

Amendment C207 - Sunbury South PSP 74

Submission Summary and VPA Response - Part A - Version 1 - 07 August 2017

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
1	Michael Mazur					
SS1	MM1	Opposed to population growth and immigration.	Current population forecasts indicate that the population of Victoria will continue to grow in the coming decades. The VPA is undertaking the planning work to ensure that this growth is managed in a sustainable manner and integrates with existing communities.	No	No action	Unresolved
2	Terry & Anne Couzens (Adjacent landowners)					
SS2	TAC1	Support urban growth in the area but believe that the area south of Watsons Road to the Bulla-Diggers Rest Road should also be included in the plans.	<p>The area south of Watsons Road is currently outside of the Urban Growth Boundary, and therefore cannot be included within the Precinct Structure Plan.</p> <p>The VPA acknowledges that the area in question may at some point in the future represent a logical extension to the Urban Growth Boundary, and recognise that Hume City Council has identified through the Hume Integrated Growth Area Plan (HIGAP) that the area may be suitable for future urban land.</p> <p>A change to the Urban Growth Boundary would require significant strategic justification and the ratification of both houses of Parliament. The VPA is not currently aware of any intention of the State Government to amend the UGB.</p>	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS2	TAC2	Contentends that the area would be suitable for development as there are no overlays affecting the small rural lots, utility services are currently available and the area is in close proximity to the Diggers Rest and proposed new Sunbury South Railway Station. The area has access to the Calder Freeway and buses are available from the Diggers Rest Station and could loop through the area. The proposed Outer Western Ring Road is going to be located in proximity to the area for quick access to the Hume Highway or Geelong. The submitters believe a large shopping centre is to be built on the western side of the Calder Freeway which, along with the proposed Harpers Creek shopping centre, would be easy access from the area, as is Watergardens Shopping Centre currently. The area is close to the proposed employment and commercial area on Old Vineyard Road which could provide employment opportunities for residents in the area.	As per response to 2(1) above, the VPA is not able to consider the inclusion of the land south of Watsons Road as part of the PSP, as it falls outside of the Urban Growth Boundary.			

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS2	TAC3	Watsons Road and Crinnion Road will be a main thoroughfare through their area, which is currently only used by local traffic and not by through traffic. These roads are relatively narrow rural roads with no lighting and no footpaths and residents currently use the roads while exercising. The use of these two roads for access around Sunbury would make it dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.	The PSP identifies that the ICP will be contributing funds towards upgrading both Watsons Road (RD07) and Crinnion Road (RD08) - refer to Table 10 of the PSP for the upgrade description. The upgrade to RD07 includes sealing the road, street lighting and a 3 metre shared path for pedestrians and cyclists. The upgrade to RD08 does not include the provision of pedestrian/cycling paths and street lighting because it is outside of the PSP and not in an urban environment. Therefore the VPA does not support changing the profile and cross-section applied to RD08.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS2	TAC4	If the area remains as semi-rural, the existing kangaroo population will stay, creating a very dangerous situation on the bypass roads for motorists. However, if the area was included in the Urban Growth Area this would encourage the kangaroos to move on further and hopefully alleviate the problem.	The Urban Growth Zone schedule under this amendment will require that prior to the certification of any plan of subdivision that a Kangaroo Management Plan must be approved by the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP). To obtain DELWP's approval, a Kangaroo Management Plan must demonstrate a suitable strategy to avoid land locking kangaroos and to minimise risks to public safety and animal welfare. DELWP's decision making focuses on encouraging passive management techniques that encourage the movement of kangaroos away from areas of new urban development. These techniques are designed to effectively management kangaroo populations while minimising harm to the animals	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS2	TAC5	If these changes in the current form were to go ahead, we believe our current lifestyle would change dramatically with traffic noise, traffic congestion, security and loss of privacy. However, we realise that times are changing and it is time again to consider our area to also be included in the Urban Growth Area.	Changing the Urban Growth Boundary is initiated by the Government of the day and requires ratification from both the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council (i.e. both houses of the Parliament of Victoria). This request is outside of the VPA's scope. The last review of the Urban Growth Boundary occurred in 2011/12. Please refer to the Logical Inclusions Advisory Committee Report dated November 2011 for more information and can be accessed via <a href="http://www.austlii.edu.au">www.austlii.edu.au</a> .	No	No action	Unresolved
3	Sharon Moore and Leigh Macdonald (Adjacent Landowner)					

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS3	SMLM1	Objects to the proposed opening up of an extension of local streets from Jacksons Hill (i.e. Bishops Way, Fentonhill Pde, Roseberry Ave and Whitechapel Way) into the new development. Concerned with the potential landscape and cultural heritage impacts this may cause, as well as the safety of pedestrians. Request that if/when the development south of Jacksons Hill goes ahead that all existing roads in Jacksons Hill be completely blocked / fenced off so no traffic can go through, particularly, Bishops Way.	<p>The VPA does not support the requested change to the PSP. It is considered important that the new communities within Sunbury are well connected with the existing township.</p> <p>It is unclear what landscape and cultural heritage impacts arise from connecting the Sunbury South PSP with Jacksons Hill. If the comment relates to impacts on the former Victoria University site, these matters will be considered through the development of the Jacksons Hill Masterplan and is a separate process to the PSP. Similarly, the Jacksons Hill Masterplan process is the appropriate forum to raise and resolve traffic concerns associated with the site. If the comment relates to the Harpers Creek section of the PSP (south of Jacksons Hill) there is a sufficient response to landscape and cultural heritage considerations in Plan 5, the requirements and guidelines in Sections 3.1.1 to 3.1.3 as well as Figure 3. These responses balance protecting landscape and cultural heritage values with the designation that land south of Jacksons Hill is to accommodate future urban growth.</p> <p>"Fencing off" Jacksons Hill from the future community in Harpers Creek is an unacceptable solution to the concerns raised about traffic congestion and pedestrian safety. It would be in conflict with the requirements under Clause 56 of the Planning Scheme regarding a well-connected local street network for local trips by car, bike and foot.</p> <p>The local street network is not anticipated to carry high volumes of through traffic as residents will be seeking to access the Harpers Creek Centre, Sunbury South Railway Station and the Sunbury Town Centre</p>	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS3	SMLM2	The area immediately to the south of Jacksons Hill will be the first to develop and without other access options, trucks will use Bishops Way for access and as thoroughfare to build the new streets in the precincts. Trucks may cause damage to nature strips, pose a risk to the safety of children and pets, and will have potential noise pollution and fumes.	Requirement 99 of the Sunbury South PSP (Page 57) requires that the "Development of land bound by the Jacksons Hill estate and Harpers Creek must have access to Fox Hollow Drive or Buckland Way prior to commencement of development. No road connection will be approved into the Jacksons Hill estate prior to the construction of the Jacksons Hill link." The VPA consider that this requirement provides sufficient protection to the residents of Jacksons Hill in relation to early development.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS3	SMLM3	Concerned about the potential for pollution and environmental impacts as a result of the construction of the link road between Sunbury Road and Vineyard Road.	The construction of the road will be require a Construction Environmental Management Plan to be prepared and complied with, which will address issues such as dust and noise impacts.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS3	SMLM4	Any increased traffic through the streets of Jacksons Hill coupled with the proposed new medium to high density housing immediately to the south will be in contrast to the quiet character of Jacksons Hill.	The existing local roads within Jacksons Hill have limited capacity, and the concept plan for the area to the immediate south is not proposing any higher order roads in light of this. Given the design requirements within the PSP, it is anticipated that the character of subdivision in this area will be generally consistent with the established character of Jacksons Hill.	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS3	SMLM5	Concerned about property being devalued as a result of increased traffic and medium to high density development south of Jacksons Hill within the PSP.	The local street network is not anticipated to carry high volumes of through traffic as residents will be seeking to access the Harpers Creek Centre, Sunbury South Railway Station and the Sunbury Town Centre via higher order arterial and connector roads identified in the PSP. There is a sufficient response to landscape and cultural heritage considerations in Plan 5, the requirements and guidelines in Sections 3.1.1 to 3.1.3 as well as Figure 3. These responses balance protecting landscape and cultural heritage values with the designation that land south of Jacksons Hill is to accommodate future urban growth.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS3	SMLM6	Concerned about the potential capacity issues in regards to accessing the Calder Freeway from Vineyard Road and the Tullamarine Freeway from Sunbury Road.	IN07 (intersecting with Vineyard Road) and upgrades to RD03 (Vineyard Road) will provide access to the Calder Freeway. Upgrades to RD07 (Watsons Road), RD08 (Crinnion Road) and IN11 (Crinnion Road and Bulla-Diggers Rest Road intersecting) will also provide additional access onto the Calder Freeway. Upgrades to RD02 (Sunbury Road) and the Bulla Bypass project will improve access to the Tullamarine Freeway. The challenge is the coordination and funding of these infrastructure projects with some projects (IN07, RD07, RD08 and IN11) being funded through the ICP and delivered by Hume and the others (RD02, RD03 and the Bulla Bypass) being funded and delivered by VicRoads. The draft Sunbury Infrastructure Co-Ordination & Delivery Strategy has considered the future infrastructure needs of Sunbury as the community grows and has identified the coordinated staging of infrastructure delivery to accommodate this growth.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS3	SMLM7	Concerned about the timeliness of the interim and ultimate delivery of RD09 (Jacksons Hill Link Road).	The PSP has identified the interim delivery of a link between Jacksons Hill and Buckland Way. This is to be delivered by Hume Council as per an existing agreement with Places Victoria and is identified in the draft Sunbury Infrastructure Co-Ordination and Delivery Strategy as being delivered in the short term (i.e. in the next 5-10 years). The delivery of the ultimate form of RD09 will be funded by the ICP and will be delivered by Hume Council and is identified as a medium term project (i.e. in 10 or more years).	No	No action	Unresolved
4	Catholic Education Melbourne					
SS4	CEM1	The location of the non-government school site is supported.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS4	CEM2	The PSP should include the provisions: - Provide for a non-government school site to meet a strategically justified need for a Catholic primary education in the area.	The VPA will advise the Catholic Education Office further on their position in relation to their submission.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS4	CEM3	The PSP should include the provisions: - Bus stop facilities must be designed as an integral part of town centres and activity generating land uses such as schools, sports fields and employment areas.	The VPA will advise the Catholic Education Office further on their position in relation to their submission.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS4	CEM4	Requests that the Background Report includes a statement along the following lines: A site for a Catholic primary school has been identified in the PSP area as a potential non-government school to assist Catholic Education Melbourne in establishing a Catholic Primary school that will meet a strategically justified need for Catholic education in the area.	The VPA will advise the Catholic Education Office further on their position in relation to their submission.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
5	Heritage Victoria					
SS5	HV1	Plan 2 Precinct features is not entirely consistent with the mapping of the heritage sites and possible heritage sites in the Heritage Overlays. Consultants have identified at least one actual location which differs from the HO mapping (actual location of the former 'Leydon' 670 Sunbury Road - HO210).	These will be comprehensively reviewed to ensure that they are accurate.	Yes	No action	Resolved
SS5	HV2	No Heritage Overlay mapping is proposed in Hume C207. Many HO Sites are mapped in a generalised manner as a circle rather than accurately. It is considered that this will lead to confusion. It would be preferable for the accurate mapping of the HO sites to occur at the same time as the Gazettal of C207 occurs but if this is not possible, then soon after.	Agree that it would be beneficial for the two Amendments to be approved concurrently, or for the Hume amendment in relation to the HO mapping to occur prior to the Gazettal of the PSP. This is likely to be the case, however the VPA cannot control this.	Yes		
SS5	HV3	Recommend that a detailed archaeology survey be conducted across both subject areas to provide greater assurance on potential for historical archaeological sites.	The VPA considers that the work undertaken to date is appropriate for the PSP level.	No		
SS5	HV4	It should be noted that under the terms of the Heritage Act, there is blanket protection for all historical archaeological sites in the State. Any disturbance to a historical archaeological site requires prior approval from the Executive Director of Heritage Victoria.	Noted.	No		
6	Melbourne Airport					
SS6	MA1	Requests that a S173 is required for lots which are within the 'N' Contours to advise future owners that these properties are or will be subject to aircraft noise, including at night.	Agree. Amend Plan 5 to show N-Contour affected area, add into legend. Added Permit Condition in UGZ: "Prior to the certification of a plan of subdivision for land shown on Plan 5 of the Sunbury South Precinct Structure Plan as being affected by the Melbourne Airport Night Contours, the owners of the land must enter into an agreement under section 173 of the Planning & Environment Act 1987 with the responsible authority and the airport lessee company of Melbourne Airport. The Agreement must be registered on title and make provision for the following: ☐ An acknowledgement that the land is in an area affected by aircraft noise, including aircraft noise at night."	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
7	David Kemp (Sunbury Resident)					

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS7	DK1	Considers the proposals to be against State planning policy seeking to reduce metropolitan urban sprawl and consolidate growth within existing town boundaries and close to existing infrastructure.	State Planning Policy identifies a number of strategies for the management of Urban Growth. Plan Melbourne clearly identifies the need to increase the housing supply in growth areas to meet housing demand. The Sunbury South and Lancefield Road precincts are growth areas which have been nominated for growth since 2010. The current process for planning for future growth in these areas is entirely consistent with State Government policy.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS7	DK2	Concern about traffic congestion that will reduce access that links Melbourne to the north-east of Victoria. In particular, traffic volumes on Sunbury Road and Lancefield Road.	Both Sunbury Road and Lancefield Road are designated to become six lane divided arterial roads. The intersection spacing on both roads has been planned in close consultation with VicRoads to ensure that the regional arterial road function of both roads is maintained.  According to the Austroads theoretical daily capacities, a six lane divided road can accommodate between 56,000-84,000 vehicles per day. The strategic transport modelling undertaken to inform the preparation of the PSPs indicates that Sunbury Road is anticipated to carry between 60,000 to 80,000 vehicles per day and Lancefield Road is anticipated to carry between 34,000 to 41,000 vehicles per day when the entire Sunbury Growth Corridor has fully developed (in 35 or more years). The two roads are expected to sufficiently accommodate expected daily traffic volumes.	Yes		
SS7	DK3	Seeks a parallel internal road network within the proposed housing estates that ensures that all local traffic is differentiated and separated from the through traffic using the Lancefield & Sunbury road transport corridor.	The Sunbury South and Lancefield Road PSPs identify connector roads that run parallel to the Sunbury Road and Lancefield Road - refer to Plan 3 in both PSPs. Connector roads provide local communities the ability for local movement and also the opportunity to access the arterial network at convenient locations where there are signalised intersections - refer to Plan 13 in both PSPs.	Yes		
SS7	DK4	Seeks that the only place that traffic from the proposed housing estates should mix with through corridor traffic would occur at one controlled intersection. The most suitable location is at the current intersection of Lancefield Road and Sunningdale Avenue, Goonawarra. For the Sunbury South development this should occur at the Lancefield and Sunbury Road intersection.	The VPA has identified 9 appropriate locations for signalised intersections to connect the connector road network the arterial network. In determining the number and location of these intersections with the City of Hume and VicRoads, the VPA has balanced the competing needs to provide for safe pedestrian and cycling crossing with avoiding unnecessary disruption to the running of the arterial road network. VicRoads has primarily been concerned with the uninterrupted movement of through traffic along Sunbury Road and Lancefield Road and are satisfied with the number of intersections that have been identified in the two PSPs. To have only two signalised intersections would place too great a burden on the two intersections and would not provide safe and convenient road crossing options for cyclists and pedestrians.	Yes		



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS7	DK5	Seeks that any proposed development must automatically set aside prior to commencement a suitable road reservation of land for future Lancefield and Sunbury roads expansion to dual carriageway so the need to compulsorily acquire land in the future is eliminated and the suitable set back for housing is maintained to reduce traffic noise impacts on future residential amenity.	There is an existing Public Acquisition Overlay adjacent to Lancefield Road which preserves the land for this purpose. The PSP ensures the protection of this land in future subdivisions, and also contains provisions that will provide for the protection of the amenity of future residents. Sunbury Road sits within an existing 60m reserve through the precinct.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS7	DK6	Opposed to the development as considers it ugly and inefficient urban sprawl.	The PSP contains many Objectives, Requirements and Guidelines which seek to provide for high quality residential communities to be delivered. The location of the growth is in accordance with the planning policy of successive governments.	Yes		Unresolved
SS7	DK7	Unchecked urban sprawl places an automatic requirement for all residents to own and operate an automobile/s for all transport activities both within the developments and to provide all transport options to connect them with other areas outside the developments.	The PSPs have been designed to ensure that all residents are provided with high quality walking, cycling and public transport options to key local and regional locations. The inclusion of a comprehensive shared path network, provision of bicycle and footpaths on connector roads, provision of future train stations within the precincts and the provision of a bus capable road network all seek to ensure that there are multiple options available for residents other than cars.	No		Unresolved
SS7	DK8	State Government planning policy needs to move firmly from guidelines and principles to mandate, to ensure more infill development within existing town boundaries and reduced growth of Greenfield developments.	The VPA is currently involved in a large number of infill and urban renewal projects in inner and middle ring suburbs of Melbourne. The State Government is providing for urban growth in Melbourne through a number of methods, one of which is Greenfield development in nominated growth areas.	No		Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS7	DK9	There will be a loss of amenity for existing residents of Sunbury and other communities due to more road congestion, which produces more time wastage and uncontrolled costs, and also leads to increased resource consumption and quicker depletion.	The Sunbury South and Lancefield Road PSPs will have impacts on the local road networks within Sunbury. Whilst the development will result in a higher population and therefore more vehicles on the roads, the PSPs will also deliver a comprehensive road network that will benefit the existing residents of Sunbury. Features such as the ultimate delivery of the Sunbury Ring Road, two new crossings of the Jacksons Creek, connections from the eastern side of Sunbury to the Calder Freeway will improve the traffic movement in and around the township.	No		Unresolved
SS7	DK10	There is currently limited rainfall within Western Water's catchment areas and the likely reduced rainfall in the future due to global warming leads to less chance of harvesting of rainwater. This will require the existing residents to be further restricted in their water allocations and paying more for the upgrading and buying of remote water for new residential developments. New development will generate greater waste volumes, which will impact on both the sewer plant capabilities and landfill requirements.	Western Water have a strategy for the staged upgrade of the Sunbury Wastewater Treatment Plant to provide the capacity required to support growth. In addition, Western Water and Melbourne Water are looking at a range of integrated water management strategies, including opportunities for stormwater to potable.	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS7	DK11	The local council will incur greater expense in serving the needs of new communities and the costs will be spread onto existing residents, which is not offset by greater rate income from new developments.	An Infrastructure Contributions Plan (ICP) will be prepared to be adopted at the same time as the PSPs. The ICP collects developer contributions towards the cost of infrastructure, and is projected to cover the majority of cost associated with new local infrastructure required to support new communities.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS7	DK12	The open plains and farming land to the North and Northwest of Melbourne are arguably some of the best quality arable farmland in Victoria and is being lost to greenfield housing and inappropriate small acreage development.	These areas have been included within the Urban Growth Boundary as a consequence of a comprehensive planning process that considered these issues, culminating in the extension of the Urban Growth Boundary in 2010	No	No action	Unresolved
8	Margaret Abernethy (Adjacent Landowner)					
SS8	MAB1	Concerned about the increase of traffic on Crinnion and Watsons Road, which will interfere with local rural and recreational activities, and wildlife.	Strategic transport modelling does project an increase in traffic volumes on Buckland Way (RD05), Watsons Road (RD07) and Crinnion Road (RD08). That said, the PSP identifies that the ICP will be contributing funds towards upgrading both Buckland Way, Watsons Road and Crinnion Road in order to sufficiently respond to those increased traffic volumes - refer to Table 10 of the PSP for the upgrade description. Upgrades to Buckland Way and Watsons Road will include cycling and pedestrian paths which will accommodate their use.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS8	MAB2	Expects that there will be an increase in wildlife using the roads with the new subdivision development works. Notes that there have been a few new mobs of kangaroos in the area since Jacksons Hill Estate developed.	The Urban Growth Zone schedule under this amendment will require that prior to the certification of any plan of subdivision that a Kangaroo Management Plan must be approved by the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP). To obtain DELWP's approval, a Kangaroo Management Plan must demonstrate a suitable strategy to avoid land locking kangaroos and to minimise risks to public safety and animal welfare. DELWP's decision making focuses on encouraging passive management techniques that encourage the movement of kangaroos away from areas of new urban development. These techniques are designed to effectively management kangaroo populations while minimising harm to the animals	No	No action	Unresolved
SS8	MAB3	Concerns about trespassing onto rural properties, noting that most of the properties in the area have dams near fence lines, which pose a risk to safety.	This will be an issue at any urban/rural interface, irrespective of location. The cross section for Watsons Road in the PSP will be updated to encourage frontage to Watsons Road, to provide for passive surveillance and discourage tresspassing.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS8	MAB4	The Holden Flora and Fauna Park needs a wildlife fence. There will be dog attacks on wildlife and carnage on the roads if this is not in place.	This is a matter for DELWP to consider. It should be noted that the Holden reserve is actually a Flora Reserve (not fauna), however it is acknowledged that this is conducive to fauna, which will need protecting.	Yes	No action	Unresolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS8	MAB5	The new Sunbury South Railway station needs 1000 parking spaces. Sunbury Station has run out of spaces and Diggers Rest is also getting full.	The VPA has worked with PTV to identify the necessary land take that will be required to deliver a railway station in Sunbury South. The land take that has been identified for this railway station will enable the delivery of 1000 car parking spaces.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS8	MAB6	Bulla Diggers Rest Road should go straight through to Plumpton Road to the south of the Diggers. There is a traffic problem in Diggers Rest with traffic winding around the streets of Diggers trying to get to Plumpton and Holden Roads. This solution involves both the Diggers Rest PSP and Sunbury South PSP.	This is a broader transport consideration that will require a discussion with the City of Hume and VicRoads in order to develop a response. This is beyond the scope of the Sunbury South PSP	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS8	MAB7	Concerned about noise, dust and traffic. Particularly dust during construction (and on windy Summer days) as the wind usually comes from the north and it gets very dry as it is within a rain shadow.	It will be a condition of planning permits that Construction Environmental Management Plan be prepared and complied with, which will address issues such as dust, noise and traffic impacts.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS8	MAB8	Concerned that land within both the Sunbury South and Lancefield Road PSPs currently has planes flying and manouvering over it at a low height.	Plan 5 is being amended to show N-Contour affected area, add into legend. Added Permit Condition in UGZ: "Prior to the certification of a plan of subdivision for land shown on Plan 5 of the Sunbury South Precinct Structure Plan as being affected by the Melbourne Airport Night Contours, the owners of the land must enter into an agreement under section 173 of the Planning & Environment Act 1987 with the responsible authority and the airport lessee company of Melbourne Airport. The Agreement must be registered on title and make provision for the following: ☐ An acknowledgement that the land is in an area affected by aircraft noise, including aircraft noise at night."	No	Change the amendment	Unresolved
9	Amit Khairajani on behalf of Calderside Group (adjacent landowners)					
SS9	AK1	The PSP is short-sighted in not considering the logical urban development opportunity to the south of Jacksons Hill adjoining Watsons Road. Submits that Hume City Council support the proposal for inclusion and has independently made similar recommendations for the area to be included. The area the submission requests is included in the UGB is east of the Calder Freeway, South of Jacksons Hill / Watsons Road, North of the proposed OMR. The submission includes a number of maps and diagrams showing the land in question.	While this land is currently outside the Urban Growth Boundary, there is nothing in the structure of the exhibited PSP that would preclude the orderly, integrated development of the land south of Watsons Road, should a future government decide to include this area within the UGB.	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS9	AK2	The submission includes substantial material which supports the request to include the land within the UGB. As discussed in response to Submission Item 9(1) above, this Amendment cannot bring the land into the Urban Growth Boundary, and as such, these points are not included in this table.	N/A	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS9	AK3	The PSP will significantly increase traffic in the area on Crinnion Road, Watsons Road and Bulla Diggers Rest Road, making the area irrelevant to support the semi-rural lifestyle, increasing risk to children and animals.	Strategic transport modelling does project an increase in traffic volumes on Watsons Road (RD07) and Crinnion Road (RD08). That said, the PSP identifies that the ICP will be contributing funds towards upgrading both Watsons Road and Crinnion Road in order to sufficiently respond to those increased traffic volumes - refer to Table 10 of the PSP for the upgrade description. Upgrades to Watsons Road will include cycling and pedestrian paths which will accommodate their use.	No	No action	Unresolved
10	Melton City Council					
SS10	MCC1	Have reviewed the PSPS and have no comments to make.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
11	Leonard Smeaton					
SS11	LS1	Southern crossing of Jacksons Creek will exacerbate the local traffic problems by bringing high volumes of traffic (including heavy traffic) and noise through Sunbury from the Hume Highway by people accessing the Calder Freeway.	Increased traffic is a consequence of growth of Sunbury as a whole and not a consequence of the southern crossing of Jacksons Creek.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS11	LS2	The traffic from the southern crossing will create a major intersection with Vineyard Road which will cause traffic delays for the residents who enter and exit Sunbury using Vineyard Road. The same problem will exist at the intersection with Sunbury Road.	The PSP will provide for a signalised intersection that links the southern crossing with Vineyard Road (IT05) as well as one that links the southern crossing with Sunbury Road (IT03). Strategic transport modelling was undertaken to test the proposed road network and identify future project vehicle numbers. These numbers were used to design intersections IT03 and IT05 to ensure that they can accommodate expected traffic volumes. In addition to this, Vineyard Road (RD03) and Sunbury Road (RD01) are designated to become 6 lane arterial roads which are sufficient in accommodating expected transport volumes. According to the Austroads theoretical daily capacities, a 6 lane divided road can accommodate between 56,000-84,000 vehicles per day. According to strategic transport modelling undertaken to inform the preparation of the PSPs, Sunbury Road is anticipated to carry between 60,000 to 80,000 vehicles per day and Vineyard Road is anticipated to carry between 49,100 to 57,400 vehicles per day when the entire Sunbury Growth Corridor has fully developed (in 35 or more years). The two roads are expected to sufficiently accommodate expected daily traffic volumes.	No		
SS11	LS3	Many residents who currently use the Sunbury road to access Sunbury will continue to use the local road rather than the Southern Crossing as they live in Sunbury East, North and North West.	It is difficult to predict what factors will influence future travel patterns. That said, it is anticipated that future communities in the PSP will choose routes that are quick or easy. It is important to ensure that the future road network will enable options for movement which is why the southern crossing has been included in the PSP. For example, the southern crossing will provide future residents in Sunbury South with access to the future proposed railway station instead of having to utilise Sunbury Road to access the Sunbury railway station.	No		

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS11	LS4	Proposed solution is to only proceed with the upgrade of Buckland Way (including connection to Yirrigan Road in Jacksons Hill), as per the current Places Victoria project. This road will provide local Sunbury traffic the solution to bypass the centre of Sunbury. Notes that the Bulla-Diggers Rest Road already provides a link from Sunbury Road to the Calder Freeway for traffic outside of Sunbury.	The need for the southern link provides numerous benefits for the existing and future Sunbury community. It will link the new suburbs in Sunbury South with two arterial roads (Sunbury Road and Vineyard Road), it will provide access to the future proposed railway station (Sunbury South) and it will provide alternative access to the Calder Freeway via Fox Hollow Drive-Watsons Road-Crinnion Road-Bulla Diggers Rest Road (RD06, RD07, RD08). Based on the above, not including the southern crossing in the PSP would be unsatisfactory.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS11	LS5	If the southern crossing proceeds it should be linked directly to the Calder Freeway using the Diggers Rest access to avoid the potential traffic jams and the new intersection with Vineyard Road.	The southern crossing will enable access to the Calder via Fox Hollow Drive-Watsons Road-Crinnion Road-Bulla Diggers Rest Road (RD06, RD07, RD08).	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS11	LS6	Current infrastructure in Sunbury is failing to service the current population. Requests that all infrastructure required in the precincts has to have financial commitment and firm start dates for building this infrastructure.	SICADs has been prepared to provide an indication into the likely timing required for key infrastructure to service growth. Mandating the specific timing of the delivery of infrastructure within the precinct is inappropriate, as this will need to respond to changes in growth rates, development fronts, and local circumstances. In addition the Precinct Infrastructure Plan identifies the projects that will be funded through the ICP	No	No action	Unresolved
SS11	LS7	The boom gates in Sunbury township need to be removed.	This is outside the scope of PSP planning. Refer to the Level Crossing Removal Authority website.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS11	LS8	Parking at Sunbury station and Sunbury town centre needs to be increased.	This is outside the scope of PSP planning. Public Transport Victoria manages railway stations. Note, the future proposed railway station in Sunbury South is anticipated to accommodate around 1000 new parking spaces.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS11	LS9	Schools should already be in the building phase.	The plan has been prepared with extensive input from the Department of Education and Training (DET). The number, size and location of the schools shown in the plan have been agreed to by DET and responds to the anticipated need. The indicative timing of the schools are shown in the Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy, and are tied to the population growth rather than years, as it is population growth that will trigger the need for a school to be delivered.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS11	LS10	The Bulla Bypass must be built and Sunbury Road duplicated before any further increase to the Sunbury population.	The draft Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy identifies that Sunbury Road will need to be duplicated and that early works (planning, design and site acquisition) is required in the short term (within the next 5 - 10 years). VicRoads has been identified as the lead agency for these two projects. Refer to Section 2.1, Section 3, Plan 2 and Table 2 of the draft Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS11	LS11	The Calder Freeway must have an overpass installed at the Calder Park drive. The Greentree Gully section of the freeway has to be fixed.	This is outside the scope of PSP planning. VicRoads looks after the management of Victoria's freeways.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
12	Sunbury Residents Association					
SS12	SRA1	Provides general feedback on consultation process, and expresses disappointment that additional time was not provided to respond.	Exhibition was extended from the standard and legislated one month period to approximately 10 weeks, in acknowledgement of the likely level of interest in the amendment within the established Sunbury community, as well as the Christmas/New Year interruption.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS12	SRA2	States that this is a 'place-holding' submission with a more detailed submission to follow.	N/A	No	No action	Resolved
SS12B	SRAB3	The submission did not specifically raise any concerns about the Sunbury South PSP.	N/A	No	No action	Resolved
13	Scott Spargo (Sunbury Resident)					
SS13	SS1	Supports the two PSPs.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS13	SS2	Congratulates the VPA for their commitment to preparing a long term vision that should allow for a structured and purposeful development of the township and responds to the unique landscape and township identity.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS13	SS3	The Jacksons Creek Southern Link is the most vital link needed to alleviate Sunbury Road traffic, and the submitter has concerns that the role of the collector road may exceed the anticipated traffic volumes anticipated in the PSPs as many residents (as well as Romsey and Lancefield Residents) may utilise it. This may result in congestion around the Vineyard Road intersection, which would be exacerbated when the train station is developed.	Strategic transport modelling for undertaken for the entire Sunbury Growth Corridor in its ultimate build out (30 or more years) anticipates that the southern link will likely be operating at or close to its capacity. However is likely that the expected level of traffic could be lower due to people changing their travel patterns with proposed improvements to public and active transport (such as effective bus transportation and cycling path networks).	No	No action	Unresolved
SS13	SS4	Notes that Elizabeth Drive is to complete the "circular loop" rood, but given the higher order of Lancefield Road, many commuters north of the Elizabeth Drive intersection are unlikely to veer from Lancefield Road.	Disagree with this statement. The creek crossing in PSP 1075 will be a quicker and shorter journey therefore will be utilised by residents.	No	No action	Unresolved
14	Colin McKinnon (adjacent landowner)					
SS14	CMc1	Submits that the VPA has copied the Developers submission and added schools etc.	The PSPs are the result of years of strategic work, and implement the vision of previous strategic documents including Hume's HIGAP and the Sunbury / Diggers Rest Growth Corridor Plan.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS14	CMc2	There is no infrastructure plan of the Sunbury Centre.	Whilst the development of the PSPs included a consideration of the capacity of existing infrastructure within the township, planning for infrastructure upgrades not directly associated with the growth planned within the precincts is beyond the scope of the PSPs	No	No action	Unresolved
SS14	CMc3	With so many new houses and no parking for rail and services suggests that the effort to look to the future is poor.	The VPA has worked with PTV to identify the necessary land take that will be required to deliver a railway station in Sunbury South. The land take that has been identified for this railway station will enable the delivery of 1000 car parking spaces at the new railway station.	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS14	CMc4	Hume Council has been given millions of dollars for the third rail crossing but has sat on its hands, cannot be relied on.	<p>Infrastructure in the precinct will primarily be funded through an Infrastructure Contribution Plan (ICP). ICPs are a transparent mechanism for funding new infrastructure.</p> <p>The Precinct Infrastructure Plan identifies the projects that will be funded through the Infrastructure Contributions Plan. Additionally, the draft Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy has been prepared to provide an indication into the likely timing required for key infrastructure to service growth. Mandating the specific timing of the delivery of infrastructure within the precinct is inappropriate, as this will need to respond to changes in growth rates, development fronts, and local circumstances.</p>	No	No action	Unresolved
15	Uwe and Heather Mahler (adjacent landowner)					
SS15	UHM1	Object to the Harker Street Residential Concept Plan based on: Density - lot sizes: The majority of Lots are about 350-400sqm and do not compliment the surrounding larger sized lots.	The concept plan will be updated to remove lot boundaries, and associated development objectives will define the need for subdivision character to respond sympathetically to the site constraints and the prevailing character	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS15	UHM2	Building sizes - small lots require maximum building cover to rationalise land cost and building costs, resulting in minimum open spaces.	See above	Yes	No action	Decision pending further review
SS15	UHM3	Bulk of development: Buildings will require two storey construction with maximum boundary to boundary sitings. Single garage sections are the only break to the otherwise large wall panel, presenting massive intrusive wall scape to the surrounding neighbourhood.	See above	Yes	No action	Decision pending further review
SS15	UHM4	Traffic: Out of the 17 home sites, it is assumed that more than 30 cars could be parked, equating to twice per day of 60 traffic movements. This would have a considerable impact in the otherwise quiet area.	This is not considered an unreasonable traffic impact on a road that effectively functions as a connector road and will be well within the carrying capacity of the road (theoretical capacity of 7,000 vehicle movements per day).	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS15	UHM5	Landscape Values: The concept plan shows a series of trees to be planted on the north/east side to screen the development exposure, however the development facing Harker street presents a stark walled elevation. The sites do not allow for comprehensive screening landscaping due to the lack of open space.	The increase in lot sizes associated with the updated concept plans will provide sufficient opportunities for additional landscaping	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS15	UHM6	The above combination will have a profound impact on existing amenities.	The updated concept plan is considered an appropriate response to the existing character of the area, and will not have an undue impact on existing amenities.	No	No action	Unresolved
16	Matthew Law (Taylors) on behalf of Resi Ventures (Landowner / Developer representative)					
SS16	RV1	Submission relates to property at 20-24 Watsons Road. Supportive of Amendment C207 and have no specific concerns at this stage, however wish to be a party to the process and reserve the right to make a future submission on land parcels within the proposed PSP.	N/A	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS16	RV2	Resi Ventures are currently in discussions with the landowner of 30 Watsons Road and anticipate to put in a future submission that proposes a more efficient design of the retarding basin nominated on this parcel.	Noted. Melbourne Water awaits submission of a functional design package for review from the submitter. The proposed design must meet the objectives of the Fox Hollow Drive Development Services Scheme (DSS).	No	No action	Awaiting response from submitter



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
17	Steven Galdes (landowner)					
SS17	SG1	Submits that the water treatment plants / retarding basins at 65 Watsons Road are in the wrong spot. The submitter would like to have the opportunity to have someone who specialises in the field to represent them in this matter.	Noted. Melbourne Water awaits submission of a functional design package for review from the submitter. The proposed design must meet the objectives of the Fox Hollow Drive Development Services Scheme (DSS). Note that this submitter has made multiple submissions on this matter, refer responses to SS41.	Yes	No action	Awaiting response from submitter
18	Greg Wood (Tract) on behalf of Marantali Ltd (Developer Representative)					
SS18	ML1	Overall the content and direction of the PSP, planning scheme changes and infrastructure co-ordination strategy in general are supported.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS18	ML2	Recommends that the future connector road situated on 615 Sunbury Road (adjacent land parcel) is set 32m inside the property boundary to the west (further inside adjacent property) in order to enable subdivision to occur without being dependent on adjacent landholder. This will involve a reduction of the long dimension of the active open space by 32m to 438m, and the additional land required for the future indoor recreation centre could be added as an embellishment to the reserve.	Submitter subsequently advised a preference for the connector road to be included within the subject property. The future urban structure will be updated to reflect this request.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS18	ML3	Requests that LP-31 be relocated approximately 80m eastward and be located within property 72 to adjoin the Subject Property.	Disagree. LP-31 is located centrally to the requisite catchment, particularly given that the land to the east of the precinct is outside of the UGB so will not provide any additional residential catchment to this local park. The location of the park is proposed be moved to be slightly off the eastern boundary of 605 Sunbury Road to encourage the park to be developed holistically with surrounding residential development. The smaller local open space node adjacent to the conservation reserve will however be moved slightly east, to ensure that it is wholly on the adjacent property	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS18	ML4	37.07-9, Clause 3.9 - Recommends that the text be amended: Paragraph 1, line 5 after precinct structure plan, change: "...must be accompanied by an Odour Environmental Risk Assessment prepared by a suitably experienced and qualified person to the satisfaction of the responsible authority..." to "...must have regard to the recommendations of an Odour Environmental Risk Assessment prepared by a suitably experienced and qualified person to the satisfaction of the responsible authority...".	The buffer to the green waste composting facility is currently under review, and the buffer and controls pertaining to it are likely to undergo significant change prior to the Panel hearing. The requested change will be considered in this re-write.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
19	Carmel and Ken Paine (Adjacent landowners)					



