilst the road network achieves a modified grid, the road network achieves these outcomes through suitable separation between arterials and connectors.
S2	Local feeder bus routes are aligned with connector streets and these connect to the PPTN (both bus and rail) and activity centres and community facilities. See Clauses 56.03-2, 56.03-3 and 56.06-3	Plan 13 sets out a detailed bus capable road network with all key roads designed to be able to handle buses.
S3	Land is set aside to enable grade separation of access crossings of all transport corridors (including roads, pedestrian and bicycle paths) across railways. The precinct structure plan should identify and preserve the land required for grade separation of the existing or proposed crossing.	Grade separation is shown via bridges on Plan 13.
S4	Land is planned and reserved for the future expansion of streets and railways (as identified by the Transport Assessment Report) to meet movement needs as the precinct or adjoining areas evolve over time.	Suitable land has been set aside for the road and rail network throughout the PSP.
S5	The most intensive land uses that have a high residential or employment density and/or a large number of frequent visitors are concentrated in or adjacent to activity centres on the PPTN or local bus route. If a railway station and/or public transport interchange facility is proposed, land use and street networks are developed to maximise catchments and accessibility. See Clauses 56.03-2 and 56.06-3	R20 and R21 sets out higher density requirements around the PPTN
S6	Freight access to and from activity centres and major employment areas minimises any adverse impacts on adjoining land uses.	Limited freight requirements in this PSP will be handled at detailed design stage.

S7	95% of dwellings are located not more than 400 metres street walking distance from the nearest existing or proposed bus stop. See Clause 56.04-1	Plan 13 shows that this will be achieved.
S8	Bus interchanges are integrated with railway stations and 'park and ride' facilities to enable easy movement of travelling by foot, car, train and bus.	Plans 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 show park and ride and kiss and ride facilities.
S9	Marked bicycle lanes are provided on all collector streets. On all arterial roads, provide a shared bicycle/footpath (segregated where possible) and on road bicycle lanes wherever possible. See Clause 56.06-2	Each cross section in the PSP delivers on this requirement.
S10	All streets have footpaths on both sides of the reservation. See Clauses 56.06-5	This is achieved for each cross section except Local Access Level 1 Rural Style on page 80 which has been specifically designed without footpaths.
S11	Avoid the use of slip lanes at locations within activity centres where significant pedestrian flows are expected, although their need will require assessment on a case by case basis.	None are shown in the concept plans.
S12	Pedestrian crossing points are provided along key pedestrian desire lines, on both sides of all legs of signalised intersections in activity centres, and at appropriate bus stops.	This level of detail is not shown but is implied by the nominated pedestrian network.
S13	Dedicated off-street shared pedestrian and cycle paths are established through open space areas. Where relatively high levels of pedestrians and cyclists are expected, segregated paths exist. See Clause 56.06-2	Plan 13 nominates the off road network.
S14	In areas of anticipated high pedestrian/cyclist demand, and where necessary and appropriate, crossings for these users should be provided across barriers such as railway lines, service easements and watercourses. These should be at a maximum spacing of 400m.	Pedestrian paths have been co-located with bridges at appropriate points.

	Road bridges should be constructed at regular intervals (ideally at about 800 metres spacing and up to a maximum of 1600m spacing) over these barriers.	
S15	Reserves along arterial roads and connector streets are made available for treed boulevards (refer to VicRoads clear zone standards).	The cross sections provide adequate room for planting of trees.

Element Seven – Utilities and Energy		
The precinct structure plan should respond to the following standards:		
	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Response in the PSP</u>
S1	Water, gas, and electricity supply and sewerage and telecommunications networks are designed to be provided to the boundary of all lots and to the satisfaction of the relevant authority See Clause 56.09-2	3.6.2 covers these matters on page 47.
S2	All areas identified for employment, including home working, are serviced by telecommunications infrastructure appropriate for business use.	This will be a requirement at the time of development.
S3	The design of key structural elements allows at least 70% of lots across the precinct to have good solar orientation. See Clause 56.04-3 and figure 9.	The road network should allow for this requirement to be achieved.
S4	Provide for internet broadband via Fibre to the Home to all properties, as proposed by the Commonwealth Government. See Clause 56.09-2.	This will be a requirement at the time of development.