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS19	CKP1	Concerned that the semi-rural lifestyle south of Watsons Road will be significantly impacted by the expected increase in local and through traffic, along with noise from the proposed close by connector roads.	Land adjacent and to the north of Watsons Road is within the UGB (by an Act that was passed by both houses of the Victorian Parliament). The land north of Watsons Road is subsequently identified to accommodate urban growth according to the Sunbury / Diggers Rest Regional Growth Corridor Plan. The upgrade of Watsons Road (RD07) is an ICP project that includes a construction of an undivided 2 lane connector road with a shared path for pedestrians and cyclists, a nature strip and a parking pay on the northern side. The Austroads theoretical daily capacity of such a road is around 7,000 vehicles a day. Strategic transport modelling for the PSP projects between 2,400 to 4,500 vehicles a day when the Sunbury Growth Corridor is fully developed (in 30 or more years). The projected numbers are well within the theoretical capacity of an upgraded Watsons Road.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS19	CKP2	Request that the VPA consider rezoning the land south of Watsons Road into the UGZ so it can be included in any future development of Sunbury South.	<p>The VPA acknowledges that the area in question may at some point in the future represent a logical extension to the Urban Growth Boundary, and recognise that Hume City Council has identified through the Hume Integrated Growth Area Plan (HIGAP) that the area may be suitable for future urban land.</p> <p>In order to rezone the land as Urban Growth Zone, the land would first need to be brought within the Urban Growth Boundary. Changing the Urban Growth Boundary is initiated by the Government of the day and requires ratification from both the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council (i.e. both houses of the Parliament of Victoria). This request is outside of the VPA's scope for Amendment C207. The last review of the Urban Growth Boundary occurred in 2011/12. The VPA is not currently aware of any intention of the State Government to amend the UGB.</p> <p>Please refer to the Logical Inclusions Advisory Committee Report dated November 2011 for more information and can be accessed via <a href="http://www.austlii.edu.au">www.austlii.edu.au</a>.</p>	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS19	CKP3	Notes that local landowners have worked hard to establish a green canopy in their area, which has resulted in increased native birdlife and kangaroos, and has positive benefits in reducing temperature and improving air quality. Has a vision for the semi-rural area to develop it in a functional sustainable manner, with blocks of between 1/2 to 5 acres, to give beneficial lifestyle options. Smaller blocks would enable better land management in terms of a functional green corridor and the eradication of invasive weed infestations.	Whilst this vision and the work of the landowners is appreciated, as described above, the VPA is unable to assist in this request as the land is outside of the UGB and falls outside of the scope of this amendment.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS19	CKP4	Also recommends the consideration of a Lifestyle / Retirement Village.	It is anticipated that lifestyle / retirement villages will develop within the PSP area, and are encouraged to do so in particular locations within proximity to services.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS19	CKP5	Consider it necessary to integrate with the adjoining residential estates as it would enhance the new development with larger blocks on the outskirts and so complete the vision for the future.	Refer responses above.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
20	Anthony Stafford (APP) on behalf of 65 Watsons Road (Landowner)					
SS20	APP1	Submits that there is a significant over allocation of drainage assets in the area between Vineyard Road and Jacksons Creek (45% of the retarding basins for 27% of the NDA).	The conceptual location of DSS assets on this property have been updated since PSP exhibition to address the submitters concern. The submitter is asked to review the latest preliminary DSS.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS20	APP2	The location of the proposed retarding /treatment ponds within the PSP has not included a detailed on-site assessment. A number of the assets have been located where topography will limit the functionality of the drainage asset, e.g. the pond near the centre of 65 Watsons Road has a proposed pond located on the side of a slope which would require a cut of 8 to 9 metres in height. Considered analysis should include opportunities for consolidation and where appropriate, the use of on-line resources where existing dams are located.	Melbourne Water's updated preliminary DSS has involved a significant reduction of drainage assets on the subject property, including the re-working of one stormwater treatment asset. The submitter is advised to review the preliminary DSS.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS20	APP3	The 'regionally significant landscape value' land allocated on the subject property (65 Watsons Road) has been allocated in areas between ponds and waterways. It is highly unlikely that any test of these values would be satisfied with the allocation appears to be arbitrary. It is suggested that if drainage assets on the subject site are appropriately consolidated or moved to locations within the existing drainage lines, the allocation of regionally significant value land would dissolve.	The regionally significant landscape values in this location have been reviewed. Areas remaining have been classified as 'Land not serviced by Development Services Scheme'. The onus will be on any applicant at the subdivision stage to demonstrate that there is a solution that would allow these areas to be developed and drained, to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and Council.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
21	Carol Morley (adjacent landowner)					
SS21	CM1	<p>Concerned about the increase of traffic on Watsons Road and Crinnion Road. The current intersection of Crinnion &amp; Bulla-Diggers Roads is a T intersection, and no mention has been made as to what sort of road remediation works would be required to manage the traffic volume. Neither road has the capacity to carry projected volume, have no drainage and are not safe dual carriageway. There is a dangerous gully at the east end of Watsons Road near the intersection with Crinnion Road, which has a blind corner. There have been numerous instances of crashes at the intersection of the roads.</p> <p>The significant traffic increase will severely impact residents amenity via noise pollution, continual traffic movement, safety accessing properties due to increased traffic flow, safety participating in recreational activities in public areas.</p>	<p>Strategic transport modelling does project an increase in traffic volumes on Buckland Way (RD05), Watsons Road (RD07) and Crinnion Road (RD08). That said, the PSP identifies that the ICP will be contributing funds towards upgrading both Buckland Way, Watsons Road and Crinnion Road in order to sufficiently respond to those increased traffic volumes - refer to Table 10 of the PSP for the upgrade description. Upgrades to Buckland Way and Watsons Road will include cycling and pedestrian paths which will accommodate their use.</p> <p>Traffic management measures such as roadside signage, reduced speed limits and speed humps will be considered and installed at the time of upgrading the road.</p>	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS21	CM2	There will be increased risk of vehicle and animal collisions following the PSP development. Where available utilize via ducts/underground tunnels to assist animals with safe pathways.  Revegetating with grasses and boundary trees, and fencing the Flora/ Fauna Park boundaries to prevent animals (kangaroos) entering residential areas.	The Urban Growth Zone schedule under this amendment will require that prior to the certification of any plan of subdivision that a Kangaroo Management Plan must be approved by the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP). To obtain DELWP's approval, a Kangaroo Management Plan must demonstrate a suitable strategy to avoid land locking kangaroos and to minimise risks to public safety and animal welfare. DELWP's decision making focuses on encouraging passive management techniques that encourage the movement of kangaroos away from areas of new urban development. These techniques are designed to effectively management kangaroo populations while minimising harm to the animals	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS21	CM3	There should be a mix of block sizes, not just 15 houses per hectare as stated. This would accommodate people who would prefer not just a town block and provide a buffer zone between the farming/rural areas and the township as provided for by other councils.	There are a number of Objectives, Requirements and Guidelines within the PSP which encourage and promote the need for a diversity of lot sizes. Higher density development (averaging 17 dwellings per hectare) is encouraged in proximity to features such as town centres, community hubs and public transport corridors, while larger lots are supported in areas of challenging topography, or to respond to landscape features.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS21	CM4	Provide roadside signage indicating wildlife areas.	Traffic management measures will be considered and installed at the time of upgrading the road.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS21	CM5	Reduce speed limits to 60kms along Fox hollow, Watsons and Crinnion Roads.  Install speed humps to slow traffic.	Traffic management measures will be considered and installed at the time of upgrading the road.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS21	CM6	Questions the impact on the Sunbury Pony Club amenity and the public's ability to ride in Sunbury.	This is an enquiry only and does not seek any specific changes to the PSP.	No	No action	Unresolved
22	Roger and Linley McGlashan (adjacent landowners)					
SS22	RLM1	Submit that the ownership and/or management responsibility for all areas designated as "Conservation" or "Open Space" be identified and empowered as promptly as is possible, so as to avoid any hiatus in the provision of adequate and proper land management, including pest and weed control.	The VPA is continuing to engage with a range of potential public land managers, including Hume City Council, Melbourne Water, the Department of Land, Water, Environment and Planning, and Parks Victoria, around future land management responsibilities for the two creek corridors. Whilst ultimate management responsibilities are outside the scope of what the PSPs can resolve, the VPA acknowledge that this is an important issue, particularly given the status of the Jacksons Creek corridor as a future regional park in Plan Melbourne 2017.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS22	RLM2	Requests that major upgrades of Sunbury Road be expedited, so as to keep traffic congestion to a minimum.	The draft Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy identifies that Sunbury Road will need to be duplicated and that early works (planning, design and site acquisition) is required in the short term (within the next 5 - 10 years). VicRoads has been identified as the lead agency for these two projects. Refer to Section 2.1, Section 3, Plan 2 and Table 2 of the draft Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS22	RLM3	Requests that until a "Bulla Bypass" is completed, Sunbury South development should be as minimal as possible. Levels of traffic congestion are unacceptable, and without a bypass, will only get worse.	<p>The Bulla Bypass is being actively planned for. VicRoads is currently reviewing the alignment of the Bulla Bypass with the view to applying a Public Acquisition Overlay through a Planning Scheme Amendment shortly.</p> <p>The Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy (exhibited concurrently with this Amendment) has identified the delivery of the southern Jacksons Creek crossing (part of the ultimate Sunbury ring road) as being critical early infrastructure to enable access to the Calder Freeway from new development fronts in the south and east of the township. This will assist in managing congestion issues on Sunbury Road while the larger Bulla Bypass Project is in planning and delivery stages.</p>	Yes	No action	Unresolved
23	Neil and Robyn Isles (adjacent landowners)					
SS23	NRI1	Submits that the quality of waterways across the entire PSP area is likely to be negatively impacted by the stormwater run-off from the proposed development with no specific integrated water management strategies evident at this time. Stormwater management issues appear to be unresolved and there are no plans for stormwater capture or reticulation areas to the north of Sunbury Road with plans for the southern area not resolved.	As the Regional Floodplain Management and Drainage Authority, Melbourne Water implements 'Development Services Schemes' to manage the impact of urban development on waterways and receiving water quality. The Development Services Scheme (DSS) provide a masterplan for the future drainage of the catchment(s) and treatment to best practice. The DSS was informed by a number of waterway geomorphic, hydrological and hydraulic background studies. The studies informed the location of treatment wetlands and bypass pipes to ensure the waterways will be protected from increased impervious area as a result of urban development. Melbourne Water would welcome the opportunity to discuss concerns with the submitter.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS23	NRI2	Requests that the VPA provide further evidence of resolution of waterway quality / stormwater management issues for community consultation prior to enabling any amendments. Include validation of the proposed plans by a reputable, qualified independent party such as Alluvium.	The conceptual design of the DSSs within the Sunbury South PSP was undertaken by Alluvium Consulting. The background reports for geomorphology were undertaken by Alluvium Consulting in association with Biosis. The background reports will be released in accordance with directions from the planning panel.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS23	NRI3	Requests that the VPA consider the use of policy instruments to facilitate the Water Authority to implement stormwater harvesting and recycled water reticulation in new developments to improve real sustainability.	Integrated water management options, including stormwater harvesting, are currently being investigated by both Melbourne Water and Western Water. These options will undergo feasibility consideration. R81 of the PSP requires a regional stormwater harvesting scheme	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS23	NRI4	<p>The main road transport issue - getting out of Sunbury and heading to Melbourne - is not well addressed in the PSP.</p> <p>Requests that the staging of development and implementation of the PSP should be more closely linked to the delivery of road infrastructure. Development should be restricted to coincide with infrastructure delivery to minimise road "gridlock".</p>	<p>The Bulla Bypass is being actively planned for. VicRoads is currently reviewing the alignment of the Bulla Bypass with the view to applying a Public Acquisition Overlay through a Planning Scheme Amendment shortly.</p> <p>The Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy (exhibited concurrently with this Amendment) has identified the delivery of the southern Jacksons Creek crossing (part of the ultimate Sunbury ring road) as being critical early infrastructure to enable access to the Calder Freeway from new development fronts in the south and east of the township. This will assist in managing congestion issues on Sunbury Road while the larger Bulla Bypass Project is in planning and delivery stages.</p>	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS23	NRI6	Requests that plans for employment centres in the PSP should be refined to consider an innovative and broader range of employment types to address / reduce the proportion of residents leaving the precinct for employment and bring this number in line with or better than the State and National averages.	The employment provision (including town centres, commercial and employment areas) within the two precincts has been planned around meeting a diverse range of future employment opportunities within Sunbury. A number of these will be delivered within the precincts themselves, whilst the Sunbury Town Centre, as the key regional centre for the growth area, will provide the balance of higher order jobs. It is considered that these different employment areas provide for a broad range of potential employment opportunities/sectors	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS23	NRI6	The submission provides additional discussion, information and evidence to support the requests and submissions. Refer submission for detail.	N/A	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
24	Sunbury Resident - Details redacted					
SS24	EB1	The current water supply and sewerage infrastructure is inadequate. Questions where will the extra water come from, and how the excess sewerage be treated.	The PSPs have been developed in consultation with service authorities, including Western Water. The VPA is satisfied that the precincts can be appropriately serviced.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS24	EB2	Residential under high transmission power lines is inappropriate (amenity).	No residential development will occur under high voltage transmission lines. The PSP makes provision for only low impact, non-residential uses within transmission line easements	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS24	EB3	Questions how the proposed development will sensitively respond and improve community access to, and protect the valleys of Jacksons and Emu Creeks, when these are also admitted to being an asset to Sunbury.	The PSPs encourage and facilitate the protection and enhancement of the Jacksons and Emu Creek valleys through their designation as Conservation Areas. The PSPs contain numerous provisions which will ensure that nearby development will mitigate potential impacts on the creek corridors. There are setbacks to escarpments and other requirements that developments must comply with to ensure that the impact on these areas is minimal.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS24	EB4	Habitat for kangaroos and other wildlife is being destroyed through development.	It is acknowledged that the development of the precinct will displace existing wildlife, including kangaroos. This is an unfortunate side effect of any greenfields development. The PSP and associated Urban Growth Zone Schedule contain requirements that seek to manage this process.	No	No action	Unresolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS24	EB5	The creek corridors and Redstone Hill volcanic cone must be protected and preserved. The blasting and removal of natural rock and earth will have major impact on the natural soaks, creeks and other waterways.	The creek corridors and Redstone Hill volcanic cone are proposed to be protected and preserved through the PSP. Should any works be proposed by the creek corridors (such as the creek crossings) they will be subject to strict environmental controls within a Construction Environmental Management Plan.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS24	EB6	The platypus and GGF will become extinct (as a result of development).	The platypus is not listed as an endangered species and the likelihood of its extinction is low. The Biodiversity Consersavation Strategy has ensured that there are significant tracts of land which are set aside within the precinct for the protection of the Growling Grass Frog.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS24	EB7	Concerned for heritage and history, submits that the proposed development will impact on the heritage sites.	The PSPs require a Heritage Conservation Management Plan to be prepared for all listed heritage sites within the precinct, and requires development of land to have regard to the heritage significance of sites and provide a sensitive interface.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS24	EB8	Urban flood zones are unprotected.	The exhibited planning scheme maps do not show the Urban Floodway Zone (UFZ); this is because there is no proposed change to the existing UFZ zones.	No	No action	Resolved
SS24	EB9	What is the Public Conservation and Resource Zone?	The Public Conservation and Resource Zone currently applies to the Holden Flora Reserve within the precinct. It's purpose is: - To implement the State Planning Policy Framework and the Local Planning Policy Framework, including the Municipal Strategic Statement and local planning policies. - To protect and conserve the natural environment and natural processes for their historic, scientific, landscape, habitat or cultural values. - To provide facilities which assist in public education and interpretation of the natural environment with minimal degradation of the natural environment or natural processes. - To provide for appropriate resource based uses.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS24	EB10	Deleting the HO from the site of the Constitution Hotel shows that the VPA is not serious about protecting Australian heritage.	This is not the case. The removal of the heritage overlay was proposed due to a report by a qualified heritage consultant which suggested that the heritage values are not of significance to retain. Additional studies are currently being undertaken by the City of Hume which will further direct the removal or retention of this Heritage Overlay. Discussions on this matter are still underway between Hume City Council and the VPA.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS24	EB11	The Craiglee vineyard is going to be destroyed as well, for what special use?	The Craiglee vineyard is being re-zoned to a Special Use Zone which will recognise and facilitate the ongoing operations of the winery, and enable the development of some additional and compatible tourism uses. This zone is being prepared at the request of the landowner.	No	No action	Unresolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS24	EB12	Objects to the removal of the ESO.	The PSP affords a level of protection to the environmentally sensitive areas which is beyond that of the overlay, as the PSP essentially prohibits the development of land within the environmentally sensitive areas. The PSP ensures that the interfaces to these areas are appropriately managed, including setback provisions. The ESO which is proposed for removal is reasonably generic and relates to rural environs. Given that the creek corridors will now be within an urban setting, this control is not considered appropriate.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS24	EB13	Objects to amending Clause 52.17 to exempt permit requirements for native vegetation removal.	The Biodiversity Conservation Strategy for Melbourne's Growth Areas is based on the premise that native vegetation and habitat that is not within a conservation area is able to be removed, as the Conservation Areas act as the offset for this land. It is therefore not considered appropriate to require a planning permit for the removal of this vegetation. The VPA will continue to propose the amendments to 52.17.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS24	EB14	Requests that private details are removed prior to submission being released.	Agreed.	No	No action	Resolved
SS24	EB15	The urban development will be stressful for animals.	The Biodiversity Conservation Strategy requires that urban development be excluded from Conservation Area 21 and that it be protected and managed for conservation in perpetuity. Within the two precincts, Conservation Area 21 extends mostly between 80 and 100 metres either side of the Jacksons Creek. It is considered that this buffer distance will protect key habitat for many species, within the two precincts, from urban development.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS24	EB16	States that the Friends of Maribyrnong Valley were not made aware of any of the proposed developments even those these creeks and waterways all run into the Maribyrnong River.	The VPA has sought to engage with and directly consult all stakeholders, however acknowledges that the list of directly engaged stakeholders is not, and cannot be, exhaustive. The public exhibition period for the PSPs were publicly advertised in several local newspaper publications, and there has also been significant local media coverage about the PSPs. Should the Friends of the Maribyrnong Valley wish to engage in the process, the VPA would be happy to discuss any specific concerns that they may have with them.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS24	EB17	There is no provision for cemeteries, law courts, extra police stations, child care or aged care in the PSPs.	<p>The provision of law courts and police stations has been considered by the relevant departments but is not required to be included within the PSP document themselves. The provision of cemeteries is not considered appropriate within the Urban Growth Zone which seeks to accommodate the growing population of Victoria. The VPA consider that this land use would be more compatible outside of the Urban Growth Boundary, particularly in the Sunbury context.</p> <p>Child care and aged care facilities will be provided for by private developers within the precinct and are encouraged to do so, particularly in locations which are easily accessible.</p>	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS24	EB18	The new residents will complain about being under the flight path and circuits.	Plan 5 is being amended to show N-Contour affected area, add into legend. Added Permit Condition in UGZ: "Prior to the certification of a plan of subdivision for land shown on Plan 5 of the Sunbury South Precinct Structure Plan as being affected by the Melbourne Airport Night Contours, the owners of the land must enter into an agreement under section 173 of the Planning & Environment Act 1987 with the responsible authority and the airport lessee company of Melbourne Airport. The Agreement must be registered on title and make provision for the following: ☐ An acknowledgement that the land is in an area affected by aircraft noise, including aircraft noise at night."	No	Change the amendment	Unresolved
25	Robert and Lynette Gee (Adjacent Resident)					
SS25	RLG1	VPA has clearly recognised the importance of maintaining the Zoning criteria for the Jacksons Creek Valley.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS25	RLG2	As depicted in the Report on pages 93 and 94, there must be a “setback required for bushfire management, protection of visual and landscape qualities, and linear trails”.	Support for the setback is noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS25	RLG3	Harker Street Concept Plan - There is an inconsistency between Page 19 and Page 92 which depicts the Residential Interface with Transmission Line (Harker Street Line).	Noted. The concept plan will be updated to remove this conflict with the transmission line.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS25	RLG4	Harker Street Concept Plan - Residential Density appears to be inconsistent. The sizes of the blocks shown on Page 19 are all very different in size. We believe there must be consistent block sizes which are in keeping with the existing property sizes, namely, 950 sqm to 600 sqm in area.	The concept plan will be updated to remove lot boundaries, and associated development objectives will define the need for subdivision character to respond sympathetically to the site constraints and the prevailing character	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS25	RLG5	Street design and development (Harker Street Plan) should be revised to provide for greater dimensions, allowing for two CFA vehicles to pass by one another in the event of a serious fire event. Residential parking on the street should be eliminated by developing off-road parking bays which would eliminate congestion or even impasse for CFA vehicles and equipment.	The road pavement will be improved along the frontage of the development site (increased to 7m pavement). It is considered inappropriate for the developer to need to fund the improvement of the balance of Harker Street, given the relatively limited increase in traffic associated with this development. The road reserve is sufficient (31m) to allow this to occur in the future, if required.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS25	RLG7	The proposed new railway crossing and/or road crossings over/under the railway line should be developed prior to or at least in conjunction with the various residential developments.	These infrastructure projects are to be funded by the Infrastructure Charges Plan for the precinct, and therefore are likely to be funded once sufficient revenue has been generated (ie once enough development has occurred to fund the projects).	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS25	RLG8	The same criteria applies to the Bulla/Sunbury Road and Calder Freeway. This comment is made in consideration of residential developments already underway at Lancefield, Gisborne, Diggers Rest and Sunbury itself, yet no changes are planned to ease the already congested access roads and freeway.	The draft Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy identifies that Sunbury Road will need to be duplicated and that early works (planning, design and site acquisition) is required in the short term (within the next 5 - 10 years). VicRoads has been identified as the lead agency for these two projects. Refer to Section 2.1, Section 3, Plan 2 and Table 2 of the draft Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
26	Oliver Hume Property Funds (Landowner within the municipality)					

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS26	OHP1	<p>The sequencing of development that could be facilitated by the four PSP's within Sunbury is incorrect and has not considered the ease at which other PSP's, namely Sunbury West, could be realised. We request that documentation supporting the Amendment 207 and 208 should refrain from prejudicing the delivery of other precincts.</p> <p>E.g. SICADS - Section 2.4 - Ultimate Build-out Sunbury at 125,000 (35+years)" says the focus of development within Sunbury during this period would be in Sunbury West and Sunbury North and by doing so, implies these precincts cannot be developed any earlier. It is inappropriate for the Sunbury South and Lancefield Road PSP's to make any reference to the timing of other nearby PSP's and by doing so prejudice the delivery of these precincts.</p> <p>The drafted documents must be amended with any such reference to the year in which other PSP's would be delivered to be omitted.</p>	While the role and format of the Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy has been reviewed following submissions, and indication of likely timing for future growth area precincts has been removed. The Strategy will continue to nominate potential projects in the two future growth precincts (with a note that these will need to be considered and confirmed as part of the future preparation of the PSP) and that the timing of the infrastructure within these precincts will also need to be defined in the PSP.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
27	Sunbury Business Association					
SS27	SBA1	<p>Existing infrastructure:</p> <p>a. Cannot meet current population needs and demands.</p> <p>b. Cannot meet additional loads from regional shoppers already wanting to use Sunbury as a regional shopping and transport hub.</p> <p>c. Creates frustration which forces Sunbury and regional residents, shoppers and commuters to travel to other hubs, resulting in lost income and jobs for Sunbury.</p>	Existing issues in the town centre, including access and car parking provision, are best dealt with as part of a project with a more specific focus on the town centre itself, which would likely be managed by Hume City Council.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS27	SBA2	Very few, if any, of the proposed infrastructure projects outlined in the PSP's including railway stations, roads, community services, educating facilities, etc., are guaranteed.	The PSPs have provided land for these land uses, and a funding source for the delivery of the land community facilities (through the ICP). It is not the role of the PSP to provide for the delivery of these services as this is a land use planning exercise. The delivery of services is outside of the scope of this planning scheme amendment, and is a matter for the relevant State and local Government departments to address in response to growth.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS27	SBA3	Concerned about the risk of projects being delayed or cancelled due to the shared funding arrangements from multiple state and local government agencies, which may not be able to commit. There should be a single agency taking responsibility for the planning and guaranteed delivery of all projects.	The Precinct Infrastructure Plan clearly sets out responsibilities for the delivery of infrastructure, and also nominates those projects to be funded by the ICP. Different agencies had different responsibilities for the delivery of infrastructure in new growth areas, and it is impractical to establish a centralised agency to manage all delivery. Nevertheless, SICADS provides a strategic overview of the roll out of infrastructure across the growth area, based upon projected growth rates. This will provide direction to agencies responsible for delivering necessary infrastructure	No	No action	Unresolved
SS27	SBA4	There is no "trigger" mechanism to guarantee commencement of projects. This means that some important projects may take 5, 10, 15 or 20 years to be completed regardless of population size, and regardless of its importance to our community.	Infrastructure roll out needs to be flexible to respond to changing growth trends/development fronts, and development triggers for all infrastructure types undermine this flexibility. The PIP provides an indicative timing for delivery of infrastructure items, based upon projected development fronts. The rationale/assumptions underpinning this are set out in SICADS	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS27	SBA5	A significant concern is the timing of the release of the PSP's and the relatively short community consultation period. Requests that the community-consultation period be extended until 30 April 2017. Requests the VPA mandate that formal Community Consultation processes be established, including; a. Formal representation from the Sunbury business and resident communities. b. Formal involvement in all Council and VPA planning processes regarding Sunbury Precinct Structure Plans. c. Formal ongoing consultation and voting-rights regarding the planning, timing and funding of infrastructure projects.	Exhibition was extended from the standard and legislated one month period to approximately 10 weeks, in acknowledgement of the likely level of interest in the amendment within the established Sunbury community, as well as the Christmas/ New Year interruption. The VPA has continued to accept late submissions beyond this period.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
28	Sean and Bianca Kerr (Sunbury residents)					
SS28	SBK1	Submission appears to relate to Hume Amendment C208, and specifically the land which is subject to the 96A application P18854. The submission has been responded to withink C208 Response Table.	N/A	No	No action	Resolved
29	RL and WA Walters (Sunbury residents)					
SS29	RWW1	These subdivisions should be delayed until the wider Sunbury's infrastructure issues such as parking, overcrowded train service, lack of rail crossings and the Bulla Bypass delay have been addressed.	Planning is well advanced in relation to a number of these regional infrastructure requirements, however it is outside the scope of a PSP process to resolve these. In addition, a number of the projects within the precinct have been planned/timed to specifically address a number of these issues (including the early delivery of a southern road crossing of the Jacksons Creek).	Yes	No action	Unresolved
30	Bryce Letcher (Sunbury resident)					
SS30	BL1	Does not believe that the public response period was adequate due to the timing over the Christmas break and that there were two PSPs which required responses.	Exhibition was extended from the standard and legislated one month period to approximately 10 weeks, in acknowledgement of the likely level of interest in the amendment within the established Sunbury community, as well as the Christmas/ New Year interruption. The VPA has continued to accept late submissions beyond this period.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS30	BL2	Does not believe that the VPA have adequately responded to queries during the public exhibition period.	The VPA has endeavoured to respond to all queries received in a reasonable timeframe.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS30	BL3	Submits that the process reflects "money talking" and does not rate the best interests of residents.	The PSPs are the result of years of strategic planning work, and implement the vision of previous strategic documents including Hume's HIGAP and the Sunbury / Diggers Rest Growth Corridor Plan.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS30	BL4	Queries where the displaced kangaroos from the Holden Flora and Fauna Reserve will go and what measures are being proposed to care for the animals which currently inhabit the area.	The Urban Growth Zone schedule under this amendment will require that prior to the certification of any plan of subdivision that a Kangaroo Management Plan must be approved by the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP). To obtain DELWP's approval, a Kangaroo Management Plan must demonstrate a suitable strategy to avoid land locking kangaroos and to minimise risks to public safety and animal welfare. DELWP's decision making focuses on encouraging passive management techniques that encourage the movement of kangaroos away from areas of new urban development. These techniques are designed to effectively management kangaroo populations while minimising harm to the animals	No	No action	Unresolved
SS30	BL5	The PSP will destroy the tranquil environment of the Watsons Road area with no compensation.	This is a comment only. No specific requests to change the Amendment.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS30	BL6	Concerned about timing of infrastructure delivery.	This is a comment only. No specific requests to change the Amendment.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS30	BL7	The Jacksons Hill Estate was to have a railway underpass to Vineyard Road, and that there is no sign of this happening. Suggests that government cannot be trusted to deliver infrastructure.	This is a comment only. No specific requests to change the Amendment.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS30	BL8	Notes that the Bully Bypass construction was 'imminent' in 1978 and has not yet been delivered.	This is a comment only. No specific requests to change the Amendment.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS30	BL9	Requires the following infrastructure to be delivered now, before the PSP is considered: - Jacksons Hill rail crossing - Bulla Bypass and duplication of Sunbury Rd to the Bulla Bypass - Traffic lights at Horne St/Gap Rd. - Grade separation of the Gap Rd rail crossing - A rail underpass between Mitchells Lane and Shield St. - A multi story carpark (near Harris Scarf) - Duplication of Riddell Rd to Phillip Drive	Planning is well advanced in relation to a number of these regional infrastructure requirements, however it is outside the scope of a PSP process to resolve these. In addition, a number of the projects within the precinct have been planned/timed to specifically address a number of these issues (including the early delivery of a southern road crossing of the Jacksons Creek).	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS30	BL10	The proposed road linking Sunbury Rd to Vineyard Rd needs to be dual lanes.	Traffic modelling undertaken in association with the preparation of the PSP has confirmed that projected traffic volumes are within the capacity of a 'boulevard connector' road.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS30	BL11	Requests a minimum residential lot size be set as 500 Sqm.	There are a number of Objectives, Requirements and Guidelines within the PSP which encourage and promote the need for a diversity of lot sizes. Higher density development (averaging 17 dwellings per hectare) is encouraged in proximity to features such as town centres, community hubs and public transport corridors, while larger lots are supported in areas of challenging topography, or to respond to landscape features. The VPA consider that there will be areas of the precincts which are appropriate for lot sizes of less than 500 metres.	Yes	No action	Unresolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS30	BL12	A number of environmental overlays are being removed however the environment hasn't changed.	The PSP affords a level of protection to the environmentally sensitive areas which is beyond that of the overlay, as the PSP essentially prohibits the development of land within the environmentally sensitive areas. The PSP ensures that the interfaces to these areas are appropriately managed, including setback provisions. The ESO which is proposed for removal is reasonably generic and relates to rural environs. Given that the creek corridors will now be within an urban setting, this control is not considered appropriate.	No	No action	Unresolved
31	Alan Moran (Landowner)					
SS31	ALM1	Lot 84 in the PSP - Figure 8 envisages the area being integrated with the rest of the proposed development area by a walking track which inadvertently appears to pass through my house.	The concept plan will be updated to realign the walking track.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS31	ALM2	Seek your agreement to reduce the stream frontage for this purpose to 10 metres on the basis that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The GGF habitat is one of close proximity to water; rarely do they venture a greater distance than this</li> <li>The northern half of the land is regularly mowed and has been for 20 years; any frogs present would have been chopped up, moreover, the area has an abundant number of foxes and feral cats which would hunt frogs not in the relative safety of water.</li> <li>The southern part of the land is bounded by an escarpment and if frogs could climb this it is surprising that they would seek to do so.</li> </ul>	This represents a very significant reduction on the GGF corridor, and DELWP have advised that they are unlikely to support this. Guidelines for the GGF corridor generally state that the corridor can be reduced to a minimum of 50m only in particular circumstances, except where the corridor takes in existing dwellings.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS31	ALM3	Wish to maintain the maximum flexibility of use of land. Seek that it be defined as being in the developable zone so that I can determine how best to direct its future use in the light of other developments. Ideally the land would be developed as part of a small estate in conjunction with the two adjoining properties.	Providing for development flexibility through a PSP would prove problematic. The VPA considers that the site is relatively separate from future communities and traditional urban development in this location would require significant services and infrastructure which would likely render development unviable, and/or result in an underserved community. Any potential development of this land needs to be planned with a relative degree of certainty over future outcomes, and	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS31	ALM4	An alternative would be initially to develop the northern area in conjunction with the adjoining properties and retain the remainder for the present as one property but with an option to subdivide it at a later stage. These would require caveats preventing building close to the creek, which would logically have only a 10 meter buffer zone.	See ALM4	Yes	No action	Unresolved
32	Faye Wheatley (Adjacent landowner)					
SS32	FW1	Concerned that the upgrade to Crinnion Road and link from Vineyard Road to the Calder will heavily impact on the residents of Crinnion and Buckley Roads. Will impact on the amenity of the land as a lifestyle property.	Strategic transport modelling does project an increase in traffic volumes on Buckland Way (RD05), Watsons Road (RD07) and Crinnion Road (RD08). That said, the PSP identifies that the ICP will be contributing funds towards upgrading both Buckland Way, Watsons Road and Crinnion Road in order to sufficiently respond to those increased traffic volumes - refer to Table 10 of the PSP for the upgrade description. Upgrades to Buckland Way and Watsons Road will include cycling and pedestrian paths which will accommodate their use.	No	No action	Unresolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS32	FW2	The Sunbury South PSP should make reference and give consideration to the future of the land wedged between Sunbury South and the planned Outer Western Ring Road.	The area south of Watsons Road is currently outside of the Urban Growth Boundary, and therefore cannot be included within the Precinct Structure Plan. Changing the Urban Growth Boundary is initiated by the Government of the day and requires ratification from both the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council (i.e. both houses of the Parliament of Victoria). This request is outside of the VPA's scope. The last review of the Urban Growth Boundary occurred in 2011/12. Please refer to the Logical Inclusions Advisory Committee Report dated November 2011 for more information and can be accessed via <a href="http://www.austlii.edu.au">www.austlii.edu.au</a> .	Yes	No action	Unresolved
33	Sustainability Victoria					
SS33	SV1	SV recommends that development within the buffer area be restricted to non-sensitive commercial and industrial uses.  SV considers that it may be worthwhile to prohibit additional potentially sensitive uses, including: place of worship, business college, employment training centre, tertiary institution, outdoor /indoor recreation facility etc., due to potential amenity impacts, or ensure that a planning mechanism is in place so that these types of uses are considered on a case by case basis in consultation with the EPA to ensure that future communities are not impacted on.	The VPA consider that it is appropriate for non-sensitive commercial and industrial uses to occur within the buffer, where the PSP nominates that as the preferred land use. There may be areas of the buffer which apply to land which is designated as residential. In these instances the controls will ensure that sensitive land uses are not developed unless it is demonstrated as being safe to do so.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS33	SV2	It should be suitably demonstrated that any new sensitive use sites will be able to comply with the relevant noise requirement in State Environment Protection Policy (Control of noise from commerce, industry and trade) No. N-1.	The EPA has advised that they do not want the requirements in the UGZ schedule to refer to the SEPP policies, as these may be superseded as best practice. Clause 3.9 of the UGZ9 will be updated to refer to "an odour, dust, noise and vibration assessment prepared by a suitably experienced and qualified person, to a method agreed to by, and to the satisfaction of the Environment Protection Authority.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS33	SV3	Each individual application will need to resolve the various buffer issues at the time each permit is lodged with Council. There may be a case where reports determine it not appropriate to develop the land for a sensitive uses in certain locations, and Council will need to have these debates each time a permit is lodged within the buffer areas. We do not support this approach and believe that sensitive uses should be prohibited within the buffer zones.	As discussed in the Part A report, the extent of the buffer to the Veolia facility is yet to be determined, however it appears unlikely that the buffer will affect more than four private landowners within the precinct. It is not anticipated that these controls will be overly onerous on Hume Council and the EPA to administer.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS33	SV4	In the provision of the Odour Environmental Risk Assessment and 53V Audit, as required above, if a report was to determine that no sensitive uses could occur in part of the buffer, but industry maybe acceptable, this may create a land use conflict issue. SV queries how these issues would be dealt with, and SV would consider a better option would be to first ascertain the appropriate buffers, and then determine appropriate land uses at the strategic planning stage, and reflected in the Precinct Structure Plan.	The PSP nominates the areas of land where industrial development is appropriate. The PSP is a very long term (30+ years) planning document. The VPA is aware that there are basic measures which could be undertaken on-site at the Veolia facility at present which would remove the need for a buffer from nearly all proposed residential land which could be affected. Given this, and that even further technological advances in the future could result in even further reductions, the VPA consider that it would be short-sighted to compromise the long-term land use outcomes of a township in order to protect a buffer which is likely to be subject to change in the future.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS33	SV5	SV request an opportunity to review the final (GHD?) report and make any comments where appropriate.	This report is not yet finalised, however the draft version has been circulated to all parties. The EPA is currently undertaking a technical review of the report which will provide comments on the final version.	No	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS33	SV6	SV recommend that the full capacity of the landfill and organics facility be considered when determining the appropriate buffer zones, if not already done so.	The Works Approval for the facility provides for 85.000t, which has been considered in the GHD odour assessment.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS33	SV7	The PSP provides an opportunity to promote the development of advanced resource recovery. This could sit comfortably in the section 3.2 of the PSP Town Centres and Employment, and 3.2.6 Employment Areas requirements and guidelines to recognise the location of the state significant waste and resource recovery hub as an opportunity.	Disagree. The VPA would need to better understand the potential implications of such uses on the future residential community of Sunbury prior to agreeing to such a change.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS33	SV8	Suggest change - Amendment to Plan 3. It is difficult to determine the type of land use being proposed within the buffer zones of this plan, this should be amended so that the delineation of land uses can be more easily determined.	Agree. The buffers will be transparent or hatched.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS33	SV9	Suggest change - That an amended organics buffer be determined in consultation with the EPA.	Agree. This is being undertaken.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS33	SV10	Suggest change - That the buffer distances acknowledge the activity areas of the organics facility, and the relevant landfills cells on site in order to ascertain appropriate buffer distances.	Agree.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS33	SV11	Suggest change - Add an overlay to the Hume Planning Scheme to clearly identify the buffers.	Disagree. The VPA consider that the PSP and UGZ schedule is the appropriate place to include the controls to the facility.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
34	APA Group					
SS34	APA1	Figure 3 - Harpers Creek Residential Concept Plan - needs to be amended to explicitly indicate that no road within the easement except for those crossing at 90 degrees. APA has no objection to lots fronting the pipeline easement (as long as they are rear loaded). APA also have no objection to the use of the pipeline easement as a linear open space reserve with a pedestrian/bike path. However APA will not permit roads over easement other than a perpendicular crossing.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS34	APA2	Plan 3 of PSP, UGZ9 and Guideline 11 refer to a gas pipeline buffer. This should read as the 'gas pipeline measurement length' to be consistent with previous PSPs.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS34	APA3	Plan 3 of PSP, Map 1 in Schedule 9 of the Urban Growth Zone are unclear, particularly with regard to the underlying land use, as the walkable catchment boundary is shaded. This shading obscures the underlying zoning identification colour. It is suggested that the walkable catchment boundary simply be identified by the current boundary marking but its internal shading be removed.	Agree. The depiction of the walkable catchments will be amended.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS34	APA4	APA is comfortable with the minimum average density of 17 dwellings per NDH, but observes that given the location of the railway station and surrounding amenities there may be pressure for higher densities to be considered. Depending on that increased density it may trigger the need for further consideration of the risk profile of the pipeline.	This is a likely scenario, although the landforms and other constraints in the area will make achieving higher density residential development difficult. It is anticipated that even if there are some individual developments which are of themselves achieving a higher density that this, the average across the area is still likely to be approximately 17 dwellings per hectare. Approximately one third of the land affected by the measurement length is outside of the walkable catchment so seeking a lower density again.	No	No action	Decision pending further review
SS34	APA5	Guideline G11 states that specialised housing forms such as retirement living or aged care should be located within walkable catchments and outside of the gas pipeline buffer. It would be more transparent if these two points were combined to read "Be located within walkable catchments other than within the Gas Pipeline Buffer as identified on Plan 3".	Agreed	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS34	APA6	<p>APA requests that an SMS be undertaken prior to any planning panel or if no panel is required then prior to the finalisation of the PSP. APA strongly recommend that the VPA, Council, the land owner, other interested parties (e.g. AusNet) and APA coordinate to undertake an SMS.</p> <p>APA acknowledges that sensitive uses such as schools and the local activity centre have been purposefully excluded from the ML. The PSP acknowledges some sensitive uses such as retirement living or aged care need to be kept away from the pipeline, specifically outside the ML of 164 metres. Sensitive uses specifically need to be kept clear of this area.</p> <p>The responsibility for coordinating and paying for the SMS process must lie with the "agent of change" and not APA, as has been the practice of previous PSPs.</p>	<p>Agree. However, further to the statement that it is VPA's responsibility to undertake a Safety Management Study for the high pressure gas pipeline running through the Sunbury PSP area, we note that:</p> <p>AS 2885.1 states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "The Licensee shall ensure that pipeline safety management activities are carried out by suitably qualified, trained and experienced personnel." (2.1 p 21)</li> <li>• 2.2.4: A safety management study shall be conducted as a result of any of the following triggers: (d) At any other time that new or changed threats occur"</li> </ul> <p>The Pipelines Act (2005) places the responsibility for Safety Management clearly with the licensee (which in this case is APA).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For example, in Part 9 it states that, "On the written application of a licensee, Energy Safe Victoria may permit the licensee to amend the Safety Management Plan that applies or is to apply to a pipeline operation of the licensee".</li> <li>• Also that, "A licensee must manage any pipeline operation so as to minimise as far as is reasonably practicable— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) hazards and risks to the safety of the public arising from the pipeline operation; and</li> <li>(b) hazards and risks to the environment arising from the pipeline operation.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Therefore the VPA does not agree with APA's assertion that it is VPA's responsibility to undertake the safety management study for the</p>	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS34	APA7	APA requires that roads, and any other infrastructure, cross the easement at 90 degrees. Any reference to oblique road crossings (or their graphic depiction on plans) needs to be removed.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS34	APA8	Plan 9 of the PSP is unclear as to whether the proposed boulevard connector street crossing both the pipeline easement and existing railway line is proposed to include a bridge or underpass.	The grade separated crossing of the rail line south of Jacksons Hill is intended to be an underpass. All PSP plans (including the Harpers Creek Concept Plan) will be updated to reflect this.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS34	APA9	It is noted that Plan 13 indicates that BR04 is proposed as a 2 lane road underpass. APA would require that any such underpass relocate the gas transmission pipeline under the future underpass. APA will not accept the pipe to be integrated into any bridge/overpass structure. These works are also likely to require an additional easement of up to 20m to be created adjacent to the existing easement for the length of the new “lower” pipeline to cater for the construction of that pipeline and to preserve the spatial requirements necessary to respond to a future pipeline needs of APA. The cost of relocating the transmission pipeline and acquisition of the additional easement will be borne by the “agent of change” and as such should be incorporated into the ICP. The PSP also needs to reference the additional easement width and acquisition needs on the relevant plans.	Plans will be updated to clearly reflect the revised alignment for the pipeline easement. The ICP will clearly articulate the scope of works associated with the construction of the underpass to include the relocation of the pipeline.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Resolved
SS34	APA10	APA would prefer that the pipeline easement is indicated as being located within a Council linear open space reserve. APA would permit some embellishment of this linear open space (bike paths/moderate landscaping) subject to detailed plans being submitted for approval.	The pipeline easement will be shown as such, however it will not be included within the credited local open space provision	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS34	APA11	The portion of easement abutting the railway station needs to clearly indicate that no buildings or structures will be constructed on the easement. In principle APA would accept a commuter car park to be constructed over the pipeline easement in this location subject to the easement and easement rights being retained, via agreement if necessary. This outcome would also be subject of detailed engineering assessment and any consequential pipeline protection measures being put in place. A detailed proposal would need to be approved by APA to its satisfaction.	Agree. Amend Figure 3 - Harpers Creek Concept Plan to show this.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS34	APA12	The pipeline easement is not to be used to co-locate other utilities and services.	The PSP does not make specific provision for other utilities and services to be co-located in the pipeline easement. Western Water's submission raised the potential to co-location however they have been advised that APA would not support this. No further change to the PSP proposed.	No	No action	Resolved
SS34	APA13	No water courses are to traverse the easement / pipelines and APA prohibits the construction of wetlands on the easement.	No wetlands/retarding basins are proposed for construction on the easement. Given the location of the easement centrally within the Harpers Creek catchment, it is impossible to redirect flows such that they will not cross the easement. The revised Draft DSS identifies two waterways traversing the APA easement	Yes	No action	Awaiting response from submitter

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS34	APA14	An existing “City Gate” gas facility operated by AusNet is located to the south of Watsons Road. These types of facilities may impact upon the amenity of surrounding uses (noise, smell, safety etc.) and should be considered when undertaking an SMS for this PSP. For this reason, APA suggests that AusNet is consulted by the VPA with regard to this facility and be invited to participate within any future SMS.	Agree	No	Further review/discussion required	Resolved
SS34	APA15	The PSP indicates the extension of Buckland Way to the north of the plan area. It would appear that this extension of Buckland Way may encroach upon the pipeline easement. The PSP plans should clearly indicate that Buckland Way will not encroach upon the easement within the Sunbury South PSP area or facilitate it’s encroachment externally.	The design for the Buckland Way to Yirrangan Way extension does not encroach into the pipeline easement. Plan 9 of the PSP will be updated to show the easement extending north outside the PSP, with the road alignment clearly shown to its east.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS34	APA16	Following the planning panel recommendation of the Mt Atkinson PSP (Melton Planning Scheme Amendment C162), APA suggests that the following proposed “Recommendations” be made “Guidelines”, this will help provide additional consistency between PSP’s with regard to land use matters near pipelines. The relevant Requirements are: R71, R80 and R90.	Agree. Will change R71, R80 and R90 to Guidelines.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS34	APA17	Requirement R80 be amended to refer to the APA VTS pipeline asset rather than “GasNet”.	The wording has been amended to "Any stormwater infrastructure constructed adjacent to or crossing the gas pipeline shown on Plan 3 should cross the pipeline at 90 degrees and be engineered to protect the integrity of the pipeline." This is consistent with the wording of the other Requirements (now Guidelines).	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS34	APA18	In the interest of consistency G11 should include the term “lifestyle communities” in addition to retirement living or aged care facilities as per the Mt Atkinson PSP.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS34	APA19	Guideline G89 be made a requirement.	This is better suited to a conditional Guideline, as it is currently placed. The clause contains discretion (i.e. Vegetation should not be planted within 3 metres of the gas pipeline...), but the Guideline contains the conditions which enable the discretion.	Yes	No action	Awaiting response from submitter
SS34	APA20	Requirement R94 requires all public open space to be finished to a standard that satisfies the requirement of the Responsible Authority which includes “Removal of all existing and disused structures, foundations, pipelines and stockpiles”. If the APA gas pipeline easement is included in an Open Space reserve vested with Council as suggested in APA Comment above then this requirement needs to be amended to remove reference to “pipeline”.	The pipeline is not to form public open space and is therefore not affected by this requirement. This requirement will be updated to refer to public open space defined in Table 6	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS34	APA21	APA recommends the following specific provisions (21a, 21b and 21c below) be included within the Schedule to the UGZ, to maintain a level of consistency with regard to land use considerations near pipelines. It is suggested that item 21c would replace Clause 4.13 in the schedule and the inclusion of the permit triggers as suggested in 21a and 21b would mean reference to the gas pipeline in clause 2.6 could be removed.	Refer below.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS34	APA21a	<p>Land use and works within Gas Pipeline Measurement Length</p> <p>Amended the Urban Growth Zone Schedule 9 to include the following Clause relating to Gas Pipelines.</p> <p>A permit is required to use land or for buildings and works associated with the following land uses that are located within 164 metres of the Deer Park to Sunbury (T062-150mm) pipeline with Pipeline Licence PL122 as shown on Plan XX in the Sunbury South Precinct Structure Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Child care centre</li> <li>• Cinema based entertainment facility</li> <li>• Corrective institution</li> <li>• Dependent persons unit;</li> <li>• Education centre;</li> <li>• Hospital</li> <li>• Place of Assembly;</li> <li>• Residential Aged Care facility;</li> <li>• Retail premises;</li> <li>• Retirement village;</li> <li>• Service Station.</li> </ul>	<p>The UGZ9 currently provides a permit trigger for a Residential Aged Care Facility within Clause 2.4.</p> <p>Most of the other uses in this list already trigger the requirement for a planning permit under the applied zones.</p> <p>The VPA is not convinced that there is a justified need for dependent persons units to required a planning permit / notice to APA. Recent Panels on the matter, including Donnybrook / Woodstock PSP, have not included this use.</p>	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS34	APA21b	<p>28b. Amend Clause 6.0 of the Urban Growth Zone Schedule 9 as follows:</p> <p>Notice must be given to the person or body listed in the Schedule to Clause 66.06 of an application and APA VTS Australia (Operations) Pty Ltd for the use or construction of a building for the following uses within the “high pressure gas transmission pipeline measurement length” show on plan 12 Utilities in the incorporated Sunbury South Precinct Structure Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Child care centre</li> <li>• Cinema based entertainment facility</li> <li>• Corrective institution</li> <li>• Dependent persons unit;</li> <li>• Education centre;</li> <li>• Hospital</li> <li>• Place of Assembly;</li> <li>• Residential Aged Care facility;</li> <li>• Retail premises;</li> <li>• Retirement Village</li> <li>• Service Station.</li> </ul> <p>Notice must be given to the person or body listed in the Schedule to Clause 66.06 of an application and APA VTS Australia (Operations) Pty Ltd for subdivision within the “high pressure gas transmission pipeline measurement length” shown on Plan 12 Utilities in the incorporated Sunbury South Precinct Structure Plan.</p>	<p>Clause 6.0 of the UGZ9 will be amended to be consistent with the Panel recommendations of the Donnybrook / Woodstock PSP. It will state:</p> <p>Notice of an application of the kind listed below must be given in accordance with section 52(1)(c) of the Act to the person or body specified in the Schedule to Clause 66.06:</p> <p>☐ An application on land shown as ‘high pressure gas transmission pipeline measurement length’ show on plan 12 Utilities in the incorporated Sunbury South Precinct Structure Plan, where the application is to use land for, or to construct a building to accommodate, any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Residential aged care facility</li> <li>- Child care centre</li> <li>- Cinema based entertainment facility</li> <li>- Education centre</li> <li>- Hospital</li> <li>- Place of assembly</li> <li>- Retail premises</li> </ul>	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS34	APA21c	<p>25c. Amend Clause 4.13 of the Urban Growth Zone Schedule 9 to read as follows:</p> <p>4.13 Specific provision – gas pipeline construction management plan required whether or not a permit is required</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of any works, including demolition, on land within, or within 50 metres of the boundary of, the high pressure gas pipeline easements shown on Plan 2 (Precinct Features) and Plan 12 (Utilities) in the Incorporated Sunbury South Precinct Structure Plan, a construction management plan must be submitted to and approved by the responsible authority. The plan must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be endorsed by the pipeline owner and operator prior to being submitted to the responsible authority</li> <li>• prohibit the use of rippers or horizontal directional drills unless otherwise agreed by the pipeline owner and operator.</li> </ul> <p>The gas pipeline construction management plan must be implemented to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.</p>	<p>Prior to the construction of a building or the carrying out of works, including demolition, on land within 50 metres of the gas pipeline easement shown on Plan 2 (Precinct Features) and Plan 12 (Utilities) in the Incorporated Sunbury South Precinct Structure Plan, a Construction Management Plan must be submitted to and approved by the responsible authority. The plan must:</p> <p>☐ Prohibit the use of rippers or horizontal directional drills unless otherwise agreed by the operator of the gas transmission pipeline.</p> <p>☐ Be endorsed by the operator of the gas transmission pipeline where the works are within or crossing the relevant gas transmission easement.</p> <p>☐ Include any other relevant matter to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.</p> <p>The Responsible Authority must be satisfied that the gas transmission pipeline licensee has reviewed and approved the Construction Management Plan.</p> <p>The Construction Management Plan must be implemented to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.</p> <p>The Construction Management Plan may be amended to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.</p>	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
35	DELWP (Integrated Water Management)					

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS35	DELWPIWM1	DELWP strongly support the submissions Hume City Council, Western Water and Melbourne Water are providing to VPA with respect to water servicing infrastructure, IWM, and other supporting comments.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS35	DELWPIWM2	Support incorporating their provided GIS data for water, sewer and alternative water infrastructure into C207 Plans 11 and 12 (page 50 and 52).	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS35	DELWPIWM3	Support adopting comments they have made on the requirements and guidelines listed in 3.5 Integrated Water Management and Utilities (C207 page 51 to 54).	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS35	DELWPIWM4	Support recognizing comments made in other sections on water service interfaces, for example road widths that allow sufficient infrastructure easements, and waterway setbacks.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
36	Jacksons Creek EcoNetwork, Friends of Holden Flora Reserve and Friends of Emu Bottom Wetlands Reserve					
SS36	JCEN1	Strongly support the proposed designation of most of the Jacksons Creek Corridor as RCZ. Also support at Holden Flora Reserve, the addition of adjacent areas of non-urban land, credited open space and areas of regionally significant landscape values, and the exclusion of these from residential development, together with 40m setbacks from the eastern escarpment, and the extent of protection in CA21 adjacent Emu Creek.	Noted.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS36	JCEN2	Holden Flora Reserve - Ownership and/ or Management Responsibility of all surrounding areas designated Conservation or Open Space, needs to be identified as promptly as possible, so as to provide adequate and proper land management, including Pest and Weed control. While it would be ideal that these areas should be incorporated into the current Reserve, it is doubtful that Parks Victoria, the responsible body, has the resources to care for the additional land.	The VPA is continuing to engage with a range of potential public land managers, including Hume City Council, Melbourne Water, the Department of Land, Water, Environment and Planning, and Parks Victoria, around future land management responsibilities for the two creek corridors. Whilst ultimate management responsibilities are outside the scope of what the PSPs can resolve, the VPA acknowledge that this is an important issue, particularly given the status of the Jacksons Creek corridor as a future regional park in Plan Melbourne 2017.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS36	JCEN3	Holden Flora Reserve - It is essential that the new bridge spanning Jacksons Creek within the Holden Reserve provides ample wildlife corridors, not just for Growling Grass frog. A high bridge allowing passage of animals beneath will best cater for needs. The elevated span must be wide enough that animals are not channelled into a trap where they are prey to foxes.	The proposed southern crossing of the Jacksons Creek sits well above the creek, with sufficient clearance to provide ample opportunities for wildlife to move through the valley below.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS36	JCEN4	Holden Flora Reserve - Rope overpasses for possums crossing the road should be considered.	There will be capacity for these to be considered as part of the detailed design of the road and bridge structure. The PSP should not be providing specific direction around this.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS36	JCEN5	The design of the bridge must be sympathetic to the surrounding landscape.	R64 of the exhibited PSP required that the Jacksons Creek Road Crossing must respond sensitively to the landform and amenity of the Jacksons Creek corridor	No	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS36	JCEN6	In the construction of the bridge, disturbance to the environment must be minimized, including disruption to platypus habitat. On completion, restoration must be in sympathy with the surrounding environment and landscape.	The construction of any major transport project is subject to extensive environmental controls, and the construction of the Southern Crossing will be under even closer scrutiny due to its trajectory through the BCS Conservation Area. The protection of the surrounding environment will be of key importance during construction phase.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS36	JCEN7	Holden Flora Reserve - Any lights in the area must be so designed and baffled to prevent light spill and glare. This is described for Conservation area 21 (R56) but apparently not for other susceptible areas. Platypus are particularly susceptible, but other creatures also require dark.	R56 to be updated to also apply to Holden Flora Reserve	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS36	JCEN8	Holden Flora Reserve - To protect already threatened native animals in the area, we advocate a cat ban, or at the least a curfew, in surrounding suburbs. Dogs must also be controlled.	This is not a matter that can be controlled through the Precinct Structure Plan.	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS36	JCEN9	Holden Flora Reserve - "Trees that may be removed" - see Map Plan 8. We oppose removal of any trees, but particularly in Area 47 where many trees provide stability to the banks of both Jacksons and Harpers Creeks. Removal of any of these trees should be avoided. A more nuanced approach to vegetation removal is needed.	Plan 8 will be updated to show trees within the Holden Flora Reserve as 'existing trees to be retained'.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS36	JCEN10	Holden Flora Reserve - Plan stops at Watsons and Diggers Rest side of Holden. Future plans for this southerly extension need to be coordinated with the Sunbury area and to be as sensitive to the needs of Holden Flora Reserve. A similar buffer zone around the Reserve is needed, rather than the present case where private properties abut the creek. Consideration of a wildlife corridor is needed, ultimately as far as Organ Pipes National Park	Whilst it is acknowledged that it is desirable to have a co-ordinated approach to the protection of the reserve, the land to the south of Watsons Road is outside of the Amendment area.	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS36	JCEN11	A last general concern is that if development goes ahead without an urgent upgrade of Sunbury Road, and the provision of a Bypass of Bulla Township, residents of Greater Sunbury will be faced with significantly worse traffic congestion than currently exists, and it won't matter how many roads you build across sensitive areas.	<p>The Bulla Bypass is being actively planned for. VicRoads is currently reviewing the alignment of the Bulla Bypass with the view to applying a Public Acquisition Overlay through a Planning Scheme Amendment shortly.</p> <p>The Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy (exhibited concurrently with this Amendment) has identified the delivery of the southern Jacksons Creek crossing (part of the ultimate Sunbury ring road) as being critical early infrastructure to enable access to the Calder Freeway from new development fronts in the south and east of the township. This will assist in managing congestion issues on Sunbury Road while the larger Bulla Bypass Project is in planning and delivery stages.</p>	No	No action	Unresolved
37	Best Hooper on Behalf of Andraos and Salem Families (Landowners of Properties 2 and 3)					

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS37	ASF1	Request that the VPA amend the alignment of RD-04 to cause it to align with the southern boundary of 175 Vineyard Road, Sunbury, and the road alignment to the overall network be adjusted to accommodate this change. This will enable the land owner to deliver an efficient subdivision layout and avoid the consequential loss of otherwise developable land in the Sunbury South PSP area.	Given topographical constraints to the east of the rail line, it is not considered feasible to realign RD04 such that it straddles the property boundary.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS37	ASF2	Alternatively, if the proposed alignment is not supported by the VPA, it is suggested that the encumbered land for RD-04 be extended to include the restricted parcel as part of the connector road reserve in the land budget. This should include setbacks required to road cut and fill areas and include any small inaccessible or undevelopable areas of land.	In the event that the retarding basin to the south (see below) is able to be moved north to the road, the balance of the parcel south of the road will be included within the encumbered land for RD04, and therefore subject to ICP funding.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS37	ASF3	Alternatively, if neither of the above suggestions are supported by the VPA, the Andraos and Salem Families seek an outcome that results in a public use of the land with a developer credit (such as credited open space).	Melbourne Water would have no in-principle objection to part of this land shown as stormwater quality treatment asset. The submitter is asked to make a submission to the draft Fox Hollow Drive DSS consultation process.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS37	ASF4	The PSP identifies land both sides of the railway line and station as being a “public transport facilities / reserve”. Request that the VPA introduce a public acquisition overlay to this public purpose land, through an additional map being incorporated into the Hume Planning Scheme.	No PAO can be introduced in favour of a government agency without that agency's consent. DEDJTR have advised that they do not wish to have a PAO introduced to land take associated with a future train station, and the site will therefore need to be acquired via negotiation. There is a proposal to trigger any application for subdivision in this location to DEDJTR as a referral authority.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS37	ASF5	The landowner requests that the VPA provides further information regarding the calculation of the pipeline measurement length, including whether a Safety Management Study has been undertaken as required by clause 2.2.4 of the Australian Standards.	The basis for the pipeline measurement length is outlined in the Jacobs servicing report, prepared as an input into the PSP. An SMS is currently underway.	No	No action	Resolved
SS37	ASF6	Plan 2 of the PSP identifies a possible heritage site on 175 Vineyard Road, Sunbury. This is in a different location to the possible heritage site identified in Plans 3 and 5 of the PSP. No heritage site exists on 175 Vineyard Road, Sunbury, nor is such a site identified in the Post-Contact Heritage Assessment prepared by Context Pty Ltd on behalf of the Metropolitan Planning Authority (now VPA). However, a possible heritage site structure was identified for 19-37 Obeid Drive, Sunbury in the Post-Contact Heritage Assessment, and this is reflected in Plan 5 but not Plan 2. The landowners seek confirmation from the VPA that the notation in Plan 2 is an error.	Noted. This is a mapping error and will be corrected in the final version of the PSP.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS37	ASF7	A small section of 165 Vineyard Road, Sunbury has been identified in Plan 5 as having a 15 to 20% slope. This is inconsistent with the slope plan commissioned by Tract Consulting on behalf of the landowner (see submission appendix). It appears that the slope corresponds with a man-made dam on the property that was built prior to 1998. The landowners seek confirmation from the VPA that the geographical data is incorrect.	Agree to amend slope layer to remove the dam.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS37	ASF8	An opportunity exists to activate the future interface with the railway station site when developed. This would include a local convenience centre that services patrons of the railway station. Requests that the Urban Growth Zone - Schedule 9, Section 1 be amended to allow a shop without a planning permit up to a leasable floor area of 850m2. Plan 3 in the PSP should be update to show a local convenience centre adjacent to the railway station on the western boundary.	Agree, subject to confirmation that this is appropriate as part of the preparation of the SMS.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS37	ASF9	Local Park LP-01 is located on the northern boundary of 165 Vineyard Road, Sunbury. While it is recognised that the park location is indicative, to better facilitate delivery of the local park and adjoining lots, the landowner seeks for the park to be relocated approximately 50m to the south.	Agree. Local park location to be changed accordingly	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS37	ASF10	R94, which will be developer funded, is unfairly onerous on the developer and uncertain as to which facilities are “consistent with the type of public open space”. Clarity is sought from the VPA on the facilities that are intended to be consistent with LP-01.	VPA to seek advice from Hume Council and advise further.	No	Further review/discussion required - HCC	Decision pending further review
SS37	ASF11	Plan 13 refers to the intersection of Sunbury Ring Road and Vineyard Road as IN-05, however this appears to be identified as IT05 in Table 10. The landowners seek confirmation from the VPA as to whether this discrepancy is a typographical error.	This is an error. Reference to be changed.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
38	Dominion Property Group on Behalf of Tranteret Pty Ltd (Landowners - 60 Gellies Road)					
SS38	TR3	Request that the approximate 6.5 hectares of land fronting Gellies Road extending back to the 190 metre contour line be identified as “residential” and the balance of the land beyond the 190 metre contour line to the 150 metre contour line which slopes back toward the Emu Creek be identified as “service open space in conservation area”.	Disagree. This land is physically separated from future urban development within the precinct, and residential development in this location will come with significant cost, including the upgrade of the single lane bridge.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS38	TR4	Amend Plan 3 Future Urban Structure to designate the a portion of the subject land as “residential” and delete the reference to “non-urban land (existing)”;	As above.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS38	TR5	Amend Zoning Map No 7 to adjust the zoning of the subject land from RCZ to Part Urban Growth Zone – Schedule 9 (UGZ9) to accord with the 190 metre contour line of the land and Part Rural Conservation Zone (RCZ) to the balance of the land (i.e. land beyond the 190 contour line to the 150 metre contour line which slopes back toward the Emu Creek).	As above.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
39	John and Linda Ware (landowners - 670 Sunbury Road)					
SS39	JLW1	Heritage listed dwelling is shown on the plans but not in the correct location which is about 400 m NW of the location shown.	Noted. This will be shown in the correct location on the final version.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS39	JLW2	There seems to be no explanation of the extension of the GGF area to the north to the hills or south up the steep slope of the valley.	The key objective for Conservation Area 21 is the protection of important populations of Growling Grass Frog and ensuring connectivity between populations within the north-western growth corridor. The boundary of the conservation area has been developed to achieve this objective by protecting key waterways with sufficient buffers that allow for protection and creation of additional breeding habitat with sufficient area for foraging and dispersal between sites.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS39	JLW3	South of the GGFA, there is land that varies from steep to gradual slopes. The steeper section is shown bounded by a "break of slope line" and appears to be identified as "service open space/retarding basin". This land is correctly identified as steep land in the PSP document and unsuitable for residential land. Why this land would be used for service open space/retarding basin is not clear.	Melbourne Water acknowledges that WI-06 is a challenging asset in challenging topography. All stormwater from development must be treated prior to the waterway as a basic Melbourne Water requirement. The asset in this location is required to treat water from land immediately upstream.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS39	JLW4	Seeks explanation of "regionally significant landscape values" on the site. This land will also be affected by drainage works to serve a large area of the PSP. We consider the zoning of this land should be reviewed.	The regionally significant landscape values in this location have been reviewed. Areas remaining have been classified as 'Land not serviced by Development Services Scheme'. The onus will be on any applicant at the subdivision stage to demonstrate that there is a solution that would allow these areas to be developed and drained, to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and Council.	No	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS39	JLW5	The LP36 is understood to be associated with future use of the creek area but the sports reserve AR04 appears to restrict road access and is not best placed for access perhaps partly because of the adjacent RCZ land. If there are changes to zoning as a result of this process, an adjustment to the location of the reserve should be considered.	AR-04 is considered to be generally centrally located within its core catchment - the residential area north of Sunbury Road and east of Lancefield Road. It is accessible via the proposed connector road network. The VPA consider this to be an appropriate location.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS39	JLW6	We have approached MWC, with Hi-Quality, to prepare a drainage strategy that would ultimately be funded and designed by our properties north of Sunbury Road while integrating with drainage south of Sunbury Road. We understand that MWC would be prepared to develop a strategy on that basis for the properties north of Sunbury Road, provided overall drainage objectives are achieved, and will allow design flexibility in delivering those objectives. We accept the proposed drainage paths and treatment locations across our land on understanding that the PSP structure will be modified subject to MWC developing designs and location of works through collaboration with landowners.	Melbourne Water Development Services Schemes are a conceptual layout of drainage and stormwater quality treatment for the catchment. It is standard practice for Melbourne Water to review alternate drainage strategies provided by the landowner/ developer which are developed in accordance with the objectives of the Development Services Scheme (usually at the time of subdivision)	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS39	JLW7	Operations at the Hi-Quality property create noise and dust from machinery operating and reversing and there is occasional blasting during operation. These are clearly perceptible and audible at our house approximately 700 m from the property boundary. We believe that there should be a buffer created to recognise the area where possible residences would be affected and that land should not be zoned for residential use within that area until the activities relocate to the east, change from night and weekend work, or cease.	The VPA is currently working with the Environment Protection Authority to ensure that the controls in the Precinct Structure Plan and Urban Growth Zone Schedule 9 provide adequate protection to both the existing operations at the Hi-Quality site and any future land uses that develop in the precinct. It is not intended that the land within the buffers to the Hi-Quality site will develop for sensitive land uses until such time as it is demonstrated to be appropriate to do so. The work on these controls is ongoing.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
40	Sunbury Community Progress Association					
SS40	SCPA1	Duplicate Lancefield Road to Romsey to ensure traffic doesn't bottle neck at the end of the road.	This is a regional transport issue for VicRoads to consider, however falls outside of the Amendment area so cannot be addressed through this process.	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS40	SCPA2	Jacksons Hill & Goonawarra need alternate roads out of town before construction has started to ease the burden of traffic through Sunbury's CBD.	. Goonawarra is considered to have sufficient connectivity to the surrounding road network, whilst Hume Council and Places Victoria are currently negotiating the provision of a southern connection to Jacksons Hill to address this issue. Whilst this connection is expected to be through the Sunbury South precinct, its provision is not considered to directly relate to the development of the Sunbury South precinct.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS40	SPCA3	Completed Bulla Bypass in early stages of Development to help people get to and from work as well as making it easier for people to gain employment.	The Bulla Bypass is being actively planned for. VicRoads is currently reviewing the alignment of the Bulla Bypass with the view to applying a Public Acquisition Overlay through a Planning Scheme Amendment shortly. The Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy (exhibited concurrently with this Amendment) has identified the delivery of the southern Jacksons Creek crossing (part of the ultimate Sunbury ring road) as being critical early infrastructure to enable access	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS40	SCPA4	CFA / SES and Ambulance Stations will need to be placed in Lancefield Road development early on in the process as our emergency services struggles during peak hour already.	The CFA have provided advice on their future needs to service projected growth in Sunbury. Sites will be identified in the PSPs, however the CFA (and other providers) will ultimately be responsible for purchasing and developing those sites)	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS40	SPCA5	Better bus connections and more frequent services to cope with the future demand.	The PSPs will provide for bus capable roads to be constructed within walking distance of all new residential areas. The bus routes and timetabling will be a matter for PTV (TfV) to address as the demand is required.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS40	SPCA6	Better train services during the day as it is currently 40 minute waits and more people will need to get to the city during the day.	Noted. The PTV Network Development Plan defines improvement to services in the Sunbury area.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS40	SPCA7	The possibility of Park and Ride to the train station in Sunbury - Will ease the traffic burden in Sunbury's CBD.	The VPA has worked with PTV to identify the necessary land take that will be required to deliver a railway station in Sunbury South. The land take that has been identified for this railway station will enable the delivery of 1000 car parking spaces, to assist with easing the pressure around the station in Sunbury CBD.	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS40	SPCA8	Better Public Transport parking during early stages (before the new train stations are built) as it is impossible to get parking in the morning.	The PSPs will provide for bus capable roads to be constructed within walking distance of all new residential areas.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS40	SPCA9	Better bus connections to facilities throughout Hume (Craigieburn & Broadmeadows).	The PSPs will provide for bus capable roads to be constructed within walking distance of all new residential areas. The bus routes and timetabling will be a matter for PTV (TfV) to address as the demand is required.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS40	SPCA10	Better Youth Services - Sunbury's Youth Centre is hardly open and with the added pressures of the new families will make it incredibly hard to sustain the growth in youth.	This is a matter for Hume City Council, who have received copies of all submissions. The PSPs makes provisions for (and funds through the ICP) community centres in which these services can operate, however cannot provide for the services themselves.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS40	SPCA11	Ensuring that the VPA and appropriate departments liaise with the Wurundjeri Community to ensure no Aboriginal Land or artefacts are destroyed in the development.	The VPA has been engaged with the Wurundjeri throughout the development of the PSPs, and has their support for the Future Urban Structure. The Precinct Structure Plans do not exempt developers from their requirements and obligations under the Aboriginal Heritage Act.	No	No action	Unresolved
41	Urban Design and Management obo SG Galdes (landowner - 65 Watsons Road - Property 32)					
SS41	SGG1	65 Watsons Road - Question the size of the land requirements for both the linear drainage reserves as well as the size of the proposed Retarding Basins.	Melbourne Water's updated drainage scheme has involved a significant reduction in stormwater quality treatment assets on the subject property. Please review the latest preliminary Development Services Scheme which was sent to all landowners.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS41	SGG2	Whilst we understand that the Melbourne Water Development Services Scheme is still under preparation, it makes it difficult to review and comment on the proposed basin sizing. In particular, WI-34 will be picking up a catchment that predominantly contains land outside of the UGB to the south of Watsons Road.	There have been significant updates to the location of assets in the latest preliminary Development Services Scheme. Melbourne Water asks the submitter review the latest plan which was sent to all landowners.	Yes	No action	Resolved
SS41	SGG3	LP-07 - The 0.25ha appears to be superfluous in this location when open space needs can be accommodated in adjacent linear open spaces. It may make more sense to combine LP-07 and LP-08 by shifting LP-08 slightly to the north-west, where it would more suitably serve the future residential catchment.	Disagree. LP-07 is a small local open space node to provide some capacity to deliver local amenities adjacent to the creek corridor. It's function is different to LP-08 which provides more of a traditional neighbourhood park function.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS41	SGG4	The area shown as having landscape values on property #32 - It is unclear why there is additional land designated on the subject site as areas of 'landscape value' when it has not been denoted as a feature in the site analysis process. Given the additional impact this has on developable area, we suggest that this designation should be reviewed. It would be useful to understand the methodology behind the designation of land with 'landscape value' for this site, given the site's location in relation to areas of high landscape value such as Harpers Creek.	The regionally significant landscape values in this location have been reviewed. Areas remaining have been classified as 'Land not serviced by Development Services Scheme'. The onus will be on any applicant at the subdivision stage to demonstrate that there is a solution that would allow these areas to be developed and drained, to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and Council.	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
42	Bart Simes (Sunbury resident)					

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS42	BS1	Has provided the "Ingredients of a city's Liveability & Appeal" and applied it to the Sunbury Township. Based on Essential Infrastructure - Vocational Education and Training - Social Infrastructure - Community - Economic Engine.	Noted.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS42	BS2	Essential Infrastructure - Sunbury already suffers from inadequate essential infrastructure. Some examples where focus is required include: 1. Hospital with Emergency Room and Maternity Ward is needed.	This is outside the scope of what can be delivered through a Precinct Structure Plan. The Lancefield Road PSP does nominate land that can be used for a future hospital or TAFE, however cannot mandate the development of such a facility.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS42	BS4	2. Storm water drainage: Many of the open spoon drains around Sunbury are eroded and have become unsightly, unsafe and have compromised road and footpath integrity.	Noted. This is a matter for Hume City Council. Please note that roads within the new development area are required to be in accordance with the cross-sections provided within the PSPs, and should avoid this type of issue happening within the new development areas.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS42	BS5	3. Road and intersection congestion: Many upgrades are required to address both safety and efficiency - such as the Bulla bypass, Gap Road rail crossing etc.	The Bulla Bypass is being actively planned for. VicRoads is currently reviewing the alignment of the Bulla Bypass with the view to applying a Public Acquisition Overlay through a Planning Scheme Amendment shortly. The Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy (exhibited concurrently with this Amendment) has identified the delivery of the southern Jacksons Creek crossing (part of the ultimate Sunbury ring road) as being critical early infrastructure to enable access to the Calder Freeway from new development fronts in the south and east of the township. This will assist in managing congestion issues on Sunbury Road while the larger Bulla Bypass Project is in planning and delivery stages.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS42	BS6	4. Parking: This is particularly an issue at Sunbury Train Station and already showing signs of becoming an issue at Sunbury Square and on Evens and O'Shannassy Streets.	The VPA has worked with PTV to identify the necessary land take that will be required to deliver a railway station in Sunbury South. The land take that has been identified for this railway station will enable the delivery of 1000 car parking spaces, to assist with easing the pressure around the station in Sunbury CBD.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS42	BS7	Vocational Education and Training - Sunbury should already have a TAFE and a University. It will definitely need each if the plan is to grow to 80,000 within a decade or two.	The Lancefield Road PSP has provision of land for a potential TAFE / Hospital. The delivery of these land uses is beyond the scope of the PSP.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS42	BS8	Social Infrastructure - 1. Keeping the country landscape: Each dwelling should have a back yard and there should be multiple expansive parklands and water ways embedded within each suburb so that the next generation are part of the environment. Areas of historical or natural significance should be preserved and their beauty leveraged with observation decks, walkways and bike tracks.	The PSP protects the areas of historical and natural significance, and also makes provision for walkways and bike tracks, particularly along the Jacksons and Emu creek corridors. The two PSPs set aside of 1300ha for waterways, open space, conservation areas and local parks. Where the General Residential Zone applies to land within the precincts, all lots over 400sqm will be required to comply with minimum garden area requirements, which will ensure the provision of backyards.	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS42	BS9	2. Keeping the community together: At the heart of any tightknit community is its ability to socially intermingle. Outdoor markets and eating/drinking with entertainment play a vital role here and are synonymous with country living. Infrastructure should be developed (perhaps within the park designs) to accommodate regular such events.	The PSPs provide for significant areas of public open space, including the provision of town squares within the town centres. Whilst the details of the park designs will be a matter for Hume Council and the developers at the time of park development, it is anticipated that they will facilitate a range of spaces to enable different activities.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS42	BS10	3. Water activities: Examples include musical fountains, water cannons, slip 'n sides, kayak hire etc. Such things could again be integrated into park designs.	As per response to BS8 above. This is outside of the scope of the PSP.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS42	BS11	Leveraging things of historical or natural significance: Underutilized historical and natural attributes of Sunbury include: Emu Bottom homestead (the oldest in Victoria), the Platypus reserve, the birthplace of the Ashes, the Sunbury Rock Festival from the 1970's, Mad Max 1, the Asylum (the mothballed Victoria University site) and the Kangaroos and general wildlife. These things should be integrated into Sunbury parks and architecture in order to preserve history and strengthen the town's brand.	The PSP does contain guidelines (refer G8 and G9 on page 16) around the need to preserve heritage sites as part of urban development, and where possible, integrate the heritage sites through adaptive re-use.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS42	BS12	Community - Sunbury still maintains a reasonably high level of community-spirit. This is due primarily to its relatively small population size. However, growth often leads to individualism, and therefore a decay in the sense of community - unless of course care is placed on the development, execution and upkeep of the other four vital attributes to improving Liveability & Appeal as discussed in this paper.	Noted. This is a comment only, and no specific change to the PSP has been requested.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS42	BS13	Economic Engine - Suggests increasing professional opportunities in Sunbury. Clear long-term planning signals to developers, businesses and workers is a start, but financial incentives (largely land grants and tax relief (State and Federal)) are necessary in order to attract the big players.	Noted. Whilst the intent is supported by the VPA, this is outside the scope of what can be achieved through this amendment.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
43	Penny Murphy (adjacent resident - Harker St)					
SS43	PM1	Harker Street Residential Concept Plan - The proposed high density development is incongruous with the exiting housing (old and newer) and will demean the aesthetic value of the landscape. The development of 17 blocks of 400-500sqm2 would be high density development, leading to issues of site coverage, overlooking, inadequate private open space and diminished property values of existing housing and the surrounding landscape. Questions the positioning of the blocks, as one is parallel to Harker Street, which will lead to locals be looking at a side fence as they drive down the street (undesirable).	Planning policy generally supports the provision of a range of block sizes to support housing diversity. Nevertheless, the revised concept plan will provide for a larger block size outcome, consistent with the surrounding subdivision character, given the relative constraints associated with the site.	No	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS43	PM2	Suggested Alternative 1 (preferred): Extension of the Open Space adjoining the RCZ	The area has been included in the urban growth boundary, and is not considered to perform a strategic open space function. Some form of urban development that sensitively responds to the landscape and character of the area.	Yes	No action	Unresolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS43	PM3	<p>Suggested Alternative 2: Incorporation of low density housing as per alternate Harker Street Residential Concept Plan.</p> <p>Some ULC key siting and design aspects which are applicable to the adjacent developed sites along Harker Street are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blocks are greater than 1000 square metres in size</li> <li>• Minimum set-back requirements for construction - 7.5m from front of site</li> <li>• Maximum construction coverage of site 55%</li> <li>• Minimum house size of 195m sq.</li> </ul>	Whilst these design requirements have not been specifically addressed in the revised concept plan for the area, and it would be inappropriate to apply all of these requirements through planning controls, it is considered that the updated concept plan provides for greater consistency with the existing subdivision character of the area.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS43	PM5	<p>Sunbury township concerns - Initial development of the Sunbury South Precinct is to be supported by the existing Sunbury township, placing additional strain on the already at-capacity resources available, particularly retail parking.</p> <p>Suggested action: Prioritise the construction of the Sunbury South Shopping Centre</p>	Whilst the timing of development of the Sunbury South Major Town Centre is to be ultimately determined by the landowner / developer, the Victorian Planning Authority supports the early development of this centre. It is understood that this centre is likely to be the earliest to be delivered in the precinct.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS43	PM6	Bring forward the construction of the Sunbury Ring Road to permit Sunbury South residents access to Diggers Rest Station and the Calder Freeway.	The Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy (exhibited as a background document with the Amendment) and the Precinct Infrastructure Plan at Plan 10 of the ICP identify that the early infrastructure priorities will deal directly with the need to provide a critical connection with the Sunbury regional road network, with the key items forming a second Jacksons Creek crossing as part of the future ring road.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS43	PM7	Liaise with Vic Roads with a view to bringing forward the construction of the Bulla bypass.	<p>The Bulla Bypass is being actively planned for. VicRoads is currently reviewing the alignment of the Bulla Bypass with the view to applying a Public Acquisition Overlay through a Planning Scheme Amendment shortly.</p> <p>The Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy (exhibited concurrently with this Amendment) has identified the delivery of the southern Jacksons Creek crossing (part of the ultimate Sunbury ring road) as being critical early infrastructure to enable access to the Calder Freeway from new development fronts in the south and east of the township. This will assist in managing congestion issues on Sunbury Road while the larger Bulla Bypass Project is in planning and delivery stages.</p>	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS43	PM8	Bring forward the construction of the Sunbury South Train Station or work with Hume City Council to construct additional parking at both Sunbury and Diggers Rest stations as an interim measure.	<p>The VPA has worked with PTV to identify the necessary land take that will be required to deliver a railway station in Sunbury South. The land take that has been identified for this railway station will enable the delivery of 1000 car parking spaces, to assist with easing the pressure around the station in Sunbury CBD.</p> <p>Existing issues in the town centre, including access and car parking provision, are best dealt with as part of a project with a more specific focus on the town centre itself, which would likely be managed by Hume City Council.</p>	Yes	No action	Unresolved
44	Taylors OBO Asia-Pacific Property Pty Ltd (Landowners 35-60 Fox Hollow Drive)					

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS44	APP1	We support the use of the Urban Growth Zone – Schedule 9 (UGZ9), Rural Conservation Zone (RCZ) and the continued use of the Urban Floodway Zone (UFZ) via the Incorporated Plan Overlay – Schedule 4 (IPO4); however, we object to the location / extent of each of the zones. The UFZ is not precise and does not match the content of the PSP and should be amended accordingly. By extension, we say that the IPO4 in the same location needs to be amended to reflect the final UFZ extents.	The current UFZ has been located over Harpers Creek, there was no proposed change to the UFZ in the exhibited Sunbury South PSP. Melbourne Water would not support a fragmented review of the UFZ alignment on each property. Melbourne Water's preference is for all landowners along the UFZ alignment to be consulted on the proposal prior to any change. Melbourne Water would support this consultation occurring through the planning panel process	Yes	Further review/discussion required - Melbourne Water	Decision pending further review
SS44	APP2	The interface between the UGZ9 and the RCZ in the north eastern portion of the site appears to be clumsy and needs to be adjusted so that they abut without leaving gaps, or overlapping the RCZ onto our land.	Updated information has been provided around 'potentially developable areas', which would require a locally responsive drainage solution.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS44	APP3	UGZ9 - Clause 3.3 – Environmental Site Assessment. Clarification is sought as to why a detailed site investigation is required in relation to the property at 37 Fox Hollow Drive.	<p>The Land Capability Assessment which informed the PSPs states that: 37 Fox Hollow Drive has had some cut and fill and stockpiles are also present on 45 Fox Hollow Drive. The stockpiles all appear to originate from the site therefore do not pose a risk of unknown imported fill, however if these properties are to be redeveloped, the stockpiled soil will need to be managed appropriately. Also note due to the sodic nature of some of the soil it may not be suitable for use as topsoil.</p> <p>The report identifies the property as a Medium Risk due to stockpiles of soil from onsite excavations, and recommends sampling and analysis of any topsoil to be removed off site as per EPA Publication IWRG621 to confirm if soil is clean fill or otherwise.</p>	Yes	No action	Resolved
SS44	APP4	UGZ9 - Clause 4.8 – Clarification is sought with respect to requirement of a S173 Agreement for Conservation Area 21. It is understood that where this land is vested with a relevant statutory authority, entering into a S173 Agreement would not be required. Confirmation is sought in this regard.	This interpretation is correct.	No	No action	Resolved
SS44	APP5	The PSP identifies a number of areas within the subject land as 'Regionally Significant Landscape Values.' To date, there appears to be no strategic justification as to the inclusion of large tracts of land within this area (as generally identified below). While it is acknowledged that part of this land is subject to slope – this is not considered prohibitive or precluding of development within these areas. It is submitted that the designation should be removed from my client's land as it has no strategic justification and there is nothing of significance located on the land.	The regionally significant landscape values in this location have been reviewed. Areas remaining have been classified as 'Land not serviced by Development Services Scheme'. The onus will be on any applicant at the subdivision stage to demonstrate that there is a solution that would allow these areas to be developed and drained, to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and Council.	No	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS44	APP6	Coupled with the designation of this land as being subject to varying landscape values, is the requirement of development setbacks in accordance with the cross-sections included within the PSP. While we are supportive of the VPA preparing a range of cross-sections to respond to a variety of situations, the required setbacks seem to be unnecessarily onerous and would almost render development impossible in some areas once a road has been delivered.	The VPA is undergoing a task of reviewing the application of the setbacks following submissions. Further detail will be provided on this, and how it affects your clients land, as part of the VPAs Part B submission to Panel	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS44	APP7	Accordingly, the cross-section ‘Regionally Significant Landscape: Escarpment top – visually sensitive’ should either be deleted from the PSP or from our client’s land and the ‘Regionally Significant Landscape: Escarpment top – non visually sensitive’ utilised in lieu. This cross-section allows for appropriate buffers and opportunities for revegetation. When considered in context of the separation required by the creek and other buffer areas, the latter cross-section will still allow for more than reasonable view lines into the site and does not represent a poor amenity outcome.	As per response above.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS44	APP8	Fox Hollow Drive currently terminates via a court-head which is formally part of an existing road reserve. A new north-south connector street is to be delivered which generally follows the (existing) alignment of Fox Hollow Drive before deviating to connect into the east-west boulevard. The alignment should be amended to utilise the existing road reserve to match into the proposed boulevard.	Agree. Further discussion within submitter resulted in the preparation of an appropriate engineering design from the that demonstrates the capacity to do so with a safe intersection to the Southern Link.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS44	APP9	While we are generally supportive of the stormwater planning provided in MW’s DSS and the PSP, the following issued are identified for further investigation: 1) It’s understood the large area set aside below WI-27 (the bowl) includes an area specifically intended for Growling Grass Frog (GGF) habitat. Any GGF habitat will need to be supported by stormwater infrastructure because treated stormwater is the only feasible means of sustaining suitably stable water levels in the ponds. The bowl is also the natural outfall for planned upstream development. It is requested the VPA facilitate acknowledgement and support from any relevant stakeholders for essential stormwater works to be undertaken within the area. 2) Request that treatment wetland WI-27 be moved into the ‘bowl’ to provide extended foraging habitat for GGF’s.	Melbourne Water has advised the submitter that stormwater quality treatment assets have not been located within the area specified due to the presence of the Growling Grass Frog Conservation Area and the associated DELWP and Commonwealth management obligations for this Conservation Area. If DELWP indicated their preference for a stormwater treatment wetland within this area, Melbourne Water would assess the proposal with regards to ability to achieve the drainage scheme objectives.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS44	APP10	Drainage outfall for asset WI-26 will be challenging due to the significant cost and undetermined feasibility of an outfall down the escarpment to Jacksons Creek to serve this small catchment. At this scale, the most feasible treatment solution would be bio-retention; including a permanently submerged drainage layer to assist the perseverance of soil moisture in this dry climate. Subject to further investigation, it may be more appropriate to allow to drainage back to WI-25 and negate the need for WI-26.	Melbourne Water has undertaken extensive background investigations and acknowledges that WI-26 is located in challenging topography. Alternative treatments can be considered in the future (subject to functional design) but would need to meet the objectives of the Development Services Scheme (DSS). A drainage outfall will be required to Jacksons Creek and the steep topography means that it is not practical to drain this area back to WI-25.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS44	APP11	The cross-section for the ‘Connector Boulevard’ is considered excessive to facilitate only two lanes of traffic. While we are supportive a high-quality streetscape outcome, an alternative, such as the ‘Connector Road’ cross-section should be considered.	A Boulevard Connector cross section has been used to provide the capacity required based on modelled volumes (approx 14,000vpd). A slightly wider cross section than typical has been provided to preserve theoretical capacity for duplication in the ultimate as a contingency. A standard connector road cross section will not provide the required capacity.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS44	APP12	The alignment of the east-west boulevard between the Harpers Creek and Jacksons Creek crossing needs to be amended. The current alignment creates inefficient areas of land between conservation areas and the road reserve and would not deliver an orderly and efficient planning outcome. An alternative alignment is provided below for consideration that is similar to the exhibited version. This alignment will be shown to be far more appropriate than the exhibited alignment as it will create efficiencies in design and lead to a far more orderly urban form than the exhibited version. The exhibited version appears to have not been put through any sort of design rigour (which to a degree is understandable), which leads one to the conclusion that our version should be preferred:	Agree. Further discussion within submitter resulted in the preparation of an appropriate engineering design from the that demonstrates the capacity to realign the road without adding significantly to cost	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS44	APP13	'Figure 3 – Harpers Creek Residential Concept Plan' identifies a 'local access opportunity' to the existing Jacksons Hill residential estate to the north (see below). While there is an existing tree reserve that separates the subject land from the estate, it is requested the PSP be updated to reflect a 'local access street' to avoid ambiguity and ensure that a local connection can be delivered.	Agree. Concept Plan is currently being reviewed, and will be revised to show breaks in the tree reserve to provide for local access street connectivity.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS44	APP14	The figure should also be updated to provide an access opportunity along the western boundary of our site into the east-west boulevard (see above) and to rationalise the draft subdivision layout that could be delivered across multiple landholdings. While indicative, the angled roads are not likely to be delivered via individual permit processes. We have examined the land in detail where our road access is proposed and there is ample room and a flat topography where we propose the road. There is no physical, ecological or traffic reason why this connection should not be provided and in fact there are many reasons why it	Currently assessing the capacity for this as part of the Harpers Creek concept plan review	Yes		
45	Spiire OBO RCL Group (Affected Landowner)					
SS45	RCL1	Request provision for left-in / left-out vehicle access between the RCL land and Sunbury Road.	After discussions with VicRoads, the VPA has determined that it is inappropriate for the PSP to show provision of Left-in / left-out access points to local roads. These will be negotiated with VicRoads as part of development discussions, noting that VicRoads will not unduly restrict access to land parcels.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS45	RCL2	Request Plan 3 of the PSP and Section 3.9 and Map 1 of the UGZ9 be amended by reducing the distance of the "composting facility odour buffer" from 1.3 kilometres to 600m based on an Odour Assessment provided to Council in 2011.	There is currently odour testing and analysis being undertaken which will inform a revised 'directional buffer' to the facility, based on local conditions. The extent of this buffer is not yet known, however all affected landowners will be advised of the outcome of this work prior to the Panel hearing.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS45	RCL3	Amend the Legend of Plan 3 and Plan 11 of the SSPSP by adding the words “(indicative location only)” immediately after “retarding basin”.	Melbourne Water understands the intent of this note is to reinforce the flexibility in the implementation of the PSP & DSS. Melbourne Water believe this wording is unnecessary because other landowners have raised issues with the word 'indicative'. Melbourne Water would be open to wording to provide flexibility in the DSS concept which was agreed with landowners during the panel process	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS45	RCL4	Continue to investigate and support opportunities to co-locate drainage assets, roads and other infrastructure and assets within the transmission line easement.	This submission has been provided to Melbourne Water for their consideration.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS45	RCL5	Add a Guideline to the PSP which positively supports the co-location of infrastructure within the electrical easement.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS45	RCL6	Add a further note to the ‘Interface with High Voltage Transmission Line’ cross section supporting the inclusion of roads, paths, utility installations and other infrastructure within the transmission line easement in appropriate circumstances	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS45	RCL7	Preliminary conversations between RCL Group and SP AusNet have identified that SP AusNet has no ‘in principal’ objection to the co-location of assets within the transmission line easement. The opportunity to locate additional utility installations within the transmission easement should be explored, including as much of the proposed retarding basin as possible as well as paths and roads. We are currently undertaking additional investigations with various authorities to identify additional infrastructure co-location opportunities and request to be involved in further conversations between the VPA, Council and SP AusNet to maximise the efficient use of this extensive area of land.	Noted. The VPA would appreciate a copy of any correspondence from SP AusNet to this effect.	No	No action	Awaiting response from submitter
SS45	RCL8	The PSP should provide further explanation and details regarding ‘break of slope’ including how this important point of reference can be precisely located on any particular parcel of land.	The break of slope will not be shown on the Future Urban Structure in the PSP going forward, and any reference to it in Requirements or Guidelines will be amended.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS45	RCL9	Submit that the required setbacks from the ‘break of slope’ are excessive and that existing visual and landscape qualities of the Jacksons Creek corridor can be appropriately preserved with a less onerous interface treatment. Request Review and reduce the setback distances that are required in relation to ‘sensitive interfaces’.	The VPA is undergoing a task of reviewing the application of the setbacks following submissions. Further detail will be provided on this, and how it affects your clients land, as part of the VPAs Part B submission to Panel	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS45	RCL10	Shift LP31 westwards so that all future abutting streets and facing houses are located on Property 71 so that the area surrounding the park (including abutting streets and fronting houses) can be designed and developed in a coordinated and holistic way.	The location of the park is proposed be moved to be slightly off the western boundary of 605 Sunbury Road to encourage the park to be developed holistically with surrounding residential development.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS45	RCL11	Delete LP30 (preferred outcome) OR Shift LP30 westwards so that the entire park and all future abutting streets and facing houses are located on Property 71. It is not clear what the intended purpose or practical value of this particular park is given its minimal size and its position immediately adjacent to an already extensive area of open space (Jacksons Creek Conservation Area).	The smaller local open space node adjacent to the conservation reserve will be moved slightly east, to be wholly on 605 Sunbury Road.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS45	RCL12	Confirm that the “proposed sewer pump station” that is located on the RCL land (refer to PSP Plan 12) is to be provided within the 9.16h of land nominated as “waterway and drainage reserve”.	To be confirmed - with Western Water.	No	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS45	RCL13	Review and amend the cross-section on page 80 of the PSP so that the total cross section width (shown as 16.0m) is equal to the sum of its component parts (currently 17.0m).	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS45	RCL14	GTA Comments - Section 3.1.3, item R9, identifies suitable walking catchment distances to key trip generators and destinations. However, of the key trip generators and destinations there is no guidance in the draft PSP on the Principle Public Transport Network extent. As such, the public transport network should be provided, including whether it forms part of 605 Sunbury Road, so no missing opportunities occur during any interim arrangements as this and other properties within the PSP area is developed.	Further review required.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS45	RCL15	Section 3.1.3, item R15, sets out the priority order for what elements lots should front. The order is generally agreed, except with local access streets, which is recommended to have a higher priority to the various types of reserves, as reserves can be activated and have passive surveillance through other measures.	Disagree. Public reserves/spaces should be priorities over local streets ffor frontage, particularly as they will often have only one potential frontage interface, whilst local streets could typically always support two	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS45	RCL16	Specific to the two local parks partially within and fronting 605 Sunbury Road, the following recommendations are made: - For the local park partially within 605 Sunbury Road (LP-30), it have the shared path within the conservation area to the south connect with the local park - For the local park along the western boundary of 605 Sunbury Road (LP-31), it either be located adjacent to one of the proposed connector level roads with bicycle facilities in Plan 9, or there be another connector road with bicycle facilities extending from the proposed network into 605 Sunbury Road (the potential need for a connector road within 605 Sunbury Road is discussed further below).	-LP-30 is a 0.25ha local park to provide some basic local park amenities on the escarpment edge. These nodes are located at points along the creek escarpments, and are of limited site given the capacity to leverage off the open space provided by the creek valleys. VPA propose to retain this, but move it wholly within the subject property, for ease of delivery. -LP-31 will be moved from the property boundary as requested, such that development frontage to the park will be wholly within the property to the west	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS45	RCL17	Section 3.3.1, item R46, requires lots fronting open space to have a primary point of access. Clarification of what a primary point of access and need for each fronting lot to provide them is requested, as this is may reduce the amenity of at least the small local parks, such as those partially within and fronting 605 Sunbury Road.	Further review required.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS45	RCL18	Section 3.3.1, item G51, identifies that all path networks associated with open space should include wayfinding signage. It is recommended that a standard suite of wayfinding signage for the PSP be identified / developed to avoid a piece-meal set of wayfinding signage being implemented.	This is beyond the scope of the PSP as it is a high level strategic planning document.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS45	RCL19	Figure 8, 9 & 10, set out the proposed shared path network within the conservation area along the creek networks in the PSP, including the southern boundary of 605 Sunbury Road. It is unclear what type of paths these will be (i.e. concrete, asphalt or crushed gravel), or if the alignments are set and what grades should be applied, as they currently cross many contour lines and could potentially require significant earth works, graded banks and/or retaining walls to implement them within what is a very sensitive environment that we should be minimising disturbances in. As such, further guidance on how these shared paths should be provided as part of the PSP.	It is not expected that the shared path network within the conservation areas will necessarily be delivered by developers through subdivisional works. Concept Plans will be updated to include a notation that the proposed shared path network is indicative only	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS45	RCL20	It is recommended that a left-in / left-out access point from 605 Sunbury Road to Sunbury Road be provided. In addition, a connector road from this access point to Sunbury Road be provided, which could well extend into the property a suitable distance before travelling west into the adjacent property to align with the local park along the western frontage of 605 Sunbury Road, and connect with the proposed connector road network in Plan 9 further to the west.	Further details required in relation to strategic transport justification	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS45	RCL21	Section 3.4.1, item R59, sets a requirement that 30% of local streets have alternative cross-sections to those provided in Appendix 4.2. Moreover, it goes on to indicate that the carriageway dimensions and road reserve widths should be consistent with the cross sections in Appendix 4.2, so can only change the nature strip and path components. As such, this 30% requirement doesn't seem reasonable and should be removed.	In response to other submissions, the 30% requirement is proposed to be modified such that it becomes a guideline	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS45	RCL22	Section 3.4.2, item R75, identifies that the bicycle parking facilities should include wayfinding signage. It is recommended that a standard suite of wayfinding signage for the PSP be identified / developed to avoid a piece-meal set of wayfinding signage being implemented.	This is beyond the scope of the PSP as it is a high level strategic planning document.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS45	RCL23	Section 3.6.3, item R93, requires traffic management measures along arterial roads to be provided as part of a subdivision, yet there are no specific projects that relate to this in Plan 13 or Table 10. As such, it is not clear what these traffic management measures would be as part of a subdivision, so should be removed from the PSP. If however they are known, and given the shared use of the arterial road network, they should be provided through the ICP.	This may include traffic management measures required on existing arterials to provide for local access. It is appropriate that this requirement remains within the PSP	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS45	RCL24	Section 3.6.3, item R93, requires street lighting along arterial roads to be provided as part of a subdivision. It is recommended that these be provided through the ICP, like those included as part of the proposed signalised intersections, given the shared use of the arterial road network.	The arterial road network cannot be improved through the ICP, given that within the precinct the arterial road network is a declared, state road network	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS45	RCL25	Plan 13 & Table 10, sets out the precinct infrastructure items. It is noted that the intersection codes on Plan 13 (i.e. 'IN' suffix) do not align with the intersection codes in Table 10 (i.e. 'IT' suffix).	This will be amended to be consistent in the final version.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS45	RCL26	Appendix 4.2, Arterial Road Cross Sections, do not give consideration / allowance to accommodate left-turn lanes. It is also recommended that the speed limits along the arterial roads within the PSP be indicated and when they will be changed from their current 100km/h as they will impact the design of the intersections along them.	The speed limit assumptions around the arterial network are set out in the detailed infrastructure designs. It is not appropriate to include these within the PSP. The arterial road cross sections are currently being reviewed	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS45	RCL27	Appendix 4.2, Connector Road Residential (25m) Cross Sections, includes a 2.1m wide parking bay. If along a bus route parking bays are typically required to be 2.3m wide by PTV.	VPA to confirm with TfV, although no concerns around these cross sections were set out in their submission	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS45	RCL28	Appendix 4.2, Shared & Pedestrian Path are located hard up against property boundaries in many cross-sections. It is recommended that suitable off-sets be provided to enable suitable sight lines, or vehicle access points be restricted along these frontages.	Shared path is only located against property boundaries on Watsons Road, given road reservation constraints. Capacity to review the cross section to determine whether a set back in existing parcels is possible to avoid this potential conflict	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
46	Taylors OBO Dr Mahinda and Mrs Charmaine Samaratna - owners 705 Sunbury Road (Affected Landowners)					
SS46	MCS1	We support the use of the UGZ9 and the designation of the land into the Residential Growth Zone.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS46	MCS2	Seeks a designation on that triangular parcel that recognises the opportunity to provide for a Medical Centre/Day Hospital and/or other non-retail / non-residential uses, perhaps in combination with residential development.	The VPA consider that these uses are more appropriately located within the Major Town Centre which is approximately 1km from the site. Should the land owner wish to develop a small medical centre at the site, a small medical centre of under 250sqm is allowable without a permit under the applied residential zones, or a larger facility with a planning permit. Given the potential off-site amenity impacts of a larger medical facility, the VPA do not consider it appropriate to permit-exempt this use within a residential zone.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS46	MCS3	It is submitted that medical facilities should be maximised wherever possible. This location, on an arterial / boulevard connector intersection, as part of an island site, on land designated Residential Growth Zone (where a 250m2 medical centre is a Section 1 use) is suitable for such a designation.	As per response to MCS2 above, the VPA consider that larger medical facilities are more appropriately placed within town centres.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS46	MCS4	Seeks clarification on the acquisition of the land in relation to the boulevard connector, the timing of such acquisition and who will be responsible for the road's delivery. To this end, we seek discussions with the VPA and Council so that a firm understanding can be reached on these matters.	This is largely a post-PSP implementation issue. The project is identified as a S-M term priority, and will be the responsibility of Hume City Council. Negotiations in relation to the potential for WIK delivery of this project will occur post PSP	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS46	MCS5	Questions the size of WI-12 (3.62ha in total, 2.03ha on submitters site) and believes that it may be oversized in relation to the land and the catchment it serves. The proposed wetland location as nominated in the PSP will require significant earthworks due to the natural topography. It is recommended the scheme be reviewed to explore opportunities to consolidate drainage assets.	Melbourne Water has designed this asset to treat stormwater to best practice (using industry standards). The conceptual design also includes provision for sediment dry-out area, 'safe' batter slopes and other Melbourne Water requirements. These can be found in the 'Constructed Wetland Design Manual'.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS46	MCS7	A more equitable distribution of the wetlands would be to increase WI-06 and WI-09 and direct more catchment to these wetlands so as to reduce WI-10 & WI-11 and combining WI-12 on the north-east side of Sunbury Road. A reduced WI-12 would result in an opportunity to reduce the burden on 705 Sunbury Road which is heavily impacted beyond an equitable level.	Melbourne Water does not support the proposed change. In the preliminary DSS which was sent to landowners, WI-06 is conceptually designed as a sediment treatment only. This is because of the challenging topography in this area.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
47	Echelon OBO of McKenzie Family - 525 Sunbury Road (adjoining Landowners)					
SS47	MF1	The western boundary of 525 Sunbury Road will adjoin urban development and the site will also ultimately be bisected by the Outer Metropolitan Ring Road. The combined impact of this will mean that the property will no longer be viable for agricultural purposes. For these reasons the site should be included within the UGB.	Changing the Urban Growth Boundary is initiated by the Government of the day and requires ratification from both the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council (i.e. both houses of the Parliament of Victoria). This request is outside of the VPA's scope. The last review of the Urban Growth Boundary occurred in 2011/12. Please refer to the Logical Inclusions Advisory Committee Report dated November 2011 for more information and can be accessed via <a href="http://www.austlii.edu.au">www.austlii.edu.au</a> .	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS47	MF2	<p>The viability of the current farming operation has been supplemented in recent years by the landowners undertaking cropping and contract work on a number of large properties within the surrounding area. A significant portion of the land that is currently being cropped is included within the Sunbury South and Lancefield Road PSP and these areas will therefore no longer be available for agricultural purposes. This will severely impact upon the financial viability of our client's current farming operations.</p> <p>When urban development occurs adjoining agricultural use, there are a number of interface issues and amenity consideration that typically result in placing limitations on the farming operations, i.e. the use of agricultural chemicals and fertilisers, scatter guns and fire arms for pest control. These impacts will also significantly limit the future viability of the existing farming operations.</p>	Noted, however as stated in response to MF1, it is outside of the scope of the PSP to rezone the land. The PSP will be amended in ways (outlined in responses below) to limit the impact of the urban development encroaching upon the farming practices.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS47	MF4	We note R18 requires ‘Any subdivision abutting a ‘fire threat edge’ as defined on Plan 5 must be designed to minimise the impact of potential bushfires...”. Although Plan 5 does not include our clients site as a ‘fire threat edge,’ our client submits that should any fire breaks be required for urban development adjoining our clients site’s western edge, setbacks and fire breaks are to be provided within the PSP area itself and are not to be provided within the client’s site. We seek confirmation that this will be the case.	The VPA has been advised that any bushfire measures to be implemented would be to occur within the PSP area, and would likely be through a requisite higher BAL rating on houses abutting the electricity easement (the edge of the bushfire threat).	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS47	MF5	The PSP proposes that Sunbury Road will ultimately be upgraded to a 6 lane, primary arterial road. Our client seeks confirmation that the existing access to and from the property for large agricultural equipment will be protected. We request that VPA and VicRoads confirm the specific arrangements will be retained for existing farming operations to allow for continued use of Sunbury road for the transportation of oversized agricultural vehicles.	This has been discussed with VicRoads, who have advised that this type of consideration will occur at the Project planning and design stage when the future upgrade happens. This is a normal consideration for VicRoads when undertaking major upgrade works on roads which traverse agricultural areas.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS47	MF6	The existing electricity line easement runs along the western boundary of the site. The PSP Cross Section ‘Local Access Street, Interface with High Voltage Transmission Line (Eastern Precinct)’ notes that planting should be small to medium sized indigenous trees to outer edge of the easement. Requests that further landscaping be required within the easement within the PSP to create a visual and physical buffer between the residential developments and the existing farming use.	This cross-section will be revised to correct a number of errors. The inclusion of additional landscaping will be considered as part of this review, but needs to also be weighed up against any increased bushfire risk.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS47	MF7	Requests to be directly consulted with by Melbourne Water in relation to the final design, location and boundary of the retarding basin adjoining the western boundary of the site. Also requests that the PSP include a requirement for the retention/reinstatement of farm fencing.	Noted. The preliminary DSS consultation will include this landowner. Melbourne Water would have no objection to a note in the PSP that requires the developer to reinstate fencing as a result of construction of water infrastructure assets.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS47	MF8	We note that a sewer rising main and pump station is shown adjoining the site along the western boundary and partially running through our client’s subject site (Plan 12 – Utilities). Further detail is provided in Figure 3.3 within the Sunbury South High Level Utility Servicing Assessment prepared by Jacobs (2014) which also proposes a pump station located adjoining the western boundary of the site and shows the sewer mains to run through the subject site and connect to Sunbury Road. Seeks confirmation that they will be directly consulted by Western Water in relation to any proposed sewer works on their land.	Western Water has been provided with this submission (along with a number of others). A response will be provided when available. It is anticipated that Western Water would directly consult with landowners prior to undertaking works which will affect their land.	No	Further review/discussion required -Western Water	Decision pending further review
48	Michael Mezzatesta (affected Landowner -720 Sunbury Road)					



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS48	MME1	Generally support the proposed land use designation contained in the Future Urban Structure Plan for the Site and the three (3) adjoining properties (Properties #73,74 & 76 within the PSP).	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS48	MME2	Support the proposed signalised intersection along the Sunbury Road frontage of the Site and the proposed connector road passing through the Site between Sunbury Road and Lancefield Road. Also support the proposed left-in left-out intersection along the Lancefield Road frontage of the Site.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS48	MME3	The proposed local convenience centre within the Craiglee site is not well located as it provides very limited access for the community within the Wedge and more broadly within the north side of Sunbury Road / Lancefield Road. The proposed location of this local convenience centre within the Craiglee site has a limited immediate catchment, compromised by the proposed primary school and active open space reserve. Sunbury road will become a significant barrier to residents in the wedge, and will encourage car use to the Local centre.	Disagree. The Local Convenience Centre is centrally located to a residential catchment to the south of Sunbury Road.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS48	MME4	An additional local convenience centre is required along Sunbury Road, north-west of the intersection of Sunbury and Lancefield Roads, to ensure that future residents within the Wedge and beyond are provided with ease of access to basic services and facilities, and that the movement economy along Sunbury Road can be captured, enhancing the centre's viability.	Agree that a small local conveninece centre is appropriate in this approximate location.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
49	Daryl Foster (Sunbury resident)					
SS49	DF1	Sunbury needs a new hospital and 24 hour emergency room immediately.	This is outside the scope of what can be delivered through a Precinct Structure Plan. The Lancefield Road PSP does nominate land that can be used for a future hospital or TAFE, however cannot mandate the development of such a facility.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS49	DF3	The high density of the proposed housing is out of character with the overall feel and history of Sunbury. The PSPs should take the opportunity to do something different and unique with Sunbury.	The PSPs include the vision to faciliate a natural extension of the established Sunbury Township, preserving and reinforcing the township and heritage character of the settlerment. The PSPs for Sunbury have been heavily tailored to respond to the unique landscape features and township character. The PSPs seek to achieve a lower density overall than is the norm for Melbourne's growth areas.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS49	DF4	Consideration should be made for a higher number of lower density areas with blocks from half to 1 acre and above.	Whilst the PSP encourages a diversity of lot sizes, including lower density development in sensitive areas, it is unlikely that there will be many blocks of this size.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS49	DF5	A town as large as proposed must have access to tertiary and vocational training.	The Lancefield Road PSP has provision of land for a potential TAFE / Hospital. The delivery of these land uses is beyond the scope of the PSP.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS49	DF6	Has consideration been made of the short to medium term issues caused in the CBD with the large increase in population? The current parking situation in the CBD, particularly for train commuters, is critically inadequate. Even with two planned new stations and their associated parking facilities the current CBD/commuter parking will be overwhelmed. It is highly probable that the new houses will be built before the new stations which will exacerbate the problem in the short to medium term.	Existing issues in the town centre, including access and car parking provision, are best dealt with as part of a project with a more specific focus on the town centre itself, which would likely be managed by Hume City Council.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS49	DF7	Queries whether the PSPs consider the need for improvements in existing roads and infrastructure before the development of new areas, or if they treat the new areas in isolation. Notes that many upgrades are required to address both safety and efficiency of existing roads, such as the Bulla bypass and Gap Road rail crossing.	The PSPs are underpinned by traffic modelling that considers existing roads and infrastructure. It is the responsibility of Council and VicRoads to undertake works to ensure that roads are maintained and upgraded as required.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS49	DF8	The timing of new infrastructure needs to be managed. It is critically important that required infrastructure is built and in-place before the new residents move in.	Infrastructure roll out needs to be flexible to respond to changing growth trends/development fronts, and development triggers for all infrastructure types undermine this flexibility. The PIP provides an indicative timing for delivery of infrastructure items, based upon projected development fronts. The rationale/assumptions underpinning this are set out in SICADS	No	No action	Unresolved
SS49	DF9	What considerations have been made for additional policing resources and the anticipated increase in crime likely to result from such an increase in population? How is the increase in police and emergency services co-ordinated with the growth of Sunbury?	The provision of emergency services and police stations has been considered by the relevant departments but is not required to be included within the PSP document themselves.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
50	Allison Watt (Adjoining Landowner - Harker Street)					
SS50	AW1	Property abuts the precinct and the submitter welcome the recommendation from the VPA that this land be identified as having regionally significant landscape values which will protect it from future residential development. This piece of land including Jacksons Creek and the escarpment is an important feature of the landscape entering Sunbury via Sunbury Road and its landscape, heritage and cultural values should be retained in perpetuity.	Noted.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS50	AW2	Any submission to the VPA to the contrary by the owner/developer of this land as part of this community engagement process would be vehemently opposed by myself and surrounding property owners before an independent planning panel.	Noted.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS50	AW3	There is a narrow tract of flat land abutting the existing residential properties in Harker Street before the escarpment falls away sharply to Jacksons Creek below. Aside from the significant landscape values, other issues with the potential development of this land include bushfire risk and access for emergency vehicles.	The Victorian Planning Authority will be undertaking a review of the Harker Street Residential Concept Plan in response to submissions received, however intend to retain the land at the rear of the allotment of 105 Harker Street as 'Landscape Values', or a similar non-developable land use designation, as per the exhibited Precinct Structure Plan.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS50	AW4	More broadly, supports the Sunbury South PSP, particularly the amount of open space.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS50	AW5	Has concerns about the impact on Sunbury Road and the Calder Freeway and the impact of an additional 10,000 Sunbury residents on an already congested road system. The VPA, Hume City Council and local Members of Parliament must lobby the State Government to fast-track the Bulla by-pass project as a matter of priority or it will be impossible for Sunbury residents to access jobs, the airport and other services out of town.	<p>The Bulla Bypass is being actively planned for. VicRoads is currently reviewing the alignment of the Bulla Bypass with the view to applying a Public Acquisition Overlay through a Planning Scheme Amendment shortly.</p> <p>The Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy (exhibited concurrently with this Amendment) has identified the delivery of the southern Jacksons Creek crossing (part of the ultimate Sunbury ring road) as being critical early infrastructure to enable access to the Calder Freeway from new development fronts in the south and east of the township. This will assist in managing congestion issues on Sunbury Road while the larger Bulla Bypass Project is in planning and delivery stages.</p>	No	No action	Unresolved
51	Ian and Patricia Payne (Crinnion Road)					
SS51	IPP1	Concerned about Kangaroo movement due to increased building works.	The Urban Growth Zone schedule under this amendment will require that prior to the certification of any plan of subdivision that a Kangaroo Management Plan must be approved by the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP). To obtain DELWP's approval, a Kangaroo Management Plan must demonstrate a suitable strategy to avoid land locking kangaroos and to minimise risks to public safety and animal welfare. DELWP's decision making focuses on encouraging passive management techniques that encourage the movement of kangaroos away from areas of new urban development. These techniques are designed to effectively management kangaroo populations while minimising harm to the animals.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS51	IPP2	Requests a comprehensive and independent study of the area in relation to the wellbeing of the Environment. This study to include animal welfare and land management as we have a National Park of considerable size right next to a proposed high density housing development.	The Biodiversity Conservation Strategy ensures the conservation of nationally endangered species, which will result in the conservation of other non-threatened native species. The quality of habitat to be preserved and created for the threatened species will also accommodate non-threatened species. Therefore, there is no need to duplicate studies, as it is clear that a properly conserved environment will benefit all species.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS51	IPP3	Weed management in the PSP needs work. There are currently weed control issues and Council do not assist. An example is the area between Buckland Way and Fox Hollow Road and Watson Road is riddled with the weed. The developers to completely eliminate all weeds by spraying of pesticide before they lift one piece of dirt in this development.	This is an issue beyond the capacity of the PSP to resolve. Hume City Council has existing weed management programs that relate to land both within and outside the precinct. It is appropriate that weed management is managed through these programs	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS51	IPP4	Opposes the use Watson Road to Crinnion Road as a main thoroughfare from Sunbury to the Calder Freeway.	This road is not specifically defined as a main throughfare, but it nevertheless forms part of the existing network, and closing this road would have adverse affects on residents south of the Sunbury South precinct. The Sunbury South PSP therefore proposes improvement works to be undertaken to this road to accomodate higher traffic volumes, to be funded through the ICP	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS51	IPP5	<p>Watson Road from Fox Hollow Road to Crinnion Road has a number of flaws.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Watson Road between Fox Hollow Road and Crinnion Road is crooked and there is a sharp incline in the road as well. Vehicles travelling in either direction speed when going downhill and vehicles have to move part of their vehicle off the bitumen road to pass.</li> <li>2. The road was too narrow for the amount of vehicles using the road.</li> <li>3. There was major concerns with heavy vehicles/buses using the road on that day which pushed drivers almost off the road and the sides of this area is definitely unsafe for passing vehicles at the moment.</li> <li>4. Where Watson Road meets Crinnion Road there is virtually a right /left hand turn vehicles have to negotiate because it is a blind corner. The lay of the land impairs vision for vehicles travelling in the opposite direction. It is unsafe at the best of time and on this day there were a number of near misses.</li> </ol>	These existing issues with Watsons Road are to be addressed by the improvements required to the road through the PSP and to be funded through the ICP	No	No action	Unresolved
SS51	IPP6	<p>Crinnion Road has a number of safety issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The blind corner at Crinnion Road and Watson Road as stated previously.</li> <li>2. The intersection of Crinnion Road and Buckley Road saw vehicles almost colliding due to no signage and drivers obviously not aware of the area.</li> <li>3. There was a traffic jam at the intersection of Bulla Diggers Rest Road and Crinnion Road due to the amount of traffic using both Roads.</li> </ol>	These existing issues with Crinion Road are to be addressed by the improvements required to the road through the PSP and to be funded through the ICP	No	No action	Unresolved
SS51	IPP7	For 10,000 vehicle movements out of the proposed development there needs to be a direct route to the Calder Freeway and not this stop gap measure being proposed.	See IPP4	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS51	IPP8	The proposed Road from Sunbury Road to Vineyard Road should be developed to take the major volume of traffic which would ensure easy access to the Calder Freeway and Plumpton Road and alternatively Sunbury Road.	This road has been defined as a boulevard connector in acknowledgement of the likely traffic volumes projected to use it. The alignment and form of the road has been specifically informed by this strategic role it will play in the overall transport network for Sunbury	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS51	IPP9	There should be a simple measures put in place to ensure motorist do not use Fox Hollow Road, Watson Road, Crinnion Road as a means to gain access to the Calder Freeway. Fox Hollow Road should be made a dead-end Street blocked at Watson Road forcing vehicles to use the road leading to Vineyard Road.	See IPP4	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS51	IPP10	Recommend that Buckland Way be developed as a dead-end Street to ensure vehicles do not use Watson Road as an escape route and are then forced to use the road leading to Vineyard Road.	See IPP4	Yes	No action	Unresolved
52	Urban Design and Management OBO owners of 705 Sunbury Road (affected landowners)					

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS52	UDM1	The northern parcel of Property 60 is awkwardly shaped which will minimise its development potential. There seems to be a lack of justification for the size of the retarding basin and we question the need for its extent. Unless we can be satisfied that it is needed in its entirety we reserve the right to challenge this at a Panel Hearing.	Melbourne Water has designed this asset to treat stormwater to best practice (using industry standards). The conceptual design also includes provision for sediment dry-out area, 'safe' batter slopes and other Melb Water requirements. These can be found in the 'Constructed Wetland Design Manual' on the Melbourne Water website. Under the Development Service Scheme, land acquisition cost is considered. The submitter is asked to contact Melbourne Water directly to discuss the DSS.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
53	Urban Design and Management OBO Hongfengshi International Property Investment PL (Shepherds Lane)					
SS53	HIP1	Consider that the current location of the primary school misses a key opportunity to provide medium density housing within close proximity to the town centre located north of Redstone Hill Road. It is also located very close to the proposed P-12 Government School which has previously been identified only as a secondary school. There are different options that would create a better planning outcome: - It may not be required at all if the adjacent school is a P-12. - It could be relocated to a different site and we note in particular there is no primary school north of Sunbury Road. - The proposed P-12 School could become a secondary school and the primary school could be relocated to the north east corner of our client's site to be co-located with the secondary school and active open space.	DET has confirmed that the delivery of the primary school on the north side of Sunbury Road isn't appropriate given that the core of the catchment is South of Sunbury Road.  The P-12 school was incorrectly shown as such in the PSP, and was intended to be a Secondary school only. However, following discussions, DET has advised that the opportunity for this to become a P-12 school should be identified within the PSP.  The VPA has proposed a re-orientation and slight increase in size of the secondary school site to support a P12, with associated changes to the connector road network to support this. This would involve re-locating the school component on this property as per the request in the submission	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS53	HIP2	We note there appears to be some ambiguity as the PIP on page 61 refers to it as a secondary (7-12) and the land budget allows 10ha which is typically a P-12 site.	As above, this was incorrectly labelled as a P-12 on the plans, and was intended to be a secondary school only. However with the change to a P12, the PIP will need to be amended accordingly	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS53	HIP3	The PSP also shows a connector road, which if located in its exhibited alignment would result in the demolition of an existing, very substantial, dwelling. This house has recently been constructed and is still some 6 months from completion but is in excess of 100 squares and has required a substantial capital investment. Suggest realignment of Connector Road as provided:	Agree to realign the road to the north in order to avoid the existing dwelling.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS53	HIP4	Given the location of the Connector Road as shown on the 96A Planning Permit Application P18858 submitted by Villawood (refer plan exhibited 'Redstone Hill, Sunbury South Subdivision Layout Plan Drawing Ref 8727_UD_SLP01_V25), and as shown on the plan attached as it affects our client's site, we formally object to the application for Planning Permit P18858 given that as it is currently shown, the road connection would require the demolition of the new dwelling. We would be happy to work with the VPA and Villawood Properties to come up with a solution that will result in the house being retained.	The VPA has agreed to amend the connector road alignment to avoid the existing dwelling, as per response above.	Yes	No action	Resolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS53	HIP5	The north/south connector road between our clients' site and the proposed P-12 government school to the east is wholly located within our client's site. We consider it a more balanced outcome if the road was shared between our client's site and the adjoining site (Property 70) to share the burden more equitably. This would result in 12.5m being provided within our client's site and 12.5m being provided within the school site.	With the reconfiguration of the secondary school to accommodate a P12, and the associated changes to the road network, the connector road has been moved central to the site and away from the property boundary. This item is therefore no longer relevant.	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
54	Select Group OBO owners of 705 Sunbury Road (affected landowners)					
SS54	xx1	That provision be made within the Sunbury South PSP for medical centres and associated ancillary uses in suitable locations not confined to town centres. That specific consideration be given for medical uses at our client's land at 705 Sunbury Road immediately to the north of the proposed new connector road running through the subject land.	The VPA consider that these uses are more appropriately located within the Major Town Centre which is approximately 1km from the site. Should the land owner wish to develop a small medical centre at the site, a small medical centre of under 250sqm is allowable without a permit under the applied residential zones, or a larger facility with a planning permit. Given the potential off-site amenity impacts of a larger medical facility, the VPA do not consider it appropriate to permit-exempt this use within a residential zone.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS54	xx3	That changes be considered to the applied zone schedules allowing medical centres and other related uses to be permitted without a planning permit, or with a higher floor area threshold before a permit is required. This would also allow for expansion of services as required as the local population increases.	Refer response to MCS2	Yes		
SS54	xx4	That more detail relating to any future proposed overlays which could affect building design outcome such as height restrictions, site coverage etc. be confirmed to provide certainty for land owners.	There are no overlays proposed to be inserted within the PSP which will affect the subject site. The provisions of the PSP, UGZ schedule and the applied zone will apply.	No	No action	Resolved
SS54	xx5	That detail regarding proposed compensation measures for land owners affected by proposed new roads and other infrastructure such as retarding basins be provided by the VPA.	Some new roads will be funded through an Infrastructure Contributions Plan (ICP) which requires the collection of funds from developers. These funds will also cover the costs of many of the bridges and intersections, local parks and community facilities. The infrastructure which will be funded through the ICP is identified in Table 10 of the PSP, which is the Precinct Infrastructure Plan.  Drainage assets will be funded through Melbourne Water's Drainage Services Scheme.	No		
SS54	xx6	That expected timeframes for the construction of future roads, drainage infrastructure be provided by the VPA.	Infrastructure roll out needs to be flexible to respond to changing growth trends/development fronts. The Precinct Infrastructure Plan provides an indicative timing for delivery of infrastructure items, based upon projected development fronts. The rationale/assumptions underpinning this are set out in Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy, which was exhibited with the Amendment and is available on the VPA website.	No	No action	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS54	xx7	That the VPA discusses possible options available to reduce the overall size of the retarding basin proposed for our client’s land, including options for further investigation of alternative sites.	Melbourne Water has designed this asset to treat stormwater to best practice (using industry standards). The conceptual design also includes provision for sediment dry-out area, 'safe' batter slopes and other Melb Water requirements. These can be found in the 'Constructed Wetland Design Manual' on the Melbourne Water website. Under the Development Service Scheme, land acquisition cost is considered. The submitter is asked to contact Melbourne Water directly to discuss the DSS.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
55	Kane and Jayde Lambert					
SS55	KJL1	Object to the development based on: Is this land not a historical site?	The Precincts themselves are not historical sites, however they do contain several heritage listed sites. The PSPs require a Heritage Conservation Management Plan to be prepared for all listed heritage sites within the precinct, and requires development of land to have regard to the heritage significance of sites and provide a sensitive interface.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS55	KJL2	Does this land not hold significance to our indigenous people and their sacred land?	The Wurundjeri have been engaged with throughout the preparation of the PSPs and are generally supportive of the future urban structure. Sensitive sites have been avoided.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS55	KJL3	Was this parcel of land not a gift to the Salesian College to be used for the purpose of education?	Whilst it is not clear from the submission, the VPA think that this is referring to land within the Lancefield Road precinct. If this is the case, as far as the VPA is aware, the Salesian College still do have interests in a portion of the land. Land for Non-Government educational facilities are provided for within the PSPs.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS55	KJL4	Is this parcel of land not significant enough for Council and Developers alike not to respect the historical significance of George Evans?	The Emu Bottom homestead, which is of significance to the local history including George Evans, is located outside of the precincts and will not be impacted on by development.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS55	KJL5	Does this land not house endangered animals such as platypus, wedge-tailed eagles, and owls (just to name a few)?	The Biodiversity Conservation Strategy has ensured that there are significant tracts of land which are set aside within the precinct for the protection of endangered species, such as the Growling Grass Frog. The substantial tracts of land which have been set aside for the protection of these species will also benefit all fauna in the precinct, including platypus, wedge-tailed eagles and owls.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS55	KJL6	Does this land not hold the Green Wedge Zone? This area was not proposed to be full of high density housing.	The land has been within the Urban Growth Boundary and zoned for development since 2010. The Green Wedge Zone is a non-urban zone.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS55	KJL7	Does Hume City Council not have a covenant or law that states, buildings cannot be built on horizon and high point areas? Wouldn't this parcel of land be considered to be a high point?	The VPA is not aware of any such law or covenant. However, the Hume Planning Scheme contains local policies around landscape features including significant features such as Redstone Hill. The PSP has sought to respond to the landscape features of the precinct and includes a number of Objectives, Requirements and Guidelines which seek to limit the impact of development on these features.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS55	KJL8	Is this land really stable enough to be suitable for building or are they just creating more problems for the future?	Any application for subdivision of land will be required to submit geotechnical details about the site, as per the existing clauses within the Hume Planning Scheme. Council will need to be satisfied that the geotechnical conditions are suitable for the proposed development.	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS55	KJL9	Have Hume City Council really thought about the future of this land and what the effect of their proposal will have on not just the Emu Bottom Community but Sunbury as a Township.	The PSPs are the result of years of strategic work, and implement the vision of previous strategic documents including Hume's HIGAP and the Sunbury / Diggers Rest Growth Corridor Plan.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS55	KJL10	Submits that this development will only create high density, cheaply made housing that developers will turn over quickly and spit out without a second thought, and walk away from. The town will become an overcrowded with not enough infrastructure to support it.	The VPA does not agree with this outlook. The PSPs seek a relatively low urban density of 15 dwelling per hectare across the precincts, and contain many requirements and guidelines which will ensure that the suburban frameworks result in positive neighbourhood outcomes. The PSPs are being progressed with an Infrastructure Contributions Plan which will provide for the funding of infrastructure for the future communities.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS55	KJL11	Council should have to make it mandatory that any new development in the area should be made to build schools, shops and sporting facilities that can support those developments at their own cost and not to the public through our rates and taxes.	Sporting facilities will be funded through an Infrastructure Contributions Plan (ICP) which requires the collection of funds from developers. These funds will also cover the costs of many of the new roads, bridges and intersections, local parks and community facilities. New primary schools will be funded by the State Government, as is expected to service the population regardless of where they reside. Commercial development is more appropriately delivered through the private sector.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
56	Insight Planning Consultants OBO SB Capital (Buckland Way - Properties 28-31 in PSP)					
SS56	SBC1	Amend Plan 2 – Precinct Features to align the ‘floodway’ area with the current Urban Floodway Zone’ area.	The current UFZ has been located over Harpers Creek, there was no proposed change to the UFZ in the exhibited Sunbury South PSP. Melbourne Water would not support a fragmented review of the UFZ alignment on each property. Melbourne Water's preference is for all landowners along the UFZ alignment to be consulted on the proposal prior to any change. Melbourne Water would support this consultation occurring through the planning panel process	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS56	SBC2	Amend Plan 3 – Future Urban Structure to locate the Harpers Creek Government Primary School on the west side of the existing Buckland Way by shifting the Town Centre further north along the future Buckland Way alignment.	DET are not supportive of moving this school site due to land fragmentation issues and the presence of the gas pipeline measurement length. The VPA also has concerns about the landform in this area, and does not consider it appropriate to shift the town centre further north, particularly as the intersection of Buckland Way / Connector boulevard will be in cut which will lead to undesirable outcomes for a future town centre. The school site will be adjusted to be only on two land parcels (27 and 28).	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS56	SBC3	Amend Figure 3 – Harpers Creek Residential Concept Plan to locate the Harpers Creek Government Primary School on the west side of the existing Buckland Way by shifting the Town Centre further north along the future Buckland Way alignment.	Refer response to SBC2 above.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS56	SBC4	Amend Figure 6 – Harpers Creek Local Town Centre Concept Plan to reflect the above change.	Refer response to SBC2 above.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS56	SBC5	Amend Plan 6 – Employment and Town Centres to reflect the above change.	Refer response to SBC2 above.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS56	SBC6	Amend other base Plans that show both the Town Centre and Government School to reflect change.	Refer response to SBC2 above.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS56	SBC7	Amend Plan 3 – Future Urban Structure to remove the areas of ‘regionally significant landscape values’ from Properties 28-31 (and potentially others in this immediate area);	The regionally significant landscape values in this location have been reviewed. Areas remaining have been classified as 'Land not serviced by Development Services Scheme'. The onus will be on any applicant at the subdivision stage to demonstrate that there is a solution that would allow these areas to be developed and drained, to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and Council.	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS56	SBC8	Amend Plan 7 – Open Space to reflect the above change; OR Include the ‘regionally significant landscape values’ land as ‘credited open space’ in Section 4.3 Property Specific Land Use Budget, Table 6 Open Space Guide and Table 10 Public Infrastructure Plan.	See SBC7 above. Any areas that remain undevelopable will not be classified as credited open space, as they do not form part of the planned local open space network.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS56	SBC9	The waterway area that runs along the southern boundary of Property 30 is overstated and its alignment significantly compromises the ability to achieve an efficient subdivision layout. Amend Plan 3 – Future Urban Structure to significantly reduce the waterway area that traverse the southern boundary of Property 30.	As the Regional Floodplain Management and Drainage Authority, Melbourne Water implements 'Development Services Schemes' (DSS) to manage the impact of urban development on waterways and receiving water quality. This includes adequate measures, such as waterway corridors, for the protection and enhancement of waterway and biodiversity values. The waterway corridor width has been guided by the background studies undertaken, the topography of the area and Melbourne Water's Waterway Corridor Guidelines. These guidelines make minimum width recommendations to ensure waterway resilience and function is maintained in the face of environmental pressures such as urban development.	Yes	Further review /discussion required	Unresolved
SS56	SBC10	Undertake an onsite review of the ‘regionally significant landscape value’ areas and key view lines and amend the Land Budget and Property Specific Land Budget to better reflect the Net Developable Area that exists across the precinct.	This has now been undertaken, as per responses to SBC7 and SBC8 above.	Yes	Further review /discussion required	Unresolved
SS56	SBC11	Amend Table 10 – Precinct Infrastructure Plan to include all local parks as infrastructure projects, as land for local public open space will be provided through the standard levy of the ICP and as such the local parks listed in Table 6 should be included in Table 10.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS56	SBC12	Amend Plan 11 – Integrated Water Management to distinguish between ‘natural waterway corridor’ and ‘required waterway corridor’ so as to recognise the difference between existing and development required waterways.	Melbourne Water does not believe this is the role of the PSP. It would make the PSP very difficult to read if every detail was included. The natural and constructed waterways are implemented through the Melbourne Water Development Services Scheme (DSS). The preliminary DSS plan is available from Melbourne Water.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS56	SBC13	The extent of retarding basins within the Fox Hollow DSS is also questionable. We intend to review the sizing requirements and may provide further submissions in relation to this matter once this assessment is complete.	Noted. The assets in draft Fox Hollow Drive have undergone significant development since PSP exhibition. The submitter is requested to review the latest draft Fox Hollow DSS	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS56	SBC14	Amend Table 10 – Precinct Infrastructure Plan to identify the ‘indicative timing’ for projects RD 05, RD 07 and BR 03 as ‘short term’.	The VPA is currently proposing to nominate all of these projects as ‘Short to Medium Term’, to provide flexibility in relation to the delivery of these items in responding to development fronts. It is understood that submissions in relation to the timing of these projects are likely to be considered further by Panel.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS56	SBC15	Amend the Local Access Street Level 1 – Interface with Constructed Waterway to: - Reduce the width of the cross section by removing the vegetation buffer which is a duplication of the road reserve; - Show a ‘shared path’ on one side of the waterway only; and - Show the overall dimension of the cross section on the diagram.	Melbourne Water would strongly oppose this change. Melbourne Water has a responsibility to establish and maintain healthy riparian zones along waterways, whether they be existing or constructed. The width of this corridor is not uniform for all constructed waterways as it is dependent on the expected flows within the waterway. Please see Melbourne Water's Waterway Corridor Guidelines for information relating to waterway corridor widths. This cross section is indicative only, and the Requirements and Guideliens of the PSP provide the opportunity for locally responsive alternative cross sections to be considered, as appropriate	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
57	Hume City Council					
SS57	HCC1	It is considered that the documentation reflects and furthers the objectives and outcomes sought within Sunbury HIGAP and the Sunbury/Diggers Rest Growth Corridor Plan with any variations considered reasonably justified. In particular the following elements have a high level of support: • The urban structure – notably the inclusion of the two creek crossings, the distribution of activity centres, the safeguarding of land for higher-order tertiary and health facilities, and the identification of employment land. • The measures to maintain the primacy of Sunbury Town Centre and achieve a good distribution of new centres. • The recognition of the landscape qualities of Sunbury – notably the escarpment setbacks, the treatment of Redstone Hill, the controls for developing on slope, and protecting significant views. • The desire to achieve boulevard treatments along Sunbury, Lancefield and Vineyard Roads. • The network of open space, including the identification of the future regional parklands along Jacksons Creek, green links, and open space nodes along the escarpments. • The measures and controls which manage the impact of future development on areas that adjoin the existing Sunbury Township, notably Harker Street, Rolling Meadows and south of Jacksons Hill. • The inclusion of residential concept plans for areas that will be difficult to develop due to slope and fragmented land ownership. Council acknowledges and is supportive of the considerable amount of specific content such as slope controls, escarpment setbacks and residential concept plans that have been included with the Sunbury	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS57	HCC2	Remove the reference to ‘land subject to capability assessment’ in the PSP and the UGZ9 and amend the PSP to show this land as encumbered open space.	Disagree. Retain the capacity for landowner to demonstrate a suitable site responsive subdivision outcome.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS57	HCC3	Reinstate Fox Hollow Drive as a sensitive residential area and include associated concept plans within the Sunbury South PSP.	Agree. Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC4	Extend the Harpers Creek sensitive residential area further south.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC5	Remove the fourth dot point from subclause 3.4 within the Sunbury South and Lancefield Road PSPs.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC6	It is noted that the last paragraph within subclause 3.4 in both PSPs refers to the objectives for the areas as set out within the relevant PSP. It is noted that there are no objectives applying to the sensitive residential areas within the PSPs. It is requested that an objective specific to the sensitive residential areas be included within the PSPs.	Additional objectives will be provided with the revised concept plans.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC7	Harpers Creek and Gellies Road concept plans should be amended to provide greater consideration of the appropriate road layout and lot size having regard to the topography and slope constraints of the land.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC8	Concept plans - The PSPs and/or UGZ schedules need to provide greater direction with respect to the staging of development and the sequencing and delivery of infrastructure, in particular the need for any out-of-sequence development to demonstrate its ability to provide for interim or out-of-sequence infrastructure.	Agree in relation to Balbethan Drive. Unsure at to whether this is required in other concept plan areas - clarification from Council	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC9	It is unclear if the residential blocks shown on the concept plans are the proposed lots or if these blocks are to consist of smaller residential lots. Clarification should be provided on the plans.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC10	Balbethan Concept Plan - This residential concept plan has not been produced to the same standard as the other residential concept plans. The plan should be amended to be of the same design level as the other residential concept plans, and include similar elements such as a legend, identification of road types, intersections, etc.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC11	Amend the text on the concept plan to require a graduation of lot sizes between Balbethan Road and the Rolling Meadows Estate boundary.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC12	41 Balbethan Drive is located within the Comprehensive Development Zone and is subject to the Rolling Meadows Local Structure Plan and associated s173 agreements. Please remove this property from the concept plan.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC13	Balbethan Concept Plan -74 Highgrove Drive is a Council owned reserve. The identification of a road over this reserve should be removed from the concept plan.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC14	Balbethan Concept Plan - It is unclear what the purpose is of the small reserve located adjacent to Lancefield Road. Please change this reserve to a residential lot.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC15	Balbethan Concept Plan - The tree reserve along the rail line will provide a link between the existing shared path along The Skyline (Rolling Meadows Estate) and the proposed Raes Road shared path. Please amend Plan 10 to show this shared path connection.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC16	Amend Plans 3 and 5 to show the tree reserve along the rail line, Raes Road and Lancefield Road.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC17	The intersection of Stockwell/Balbethan Drive doesn't align with that shown on the Aurecon Grade Crossing Report (May, 2015). Amend the concept plan to reflect this work in regards to the intersection, lot design and lot access.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC18	There are a number of proposed new roads that straddle property boundaries. The implementation of the concept plan and construction of these roads will be difficult due to the fragmented land ownership. These roads should be realigned to sit within a single property.	Agree where practical to do so, however it is considered unfeasible to do so in all cases	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC19	The Balbethan concept plan does not give consideration to the location of existing dwellings, with a number of roads aligned through existing dwellings. Council is aware of a number of landowners within this concept plan area who would like to remain on site. All proposed roads should be realigned to avoid existing dwellings where possible.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC20	Amend the Balbethan concept plan to show roundabouts at all crossroads, and a signalised intersection at Balbethan Drive / Lancefield Road.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC21	The intersection immediately adjacent the rail crossing is not supported. Amend the Balbethan concept plan to remove or move this intersection further to the east.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC22	There are a number of staggered intersections within the Balbethan concept plan that are too close to each other and are considered dangerous. Amend the road layout to provide for a wider distance between the two intersecting roads.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC23	Harker Street Concept Plan - The extent of developable area may need to be amended on finalisation of the Terramatrix Bushfire Risk Assessment. The current draft indicates that the extent of development area is close to that shown on the concept plan.	The extent of the developable area has been amended to respond to the existing transmission line easement. The Terramatrix report did not specify any additional setbacks.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS57	HCC24	Harker Street Concept Plan - Amend the concept plan to remove development from within the electricity transmission easement.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC25	Harker Street Concept Plan - Amend the concept plan to ensure that road frontage is provided adjacent to the regionally significant landscape values, consistent with the requirements of the PSP.	Unsure as to the areas where the concept plan does not provide a road interface. Council to provide further advice	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC26	Harker Street Concept Plan - Amend the plans to identify adjoining surplus Government land and the potential for this land to be included within the concept plan as an additional lot accessed off Harker Street.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC27	Harker Street Concept Plan - Break of Slope needs to be defined (see Break of Slope comments in Section 10).	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC28	Gellies Road Concept Plan - The extent of developable area may need to be amended on finalisation of the Terramatrix Bushfire Risk Assessment. The current draft indicates significant portions of the land shown on this plan as undevelopable at BAL 12.5.	Further discussion required. The VPA does not agree that the Terramatrix report shows the land as undevelopable, however will discuss further with Council and Terramatrix.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC29	Gellies Road Concept Plan - Amend the concept plan to ensure that road frontage is provided adjacent to the conservation land/escarpment, consistent with the requirements of the PSP.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC30	Gellies Road Concept Plan - Break of Slope needs to be defined (see Break of Slope comments in Section 10).	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC31	Gellies Road Concept Plan - The two left-in, left-out intersections on Lancefield Road do not provide access to the concept plan area for people driving north or pedestrians. The first signalised intersection that provides an opportunity for a U-turn is 2km north. At least one of these two intersections needs to be signalised or pedestrian crossing facilities provided together with U turn capacity mid-block. Council's preference is for a signalised intersection at the crossroad with Lancefield Road to the west.	Agree. Additional signalised intersection will be provided in this location, based upon feedback from VicRoads	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC32	Gellies Road Concept Plan - The illustration of slope on the non-developable land gives the impression that the developable land is flat. The concept plan should clearly illustrate slope constraints.	Unsure as to what these legibility issues are. Council to clarify. Please note that a revised concept plan will be circulated as part of the VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC33	Gellies Road Concept Plan - A number of properties within this concept plan are reliant on other properties for access. The concept plan should be amended to include a staging plan and associated text within the PSP that acknowledges that some properties are reliant on others to develop.	Do not believe that is necessary to define a staging plan for this area, however staging principles to be included on the concept plan itself	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC34	Harpers Creek Concept Plan - Further work is required to confirm the design of this concept plan, having regard to the Jacksons Hill Road link.	Does this relate to the interim Jacksons Hill Link? If so, Council to provide advice on alignment/timing of resolution	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC35	Harpers Creek Concept Plan - This residential concept plan has not been produced to the same standard as the other residential concept plans. The plan should be amended to be of the same design level as the other residential concept plans, and include similar elements such as identification of slope, lots, road types, intersections, etc.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC36	Harpers Creek Concept Plan - Amend the text on the plan to require a graduation of lot sizes between the Harpers Creek Concept Plan boundary and the Jacksons Hill Estate.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC37	Harpers Creek Concept Plan - Amend the concept plan to show the gas pipeline buffer, sloping land, off-road shared path consistent with Plan 10 and LP03 consistent with Plan 7.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC38	Harpers Creek Concept Plan - Amend Plan 5 sensitive residential area to match the area shown in the concept plan.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC39	Harpers Creek Concept Plan - The reference to local access opportunity (through Jacksons Hill) should reference the requirements of R99.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC40	Harpers Creek Concept Plan - It is unclear if the two local access roads connect into the Southern Link.	VPA to discuss further with Council.	No	Further review/discussion required	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS57	HCC41	Harpers Creek Concept Plan - The concept plan should provide further direction on lot size, having regard to slope.	Agree. Principles on concept plan will flag the need for lot sizes to respond to topography, including larger lots where appropriate on sloping land	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC42	Harpers Creek Concept Plan - A number of properties within this concept plan are reliant on other properties for access. The concept plan should be amended to include a staging plan and associated text within the PSP that acknowledges that some properties are reliant on others to develop.	Do not believe that is necessary to define a staging plan for this area, however staging principles to be included on the concept plan itself	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC43	Amend UGZ schedule sloping land subdivision requirements to add the following text after the words ‘design guidelines that’, “minimise the landscape and visual impact of development on sloping land and”.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC44	Amend UGZ schedule sloping land subdivision requirements to include an additional dot point “measures to manage surface run off”.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC45	Amend UGZ subclause 4.1 to: o Require design standards falling out of the design guidelines to be restricted on title by way of a MCP. o Provide a timeframe after registration of the plan of subdivision that requires the lodgement of the approved plan of subdivision and all restrictions on title by the Land Titles Office, with Council to confirm that this has been satisfied. Council will need to be given an opportunity to review these (and other restrictions on title) by way of a separate condition on the permit to this effect.	Agree, but have requested further guidance from Council as to how they would like this worded.	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC46	The wording of G15 (Lancefield Road) and G17 (Sunbury South) appears to inadvertently encourage development in the vicinity of the creeks. Amend to read “Larger lots capable of managing steep topography should be provided in areas with slope constraints, particularly land with a slope in excess of 10%”.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC47	Additional road cross sections are provided for Local Access Streets Level 2 and Connector Roads on sloping land.	Agree. Cross sections will be included	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC48	Include design guidelines contained with the sloping land cross sections as requirements within the Section 3.1.3 of the PSPs.	Agree, although some may be better suited as guidelines. To work through.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC49	Amend O7 (both PSPs) to include reference to sensitive/prominent view lines.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC50	The identification of ‘walkable catchments’ are removed from the PSPs, and identification of medium density housing is provided consistent with previous PSPs.	The walkable catchment approach represents the VPAs preferred model for providing direction around higher density opportunities and the application of the residential zones	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS57	HCC51	Objective O6 (both PSPs) should be amended to include reference to town centres. Clarification is also required around what is meant by ‘high amenity features’.	Agree. Will include reference to town centres and will change 'high amenity features' to 'local and district open space'. To read: "Ensure medium and high density development is prioritised within a walkable catchment of town centres, local and district open space and public transport."	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC52	Amend G21 (Lancefield Road) to include an addition dot point stating that “The use will not prejudice the subdivision of surrounding land identified for residential purposes”.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC53	Include G20 and G21 (Lancefield Road) in the Sunbury South PSP.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC54	Table 2 is confusing to read. It is unclear how to read the table or if the blue shading is meant to represent a ‘yes’ or ‘no’. Amend table to show a ‘tick’ or a ‘cross’ in each box	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC55	The Sunbury South PSP and overlay map should be amended to show the retention of HO358.	Further discussion required with Hume.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC56	The Redstone Hill 96A application should be amended to show the retention of HO358. Council is supportive of discussions regarding the reduction in the overlay curtilage.	As HCC55 above.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC57	It is Council's preference that the alignment of this crossing avoids the Cannon Gully site. The Post-Contact Heritage Assessment (Context, December 2014) provides a number of recommendations in regards to this site and the proposed creek crossing, including the need for consent from Heritage Victoria, archaeological investigations, detailed construction plans, a landscape assessment, and site interpretation features. It is requested that this work be undertaken prior to approval of the PSP. Council has been involved in discussions to date regarding the alignment of this creek crossing, and requests continued involvement in the resolution of the final alignment of this road. In addition, it is requested that the PSPs and Infrastructure Contributions Plan (ICP) are not approved until the alignment of this road has been resolved. Any change in the alignment of this road will have significant implications on the Future Urban Structure, Sherwood Heights 96A application, and the ICP.	Agree. Revised alignment has been developed to avoid aboriginal cultural and post contact heritage values. PSP and ICP will not be approved until ongoing alignment refinement has been concluded	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS57	HCC58	That the VPA prepare a CHMP for land subject to the creek crossings prior to any panel hearing.	The level of design detail required to undertake a CHMP is not available at the PSP stage of the planning process. The VPA has sought the endorsement of the Wurundjeri of the alignment.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS57	HCC59	That the Sherwood Heights 96A application not progress to any panel hearing until a CHMP is approved for the land.	A CHMP has now been approved for the site	No	No action	Unresolved
SS57	HCC60	Amend the wording of Section 3.1 Subdivision - Residential Development, to clarify that the Heritage Conservation Management Plan application requirement applies to all heritage sites as shown on Plan 3.	Wording to change to: 'An application that includes a confirmed or possible heritage site on Plan 3 of the (relevant) PSP must be accompanied by an assessment by a qualified heritage consultant which describes any heritage features of the site and recommendations regarding the protection of heritage features, or where appropriate, integration of heritage into the broader subdivision'.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS57	HCC61	Amend R7 (Sunbury South) and R8 (Lancefield Road) to clarify that this requirement applies to all heritage sites as shown on Plan 3.	The heritage significance of the potential heritage sites has not been demonstrated to a degree which warrants this level of protection. The inclusion of an additional requirement (to be contained in Section 3.1 of the UGZ schedule, as outlined in response to HCC60 above) should achieve the protection desired, should the potential sites be demonstrated to warrant it.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS57	HCC62	Redstone Hill Major Town Centre Community Centre - Council has previously advised that it supports the location of the Community Activity Centre on the eastern corner of the two crossroad connector streets located at the south-west corner of the town centre as shown on Plan 3 – Future Urban Structure. The two 'possible alternative Community Activity site' should be deleted from Figure 4.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC63	Redstone Hill MTC - It is not possible to differentiate between the legend for Industrial, Medium density residential and car parking. The legend should be amended.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC64	Redstone Hill MTC - Additional open spaces shown with the concept plan are not in accordance with Plan 7 and should be removed.	Review of PSP and 96A application to ensure consistency	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC65	Redstone Hill MTC - Remove the services roads from the concept plan. If retained on the plan a notation should state that the service roads are to be constructed outside of the Sunbury Road reservation.	Service roads to remain, without direct connections into the greater centre. Notation on plan that service roads will be outside the road reserve, unless it can be demonstrated that they will not adversely impact the boulevard aspect of Sunbury Road.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC66	Redstone Hill MTC - Amend the concept plan to show landscape buffers along Sunbury Road consistent with R37.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC67	Redstone Hill MTC - Amend the UDF requirements as follows: i) Include reference to Figure 5 within the first dot point. ii) All guidelines should be changed to requirements. iii) Include the following requirement “Identifies the key elements of the public realm and publically accessible private spaces and the preferred materials, treatments, and landscaping of these spaces to ensure a continuity of design and sense of place”. iv) Include the following requirement “Outline the measures to ensure that development and access along Sunbury Road does not direct activity away from the Main Street and town centre core”. v) Include the following requirement “Restrict the development of convenience restaurants along Sunbury Road frontage” consistent with the UGZ schedule cap for retail. vi) Add a requirement relating to the medium density housing within the centre, including the preference for shop-top residential.	i) agreed ii) disagree. The guidelines have been defined based upon anticipated ways to achieve key objectives for the centre. These will be default outcomes, however the PSP should provide for some design flexibility. Will liaise with Council on a case by case basis as to the merits of a requirement iii) agree to include, subject to discussion around appropriateness as a requirement or guideline. iv) Agree. v) Agree, perhaps rephrased to 'limit'. vi) agree, however MDH may be included as a requirement, shop top as a guideline.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC68	Redstone Hill MTC - Council supports preparation of the UDF to the satisfaction of the responsible authority and the VPA. However, the requirement for an amendment to the UDF to be to the satisfaction of the VPA and Council is considered unnecessary. Amend the UGZ schedule subclause 2.9 to remove the requirement that an amendment to the UDF is to be to the satisfaction of the VPA.	Disagree.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS57	HCC69	Redstone Hill MTC - Include permit application referral requirements for the major town centre consistent with the requirement for referral of local town centre applications.	The VPA is a referral authority for the UDF and consider that this is an appropriate level of involvement. Can be discussed further.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC70	Redstone Hill MTC - Section 2.9 of Schedule 9 – The fourth requirement for the UDF mentions ‘supporting measures.’ It is unclear what this means. The wording of the schedule should be amended.	Bullet point 4 of Clause 2.9 reworded to: "Identifies the location and method for deliveries, waste disposal, parking, and vehicle access, particularly for non-retail elements within the town centres."	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC71	Yellow Gum LTC - Concerned about the orientation of the main street along the Northern Link/Elizabeth Drive extension and the extent to which a functional main street can be achieved along what will be a high volume traffic road (estimated 15,000 vpd). Conversely, the achievement of a main street on this road will impact on the traffic functionality of this connector road, through the need for reduced traffic speeds through the centre (40km/hr as required by R23). Council's preference is for a north-south main street, with earlier concepts prepared by the VPA addressing this concern.	Agree. Ongoing design review with Council will inform the structure of the concept plan. A revised Concept Plan will be circulated with the VPA's Part B submission to Panel.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC72	Amend the PSP to include the requirement for the preparation of the UDF for Yellow Gum Town Centre.	Potentially agree. Further discussion required following the update to the LTC Concept Plan, in response to submissions	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC73	Emu Creek LTC -Request that the VPA work with Council to amend the concept plan for this centre. Specific changes required (but are not limited to): o Provide for a road and active frontage between the medium density housing and the regionally significant landscape values, consistent with the requirements of the PSP.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC74	o A reduction in the size of the town centre site consistent with the 6,000m <sup>2</sup> specified in the PSP.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC75	o Limit the main street to one connector road.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC76	o Amendment of PSP plans to show regionally significant landscape abutting the town centre as per the concept plan.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC77	o Relocation of the plaza away from the roundabout.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC78	o Provide clarification of the land uses fronting Lancefield Road.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC79	Harpers Creek LTC - Further work is required to confirm the design and location of this centre, having regard to the Jacksons Hill road link.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC80	Harpers Creek LTC - Amend the concept plan to show LP03 consistent with Plan 7.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC81	Harpers Creek LTC - Amend the concept plan to show landscape buffers and shared paths along the railway line consistent with requirements of the PSP.	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC82	LTCs - •Amend Principle 2 to include two dot points; o relating to maximising solar passive orientation and providing suitable protection from high winds through suitable siting and design techniques, and o allowing public access to this space outside the typical commercial operating hours of 9am to 5:30pm.	Further work required.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC83	LTCs - Under Principle 3, add a dot point that talks about adaptability of tenancies and retail / commercial floor space. A dot point should also be added that makes specific mention of designing tenancies so that exhaust flues and other necessary equipment required for food and drinks premises can be installed. This is especially important for multi-storey developments.	Further work required.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC84	LTCs - Under Principle 5, add a dot point that seeks to avoid the use of local access streets for car parking and service/delivery access to commercial retail components of the centre. This should also be reiterated in Principle 6.	Further work required.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC85	LTCs - Amend Principle 7 to include two additional dot points: o “Landscape buffers are to be provided between carparks and adjacent roads”, and o “Landscape buffers are to be provided between carparks/commercial uses and medium density housing sites.”	Further work required.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC86	LTCs - Amend the dot point relating to the supermarket design to clearly mention clear glazing towards any street interface. The use of 'directly address' is vague.	Further work required.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC87	UGZ Schedule - Referral of applications – Local Town Centres (both PSPs) - Wording should be changed from “land in a Local Town Centre” to “Land shown as a Local Town Centre”.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC88	LCCs - Amend Principle 3, 7th dot point, add “and treat stormwater runoff” (both PSPs).	Further work required.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC89	LCCs - Amend Principle 3 to include a dot point that makes specific reference to accommodating all loading and service delivery/pick up points off-road and within the convenience centre.	Further work required.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC90	LCCs - Amend Principle 4 to include a dot point which discourages car parking, service and delivery access from local access streets.	Further work required.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC91	Provide for an additional 53ha of employment land on Sunbury Bulla Road consistent with that specified in Sunbury HIGAP and the Sunbury/Diggers Rest Growth Corridor Plan.	The VPA has circulated further advice in relation to this matter, and believes that the 48 hectares provided in this location satisfactorily meets the demand as established through the Hill PDA assessment	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC92	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new requirement should be added to Sunbury South PSP, Section 3.2.6: "The design of a restricted retail centre or area on Vineyard Road must be integrated, even where development is proposed on multiple adjoining properties and:</li> <li>• Provide for easy vehicular and pedestrian movement to all restricted retail tenancies within the centre or area.</li> <li>• Provide integrated car parking with dedicated pedestrian routes that enables access to all tenancies and a 'park once' approach.</li> <li>• Limit fencing and landscaping which prohibits vehicular and pedestrian movement between tenancies.</li> <li>• Provide dedicated access arrangements for servicing and delivery vehicles from the road network or a clearly separate arrangement where access is proposed from the car park.</li> <li>• Be separated from residential and other sensitive uses by a local road.</li> <li>• Be designed to minimise impact on amenity of adjoining uses including appropriate siting of buildings, height controls, landscaping and use of materials.</li> <li>• Respond to slope and minimise cut and fill."</li> </ul>	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC93	Council still has outstanding concerns regarding the access arrangements off Vineyard Road into the employment area. This concern relates to traffic volumes on Moore Road and the potential need to signalise the intersection with Vineyard Road. Requests that further discussions be held with VicRoads regarding the Vineyard Road access arrangements.	Agree. PSP will now provide for a signalised intersection at Moore Road	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC94	The concept plan for the Vineyard Road Employment Area is not linked to any PSP requirement under Section 3.2.6, in the same manner that the town centre concept plans are. Amend the PSP to add a requirement relating to development of this land being consistent with the concept plan (Figure 7).	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC95	Show 5m wide landscape buffers along Vineyard Road consistent with R37.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC96	Sunbury South R34 and R37 are contradictory to one another in terms of the location of car parking. Please amend/clarify. If car parking is to be provided to the side or rear of the buildings as per R34, side landscaping requirements should be included.	Disagree that R34 and R37 are in conflict. 5m set back requirement could apply to side parking, However R34 and G38 as it stands are in conflict. Potential to make R34 a guideline - for further discussion	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC97	Sunbury South G38 and R37 are contradictory to one another in terms of setbacks. Please amend/clarify.	G38 to be amended to clarify that the 3m setback applies to roads other than Sunbury Road and Vineyard Road.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC98	Amend Table 6 within both PSPs to change the responsibility for local parks from 'Council' to 'Land Developer'.	The intention of this table to is reflect ultimate management responsibility. Propose to change table heading to reflect this. Potential to include a note after table that land developer responsibilities prior to transfer to Council are set out at 3.6.3	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC99	Amend the park type for all 0.25ha sites to read 'Passive Recreation Node'.	Agree, subject to confirmation that this will not pose implications for ICP or other references to LPs throughout the documents. VPA to advise further.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC100	Amend G48 (Sunbury South) and G36 (Lancefield Road) to delete 'except where housing fronts open space with a paper road to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority'. Delete R46 and R47 (Sunbury South) R35 and R36 (Lancefield Road). Council does not support housing directly fronting open space.	Disagree. This is a guideline, and may be an appropriate design response in some instances. The Council still has the discretion to not support this through this guideline, but the flexibility is provided.	Yes	No action	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC101	Amend R43 (Sunbury South) and R32 (Lancefield Road), to include reference to R93 and R94 (Sunbury South), and R87 and R88 (Lancefield Road).	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC102	Amend R94 (Sunbury South) and R88 (Lancefield Road) to add: o "and contaminated soils" to dot point 1. o delete "barbeques" from dot point 7. Barbeques will not be supported by Council. o A new dot point requiring the protection and interim maintenance of any remnant trees identified for retention.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC103	Amend Plan 7 of both PSPs consistent with <b>Attachments 1 and 2</b> .	Generally agree, subject to ongoing discussions in relation to the Racecourse Road 96a and revisions to DSSs	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC104	Amend the Lancefield Road PSP to show SR02 as per the location and orientation in the agency exhibited version of the PSP.	Agree. This will occur, subject to the Conservation Area boundary realignment being approved by the Commonwealth.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC105	Amend the description to cricket/senior AFL/Cricket ovals for Sunbury South SR03.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC106	Amend the description to soccer/rugby for Sunbury South SR04.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC107	Amend SR01 to indicate that it is part of the sporting reserve, with the other half to be provided within the future Lancefield Road North PSP.	Agree. Will be redesignated local sports reserve as per other sporting fields	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC108	Amend the legend for the regional sports reserve on all plans. The hatching makes it appear that this reserve is located in the conservation reserve.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC109	Amend description to include netball for Lancefield Road SR02	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC110	Amend R95 (Sunbury South) and R89 (Lancefield Road) to state that "these works MAY be eligible for a works-in-kind credit". It the responsibility of Council as the collecting agency to determine whether a project is suitable as works-in-kind.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC111	Amend location of visual wedge between Redstone Hill and Jackson Creek as per Figure provided.	To discuss with Council and Villawood following site pegging.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC112	Amend zone map to match future urban structure extent of Redstone Hill encumbered land.	Agree, following agreement on HCC111.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC113	Amend requirement R16 to refer to the Redstone Hill indicative views cross section on page 95 of the PSP.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC114	The Redstone Hill 96A should be amended to address the UGZ9 Redstone Hill height controls.	Agree	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Resolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC115	That the bushfire risk assessment be finalised and that the recommendations of this work be used to inform the development setbacks and identify any areas of fire edge threat.	Agree. To be updated following receipt and review of bushfire assessment.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC116	The UGZ schedule condition relating to bushfire risk should reference the need to adhere with the findings of the bushfire assessment application requirement.	Agree. To be updated following receipt and review of bushfire assessment.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC117	Amend G7 (both PSPs) to ensure these guidelines do not confuse or contradict efforts to control the impact of development on escarpments and Redstone Hill.	Agree, subject to clarification from Council.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC118	Include controls on building height for development along the top of the escarpment to limit all development to 8m.	VPA currently reviewing in the context of the updated Residential zones	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC119	It is requested that the VPA, Council and Melbourne Water work together to determine an agreed break of slope, and that adequate time be allowed for the agreed break of slope to be used to inform the bushfire study, drainage scheme and other elements of the PSPs.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC120	The PSPs identify approximately 1,680ha of encumbered /conservation land with no certainty over ownership. It is noted that whilst Council, the VPA, DELWP, Parks Victoria and Melbourne Water have met to discuss the issue, a shared ownership /management approach is yet to be agreed on. Given the extensive amount of encumbered land within these two PSPs, it is considered essential that the PSPs provide a greater level of direction on land ownership and management. Council requests that the VPA continue to work with Council, DELWP, Parks Victoria and Melbourne Water to resolve this matter, prior to the approval of the PSPs.	VPA to continue to seek to facilitate resolution - may not be possible through PSP	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS57	HCC121	Apply of the Significant Landscape Overlay to Jacksons, Emu and Harpers Creeks and Redstone Hill areas.	Not supported, nor deemed necessary. Appropriate controls apply through the PSP, zones or BCS	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS57	HCC122	Retain the existing ESO1 along Jackson and Emu Creeks.	Disagree. The BCS and PSP provide adequate protection to the waterways. The ESO1 relates to Rural areas, and the land in the future will be within an urban context. The ESO1 is no longer considered relevant or necessary.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS57	HCC123	The explanatory report states that the IPO4 has been applied to land which will be zoned Rural Conservation Zone and is located outside of the BCS. It unclear why wording in the proposed IPO4 areas relates to the BCS, when the BCS conservation areas do not apply to this area.	Agree. This has been progressed with DELWP, and all unnecessary clauses will be removed from the IPO4.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC124	It is requested that the CACPs should include an overview plan, which shows the entire Regional Significant Landscape Area including Harpers Creek, not just the BCS areas.	Agree, however it will be made clear that the CACPs relate only to conservation areas	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC125	Amend CACPs/Plan 10 to ensure consistency between the plans.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC126	The CACP should be amended to show all heritage sites.	Agree, subject to the support of DELWP	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC127	It would assist in reading the CACPs if the legend indicated which areas are Ca18, 19, 20 and 21.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC128	Amend Figure 9/Plan 10 to show a shared path down to the peninsula on the eastern side of Jacksons Creek.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC129	Clarification of funding for shared path creek crossings within the CACPs.	None of the improvements identified within the CACPs, other than those proposed to be funded by the ICP or DSS, have a committed source of funding	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS57	HCC130	Amend G64 (Sunbury South) and G51 (Lancefield Road) to add “of local provenance to the satisfaction of Council” to the end of the guideline.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC131	Clarification is required as to whether habitat compensation offsets are required for shared paths within BCS areas if the area contains an existing track or is already clear of native vegetation.	DELWP have indicated that offsets would be required	No	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC132	The PSPs should not identify any native vegetation to be removed without a planning permit anywhere within IPO4, Significant Landscape Values Areas, drainages reserves, Raes Road conservation reserve, and Emu, Jacksons and Harpers Creeks. Request that removal of native vegetation in the areas outlined above should be subject to a planning permit, to the satisfaction of Council and DELWP.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC133	A statement about the payment of all habitat compensation obligations should be in the PSP (e.g. Growling Grass Frog and Golden Sun Moth). It is unclear how an applicant will be made aware of their need to pay offsets or habitat compensation obligations.	Clarification required - DELWP	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC134	Increased recognition of Harpers Creek should be provided within the PSPs. It is suggested that second point in the vision and Objective 3 be amended to include reference to Harpers Creek.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC135	Amend R44 (Lancefield Road) to remove the word ‘zone’ it confuses the intent of this requirement.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC136	Amend R54 (Sunbury South) and R45 (Lancefield Road) to: o Include ‘to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority’. o Correctly reference the Conservation Interface Cross Section. o Include reference to the figures of the CACPs within R54.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC137	Amend G50 (Lancefield Road) G63 (Sunbury South) to remove reference to the word ‘buffering’, which conflicts with the word ‘co-located’.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC138	It is requested that the PPCZ (as existing) and the ESO apply to the entirety of the reserve. It is unclear why the RCZ and ESO have been applied to part of the Holden Flora reserve.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC139	It is unclear the extent to which the Crown have been consulted regarding the need to obtain some of the Holden Flora Reserve land to build the southern creek crossing. Confirmation and clarification of the process required to obtain this land is requested.	DELWP has been consulted regarding this matter. Further advice has been provided to Council.	No	No action	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC140	Amend the Sunbury South Precinct Structure Plan to reinsert the government secondary school as per its location at agency consultation.	DET has advised that an additional government secondary school is not required in this location.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS57	HCC141	Amend Table 5 in recognition of two government secondary schools.	As per response to HCC140, there DET has not identified a need for a second secondary school in this location	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS57	HCC142	Remove all references to the designation of non-government schools as 'Catholic schools' with the PSPs and associated documentation.	Further discussion required	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC143	Council requests that Harpers Creek, Jacksons Creek and Emu Creek community centres be changed to Level 2 facilities within the PSPs and the Infrastructure Strategy is consistent with K2 Community Infrastructure Assessment.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC144	Council requests clarification on the timing/staging of the Harpers Creek, Jacksons Creek, Redstone Hill and Yellow Gum community centres with regards to the discrepancies between the timing/staging listed in the PSPs, compared with the infrastructure strategy. Until such clarification is received, Council is unable to provide comment on the proposed timing/staging of these centres.	All would be nominated as S-M, with the exception of Yellow Gum (M-L). Council to advise on position	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC145	Change G57 (Sunbury South) and G44 (Lancefield Road) to requirements. The use of the word 'must' within this guideline is supported.	The VPA do not agree that this should be a Requirement and propose to amend 'must' to should to reflect the Guideline status. There may be instances where educational or lower order community uses (i.e. mens' sheds, neighbourhood houses or agricultural training areas) that we would not want to see prohibited because of this requirement.	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC146	It is unclear from the traffic modelling provided whether the southern creek crossing will assist in reducing traffic volumes on Sunbury Bulla Road. It is of concern that in the absence of this evidence, the southern creek crossing is being prioritised in the short term at the expense of other infrastructure needs. Council seeks clarification from the VPA as to the traffic modelling evidence that supports the need for the early delivery of the creek crossing.	Further information has been provided in terms of GTA work. Council to provide position based on updated advice	No	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS57	HCC147	It is requested that the VPA resolve all outstanding post-contact and Aboriginal cultural heritage concerns in order to confirm the alignment of this bridge prior to any panel hearing. Left unresolved, the alignment of the creek crossing will impact on the urban structure and ability of landowners to develop (including the Sherwood Heights 96A application), and the ICP. Until such point in time that the alignment of this road is confirmed, Council is unable to determine whether the standard levy is sufficient to cover the costs of delivering the crossing, or if a supplementary levy is required.	Do not agree that full resolution of all cultural heritage issues is possible. Ongoing discussions with Council around the capacity to bring forward the approval of relevant CHMPs. The Wurundjeri has endorsed the revised alignment of the northern crossing, subject to further assessments being undertaken during detailed design.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC148	It is noted that the PSP proposes a connection to the Jacksons Hill Estate as a future ICP item. The provision of a road connection from the Jacksons Hill Estate to Vineyard Road is also an obligation of the developer of the Jacksons Hill Estate (Places Victoria) as outlined in the Jacksons Hill Local Structure Plan. Two different road alignments are proposed, with the PSP assuming that the Place Victoria connection has been delivered prior to the delivery of the PSP connection. It is requested that the PSP and ICP not be approved until Places Victoria deliver or enter into an arrangement for the delivery of the connection.	Agree in principle, subject to an update as to the status of these negotiations	No	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC149	Amend Plan 9/10 to show the location of the various cross sections.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC150	Amend Plan 4 and the Property Budget to provide for land take for Connector Roads proposed on existing roads.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC151	That the VPA work with Council, VicRoads and the servicing authorities to ensure that the cross sections met VicRoads clear zone requirements and that adequate land is set aside for servicing.	Agree. These discussions are ongoing in relation to the profile of arterial road	No	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS57	HCC152	There are number of inconsistencies in the different documents regarding the proposed transport network, particularly the road network hierarchy as shown on various plans and cross sections. This has resulted in difficulty in assessing a number of the cross sections. A number of changes are requested to the various cross sections. A full list of changes required will be provided once clarification on the inconsistencies is confirmed.	Council to provide.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC153	Clarification is requested to the inclusion of the potential grade separation of the Watsons Road rail crossing. Request that the grade separation be removed from plan	There is no design for any grade separation at Watsons Road, nor is it proposed to be funded through the ICP. Any future grade separation would require land acquisition and future funding. Land take will not be shown on plan 9, but notation around potential to remain	No	No action	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC154	Amend R69 (Sunbury South) and R59 (Lancefield Road) to provide greater clarity in terms of which developer(s) is/are required to construct the bridge where a connector street crosses a waterway.	For further discussion. Only intended to apply to non-ICP funded crossings	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC155	Amend G69 (Sunbury South) and G56 (Lancefield Road) to state 'where a lot is six metres or less in width, vehicle access must be via a rear laneway'.	Agree. This will be a Requirement rather than a Guideline.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC156	Clarify the intent of R62 (Sunbury South) and R52 (Lancefield Road). Does this mean any property or only properties that have been subdivided? It is currently unclear as worded.	For further discussion. The intention is that it would apply to both.	No	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC157	Amend R64 (Sunbury South) and R54 (Lancefield Road) to also include the need for the crossing to respond to heritage and cultural values.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC158	Amend R59 (Sunbury South) and R49 (Lancefield Road) to remove the 30% requirement for cross sections.	The 30% requirement is proposed to be modified such that it becomes a guideline	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC159	Amend Plan 10 to show: o The designation of the cross sections and associated bike lane and shared path network. o Inclusion/extension of a number of off road shared paths as shown on <b>Attachments 3 and 4.</b>	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC160	G76 (Sunbury South) and G63 (Lancefield Road) should be deleted. Off-road shared paths are intended for recreational cycling, and are shared paths for use by both pedestrians and cyclists. Cyclists using these paths should not be encouraged to travel at 30km/hr. Fast travelling cyclists should use the road network or on-road cycle paths.	For further discussion. It is expected that the off road network will be used for both recreation and commuter cycling. Capacity to qualify 'unless the primary purpose of the off road path is recreational cycling'	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC161	Ensure consistency between Plan 10 and the CACPs.	Agree. As per HCC125 above.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC162	Insert public transport requirements and guidelines in the Sunbury South PSPs.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC163	Amend the UGZ schedule to remove the exemption for buildings and works abutting Railway Corridor.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC164	Amend subclause 2.6 with the UGZ schedule to include non-government schools within the list of land uses.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC165	The intent of the 'responsibility' column in Table 9 should be clarified.	These are based upon the established protocol whereby Council take responsibility for assets serving catchments less than 60ha in area. These will be reviewed in association with the DSS. If the concern relates to responsibility for delivering the asset in the first place, this clarification can be made to the PSP (ie developer works as required under DSS)	No	No action	Unresolved
SS57	HCC166	Amend the 3rd dot point of G80 (Sunbury South) and G70 (Lancefield Road) to add "stabilise and rehabilitate all disturbances caused by development works".	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC167	Delete G84 (Sunbury South) and G74 (Lancefield Road). Lots with direct frontage to waterways are not supported by Council. This also contradicts R12 and R65 (Sunbury South) and R13 and R55 (Lancefield Road).	Disagree. The PSP provides a clear expectation that in nearly all instances direct waterway frontage will not be accepted. The PSP needs to provide some flexibility for complex sites -review capacity to strengthen through related requirement	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS57	HCC168	Amend the note on Plan 11 to include reference to Council in addition to Melbourne Water and Western Water.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC169	Plan 12 shows a number of sewer alignments proposed within conservation areas. This contradicts with R88 (Sunbury South) and R84 (Lancefield Road). Clarification/changes are required to address this conflict and confirm the support of DELWP.	Requirement should be modified to a guideline, as there may be certain instances where this is not feasible. Updated GIS files from WW show current trunk infrastructure planning - VPA to confirm the degree to which there is still conflict.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC170	Confirm capacity of existing road reserve (Lancefield Road) and proposed cross section to accommodate utilities.	The VPA has had further discussions with Council on this matter. Western Water has indicated that they can place their services in service roads rather than the Lancefield Road alignment.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC171	Amend the location of the proposed sewer pump stations on Plan 12 to avoid conflict with the rail line and retarding basins.	The DSS has been updated since the exhibited version, and Western Water has provided updated servicing plans. The VPA is still working with these service authorities to remove minor conflicting assets.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC172	Include a new guideline relating to any constructed waterways to be created and landscaped to provide a natural appearance.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC173	Provide provisions or guidance with the PSP or the UGZ schedule that relate to land within the gas pipeline buffer.	Subject to SMS, which will be completed shortly.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC174	Plan 3 should be amended to show the gas easement for the full length of the easement through the PSP.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC175	It is unclear why UGZ9 subclause 2.4 requires a permit for the use of the land for a residential aged care facility when this is a permit required use under the applied zone.	The applied zone is General Residential Zone. A permit is not required for a Residential aged care facility under the GRZ.	No	No action	Resolved
SS57	HCC176	Remove the land subject to the high voltage electricity easement from SUZ9.	Disagree.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS57	HCC177	If the above change is not made, the following changes are requested: o Amend the Sunbury South PSP to provide guidelines on land use and development with the electricity easement.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC178	o Remove Convenience Shop, Place of Assembly and Transfer Station from the list of Section 2 uses.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC179	o The Section 3 exemptions for Shop are not consistent with the uses shown in Section 1 and 2. As outlined above, Council requests that Convenience Shop to be removed from Section 2.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC180	o Confirm the width of the two easements and ensure that these are accurately shown on Plan 12 and the zoning maps.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC181	o The titles for the property at 725 Sunbury Road, Sunbury show that the easement width varies from 16m - 20m in width. Amend Plan 12 to remove reference to an easement width of 16m. It is unclear whether the width of the SUZ9 on the zone map needs to be corrected also. (Note: the background report says this easement is 50m wide).	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC182	o The zone map shows the electricity easement located only on the property at 725 Sunbury Road, Sunbury. This easement does not terminate at the title boundaries for this property, but runs over the property at 108 Brook Street, Sunbury and the Jacksons Creek RCZ land. Amend the zone map to accurately reflect the length of this easement. The concept plan for SUZ10 should also be amended to reflect the SUZ9 as this will impact on the extent of potential developable area as shown on the plan.	The SUZ9 only applies where the land would otherwise be zoned UGZ9. The RCZ and SUZ10 are considered appropriate zones for the easement.	Yes	No action	Resolved
SS57	HCC183	o The title for 605 Sunbury Road, Sunbury shows the electricity easement extending to the southern boundary of the property (Jacksons Creek). Amend the zone map to show SUZ9 extending to the southern boundary of this property.	The SUZ9 will be amended to end at the landscape values. The RCZ will apply to the landscape values / BCS area.	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC184	Council questions how much development should be allowed to proceed without any commitment to the funding or delivery of these items ( Sunbury South Train Station, duplication of arterial roads, and Government Schools) by the State Government.	SICADs is intended to outline the anticipated timing associated with key infrastructure. We do not support including lot triggers around these outcomes.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS57	HCC185	That the timing column is removed from Table 10 in both PSPs. If this is not acceptable, it is requested that priorities are used instead of timings and a disclaimer is added at the foot of the table: 'Timing is indicative only – it is subject to infrastructure constraints, the geography of development and priorities of the Collecting Agency, or relevant lead agency.'	Timing column must remain in order to inform the ICP. VPA to confirm capacity to accommodate prioritisation and disclaimer based upon new ICP regime.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC186	Amend subclause 4.12 of Schedule 9 and Condition 4.11 of Schedule 10 to change ‘must’ to ‘may.’	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC187	A number of infrastructure items are not included in the Precinct Infrastructure Plan and others are inconsistently shown across the documents. Clarification on the proposed items to be funded by the ICP is requested.	List of proposed ICP funded projects has been provided to Council as part of broader discussions on ICP	No	No action	Resolved
SS57	HCC188	Council has not seen all the infrastructures costings, and, as such, are unable to determine at this stage whether a supplementary levy is required. The absence of a number of these costings, along with the absence of an ICP at exhibition stage is a significant concern. It is requested that these costings are made available to Council prior to any panel hearing in order for officers to form a position on the need for a supplementary levy.	Council has been provided with costings. Updated costings for re-work of Northern Crossing to be provided.	No	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC189	Council requests that it be provided with a copy of the ICP for review and comment as soon as it is available. Additionally, it is requested that the PSPs are not approved until such time as the ICP has been prepared, reviewed, and ultimately endorsed by Council as the Responsible Authority, Collection Agency and Development Agency.	Agree	No	No action	Unresolved
SS57	HCC190	Council does not support the Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy, in particular the extent to which it seeks to control the staging of infrastructure.	SICADs is being reviewed, and its statutory relationship to the PSP will be removed. It will form a background report only, with acknowledgement that infrastructure priority will be reviewed as development unfolds, and that the distribution and rate of growth is the driver behind the provision of infrastructure, rather than specifically timing	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS57	HCC191	Council has concerns with the staging of a number of infrastructure items. Of particular concern, and discussed in Section 13, is the prioritisation of the southern creek crossing as the first item to be delivered across the two precincts. The prioritisation of this item will mean that all contributions for the next 5-10 years will be required to fund this crossing, limiting the ability of Council to fund any other infrastructure within the precincts. This is significant when the approval of the Section 96A permits will establish three new and separate development fronts.	Villawood have similarly expressed concerns around the timing of community infrastructure at Redstone Hill. Some flexibility to be provided around the early delivery of community infrastructure at Redstone Hill.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS57	HCC192	Council requests that the SICADS document not form part of the exhibited PSPs documentation and that all references to the strategy within the PSPs and associated documentation, including UGZ schedules, be removed.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC193	Amend Table 3 in UGZ9 to include 45 Fox Hollow Drive, Sunbury	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC194	Amend SUZ10 to include environmental site assessment requirements.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC195	Require the Wincity Kingfisher Estate and the Villawood Redstone Hill Estate 96A permit applications to undertake a phase 2 assessment prior to the approval of any permit.	Agree. This has been requested of the applicants in an RFI.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS57	HCC196	Amend plans within the PSP to show the full extent of the quarry buffer consistent with the extractive industry works authority.	The full extent of the quarry buffer will be shown within the Precinct.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC197	Amend the heading of UGZ9 subclause 2.12 UGZ9 to remove reference to the property address. The heading implies that the buffer relates to this specific property, when the buffer applies to a number of other properties.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC198	UGZ9 subclause 3.9 refers to a 1.3km buffer as shown on Map 1 of the Schedule and Plan 3 of the PSP however the plans both show this buffer as 'TBC' in the legend. Clarification is required on the extent of the buffer.	The extent of the buffer will be determined by work which is currently being undertaken by GHD.	No	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC199	Service Placement Guidelines - Amend drainage and trunk services to 'no' under kerb.	VPA to advise.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC200	Service Placement Guidelines - Amend drainage to 'preferred' under nature strips.	VPA to advise.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC201	Service Placement Guidelines - After 'other non-standard outcomes are encouraged', add "to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority".	VPA to advise.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC202	Service Placement Guidelines - Add the following text at the end of Note 2, "where services are placed under road pavement and paths, Level 1 supervision of compacted crushed rock backfill is required".	VPA to advise.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC203	Service Placement Guidelines - Add the following text at the end of dot point 4, "within widened nature strips", so as to allow room for street trees and paths that are often in conflict with service authority requirements.	VPA to advise.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC204	Request that the second purpose "to provide for the use and development of land for tourism purposes" be removed. Consistent with previous correspondence Council does not support this purpose as it restricts the use of the site to 'tourism purposes'. It is considered that the first purpose provides for a wide range of land uses, inclusive of tourism.	Disagree. The Growth Corridor Plan nominates the site as having potential for expanded tourism and commercial activities.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS57	HCC205	Art Gallery is not supported as a Section 1 Use. Art Gallery as a land use is considered to be of a similar scale and nature to the land uses listed in Section 2. It has the potential to be a large scale use with a range of impacts e.g. traffic, that need to be adequately assessed. As such, this land use should be subject to the same application requirements as the other Section 2 land uses e.g. the application should demonstrate the suitability/scale/appropriateness of the use and have it subject to conditions.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC206	Section 3 lists 'Warehousing' as a prohibited use other than Freezing and Cool Storage, Milk Depot, Rural Store, Solid Fuel Depot and Vehicle Store. All Warehousing should be prohibited in the zone (apart from rural store) as these do not match the purpose to the zone, which is to use the land for a vineyard and winery.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC207	A previous version of the SUZ10 reviewed by Council contained an application requirement that site plans showed “the extension of the existing Jacksons Creek shared path through the site”. The Jacksons Creek shared path is an important pedestrian and cycle connection that will ultimately extend the length of the Jacksons Creek Regional Park. The Conservation Area Concept Plans show this shared path extending the length of Jacksons Creek through both the Sunbury South and Lancefield Road PSPs. However, as this site is proposed to be removed from the Sunbury South PSP, the Conservation Area Concept Plans shows this path terminating at both boundaries of the subject site. It is important that the SUZ10 schedule identifies the need to provide for this shared path on the subject site to ensure that this important recreational link can be delivered along the full length of the Jacksons Creek Regional Park. It is requested that the original wording as stated or (or a similar requirement) be reinserted into the SUZ10.	Given the limited type and scale of development that is allowable the VPA do not agree that it is appropriate to trigger the requirement to construct a public path through this land.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS57	HCC208	Amend decision guideline “How the use or development conserves the values of Jacksons Creek”, replacing ‘conserve’ with ‘protects and enhances’, consistent with the objectives for Jacksons Creek contained within the PSPs.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS57	HCC209	96A applications - In particular it is noted that the permits are inconsistent with: • Elements of the future urban structure, in particular road alignments, road cross sections, passive open space, and drainage.	Noted. The applicants have been asked to address these inconsistencies in their revised plans, noting that some of these elements of the PSPs (i.e. Drainage) have been revised since the exhibition period.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC210	• The extent of the developable area as shown within the PSPs, with development areas encroaching on significant landscape values and drainage land.	As per response to HCC209 above.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC211	• The application requirements of UGZ schedule, including (but not limited to), requirements for subdivision and housing guidelines, environmental site assessments, traffic impact assessment reports and slope guidelines.	Further information has been requested of the applicants.	No	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC212	• Permit condition requirements within the UGZ schedule, including (but not limited to), requirements for permit conditions relating to sloping land, Redstone Hill height controls, and bushfire risk.	The permits will be reviewed to ensure consistency with the UGZ Schedules.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC213	A review of the planning permit against the requirements of the Schedule must be undertaken to ensure all required conditions are included on the planning permit. It is requested that the permits not be approved until these outstanding matters are resolved.	As above.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS57	HCC214	It is noted that a Cultural Heritage Management Plan has not yet been approved for the Sherwood Heights 96A application.	A CHMP has now been prepared for this site. Council has indicated that they are unsatisfied with the extent of the CHMP. Further discussion required	No	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS57	HCC215	Given the extent to which the 96A applications will need to be amended to ensure consistency and compliance with the requirements of the PSPs and the UGZ schedule, a complete assessment of the 96A applications has not been provided within this submission.	Noted. These have now been received by the VPA.	No	No action	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS57	HCC216	It is noted that the schedule to Clause 52.02 seeks to remove two restrictive covenants from properties in Stockwell Drive, Sunbury. It is understood that the covenants are sought to be removed as they restrict further development of the land. It is unclear whether these two covenants represent an exhaustive list of all covenants required to be removed as part of the PSP amendment process.	All titles within the Balbethan area were checked for restrictive covenants. The VPA is of the opinion that the likelihood of any other areas of the PSP having restrictive covenants is low, and does not think that it is necessary to undertake an exhaustive review of all titles.	No	No action	Resolved
SS57	HCC217	Whilst the significant tree retention guideline G5 is supported, this will be difficult to achieve without a permit trigger for the removal of non-indigenous trees, as significant non-indigenous trees are often removed before permit applications are received.	Noted, however under the BCS, it is not desirable to introduce additional permit triggers for non-indigenous species outside of conservation areas.	No	No action	Awaiting response from submitter
SS57	HCC218	Clarity is required regarding whether the following roads/land is included within the PSPs o Old Vineyard Road o Racecourse Road o Land adjoining the escarpment of Emu Creek that is outside of the UGB (break of slope to further back than UGB).	None of these are currently within the PSP, and the zone of each would need to change for the PSP to have effect. Council and VPA to discuss implications.	No	No action	Awaiting response from submitter
58	Juliette O'Kelly (Sunbury resident)					
SS58	JOK1	The congestion on Sunbury Road and Calder Freeway will drive people of higher economic standing out of the area.	This is a comment only. No specific request to change the Amendment.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS58	JOK2	Queries whether there will be additional emergency services or police force.	The provision of emergency services and police stations has been considered by the relevant departments but is not required to be included within the PSP document themselves.	No	No action	Unresolved
59	David Lock and Associates (OBO Sunbury Realty Pty Ltd - 615 Sunbury Road, Sunbury)					
SS59	SR1	Relocate the proposed government secondary school to a more central and accessible location within the broader PSP area to better serve the wider community.	DET are not supportive of a shift, as the connectivity to the active open space is important. Please note that further review of the school site is currently being undertaken by the Department, to potentially accommodate an 11.9ha land take associated with the P-12 school.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS59	SR2	Reposition the proposed active open space for the subject site to allow for greater integration of the northern residential area with the balance of the community. Will provide a master plan showing preferred location.	Awaiting information from the submitter.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS59	SR3	Relocate the eastern connector road so it allows for development on both sides of the road within the subject site.	The VPA propose to shift the connector road wholly on to the property to the east. The subject property will still be provided with direct access to Sunbury Road via the existing Shepherds Road intersection (which will require upgrading)	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS59	SR4	Relocate the southern retarding basin to its original location.	The location of this asset (WI-21 exhibited PSP) has been updated in the latest release of the preliminary Development Services Scheme. The submitter is advised to review the latest plan.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS59	SR5	Clearly identify a small LAC in the southern part of the subject site consistent with the HillPDA report dated October 2014.	Support the provision of a LCC (with a cap of 500sqm of shop uses) generally in this location	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS59	SR6	There is an excessive and inequitable burden of infrastructure on the subject site.	The VPA concedes that there is a significant amount of community infrastructure on the subject site, however given the relationship between land uses and parcel boundaries in this location, this is difficult to avoid. The VPA are pursuing a re-orientation of the government secondary school and consolidation with the primary school, such that the land take on the subject land will be reduced. We will continue to liaise with you in relation to this ahead of Panel.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
60	Ange Witzke (Sunbury Resident)					
SS60	AW1	Issues of car parking, level crossings and traffic congestion need to be addressed by new infrastructure now. The plan does not address the issues, particularly car parking, in the short term.	Existing issues in the town centre, including access and car parking provision, are best dealt with as part of a project with a more specific focus on the town centre itself, which would likely be managed by Hume City Council.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
61	Hi Quality					
SS61	HQ1	The cross-hatched area marked “UGZ9 zone” on the attached plan should be rezoned from RCZ and SUZ1 to UGZ9.	Disagree. See specific discussion around particular land uses below	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS61	HQ2	The area marked “residential” on the <b>attached plan</b> should be designated on the FUSP as “residential” instead of “regionally significant landscape values”, “industrial-light” “retarding basin” and “industrial”.	Disagree. This part of the precinct provides the only additional industrial land across the four precincts within Sunbury. Unless it can be clearly demonstrated that sufficient industrial land can be provided across the site (including land currently not serviced by the draft DSS) this will lead to an erosion of the total industrial land supply across the precinct.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS61	HQ3	The area marked “employment & commercial” on the attached plan, on the northern side of Sunbury Road, should be designated on the FUSP as “employment & commercial” instead of “industrial”.	See above	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS61	HQ4	The area marked “industrial” on the attached plan should be designated on the FUSP as “industrial” instead of “regionally significant landscape values”.	There is not sufficient information available to suggest that this land is able to be made available for industrial development. Whilst there is some sense to maximising the use of the land for the purpose of industrial land, unless this can be clearly demonstrated, the PSP should not identify it for this purpose.	Yes	Further review /discussion required	Unresolved
SS61	HQ5	The area marked “residential investigation area” on the attached plan should be designated on the FUSP as “residential investigation area” as well as “quarry/landfill”.	Given the uncertainty associated with the development potential of the land, as well as the potential impacts associated with quarry, landfill and organic waste buffers, the VPA is unable to support this designation at this stage	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS61	HQ6	Break of slope designations should be updated	The VPA has undertaken a comprehensive review of the break of slope for the precinct (in association with Hume City Council and Melbourne Water). This will form the basis of the designation of the Break of Slope moving forward	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS61	HQ7	The extent of the approved quarry/landfill operations should be accurately shown	The future urban structure will be updated to reflect full extent of operations (to the conservation area boundary. The conservation area boundary has been defined under the BCS and will therefore not be modified	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS61	HQ8	The PSP does not show, and has not acknowledged, the existing access road into Hi-Quality's Eco Park. This road would provide sensible access to the industrial and commercial land proposed for along Sunbury Road, allowing for separation of heavy vehicles and residential traffic. This road should be shown on the PSP and integrated into the street network.	Agreed. This road will be shown on the future urban structure as a left in, left out intersection, integrated with a connector road network through the employment precinct	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS61	HQ9	The existing access road is the only current legal point of access to property 98 and 99.	Noted.	No	No action	Decision pending further review
SS61	HQ10	The PSP should also show a connector street running between the proposed commercial and employment land along Sunbury Road on properties 97 and 98.	Agreed. This road will be shown on the future urban structure.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS61	HQ11	The intersection of the existing access road and Sunbury Road should be considered for upgrade and signalisation.	Disagree. This is located too close to the proposed signals to the north-west, and would only service one side of Sunbury Road	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS61	HQ12	Hi-Quality is continuing discussions with Melbourne Water in relation to the drainage of the Hi-Quality land and property 94. Hi-Quality does not consider that retarding basin/wetland WI-14 is required. Hi-Quality also disputes the size, location and need for retarding basin/wetland WI-16 and WI-18.	Ongoing discussions are noted. WI-14 is required to control and treat the stormwater from the significant developable area to the north west. Similarly WI-16 and WI-18 are required to service the runoff from the industrial area.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS61	HQ13	Hi-Quality will continue its discussions with Melbourne Water, but reiterates its submission above that the PSP should allow for flexibility in drainage arrangements, including providing alternative land uses for areas designated for drainage assets.	Noted. The DSS provides for flexibility at the time of subdivision provided the intent of the scheme is achieved	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS61	HQ14	Hi-Quality is not satisfied that a 500 metres landfill buffer is appropriate having regard to the type of waste accepted on the Hi-Quality site, and current policy uncertainty in relation to landfill buffers. Hi-Quality is obtaining further advice on this point and will expand on this submission in the coming weeks. Active quarry operations will only be within 250 metres of the PSP for a limited period of time. Hi-Quality requests that this is reflected in the PSP and the UGZ schedule's requirements in relation to the quarry buffer.	This is subject to ongoing consideration and review involving multiple parties.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS61	HQ15	Hi-Quality submits that the composting facility odour buffer should be reduced to 600 metres, and the walkable catchment boundary should be adjusted accordingly. 600 metres is an appropriate buffer having regard to works proposed by Veolia to manage odour. Hi-Quality will make a further submission in relation to this issue in the coming weeks.	This is subject to ongoing consideration and review involving multiple parties.	Yes		Decision pending further review
62	Australian Property Partnership OBO 235 Old Vineyard Road, Sunbury					
SS62	APP1	Agrees with the designation in the PSP that Intersection No 7 (Vineyard Road and Watsons Road) be classified as Short Term. Requests that the SICADS be amended to reflect the PSP in this regard.	This intersection has not been supported by VicRoads, who have indicated that an alternative option providing for a signalised intersection at Vineyard Road and Moore Road be pursued. This option has been designed and is proposed to replace the exhibited Intersection 7. It will be classified as a S-M term priority	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS62	APP2	Requests the removal of the 500sqm cap on supermarket in the applied C2Z in the UGZ9.	The VPA is of the view that the 500sqm cap is appropriate. The proximity to Harpers Creek LTC and other nearby local centres may result in the establishment of a full-line supermarket in this location undermining the ability of the LTC to deliver this function. Additionally, as a result of submissions, the VPA is supportive of including an additional Local Convenience Centre adjacent to the Sunbury South Railway Station to provide local scale retail services to commuters.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
63	John Hennessy (Sunbury Resident)					
SS63	JH1	Requests that the VPA and HCC produce a long term strategic transport plan for Sunbury (and include community engagement).	Existing issues in the town centre, including access and car parking provision, are best dealt with as part of a project with a more specific focus on the town centre itself, which would likely be managed by Hume City Council.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
64	Australian Property Partnership OBO Fox Hollow Drive Properties					
SS64	FHD1	There has been an incorrect labelling of the 'escarpment' (refer Plan 5) on lots numbers 40, 41, 42 and 43 (refer Plan 4). The labelling of the escarpment on these properties appears to have led to the introduction of the 'regionally significant landscape value' land on the subject site.	The regionally significant landscape values in this location have been reviewed. Areas remaining have been classified as 'Land not serviced by Development Services Scheme'. The onus will be on any applicant at the subdivision stage to demonstrate that there is a solution that would allow these areas to be developed and drained, to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and Council.	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS64	FHD2	The location of the fire threat edge on Lot 41 is inaccurate, perhaps due to the incorrect labelling of the escarpment. It is suggested that the designation of the escarpment line should be more closely aligned with the break of slope being the brown line visible on Plan 5, page 14.	The Fire Threat Edge is proposed to be removed following completion of the bushfire study which confirms bushfire threat in these precincts can be dealt with through the Bushfire Prone Area controls, without the need for additional controls within the PSP	Yes	Further review/discussion required - Terramatrix	Resolved
SS64	FHD3	The proposed retarding/treatment pond on the subject site is overstated and inaccurate. This pond should be scaled to the catchment it serves. Given the topography of land in this area, the pond itself could also be located within the very large Conservation Area that has been set aside for the future creation of frog ponds.	The VPA has provided the submission on this matter to Melbourne Water. Melbourne Water has reviewed their DSS for the land. As part of the DSS review, Melbourne Water are seeking to consolidate a number of the assets in this part of the precinct, however we do not have any more information which we can provide at this point in time.	Yes	Further review/discussion required - Melbourne Water	Decision pending further review
65	Echelon for the Carmody Family (landowners)					
SS65	PDC1	Holding submission	N/A	No	No action	Resolved
SS65	PDC2	The SUZ10 should properly recognise the ongoing right to use and develop the land for agriculture. The land holdings have been continuously used for various forms of animal husbandry (including extensive animal husbandry, animal keeping and horse stabling), and these uses should be specifically listed as Section 1 'as of right' uses within SUZ10. The use of land for host-farm activities should also be 'as of right'.	Agree to exempt Intensive animal husbandry from Section 1, rather than animal husbandry.  Do not agree to amend the purpose of the zone. The intention of the SUZ10 is to enable a range of tourism uses, preferably in association with the ongoing winery operation on the site. Agricultural uses will still be allowed, but is not the zone purpose, as it is not deemed an appropriate intention for what will be an inner-urban site.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS65	PDC3	The permit triggers under the zone be limited in their application to 'Section 2' uses.	Do not agree.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS65	PDC4	The condition requiring that all Section 2 uses ‘must be in conjunction with a winery use on the site’ be deleted from the draft SUZ10.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS65	PDC5	If the buildings and works permit requirement is not limited to only Section 2 uses (as per section 6.2 of this submission), then the use of the land for a restaurant, conference centre, museum and reception centre be made Section 1 uses under the zone, with the following condition: ‘Must be located within the ‘Potential Development Area’ in the Craiglee and Ben Eadie Concept Plan, November 2016.’	Disagree. These are land uses which may have potentially significant off-site impacts. These uses are not Section 1 uses under any VPP zones, and the VPA is of the view that there is not strategic justification for allowing this in this location.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS65	PDC6	The type of activities permitted under SUZ10 cannot be defined as ‘urban development’.	This is a matter for DELWP relating to the BCS and cannot be addressed through the planning scheme. The VPA has recommended that the landowner progress this discussion with DELWP.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS65	PDC7	The provisions of the Victorian Biodiversity Conservation Strategy should not apply to the land holdings. The bilateral agreement entered into between the State and Commonwealth Government under the EPBC Act does not provide a head of power for these conditions to apply to the land holdings in the manner proposed by the draft UGZ10. We submit that urban development is neither contemplated nor permitted on the land holdings under the draft SUZ10 and as such the proposed provisions relating to the BCS should be removed from the zone.	The BCS does apply to the land, and as such it is appropriate to include the controls required to implement it. Further discussion with DELWP is required in relation to the timing identified for triggering the BCS land management conditions.	Yes	Further review/discussion required - DELWP	Unresolved
SS65	PDC8	The condition under section 5 of the SUZ10 treats any form of subdivision on the properties as if it were for the purposes of urban development. This is unjustifiable given that any future subdivision on the subject land may well be for any number of reasons that are entirely unrelated to development at all, let alone urban development.	Noted. As per the response to PDC7 above.	Yes	Further review/discussion required - DELWP	Unresolved
SS65	PDC9	The ‘creek environs’ boundary shown on the draft Craiglee and Ben Eadie concept plan requires modification. REFER ATTACHMENT.	Agree. An updated concept plan will be included.	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS65	PDC10	The existing Environmental Significance Overlay applying to the land holdings is redundant and should be deleted.	The ESO10 will be scaled back to apply to the land within the Creek Environs (as per concept plan) only.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS65	PDC11	Amendment C207 proposes to substantially increase the area of land along the Jacksons Creek for conservation purposes. The GGF21 could be deleted from the Carmody property and C207 would still be larger than the reserve proposed in the BCS.	The GGF corridor is proposed to be reduced on the property through this process. The updated concept plan reflects the proposed new BCS area on the property.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS65	PDC12	The Schedule to the Heritage Overlay be amended to allow prohibited uses to be permitted on land and buildings located within HO396.	Disagree.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS65	PDC13	SUZ10 - Delete the 40ha subdivision minimum.	Disagree.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS65	PDC14	SUZ10 - application requirements - The application requirements apply to any applications to use land to construct works. The requirements extend to preparing landscape plans, traffic impact assessments, stormwater management and conservation interface plans. These requirements are unnecessary and onerous for applications to undertake works associated with a section 1 use and should only apply to section 2 uses and associated works.	Agreed.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS65	PDC15	Conservation interface plan requirements - request this requirement be deleted from the application requirements under the SUZ10	DELWP has requested that this requirement be retained as it is important for ensuring the protection of the Conservation Area.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS65	PDC16	Delete DELWP as a referral authority under the schedule to Clause 66.04	DELWP has requested that this requirement be retained as it is important for ensuring the protection of the Conservation Area.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS65	PDC17	The last decision guideline in SUZ10 (relating to whether any future use or development affects the values of conservation area 21) should be deleted as it has significant potential to be relied upon by the responsible authority or any referral authorities to prevent the reasonable future use and development of the land holdings.	DELWP has requested that this requirement be retained as it is important for ensuring the protection of the Conservation Area.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS65	PDC18	The decision guidelines should be edited because they are repetitive and duplicate other provisions under the planning scheme – for example the provisions set out under the heritage overlay.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
66	Arnie Azaris (Sunbury resident)					
SS66	AA1	The Jacksons Creek valley and Holden Flora reserve have significant Aboriginal and European heritage values that must not be destroyed. This area should remain as is.	The Jacksons Creek valley and Holden Flora reserve will remain undeveloped under the PSPs.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS66	AA2	Small amounts of residential development may be possible on the Jacksons Hill side of Jacksons Creek but would need large (at least 500m) buffers between development and the creek, Holden Flora Reserve and the Organ Pipes National Park.	The VPA consider that the creek corridors and Holden Flora Reserve are appropriately protected through the PSP as it stands. In most areas, there will be at least 200m between the creekline and development due to the presence of the BCS conservation areas, landscape values and drainage infrastructure. The Organ Pipes National Park is outside of the precinct.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS66	AA3	Does not believe that adequate environmental or heritage studies were completed prior to the development of the plan, and thus vital information has not been taken into account during their preparation.	The Biodiversity Conservation Strategy ensures the conservation of nationally endangered species, which will result in the conservation of other non-threatened native species. The quality of habitat to be preserved and created for the threatened species will also accommodate non-threatened species. Therefore, there is no need to duplicate studies, as it is clear that a properly conserved environment will benefit all species.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS66	AA4	Submits that this is not an unbiased proposal but developer led.	The PSPs are the result of years of strategic planning work, and implement the vision of previous strategic documents including Hume's HIGAP and the Sunbury / Diggers Rest Growth Corridor Plan.	No	No action	Unresolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS66	AA5	Community consultation has been inadequate as community views are not evidenced in the proposed plans.	Exhibition was extended from the standard and legislated one month period to approximately 10 weeks, in acknowledgement of the likely level of interest in the amendment within the established Sunbury community, as well as the Christmas/ New Year interruption. The VPA has continued to accept late submissions beyond this period.	No	No action	Unresolved
67	Western Water					
SS67	WW1	Provided AutoCAD files with the most up to date information on location, size and extent of water, sewer and recycled water infrastructure as part of submission.	Noted. Plan 12 will be updated to reflect the current planned infrastructure	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS67	WW2	<p>To service the proposed growth, Western Water will need to acquire numerous sites for tanks and pump stations (both water and sewer). All site acquisitions will be for permanent assets and will include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shepherds Lane WPS upgrade</li> <li>• Emu Creek SPS</li> <li>• Hi Quality SPS</li> <li>• Buckland Way SPS</li> <li>• Redstone Hill WPS and tank</li> </ul> <p>Sizing of these sites shall be further developed as the functional designs for these sites are carried out. It is expected that these sites will need a parcel of land that is larger than a standard residential block. There are 14 sewer pump stations proposed. The remaining 11 will not require significant space and can be built into any subdivision plans.</p>	Noted. Based upon discussions with Western Water, provision does not need to be made for these items within the PSP land budget	Yes		Decision pending further review
SS67	WW3	A review of the transfer infrastructure required has identified that the Shepherds Lane water pump station may need to increase in size, including the construction of a 10 ML tank. To accommodate both the larger pump station and tank, the site would need to increase from the current 3000 sqm to approximately 6000 sqm. It is anticipated that along with the pump station and tank, a temporary sewer pump station may be required within this site. There is a possibility that this will then impact upon the proposed retarding basin (WI-15) as stated above.	This need will be considered by Melbourne Water as part of their review of the relevant DSS. Will involve close engagement with Western Water	Yes		Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS67	WW4	<p>Western Water has identified that Melbourne-Lancefield Rd will contain a significant amount of infrastructure to service both the Lancefield Rd and Sunbury South PSPs. This will include, in addition to any other utilities requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dual alternative water supply pipes</li> <li>• Gravity trunk sewer main</li> <li>• Trunk potable water main</li> <li>• Possible reticulated mains for potable and alternative water</li> </ul> <p>Temporary pump stations and rising mains may also be required to service early out of sequence developments. Western Water will need to work closely with the VPA, Hume City Council and VicRoads to ensure that all appropriate services can be contained within the road reserve. If the road reserve is found to be too small then other alternatives will be required.</p> <p>Melbourne-Lancefield Rd may be used to collect and distribute any stormwater captured from the regional stormwater harvesting scheme.</p>	Given the limited future road reserve (approximately 40m) for Lancefield Road, Western Water have been advised that there may be a need to provide for some sewerage and water infrastructure within internal loop roads adjacent to Lancefield Road, or within the parallel connector road network. A notation on the Lancefield Road cross section will highlight this potential outcome.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Resolved
SS67	WW5	Western Water has identified the need to install mains along the connector road between Sunbury Rd and Vineyard Rd over Jacksons Creek. Provision for these mains on the bridge will be critical to reinforce the network by providing a level of security and redundancy into the network.	Noted. Updated Plan 12 will reflect this (see WW1)	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Resolved
SS67	WW6	Western Water has identified the need to install both potable and recycled water mains along the connector road between both Racecourse Rd and Melbourne-Lancefield Rd. Provision for these mains on the bridge/s will be critical to reinforce the network by providing a level of security and redundancy into the network.	Relates to Hume C208	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS67	WW7	Plan 11 -Integrated Water Management - MW and WW will provide an indicative stormwater harvesting network location to this Plan in GIS format	Noted. Plan 11 will be reviewed subject to receipt of this	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS67	WW8	3.5 Integrated Water Management and Utilities -R82 - Please include an additional point "A Sunbury Integrated Water Management Plan is being developed by Western Water and Melbourne Water (the Approving Authorities). The developer is responsible for completing an Integrated Water Management Plan that meets the objects of the overall Sunbury Integrated Water Management Plan."	Agree. Requirement will be updated to reflect this.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS67	WW9	3.5.1 Integrated Water Management - Please include an additional requirement - "A permit for subdivision must ensure that the ultimate stormwater management assets and associated land described in the precinct structure plan are provided by the developer prior to the issue of a statement of compliance. In the event that Melbourne Water and the Responsible Authority agree to an interim storm water management solution, the developer must: I) Provide the land required for the ultimate drainage solution prior to the issue of a statement of compliance; and I) Demonstrate that the interim solution will not result in an increase in the cost of achieving"	Agree. Additional requirement to be added	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Resolved
SS67	WW10	3.5.2 Utilities - R92 - Replace 'recycled' with 'alternative' - "Any plan of subdivision must contain a restriction which provides that no dwelling or commercial building may be constructed on any allotment unless the building incorporates dual plumbing for recycled alternative water supply for toilet flushing and garden watering use should it become available."	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS67	WW11	Western Water notes that a 20m wide gas easement is proposed to follow the Melbourne Bendigo railway. Western Water is looking at options for upgrading the sewer network for Diggers Rest and will need to find an alignment for a future sewer rising main. The current plans show that this rising main would follow the Bendigo to Melbourne Railway line and utilising the proposed gas easement would be a preferred outcome.	Noted, however the VPA has recommended that Western Water directly contact APA Group to discuss this proposal. APA has submitted to the amendment that "The pipeline easement is not to be used to co-locate other utilities and services".	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS67	WW12	Western Water would like to work with the VPA to ensure that WI-05 is kept at the current location. Given the proximity to the recycled water plant, we feel that this is an appropriate use for this land. A point to note for this retarding basin is that the size shown on the plan seems to be significantly different to the proposed size in table 9 of the report. Please confirm whether all the space highlighted would be used as Western Water would like the basin to be as large as possible.	The latest preliminary DSS has located this asset in a slightly different location but still proximate to the recycled water plant. The asset size in the DSS has been designed to meet the stormwater management objectives.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS67	WW13	The location of WI-15, next to the Shepherds Lane water pump station, will need to be reconsidered. It is likely that Western Water will need to increase the size of land for the Shepherds Lane water pump station and this may impact upon the location of the retarding basin.	Melbourne Water has not received any plans from Western Water regarding a pump station in this location. This needs to be discussed with Western Water as a priority as they consider any potential changes to their DSS for the area	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS67	WW14	Please change all references of recycled water to alternative water.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS67	WW15	It is noted that R85 (Lancefield Rd PSP) and R89 (Sunbury South PSP) did not state that a recycled water connection would be required for all new residential lots. This may be inconsistent with R86 (Lancefield Rd PSP) and R92 (Sunbury South PSP) which require a restriction for a recycled water connection. Western Water requests that these be changed from recycled water to "alternative water".	Agree. See WW14	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS67	WW16	The attached plans show the distribution assets for an alternative water supply. This requires a tank on Redstone Hill with a top water level of 250m and major supply infrastructure along Melbourne-Lancefield Rd. It is proposed that a tank supplying the Lancefield Rd PSP is built near to Konagaderra Road and that there will be an inlet and outlet main to this tank. The Redstone Hill tank is just below the crest of the hill and therefore Western Water needs to work through the implications of this with the VPA and Hume City Council. The site will also require a pump station. This will pump water up to the proposed tank at Konagaderra Rd tank. It is not expected that either the pump station or Konagaderra Rd tank will be built immediately.	Noted	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS67	WW17	Would like the Class B recycled water network to extend into the PSP areas.	Noted	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
68	Leanne Morgan (Sunbury Resident)					
SS68	LM1	Opposes the development of the land on environmental (views, air pollution from vehicles, biodiversity), community and heritage grounds.	General objection is noted.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS68	LM2	Submits that the PSP process has not implemented a community development approach, and are development led.	The PSPs are the result of years of strategic planning work, and implement the vision of previous strategic documents including Hume's HIGAP and the Sunbury / Diggers Rest Growth Corridor Plan.	No	No action	Unresolved
69	Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Group					
SS69	MWRRG1	Refer to Veolia facility as "garden and food organics facility"	Agree, subject to confirmation from Veolia and EPA that this is an accurate reflection.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS69	MWRRG2	Apply an ESO to the buffer areas as described above. This will ensure any use that is potentially sensitive will require a planning permit and decision guidelines will assist responsible authorities to determine appropriate land uses in buffer areas	Please refer to the Part A submission for the VPA's response to the Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Group's submission on buffers.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS69	MWRRG3	All land within the 1300m odour and 500m landfill buffer is not zoned residential	Please refer to the Part A submission for the VPA's response to the Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Group's submission on buffers.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS69	MWRRG4	To Structure Plan Map 1 in UGZ Schedule 9: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map 1 include the location of the Veolia in vessel composting facility</li> <li>• Map 1 to clearly articulate all buffers</li> <li>• Landfill buffer area renamed "Landfill gas migration and amenity buffer area"</li> <li>• Map 1 be amended to not identify land within the 500 meter landfill gas migration buffer for residential purposes.</li> </ul>	Please refer to the Part A submission for the VPA's response to the Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Group's submission on buffers.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
70	Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources - Transport					

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS70	DEDJTR1	The proposed bus interchange location at Redstone Hill Major Town Centre is not supported. The ideal location for the bus interchange is along the town centre connector Street. Opportunities for buses to U-turn (such as roundabouts) also need to be provided for buses approaching from either end of the town centre connector road {Please refer to Attachment 3).	Agree with the revised bus interchange location on the key connector road, given that this road no longer forms the primary 'main street' under the revised town centre concept. A notation on the concept plan will indicate that bus turnaround capacity needs to be considered as part of the design of future intersections along the connector through the MTC.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS70	DEDJTR2	A strong pedestrian link should be provided to the potential future railway station from the north - south connector road, (located to the west of the railway corridor).	Agree. Key Local Access streets will be identified on plan connecting both connector roads (east and west of the rail line) to the rail station, together with a new concept plan clearly demonstrating these connections	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS70	DEDJTR3	The proposed left in left out access on Lancefield Road just south of Gellies Road) would not allow buses to utilise the proposed connector road extending east along Lancefield Road. The proposed access will need to be modified to allow buses the option of a right turn. Alternatively; buses could utilise Lancefield Road however, pedestrian crossings would need to be provided along Lancefield Road at 400 metre intervals. (Please refer to Attachment 4 ).	A new signalised intersection will be provided on Lancefield Road, roughly midway between Sunbury Road and Gellies Road. These signals will provide for full bus movements as required. The intersection is propsoed to be funded through the ICP	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS70	DEDJTR4	The proposed Sunbury Road left in left out intersection will need to allow buses to perform a right turn movement, in order to provide sufficient coverage. (Please refer to Attachment 4 ).	Agree. This left-in, left-out intersection will be defined as an intersection to be designed to accommodate right hand turn moves for buses, subject to reciept of further advice from VicRoads around the requirements for this configuration	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS70	DEDJTR5	The potential future station will need to provide terminus facilities for two bus routes.	Noted. The land area has been defined based upon this assumption	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS70	DEDJTR6	Plan 10 Public Transport and Path Network - The rail station should be labelled as a 'potential future rail station'. All other references in the PSP should also be amended to 'potential future rail station'.	Agree. Plan and references throughout the PSP will be updated to reflect this designation	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS70	DEDJTR7	3.4.1 Street Network - This section should include the following requirement: "Any connector road or access street abutting a school must be designed to achieve safe and low vehicle speeds."	Agree. Requirement will be added	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS70	DEDJTR8	3.4.3 Public Transport - This section has not been added to the Precinct Structure Plan	Will insert Public Transport requirements. This was a formatting error.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS70	DEDJTR9	3.6.3 Subdivision Works - The below should also be a requirement: "Vic Track/PTV approved fencing along railway corridors which have not been fenced to be provided by the developer, prior to a Statement of Compliance being issued."	Agree. Requirement will be added	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS70	DEDJTR10	Road Cross Sections: The main connector street within the Redstone Hill Town Centre will need to be bus capable. <b>The Network and Corridor Planning team within DEDJTR - Transport have provided their comments via attachments to this letter. (Please refer to Attachment 1 and Attachment 2).</b>	Noted. This is a standard connector road and hence bus capable. It is nominated as a bus capable road on Plan 10 of the exhibited PSP	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS70	DEDJTR11	Planning Permit P18858: Due to the proposed changes to the bus interchange location and to the main connector road at Redstone Hill Town Centre, planning permit conditions will not be provided until this has been taken into consideration.	Noted. Await updated conditions.	Yes	Further review/discussion required - MR	Awaiting response from submitter
SS70	DEDJTR12	Cross Sections - Pages 68, 69, 70 and 71 - These have been labelled as Secondary Arterial Road, should read "Primary Arterial Road (6 Lane)".	Agree. Cross sections to be updated	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS70	DEDJTR13	The required signals at Vineyard Road and the on and off ramps are not funded by the PSP. Moore Road and Vineyard Road intersection is shown as left-in and left-out, consideration should be given to signalising the intersection. Both intersections require further assessment and therefore it is requested a hold be placed over the two intersections indicating that further work is required. Interested parties, VicRoads, Transport Group, VPA, City of Hume to continue with further discussions to resolve prior to panel.	Agree. Moore Road intersection to be a signalised ICP funded intersection. On Ramp intersection to be deleted.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS70	DEDJTR14	Redstone Hill Town Centre Concept Plan - Removal internal road connections from the service road.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS70	DEDJTR15	Road 02 - Change indicative timing from Short to Long term.	Two separate projects to be included in Table 10. RD02 upgraded to 4 lanes to be a short term project, RD02 updated to 6 lanes to be a long term project. Plan 13 to be updated to identify the balance of Sunbury Road through the precinct as forming part of RD02	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS70	DEDJTR14	P18858 - Amend permit to include VicRoads conditions when works impact on the Primary Arterial Network. The Section 96A draft Planning Permit conditions are required to be referred to VicRoads for comment. Preference is to work with Hume City Council, VPA, VicRoads and Transport Group to determine the most appropriate conditions on permit, at this stage request further time to	Template conditions provided only. Further discussions with VicRoads required	Yes	Further review/discussion required - MR	Decision pending further review
SS70	DEDJTR14	VicRoads template planning permit conditions provided for inclusion with the 96A permit.	As above.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS70	DEDJTR14	P18858 and P18855 - Planning Permit conditions from PTV are provided within the submission.	Noted.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS70	DEDJTR14	P18858 and P18855 -Add condition - PTV - 1) Pursuant to Section 8 (a) of the Subdivision Act 1988, only Plans of Subdivision which contain or abut a road nominated as a potential bus route identified within the Lancefield Road Structure Plan must be referred to Public Transport Victoria for Certification and consent to Statement of Compliance.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS70	DEDJTR14	2) Unless otherwise agreed to in writing with Public Transport Victoria, prior to the Certification of a Plan of Subdivision, construction engineering plans, for any subdivision stages which contain or abut a road nominated as a potential bus route in the Lancefield Road PSP, must be submitted to Public Transport Victoria for approval. The plan must be to the satisfaction of Public Transport Victoria and the Responsible Authority. a) The plans must depict the road cross section to be constructed and the location and design of bus stops (if required).	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS70	DEDJTR14	Unless otherwise agreed to in writing with Public Transport Victoria, prior to the issue of a Statement of Compliance for any subdivision stages that contain or abut a road nominated as a potential bus route in the Lancefield Road PSP, that portion of road (including interim works if and where relevant) must be constructed to accommodate public transport access for buses, and in accordance with its corresponding Cross Sections as outlined in the Lancefield Road PSP. This must be constructed to the satisfaction of and at no cost to Public Transport Victoria.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS70	DEDJTR14	4) Unless otherwise agreed to in writing with Public Transport Victoria, prior to the issue of a Statement of Compliance for any subdivision stages containing a road nominated as a potential bus route within the Lancefield Road PSP bus stops must be constructed to the satisfaction of and at no cost to Public Transport Victoria. Bus stops must be designed and constructed: a) In locations nominated in writing by Public Transport Victoria. b) In accordance with the VicRoads Bus Stop Guidelines February 2006, and the DOT Public Transport Guidelines for Land Use and Development. c) Compliant with the Disability Discrimination Act - Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport 2002. d) Be provided with direct and safe pedestrian access to a shared/pedestrian path.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS70	DEDJTR14	5) Any roundabouts constructed on roads designated a future public transport route within the subdivision, must be designed to accommodate ultra-low floor buses, to the satisfaction of and at no cost to Public Transport Victoria.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS70	DEDJTR14	6) Intersections, slow points, splitter islands and the like must be designed and constructed in accordance with the Public Transport Guidelines for Land Use and Development. The use of speed humps, raised platforms, one-way road narrowing and 'weave points' are not accepted on any portion of the potential bus route.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
71	Mesh on behalf of Villawood					

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS71	VW1	Redstone Hill Submission - Villawood propose to progress a draft UDF in the intervening period between exhibition and the panel hearing, in order to test and confirm likely implementation outcomes. Specifically, the UDF requirements set out in R20 and G22.	Noted.	No	No action	Awaiting response from submitter
SS71	VW2	All connector road intersections with Sunbury Road should be included in the ICP.	All signalised intersections with Sunbury Road are to be included within the ICP. Left-in/left-out intersections are not to be included in the ICP, as these come at relatively limited cost (in terms of works and land take), and are largely associated with providing local access to new subdivisions	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS71	VW3	The regionally significant role of the open space network should be emphasised in the PSPs to a greater degree that the exhibition versions currently identify. Should also provide clarification about how these spaces are intended to be embellished an managed and what funding opportunities are available to deliver these functions.	Agree to an extent. The PSP vision will be reviewed to further highlight the important regional function of the Jacksons Creek (and it's potential regional park status nominated under Plan Melbourne 2017), the Emu Creek, and Redstone Hill. There is no capacity to fund improvements to the open space network (beyond the construction of sporting fields and associated facilities) through the ICP.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS71	VW4	Further discuss with VPA the scale and implementation of the Redstone Hill open space and visual links to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refine the scale of the hilltop parkland and the visual links to more effectively respond to view lines, land use interface outcomes and implementation/funding issues;</li> <li>• Seek clarity about permitted and intended handover condition and cope of embellishment within RCZ areas of the hilltop parkland and visual link; and</li> <li>• Recognize the regional parkland role of Redstone Hill and the valuable contribution of the parkland to the broader community, by incorporating significant funding or ‘credit’ either for land of embellishment works (or both)(refer to Infrastructure Strategy submission).</li> </ul>	Further discussion required between VPA, HCC and Villawood around improvements to Redstone Hill and refinement of boundaries. See above re: potential for ICP funding for improvements to Redstone Hill open space	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW5	Villawood is prepared to accept the requirement for a 40m offset from the escarpment from pre-defined areas of visually significant landscape, provided that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the offset is located wholly within RCZ land (i.e. not subject to GAIC and ICP payments),</li> <li>• any edge road is permitted within the 40m offset,</li> <li>• identified open space nodes (which are subject to open space credit) are located within the escarpment offset/RCZ land, and are not located within otherwise developable land, and</li> <li>• drainage facilities are wherever possible located within the RCZ (and in limited situations partially within conservation areas with the agreement of the relevant authorities)</li> </ul>	<p>Where the land is currently zoned RCZ, the RCZ zoning will be retained for the 25.2 metres of land adjacent the escarpment. The roads will not be located within the RCZ as they support the urban development, however they will form part of the 40m offset, as per the cross section.</p> <p>Where land is already within the UGZ, no rezoning is proposed, as this is a reasonable constraint of the land.</p> <p>The open space nodes are considered to complement the local park network and will be treated as local parks, i.e. zoned UGZ and land funded through the ICP.</p> <p>Melbourne Water are currently reviewing their DSS, and are looking to, wherever possible and consistent with the overarching principles of DSS design, locate drainage assets within the RCZ (including limited incursion into Conservation Areas where supported by DELWP)</p>	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS71	VW6	Reconfigure open space area LP-28 by relocating it into the MTC and reducing its size from 0.75ha to 0.5ha to provide an urban park, and by enlarging LP-27 from 0.75ha to 1ha.	Agree	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW7	The planning permit conditions appear to suggest that Clause 52.01 will be used (refer to Condition 24c), however there appears to be no schedule exhibited for Clause 52.01.	This was an error. Clause 52.01 will not be used.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW8	Villawood requests that the PSP be updated to refine drainage areas as work with Melbourne Water continues. Villawood also seeks confirmation that, post PSP approval, should any further refinements to drainage areas occur, that remaining land will revert to developable land.	Updated Draft DSS information has been provided to landowners ahead of the Panel Hearing. Discussions in relation to this matter are expected to be ongoing.	Yes	Further review/discussion required - MR	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW9	It is requested that the PSP provide further commentary and guidance on how density targets should be balanced with other matters, specifically noting that density targets may need to be lowered or adjustments in particular locations, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The requirement for higher densities should be limited to a 400m catchment to the MTC (not 800m);</li> <li>• Density targets should be specifically lowered in areas of greater slope (for example, greater than 7.5%); and</li> <li>• The overall density target/yield assumptions for Sunbury may need to be reduced having regard to topography and Sunbury's peri-urban location.</li> </ul>	-The overall density targets within the PSP are lower than comparable growth area precincts, in large part in acknowledgement of some of the site specific and market constraints associated with the precinct. The 17 dwelling per hectare figure within the walkable catchment is likewise lower than comparable targets in other PSPs. R9 of the PSP provides for consideration of the capacity for density targets to be achieved over time, and it is therefore not mandatory that every staged subdivision application meets these targets. -The VPA are currently considering specific locations where it may be appropriate to define lower density outcomes, and would welcome any site specific advice from Villawood as to which parts of their site these should apply to.	Yes		Decision pending further review
SS71	VW10	Provide more specific direction in relation to implementation of streetscape diversity, having specific regard to Hume City Council's likely maintenance-based responses.	Further discussion required with Hume and the submitter	Yes		Decision pending further review
SS71	VW11	Villawood requests minor changes to the RCZ boundary once the PSP plan is finalised, to align correctly with undevelopable land along the Jacksons Creek and Redstone Hill.	Agree. The application of zones will be based on any changes to the Future Urban Structure	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW12	Villawood requests that the cross-section relevant to slope include notations that enable flexibility in implementation, including use of front and side retaining walls where appropriate.	Broader internal discussion required at VPA	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
		<b>Plan based submissions (refer submission)</b>				
SS71	VW13	Request confirmation that no additional widening of Sunbury Road is required - as per Cross Sections: Sunbury Road - Ultimate option 1 & 2.	No additional land is required beyond the 59-60m current road reserve to accommodate ultimate 6 lane cross section	Yes	No action	Resolved
SS71	VW14	Intersection type and extent to be confirmed.	This intersection will be a left-in/left-out only	No	No action	Resolved
SS71	VW15	Size and shape of drainage reserves differ to Villawood concept shown in the 'Redstone Hill, Sunbury South, Planning Permit Application Part 1 Residential Subdivision'. Size and shape of Melbourne Water drainage reserve to be confirmed once DSS available.	Melbourne Water has provided an updated preliminary Development Services Scheme(s) to the submitter.	Yes	No action	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS71	VW16	Request relocation of drainage reserves as shown, outside the developable area, and as per discussions with Melbourne Water and DELWP.	Melbourne Water has provided an updated preliminary Development Services Scheme to the submitter. An alternative drainage plan must meet the objectives of the preliminary DSS.	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS71	VW17	Request clarification regarding the possible heritage site. Villawood are unaware of any heritage values in this area. (HO358)	Further discussions are occurring with HCC on this matter.	No	Further review/discussion required - HCC	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW18	Preferred general location of open space (5.) - as per Figure 4: Redstone Major Town Centre Concept Plan. Size to match area 5.	Agree, subject to confirmation from HCC	Yes	Further review/discussion required - HCC	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW19	Confirm opportunities for alternative CAC locations within Town Centre as per Figure 4: Redstone Major Town Centre Concept Plan. Priority of timing sought for the CAC as part of the Town Centre	HCC have advised that their preferred location for the CAC is as highlighted in the Future Urban Structure. Some flexibility will remain in ultimate location, however it is not proposed to nominate alternative sites on the FUS or concept plan. Timing of CAC will be nominated as S-M term in the PIP	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS71	VW20	Confirm extension of Redstone Hill Road reserve will be located entirely within the Villawood title, to allow implementation of this road as part of the Town Centre.	As a connector road this will not be nominated in the property specific land budget. However capacity to 'crank' the road on the FUS to reflect its location on the Villawood title.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW21	A minor realignment may be necessary to transition the extension of Redstone Hill Road east.	See above	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW22	PSP indicates 3.0ha for Non-Government Primary School. 'Redstone Hill, Sunbury South, Planning Permit Application Part 1 Residential Subdivision' sets aside 2.7ha for this parcel as per discussions with the Catholic Education Office. A reduction to 2.7ha is requested.	Agree	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW23	Confirmation requested as to whether a road reserve can form part of the visual open space link to Redstone Hill, and rationale for 4m legal carriageway between lots and reserve (as required in S96A permit condition 1c of 'Redstone Hill, Sunbury South, Planning Permit Application Part 1 Residential Subdivision').	Further discussion required in the context of the 96A	No	Further review /discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW24	Request a reshaping of the Redstone Hill Reserve in this location to allow enable active built form presentation to reserve and passive surveillance of proposed district park. Extent to follow 250m AHD contour as shown.	Discussions with submitter in relation to an on site visit to view those areas proposed for exclusion from the reserve. This site visit has yet to occur	Yes	Further review /discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS71	VW25	Review and confirm location of Redstone Hill view line, potential use and credit as per comments in response to Draft Infrastructure Co-ordination & Delivery Strategy.	Subject to further discussions between VPA, HCC and Villawood	No	Further review /discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW26	Slight mapping discrepancy to be resolved. RCZ boundary overlaid as green dashed line on plan (Cross section for Regional Significant Landscape interface).	Agree to a degree. See VW5	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS71	VW27	Request extension of development in this area (Landscape values / GGF indent) subject to discussions with Melbourne Water and DELWP.	Agree, subject to revised DSS and BCS boundary realignment.	Yes	Further review /discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW28	Request that balance land to be nominated as open space (indent).	Support provision of a 0.25ha passive node in this location	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS71	VW29	Clarify methodology for extent of walkable catchment, catchment differs from catchments shown on Plan 5.	The basis for the application of the walkable catchment is defined at R9 of the Sunbury South PSP	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS71	VW30	Seek clarification that limited access to boulevard connector road is permitted where appropriate. Confirm all widening to Redstone Hill Road is to the north (on adjacent parcel).	Property access directly to the Boulevard Connector will be supported where appropriate. Notation on relevant cross section will clarify this. Widening to occur on northern side, as per property specific land budget.	No	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW31	Request flexibility delivering interim access within the current 20m Redstone Hill Road reserve.	Capacity to demonstrate this as part of 96A. Does not require a change to the PSP	Yes	No action	Resolved
SS71	VW32	Request that the southern link boulevard connector (34m) road remains entirely outside the Villawood parcel (currently clips the corner). Any deviation of this connector boulevard is requested to occur further north as not to encroach into Villawood parcel 61 and to facilitate implementation, in accordance with design submitted by Villawood and Capital Property.	Agree, subject to further design confirming the capacity to deliver this outcome	Yes	Further review /discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS71	VW33	Road link is considered a lower order connector and therefore seek confirmation that any boulevard / median treatments proposed are for streetscape diversity purposes only. Therefore application of the full boulevard cross section (34m) as requested in permit conditions, is not required.	Agree, this is a standard connector road. Any 'boulevard treatment' is to provide streetscape diversity outcomes, rather than traffic capacity.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW34	Realign connector road to avoid existing dwellings on adjoining land.	Agree. Connector road to be realigned to avoid adjacent dwelling	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW35	Plan 2 - Remove the designation of linkages to Redstone Hill top as having landscape values. Make other edits to plans following clarification of queries	Agree. Existing strategic view will be applied to these viewlines (based on any amendments agreed by VPA, HCC and Villawood)	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW36	2.1 Vision - Amend dot point 1 to remove reference to 'boulevard' treatment. Additional dot point added, recognising the regional open space role of the Redstone Hill hilltop park	Disagree. -A boulevard outcome does not predetermine a particular cross section outcome. Any amendments to the cross section for Sunbury Road will need to preserve the capacity to provide a high quality, landscaped boulevard outcome. -Redstone Hill will perform an important open space/landscape function, but it is not considered to be regional in nature in the same way as Jacksons Creek	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS71	VW37	O2 - Amend objective or add additional objective to relate to the connector road network as well	Agree. Additional objective around diverse boulevard outcomes for connector roads to be included	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW38	O6 - Amend objective to acknowledge other factors as noted	Agree. Objective will be amended to acknowledge other considerations that will affect density.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW39	O9 - No change to objective sought. Changes to permit conditions sought.	Noted	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS71	VW40	O12 - No change to objective sought. Change to Plan 3 sought to include credited open space within Jacksons Creek setback.	Noted	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS71	VW41	O18 - This objective is supported, however, Villawood makes a number of submissions in relation to how this objective is interpreted and implemented.	Noted	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS71	VW42	O31 - Amend objective to include reference to connector roads and key local character roads. Other amendments may be required following discussions with VPA about the Sunbury Road cross-section.	Agree to changes to reflect landscape outcomes on connector/key local streets. No changes deemed necessary in relation to Sunbury Road	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS71	VW43	O36 - Amend objective to include the words "where suitable".	Agree. Note it is not expected that 'third pipe' recycled water will be rolled out across the precinct, however the objective may provide for other 'recycled' water reuse.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW44	2.3 - Include acknowledgement that a 15 dwellings per ha target will not be achievable across the entire PSP area. Amend land budget as required in response to submissions	Plan Melbourne identifies average densities in growth areas as being 15d/ha, and requires these to increase to in excess of 20dw/ha over time.. However there is greater capacity to reflect the fact that this will be achieved across the precinct, and that individual sites/parcels will feature constraints that may mean 15d/ha is not a desirable outcome.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW45	Plan 5 - Amend Plan to clarify graphics - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>slope colours in legend do not match plan</li> <li>difficult to read slope affected areas under the red "Redstone Hill sensitive view line area"</li> <li>remove heritage site from Redstone Hill land</li> <li>consider that the orange coloured land should be removed from the plan</li> </ul> It is also considered that the sensitivity of view lines surrounding Redstone Hill are not equal. View to south (Jacksons Creek) and south-east (to city skyline) are of greater value than views to the north and north-west. This should be reflected graphically.	Acknowledge that the plan is difficult to read in its current form. The VPA are reviewing the detail on the plan, and it may be necessary to create multiple plans to ensure legibility. Villawood to clarify 'orange colour'? Is this slope? Redstone Hill views - Viewline to Jacksons Hill is considered important, as well as to the main street of the town centre.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW46	R5 - This objective is supported in principle, however it is noted that implementation can be problematic in terms of impacts on streetscape character, when additional matters, such as maintenance requirements are overlaid.	Noted	No	No action	Resolved
SS71	VW47	G2 - No change to guideline, however changes to plan sought.	Villawood to confirm extent of plan based changes	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS71	VW48	G3 - Amend objective to remove 'consistent' and instead acknowledge that street tree planting themes can be used to differentiate neighbourhood character.	Guideline to be modified generally as requested	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW49	R9 - Amend requirement to be a guideline, noting it is necessary to balance the objective for higher density with other considerations and objectives. Remove reference to 800m. Amend Table 2	Disagree (see earlier comments), however prepared to consider excluding a number of areas from the walkable catchment where site constraints would preclude these densities	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS71	VW50	R10 - Further discussion required, this is an example of a requirement that must be balanced against objectives relating to density targets.	For further discussion	No	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS71	VW51	R13 - wording should be amended to refer to 'visible scarring'	Agree. Requirement will be amended to include the word 'visible'	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW52	R15 - Delete R15. Redraft as guideline stating the lots 'should generally front', (for example, as per G15)	Tentatively agree, subject to further internal discussion	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW53	R16 - Amend Plan 5 to remove 'Sensitive View line Designation to north of park, and amend the requirement to indicate that a varied interface treatment to the Redstone Hill hilltop park is sought	For further discussion	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW54	G13 - Amend guideline to acknowledge impact on density target	Do not believe this would be necessary, based upon other proposed changes to the PSP (to specifically identify areas not subject to the density targets)	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS71	VW55	G14 - This guideline appears to duplicate R9. As noted above, Villawood is supportive of this objective being drafted as a guideline instead of a requirement.	Agree that this is effectively a duplicate of R9. VPA would propose to delete this guideline.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW56	G15 - Appears to duplicate and confuse R15 - G15 is supported by Villawood, not R15. Refer to R15 submission	Tentatively agree. See VW52 above.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW57	G16 - Amend guideline or Plan 5 to define 'significant slope'. Specify potential variations/flexibility will be considered. Amend cross-sections to provide for possibility of retaining wall (up to 1m high) at the front of lots.	Agree. Heading of 'significant slope' will take in 10-15% and 15-20% sloped land. The guideline already makes provision for variations to be considered by Council. 1m retaining wall at the front of lots requires further discussion	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW58	G19 - It is noted that this guideline conflicts with requirements for increased setbacks of 6m (as per the cross-sections). The greater the setback, the more likely the house will appear 'sunken'	For further discussion	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW59	3.2.1 - This blurb will need to be slightly redrafted in the context of the revised MTC plan. Specifically, it is noted that the connector road is no longer the main street. The connector road provides view line to Sunbury Road and Redstone Hill, not main street. Also reference to all roads having dedicated cycle paths should be reworded to key roads. Wording should also enable housing on ground floor - for example, current proposal provides for terrace housing within the centre.	Agree. 3.2.1 needs to be redrafted to reflect the updated town centre structure reflected in the concept plan. Need further discussions around residential at ground level, as this may have applied zone implications	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW60	Table 4 - As per the above, blurb will need to be redrafted with respect to view lines	Agree (see VW59)	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW61	Plan 7 - Villawood request amendments to the open space configuration, as per the enclosed plan-based comments. Specifically, we have made submissions regarding the reconfiguration of LP28 and LP27 (items 5 and 24 on enclosed submission plan) and the Redstone Hill view corridors (item 14 on enclosed plan).	HCC have previously indicated a strong preference for standard 0.75ha sizing for local parks, with 0.25ha passive nodes adjacent to creeks. R43 provides for alternatives to be considered at the permit stage, although obviously the 96A is driving this specific outcome to be reflected within the PSP. The VPA support making changes to those parks in support of the 96A application	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW62	Table 6 - P-01 (Redstone Hill Hilltop Park) not listed in this table. Refer to written submission regarding open space. LP-27 - Villawood request that this park be enlarged to 1ha. It will be the first park in the broader precinct and will serve several purposes for a significant amount of time. It is considered that the effect of this can be netted with a reduction in the size of LP-28, which Villawood propose to relocate to the MTC as an urban park of a smaller scale.	See above	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW63	R43 - Amend requirements to include additional dot points identifying positive outcomes of alternative open space provision (e.g. enhanced amenity, identifiable neighbourhood character and diverse land use opportunities).	VPA are prepared to consider providing additional direction around positive outcomes associated with alternative open space provision models. Villawood to provide proposed wording for review	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS71	VW64	G57 - Amend guideline to specific 'should' instead of 'must'	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW65	Plan 8 - Amend plan to include conservation area number reference	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS71	VW66	Figure 9 + 10 - Concerned with regard to the designation of the 'Conservation Interface Zone'- the conservation area already contains its own allowance for a buffer, so further buffers are unnecessary. The plan should also provide an allowance for some landscaping/parks nearer to the creek, where appropriate. The plan also appears to not reflect agreed outcomes with DELWP, VPA and Villawood regarding changes to the BCS area in relation to drainage.	Conservation Interface Zone reference applies to cross sections demonstrating interface outcomes not exhibited with the PSP. The VPA is currently discussing the detail of these with DELWP and will provide indicative cross sections as these are agreed. Updated DSS will be incorporated into reworked CACPs	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW67	R59 - Reword as a guideline. Refer to Permit Conditions submissions for further comments on implementation.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW68	Plan 10 - Amend legend to clarify a combination of bike lanes/dedicated paths will be delivered in connector roads.	The intention of this designation is that the bicycle lane provision is within the road reserve, rather than specifically 'on road'. VPA will review description to avoid confusion.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS71	VW69	G74 - Clarify how it is to be balanced with other objectives	The VPA generally consider that there is sufficient direction around density in other sections of the PSP that this guideline can be appropriately balanced against these requirements as part of a permit application process. Happy to consider additional wording if it is provided, but generally feel that the guideline is workable without further change	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS71	VW70	Table 7 - include a notation that provide for localised increases in maximum allowable slope where terrain requires.	Agree. Notation will be included	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW71	Table 8 - Amend table to provide additional information regarding potential streetscape variations and Sunbury Road variations, and to reflect any amendments to other cross-sections in response to these submissions	If this is for local streets, it might be difficult to capture all potential variations, without implying the list is exhaustive (and therefore further variations not possible). This table is intended to be a guide only	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS71	VW72	Plan 11 - Amend Plan 11 to accord with annotations on enclosed Plan 3	List of proposed changes provided to submitter. Awaiting response	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS71	VW73	R76 - Amend PSP plans to accord with the refined wetland arrangements for Part 1 application area.	PSP will be updated to reflect revised DSS	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW74	R77 - should be reworded to enable overland flow across open space (subject to responsible authority approval).	This is not the intent of this requirement. The intent is that provision is made for overland flow and it is safely conveyed down through the catchment. Any discussion of overland flow through open space must be made in discussion with the responsible authority.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS71	VW75	R81 - redraft as a guideline	Melbourne Water have advised that they do not support this change. Melbourne Water has undertaken a significant amount of background work to understand the impact of volume on receiving waterways.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS71	VW76	R83 - If further areas are approved by DELWP, then the PSP should state that any UGZ land that is no longer required for drainage purposes should revert to residential purposes.	Melbourne Water have advised that they do not understand how the requirement (R83) relates to the submission comment. Melbourne Water understands the intent of R83 is that any assets proposed in conservation areas must accord with DELWP requirements.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS71	VW77	G80 - Amend guideline to refer to high value natural waterways, and include guidance on when alternative solutions might be accepted.	Disagree. Its more appropriate that an alterative approach is considered at the subdivisonal stage and is site responsive. As the designated caretaker for river health Melbourne Water does not support the proposed change. Those waterways that have been identified for protection are to be managed with appropriate controls, as identified in G80.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS71	VW78	Table 9 - Update table with refined areas following discussions with Melbourne Water	Agree. Table to be modified to reflect updated DSS	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW79	R93 - Delete reference to gas in the requirement. Suggest it is a guideline, should refer to "gas should generally made available where it is already provided in the adjacent street network".	Propose to include a qualification of 'where available' in requirement as exhibited.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW80	R94 - Amend requirement to exclude RCZ, landscape value land and Redstone Hill hilltop park and delete reference to Table 6	Agree. Explicit reference to these open space areas not being captured by R94 will be included, and deletion of reference to Table 6	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW81	3.6 - Submission pending release of ICP and DSS.	Noted	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS71	VW82	G91 - Amend guideline to refer to Table 10	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW83	Table 10 •D04 - includes an asterisk on timeframe. Definition of the asterisk is not provided. • IT02 - labelled as IN02 on the plan •CI03 - The S-M timeframe is supported by Villawood, however it is not that this is not consistent with the timing in the Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Plan (which puts it at Stage 3, behind other CACs). Villawood propose to deliver this CAC (land and construction) as a WIK project as part of delivery of Stage 1 of the MTC (refer to written submission and separate submission on the Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Plan). • IN02 and IN03 - the practicality of delivery of these intersections in their current four lane format will be problematic. The large median and extensive tapers will result in short sections of upgraded Sunbury Road between the intersections. A more superior and practical outcome would be for Sunbury Road to be included as an ICP (or GAIC item) as per RD-01 and RD-02. • the Redstone Hill Stage 1 connector road intersects with an arterial road, and therefore should be included as an ICP item (short term). It is also noted that this intersection, while being a left-in, left-out in the ultimate, will operate as fully directional in the interim. • As per written submissions, funding for Redstone Hill Hilltop Park, as a regional parkland, should be included in the ICP, either as a land credit or for embellishment works. • The PIP should have regard to potential ICP funding, and WIK, for interim intersections. Particularly noting the likely implementation issues there will be with intersection along the pre-and post duplicated section of Sunbury Road.	Most changes supported. Redstone Hill connector road requires further discussion - VPA view is that it should not be included within the ICP	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS71	VW84	Cross-section P.66 - Primary Arterial Road (6 lane) Sunbury Road- Ultimate Option 1 - Review cross-section. Villawood will prepare an alternative cross-section for discussion with VPA.	Ongoing discussions with VicRoads and HCC in relation to this	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS71	VW85	Cross section P.67 - Primary Arterial Road (6 lane) Sunbury Road- Ultimate Option 2 - Clarify difference between cross-section 1 and 2, and potentially delete Cross-section 2, with ability for variations noted on Cross-section 1.	Difference relates only to minor variations in road reservation width. Agree that in the event that any amended road profile remains generally uniform, minor road reserve width variations can be noted on the cross section, rather than unnecessary include of additional sections	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW86	Cross-section P.72 - Connector Boulevard - Review and amend.	For further discussion, however the 7m median has been provided to preserve potential duplication in the ultimate.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW87	Cross-section P.84 - Main Street MTC Redstone Hill - Replace cross-section with enclosed cross-section, with notation stating that it is indicative only - exact cross-section details will be determined during the UDF process	Clarification as to which section is proposed to apply sought (not included in submission)	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS71	VW88	4.3 - Amend Property Specific Land Budget table to identify sub-column totals and to include revised land areas following plan-based changes	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
		<b>Planning Permit P18858</b>				
SS71	VW89	Permit Preamble - Request preamble to read "Staged Subdivision..."	This was not specified on application form. No master plan was provided, as required by Section 37 of Subdivision Act 1988. Further discussion required.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW90	Subdivision Concept Plan - Villawood propose to submit an amended concept plan following discussions with VPA and Hume regarding the PSP and permit submissions. Please note that as identified in the application, Villawood will seek to apply an Owners Corporation. As such, on the amended plan, indicative land will be identified as 'common property' to facilitate creation of the Owners Corp	Awaiting further plans from Applicant.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
		Review preamble to allow staged subdivision.	No rationale provided. Seek clarification.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS71	VW91	1a - Delete condition	Agree. Roads Authority has confirmed existing road reserve is sufficient.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW92	1b - Delete condition and amend PSP Land Budget to remove road widening for RD-04	Agree to delete condition.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW93	1c - Noted. Subdivision Concept Pan will be amended to show a 4m paper road where there is direct property abuttal to open space	No change sought. Noted.	Yes	No action	Resolved
SS71	VW94	1d - Delete or amend condition subject to further discussions	May be deleted, subject to review of cross-sections as discussed in letter to applicant (to be provided).	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS71	VW95	1e - Delete condition	As per VW94 above.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS71	VW96	1f - The details of the proposed MTC Main Street are to be refined during the UDF and Permit process for the MTC. Notwithstanding, we are happy to indicatively identify the proposed future alignment of the Main Street on the Subdivision Concept Plan, provided this does not prevent super lots being creating in the configuration shown on the Concept Plan	Agree to delete. Subdvision does not prevent the delivery of the main street at a future stage.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW97	1h - No change sought, subject to discussions about potential plan amendment	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS71	VW98	1i - No change sought, subject to discussions about potential plan amendment	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS71	VW99	1j - Delete condition	May be deleted, subject to receipt of plans addressing the matter.	Yes	Further review/discussion required - MR	Awaiting response from submitter
SS71	VW100	1l - No change sought, subject to discussions about potential plan amendment	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS71	VW101	1m - Amend condition to be clear that any depiction of potential outcomes is indicative only, and will not be used to assess future planning permits.	Will amend to be application requirement.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW102	1n - Delete condition	Awaiting review of PSP layout, which may change the location of the park. TBC.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW103	1o - Delete condition	Agree. Subdivision does not prevent the delivery of a community facility lot in the future.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW104	1p - Delete condition	May be deleted, subject to receipt of plans addressing the matter.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS71	VW105	13 b)iv) Amend condition. Condition should be reworded to state "excluding cables of 66kV and above"	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW106	13 b)vi) Delete condition	Do not agree.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS71	VW107	18) condition be reworded to require landscape plans prior to Statement of Compliance or commencement of landscape works (whichever is sooner).	Adjust the timing to allow for submission of detailed landscape plans before completion of civil works.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW108	19 c) Amend to specify where paths are provided in adjacent open space as an accepted circumstance, or where paths are provided on any other adjacent land such as drainage land or arterial roads.	VPA don't agree to amend the condition as requested. The discretion to accept open space and other footpath lies with Council under the condition.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS71	VW109	19h) Should be reworded to a should, rather than must requirements. In addition, it is noted that 3m wide cross-overs are not practical.	Condition to be deleted with the exception of "A vehicular crossing to each lot".	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW110	19p) This condition should be explicit that this only applies on designated bus routes	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW111	23 - this condition should be explicit that it refers to temporary fencing during construction works only. Further, it is considered excessive to require a 2m buffer to conservation areas	Do not agree, this is a mandatory condition of the scheme.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS71	VW112	25c) Further detail regarding the proposed valuation methodology is sought. Note that the reference to R36 appears incorrect.	Condition to be deleted.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW113	26 - This condition appears to incorrectly state " no less than 21 days prior" rather than "no more than 21 days prior" which is the standard approach.	Agree. Correct condition.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW114	27 - as per 26 above.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS71	VW115	37 - Delete condition	This is a mandatory condition, to be retained.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
		<b>SICADS submission</b>				

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS71	VW116	<p>In terms of the direction that is provided in the draft strategy in section 1.1 it is requested that the strategy include reference to three important principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Firstly, that the positive influence of larger landholdings is such that co-ordinated growth which ensures the most efficient use of public funds and resources whilst providing the greatest benefit to the existing and future communities may not be spatially sequential; and</li> <li>• Secondly, that priority should be given to infrastructure provision on larger landholdings and in proximity to activity centres to provide a focus for newly emerging communities and in order to achieve the greatest benefit for existing and future communities; and</li> <li>• Thirdly, larger projects have the capacity to reduce Council's financial risk by delivering key infrastructure items as works in kind projects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree, however the VPA consider this discussion is better placed at 1.3</li> <li>• Disagree. This is too broad a generalisation as to the likely priority associated with early infrastructure delivery, and in fact a number of proects associated with earlier stages of development would not meet this test.</li> <li>• Agree, however the VPA consider this discussion is better placed at 1.3</li> </ul>	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW117	It is requested that the draft strategy include reference to the positive contribution that development within the Sunbury growth areas, in accordance with the Sunbury Growth Corridor Plan, can make to the overall Sunbury community.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW118	It is requested that the draft strategy be amended to bring forward delivery of the Redstone Hill community centre to stage 2 (or other earlier timing as agreed by the Hume City Council) as a potential works in kind project to coincide with early delivery of the major town centre.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW119	<p>Inclusion of the Bulla Bypass project (in accordance with the project description) is supported as an important improvement to the existing arterial road network however it is requested that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the draft strategy recognize that the need for delivery of the project is created by regional traffic demand;</li> <li>• the draft strategy recognize that developers of land in Sunbury cannot control delivery of the Bulla Bypass project;</li> <li>• clarification be provided by the VPA regarding any relationship between timing of delivery of the Bulla Bypass and potential lot release beyond stage 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> <li>• Agree</li> <li>• Disagree. The role of the strategy is to provide some direction around the strategic need for infrastructure projects, relative the the distribution and level of development. Whilst the strategy idetnifies the need for construction of the Bulla Bypass in the second stage, neither SICADs nor the PSPs propose limits to development in the event that the Bulla Bypass is not delivered.</li> </ul>	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW120	<p>To improve the efficiency of delivery of the intersections and upgrade of the arterial road network it is requested that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft strategy recognise the need to achieve efficiencies with regard to delivery of key transport infrastructure;</li> </ul>	Agreed. The Strategy will be updated to incorporate this discussion	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW121	The draft strategy recognise the potential need for staged delivery of intersections with an associated ICP credit;	Agreed. The Strategy will be updated to incorporate this discussion	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW122	The draft strategy support the principle of GAIC WIK projects as a potential delivery option;	Agreed. The Strategy will be updated to incorporate this discussion	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW123	The draft strategy include land to achieve the ultimate condition of Sunbury (between intersections IN-03 and IN-02 and IN-02 and IN-01) in stage 1 of the delivery strategy; and	The revised cross section of Sunbury Road will not require provision of land beyond the current 60m reservation (see below)	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS71	VW124	An opportunity be made available to meet with the relevant authorities to consider a possible response to key implementation issues associated with the planned intersections and the upgrade of Sunbury Road.	Agree. This is ongoing and the VPA expect that a decision an an updated cross section for Sunbury Road will be agreed amongst the various parties. This will be detailed in our Part B submission to panel	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS71	VW125	It is requested that consideration be given to the inclusion of the activity centre connector road / Sunbury road intersection as an ICP project.	If this comment relates to IN02, this intersection is proposed to be funded through the ICP	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS71	VW126	There is an opportunity to meet with Council and the VPA to confirm the purpose of the Redstone Hill view corridor and to resolve the extent to which it can be embellished and used for other purposes if it is to be retained; and	See VW24	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS71	VW127	The VPA and Council give consideration to inclusion of Redstone Hill as a regional open space (land or construction project) noting the recent Ministerial Direction in relation to allowable items and supplementary items that may be funded by an Infrastructure Contributions Plan (ICP).	The VPA do not consider that there is capacity to provide for improvements to the Redstone Hill Park through the ICP. Submitter to provide specific infromation as to how this could be achieved.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS71	VW128	In order to anticipate the possibility of changes to the staging of infrastructure delivery and possible changes to the delivery partners it is requested that the draft strategy be amended to include recognition that infrastructure priorities and project partners may change subject to agreement being reached with the Council. It is accepted that an important aspect of any proposal which seeks to bring forward infrastructure provision will be to consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The potential benefit of delivery of the infrastructure to existing and future communities; and</li> <li>• The timing of credits for brought forward infrastructure relative to other priorities.</li> </ul>	Agreed. The Strategy will be updated to incorporate this discussion	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
72	DELWP - Environment					
SS72	DELWPE1	FUS and UGZ9 - Map 1 - The 'service open space in conservation area' layer to be removed leaving only one 'conservation area' layer. DELWP queries the use of the term 'service open space' with regard to the conservation area. DELWP does not object to 'drainage/waterway areas' being hatched over the relevant extent of the conservation area subject to the boundary of the conservation area remaining clear.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE2	FUS and UGZ9 - North of the Jacksons Creek crossing the 'connector road' boulevard is shown to encroach into Conservation Area 21 (refer copied image below). The connector road must be realigned at this location to wholly avoid the conservation area through this section.	Further discussion required. Would be complex to achieve from an engineering perspective.	Yes	Further review/discussion required - DELWP	Decision pending further review
SS72	DELWPE3	Plans must clearly show the boundary of the Holden Flora Reserve	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS72	DELWPE4	UGZ9 - Land Management Co-operative Agreement - Conservation area categorised as Growling Grass Frog - Reference in the final dot point to the 'Secretary to the Environment, Land Water and Planning to be changed to 'Secretary to the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning'.	Agree. The IPOs have also been updated.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE5	IPO3 and IPO4 - Protection of conservation areas and native vegetation during construction - Reference in the first paragraph to 'this precinct structure plan' to be changed to: "the Lancefield Road Precinct Structure Plan or Sunbury South Precinct Structure Plan"	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE6	Interface plan with Holden Flora Reserve - The future urban structure indicates there will be a significant interface between the Holden Flora Reserve and residential land. It is considered critical that an interface plan for the Holden Flora Reserve is provided in the PSP to ensure the protection of the its significant biodiversity and cultural heritage values. The PSP to include an interface. plan for the Holden Flora Reserve. The interface plan should be generally consistent with that provided for 'nature conservation' conservation areas under the MSA program and must be based on the principle that an adequate buffer zone is provided to ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A fire break can be maintained without compromising biological land values;</li> <li>• Regular burning of native vegetation within the Reserve can be undertaken without endangering life and property;</li> <li>• Excess nutrient can be absorbed from adjoining land .</li> </ul>	Agree. Interface plan generally consistent with the requirements set out in the submission to be prepared and included within the PSP	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS72	DELWPE7	Land Management Policy response to Sunbury South PSP - Land Management Policy would prefer that the generic term "open space" or "proposed open space" is used rather than 'regional open space' or 'metro open space' or 'metropolitan park' or 'regional park' alluded to in the PSP (including on any concept plan maps), so as to not to raise community and/or council expectations about the possibility of DELWP acquiring land to provide a regional (metropolitan) park.	The updated Plan Melbourne (2017) makes specific reference to the potential for a future regional park along the Jacksons Creek at Sunbury. The exhibited PSP is therefore consistent with state planning policy in relation to this matter.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS72	DELWPE8	All plans to clearly show the boundary of the Holden Flora Reserve (note the plan incorrectly refers to the Holden Flora and Fauna Reserve).	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE9	All plans - The road reserve associated with Eighnane Vly to be removed from Conservation Area 21	Agree. This will be removed from Plan 2.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE10	Reference to the Jacksons Creek regional park in Objective 018 to be removed	See above	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS72	DELWPE11	Plan 5 - The plan does not show the majority of interfaces with the conservation area and does not show the interface with the Holden Flora Reserve. All interfaces with the conservation area and Holden Flora Reserve are to be shown.	Agree	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS72	DELWPE12	Plan 8 - The wording in the legend should refer to 'scattered trees' instead of 'existing trees';	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS72	DELWPE13	Plan 8 - The scattered tree points don't represent DELWP's final scattered tree layer. DELWP to provide VPA with final scattered tree layer	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE14	The plan does not show any native vegetation or scattered trees within Conservation Area 21. All native vegetation and scattered trees within the conservation area to be shown as to be retained.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE15	R53 to be amended as follows: Native vegetation may be removed as illustrated on Plan 8 provided it is carried out in accordance with the 'Final...	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE16	R54 - Correct reference to location of CACP {Figure 8) and Interface Cross Section (Appendix 4) to be inserted.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE17	R55 - The final sentence to finish with the following: "to the satisfaction of the Department of Environment Land Water and Planning	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE18	Figures 8, 9 & 10 - DELWP has recently finalised its Areas of Strategic Importance (ASI) mapping for GGF (as part of master planning process) and requests these be included in the CACP's . DELWP to provide VPA with ASI spatial files.	Agree.	Yes	Further review/discussion required - DELWP	Awaiting response from submitter
SS72	DELWPE19	Figures 8, 9 & 10 - The native vegetation layer does not represent the timestamping data layer in all instances. An example is provided. DELWP requests an opportunity to review final extent of native vegetation prior to PSP being finalised.	Agree.	Yes	Further review/discussion required - DELWP	Decision pending further review
SS72	DELWPE20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Figures 8, 9 &amp; 10 - Large sections of Conservation Area 21 have not been site surveyed for native vegetation. The final shared path alignment should be determined after all areas of the conservation area have been site surveyed. To reflect this DELWP requests the following be added to 'proposed shared path' in the legend: "(final alignment subject to future planning and approvals process)"</li> </ul>	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE21	Figure 9 - In a section highlighted (provided), the shared path is aligned through native vegetation recorded through site surveys. DELWP requests path alignment be changed to avoid native vegetation.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE22	Figure 9 - the southernmost shared path crossing of the Jacksons Creek is in a location where instream pools providing GGF habitat have been identified. DELWP requests the crossing be shown further downstream (approximately 115 metres) to avoid any impacts to these pools.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE23	The shared path alignment within Conservation Area 21 is not in all cases consistent with the CACP's in Figures 8,9 & 10. Plan 10 should not introduce new path alignments within the conservation area. Note that DELWP would not support the below path alignment highlighted in yellow due to its close proximity to an area of Strategic Importance for GGF related to construction of a future GGF habitat.	Agree and noted.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS72	DELWPE24	Water asset WL-27 appears to be partially appears to extend into the Holden Flora Reserve. A stormwater asset would not be consistent with the reservation purpose for the Reserve and would not be supported.	Melbourne Water has updated the preliminary Development Services Scheme to locate the asset outside the Holden Flora Reserve (conservation area)	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE25	Plan 11 shows stormwater treatment assets which appear to be located within Conservation Area 21. These are not displayed in the Conservation Area Concept Plans. Please provide spatial files for the location of stormwater assets for DELWP to determine their suitability with respect to Conservation Area 21. The finalised PSP must not show any stormwater assets within conservation areas where DELWP approval has not been provided.	Updated Draft DSS information has been provided to DELWP. Further discussion required in relation to updated DSS and impact of CA21	Yes	Further review/discussion required - MW	Decision pending further review
SS72	DELWPE26	Plan 12 proposes a number of utilities located within Conservation Area 21 including sewers, sewer rising mains and a sewer pump station. The location of utilities shown in Plan 12 are likely to impact instream habitat for Growling Grass Frog and remnant native vegetation. As a first principle utilities should be placed outside conservation areas however where there is no alternative, disturbance to existing waterway values, native vegetation and habitat for matters for national environmental significance must be avoided. In order to be able to provide further advice DELWP requests further information (request within submission)	Noted. Plan 11 represents indicative high level location of future trunk services infrastructure. Ultimate design and construction will be subject to review, and approval of DELWP	No		Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS72	DELWPE27	A proposed sewer rising main is shown through the Holden Flora Reserve. The construction of a sewer rising main within Holden Flora Reserve would be considered inconsistent with its reservation purpose which is 'preservation of an area of ecological significance'. The proposed sewer rising main must be shown as outside of the Holden Flora Reserve.	See above	No	Further review/discussion required - WW	
SS72	DELWPE28	Section 3.5.2 - The following requirement to be include: "Utilities must be placed outside conservation areas in the first instance. Where services cannot avoid crossing or being located within a conservation area they must be located to avoid disturbance to existing waterway values, native vegetation, matters for national environmental significance, significant landform features and heritage sites, to the satisfaction of the Department of Environment, Land Water and Planning."	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE29	Section 3.6.4 - The following should be included as a guideline: "Development applications should demonstrate how the development will avoid and minimise impacts to conservation areas through consolidating utilities into dedicated service corridors."	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE30	The interface place to be titled 'Interface with conservation areas'	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE31	Appendix D - The following dot point to be added to the sub heading 'General principles for service placement': Avoid impact to native vegetation and habitat for matters of national environmental significance within Conservation Area 21.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS72	DELWPE32	52.17 - The wording the planning permit exemption to be replaced with the following wording: "All native vegetation the removal, destruction or lopping of which is required for any development that is subject to and carried out in accordance with the following approval made pursuant to section 1468 of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth): 'Final approval for urban development in three growth corridors under the Melbourne urban growth program strategic assessment, 5 September 2013. This does not apply to native vegetation or scattered trees identified as to be retained in Plan 8 of the Sunbury South Precinct Structure Plan."	Agree subject to review of specific wording	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS72	DELWPE33	IPO3 and IPO4 - Protection of conservation areas and native vegetation during construction - Reference in the first paragraph to 'this precinct structure plan' to be changed to: "the Lancefield Road Precinct Structure Plan or Sunbury South Precinct Structure Plan"	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE34	IPO3 and IPO4 - Land Management Co-operative Agreement - Conservation area categorised as Growling Grass Frog - • Reference to conservation areas 18,19 or 20 to be changed to Conservation Area 21; • Reference in the final dot point to the 'Secretary to the Environment, Land Water and Planning' to be changed to 'Secretary to the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning'.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE35	IPO3 and IPO4 - Section 2 - KMP - As areas covered by schedules 4 & 5 of the IPO will not be subject to future residential development DEL WP believes a condition requiring a Kangaroo Management Plan (KMP) is not required. DELWP requests KMP conditions be removed from the IPO schedules.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE36	SUZ10 - The concept plan does not reflect a map sent by DELWP via email on 21 (sent from Michael Ward to Sarah McMaster). Note that the area shown as 'potential development area' in the final concept plan must not encroach into Conservation Area 21. DELWP suggests follow up meeting with VPA to further discuss.	Noted. The concept plan has been updated.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS72	DELWPE37	IPO4 - Land identified in the PSP as 'quarry/landfill' is not under the proposed amendment to biodiversity conditions required under the Melbourne Strategic Assessment Program. To ensure relevant biodiversity conditions are implemented over this land DELWP requests that the extent IPO schedule 4 be increased to cover land identified as 'quarry/landfill';	The quarry / landfill is not subject to the PSP, and is not proposed to be included as part of this Amendment. This will be clearer in the final version of the PSP. Therefore, it is not appropriate to apply the IPO to the quarry / landfill. This should be appropriate, as there is no capacity for Urban Development on the landfill / quarry site.	Yes	No action	Decision pending further review
73	UDIA					
SS73	UDIA1	UGZ9 - Clause 4.11 - queries where within the Planning and Environment Act 1987, Council will have the right to require additional land for an arterial road intersection not identified within the relevant ICP;	This clause relates to intersections which are not identified in the PSP i.e. left-in/left-outs that are subdivisional works, the costs of which are usually borne by the developer. The clause is considered appropriate.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS73	UDIA2	UGZ9 - Clause 4.11 - UDIA raises questions of fairness and appropriateness. Requests deletion.	As above.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
74	CFA					
SS74	CFA1	Any proposals to increase the degree of predominant vegetation within the precinct must be carefully considered. Replanting or revegetation must not increase the bushfire loads, particularly along the steep waterway escarpments.	Noted. These areas will be managed by public authorities who will be aware of the potential increase of bushfire risk associated with re-vegetation.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS74	CFA2	The Draft Planning Permit conditions specify a requirement for an annual Bushfire Management Plan to be developed to the satisfaction of the Municipality. This plan should identify where certain fuel reduction works need to be provided, by whom (e.g. Developers), the standard and timelines for completion of such works.	Advice noted. No request to include the suggested plan content in the condition.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS74	CFA3	Roads should be designed to address Clause 56 requirements.	VPA to assess on behalf of CFA.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS74	CFA4	CFA need to articulate that additional Fire service delivery points (fire stations) need to be incorporated into the PSP Service requirements. Further discussion will need to occur with the CFA. These locations may / may not be associated with other emergency service providers in an "Emergency Services Hub".	Noted. The VPA has progressed this with the CFA and is awaiting input from the CFA.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS74	CFA5	CFA supports the amendment in its current form.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
75	Tract OBO Capitol					
SS75	CAP1	Amend PSP Plan 2 - 'Precinct Features' to remove the 'Landscape Values' designation to that area that is designated 'land subject to capability assessment' in Plan 3.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS75	CAP2	Amend Plan 3, 2 and 6 to remove 'break of slope' designation from the 'land subject to capability assessment' land.	The break of slope will not be shown on the Future Urban Structure (Plan 3) or Plan 6. It is appropriate to retain the break of slope on Plan 2 - Precinct features, with a different graphical representation to note that the Break of Slope is much more gentle in this locaiton (internal sloping land)	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS75	CAP3	Amend Plan 5 to remove the designation 'interface with escarpment (non-visual)' from the 'land subject to capability assessment' land.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS75	CAP4	Amend Plan 10 - to remove the off road path within the 'land subject to capability assessment' land.	Agree. However requirements for 'land subject to capability assessment' will be modified to include appropriate provision for 'on road' cycling along the internal sloping land	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS75	CAP5	Amend Figure 9 and Plan 9 to remove the designation 'setback from escarpment (non visual) from the 'land subject to capability assessment' land.	Agree for Figure 9. Not required for Plan 9	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS75	CAP6	Replace the text at UGZ9 Clause 3.13 dot point 7 with "The indicative cross sections for development that responds to slope and where relevant, cross sections outlined in Appendix 4.2 of the Sunbury South Precinct Structure Plan'.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS75	CAP7	Plan 3, 11 and other plans and land budget should be amended to accommodate the detailed drainage concept presented in submission.	Melbourne Water has reviewed alternate designs from the developer of these properties for the stormwater planning. Melbourne Water believes the latest preliminary Development Services Scheme is in line with the designs provided by the developer's consultants. The submitter is asked to review the latest draft DSS.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS75	CAP8	The flow path reservation be removed from that part of the site above the Internal Sloping Land within Plans 3, 11 and other plans.	Melbourne Water believes this item has been addressed in the latest draft Development Services Scheme. The submitter is asked to review the latest draft and provide confirmation this item has been addressed.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS75	CAP9	All relevant plans be amended to show an overload flow path of no more than 30m width below the top of the Internal Sloping Land.	Melbourne Water believes this item has been addressed in the latest draft Development Services Scheme. The submitter is asked to review the latest draft and provide confirmation this item has been addressed.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS75	CAP10	Amend plans and LUB to reflect the land use designations in the submitted plan to recognise the development potential of the north western corner of the Harker Street area.	Disagree. Do not support development in that part of the Harker Street area.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS75	CAP11	Remove the designation of Local Open Space from plans and land budget to designate the knoll as a conservation area.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS75	CAP12	Delete or amend Figure 2 (Harker Street Concept Plan) to generally reflect the submitted plan.	Disagree. Do not support development in that part of the Harker Street area.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS75	CAP13	Remove cross-section 4.2	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS75	CAP14	Amend the zoning map to apply the RCZ to all land within the Harker Street precinct that is not identified in the PSP as residential and apply the UGZ to the residential designated areas only, and RCZ to the balance of the area. All PSP and supporting planning scheme maps should be modified to reflect the submitted changes.	Agree, however the VPA do not support the extend of UGZ land proposed in the submission	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS75	CAP15	That the land area identified for the service open space in conservation area and conservation area be modified to reflect the area shown in plan submitted, and all relevant plans and LUB updated to reflect.	In principle agreement to include land to the break of slope as 'UGZ', subject to agreement with DELWP around the modifications to the GGF corridor.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS75	CAP16	That a notation be included within Figures 8, 9 and 10 which clarifies that the concepts are indicative only and that development of the reserves and construction of assets within will not form part of any developer contributions or funding.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS75	CAP17	Amend R93 to incorporate a notation confirming that developer funding of shared paths, paths on arterial roads and bridges are for urban development areas only.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS75	CAP18	Plan 12 be amended to reflect the updated position of each of the servicing authorities.	Agree. This is being undertaken in response to other submissions	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS75	CAP19	A note should be added to the cross section for Sunbury Road, Options 1 and 2, as follows: Plan 12 be amended to reflect the updated position of each of the servicing authorities. "The width of the median strip may be adjusted to the satisfaction of the responsible authority, with consideration of existing trees, the Melbourne to Sunbury water main, the existing 66kv power lines, and with the objective of delivering the road in accordance with the existing road reserve to minimise land acquisition requirements and streamline construction."	Indicative cross section is being comprehensively reviewed, with input from VicRoads and Hume City Council. Updated cross sections will be presented as part of VPA's submission to Panel. Notation on updated cross section will acknowledge the need for local variation to accomodate existing and planned services	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS75	CAP20	Plan 9 be amended to include a left in-left out intersection approximately midpoint between intersections IN-04 and the Francis Boulevard roundabout, and An access point onto the Francis Boulevard roundabout.	Disagree. Left-in Left Out intersections have been included where they provide a strategic connection to the connector and arterial road network. LiLo intersections for local access only are subject to agreement with Council and vicRoads, and should be considered at the subdivision stage	Yes	No action	Unresolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS75	CAP21	The 'Possible' heritage site identified on Property No 59 has no heritage value and this designation should be removed.	The VPA is prepared to review this designation, subject to the submitter providing the heritage advice referenced in the submission	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS75	CAP22	The PSP should provide specific interim management and handover requirements in relation to areas earmarked as 'service open space in conservation area', regionally significant landscape values' and 'conservation area' and confirm that fencing is only required where these areas interface with urban development for interim protection of conservation areas during construction.	Partially agree. Additional direction on handover obligations for regionally significant open space will be built into the PSP. Obligations for conservation areas are set out as part of the implementation of the BCS.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS75	CAP23	That the heading for requirement R94 be amended to read 'Local municipal open space delivery'.	Agree. R94 will be updated to acknowledge that these requirements relate only to local open space	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS75	CAP24	Remove the requirement for the provision of gas to all lots under R89 and include the provision under the Guidelines section at 3.5.2 of the PSP.	Propose to include a qualification of 'where available' in requirement as exhibited.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS75	CAP25	The PB functional designs be updated or replaced with designs that support the exhibited PSP road alignments and intersection locations, particularly RD-04 and IN-03.	Agree. The designs will be updated to reflect the exhibited PSP, plus any modifications falling out of Panel recommendations. Associated changes will be made to the Land Use Budget	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS75	CAP26	RCZ and UGZ - adjust the zones to reflect the land use changes in this submission.	Refer response to CAP14	Yes	No action	Decision pending further review
SS75	CAP27	Include the setback to the top of the escarpment as the RCZ.	Agree, refer response to CAP14.	Yes	No action	Decision pending further review
SS75	CAP28	Apply the PAO to the southern connector road reservation to facilitate the early delivery of RD-04, at a point in time when the road alignment is confirmed.	A PAO has not been exhibited and could only be applied at Council's request. It can not be applied as part of the current planning scheme amendment	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS75	CAP29	The SICADS needs to provide clarity that population growth will be the mechanism applied to confirm progression from one stage to the next.	SICADs is being reviewed, and its statutory relationship to the PSP will be removed. It will form a background report only, with acknowledgement that infrastructure priority will be reviewed as development unfolds, and that the distribution and rate of growth is the driver behind the provision of infrastructure, rather than specifically timing	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS75	CAP30	The SICADS needs to provide clarity on the calculations behind the proposed population thresholds.	See above	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS75	CAP31	In making the submission, the opportunity to provide a more detailed response to the ICP when available, is requested.	As it is expected that the ICP will be a standard levy, there is unlikely to be an opportunity for public submissions on this document. In the event that it involves a supplementary levy, it will be subject to full exhibition. The infrastructure projects proposed to be funded through the ICP are outlined in the PIP at Table 10 of the PSP.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
76	Melbourne Water - Planning Permit					
SS76	MWPP1	Melbourne Water objects to the above 96A Planning Permit Application for staged subdivision on the following grounds:	Noted.	Yes	No action	Decision pending further review
SS76	MWPP2	1. The subdivision is inconsistent with State and Local Planning Policy relating to the protection of waterways, the natural environment and River Health.	Noted.	No	No action	Decision pending further review
SS76	MWPP3	2. The subdivision is inconsistent with State and Local Planning Policy relating to drainage and floodplain management.	Noted.	No	No action	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS76	MWPP4	3. The planning permit application is premature and conflicts with the draft PSP and development drainage scheme (planned drainage infrastructure) for the PSP area.	Noted.	No	No action	Decision pending further review
SS76	MWPP5	4. The subdivision does not advance the objectives of proper and orderly planning in Victoria.	Noted.	No	No action	Decision pending further review
SS76	MWPP6	The footprint area of stormwater treatment assets in the Redstone Hill subdivision masterplan layout is not large enough to treat stormwater to best practice.	Noted. Will need to be adjusted to reflect to updated DSS	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS76	MWPP7	The Turnberry Drive and Shepherds Lane DSSs require two stormwater treatment assets in the Redstone Hill Estate to treat stormwater from the catchments to best practice. The two required assets are WI-12 and WI-15 as shown in figure (submitted).	Noted. Will need to be adjusted to reflect to updated DSS	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS76	MWPP8	Based on modelling and calculations undertaken by Melbourne Water, the land area required for WI-12 is 3.62 Hectares (as shown in Table 9 of the exhibited Sunbury South PSP). Based on the application submitted, only 1.25 Ha has been provided for drainage. This is unacceptable.	Noted. Will need to be adjusted to reflect to updated DSS	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS76	MWPP9	Based on modelling and calculations undertaken by Melbourne Water, the area of land the required for WI-15 is 5.33 Ha (as shown in Table 9 of the exhibited Sunbury South PSP). Based on the application submitted, no provision has been made for the required asset in the subdivision masterplan (Figure 2).	Noted. Will need to be adjusted to reflect to updated DSS	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS76	MWPP10	Development of Stage 1 would result in increased volume and frequency of stormwater runoff into the Hi Quality property downstream of Sunbury Road. Hi Quality own and operate an existing quarry on this site and currently store existing stormwater runoff from the proposed development area in a large artificial dam. Increasing the volume and frequency of stormwater runoff from the proposed development risks impacting the function of this dam and potential adverse impacts on the downstream landowner. The stormwater management strategy for this subdivision must address any potential adverse impacts on the downstream landowner and adequately consult with the affected landowner.	Noted.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
77	Melbourne Water - PSP					

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS77	MW1	Note to VPA: Melbourne Water is currently undertaking concept review and functional design of the drainage infrastructure (DSS) required to service future development in the Sunbury South and Lancefield Road PSP's. The outcome of this body of work may result in significant changes to the proposed layout and size of works in the applicable Development Services Scheme's and Strategies. Melbourne Water will endeavour to keep the VPA updated on the progress of these studies and will provide updated designs to inform future iterations of the PSP's. Melbourne Water understands that the VPA will coordinate consultation with landowners and stakeholders affected by these future changes to the PSP and update the PSP accordingly.	Noted	Yes	No action	Resolved
SS77	MW2	Update Plan 11 based on the latest GIS information provided from Melbourne Water – Attachment 3 Sunbury Development Services Scheme GIS Files	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW3	Plan 3 - “Regionally significant landscape values” line should be clearly differentiated with the waterway corridor line.  These must be updated using Attachment 4 – Sunbury Waterway Corridor GIS Files.  Replace “Service open space / retarding basin” with “Waterway/drainage reserve”	Agree. All plans will be updated to use the 'Waterway/drainage reserve' reference.Areas of the Regionally Significant Landscape Values which may be developable subject to an appropriate drainage solution will be re-named 'Land not service by Development Services Scheme'.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW4	Plan 2 - Add note to note to Plan to indicate break of slope analysis is still undergoing refinement.	No longer required. The Break of Slope has been reviewed and an updated version will be included on Plan 2	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW5	Section 2.1 - Vision (last paragraph) - Add reference to significant tributaries - “Development that sensitively responds to, improves community access to, and protects the fragile twin creek valleys of Jacksons and Emu Creek and their significant tributaries”	Agree. Vision will be changed accordingly	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW6	Section 2.2 Objectives (Objective 3) - Change wording to: “Create subdivision layouts and built form that responds to the topographical constraints and the undulating nature of much the precinct, including the key landscape features of the Jacksons Creek and Emu Creek corridors and their significant tributaries, as well as Redstone Hill.”	Agree. Objective will be changed accordingly	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW7	Objective 12 - Change wording to: “Facilitate urban development that responds sympathetically to the unique, high landscape values of the precinct, protecting the natural landscape qualities of the Jacksons and Emu Creek corridor and their tributaries, and providing a usable network of open space adjacent to the creeks and above the break of slope.”	Agree. Objective will be changed accordingly, however will delete the word 'significant' and include specific reference to Harpers Creek.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS77	MW8	3.5.1 – Integrated Water Management – para 2 - Change wording to include: “Jacksons and Emu Creek catchments have been identified as having a diversity of ecological and social values and are designated priority areas within Melbourne Water’s Healthy Waterways Strategy. In addition, they are highly valued by the community and have been identified as highly erosive.”	Agree. Query as to whether this should also apply to Lancefield Road (MW to confirm)	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW9	Figure 1 - Modify concept plan layout to show road avoiding proposed stormwater quality treatment assets.	Agree, however the Concept Plan is being reviewed, based upon updated DSS for this area.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW10	Figure 4 – Redstone Major Town Centre Concept Plan - Modify layout so that roads do not encroach on the retarding basin asset proposed by Melbourne Water.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW11	Figure 5 (all elements) - Update all elements to show the Melbourne Water proposed retarding basin shape and size.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW12	Figure 6 – Harpers Creek Local Town Centre Concept Plan - Modify legend label to show ‘landscape value’	Legend will be consistent with agreed treatment of landscape values, based on further discussions with MW	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW13	G70 IWM - Suggested modification to G70 second point:  “Retain existing vegetation within waterway corridors”	Agree (although this change will be to G80, rather than G70).Wording will be: “Subdivision in areas containing natural waterways should, to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and the responsible authority: ☐ Minimise earthworks and changes to the existing landform; ☐ Retain existing native vegetation ☐ Make provision for appropriate works to stabilise existing erosion (if required) of the waterway (bed and banks) in a manner that is sensitive to the waterway values ☐ Make provision for appropriate revegetation of indigenous species to improve waterway vales"	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW14	Figures 8, 9 and 10 - Many shared paths proposed on, near or crossing highly sensitive and valuable waterways / tributaries. Discussion required.	Melbourne Water to provide specific advice on paths on sensitive waterways and tributaries. The CACPs will be modified accordingly	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS77	MW15	Figure 10 - Update Figure to show correct asset shape and size using Melb Water supplied GIS files.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW16	Figure 10 - Update the plan to show shared path network avoiding land required to house assets under the proposed draft Development Services Scheme.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW17	3.5.2 Utilities –R92 - Requested change: Any plan of subdivision must contain a restriction which provides that no dwelling or commercial building may be constructed on any allotment unless the building incorporates dual plumbing for <b>recycled (delete)</b> alternative water supply for toilet flushing and garden watering use should it become available	Agree. Requirement to be modified accordingly	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW18	Plan 11 – Integrated Water Management Plan - Plan should note that it is subject to change to align with the IWM Plan requirements as stipulated by Western Water and Melbourne Water. The draft assets are contained in Attachment 5 – Sunbury draft alternative water supply GIS files.	Agree. Note will be prepared to incorporate this discussion (as well as submissions from other parties). Proposed note will be provided to MW for review.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS77	MW19	R64 - Modify R64 "Road crossings of waterways must respond sensitively to landform, environment and the amenity of the waterway subject to Melbourne Water approval"	Agree. Requirement to be modified accordingly	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW20	Table 9 – Retarding Basins - This heading must be re-named 'Stormwater Quality Treatment'.	Agree. Table to be modified accordingly	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW21	Table 9 - Under the heading 'Type', each must be changed to 'Stormwater Quality Treatment'. The function of these assets is not primarily a retarding function.	Agree. Table to be modified accordingly	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS77	MW22	3.5.1 – G84 – Integrated Water Management - Make G84 a Requirement and remove reference to lots facing directly onto waterway: "Streets should be the primary interface between development and waterways. Public open space <b>and lots</b> (delete) with a direct frontage may be provided as a minor component of the waterway interface only where necessary for logical subdivision design. <b>Where lots with direct frontage are provided, they should be set back up to 5.0 metres from the waterway corridor to provide pedestrian and service vehicle access to those lots (deleted)</b> , to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and the Responsible Authority."	Disagree. There may be isolated instances where this form of interface may be acceptable. If this is changed from a Guideline to Requirement these will not be able to be considered.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS77	MW23	Melbourne Water also provided a number of considerations for the VPA to consider that do not form part of the formal submission. These will also be considered by the VPA.	Agree.	Yes	No action	Resolved
78	Department of Justice and Regulation					
SS78	DJR1	The department has a number of logistical and operational requirements when selecting sites for justice services which may make the established Sunbury town centre a preferable location rather than the proposed Lancefield Road and Sunbury South developments. Due to the uncertainty around these requirements and the forecast timeframe, the department has elected not to reserve land in the new developments.	N/A	No	No action	Resolved
79	Macedon Ranges Shire Council					
SS79	MRSC1	1. There is a need to review the capacity to increase passenger services via the Metro and V/Line network. Discussions with relevant transport organisations are needed to better understand how the metro/regional public transport system can respond to the growth in_ population without impacting adversely on the existing arterial road networks.	Noted. This cannot be addressed through this Amendment.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS79	MRSC2	2. Council seeks commitment in the PSP documentation that additional capacity will be provided on the existing metropolitan and V/Line network (i.e. train passenger capacity and frequency of service) to meet the demands of this growing commuter population.	<p>The VPA concedes that whilst the key regional service and employment role that Sunbury performs for peri urban areas beyond Melbourne was very much considered in the development of the PSPs, this does not clearly come through in the PSP documentation. To address this, the VPA propose to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Modify the Metropolitan Context Plan (Plan 1) to better acknowledge the spatial relationship of the growth precincts to both metropolitan Melbourne and the peri-urban areas, including in particular southern Macedon Ranges Shire.</li> <li>2. Acknowledge in the respective visions of the both PSPs the important regional services and employment role that Sunbury will continue to perform for peri urban communities to the north-west of Melbourne.</li> <li>3. Incorporate additional objectives in the 'Transport and Movement' section of each PSP around preserving the capacity of the regional arterial and public transport commuter networks to ensure that existing connections to Sunbury and Melbourne from regional Victoria are not compromised.</li> </ol>	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS79	MRSC3	3. Discussions with VicRoads must consider road safety infrastructure investments to improve the safety of all types of road users using the Melbourne to Lancefield Rd (rural and planned urban stretches of this road). This road is already well-recognised as a dangerous stretch of high speed, rural road. Vic Roads are currently planning road safety upgrade treatments along this rural road. Increasing population to this area, would require review and coordination of metropolitan and regional road safety treatments.	Agree.	No	No action	Resolved
SS79	MRSC4	4. As traffic volumes increase on the Calder Hwy, Council needs further information regarding what treatments for existing infrastructure are planned to be in place to manage the increase in vehicle traffic demand, and increased demand at the Calder Highway and Diggers/Bulla Rd interchange.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
	MRSC5	5. Currently traffic volumes from Keilor Park Drive and Kings Rd are increasing at levels which are already causing significant congestion in this area - e.g. during peak times, travel speeds currently decrease substantially to 20-40km, and sometimes traffic stops at a standstill. Ramp metering has been recently installed at Keilor Park Drive as part of the City Tullamarine Widening project.	Noted.	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS79	MRSC6	Seek certainty in the delivery of the Bulla Bypass. Asserts that it is needed now, and notes that there is uncertainty that it will be undertaken in 2025 as projected.	<p>The Bulla Bypass is being actively planned for. VicRoads is currently reviewing the alignment of the Bulla Bypass with the view to applying a Public Acquisition Overlay through a Planning Scheme Amendment shortly.</p> <p>The Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy (exhibited concurrently with this Amendment) has identified the delivery of the southern Jacksons Creek crossing (part of the ultimate Sunbury ring road) as being critical early infrastructure to enable access to the Calder Freeway from new development fronts in the south and east of the township. This will assist in managing congestion issues on Sunbury Road while the larger Bulla Bypass Project is in planning and delivery stages.</p>	No	No action	Unresolved
SS79	MRSC7	Requests the traffic modelling data be reviewed to include regional traffic volume data for state arterial road networks.	Strategic transport modelling undertaken for the two PSPs utilised the Victorian Integrated Transport Model (VITM) which is administered by the Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources (DEDJTR). VITM is informed by population projections included in Victoria in Future (VIF) data which is prepared by the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP). Therefore the population projections included in VITM reference case models for future years (including anticipated population change in Macedon Ranges Shire's townships) inform the transport inputs (including traffic volumes on state roads) of the model. Both VIF and VITM are updated by DELWP and DEDJTR periodically. Council will need to contact these departments if it does not believe that the data reflects the projected growth of relevant townships as it is out of the scope of strategic modelling for the PSPs to revise state models.	Yes	No action	Awaiting response from submitter
SS79	MRSC8	The interim (southern access road) option to the Bulla Bypass is reasonable but must be conditional on the PSP amendments specifying the programming and committed funding for the Sunbury Bulla By Pass by a defined date. Without this, there is a risk in further delay in the delivery of the Sunbury Rd / Bulla By Pass Rd and an interim option becoming a long term result.	<p>The Bulla Bypass is being actively planned for. VicRoads is currently reviewing the alignment of the Bulla Bypass with the view to applying a Public Acquisition Overlay through a Planning Scheme Amendment shortly.</p> <p>The Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy (exhibited concurrently with this Amendment) has identified the delivery of the southern Jacksons Creek crossing (part of the ultimate Sunbury ring road) as being critical early infrastructure to enable access to the Calder Freeway from new development fronts in the south and east of the township. This will assist in managing congestion issues on Sunbury Road while the larger Bulla Bypass Project is in planning and delivery stages.</p>	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS79	MRSC9	Request the inclusion of an ICPO.	<p>An ICPO will be applied through a subsequent amendment. Whilst an ICP has not been exhibited in association with the PSPs, Table 10 of each PSP (Precinct Infrastructure Plan) nominates those specific projects that will be funded through a future PSP. All of these projects are proposed to be fully funded through the ICP, with several of the projects expected to include an external apportionment to neighbouring future precincts (Sunbury West and Sunbury North) that will benefit from these items.</p> <p>At this stage we expect that the ICP will be a standard rate, and will be approved at the same time as the PSPs without the need for further exhibition.</p> <p>In the event that the ICP incorporates a supplementary levy, it will be subject to full public exhibition.</p>	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS79	MRSC10	Planning of facilities adjacent the proposed northern rail station in the Lancefield Rd PSP should be amended to locate the proposed secondary school, private hospital and TAFE facility closer to this proposed rail station in order to service the needs of wider regional catchments of communities such as Riddells Creek, New Gisborne, Macedon and Woodend.	This submission relates specifically to C208	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS79	MRSC11	Development should be prohibited on slopes greater than 15%.	<p>The VPA undertook a comprehensive assessment of slope across the precincts as part of developing the urban structure in each PSP. The slope is defined on Plan 5. The PSPs have nominated all land above 20% as being undevelopable.</p> <p>Consistent with our approach in a number of another growth area PSPs, we have taken the view that land on slopes of up to 20% is able to support urban development. In recognition of some of the unique landscape characteristics of Sunbury, as well as some earlier examples of development responding poorly to slope, we have sought to provide additional control in the PSPs to ensure that development in areas of 10-20% slope is site responsive. We are currently further reviewing these controls in relation to the Racecourse Road site in Lancefield Road to determine whether a more site-responsive set of controls are appropriate.</p>	Yes	No action	Unresolved
80	AHB					
SS80	AHB1	Request that documentation supporting the Amendment 207 and 208 should refrain from prejudicing the delivery of other precincts (i.e. Sunbury West). E.g. Section 2.4 of the SICADS says the focus of development within Sunbury during this period (125,000 pop) would be in Sunbury West and Sunbury North and by doing so, implies these precincts cannot be developed any earlier. The drafted documents must be amended with any such reference to the year in which other PSP's would be delivered to be omitted.	While the role and format of the Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy has been reviewed following submissions, and indication of likely timing for future growth area precincts has been removed. The Strategy will continue to nominate potential projects in the two future growth precincts (with a note that these will need to be considered and confirmed as part of the future preparation of the PSP) and that the timing of the infrastructure within these precincts will also need to be defined in the PSP.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS80	AHB2	Advocates for the earlier development of the Sunbury West precinct.	Noted. However this outcome cannot be delivered through this amendment.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
81	Tract OBO Salim Dammous					
SS81	SD1	Supports the amendment as exhibited and requests no change in relation to Property 1 of the PSP.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
82	EPA					
SS82	EPA1	1. The mapping clarity and discrepancies be addressed, including the mention of the Prescribed Industrial Waste Management facility (Licence No. 129589, issued 26/8/2016} in the PSP.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS82	EPA2	2. Sensitive uses be excluded from the quarry and landfill buffers in order to protect such uses from the amenity impacts of the operating landfills and quarry and deter encroachment into the viability of these industrial sites.	Please refer to Part A report for the VPA's response to the EPA's submission on buffers.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS82	EPA3	3. The delineation of the proposed 1.3m odour buffer for the composting facility must be justified by odour assessment which includes both desktop modelling and odour surveillance. This is to be undertaken prior to the rezoning of the area for sensitive uses.	Agree.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Resolved
SS82	EPA4	4. Noise assessment be undertaken in relations to siting sensitive uses near the quarry, landfill and composting facility prior to the rezoning of the land for sensitive uses.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS82	EPA5	5. Clarification be provided as to what extent of the population growth associated with C207 and C208 will be accommodated by the Sunbury RWP and how the proposal responds to the required buffer for the Sunbury RWP.	Please refer to Part A report for the VPA's response to the EPA's submission on buffers.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS82	EPA6	The management of the contaminated land is generally satisfactory with the recommendation that the high risk site be identified and the use of planning requirements to implement and enforce the recommendations of the Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment.	Noted.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS82	EPA7	Landfill Buffer - Sensitive uses - EPA recommend a 53V audit to assesss the risk of harm to the proposed sensitive use posed by the potential offsite migration of landfill gas and all other amenity impacts (such as odours, noise, litter and dust) resulting from the active landfill	Agree. Clause 3.8 of the UGZ9 will be updated.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS82	EPA8	Landfill Buffer - non sensitive use and development (buildings and subfloor structures) a s53V is recommended to assess the risk of harm to the non sensitive use and development posed by the potential offsite gas migration	Agree	Yes	No action	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS82	EPA9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C207 identifies a 500m buffer distance around the active landfill.</li> <li>o EPA agrees that a 500m buffer should be applied to the landfill.</li> <li>o In defining the buffer, EPA recommends that any future expansion plans for the landfill should be taken into consideration.</li> </ul>	Noted. The VPA has been liaising with the landfill operator throughout the process, and has accounted for the future landfill cells in identifying the buffer.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS82	EPA10	o EPA therefore strongly recommends the responsible authority to exclude sensitive uses to amenity from the landfill buffer while the landfill continues to operate.	Agree. The controls will ensure that sensitive uses are not developed prematurely. Please refer to Part A report for the VPA's response to the EPA's submission on buffers.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS82	EPA11	UGZ9 - Clause 3.8 - In this instance, EPA recommends a s53V audit rather than a gas risk assessment, as this is in accordance with BPEM for an operating landfill.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS82	EPA12	o With regards to Clause 3.8 of UGZ9, EPA also recommends that the responsible authority require the applicant to submit a scope of any proposed audit to the responsible authority for review, prior to conducting an audit.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS82	EPA13	With regards to Clause 3.8 of UGZ9, EPA also recommends that the responsible authority consider how any recommendations from an audit, for example for mitigation measures, can be translated into an appropriate planning tool to ensure the works are undertaken and for the purpose of enforcement.	This will be done as part of the normal practice of the issuing of a planning permit, most likely as conditions on the planning permit.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS82	EPA14	It is recommended that residential uses interface with less amenity impacting zones or land uses than Industrial 1 and Industrial 3 zones.	The Industrial 3 Zone is designed to interface with residential areas. The PSP at R32 requires that "The location of land uses, building design, and interface treatment in the industrial and commercial areas shown on Plan 6 must minimise negative impacts on the amenity of nearby residential areas."	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS82	EPA15	The EPA seeks clarification on the following relating to the Western Water treatment plant: 1. Whether the proposed residential area associated with C207 encroaches into the above 385m buffer. EPA has measured this and it appears that there is a portion of proposed residential land encroaching into this buffer.	Please refer to Part A report for the VPA's response to the EPA's submission on buffers.	No	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS82	EPA16	2. Whether the total population growth resulting from both C207 and C208 will be serviced by the Sunbury RWP and whether this is accounted for in Works Approval No 112128 for 57,500 people.	Please refer to Part A report for the VPA's response to the EPA's submission on buffers.	No	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS82	EPA17	3. Whether the above encroachment has been resolved or proposed to be resolved through any technology or design upgrade to the RWP.	Please refer to Part A report for the VPA's response to the EPA's submission on buffers.	No	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
SS82	EPA18	4. Whether Western Water has been notified of C207 and C208.	Yes.	No	No action	Resolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS82	EPA19	Whether any future population growth from other surrounding areas (besides C207 and C208) will increase the capacity of the RWP and its buffer beyond 385m or result in the construction of other RWP; and whether these have been confirmed with Western Water in writing.	Please refer to Part A report for the VPA's response to the EPA's submission on buffers.	No	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
83	Trevor Dance					
SS83	TD1	Concerned that there was not a robust consultation process.	Exhibition was extended from the standard and legislated one month period to approximately 10 weeks, in acknowledgement of the likely level of interest in the amendment within the established Sunbury community, as well as the Christmas/New Year interruption.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS83	TD2	Existing infrastructure is at capacity - cites concern, particularly regarding water services and transport infrastructure.	Service authorities have been consulted as part of the preparation of the PSP. The VPA is satisfied that the new growth can be appropriately serviced.	No		Unresolved
SS83	TD3	There is a need for a third railway crossing, and the one planned by the VPA will not solve the traffic issue. This has implications for emergency service access.	The PSP proposes an additional railway crossing. It is unclear why the submitter does not think that this will be inadequate.	No		Unresolved
SS83	TD4	The PSPs show no solid new emergency service facilities or medical services.	This is outside the scope of what can be delivered through a Precinct Structure Plan. The Lancefield Road PSP does nominate land that can be used for a future hospital or TAFE, however cannot mandate the development of such a facility.	Yes		Unresolved
SS83	TD5	Bulla Bypass is required and is not scheduled for in these plans.	The Bulla Bypass is being actively planned for. VicRoads is currently reviewing the alignment of the Bulla Bypass with the view to applying a Public Acquisition Overlay through a Planning Scheme Amendment shortly.  The Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy (exhibited concurrently with this Amendment) has identified the delivery of the southern Jacksons Creek crossing (part of the ultimate Sunbury ring road) as being critical early infrastructure to enable access to the Calder Freeway from new development fronts in the south and east of the township. This will assist in managing congestion issues on Sunbury Road while the larger Bulla Bypass Project is in planning and delivery stages.	Yes		Unresolved
SS83	TD6	Concerned about car parking in the Sunbury town centre / railway station.	Existing issues in the town centre, including access and car parking provision, are best dealt with as part of a project with a more specific focus on the town centre itself, which would likely be managed by Hume City Council.	No		Unresolved
SS83	TD7	Hume Council has failed to deliver the 3rd Railway Crossing, despite having funding, and the new access point to Jacksons Hill Estate.	This is a matter for Hume City Council and cannot be addressed through this amendment.	No		Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS83	TD8	Concerned about the environmental / landscape impacts of recent developments in Sunbury (i.e. Holden Hill and 275 Racecourse Road) and that the PSPs will allow for more of the same.	The PSPs contain a large number of controls above and beyond those that are contained within the Hume Planning Scheme for other areas of land. The PSPs contain controls regarding matters such as development on slope which seek to produce high quality developmetn outcomes.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS83	TD9	Concerned about the lack of protection for endangered flora species and the health of the creek corridors. Also concerned that the BCS does not provide adequate protection of species.	The Biodiversity Conservation Strategy ensures the conservation of nationally endangered species, which will result in the conservation of other non-threatened native species. The quality of habitat to be preserved and created for the threatened species will also accommodate non-threatened species. A properly conserved environment will benefit all species.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS83	TD10	Submits that Sunbury is unique, and not like other main PSP sites.	The PSPs include the vision to facilitate a natural extension of the established Sunbury Township, preserving and reinforcing the township and heritage character of the settlement. The PSPs for Sunbury have been heavily tailored to respond to the unique landscape features and township character. The PSPs seek to achieve a lower density overall than is the norm for Melbourne's growth areas.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS83	TD11	Requests all traffic studies done for Elizabeth Drive, Racecourse Road, Lancefield Road and Riddell Road (from Council).	This is a matter for Hume City Council.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS83	TD13	Concerned about the visual impact caused by housing density.	The PSPs include the vision to facilitate a natural extension of the established Sunbury Township, preserving and reinforcing the township and heritage character of the settlement. The PSPs for Sunbury have been heavily tailored to respond to the unique landscape features and township character. The PSPs seek to achieve a lower density overall than is the norm for Melbourne's growth areas.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS83	TD14	Concerned about increased bushfire risk.	Mat	No	Further review/discussion required	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS83	TD15	Concerned about erosion risk.	As the Regional Floodplain Management and Drainage Authority, Melbourne Water implements 'Development Services Schemes' to manage the impact of urban development on waterways and receiving water quality. The Development Services Scheme (DSS) provide a masterplan for the future drainage of the catchment(s) and treatment to best practice. The DSS was informed by a number of waterway geomorphic, hydrological and hydraulic background studies, including an assessment of erosion potential. These studies informed the location of treatment wetlands in addition to bypass pipes to ensure the waterways will be protected from increased flows resulting from increased impervious area of urban development. These background studies have been made available to the submitter.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS83	TD16	Concerned that Melbourne Water flood mapping is not up to date.	Melbourne Water is satisfied that we have met our requirements as the Regional Floodplain Management and Drainage Authority. Flood mapping has been undertaken in accordance with industry standards.	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS83	TD17	No environmental impact study report has been provided (as requested).	The Biodiversity Conservation Strategy ensures the conservation of nationally endangered species, which will result in the conservation of other non-threatened native species. The quality of habitat to be preserved and created for the threatened species will also accommodate non-threatened species. Therefore, there is no need to duplicate studies, as it is clear that a properly conserved environment will benefit all species.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS83	TD18	Requests forward thinking plans, such as: - interactive platypus and wildlife tourist centre with viewing platforms - A cultural centre - Aboriginal and European history - The Ashes centre - The Jacksons Hill Centre - Landcare Fauna and Flora Centre	Opportunities for these uses will exist both within the Sunbury South PSP and in the general Sunbury region. It would not be appropriate to earmark sites for such specific uses in a high level master plan such as a PSP.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
84	Echelon OBO Kolceg Family - 35 Buckland Way					
SS84	KF1	Have proposed an alternative configuration of the Harpers Creek town centre, school, community facility and active open space.	DET are not supportive of moving this school site due to land fragmentation issues and the presence of the gas pipeline measurement length. The VPA also has concerns about the landform in this area, and does not consider it appropriate to shift the town centre further north, particularly as the intersection of Buckland Way / Connector boulevard will be in cut which will lead to undesirable outcomes for a future town centre. The school site will be adjusted to be only on two land parcels (27 and 28).	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS84	KF2	Request that if drainage infrastructure is necessary on the subject site that it be piped instead.	As the caretaker of waterway health, Melbourne Water has an obligation to ensure that appropriate provisions are made to ensure waterway resilience and function is maintained in the face of environmental pressures such as urban development. The unique Sunbury landscape includes numerous tributaries of high geomorphic significance, and rarity across the broader Port Philip and Western Port region. The tributaries to the immediate upstream and downstream of the reach which passes through the submitters property have been assessed as have either extreme or high geomorphic values and of importance to protect. In order to maintain a natural channel form and longitudinal connection for the greater tributary Melbourne Water has identified this whole tributary as being protected and as such does not support the piping of this waterway on this property.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS84	KF3	Should the waterway be piped as per submission, we request that the walkable catchment boundary also be amended to reflect the catchment shown on Plan 6 – Employment and Town Centres, which would recognise that the entire site is within 400 metres of the Town Centre.	See above. Melbourne Water does not support piping this waterway.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS84	KF4	We seek confirmation from the VPA that medium/high density development will not be restricted by any gas easement buffer.	APA is comfortable with the minimum average density of 17 dwellings per NDH, but observes that given the location of the railway station and surrounding amenities there may be pressure for higher densities to be considered. Depending on that increased density it may trigger the need for further consideration of the risk profile of the pipeline. The VPA is in the process of undertaking a Safety Management Study for the pipeline that will further investigate these matters.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS84	KF5	Request that the local roads be deleted from the Concept Plan.	Providing some indication of the local road network response to site constraints is a key reason concept plans for specific residential areas are included within the PSP. VPA propose to retain the local street network, with qualifications on the concept plan itself that clearly indicate that the local street network is indicative only, and variations that are consistent with the objectives of the PSP and the concept plan will be considered at the time of subdivision	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS84	KF6	Should local roads be retained on the Concept Plan, a more efficient layout would be to provide access from the north. Furthermore, as per submission point 2, we request that the proposed waterway be piped, which will remove the need to construct an additional culvert. This reconfigured access layout should be adopted whether or not our first submission point relating to the future urban structure is adopted.	This will be considered in the revised concept plan.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS84	KF7	Seek confirmation from the VPA that the construction of the Buckland Way Link including the connector road bridge will be undertaken by Hume Council and Places Victoria and that the owners of 35 Buckland Way will only need to provide the land for the road as per the road widening public acquisition overlay that has been in place for some time, subject to the normal acquisition process, and that they will not be required to construct the bridge.	This is a matter for Hume City Council and Places Victoria, and it is not appropriate for the VPA to provide comment.	No	No action	Unresolved
SS84	KF8	If our assumptions above are not correct, the wording of R69 is of concern. The construction of the connector street bridge should be linked to traffic volumes rather than what sequence developers seek approvals. We seek clarification from the VPA as to how R69 would be applied to 35 Buckland Way.	This requirement is intended to apply to non-ICP items, and therefore will not apply in this instance to the property at 35 Buckland Way. The requirement will be redrafted to reflect this. The requirement will be further modified such that Council may consider deferral of a non-ICP funded road over a waterway provided the provision of such bridge in the future at the developers costs is appropriately protected, to Council's satisfaction	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS84	KF9	Given the UGZ -9 refers specifically to Plan 5 'Interface with the Railway' and 'Interface with the transmission gas pipeline' we request that the 'Railway Noise amenity buffer' be removed from Plan 10 to avoid confusion and ensure consistency.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS84	KF10	Seek confirmation that the railway noise amenity buffer will not restrict the construction of medium/high density residential developments within 100 metres of the railway corridor.	It is not the intent of the buffer to restrict the density of housing, rather to ensure that any dwellings that are constructed include appropriate noise attenuation, if required.	Yes	No action	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS84	KF11	Request that the connector roads and associated bridges and intersections be shown as short term priorities as they provide immediate access to the precinct, and that the local sports reserve be shown as a medium term priority, noting that the catchment for this is some 3000 dwellings.	These ICP projects will be defined as S-M term priorities, however most are required only to support the development of this part of the precinct, rather than providing a broader network benefit.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
SS84	KF12	Request that the interim Jacksons Hill road link be deleted and that the ultimate alignment be constructed as a short term priority.	The interim Jacksons Hill road link is not to be funded by the ICP, and will be delivered by others. It is being delivered in response to needs outside the precinct. The ultimate alignment is a more expensive project, and it is not considered feasible to deliver this in the short term	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS84	KF13	The Land Budget in Appendix 4.3 of the PSP includes a site area of 8.99 hectares, however the sum of the separate land uses equates to 9.22 hectares. We seek confirmation in relation to the specific areas for each land use.	The land budget for Property 22 equates to 8.98 hectares (with the discrepancy likely due to rounding). The 0.24 hectares for RD-05 is included in two columns, as one of these is a 'total' colum for road projects, and this would explain the discrepancy.	Yes	No action	Resolved
85	Echelon OBO Ive, Danica, Nikola and Ljubica Kolceg -60 Buckland Way					
SS85	IDNJK1	Seek clarification in relation to the methodology for determining the landscape values boundary on the site. Submit that the boundary on the subject site be assessed in further detail and be removed (and the shared path locations amended as necessary). Note that Objective O12 refers to protecting the natural values of Jacksons and Emu Creeks, but does not refer to Harpers Creek.	The regionally significant landscape values in this location have been reviewed. Areas remaining have been classified as 'Land not serviced by Development Services Scheme'. The onus will be on any applicant at the subdivision stage to demonstrate that there is a solution that would allow these areas to be developed and drained, to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and Council.  O12 is being updated to refer to the tributaries of Jacksons and Emu Creeks, which includes Harpers Creek.	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS85	IDNJK3	Landscape Values should be credited as a form of open space in the land budget.	Refer response to IDNJK1. The land is not considered to be open space.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS85	IDNJK4	Request confirmation in relation to who will be managing this open space (Regionally significant landscape values land).	As above.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS85	IDNJK5	Request that the size and location of the retarding basin on the subject site be reviewed.	Melbourne Water has made modifications to the location of this asset in the preliminary DSS which has been released. Melbourne Water advises the submitter to review the latest release of the DSS plan.	Yes	No action	Awaiting response from submitter
SS85	IDNJK6	Harpers Creek Concept Plan - Request this plan is deleted.	Disagree. This area of the precinct contains challenging topographical features and land fragmentation. It is considered that a concept plan will assist with the orderly development of the area.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS85	IDNJK7	If the plan is not to be deleted, we submit that the indicative road layout be removed from the plan. Rather than specify the internal road layout, a few key access points could be shown to provide greater flexibility, noting that this has already been shown on Plan 9.	Providing some indication of the local road network response to site constraints is a key reason concept plans for specific residential areas are included within the PSP. VPA propose to retain the local street network, with qualifications on the concept plan itself that clearly indicate that the local street network is indicative only, and variations that are consistent with the objectives of the PSP and the concept plan will be considered at the time of subdivision	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS85	IDNJK8	If the plan is to be retained, we request that the wording of Clause 3.4 be amended to require that the subdivision applications must 'respond to' the principles of the concept plan rather than be 'consistent with' to allow Council greater discretion in assessing whether a proposed subdivision layout is appropriate.	Disagree. The clause provides sufficient flexibility through the inclusion of the phrase "unless if, in the opinion of the responsible authority, the permit implements the objectives for the area as set out within the Sunbury South Precinct Structure Plan". Further qualifications (as outlined above) will reinforce this discretion	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS85	IDNJK9	Request that Requirement R99 be deleted.	This Requirement is required to protect the existing residents of Jacksons Hill from an inappropriate increase in traffic, including construction traffic. Do not agree to delete.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS85	IDNJK10	R69 - The construction of the connector street bridge should be linked to traffic volumes rather than what sequence developers seek approvals. The timing of the construction of bridges therefore needs to be considered on a site-by-site basis as it is in other PSPs, and we seek clarification from the VPA as to how R69 would be applied to 35 Buckland Way.	This requirement is intended to apply to non-ICP items, and therefore will not apply in this instance to the property at 35 Buckland Way. The requirement will be redrafted to reflect this. The requirement will be further modified such that Council may consider deferral of a non-ICP funded road over a waterway provided the provision of such bridge in the future at the developers costs is appropriately protected, to Council's satisfaction	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS85	IDNJK11	Amend Guideline 17 to replace the word 'encourage' with 'suitable' in relation to lot sizes on slope.	Disagree. Larger lot sizes are encouraged in these areas.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS85	IDNJK12	Should a minimum lot size be considered for introduction through the amendment process, suggest that 800sqm would be a useful benchmark. However, as preference is that no specific lot dimension be imposed and that this should be assessed on a site-specific basis.	At this stage, there is no intention of inserting a minimum lot size into the Precinct Structure Plan.	Yes	No action	Resolved
SS85	IDNJK13	Seek clarification that G18 only applies to front and rear setbacks, as would be too onerous if applied to side setbacks as well.	Guideline under revision. Will likely be deleted, or amended in accordance with request.	No	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
SS85	IDNJK14	Request that the connector roads and associated bridges and intersections be shown as short term priorities. We also request that the interim Jacksons Hill road link be deleted and that the ultimate alignment be constructed as a short term priority.	These ICP projects will be defined at S-M term priorities, however most are required only to support the development of this part of the precinct, rather than providing a broader network benefit. The interim Jacksons Hill road link is not to be funded by the ICP, and will be delivered by others. It is being delivered in response to needs outside the precinct. The ultimate alignment is a more expensive project, and it is not considered feasible to deliver this in the short term.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS85	IDNJK15	We seek confirmation in relation to the specific areas for each land use. We note that the title for the site specifies the area of the site is 19.59 hectares.	The land budget for Property 26 equates to 19.48 hectares. The 0.36 hectares for RD-04 is included in two columns, as one of these is a 'total' column for road projects, and this would explain the discrepancy. In relation to the discrepancy with the Title, the VPA will look into this when undertaking the revised land budget, and update accordingly.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
86	Tomkinson Group OBO the Polidoro Family (700 Sunbury Road)					
SS86	PF1	Generally supportive of overall intent of Amendment C207 and proposal to rezone their land for residential use.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS86	PF2	Interested in commenting on the provisions specific to their site, and how the amendment facilitates, or not, development of individual sites, as opposed to consolidated larger holdings.	There is not enough information provided within the submission for the VPA to provide a meaningful response. The submitter has subsequently advised that this submission has been superseded (but not formally withdrawn).	No	No action	Resolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS86	PF3	The amendment does not adequately guide individual title landowners for cost efficient and sustainable outcomes.	As per response to PF2 above.	No	No action	Resolved
87	Parks Victoria					
SS87	PV1	The PSP needs to clearly identify the 90.7 ha Holden Flora Reserve, being the entirety of Property 47 and Property 49.	Agree. The PSP will be updated.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS87	PV2	Suggest including Holden Flora Reserve as a separate 90.7 hectare line item under Regional Open Space in Table 1 Summary Land Use Budget to accurately represent land use changes and alter the zoning of different components of the reserve.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS87	PV3	This would subsequently reduce the "Uncredited Open Space" line in Table 1 (details provided).	Noted.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS87	PV4	Approximately 1.61 ha within the reserve was not identified under the land use table, included 0.62 incorrecctly categorised as NDA and 1 hectare (sic). This should be included in the Regional Open Space section within the Holden Flora Reserve.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS87	PV5	Approximately one hectare of land (property 47) should have been categorised as a proposed excision for the ICP RD-04 Non-arterial road. This should be updated in the land budget (and summary land budget under Transport).	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS87	PV6	Plan 8 map should be amended to remove suggestion of native vegetation removal in Holden Flora Reserve on Properties 47 and 49 and any native vegetation removal land use budget calculation for DELWP amended accordingly.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS87	PV7	The shared path trail (east-west) should run on the boundary outside Holden Flora Reserve. Figure 9 and Plan 10 need to be updated.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS87	PV8	The legal points of discharge from the 4 RBs will be critically important. Stormwater and overflow discharge to Jacksons Creek will significantly impact on the reserve.	Melbourne Water acknowledges the important environmental values of the Holden Flora Reserve, the GGF Corridor Conservation Area and the broader waterway and tributaries of Jackson’s Creek. The challenging topography of the Sunbury area is a significant influence in the design of the Development Services Scheme for the area, with Melbourne Water still progressing concept options for the most suitable locations of pipe outfalls down the escarpments and into the receiving waterways. The current concept design are subject to functional and detailed design and Melbourne Water will work with the relevant authorities to determine the most appropriate outfall locations and ultimately to minimise disturbance.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS87	PV9	Plan 12 - The proposed sewer rising main shown going through the Nature Conservation Reserve (PR DN 250mm (2018-2023) requires initial discussion to determine whether the sewer rising main alignment can follow the boundary of the reserve and mitigate impacts.	This has been relayed to Western Water. A note will be added to Plan 12 to indicate discussions with Parks Victoria around the alignment of utilities through Holden Flora Reserve will be required at detailed design.	Yes	Further review/discussion required - WW	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS87	PV10	Figure 9 & 10 – Conservation Area 21 - Some “proposed shared path” alignments have been considered in the 2011 Maribyrnong River (Jacksons Creek) trail option assessment but not endorsed due to the high cultural heritage and conservation values. Previous studies identified that more considered design would be required. Parks Victoria suggest that these be relabelled “potential shared path” and that Holden Flora reserve boundary should be clearly marked.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS87	PV11	Crown Land excision from Holden Flora Reserve - Excision of Crown Land from Nature Conservation Reserves for proposed roads is a complicated process that will need to be assessed and progressed through the Department (DELWP). Parks Victoria will assist DELWP with advice about the values requiring protection in the Holden Flora Reserve and avoiding or mitigating impacts from infrastructure in the conservation reserve. DELWP have also advised that Native title has not been extinguished in this vicinity.	Noted. DELWP has subsequently advised the VPA that Native Title has been extinguished in the land affected by the proposed creek crossing.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
88	TW Consulting OBO Charles Lloyd					
SS88	CL1	700 Sunbury Road should provide for a local convenience centre to accommodate a range of non-residential land uses, including service station, take away / fast food, supermarket with specialty shops, restricted retail / bulky goods and medium to high density residential abutting non-residential land uses.	The VPA undertook discussions with the submitter about the range of uses proposed, and any economic justification/concept design for the site. To date the VPA has not been provided with either, although it is understood that these will be provided as evidence to Panel in support of the submission. The VPA has therefore not been able to consider the submission further	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
SS88	CL2	Premium lots should be delivered to the north of the site.	The exhibited PSP makes provision for residential uses across the site.	Yes	Further review/discussion	Resolved
SS88	CL3	Seeks a non-residential zoning for a portion of the site.	See CL1	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
89	Human Habitats OBO Oreana Project Management					
SS89	OP1	Submission relates to Harpers Creek Local Town Centre and 45 Buckland Way.	N/A	No	No action	Resolved
SS89	OP2	Shift Alignment of the Waterway to more closely resemble the western natural channel.	Melbourne Water's updated drainage scheme has involved a realignment of the waterway corridor on the subject property generally as requested. Please review the latest preliminary Development Services Scheme which was sent to all landowners.	Yes	No action	Awaiting response from submitter
SS89	OP3	The FUS should be changed to allow for medium density adjacent the town centre.	The FUS, as exhibited, allows for medium density development.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS89	OP4	The LTC concept plan (provided in submission) should be adopted. This demonstrates how separate developers can deliver a mixed use interface efficiently.	The VPA has been in ongoing discussions with the submitter. A number of the changes proposed in the submission are supported, and are proposed to be incorporated into an update on the plan	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS89	OP5	The FUS should demonstrate retail use components.	Disagree. This level of detail is not to be included on the FUS.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS89	OP6	Buckland Way should be shown in a final FUS or Concept Plan for certainty of development.	That section of Buckland Way that is proposed to be upgraded as a connector road is identified in the exhibited PSP. The northern section of Buckland Way is not proposed to form part of the connector road network, and it's upgrade as part of a local road network would be subject to detailed subdivision design	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS89	OP7	The school and the community centre parcels should be shown to be practical development/ subdivision parcels, rather than creating awkward subdivision issues across titles.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS89	OP8	The LTC area should be extended as it would otherwise become an awkward development parcel, as the FUS does not give regard to the future extension and connection of Buckland Way to the connector street/bridge.	Agree. Future Urban Structure will be updated to reflect the revised configuration of the town centre reflected in the submission	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
SS89	OP9	The extra open space area shown should be placed in an area that is more usual and creates amenity where there is currently none (potentially located in conjunction with the medium density parcel).	This land was not local open space, it was largely undevelopable on the basis of the proximity of the water quality asset to the waterway. This has been superceded by the updated drainage scheme, and this land will now be idetnified as residential.	Yes	No action	Decision pending further review
SS89	OP10	Seek clarification on the PSP road networks which do not take account of the existing PAO.	The existing PAO is to provide for a connection from Buckalnd Way to Yirrangan Way to provide local access from Jacksons Hill to Watsons Road. Given topographical constraints, this alignment is unable to be used in the ultimate for an effective connection with the Southern Link boulevard connector. It may be able to be used as part of a local road network, subject to detailed subdivision design	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
90	Ailsa Jones					
SS90	AJ1	The walking path from the town centre to the Redstone Hill Park is shown on land that will be too steep for much of the community to climb. Suggests moving the track to where the incline is not as steep.	Agree. Indicative off road shared path network will be shown around the base of Redstone Hill, adjacent to the developable area	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Resolved
91	Department of Education and Training					
SS91	DET1	Considers the provision of three government primary schools and one government secondary school in the Sunbury South PSP and two government primary schools and one government secondary school in the Lancefiled Road PSP will meet future demand for government school education within that network.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS91	DET2	The Department notes that the P12 Government school site nominated in the Sunbury South PSP near the MTC should be a secondary school rather than a P-12 school.	This has been discussed further with DET since this submission was received. DET has advised that it is their preference that this school is a P-12 Government School.	No	Change the amendment	Resolved
SS91	DET3	The above analysis presumes that there will be an opportunity to locate a proposed government secondary school on Jacksons Hill.	Noted	No	No action	Resolved
SS91	DET4	The Department generally supports the proposed distribution of school sites across the two Precinct Structure Plan areas, subject to ongoing specific siting discussions between the Victorian Planning Authority and the Department of Education and Training that gives consideration to the submissions from other parties and more detailed planning considerations.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
SS91	DET5	It is a Department objective to minimise the impact of busy roads on future school sites and to improve the amenity and safety of schools, and that the Department does not support locating schools on arterial roads.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
92	Leigh Johnson					
SS92	LJ1	Submission does not make any direct references to the Sunbury South PSP or Amendment C208, other than in title.	N/A	No	No action	Resolved
93	S and M Bardaris Investments (represented by Urbis)					

Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS93	SMBI1	Overall supportive of the amenmdment, particularly the retention of the UGZ, the identification of 30 Lancefield Road for residential purposes and the nomination of part of the site for service open space / retarding basin.	Noted	No	No action	Resolved
SS93	SMBI2	Would like to see the RCZ land at 30 Lancefield Road reduced, with the UGZ used for land that could be developed, noting that servicing and engineering solutions may need to be explored.	The regionally significant landscape values in this location have been reviewed. Areas remaining that are considered may have development potential have been classified as 'Land not serviced by Development Services Scheme'. This land will be zoned UGZ9 with the applied General Residential Zone. The onus will be on any applicant at the subdivision stage to demonstrate that there is a solution that would allow these areas to be developed and drained, to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and Council.	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
SS93	SMBI3	It is submitted that the extent of land nominated for regionally significant landscape values is excessive, and prevents appropriate residential development of the land. Whilst the land does experience slope, there is an opportunity to provide low-density housing within the land designated for “significant landscape values” that will not impact on the amenity of the area.	As above. It is proposed to make provision for part of the land exhibited as regionally significant landscape values to be developed, subject to an appropriate locally responsive drainage solution.	Yes	No action	Awaiting response from submitter
SS93	SMBI4	Would like the Gellies Road concept plan updated to reflect the opportunity to provide low-density housing on the sloped land.	A new development objective will be added to the concept plan, to identify the opportunity for lower density residential outcomes within the concept plan area, particularly for those developable sites below the upper break of slope.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
SS93	SMBI5	note that the setback between the break of slope and development front, as shown on the concept plan, well exceeds the 40m setback as identified at Appendix 4.2 (Regionally Significant Landscape – Escarpment Top – Visually Sensitive).	Noted. The concept plan will be updated.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
94	Sunbury West Owners Group (Oliver Hume)					
SS94	SWOG1	The sequencing of development that could be facilitated by the four PSP's within Sunbury is incorrect and has not considered the ease at which other PSP's, namely Sunbury West, could be realised. We request that documentation supporting the Amendment 207 and 208 should refrain from prejudicing the delivery of other precincts. E.g. SICADS - Section 2.4 - Ultimate Build-out Sunbury at 125,000 (35+years)" says the focus of development within Sunbury during this period would be in Sunbury West and Sunbury North and by doing so, implies these precincts cannot be developed any earlier. It is inappropriate for the Sunbury South and Lancefield Road PSP's to make any reference to the timing of other nearby PSP's and by doing so prejudice the delivery of these precincts. The drafted documents must be amended with any such reference to the year in which other PSP's would be delivered to be omitted.	While the role and format of the Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy has been reviewed following submissions, and indication of likely timing for future growth area precincts has been removed. The Strategy will continue to nominate potential projects in the two future growth precincts (with a note that these will need to be considered and confirmed as part of the future preparation of the PSP) and that the timing of the infrastructure within these precincts will also need to be defined in the PSP.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
95	Veolia					



Sub #	Item		VPA comment	Changes to the Amendment	Action	Status
SS95	V1	Veolia requests that the VPA acknowledge that an organisation that could offer robust practical advice on the Sunbury South composting facility buffers - should be the composting facility (i.e. Veolia).	It is acknowledged that the green waste facility operator is an important stakeholder in the discussions regarding composting buffers. A number of other stakeholders also have important input on this matter, including the Environment Protection Authority.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS95	V2	Veolia requests that the VPA grants Veolia time to prepare a formal response to the High Quality/ GHD submission and allows that submission to be heard as part of the Public Hearing.	Agreed. The VPA has accepted Veolia's late submission to the Amendment and note that PPV has also agreed to accept their request to be heard form for the Panel hearing.	No		Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
SS95	V3	Veolia requests that the VPA consider evidence in regards to what a valid odour sampling and assessment program could look like that would satisfy the Victorian EPA in regards to alternate buffer distances that protect sensitive receptors in line with EPA Publication 1588 Designing, Constructing and Operating Compost Facilities.	Agree.	No		Unresolved